27th Legislative Day 3/27/2003

нв0059	First Reading	107
HB0062	First Reading	5
HB0092	First Reading	107
НВ0115	First Reading	107
HB0117	First Reading	108
HB0183	First Reading	5
HB0300	First Reading	108
НВ0318	First Reading	108
нв0337	First Reading	5
нв0353	First Reading	108
НВ0413	First Reading	5
HB0414	First Reading	5
HB0527	First Reading	5
HB1161	First Reading	108
HB1189	First Reading	5
нв1195	First Reading	108
HB1250	First Reading	108
HB1447	First Reading	5
HB1486	First Reading	108
HB1491	First Reading	5
нв1535	First Reading	108
нв1536	First Reading	5
нв1586	First Reading	5
нв1630	First Reading	5
HB1632	First Reading	5
HB2205	First Reading	108
HB2291	First Reading	5
HB2299	First Reading	108
нв2332	First Reading	108
HB2345	First Reading	5
HB2413	First Reading	5
HB2441	First Reading	6
нв2453	First Reading	6
HB2515	First Reading	108
нв2523	First Reading	108
HB2537	First Reading	6
HB2543	First Reading	108
HB2626	Second Reading	105
HB2634	First Reading	103
HB2653	First Reading	108
нв2660	Second Reading	105
HB2835	First Reading	6
HB2855	First Reading	6
HB2864	First Reading	6
HB2954		6
	First Reading	
HB2955	First Reading	108
HB2972	First Reading	108
HB2980	First Reading	109
HB3001	First Reading	109
HB3049	First Reading	109
HB3063	First Reading	109
HB3066	First Reading	109
HB3071	First Reading	109
HB3072	First Reading	109
HB3405	First Reading	109
HB3411	First Reading	109
нв3480	First Reading	109

27th Legislative Day		3/27/2003
нв3489	First Reading	109
нв3501	First Reading	109
нв3508	First Reading	109
нв3522	First Reading	109
НВ3526	First Reading	109
НВ3528	First Reading	109
SB0010	Second Reading	61
SB0013	Second Reading	68
SB0020	Discussed	50
SB0020	Third Reading	37
SB0022 SB0022	Other Other	4 2
SB0022 SB0030	Second Reading	69
SB0030	Third Reading	37
SB0031	Third Reading	37
SB0036	Third Reading	37
SB0037	Third Reading	37
SB0067	Second Reading	70
SB0099	Second Reading	75
SB0101	Second Reading	75
SB0102	Second Reading	76
SB0109	Second Reading	76
SB0158	Second Reading	76
SB0224	Second Reading	76
SB0248	Second Reading	77
SB0263 SB0309	Second Reading Second Reading	77 77
SB0309	Second Reading	78
SB0374	Second Reading	78
SB0481	Second Reading	78
SB0517	Second Reading	78
SB0518	Second Reading	78
SB0521	Second Reading	79
SB0552	Second Reading	79
SB0566	Second Reading	80
SB0567 SB0591	Second Reading Second Reading	80 80
SB0591	Second Reading	81
SB0594 SB0599	Second Reading	81
SB0605	Second Reading	81
SB0615	Second Reading	81
SB0623	Second Reading	84
SB0624	Second Reading	84
SB0629	Out Of Record	94
SB0629	Second Reading	85
SB0655	Second Reading	94
SB0656	Second Reading	94
SB0657	Second Reading	95 95
SB0658 SB0659	Second Reading Second Reading	95 95
SB0660	Second Reading Second Reading	95
SB0661	Second Reading	95
SB0662	Second Reading	96
SB0663	Second Reading	96
SB0664	Second Reading	96
SB0665	Second Reading	96
SB0666	Second Reading	96
SB0667	Second Reading	96

27th Legislative Day

27th hegistative day	-	5/21/2003
SB0668	Second Reading	97
SB0669	Second Reading	97
SB0670	Second Reading	97
SB0671	Second Reading	97
SB0672	Second Reading	97
SB0673	Second Reading	97
SB0674	Second Reading	98
SB0675	Second Reading	98
SB0676	Second Reading	98
SB0677	Second Reading	98 98
SB0678 SB0680	Second Reading Second Reading	99
SB0682	Second Reading	99
SB0701	Third Reading	37
SB0702	Third Reading  Third Reading	37
SB0706	Third Reading	37
SB0709	Third Reading	37
SB0710	Third Reading	38
SB0711	Third Reading	38
SB0712	Third Reading	38
SB0713	Third Reading	38
SB0719	Third Reading	38
SB0723	Third Reading	38
SB0724	Third Reading	38
SB0726	Third Reading	38
SB0728	Third Reading	38
SB0729	Third Reading	38
SB0735	Third Reading	38
SB0738	Third Reading	38
SB0739	Third Reading	38
SB0740	Third Reading	38
SB0742	Third Reading	38
SB0744	Third Reading	38
SB0746 SB0748	Third Reading Third Reading	38 38
SB0750	Third Reading Third Reading	38
SB0751	Third Reading Third Reading	39
SB0755	Third Reading	39
SB0759	Third Reading	39
SB0763	Third Reading	39
SB0764	Third Reading	39
SB0769	Third Reading	39
SB0771	Third Reading	39
SB0773	Third Reading	39
SB0774	Third Reading	39
SB0776	Third Reading	39
SB0777	Third Reading	39
SB0778	Third Reading	39
SB0783	Third Reading	39
SB0785	Third Reading	39
SB0787	Third Reading	39
SB0788	Third Reading	39
SB0792	Third Reading	39
SB0794	Third Reading	39
SB0796	Third Reading	39
SB0797	Third Reading	39
SB0798	Third Reading	40
SB0800	Third Reading	40

27th Legislative Day		3/27/2003
SB0802	Third Reading	40
SB0812	Second Reading	99
SB0821	Third Reading	40
SB0823	Third Reading	40
SB0825	Third Reading	40
SB0827	Third Reading	40
SB0829	Third Reading	40
SB0831	Third Reading	40
SB0833	Third Reading	40
SB0841	Third Reading	40
SB0842	Third Reading	40
SB0843 SB0844	Third Reading Third Reading	40 40
SB0852	Third Reading Third Reading	40
SB0857	Third Reading	40
SB0858	Third Reading	40
SB0861	Third Reading	40
SB0862	Third Reading	40
SB0864	Third Reading	41
SB0865	Third Reading	41
SB0867	Third Reading	41
SB0869	Third Reading	41
SB0871	Third Reading	41
SB0874 SB0891	Third Reading Second Reading	41 99
SB0891 SB0892	Second Reading	100
SB0915	Second Reading	101
SB0916	Third Reading	41
SB0918	Third Reading	41
SB0919	Third Reading	41
SB0920	Third Reading	41
SB0922	Third Reading	41
SB0924	Third Reading	41
SB0926 SB0928	Third Reading Third Reading	41 41
SB0928 SB0929	Third Reading Third Reading	41
SB0930	Third Reading	41
SB0931	Third Reading	41
SB0932	Third Reading	41
SB0933	Third Reading	41
SB0934	Third Reading	41
SB0936	Third Reading	42
SB0938	Third Reading	42
SB0943 SB0945	Third Reading Third Reading	42 42
SB0946	Third Reading	42
SB0947	Third Reading  Third Reading	42
SB0955	Third Reading	42
SB0956	Third Reading	42
SB0958	Third Reading	42
SB0963	Third Reading	42
SB0969	Third Reading	42
SB0976	Third Reading	42
SB0978	Third Reading	42
SB0980 SB0984	Third Reading	42 42
SB0989	Third Reading Third Reading	42
SB0909 SB0992	Third Reading Third Reading	42

27th Legislative Day		3/27/2003
~~ 0.0 0.4		4.0
SB0994	Third Reading	42
SB1000 SB1005	Third Reading	42
SB1005 SB1013	Third Reading Third Reading	43 43
SB1013 SB1014	Third Reading Third Reading	43
SB1014 SB1021	Third Reading	43
SB1021 SB1045	Second Reading	101
SB1049	Second Reading	102
SB1215	Third Reading	43
SB1216	Third Reading	43
SB1218	Third Reading	43
SB1219	Third Reading	43
SB1221	Third Reading	43
SB1223	Third Reading	43
SB1225	Third Reading	43
SB1227	Third Reading	43
SB1231	Third Reading	43
SB1233	Third Reading	43
SB1235	Third Reading	43
SB1237	Third Reading	43
SB1239	Third Reading	43
SB1241	Third Reading	43
SB1243 SB1245	Third Reading Third Reading	43 43
SB1245 SB1247	Third Reading Third Reading	44
SB1247 SB1248	Third Reading Third Reading	44
SB1249	Third Reading	44
SB1251	Third Reading	44
SB1253	Third Reading	44
SB1255	Third Reading	44
SB1258	Third Reading	44
SB1262	Third Reading	44
SB1264	Third Reading	44
SB1266	Third Reading	44
SB1268	Third Reading	44
SB1271	Third Reading	44
SB1273	Third Reading	44
SB1276	Third Reading	44
SB1278	Third Reading	44
SB1282 SB1283	Third Reading Third Reading	44 44
SB1285	Third Reading Third Reading	44
SB1287	Third Reading Third Reading	44
SB1289	Third Reading	45
SB1291	Third Reading	45
SB1292	Third Reading	45
SB1293	Third Reading	45
SB1296	Third Reading	45
SB1298	Third Reading	45
SB1301	Third Reading	45
SB1303	Third Reading	45
SB1305	Third Reading	45
SB1307	Third Reading	45
SB1309	Third Reading	45
SB1311	Third Reading	45
SB1314	Third Reading	45
SB1316	Third Reading	45
SB1318	Third Reading	45

27th Legislative Day	У	3/27/2003
SB1319	Third Reading	45
SB1553	Third Reading	45
SB1557	Third Reading	45
SB1559	Third Reading	45
SB1560	Third Reading	45
SB1567	Third Reading	46
SB1598	Third Reading	46
SB1599	Third Reading	46
SB1604	Third Reading	46
SB1605	Third Reading	46
SB1606 SB1607	Third Reading Third Reading	46 46
SB1610	Third Reading Third Reading	46
SB1610	Third Reading	46
SB1620	Third Reading	46
SB1621	Third Reading	46
SB1626	Third Reading	46
SB1631	Third Reading	46
SB1634	Third Reading	46
SB1638	Third Reading	46
SB1641	Third Reading	46
SB1645	Third Reading	46
SB1650	Third Reading	46
SB1656	Third Reading	46
SB1657	Third Reading	47
SB1666	Third Reading	47 47
SB1668 SB1676	Third Reading Third Reading	47
SB1680	Third Reading Third Reading	47
SB1684	Third Reading	47
SB1689	Third Reading	47
SB1691	Third Reading	47
SB1699	Third Reading	47
SB1701	Third Reading	47
SB1704	Third Reading	47
SB1705	Third Reading	47
SB1725	Third Reading	47
SB1733	Third Reading	47
SB1736	Third Reading	47
SB1740	Third Reading	47
SB1742 SB1743	Third Reading Third Reading	47 47
SB1745	Third Reading Third Reading	47
SB1758	Third Reading	6
SB1759	Third Reading	19
SB1765	Third Reading	20
SB1784	Third Reading	22
SB1869	Third Reading	23
SB1872	Third Reading	24
SB1897	Third Reading	47
SB1901	Third Reading	48
SB1903	Third Reading	48
SB1904	Third Reading	48
SB1909	Third Reading	48
SB1912	Third Reading	48
SB1913 SB1914	Third Reading	48
SB1914 SB1915	Third Reading Third Reading	48 48
001713	IIIII NeadIII9	40

27th Legislative	Day	3/27/2003
SB1920	Third Reading	48
SB1921	Third Reading	48
SB1923	Third Reading	48
SB1924	Third Reading	48
SB1934	Third Reading	48
SB1935	Third Reading	48
SB1936	Third Reading	48
SB1937	Third Reading	48
SB1943	Third Reading	48
SB1944	Third Reading	48
SB1945	Third Reading	48
SB1946	Third Reading	49
SB1949	Third Reading	49
SB1951	Third Reading	49
SB1953	Third Reading	49
SB1955	Third Reading	49
SB1957	Third Reading	49
SB1960	Third Reading	49
SB1962 SB1971	Third Reading Third Reading	49 49
SB1971 SB1972	Third Reading Third Reading	49
SB1972	Third Reading  Third Reading	49
SB1973	Third Reading Third Reading	49
SB1975	Third Reading  Third Reading	49
SB1976	Third Reading	49
SB1977	Third Reading	49
SB1978	Third Reading	49
SB1979	Third Reading	49
SB1980	Third Reading	49
SB1988	Third Reading	49
SB1991	Third Reading	49
SB1993	Third Reading	50
SB1994	Third Reading	50
SB1995	Third Reading	50
SB2003	Third Reading	50
SR0100	Resolution Offered	2
SR0101	Resolution Offered	2
SR0102	Resolution Offered	3
HJR0028	Resolution Offered	2
HJR0028	Adopted	104
SJR0003 SJR0004	Adopted	103 103
SJR0024	Adopted Adopted	103
SJR0024 SJR0029	Adopted Adopted	106
SJR0029	Resolution Offered	106
Senate to Order-S Prayer-Pastor Jef Pledge of Allegia Journals-Approved Journals-Postpone Messages from the Message from the Presentation to S	f Nelsen ance d ed e House Governor	1 1 1 1 2 3 17
Remarks by Senato		18
Discussion Regard	ling 3rd Reading Bill List Recess/Reconvenes	26 53

# 27th Legislative Day Senate Stands in Recess/Reconvenes Committee Reports Bill List Vote-Senator Bomke Resolutions Consent Calendar-Adopted Adjournment 3/27/2003 54 67 Resolutions Consent Calendar-Adopted 106

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Ladies and Gentlemen, the hour of 10:30 having arrived, the Senate will come to order. Our Members will be at their desks and our guests in the gallery will please rise. Our invocation today will be by Pastor Jeff Nelsen, Cherry Hills Baptist Church, of Springfield, Illinois. Pastor Nelsen.

PASTOR JEFF NELSEN:

(Prayer by Pastor Jeff Nelsen)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

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

SENATOR LINK:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Link)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Reading of the Journal, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Journals of Wednesday, March 19, and Thursday, March 20, 2003.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Woolard.

SENATOR WOOLARD:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Woolard moves the -- to approve the Journals just read by the Secretary. Being -- there being no objections, so ordered. Senator Woolard.

SENATOR WOOLARD:

Mr. President, I move that the reading and approval of the Journals of Friday, March 21st; Monday, March 24th; Tuesday, March 25th; and Wednesday, March 26th, in the year 2003, be postponed, pending arrival of the printed Journals.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Woolard has moved to -- postpone the reading and approval of the Journals, pending the arrival of -- printed transcripts. There being no objections, so ordered. Senator Bomke, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BOMKE:

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Thank you, Mr. President. Yesterday there was a Senate Bill 22 before us. I inadvertently pushed the red button, and I had intended to vote Aye on that bill, Senate Bill 22. Would the record reflect that, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

The record will so reflect. Messages from the House. SECRETARY HAWKER:

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has adopted the following joint resolution, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Joint Resolution 28.

Passed the House, March 26, 2003.

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

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

House Bills 92, 277, 370, 548, 1088, 1373, 1400, 2329, 2890, 2488 {sic}(3488) and 3620.

All passed the House, March 26, 2003.

I have a like Message with respect to House Bills 13, 93, 115, 121, 259, 300, 318, 1161, 1195, -- 1251, 2216, 2450, -- I mean, 3386, 20 -- House Bills 20, 197, 353, 1165, 1364, 2246 {sic}(2244), 2318, 2425, 2601, 2975 and 3440. And House Bills 1574, 2390, 2567, 3062 and 3078.

Passed the House, March 26, 2003.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. The Order of Resolutions, Madam Secretary. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 100, offered by Senator Viverito and all Members.

Senate Resolution 101, offered by Senator Roskam and all Members.

They're both death resolutions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Resolutions Consent Calendar.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

And Senate Resolution 102, offered by Senator Geo-Karis. It is substantive.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Message from the Governor.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

A Message for the Governor by Joseph B. Handley, Deputy Chief of Staff for Legislative Affairs, March 27, 2003.

Mr. President - The Governor directs me to lay before the Senate the following Message:

To the Honorable Members of the Senate, 93rd General Assembly - I have nominated and appointed the following named persons to the offices enumerated below and respectfully ask concurrence in and confirmation of these appointments of your Honorable Body.

Rod Blagojevich, Governor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

With leave of the Body, let's -- let's go to the Order of House Bills 1st Reading for awhile. House Bills 1st Reading. Oh! Excuse me, Madam Secretary, before you begin. Senator Woolard, for what purpose do you rise?

### SENATOR WOOLARD:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

State your point.

#### SENATOR WOOLARD:

I have with me -- I think everybody has special people in their areas that do special things, but I've got the guy that fixes the potholes on the interstates in southern Illinois standing beside me - the district engineer from Mike Bost and I's area of this State, guy that does a great job, and -- and one of the few Democrats in hierarchy in that agency at this time, a great friend and -- and a great person for the Department of Transportation, Tom Zerrusen.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Welcome to Springfield, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senator Clayborne, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

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

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

State your point, sir.

### SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Behind me, in the gallery, we have the fifth graders from Marie Schaefer Junior High School in O'Fallon, and I would like for them to be recognized by the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

...our guests in the gallery please rise. Welcome to Springfield. Senator Wojcik, what purpose do you rise?

#### SENATOR WOJCIK:

Yes, Mr. President, I rise for the point of personal privilege. Next to me I have young Felipe Batista. He's an exchange student from Brazil and he is here through the Schaumburg Rotary. Our young man, if you'd like to welcome him. And then next to him is Max Millstien, who is the son of the Rotary member in Schaumburg who was instrumental in getting Felipe down here and to visit with us.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Our guest please rise? Thank you. Welcome to Springfield. Further discussion? I mean -- sorry. Senator Winkel, for what purpose do you rise?

#### SENATOR WINKEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. Yesterday, on Senate Bill 22, I inadvertently voted No. Meant to vote Yes. Would like the record to so reflect.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

The record will so reflect. Senator Welch, for what purpose do you rise?

#### SENATOR WELCH:

Purposes of an announcement. Mr. President, today is Senator Carol Ronen's birthday. She's thirty-nine. Tomorrow, rather, not today. Tomorrow. And she has provided a lot of sweet rolls down here on the Democratic side of the Podium. If you folks want to get some calories, over here in the front. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, thank you. I -- I notice that we have a guest on the Floor, former -- Senator Ronen, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR RONEN:

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Thank you, Mr. President. It's my honor to introduce to you again, to -- for us to welcome back our great friend and great Senator, Art Berman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

And for those of you that know him, I would advise you, if you want to get your sweet roll, get down here right away. House Bills 1st Reading, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 62, offered by Senator John Jones.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 183, offered by Senator Harmon.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 337, offered by Senator Crotty.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 413, offered by Senator Welch.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 414, offered by Senator Schoenberg.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 527, offered by Senator Walsh.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1189, offered by Senator John Sullivan.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1447, offered by Senator Sandoval.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1491, offered by Senator Welch.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1536, offered by Senators Clayborne and Dillard.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1586, offered by Senator Peterson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1630, offered by Senator Martinez.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1632, offered by Senator Martinez.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2291, offered by Senator Halvorson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2345, offered by Senator Schoenberg.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2413, offered by Senator Shadid.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2441, offered by Senator Sandoval.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2453, offered by Senator Martinez.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2537, offered by Senator Syverson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2835, offered by Senator Righter.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2855, offered by Senator Garrett.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2864, offered by Senator Crotty.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

And House Bill 2954, offered by Senator Jacobs.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. We'll come back this afternoon to read the remaining -- remaining bills on House -- House Bills on 1st Reading. Page 61, Madam Secretary, is Motions in Writing. Senator Welch has moved to re-refer all of those bills that have been listed in the motion on writing -- in writing. Those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have The motion is adopted. Those bills will be re-referred to the Rules Committee. On page... All right. Gentlemen, we'll go to the Order of 3rd Reading on page 34. We will begin where we left off. On page 34 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, We will begin with 1758. this is final action. Schoenberg on the Floor? Page 34. 1758. Senator Schoenberg. Are you ready to proceed with your bill on the Order of 3rd Reading? Good. Let's get -- let's get started. Ladies and Gentlemen, on Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, 1758. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1758.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Senator Schoenberg.

#### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Thank you. Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, this is one -- another component part of the Comptroller's budgetary reform package.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Pardon me. Pardon me just a moment. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is final action. We are on the Order of 3rd Reading. I'm sorry, Senator Schoenberg. Let me apologize. Senator Schoenberg.

#### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President. As I indicated, this is another part of the Comptroller's budgetary and fiscal reform package. It creates a Revenue Estimating Council. The purpose of -- this Revenue Estimating Council would consist of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the State Comptroller and the Director of the Economic and Fiscal Commission. There's a procedure -- a time frame by which the Revenue Estimating Council would provide more accurate and genuine estimates on revenues and fund transfers that might be available, and most notably, this Council would certify the estimate of all income from all applicable revenue sources. The intent of this is to ensure that we are able to sufficiently match up revenues with anticipated expenditures. I -- I would be happy to answer any questions, and I know of no opposition to this matter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Senator Lauzen.

### SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you. Mr. President, a question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Lauzen.

### SENATOR LAUZEN:

What happens when these folks -- what happens when these folks don't agree? I mean, everybody has their estimate. Everybody in the past has been wrong. What happens when they don't agree?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schoenberg.

### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

legislation, Under -- under this the Council would reconcile -- would reconcile their -- if there were competing initial projections, they would be charged with reconciling it. And the purpose of this legislation is to address an issue which I know has vexed many of us over the years; namely, that at times, there is a sufficient disparity between the projections -- revenue projections of the Bureau of the Budget and the Economic and Fiscal Commission, and then it become -- the revenue projections, particularly toward the end of Session, have historically become moving targets in order to achieve the expenditure goals which have been set in the budget document. Here we provide a mechanism to ensure that the numbers, the revenue projections, would be certified and therefore more precise.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lauzen.

#### SENATOR LAUZEN:

I'm sorry. For the sponsor, the question, though, is then - maybe I should have used the word "reconcile". What happens
when they can't come to reconciliation? Let's say that in good
faith, one member of this Council, in good faith, believes that
the number is, you know, twenty-seven billion and the other
believes it's twenty-five billion, and in good faith, they say,
no. What happens when they don't reconcile? What in this -- the
language of this bill causes them -- what happens then?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schoenberg.

### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

There is nothing -- this bill is silent on that, on what would happen in the -- in the -- what I believe is the unlikely event of there being an inability to reconcile their respective projections. If anything, the purpose of this Council is to ensure that we have one certified, definitive figure by which we can then peg our expenditures towards.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Lauzen.

#### SENATOR LAUZEN:

Then -- then, to the bill: Then, obviously, we have the same situation that we have currently where there is no --

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

there's no -- they don't have to reconcile this, so we're going to be in the same soup that we were before. I would like to bring to the attention, also, that -- well, I'll leave it at that. I would advise a No or Present vote because this is meaningless. There are no teeth attached to the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Burzynski.

#### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Burzynski.

#### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. If -- if this commission becomes law, what purpose does Ec and Fisc have?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schoenberg.

#### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

That's something I, perhaps, can speak to a little better recently, since I've become the Senate Chair of Ec and Fisc. The Ec and -- Economic and Fiscal Commission, under any -- whether this bill becomes law or not, has invaluable resources at its disposal to not only track trends in revenue projections, but also to ascertain the voracity of -- of -- of debt, as well as potential -- potential costs. The Economic and Fiscal Commission does provide a very independent perspective, but we don't view what the Economic and Fiscal Commission does. And to some extent, you could probably make the same claim about the Bureau of the Budget. We don't have any certification of what constitutes the revenue figure that we're working from. So, this Council would essentially certify that a revenue projection would be kosher, perhaps, for lack of a better word.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Burzynski.

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

I guess my question is, what -- what precludes the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the State Comptroller and the Ec and Fisc Commission from doing what you're talking about now? Is there anything that precludes them from -- from taking action?

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schoenberg.

#### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

The key -- sir, the key element to this is that you would have a certified, singular revenue figure which was arrived at by calling the expertise of the respective parties who are involved. I think that that's a healthy process to take, and I think, frankly, by certifying a -- an official, kosher revenue figure, we then don't have to -- it then insulates everybody from any charge that revenues are being manipulated in order to achieve -- what the expenditure side will be.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Burzynski.

#### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Well, thank you for the answer. I -- I guess what I'm -- what I'm really questioning, it seems to me like if you have independent sources that are coming together, at least then there can be some viable debate on what the real numbers are. If they're -- if this commission is to set the standard, if you will, and they're off base on the revenue estimates, then we're really back to square one. At least if we have two or three independent people giving us those estimates, we have some way to do. And just one last -- one last question: Does the State Comptroller want to be a part of this commission or is it like the commission we dealt with yesterday?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schoenberg.

### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

That -- that's somewhat of a loaded question, so I'll just let it go.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Dillard.

### SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I rise in support of this particular measure. The -- I'm sorry. Can we have some order in here, Mr. President?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

...I've been trying to do that all morning. Senator Dillard. SENATOR DILLARD:

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Thank you. Thought I was a Member of the House for a second, with all the noise.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

I -- I don't know if that's an appropriate comeback. Senator Dillard.

#### SENATOR DILLARD:

Maybe it was wishful thinking on the part of myself and I rise in support of this. The Taxpayers' other Members here. Federation of Illinois has been a major proponent of this particular initiative, and I've lived through, in my past life, seven years as a Governor's Legislative Director under the Thompson administration and as Governor Edgar's Chief of Staff in the early 1990s. And if I learned one thing from my entrance into the budgetary process, it is: It is a dangerous thing when you get down to the closing days of the legislative Session, and I can't tell you how many times I had legislators ask me to more than manipulate the revenue estimate, under two Governors, so that the Legislature could adjourn at the end of Session. I've seen it firsthand. I've had multiple legislators in multiple Chambers say, "Well, let's just doctor the revenue-estimating numbers so we can go home." And I believe that this kind of Council will stop that kind of shenanigans from taking place. And in my estimation, having lived through about twelve years of budgetary making from the Second Floor, as opposed to being a Member of the General Assembly, I believe this proposal will lead to a more truthful revenue projection, and it's a better way to go than we have operated, perhaps, in the last eighteen to twenty years around here. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

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

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Just -- I'm standing briefly in support of this legislation. You know, I -- I think that we've all, over the last several years, done our absolute best in terms of making sure that we deal appropriately with the budget, and this year we're having to deal with a budget that's much more difficult than normal. But I think we all also agree that the process has never been entirely smooth, and we, as legislators at least,

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

have never had precisely clear estimates in terms of what revenues we're working with. That's true this year; it was true last year. It's been true in fat times and lean times. I know that there's a tendency, I think, for us to get caught up in the politics of this issue. I think some of that, perhaps, has to do with the sponsor and the fact that he may be running, like in -- in other races. But I think that it's some of us, important to recognize that on -- on -- on this particular issue, it's a modest proposal that I think would, in fact, give us better information in our decision-making process. As I understand the bill, these reports would be issued to the General Assembly and we would then be empowered in ways that we might not be empowered now. So, I would strongly urge this Chamber to take an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Righter.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield for a question.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Schoenberg, you are -- you are a good deal more educated in the finance issues than I am, and -- and I am not quite understanding what this particular bill will do to improve the accuracy of the financial forecast or revenue forecast that we get now. I mean, how is this moving the ball forward for us in terms of accuracy?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schoenberg.

#### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

I would say it moves the ball forward in three specific ways. One is that it provides a certified, indisputable revenue projection so that any -- anything that needed to be reconciled in terms of a revenue projection would have been reconciled on the front end and not during that time that Senator Dillard so aptly pointed out, when everybody is, frankly, looking -- looking for ways just to - he called it manipulating; I'll call it massaging, but the end result is the same - to -- to do that with revenue projections. The second area in which this would

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

make a big difference, aside from having a certified, singular, kosher source of revenue, would be, this would -- this Council would take a multiple-year approach to -- to projecting revenues, working off of more than one year, in order to be able to determine trends. And that takes me to the third -- which we really don't see. We tend to lurch from year to year and we really shouldn't do that. We need -- I think we need to take a multiple-year approach in projecting revenues, as well And finally, the way that it really projecting expenditures. would be very helpful along those same lines, is that this Council would be charged with providing hard data on cash flow. And for the very reason that I just spoke to previously, we don't do that. We don't speak to cash flow. We lurch from good times to bad and from crisis to crisis without taking a longer view. This Council not only would provide greater voracity, but also take that longer view.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Righter.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. And thank you for those answers, Senator. The certification, that is an issue, to me, unless there's going to be some substantive change in the way they do the forecast - the fact that it's certified as opposed to not certified - is -- is there some significance in the fact that they're going to issue a certified forecast as opposed to one that is not entitled so? I mean, does that by itself bring it more credibility in your mind?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator -- hold on. The staff take their conferences off the Floor, please. Have some order. Senator -- Senator Schoenberg.

#### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

I believe a certified revenue estimate does carry greater weight and so does the broad range of supporters who've signed up behind this, ranging from the medical community to human service providers to the Retail Merchants, the Taxpayers' Federation, as well as the Comptroller.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Righter.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

And, Senator, I have no doubt there are many good people behind the bill, but that's not really what I want to talk about. The certification itself, that's only going to make a difference if the way they do the forecasting is improved. And assuming that you agree with that, then aren't the ways that you've described in improving the forecast, such as looking at multiple-year trends or cash flow, that's something that the Bureau of the Budget or the Economic and Fiscal Commission could be charged with now. I mean, we can do all those things now without creating a new council, can't we?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schoenberg.

#### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

They can do that on -- they can currently do that, but the major difference, again, is when you certify something, you're putting considerably more weight and credibility behind it. To have a -- a singular agreed revenue source by which we can then peg our expenditures towards I think is a more responsible approach to take, and the fact that this Council would not be considering -- expenditures but the larger picture of revenues and expenditures on a multiple-year period and then verifying those, I think that certification makes a great deal of difference.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Righter, your time has expired. If you wish, I -- I could return. Senator Brady.

### SENATOR BRADY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Brady.

#### SENATOR BRADY:

Senator, if this commission were to -- one of the things you want to do is try to, I guess, create a consensus. Is that correct? You want to -- you want to create a consensus on which we can base our budgeting?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

It's not just a question of consensus; it's a question of eliminating the ability -- it's not just a question of consensus; it's a question of providing a series of checks and balances and -- and a definitive outcome which we can more rely -- our expenditures towards.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Brady.

#### SENATOR BRADY:

So you want to create this extra level of government. Irregardless of what we say, we'll have expense and cost and -least spend more time, at a time when it's very difficult. You've got three members, as I understand it: the Bureau of the Budget Director, Comptroller, and a designee from Ec and Fisc. Correct? Now, let's just hypothetically suggest that things continue as they have and the Economic and Fiscal Commission comes up with one set of numbers and the Bureau of Budget with another set of numbers, and they don't agree. you continue to have is -- maybe it's certified by a two-to-one vote, but what you continue to have is confusion and difference. And this doesn't necessarily mean that the Bureau of the Budget and the Economic and Fiscal Commission's going to come to consensus or agreement. Would you not agree that that's hypothetically possible, if not probable?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schoenberg.

### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

I believe I have addressed some of those concerns in several of the prior questioners. I just think that we need to have more voracity and a certified -- certified revenue figure, one that factors in cash flow trends, one that takes a multiple-year approach, to determine how revenues are growing, staying stagnant or declining. I think that this is a -- a very modest effort that, frankly, it surprises me, all the attention that it's getting.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator -- Senator Brady. SENATOR BRADY:

Just to speak in opposition to the bill. I -- I think this is a useless piece of legislation. We have an Economic and

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Fiscal Commission which, if it's not doing its job, we ought to change that. We don't need another layer that's just going to create confusion. We won't have consensus in this case, and this is really, in my opinion, a -- a waste of our time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Why didn't you not include the State Treasurer as one of the parties to be -- to work together on this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schoenberg.

#### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

The State Treasurer -- the State Treasurer's role is one of being this State's chief investment officer. This is not so much a question of whether we are -- of how the State is investing its funds and whether we're linking those investments to achieve specific policy purposes, but rather to ensure that the revenues -- can accurately meet the expenditures. It's making that bridge between the revenue and expenditure side that, I think, makes the Comptroller's Office the more natural -- the more natural constitutional officer that drives this legislation. But I -- I think if you want to follow up with that further, I would address that to the Comptroller's Office directly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Geo-Karis.

#### SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, the State Treasurer is a very knowledgeable person who's made very good investments for us and has brought us billions of dollars in -- in interest, and if anyone should be a part of that -- the group that you've got designated in your bill, she should be in it. And I -- I -- I don't agree with your logic about the State Treasurer at all, because you know and I know that she is -- she has to be very conscious and very conscientious about what she has in the State treasury. And therefore, I rise to speak

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

against the bill for the same reasons that Senator Brady enumerated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. The question is, shall Senate Bill 1758 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 35, the Nays are 18, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 1758, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. I now will yield the Chair to Senator Watson for a special presentation.

#### SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you very much, Senator Demuzio. And I appreciate the Membership giving me this opportunity to recognize one of our own, obviously, which we all know is Adeline Geo-Karis. She, along, I guess, with Senator Ronen, will be celebrating a birthday, although Adeline's is Saturday and we will not, obviously, be in Session and here to -- to recognize her eightyfive years of existence on this. So, as she comes up, we have -we've got a lot of cake over here, too, for you. I guess you've known -- noticed that. But anyway, I want you to know that there's at least six of your House Members that are here, Geo, all in recognition of -- of all the years that -- of your service. But let me -- we have a -- we have a plaque we want to present her from -- Senate recognition, from all of us here. "The Illinois Senate of the 93rd General Assembly of the State of Illinois acknowledges Adeline Jay Geo-Karis, 'First Lady of the Illinois Senate'". Adeline Jay Geo-Karis, First Lady of the Illinois Senate. In recognition of her eighty-fifth birthday, extending its heartfelt congratulations and best wishes to her on this occasion, and further extending its admiration and respect for the honored -- from -- for an honored colleague and for her many accomplishments, and commends her for paving the way for other women, through her service as Lake -- as first Lake County woman appointed Assistant State's Attorney, elected Justice of the Peace, elected to the Illinois House and Senate, and appointed to serve in the Senate Leadership.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Offered by Senator Frank Watson, Emil Jones. So, Adeline, congratulations.

#### SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

President Jones and Republican Leader Watson - you do, Watson, some overwhelming things - I am very shocked, very pleasantly surprised. I'm pleasantly surprised to see my colleagues from the House here, too. All of you knew about it, but I didn't. But I want to thank all of you for being so nice, I can't believe I'm eighty-five. the staff. I really feel younger than you do, Frank. But -- but -- but God has been very good to me, and I -- I look forward to serving and, God willing, I'll be eighty-five Saturday and I hope I can finish my term. I have a four-year term so I can hound both the President and the Republican Leader with my presence. But I want to thank all of you for being so nice. God bless all of you. God bless America. And thank you, again.

#### SENATOR E. JONES:

I'd just like to add that Adeline and I have been friends for a little more than thirty-one years. We came in the House together, and she abandoned me and came over to the Senate and I followed her. She always called me her Mediterranean cousin. But she's a great lady. Adeline, we wish you have eighty-five more great years. You're a wonderful person. God bless you.

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

### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

State your point, sir.

### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, to my rear in the gallery on the Republican side are the boys and girls of the seventh-grade class of St. Michael's School in Wheaton, Illinois. Unbeknownst to them, they are joining in the Senate celebration of Senator Geo-Karis. Will you please greet them warmly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Will our guests in the gallery please rise? Welcome. Welcome. All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, on the Order of 3rd Reading, we'll go back to where we are, at Senate Bill 1759. Senator Schoenberg. Madam Secretary, read the bill. 1759. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1759.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schoenberg.

#### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen in the This is the final piece of the aforementioned Comptroller's budgetary and fiscal reform package. It states that starting in Fiscal Year 2005 and in each subsequent fiscal year, it would require annual appropriations to feature one or more separate line items for payments of liabilities which were incurred in a prior fiscal year and that were authorized to be paid during the budget year. There was no opposition in committee. And this bill would require a State agency to pay a bill during the same fiscal year it was approved. This is a sound business practice that we should have long adopted. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Is there discussion? Senator Lauzen. SENATOR LAUZEN:

Again, I -- I'm -- I feel -- well, just to the bill: I almost feel cursed with having a background in bookkeeping and accounting because Section 25, lapse-period spending is the same thing as -- it's analogous to the accounts payable. We appropriate for that lapse-period spending when we go through the appropriation process each year. If we do what the Comptroller is suggesting that we do, we are going to double-appropriate the same expenses. And it's just -- it's like reappropriating onto the operating statement the accounts payable from the balance sheet. It's double counting the payables, and this is just a bad idea. So, I mean, we've gone through it. If this was such a good idea, Ladies and Gentlemen, wouldn't you think that over the last thirty or forty years someone, whether

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

it's a Republican or a Democrat, would have figured this out? So, I'm suggesting that this is nothing more than a vehicle in a -- in a campaign -- a politically motivated. As Senator Brady said a little while ago, the previous piece of legislation is useless and unnecessary. This, unfortunately, demonstrates a lack of understanding of accrual accounting. I'm sorry, Ladies and Gentlemen, if this was such a good idea, it would have been done twenty, thirty years ago. It's not necessary. It double counts the accounts payable.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1759 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes 35, the Nays are 21, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1759, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1762. On the Order of 3rd Reading -- Senator Schoenberg, we're at 1762. On the -- all right. 1765. Senator Obama? Senator Schoenberg, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Mr. President, I believe there was an amendment filed yesterday. Could I have leave of the Body to return the bill to 2nd -- 2nd Reading?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, I assume the amendment's still in Rules and Rules hasn't met. So, we don't have the amendment, so we're moving on. Senate Bill 1765. Senator Obama. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 1765. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1765.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Obama.

#### SENATOR OBAMA:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This bill creates a very short-term commission. It's

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

supposed to report by the end of the year. We discussed this on 2nd Reading. Its basic purpose is to examine our tax expenditures and -- to see how effective they have been. You know, obviously we're going to be discussing many of these tax expenditures during the course of this budget year, but in some cases, we will not have enough information. I know of no opposition. I'd ask for an affirmative roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, for the benefit of the Members, is this the bill yesterday where the Comptroller was in and now the Comptroller is out? You're nodding your head yes. Can you give us, really, the serious rationale, if there is one, or is this kind of a political deal? And if it is, you've usually been fairly transparent with this Body to say, yeah, it is. But it -- it seems interesting that the Comptroller would -- would come out. Can you explain your rationale?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Obama.

#### SENATOR OBAMA:

I cannot explain my rationale. The -- we originally, in drafting the bill, had failed to include three parties: the Comptroller, the Treasurer, and Economic and Fisc. We -- we amended the bill, and it was just a drafting oversight. We put them in. I received a request from the Comptroller's Office that they didn't think it was appropriate -- or they didn't want to participate, but that they would provide reports and assist in the work of the commission. It may just be that they felt that they were overloaded with some of the other work that they've initiated through their bill and thought maybe it would be best to do it this way.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, question is, shall Senate Bill 1765 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 48, the Nays are 7, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1765, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Bottom of page 34. 1774. Top of page 35, Ladies and Gentlemen. 1777. Senator Jacobs. On the Order of -- Senate Bills 3rd Reading, top of page 5, is Senate Bill 1784, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill -- pardon me, 1784.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Link.

#### SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill amends the Deposit for State Money {sic}. Authorizes that all public agencies to accept the same types of collateral to secure or guarantee public funds for which there are already precedent in the statute for other public agencies. Would be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Wendell Jones.

#### SENATOR W. JONES:

Yes. I just signed on as -- as a hyphenated cosponsor of this bill, Senator, and I would like to urge it have a unanimous roll call. It's a very fine bill. Thank you. I sponsored it last year.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1784 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Take the record. question, the Ayes are 56, the Nays are none, none voting Senate Bill 1784, having received the required Present. constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1787. Senator Jones. Emil Jones. 1803. 1854. Jacobs. 1855. Senator Ronen. 1865. Senator Welch? 1869.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Senator Cullerton? On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 1869, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1869.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Cullerton.

#### SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This bill amends the Parentage Act and it comes to us as a result of a Supreme Court decision where the Supreme Court indicated that this Act should be revisited. Back about nineteen years ago, when we passed the Parentage Act amendment that we're dealing with here, we were concerned about the -- kind of a new process, I guess, at the time, of artificial insemination, where we wanted to make -- make it clear that if a -- if a husband and wife had a baby by artificial insemination, that they would -we would spell out the rights and obligations. And the law -current law says that a husband and wife, when they do this, that the -- that the husband is the -- the -- the natural father and he has the responsibilities to raise that child. What's -what happened in this Supreme Court case was instead of a husband and wife having a baby this way, they actually had -they actually had a man and woman who are living together as husband and wife. And they did have -- this -- this husband participated in the -- paying for this procedure, he raised the kid for three years, and then he took off. And as a result, the mother came forward, tried to get child support and the Supreme Court looked at the statute and said: You know what? This says husband and wife, not, you know, somebody who's living together. So, the point of this bill is to focus in on the rights of that child or children who are born through this procedure to make sure that it's clear that they have a father who is responsible to take care of that child. I'll be happy to answer any questions and ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1869 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those -- 1869.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Senator Dillard, I'm sorry. I -- I didn't see it. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 43, the Nays are 11, 2 voting Present. Senate Bill 1869, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Dillard, sometimes there's a glare on this board here, and I -- you know, I even looked a second time and I didn't see anybody, and I know you -- you weren't practicing your -- your House methods, otherwise you would have been screaming, but I'm sorry about that. 1872. Senator Garrett. Madam Secretary, 3rd Reading, 1872.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 1872.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Garrett.

#### SENATOR GARRETT:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Bill 1872 creates the Whistleblower Act that basically says an employer may not: make, adopt, or enforce any rule, regulation, or policy preventing an employee from disclosing information to a government or law enforcement agency if the employee has reasonable cause to believe that the information discloses a violation of a State or federal law, rule, or regulation; retaliate against any employee for refusing to participate in an activity that would result in a violation of a State or federal law, rule, or regulation. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Senator Roskam.

### SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

Indicates she will yield. Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator Garrett, thank you for making the changes that we talked about in committee and I think it corrects the drafting problem. The question that you and I spoke about, Senator, in

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

committee, if I could just direct your attention - maybe your staff can get you a copy of the bill - under Section 20. First of all, I think the underlying concept is excellent. There's nobody that wants to create, you know, a situation where whistleblowers in good faith, who are coming forward, aren't protected. So, I agree wholeheartedly with you. Here's my question. Section 20 says "Retaliation for certain refusals prohibited." And this is the relevant part: "An employer may not retaliate against an employee for refusing to participate in an activity that would result in a violation of a State or federal law, rule, or regulation." At its heart, I understand what you're trying to do; my question is the unintended consequence. If, for example -- and it's tough to think of a -kind of a crisp, clean example, so I'll just sort of muddle along for a minute here. But there are things that -- that violate some minor code that would be -- you and I would characterize as a technical violation. That's not really at the heart, I don't think, of what you're trying to get to. You're trying to get to, if I -- if I could presume to speak for you, you're trying to get to the violator. You're trying to get to the company that is polluting the stream, to the company that is allowing and promoting sexual harassment in the workplace, a company that is committing an Enron type of crime. It doesn't seem to me like you're trying to get to those -- yeah, somebody who forgets to file a report, for example, or some sort of technical violation. Could you speak to that issue, maybe for purposes of legislative intent? I -- I -- I think we could have come up with a better -- some better language, but that's not an opportunity now. But could you speak to that issue?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Garrett.

### SENATOR GARRETT:

Thank -- thank you, Senator. In Section 20 of the bill, it was also brought to my attention, I think, by the Illinois Chamber of Commerce who also had some questions about this. But in reading this particular Section, I think what sets this apart from any technical or frivolous issue is the word "would". Let me just read it back to you: "An employer may not retaliate against an employee for refusing to participate in an activity

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

that would result", not that "may" result, but that "would" result. So, the -- the intent is very clear, that this is clearly a violation of State or federal law, and that is, I think, where the line has to be drawn.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator -- Senator Roskam. SENATOR ROSKAM:

Just briefly to the bill: I -- I intend to recommend that we vote for this bill. I commend the sponsor for her efforts. I hope that if -- that we can continue the dialogue on this because I think that there is an opportunity to tighten this up. I won't belabor the point this morning, but I -- I would hope that we can continue this conversation when the bill is over in the House. And I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, the following members of the media have sought leave to photograph or videotape the proceedings: Channel 20. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Further discussion? Senator Garrett may close.

### SENATOR GARRETT:

I want to thank Senator Roskam for his input. He actually gave me some amendments that we looked at to make it more precise, but -- but I think this is a bill that is precise in the way it is now. And if, in fact, Senator, there are some issues that need to be readdressed, I will give you my commitment that we will bring it back in amendment. I urge everybody in the Chamber to give us a Yes vote on this. Thank you.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is, shall Senate Bill 1872 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all Take the record. On that question, the Ayes voted who wish? are 57, the Nays are 1, none voting Present. Senate Bill 1872, having received the required constitutional majority, Senator Garrett? 1882. Senator Emil declared passed. 1873. Jones? All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, if you would all turn to page 38, please. There is Senate Bills 3rd Reading, Non-Substantive. It's the intention of the Chair to ask that the

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Clerk read these non-substantive bills on -- by title and that they be passed on one roll call. Is there -- Senator Roskam, for what purpose do you rise?

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Parliamentary inquiry and a point of order, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

State your point.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you. Mr. President, it -- our reading of the Constitution -- we saw this on the Calendar -- couple of points. First of all, it's my understanding that this is unprecedented. This is not a pattern that the -- the Senate has been involved in, in the past, and -- and certainly not in the more recent past; that is, within the past ten years. This is very, very, very aggressive procedurally, Mr. President. There's a couple questions that I would have of you. First of all, there's a number of bills that are on the -- that are on the Calendar that are in this posture - shell bills - some of which would apparently stay on the Order of 3rd Reading, some of which are -- have been moved to this Order that you're proposing to move on one roll call. What was the -- what was the thinking, what was the bright line that divided those that -- that were -- you're contemplating to move today and the ones that you're -- that you're not?

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

It's my understanding that the -- the -- the non-substantive bills that remain on the Calendar are to be somewhat -- Members have prospective amendments that they wish to offer next week, and so, that was the determining factor. Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

So, I -- it's a little tough to hear.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senator Roskam.

### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you. So, you said that the ones that are on page 38, this new order of business that we've not seen before, those are ones where there's no intention of any amendments in the Senate

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

and the -- the other ones have Senate amendments that are likely to come and we'll see them next week?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

That -- I think that's correct, yes.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Okay. Of the bills here, Mr. President, on page 38, in this order of business, I mean, it is a wide, wide, wide range of subject matter. We're dealing with everything from budget implementation to wineries to business organizations to IDPA to the Civil -- Code of Civil Procedure to IDOT, education, higher ed, Bureau of the Budget, child care, child labor, cigarettes, Secretary of State, State employees. It is not an unreasonable request to ask the sponsor of the bill to stand up, to tell the Body what his or her intentions are on this bill in the House. Legislators have an opportunity to ask questions, to commitments and to say, "Look, we're prepared to support or not support based on the representations of the Members." But, Mr. President, this is a very, very, very aggressive move. I think it violates the Constitution based on the requirement that bills read for a third time, and I would request reconsideration.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Let me -- let me -- the Chair will point out to you that as I indicated when we went to this order of business, that all these bills had to be read by title a third time but they would be -- all be considered on one roll call. The -- the fact that the Governor has been allocated the opportunity to go till April the 8th with respect to his Budget Message, some of the Members don't really know what's being contemplated with respect to their bills and therefore -- these are totally non-substantive bills. If there's any substantive amendments to be drafted by the House, they will, in fact, return here. At that point, we'll have an opportunity to debate them. Now, with respect to the other question that you posed, it is not -- has not been an unusual practice around here to have agreed bills from both the -- the House and Senate, and we have -- have, in fact, utilized this procedure in the past. These are non-substantive bills. They -- they don't -- they don't have anything -- other than amending the title. The Clerk will -- will, in fact, read the

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

title - and that's what we intend to do. Senator Watson, for what purpose do you rise?

### SENATOR WATSON:

Well, I appreciate your editorial comment there, Mr. President, but that isn't actually fact, what you just said. When -- for the last ten years, since 1992, the election of 1992, in the Session beginning in 1993, we have not -- we did not have an Agreed Bill List, such as you've had and you're presenting here today. We did not have 3rd Readings that were passed out on an Agreed Bill List. So that's contrary, I believe, to what you just said. You said past practice. practice may be true, but that was prior to 1992. It's business as usual. It's business as usual right now, Mr. President. One more time. The public's shut out. The Members are shut out. No -- no process -- no due process for the people on the street who want to be a part of this. You -- once more, again, we're back to the way it was. One more time. And we -- we're just objecting to this, and we take total objection to this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

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

Yes, Mr. President, I would like to make a statement, if I could, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones.

### SENATOR W. JONES:

I would just harken back to about a year ago today and I was thinking what speech the current President that's presiding this morning would have made would have this happened when we were in charge of this Body. And you would have been louder and longer than Senator Watson and you would have been protesting and protesting and protesting. But now the shoe is on the other foot. We knew it was going to happen when they -- when they drew out of Lincoln's hat. But we've come to the moment in time now when you have the opportunity to do it, and I don't hear any protests. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Thank you for your statement. Further discussion? Senator Jones.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

#### SENATOR E. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. Listening to the comments coming from the other side, and perhaps the volume of the -- the volume was not quite high enough and they didn't hear what you said. These are non-substantive bills. They're non-substantive bills. If any action is taken upon them, they have to come back and go through the committee process. You know it and I know it. You have an opportunity to present your views amendments. Some may end in conference committee. been issues before this Body that have ended up in the courts, and you know about the single subject rule. The single subject rule which means simply that that bill and its title should deal only with that subject matter. And it's not business as usual, Mr. Minority Leader. It's opening up the process, affording everyone the opportunity to be heard. To be opposed to this just because it didn't happen in the past ten years, just to be opposed for opposition's sake, doesn't make sense. We're trying to take care of the process. Because something -- on -- on something your Members may want, there's a bill here to take And we try to be fair. The majority of the substantive bills that your Members introduced came out of the committee, was heard in committee. There will be many more issues coming up that we're going to have to deal with as a Body, not as Democrats or Republican, but as Senators, and we will continue the process. So, to be dilatory and say that it didn't happen in the past here, maybe it should have happened. Maybe we're not -- we would not be in court on certain laws that were passed that were thrown together on bills that should not have happened. We want to avoid that. Perhaps you do not. It's the proper way to go, and I urge you to be part of the process. I wish you would have said also that opening up the process of the bills that were introduced by your Members, of substance, a greater majority of those bills were let out and A greater percentage. heard in committee. But you don't appreciate that. That's the major change, Wendell Jones: When we pulled the name out of the hat, we were being fair. a good process because there may be a issue in one of your districts that you may need a vehicle to get it done. affords you the opportunity to have that vehicle. It affords you

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

the opportunity and put us in position where we do not have to violate the single subject matter. So, I urge you to rethink your -- your point of view on this issue and support this concept.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Righter.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Of course, I'm a new Member here in the Senate, and we didn't even do this in the House. the -- the -- we had Agreed Bill Lists. Mr. President, I want to We -- we had Agreed Bill Lists in -- in the explain that. House, Mr. President, but on those occasions when they had those lists, they handed them out, an individual copy to each Member and we were given time to walk through those, go through our laptops, talk to other Members, go talk to the sponsor and ask them what they had in mind for the bill before we were asked to And we were allowed the opportunity to cast an cast a vote. individual Yes or No vote on each one of the bills, and, here, we're not being given the opportunity to do that. One of the earlier speakers made the comment that they would like to know, at least to some extent, what the sponsor's got in mind. And I appreciate the fact, as the Senate President said, that they're all very short titles, one on government ethics and one on limited liability companies and things like that. have any idea what they've got in mind when they filed that. Do they want to abolish limited liability companies? Do they want to open them up and allow them to do more? I understand that we may get a vote on the substantive issue, but for now, when I'm casting a vote, I'd like to at least have some idea on what all the sponsors from your side of the aisle have in mind on these. And I would also ask that this process be rethought and give the Members a little more input on what's being done here. you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further -- further discussion? Senator -- Senator Petka.

### SENATOR PETKA:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I had the distinct privilege and honor to serve in the

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

House for a period of six years, and when I had the opportunity to run for the Senate and to participate in a process in which we are now engaged, I -- one of the things that I personally found offensive was the idea that we would have almost a cattle call on -- on roll calls on bills. I think it denigrates the I think that it -- it demeans the sponsors of legislation, and one of the things that -- suggested to the former President is that we simply do away with the concept of the Agreed Bill List because, as an institution, I believe that we suffer when we do this. And be -- I would just ask that there be a reconsideration of this. I do believe that, you know, since they are bills that -- which by and large are noncontroversial, by simply running them through, we -- we will basically place this institution in a posture that we, in fact, follow the intent of  $\operatorname{\mathsf{--}}$  of the way that we were supposed to function in the first place.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Welch.

#### SENATOR WELCH:

...know, I don't really care what the House did or didn't do. This is the Senate. We're Senators. We have our own rules. We'll abide by those rules. What we're doing here, this is form over substance. I mean, these bills are empty shells. There's nothing in 'em. We can go one by one and pass every one, either They're all going to pass. on a partisan roll call or not. Every year, for the last several years, we took revenue bills, passed -- the appropriation bills, passed 'em over to the House. We didn't know what was in 'em. Then they came back and we talked about 'em then. That's what this process is. So, these references to the House, you know, that's those guys. Let them mind their own business. We'll mind ours. So, thanks for the House advice, but no thanks.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Schoenberg.

### SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Thank you. I -- I would just like to point out, to provide some further context, since I served with so many people from the other side of the aisle, that I vividly recall an evening in 1995, during that brief tenure that the Republicans were in the

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Majority of the House, where there were several hundred bills called in one roll call, no prior notification, in the blink of an eye. Half the people in the room weren't even at their switches, and many of the people who are complaining the loudest now were party to that very procedure then. So, I'd just like to point out the consistency in some of the comments. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Roskam is the last speaker. Senator Roskam. You want to go to -- all right. Senator Rutherford.

#### SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Just for the respect, Senator Schoenberg, I opposed that as well. I thought it was wrong, inappropriate, a vile broach upon a democratic process. As a House Member, I objected to that as well

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Hendon.

#### SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. At least Senator Rutherford was honest enough to admit that it happened, and even though he may have opposed it individually, it still took place. And I just want to remind everyone, under the illustrious leadership of former President Pate Philip, you did many things that we disagreed with, but you did it anyway. You had the votes. So, call the roll.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Roskam, may close.

### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Mr. President, a couple of points that we haven't touched on. One, in following up on Senator Welch's comment, I recall Senator Rauschenberger frequently would get up, explain to the Body what was in the shell bill. He'd say "Nothing is in this bill; the intention is to move it over", and everyone was posted. We all, as Members, had the opportunity to make a decision, Yes or No, and there was not very much ambiguity. We all knew what the program was, but the point was, we all had the chance to vote Yes or No and we had a chance to ask the sponsor direct questions about his intentions, and the integrity of the

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

process was intact. I suggest, Mr. President, that the bills, if they move out in this roll call, are constitutionally suspect, and I want to put that on the record. This is an unprecedented move. The Illinois Constitution, the -- the citation is fairly clear -- Article IV, Section 8, paragraph (d) says "A bill shall be read by title on three different days in each house." Implicit in that is the opportunity to question the sponsor. This is not government by freight train. This is not government by sitting on I-55, watching the semis come by. You have an opportunity as Senators. You all are representing a -- two hundred thousand people. You have the opportunity to get up and question a Senator, to ask amendments, to drive him into the ground, to make 'em earn their keep, and you're -- you're -you're being -- acting like peasants. We are not peasants; we are not servants. We are sons and daughters in this process. And for us to sit around here and act as if we are completely irrelevant is a denigration to the very process that we're called to. So, Mr. President, pursuant to Senate Rule 7-14, I move that the question be divided.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Divided as -- as -- how such? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Divided into as many parts as you have shell bills, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

I would join him.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, how would you like to have the question divided, Senator? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, my -- Mr. President, my motion is simple. To each bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Pardon me. Point of order. Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Mr. President, I would ask that we strike the comments of Senator Roskam referring to us as peasants from the record of

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

the Senate. This is unprecedented, for a Member to refer to all of the rest of the Members in a derogatory term like that. And I would ask that pursuant to our rules, that reference be stricken.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

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

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Well, to address that issue. I didn't call anybody peasants, Senator. I said let's not act like it. Let's act like sons and daughters in this process and not act like servants and peasants, and I stand by my remarks.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Roskam, what is there to divide? I don't understand the motion? Senator -- Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

The motion, Mr. President, is to divide the question into each bill. Mr. President, this is not...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

There -- there...

### SENATOR ROSKAM:

This is not a situation where there's really discretion, with all due respect to everybody that's -- it's not a debatable motion. This is a right that an individual Senator has to have an individual roll call on every bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Welch.

## SENATOR WELCH:

I would move to lay that motion on the table, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Welch has moved to lay the gentleman's motion on the table. Is there -- Senator Roskam, for what purpose do you rise? Senator Roskam.

### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Well, if I was inarticulate in my previous remark -- or, my previous presentation, I am not asserting a motion; I am asserting a right pursuant to Senate rule that we have. That's not a debatable subject, Mr. President. The -- the -- the

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

question is, if a question in debate contains several points, any Senator may have the same divided - Rule 7-14.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, Senator Roskam, you just indicated that you did not have a motion before the Body, and now you've indicated that you have a motion to do something to separate the -- the question. Senator Roskam, you want to restate your -- your position before we take up Senator Welch's motion? Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, I -- Mr. President, I am asserting my right as a Senator, pursuant to 7 Rule 7 -- Senate Rule 7-14, to divide the question into the individual bills that you are seeking to move on one roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Welch, is that your motion, to -- Senator Welch, restate your motion.

SENATOR WELCH:

My motion is to lay that motion on the table.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. All in favor of -- of the -- Senator Welch's -- Senator Roskam, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Well, Senator -- Mr. President...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

We have a motion to table.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

How can you table the right of an elected Senator? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, I guess the question is, do you have a motion or do you not?

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

It's not a -- Mr. President, I'm asserting a right. These are your rules that you drafted that you've -- that -- that -- that you advanced to the Body. Great. They are now the rules of the land. Now, I, as an individual Senator, and I'm sure I'm joined by twenty-five others, have the ability to ask these questions to be divided. That is my implicit right as a Senator. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Thank you very much. Senator Welch.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

#### SENATOR WELCH:

Mr. President, there's one of two things here: Either it's a motion subject to my motion to table, or he's asking for a ruling of the Parliamentarian. That seems to be what he's asking for. So, those are one of two ways to figure this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

I accept Senator Welch's observation and I'm asking for a ruling of the Chair whether the plain reading of these words, and I quote Rule 7-14: "If a {sic} (the) question in debate contains several points, any Senator may have the same divided." Mr. President, do I have that right, pursuant to the rules? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

The -- the Chair had indicated that we were going to have all of these read in a third time and that they would, in fact, be read a third time and they would be passed -- or, they would -- on -- on one roll call. And that is the -- that is still the Chair's -- Chair's position. Madam Secretary, read the bills. ...ruling -- the ruling is that there are no parts to divide in this question and, therefore, Madam Secretary, read the bills. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 20.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 31.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 35.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 36.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 37.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 701.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 702.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 706.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 709.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 710.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 711.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 712.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 713.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 719.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 723.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 724.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 726.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 728.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 729.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 735.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 738.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 739.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 740.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 742.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 744.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 746.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 748.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 750.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Senate Bill 751.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 751 {sic} (755).

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 759.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 763.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 764.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 769.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 771.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 773.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 774.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 776.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 777.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 778.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 783.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 785.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 787.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 788.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 792.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 794.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 796.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 797.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 798.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 800.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 802.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 821.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 823.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 825.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 827.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 829.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 831.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 833.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 841.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 842.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 843.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 844.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 852.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 857.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 858.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 861.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 862.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Senate Bill 864.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 865.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 867.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 869.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 871.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 874.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill -- 916.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 918.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 919.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 920.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 922.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 924.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 926.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 928.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 929.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 930.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 931.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 932.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 933.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 934.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 936.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 938.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 943.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 945.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 946.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 947.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 955.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 956.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 958.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 963.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 969.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 976.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 978.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 980.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 984.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 989.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 992.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 994.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1000.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Senate Bill 1005.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1013.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1014.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1021.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1215.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1216.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1218.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1219.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1221.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1223.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1225.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1227.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1231.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1233.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1235.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1237.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1239.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1241.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1243.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1245.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1247.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1248.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1249.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1051 {sic} (1251).

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1253.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1255.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1258.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1262.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1264.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1266.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1268.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1271.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1273.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1276.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1278.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1282.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1283.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1285.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1287.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Senate Bill 1289.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1291.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1292.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1293.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1296.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1298.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1301.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1303.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1305.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1307.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1309.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1311.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1314.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1316.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1318.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1319.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1553.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1557.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1559.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1560.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1567.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1598.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1599.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1604.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1605.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1606.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1607.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1610.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1611.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1620.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1621.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1626.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1631.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1634.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1638.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1641.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1645.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1650.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1656.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Senate Bill 1657.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1666.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1668.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1676.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1680.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1684.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1689.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1691.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1699.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1701.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1704.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1705.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1725.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1733.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1736.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1740.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1742.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1743.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1745.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1897.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill) Senate Bill 1901.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1903.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1904.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1909.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1912.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1913.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1914.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1915.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1920.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1921.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1924 {sic} (1923).

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1924.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1934.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1935.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1936.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1937.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1943.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1944.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1945.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Senate Bill 1946.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1949.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1951.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1953.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1955.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1957.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1960.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1962.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1971.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1972.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1973.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1974.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1975.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1976.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1977.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1978.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1979.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1980.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1988.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1991.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1993.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1994.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1995.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

And Senate Bill 2003.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading -- 3rd Reading of the bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is, shall Senate Bills on this order pass. All in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 32, the Nays are 16, 2 voting Present. The -- the bills just read by the Secretary on this order of business, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Announcements. Senator Watson. Senator Watson.

### SENATOR WATSON:

We would like to verify the affirmative on Senate Bill 20. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Watson has... Senator Watson has moved - Senator Welch, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR WELCH:

Mr. Chairman, this is another way to divide the question. It's dilatory, and I would ask the Chair rule it out of order.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson, it's the -- it's the opinion of the Chair that if, in fact, you wish -- if you wish a verification of the roll call, it would be on the entire order of the bills that just passed, not just a single -- not just a single vote. So, you request a verification of -- of the vote of the bills that we just passed? Senator Watson.

### SENATOR WATSON:

I would like to have Senator Righter recognized.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Senator Righter.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Mr. President, I -- I need you to help me through something. In walking through some of these bills, I can see that there's probably a number of these bills that I would intend to vote Yes on. Now, as you can see, I've got my No -- my No...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, Senator Righter, we're on -- we're on the -- we're on the question of verification. Now are we -- are we verifying or what are we doing? Senator Righter.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Well, if we're going to go forward to the -- verification, then I would more than be glad to make my point after the verification's completed, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

### SENATOR WATSON:

Well, we just want to reemphasize the fact that the verification should be on Senate Bill 20, each -- we -- we didn't have any opportunity for debate on any of these bills. There could very well be some of us that would like to vote for it, some would vote against, some would vote -- but we -- we think we -- we want a verification on Senate Bill 20.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson...

### SENATOR WATSON:

And we think we have every right to do that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Chair rules that out of order. If you wish to have verification on the entire package of bills that passed, that's another matter. Senator Watson.

### SENATOR WATSON:

Well, once again, if you're going to trample on the right of a Member, that's fine, I guess, in the eyes of at least thirty-three Members, but we, on this side, don't agree with that at all. But we will go ahead and proceed with a verification of the thirty-two Yes votes on this... what bill number is this by the way? What bill number is this?

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

It is on the package of bills that were read by the Secretary that passed. Senator Watson seeks verification. Do you still seek verification, Senator? He still seeks verification. Madam Secretary, will you read those Members who voted in the affirmative. Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson, do you challenge the -- anyone who -- any Member who voted in the affirmative? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Senator John Sullivan.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator John Sullivan is near his seat. Near his seat. Oh, I beg your pardon. He did not vote. Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

You know, I wonder why he voted No, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

It's the...

### SENATOR WATSON:

I think -- I think I know why he voted No, is that your staff and you understand that this process smells, that this is not right.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson, we're on verification.

## SENATOR WATSON:

That's what you understand and that's what your staff has directed him to do: John, you vote No on this because this is not good process. This is not what it's all about.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

On a verified...

### SENATOR WATSON:

This is trampling on the rights of Members.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

On a...

### SENATOR WATSON:

This is something that I know the people over there on that side did not agree with what we're doing here today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

On a verification, the Ayes are 30, the Nays are 16... SENATOR WATSON:

The vast majority of you wouldn't agree with this process. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

...2 voting Present. Senate stands in recess to the call of the Chair.

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES)

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senate will come to order. There is a series of announcements that Members wish there to be made. There -- on announcements. Senator Silverstein, for what purpose do you rise?

### SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

For purpose of an announcement, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

State your point.

### SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

I just want to announce that the Senate Executive Committee -- Committee will meet at 1 o'clock in Room 212, and I'm also announcing that the Floor amendments will be heard one hour from the time that we recess, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further announcements? Link? Senator Link. SENATOR LINK:

Yes, Mr. President, I want to announce that the Senate Revenue Committee will be meeting one hour after recess in Room 400.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Woolard.

SENATOR WOOLARD:

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Likewise, I'd like to make an announcement that in A-1, one hour preceding for -- following the -- or, recess, that State Government will be meeting.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Cullerton.

### SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes, for the purposes of an announcement. The Judiciary Committee scheduled to meet at 2:30 in Room 400. We will meet at that time unless the Executive Committee has not completed their business, and if they haven't, we'll meet as soon as the Executive is completed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Shadid.

### SENATOR SHADID:

Have an announcement, Mr. President. Transportation -- Transportation will be meeting at 2:30 in A-1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. The -- the Senate will recess to the call of the Chair this afternoon. Recess.

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES)

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Would the Members who are in their offices please come to the Floor? We're going to start action in a couple of minutes. Please have all Members up on the Floor of the Senate. Thank you. The Senate will come to order. Madam Secretary, Committee Reports.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Demuzio, Chairman of the Committee on Rules, reports the following Legislative Measures have been assigned: Refer to Agriculture and Conservation Committee -- pardon me, the only item on is Be Approved for Consideration - House Joint Resolution No. 28.

Senator Silverstein, Chairperson of the Committee on Executive, reports Senate Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 10, Senate Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 13, Senate Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 67, Senate Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 553, Senate Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 591, Senate Amendment No.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

2 to Senate Bill 629, Senate Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 640, Senate Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1003, Senate Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1054, Senate Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 1497, and Senate Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1586, all be --all Be Adopted.

Senator Silverstein, Chairperson of the Committee on Executive, reports House Bills 2626 and 2660 Do Pass, and House Joint Resolution 11 Be Adopted.

Senator Woolard, Chairperson of the Committee on State Government, reports Senate Bill -- pardon me, Senate Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1530 {sic}(1069) and Senate Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1530, all Be Adopted.

Senator Link, Chairperson of the Committee on Revenue, reports Senate Amendments -- 1 to Senate Bill 529, Senate Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1102, Senate Amendment No. 2 -- No. 1 to Senate Bill 1126, all Be Adopted.

Senator Shadid, Chairperson of the Committee on Transportation, reports Senate Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 150 Be Adopted.

Senator -- pardon me, Senators Cullerton and Dillard, Chairpersons of the Committee on Judiciary, reports Senate Amendment No. 4 to Senate Bill 15, Senate Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 52, Senate Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 96, Senate Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 173, Senate Amendment No. 4 to Senate Bill 472, Senate Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 690, Senate Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1053, Senate Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 690, Senate Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1053, Senate Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1506, all Be Approved for Consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

A point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

State your point, Senator.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Well, I wanted to thank everyone here for helping me have a very...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Could we -- could we have the Senate's attention? SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

For having -- for helping me have a very unusual and very happy birthday today, a couple of days ahead of time, but it's nice that it is today. And I want to remind everyone that I wish congratulations to our good friend, Carol Cronin -- Carol Ronen, rather, on her birthday. We're both Aries, both stubborn women, you know, and I want to tell everyone that we have plenty of cake. We have another cake back here. Please help yourself. We have plenty of cake and please enjoy it. And thank you, again, for being so nice.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Oh...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

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

Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

State your point, Senator.

### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Yesterday my good friend, Dave Syverson, alerted the -- the technical staff and the electrician that my red light must have been malfunctioning 'cause I voted green twice. I'd just like the same -- and I appreciate the -- the -- the astute and very quick effort to repair my light. Earlier this morning, I had my speak light on before we recessed, and it appears that my speak light may not be working today. Maybe the same electrician, when he was doing the correction, if you could ask him to take a look, 'cause I thought when it flashed, it would be recognized up there. So, I'd appreciate the Senate -- the President's attention.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

I don't know how that happened. Senator Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I forgot -- thank you. Point of personal privilege. I want to...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

State -- state your point, Senator.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

#### SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I want to thank Linda Hinton and all the staff and Senator Watson and Senator Jones for all being so nice. And please help yourself to the cake. And thank you again.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

It's a second call to eat cake from Senator Geo-Karis. Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR RIGHTER:

Point of order, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

State your point.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Mr. President, before we recessed the Chamber earlier today, I had risen on a point of order to discuss the way the bills were being handled on the Calendar. There was a pending verification of the roll call. I was told that they would come back to me. Of course, that never happened. I'd like to, just very briefly, make that point right now before we get rolling on everything else just to save a little time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Please proceed.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

I was -- to be fair, that's right, Senator Woolard, I left with my speak light on and I was told -- and when I came back, it was off and I was told that I had been recognized while I was gone. And I understand why you might want to do that. In all seriousness, Mr. President, regarding the way that was handled earlier today, with regards to the calling not of a number of bills, but of eleven pages on the two hundred and forty-seven bills, Calendar, it's expectation, as a Member of the Senate, to be able to vote on these bills individually, not to spend all the time in the world debating them and arguing with their sponsor and having everything I want, but having the opportunity to vote on the bills individually. And the problem I have, Mr. President, is that I would have liked to have supported some of those bills. I would have liked to talk to the sponsors, even for just ninety seconds, about some of the bills, before deciding what I wanted to do. I'm an attorney here in Illinois. I'm bound by Supreme

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Court rule and Illinois law that I've got certain conflict of interest that I have to deal with, and that's the reason I couldn't vote yet on -- Yes on those bills because there may very well be in those bills conflict of interest positions for me, which, even though they're shells now, it would be a very, very bad idea for me to vote on those. So, I mean, that's the reason I was forced to vote No on those; otherwise, I would have certainly liked to have supported those bills. I appreciate, Mr. President, you taking the time to listen to my point of order.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator, the record will reflect your statement. Senator Brady, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BRADY:

Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

State your point.

### SENATOR BRADY:

The episode that happened before we recessed was one of a first for me in my ten years. Even in the House in ten years, I've never been in a situation where my speak light wasn't recognized. Believing that I would have been given the courtesy in being recognized, I waited and didn't vote, which meant that I and other Members in this Chamber, because of the lack of courtesy, didn't have a chance to vote, believing they would be I want the record to reflect that I did not intend recognized. to miss two hundred and some votes at one time, believing that that courtesy would be extended. A question, though, in my point, to Senator Jacobs, on -- bills 1701, 1704, and 1705, these were pension bills in that massive two hundred and forty vote. Our side is very concerned that those pension bills may deal with Chicago teacher pension issues. If Senator Jacobs could respond to that to give some assurance to our side about the intention of those bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator -- Senator Jacobs hasn't yield, however he does have his light on, so I will call on him and leave it up to him whether he wishes to answer or not. All right? Senator Jacobs, for what purpose do you rise?

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

#### SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Just to -- and, Senator Brady, I -- I don't remember right now - I don't have the list in front of me - whether those were on the Agreed List that we had talked about. Those were the only ones. If they were, I apologize for that action. But -but let me state this, in regards to the previous speaker on -on debating, you know, or -- or wanting to vote individually on certain shell bills. I guess my question is, how do you debate a shell bill? There is nothing in it. There is no intent. don't really know - and -- and you're very well aware of it on the other side of the aisle - what the -- what the Leadership may have in mind with certain shell bills or what may happen to 'em in the House, because when they come back, we still have the opportunity to vote on those bills. So, I -- I share your concern. I share your -- your frustration, but yet, at the same time -- and I share your pain. But what I want to do is to ensure that the process moves along and that we're not dilatory. I think that was the President's intent, and I don't think it was the intent to push anything down anybody's throat, because we're going to have to see these bills again if they have any substantive language in 'em. And I will confer with Senator Brady on those bills that he referred to.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Watson, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank -- thank you very much, Mr. President. Earlier today, an entire order of business containing two hundred and forty-seven divisible points was passed out of this Chamber on one single roll call. The bill numbers were not identified on the electronic tote board and the Members were not afforded an opportunity to question the sponsors. No individual roll calls were taken. Pursuant to the Illinois Constitution and the Senate rules, each House must keep a daily Journal of its proceedings. How is such action, Mr. President, reflected in the Journal, and without individual roll calls, how will the action taken earlier today be journalized for the record? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

The bills were read individually by the Clerk. The record will reflect that. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are going to try to get out of here tonight and not be in here Friday. For that reason, on page 2 of the Calendar is the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading. Senator, that issue has been disposed of. Yes it has. Madam Secretary, Order of 2nd Reading. What -- for what purpose do you rise?

#### SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you. Thank you very much. Just to -- one thing to say is that in all the times that I've been -- and I'm -- all the times that I've been in the Senate, both under Senate Democrat and Republican leadership, a Leader, regardless of whether he was the President of the Senate or a Minority Leader, had never been denied the opportunity to speak. I was denied that opportunity. I was denied that opportunity, Mr. President, under a different leadership at the podium, just for your -- for the record. But I also want to -- like to ask, what type of documentation will be provided in the official bill file for each of these bills when a roll call was not taken on each of the -- of the bills?

## PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator, it's the Chair's position that roll calls were taken on each and every bill because each and every bill was read with the understanding, implied and expressed, that the roll call would apply to each and every bill. Senator Jones, for what purpose do you rise?

### SENATOR E. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. I feel compelled to respond to the remarks of the Minority Leader. If I can recall correctly, when the Minority Leader was in the Chair and I served in that capacity with my light on, asking you to recognize me, and you just ignored me as if I did not exist, on the closing night of Session. As I told you in our conversations, we, on this side, will be fair. I can understand dilatory tactics in attempt to slow down the process. But I recall you in that Chair refusing to recognize me. So, don't make that statement that the Minority Leader was never recognized. I'm a witness to it. But having served in the Minority, as I indicated to you, I'll always be fair. I can sympathize with you. I still have the

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

scars on my back, so not -- don't stand before this Body now and talk about you -- you're being mistreated. We've been very fair with you. I believe last Session, Session before that, Session before that, we were lucky if we got five or ten percent of the bills introduced were let out of the Rules Committee. Over fifty percent of the bills your Members introduced have been let out. So, maybe we've been too fair. But we don't want to act as though -- the way you acted in the past. We will continue to be fair with each and every individual. But don't get on the Floor and talk about how good things were, and so forth. When I looked you in your eye, and you refused to recognize me.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Page -- page 2, 2nd Reading, Senate Bill 2 has a fiscal note. Senate Bill No. 10. Senator Larry Walsh. Senate -- we're -- we're on the order of business of 2nd Reading, Senator. Senator Larry Walsh. Senate Bill 10. We're on the Order of 2nd Reading. Senator Watson.

### SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you. Thank you. Well, I -- I don't know what to say in regard to Senator Jones' comments here. Whenever I was in the Chair, I made every effort to be as fair as I could and I recognized everyone when anytime their light was on. I don't recall that at all, Senator Jones, and what you're referring to. It certainly would never have been my intent to do what was done earlier today in the manner in which it was done, Senator. I would never have done that. So, I just -- you know, I'm sorry that you feel that way, but we were shut down. I was given -- I was not given the opportunity to speak and, in fact, similar -- looks as though it's not going to end now with -- with the current President, giving us the opportunity to at least have access to -- to the Floor and to the microphone. So, I think this is a -- kind of a sad day.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senate Bill 10. Senator Larry Walsh. Senator Walsh, do you wish the bill read? Madam Secretary, read the bill.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 10.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Walsh.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Larry Walsh.

#### SENATOR WALSH:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 10 basically starts a tuition -- a program that -- in our higher education institutions that we would start a tuition charged an undergraduate student who is an Illinois resident shall not exceed that amount that the student was charged for the time he or she is enrolled in the university. So, it basically is a guaranteed tuition cost for a four-year period.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Jacobs, for what purpose do you rise?

### SENATOR JACOBS:

...the previous question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Jacobs moves the previous question. All in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. On Senate Bills 2nd Reading, all in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. 3rd Reading. Senate Bill 13. Senator Demuzio. Please -- Senator, please read the rules. Recognition of lights is up to the Chair. It's in the rules. We have spoken on the same issue time after time. The question was -- the question was moved. There was a motion to move the previous question. All right. All right. Senator Burzynski, for what purpose do you rise?

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you. Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Senator, I know that we went through this in committee, but I think it's important we go through it again so that the rest of the Members understand what this bill does, what its impact is on our universities throughout the State, what its potential impact could be on students in the State, what its impact could be on the budget that we've got that's supposed to be proposed, its impact is on the current fiscal year universities are in. In light of the fact that the Governor's Office has asked all of our universities for an eight-percent holdback in its current year's budget - that's Fiscal Year '03, I might add - which is quite a bit of funding when we consider there are only about two and a half months left in the fiscal year for these universities, what impact could this bill have on these universities in FY'04?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

### SENATOR WALSH:

Thank you, Senator. The impact -- there wouldn't be any impact because -- until the new -- the new -- the -- the date of the beginning of this program, which would be in 2004.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Burzynski.

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

...you. Thank you. I -- I want to just make sure we clarified that, so that's good. The second question I had when we talked about this in committee is that a concern that I have is the fact that we're looking at doing this at a time when we do have such restrictions that are being placed. Has there been any concern that universities prior to this time might actually bump up tuition rates, inflate them, because of the potential impact this bill could have on their budgets?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

## SENATOR WALSH:

As we said in committee, that is absolutely true. The issue is, is that we have been watching inflated tuition increases every year. For us to say that that -- that that won't happen, well, we'd be foolish to say that. But let me -- let me just say, if I may interject, Senator Burzynski, that as soon as

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

-- as soon as I left the Executive Committee, members from universities have been with me for a thirty-minute meeting and we have discussed already the -- the possibility of another amendment that I had indicated in the committee that they feel comfortable in that would maybe address many of the concerns. We had a good line of communications and honest discussions on how we can address some of the concerns that they heard in committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Burzynski.

#### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President. Then just as a -- a kind of a final follow-up then, 'cause I don't want to belabor it: I'm -- I'm glad they came to see you, because I think that's important. And they had indicated they hadn't spoken to you personally. So, that's great. But let me -- let me indicate that -- that is it your -- is it your intention, then, to hold this bill on 3rd next week in -- in hopes that there is an amendment that comes forward, or do you think that's a possibility?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

### SENATOR WALSH:

No, honestly, Senator, I think I'm going to have amendment ready to -- to present before the deadline next week and -- and put it on and actually, hopefully, pass Senate Bill 10 out of -out of this Chamber by the end of the week. And let me -- let indicate that -- that a representative from Western University was in the discussions today. This basically is somewhat of a model program that we are running off of theirs. They indicated that they're into the third year. They haven't really worked out all of the niches yet but that they are working forward. And -- and in -- in all reality, what we are trying to do with Senate Bill 10 was for that purpose, was to bring the universities to the table to talk about the issue of ever, ever increasing tuition costs. And -- and now that we have really sat down, we've come up with some good ideas. talked about a lot of good ideas on how we're going to handle the fifth-year student and issues like that, that I think we can come to a commonsense approach of solving the problem.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Indicates he'll yield, Senator.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, I think it's a good idea. A couple of questions for the benefit of the Members and then a follow-up question based on your -- your possible amendments. First is, this does not include out-of-state students, is that right?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

That is correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

That's a good idea. The second thing is, do you -- does your staff have an indication about the cost involved, the amount of savings that you would anticipate that students would receive under your proposal, on average?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

We guesstimate that we probably will be saving the student three to four percent per year over the term of either a fouror five-year program.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator Walsh, one of the -- one of the issues that our staff brought up was the -- the concept of the definition of an academic year. The bill, as it's currently drafted, as I understand it - and I don't think it's in the amendment - has -- there is no definition of academic year. That is something, clearly, that needs to be addressed so that you don't have the person who's just sort of lumping along, not just on the five-year plan, but the six-year and the seven-year and the eight-

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

year plan. Could you speak to that and just reveal your intentions? Maybe...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

...it came out of your committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

#### SENATOR WALSH:

Our -- our discussion, we -- we were -- we -- we discussed that issue. We have a -- a couple of ideas in regards to the fact that, for an example, if a student started his freshman year and he was taking a major in, let's just say, liberal arts and that tuition was five thousand dollars a year. After two years he decided he wanted to go to engineering, that -- and that tuition at the beginning of his freshman year would have cost six thousand dollars, then the remaining two years would be at that higher price. And the same would work for the fact that if he started as a freshman in engineering and paying six thousand dollars and, after two years, made the decision that he did not want to continue but to drop down into a liberal arts program, his tuition would be reduced by the same amount, based on what the tuition cost would have been as a freshman. On the fifth year, we -- we also discussed the issue of a fifth year. Some college courses take a five year. We were going to leave the latitude to -- as it stands right now, the discussion was, we were going to leave the latitude of -- of working that out to the institution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Last question. Does this have any impact on the Bright Start Program or any of the prepaid college programs that we have in the State?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

#### SENATOR WALSH:

It is our intention that it should not have any -- any plan at all. I think what this is going to do is maybe -- maybe,

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

hopefully, even help those programs that when their student -when their child goes to school, that they'll know that they have a predicted amount of -- of cost for the term of -- they're going to be in college.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Winkel.

#### SENATOR WINKEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. I notice on the board, there's no indication as to which amendment we're debating here. Just thought I'd point that out. I...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Thank you, Senator.

#### SENATOR WINKEL:

Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Yes. State your point.

#### SENATOR WINKEL:

Earlier today, there was -- there was a vote on two hundred and forty-seven bills on 3rd Reading. I had my light on, wasn't recognized, had hoped to speak and did not vote on that bill. And as a previous speaker indicated, I certainly would not have the record reflect that I missed a vote on two hundred and forty-seven bills. That would be highly inaccurate. So, obviously, I do appreciate your recognizing me now and would have appreciated, had I been recognized by the President who was in the Chair earlier today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

The record will so reflect, Senator Winkel. Senator Bomke. SENATOR BOMKE:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Would the gentleman in front of you please -- thank you. SENATOR BOMKE:

Thank you. Like Senator Brady and Senator Winkel, I too had my light on this afternoon with full expectations of having an opportunity to speak. Therefore, I -- in waiting, in anticipation of speaking, I did not vote. Had I voted, I would have voted No on all two hundred and forty-seven of those bills, and I'd like the record to reflect that, please.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

The record will reflect your intention, Senator Bomke. There being no further discussion, all in favor of Floor Amendment No. 2, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 13. Senator Demuzio. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 13.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Are there any Floor amendments?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Demuzio.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Demuzio.

### SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you very much, Mr. -- Mr. President. Amendment No. 1 retained the underlying bill. It had a -- to do with the subpoena power of the Secretary of State Inspector General. Would exempt records of a recognized labor organization that is the exclusive bargaining representative of employees. We will modify that by the -- we will adopt this amendment and then we will put the committee amendment on that was necessary in order to correct this by the next amendment. I would move the adoption of this amendment.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Madam Secretary, are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 14 is being held. Senator Obama. Senate Bill 15. Senate Bill 15 has a fiscal note. We're holding that one. Senate Bill 24. Senator del Valle. Senator del Valle. Senator del Valle. Senator Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 30.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Madam Secretary, are there any Floor amendments

approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Obama.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Obama.

#### SENATOR OBAMA:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is the racial profiling bill that we've been working on with law enforcement and others. The -- this amendment essentially reflects the latest state of affairs. We may have one more additional Floor amendment to add. I'd ask that we hold debate on the bill, at this point, until we have all the amendments in place.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

You wish to hold this bill on 2nd?

### SENATOR OBAMA:

No. I would like to move it to 3rd, but we may have an additional Floor amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

All right. Okay. I'm sorry. I misunderstood. Is there any discussion? Senator Righter.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Just -- and I'm sorry if I missed it, Mr. President. If the sponsor explained the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Obama.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

#### SENATOR OBAMA:

Senator Righter, this is the racial profiling legislation that we've been working on for quite some time. The amendment tunes up on the basic concept that had to do with -- essentially, the structure of the bill is that it -- it requires diversity training and, in addition to that, it also provides for data collection. We're still working on the process. We anticipate that there may be one final clean-up amendment. It came out of committee with no opposition, and I would ask that in terms of debating the merits of the bill, that we wait until 3rd Reading, when all the amendments are in place.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Righter.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Point of order, Mr. President. Is there a fiscal note...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

State your point.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

...on this legislation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

There is a fiscal note. It was received yesterday.

### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

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

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 67. Senator del Valle. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 67.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The committee -- no committee amendments.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

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

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator del Valle.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator del Valle.

#### SENATOR DEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is a bill also that is not necessarily in its final form. I'd like to adopt the Floor amendment and move it to 3rd. We're going to continue to talk to the Secretary of State's Office and the Governor's Office, and hopefully we'll come up with a -- with a final version.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

All right. Is there any discussion? Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator.

### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, just for the benefit of the Members, could you explain the -- the amendment as it relates to the original bill and sort of what direction the negotiations are going and -- just to kind of put it in context as it relates to the original bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator del Valle.

### SENATOR DEL VALLE:

Yes, Senator Roskam. The amendment would require the use of the individual tax identification number as a substitute for the social security number. It would also allow the Secretary of State to establish another discreet number and require the Secretary of State to establish rules to determine additional identification necessary in order to determine residency in the State of Illinois. That's what the amendment does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, what would be the purpose of having the Secretary of State have an additional number? I understand -- I may not agree, necessarily, and we'll talk about that on 3rd Reading,

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

but -- about -- about the ITIN number. But what would be the possible reason for the Secretary of State to have an additional number that -- that they could -- that they could come up with? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator del Valle.

#### SENATOR DEL VALLE:

The reason I -- I left that in the bill is because it's -- it's part of the -- the current -- current law, and in discussions with the Secretary of State's Office, they said that they would want to have that option still available to them. The reasons for that...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam. Sorry.

#### SENATOR DEL VALLE:

I think they'd -- they'd have to elaborate on that, but they said they didn't want that option taken away from them. Currently, the whole -- the whole requirement is discretionary, because the current law says the Secretary of State "may". So, we're already changing that to requiring the ITIN number and allowing the additional number to be discretionary, as it is now in the existing law.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

For the benefit of the Members, can you just briefly explain what an ITIN number is - that's a term of art that in the committee we've gotten to know - and, also, how you acquire it and how that's different than the acquisition of a social security number?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator del Valle.

### SENATOR DEL VALLE:

I'll be glad to get into that, but if I call the bill on 3rd Reading, I'll be glad to elaborate on all of this. The individual tax identification number is given to an individual who has to file and is filing taxes with the IRS, and that individual number is given to a person who does not have a social security number for the purpose of filing. Now, in the process of filing the ITIN and getting the ITIN number, they

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

have to present several pieces of identification, including birth certificate and a number of other things that -- that -- that verify their address, et cetera.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Rauschenberger.

#### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

I just want to rise Thank you, Mr. President. enthusiastic compliment to the sponsor. He's done a lot of work on this bill, and this is a concept that I think Illinois needs to really move forward on and get their arms around. But I did want to kind of put the Members on notice that -- that there's also some hope, over time, that we take a solid look at the concept of biometrics as a primary identifier. Conceptually, when -- when anybody seeks to identify anybody, they start with the primary documents - the birth certificate, the -- the marriage certificate, your -- your baptismal certificate. Those kind of things provide, in the American system, the kind of primary documents. There's no really official government process of establishing identity. Now, when we have people who come to the United States and become, you know, residents but don't end up establishing official documentation and are residents here for a long time, one of the ways that's being kind of discussed in the Washington scene is -- is using a biometric model like identification. Because the goal of the process eventually, from a homeland security point of view, is to make sure that we have a single un-duplicable identity for each person that we issue a State ID to. So, I just think the I've talked a little bit about sponsor's done a lot of work. biometrics with him. I realize that this is a process he's going through, but I -- I just -- he's spent a lot of time on this, and I just want him to know that we're trying to get there with him and appreciate the work he's done.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

Point of order, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

State your point, Senator.

SENATOR OBAMA:

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

You know, I just have a -- a brief comment. I know that this has been a frustrating day for many Members, particularly Members on that side of the aisle. I respect the notion that you're, you know, concerned about it. I -- I -- I just want to make the comment that in my experience in the seven years of being in the Senate, that most of the time, at least, when we were moving 2nds to 3rds, that that was seen as a procedural matter and that most of the debate would then take place on 3rd. I very much think that -- many of these issues and the points that are being raised are legitimate, are of relevant concern, but, unfortunately, what ends up happening, I think, on a lot of this stuff is we're going to end up having duplicative debates, we're going to debate it for ten minutes or thirty minutes on 2nd Reading and then do the same on 3rd. And it just strikes me that if all of us can show a little bit of restraint on the 2nds -- moving 2nds to 3rds, I think we will still have ample time to debate back and forth these matters on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Watson.

#### SENATOR WATSON:

Well, in light of that previous comment, I'm -- just got to refer back to the entire order of business containing two hundred and forty-seven divisible points was passed out of this Chamber on one single roll call. We weren't given -- there was no debate, Mr. President, not one single opportunity for debate from any Member of this Body. So for -- the comments from the previous speaker were ludicrous, ludicrous. And I don't hear anybody here -- these are all legitimate questions. And I sat in the committee -- I sat in the committee, the Executive Committee, and listened to a lot of the -- the legislation and debate that took place there and these are legitimate questions that we had in committee. We're not -- this is not dilatory. We're not trying to slow the process down. That -- that's not it at all. So, that last -- that last comment that was made is -- just strike it from the record.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator del Valle -- Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Thank you, Mr. President. You know, there were some of us on this side of the aisle who had our light lit, too, and they ignored us as well because they wanted the process to move forward. But I do want to remind Minority Leader Watson, you used to be in that Chair, and when you were in that Chair, you were firmly in control. You ran the Senate the way you wanted to run it, and you didn't care what no one else had to say. So, you -- you -- what a difference a day makes. But, remember, you were firm, you were in control, and you handled the Senate business in the way that you desired and the desires of President Philip and you -- you did what you wanted to do. So, at least now allow debate on 3rd Reading instead of these stalling tactics, because that does no good for anyone.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Seeing no further discussion, all those in favor of the amendment, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is approved. Are there any further Floor amendments? SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 71. Senator Walsh. Senate Bill 77. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 99. Senator Carol Ronen. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 99.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 101. Senator Ronen. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 101.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Committee on Executive. Are there any Floor amendments? SECRETARY HAWKER:

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 102. Senator Clayborne. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 102.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Executive adopted Committee Amendment No. 3.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Are there any Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 109. Senator Watson. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 109.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Are there any Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senator Dillard. Senate Bill 114. Senator Obama. Senate Bill 127. Senate Bill 132. Senator Walsh. Senate Bill 151. Senator Viverito. Senate Bill 158. Senator Halvorson. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 158.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 172. Senator John Sullivan. Senate Bill 224. Senator Clayborne. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

3/27/2003

27th Legislative Day

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 224.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 247. Senator Brady. Senate Bill 248. Senator Ronen. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 248.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Are there any Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 263. Senator Obama. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 263.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Health and Human Services adopted Committee Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Are there any Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 309. Senator Ronen. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 309.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 315. Senator Viverito. Senate Bill 324. Senator Schoenberg. Read the bill, Madam Secretary. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 324.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 334. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 374. Senator Hunter. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 374.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 383. Senator Viverito. Senate Bill 397. Senator Schoenberg. Senate Bill 429. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 430. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 475. Senator Silverstein. Senate Bill 481. Senator Clayborne. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 481.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 498. Senator Halvorson. Senate Bill 501. Senator Halvorson. Top of page 4. Senate Bill 517. Senator Schoenberg. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 517.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. 518. Senator Schoenberg. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Senate Bill 518.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senator Schoenberg. Senate Bill 521. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 521.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Are there any Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Yes. Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Schoenberg.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Floor Amendment No. 1 is a technical change as a result of a drafting error.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 552. Senator Obama. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 552.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. Committee on Health and Human Services adopted Committee Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Are there any Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 566. Senator Demuzio. Read the bill.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 566.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 567. Senator Halvorson. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 567.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 580. Senator DeLeo. Senate Bill 581. Senator DeLeo. 582, 583, 584, 585, 586. 588. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 589. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 591. Senator Martinez. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 591.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Are there any Floor amendments?

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Martinez.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Martinez.

#### SENATOR MARTINEZ:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. This is just a technical, cleaning up the language in the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments?

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 594. Senator Clayborne. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 594.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 599. Senator Lauzen. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 599.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 600. Senator Lightford. Top of page 5. Senate Bill 605. Senator Radogno. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 605.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. The Committee on Local Government adopted Committee -- pardon me. Pardon me. No -- no committee or Floor amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 609. Senator Jacobs. Senate Bill 615. Senator DeLeo. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 615.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Are there any Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator DeLeo.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Senator DeLeo.

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Amendment No. 1 was something that came up in the -- in the committee about the notice and this -- this allows notice to be sent to the person who's most recent tax bill would be mailed to. This was a -- was asked in committee. The amendment addresses that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, can you tell us about this amendment and the underlying bill and how the bill is changed by the amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator DeLeo.

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

The original underlying bill said they could just publish it in a -- in a newspaper. The amendment says that people be notified by the assessor by mail.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

### SENATOR ROSKAM:

This is on changes to the assessments, is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator DeLeo.

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

No, it is not.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Then you lost me. What's the cost in mail versus newspaper, Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator DeLeo.

### SENATOR DeLEO:

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

I have no idea.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

I don't -- I have no idea because I don't know the -- the number of people that would be notified on an assessment change.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Well, if -- if you had to venture a guess. I mean, you're proposing a change in the law and if you had to estimate. We've done -- I haven't heard too many good numbers today, actually, in the Executive Committee, in terms of estimates, but you're a better estimator than we heard today. What would you estimate, Senator, is the cost of your bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator DeLeo.

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

I don't think that would be a fair factor and -- we could get an estimate. We'll have the assessor give us an estimate before this moves out of this Chamber on 3rd Reading, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Well, just so we're clear. What -- what you're proposing is to change the way in which changes in the assessments are communicated to property taxpayers?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator DeLeo.

#### SENATOR DeLEO:

That's in the bill. This is the amendment we're adopting now, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

I understand that, Senator, but what I'm trying to -- to get is, what's the relationship between the amendment and the bill? That's still not clear to me. Everybody else here gets it, but I still don't get it.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

Are we talking about the amendment or the assessment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR DELEO:

...the amendment or the -- the actual bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

The amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

The amendment -- individual notice if the assessment is changed. There'll be written notice if the assessment is changed. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

No further discussion, all those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 623. Senator Sieben. Senator Sieben. There he is. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 623.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 624. Senator Sieben. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 624.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Are there any Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senator Walsh. Senate Bill 629. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 629.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd Reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Are there any Floor amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Floor Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Walsh.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

I'll be right with you. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Amendment No. 2 amends the United {sic} (Unified) Code of Corrections in the privatization of commissary services. We have been working on this bill for the last two or three weeks and feel that we have come together in regards to the -- putting together a program on the profits that are made off of commissary at our correction facilities. It's language that was put together with AFSCME locals -- or, AFSCME union employees and DOC. And basically what it does is retains the underlying bill and sets charges or gives them the opportunity to set what they feel are the necessary mark-up charges on products that are sold at commissary. So, I'd be willing to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Couple questions of the sponsor and I'll try to talk...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

#### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

...real fast. Am I correct in the change in the bill, we're no longer taking the commissary profits and returning them to the General Revenue Fund? Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

#### SENATOR WALSH:

Yes, you are correct. They go straight to the Department of Corrections.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Rauschenberger.

#### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Well, and then just -- I'll just make a quick statement and you just tell me whether I'm nuts or not. I'll talk real fast. But I -- I thought the original concept of this bill was to -to allow commissaries to raise their prices, to take their profits, return 'em to the General Revenue Fund, because that helped us justify not competitively bidding out commissary. other words, the excess profits would help offset the costs of using unionized people to run a commissary instead of bidding it out. So now we've taken this -- what some might argue was a pretty good idea and helped us justify not privatizing any further even though it would benefit the taxpayers - we were kind of returning to the taxpayers with the commissary funds now we've decided in this bill, as I understand the amendment, that we're going to take the excess commissary profits, which are made from inmates who have no choice but to buy from our commissary, and we're going to use them for recreational and beneficial things for union AFSCME employees and, once in a Is that -- is that while maybe, perhaps, the inmates. essentially what this reform bill now does?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

### SENATOR WALSH:

Well, I don't think that is exactly right in the -- in the way that you laid it out, Senator, that once in a while it goes back to the inmates. Basically, what -- what we are doing with this bill is the -- the -- the profits -- originally, the language in this bill wanted the -- wanted the profits to go to

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

help underwrite the cost of employees' salaries and benefits. And DOC came to us and explained that that was going to cause a problem as far as a -- as a secondary source of -- of income for an employee and problems with -- problems with pensions and W-2s and et cetera, et cetera, et cetera all come forward. So, they decided that -- that General Revenue funds would still pay for the employees and this money would then go to the benefits of employees working in the commissary and in inmates in the facilities. The -- the issues -- or, the products and services that they've provided to the -- to the employees and the inmates that used to be under tax dollars, that used to be expended by taxpayers' dollars, are now going to be paid for by the profits from the commissary.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Rauschenberger.

#### SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

I -- I won't belabor the point 'cause I do not want to annoy the -- the guy with the gavel. But it would seem to me that -- that we don't have a definition for "benefits". The idea, somehow, that there is no oversight on this money, except for each local bargaining unit and the warden get to kind of control the distribution of this little slush fund, I think we've taken an idea that had some merit - reimbursing the General Fund for the expense - and now turned it into something that may make some State employees happy but I -- you know, I think you've got a good bill and you're -- you're not making it any better, but I certainly appreciate your right to bring the bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Watson.

#### SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator.

### SENATOR WATSON:

Do you have any idea, Larry, how much this will generate in -- in additional dollars?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

#### SENATOR WALSH:

Senator, I don't have -- I don't have a number available right here. I can get that number. I will try and get that as close as we can, as far as additional dollars.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Watson.

#### SENATOR WATSON:

If this -- if it's the same markup that we had Okay. talked about under the bill that we passed last year, if it's the same percentages, if I recall, it was about nine million dollars, and it passed almost unanimously here in the -- in the Senate and I believe in the House also. And then unfortunately, it was vetoed by Governor Ryan, and the reason that it was vetoed was -- at least from his perspective - was that it was a anti-privatization attempt by the General Assembly. We -- and that's what your underlying language was, that legislation. And anybody that's on our side here or -- that has their analysis, it says that this is very similar to Senator Watson's bill from last year. Well, now it is not at all with this -- with this amendment. So, I guess my concern is that we are now generating another, if it is accurate, nine million dollars that's going to go into a fund that it will benefit the inmates and employees for whatever the decision of this committee would be. really isn't a lot of oversight or -- or responsibility on -- on -- in regard to this. The original intent was to have the money go for wages and -- and benefits of the employees in the commissary. And -- and that was to help offset the cost, and -and we were talking around nine million dollars. And we thought that was a reasonable approach to the whole issue of salaries of the people that were going to be privatized under Governor Ryan's initiative. So, to me, I -- I just think that this is turning -- turning the responsibility of nine million dollars over to a group that I would truly question should have that responsibility, and that's going to be employees, both union and management. I don't think that they should have the responsibility to determine how this slush fund will allocated. So, I think we ought to rise in opposition, and I ask for a roll call on this amendment, Mr. President, at appropriate time. Thank you.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Jacobs, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Move the previous question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Jacobs moves the previous question. There are three remaining speakers. Senator Righter.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

Indicates he'll yield.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Walsh, I have a couple Department of Corrections' facilities in my district and what -- the understanding that I had of the bill which, on very -- very thin ice, was shattered when you and Senator Rauschenberger went back and forth, and I want -- I'm not sure I understand exactly why you're trying to change it. It's my understanding that the underlying bill put the money from this increase back into the General Revenue Fund.

Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

#### SENATOR WALSH:

That is -- that is partially correct. DOC -- that money was supposed to go into General Revenue funds and then be put back into Department of Corrections' allocations -- appropriations and that DOC wanted that to come directly to them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Righter.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

And so the -- the purpose of the amendment is because the Department of Corrections wanted it come directly to them. But earlier, in -- in -- in -- an exchange that you had, you said there was a problem with the payment of benefits or them receiving other income. And what exactly would -- is that problem that the Department is trying to cure by putting this amendment on the bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

#### SENATOR WALSH:

DOC was just wanting to be assured that -- that that money that they were generating within their facilities was coming back to -- to DOC and to be used -- to be used on services and - that were -- this bill -- this bill is changing nothing more than what has been done in the -- in the -- in the -- in the State institutions for years, but it's just the fact that -- that -- that it is coming back and -- and being done by commissary money - commissary money - providing services by the commissary income, instead of by the taxpayers' dollars. That's what the long and short of this bill is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

It's getting pretty loud in here. Senator Righter.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Walsh, then what benefits are not being provided now for the employees and the inmates that will hope to be funded by this change?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

#### SENATOR WALSH:

It's -- it's exactly the same benefits.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Righter.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Then -- then -- I guess, then -- I'm truly lost. Then why -- what's the point of the change at all then?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

### SENATOR WALSH:

Because the benefits are now being paid by the money generated by the -- by the products purchased by -- by employees and by the -- the inmates in the facilities.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Righter.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

This -- this lifts a cap or increases a cap of what can be paid out for those -- benefits and services, is that right?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Senator Righter, he couldn't hear you. Will we please break up the conversations around Senator Walsh? Thank you. Senator Righter.

#### SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. This lifts the -- what is right now a statutorily imposed cap on the profits that can be then put into the services and benefits. Is that fair to say about the amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

#### SENATOR WALSH:

This -- what we are doing here is moving the -- the percentage of markup in our State facilities to exactly what is allowed by the federal government.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Luechtefeld.

#### SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

A question of the sponsor?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Indicates he'll yield, Senator.

### SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Senator, as you remember, last year this was a huge issue, the privatization issue, and the Governor was going to privatize dietary and commissary and so on. And I have probably more prison guards in my district than any other district in the State. Anyway, Senator Watson introduced a bill that I thought was a good bill to give a -- a good reason why we needed to continue to get away from privatization in -- in this area of commissary, in particular. Basically today, right now, there is a markup on those products and there is a profit. My first question is, if things stay exactly as they are now, tell me where that money goes. Now, I know part of it goes for equipment and stuff like that for the inmates. Am I right about that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

#### SENATOR WALSH:

That's correct, plus hygiene items and other, et cetera, you know, things for the -- for the inmates.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Does all of it go in -- under the present form, if nothing changed, does all of it go to the inmates in one form or another?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Where -- where does the other part go?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

It's -- also allows to provide benefits for the employees of the -- of the facilities.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Would you give me an example of benefits? What -- what are we talking about here?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

Senator Luechtefeld, before I make a statement that I -- that I -- I might be incorrect in, I will -- I will have that information for you on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Well, you know, I -- as you know, I am a hyphenated cosponsor on this bill because I thought it was the same bill, basically, that we did last year. And -- and, again, I -- I guess another question I would ask you: If we're going to up that limit that they can make up -- as far as profit is concerned - part of it's going to the inmates; is -- then part

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

of it's going to the employees - it will be used for the same thing that it has been used before, is that right? Nothing else changes? In other words, it'll be used for the same thing, which we're not real sure what that is right now, except that it will be a lot more money.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

#### SENATOR WALSH:

That -- that is my understanding. And let me just -- let me just say I've been handed information in regards to the comment that Minority Leader Watson made. The figure -- the figure that we're looking at here is about 2.8 million dollars. Now, I don't know where Senator Watson -- not, you know, debating his -- his -- his comment, but we are -- we are estimating that about 2.8 million dollars. So, but you are - you are correct, Senator Luechtefeld, that that is correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Luechtefeld.

#### SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Well -- and -- and I -- and we were involved in this in a big way last year to try to make this happen. As I remember it, the Department at that time said somewhere between six and eight million dollars. Again, but that money was going to be used to see to it that we -- that we did not privatize. Now it's not going to be used to see to it that we do not privatize. Is that issue, I take it, been guaranteed to you that that's off of the table, or...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Walsh.

### SENATOR WALSH:

No, it is -- it is still our -- it is still our -- our issue that -- that we are committing not to privatize. That is our intention. We are -- our intention is to make sure that -- that we -- that we maintain our -- our employees in the facilities to do the commissary work.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Well, it -- it would make sense, especially with the budget problems that we have today -- and -- and it's hard for me to believe that the Department of Corrections can't work that out, that it go to pay for salaries of those people who work there. I mean, we have -- instead, we're going to spend it on something else. We don't know exactly what, and -- and I understand that you're going to try to come up with some -- some examples. But that's going to be quite a bit of money that the employees now are going to have at their -- at their discretion, I guess. So, hopefully, we can get some of those answers when we -- we get on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, you'll recall a few years ago, and I mentioned this in committee a couple...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Excuse me, Senator Roskam. Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

Mr. President, let me allow to take this bill out of the record and -- and we'll move forward.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Take the bill out of the record. Senate Bill 655. Senator Radogno. Do you wish to move this bill? Senate Bill 656. They're appropriation vehicle bills, Senator. Do you want to move all of them? All right. Senate Bill 655. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 655.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 656. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Senate Bill 656.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 657. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 657.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 658. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 658.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 659, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 659.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 660, Mr. Secretary. Read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 660.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 661. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 661.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 662. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 662.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 663. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 663.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 664. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 664.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 665, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 665.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 666. Senator Syverson, do you wish to move that bill? Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 666.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 667. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 667.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senate -- 3rd Reading. Senate Bill 668. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 668.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 669. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 669.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 670. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 670.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 671. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary. ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 671.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 672. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 672.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 673. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Senate Bill 673.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 674. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 674.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 675. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 675.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 676. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 676.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 677. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 677.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 678. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 678.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 680. Senator Sandoval. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 680.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 681. Senator Ronen. Senate Bill 682. Senator Lightford. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 682.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 684. Senator Crotty. Senate Bill -- excuse me. Senate Bill 812. Senator Sandoval. Senator Sandoval. Could you please break up the conference in front of Senator Sandoval? Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 812.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 891. Senator Obama. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 891.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Are there any Floor amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Watson, do you seek recognition on this bill? SENATOR WATSON:

Not necessarily, but for a comment. You just read -- oh, I don't know how many there were. I didn't count. But eight

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

percent of the bills that are on the Calendar are Republican bills. Eight percent, single digits. You just read seventy-five percent of our eight percent. So, we're doing quite well over here and we're very appreciative of the fact that you've identified the fact that we can have a little input into this process. And thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

The record will reflect your comments. All in favor of the amendment, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Are there any Floor amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 892. Senator Lauzen. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 892.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 909. Senator DeLeo. Senate Bill 910. Senator DeLeo. Senator Jacobs, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR JACOBS:

For a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

State your point.

SENATOR JACOBS:

We -- we -- we've had an agreement on both sides here, regards to pension bills. So far we've violated that, I think four times now, and two of 'em by Republicans and two of 'em by Democrats. And, you know, it's a little bit of an insult to me whenever we have an agreement, and I think all Members are well aware of that, and I know that Senator Schoenberg moved two pension bills and we asked to have 'em remain on 2nd. It's already been done. Nothing we can do about it, but on 3rd we'll have a few words to say about that. Thank you.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Senator, the Chair was not aware of any agreement. If you could advise the Chair, we'll -- we'll have the Calendar reflect -- all right. Senate Bill 911. Senator DeLeo. Senate Bill 915. Senator Demuzio. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 915.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 959. Senator Ronen. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary. We'd ask for leave to come back to that, Senator. Senate Bill 1033. Senator Silverstein. Senator Silverstein. Senator Silverstein. 1033. Senate Bill 1045. Senator Schoenberg. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1045.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Lauzen, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR LAUZEN:

Mr. President, just a response -- a response to Senator Jacobs, my friend and colleague. I just wanted to point out, certainly I respect commitments made on the Floor and in committee and in subcommittee on bills. Let me just say that we are following your lead on that side, in that three Democrat bills, Nos. 309, 517, 518, were moved. If you're going to move yours, we're going to move ours. I then, after that, moved 599 and 892. Just to provide an explanation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Ladies and Gentlemen, this is something that can be resolved on 3rd Reading by advising the Chair not to call those bills. I -- I don't think we need to get into a colloquial here on the Floor. Senator Jacobs, what purpose do you rise? SENATOR JACOBS:

Well, just real quick in response to that and -- and I think if you notice, Senator, I said that we moved a couple inadvertently. So -- so now I think it's our best solution to move 'em to 3rd and ask you to hold 'em on 3rd and at least we

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

get it cleared off the Calendar on 2nd, if -- if that meets with the approval of the Minority Spokesman of the -- the Pension Committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Brady, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BRADY:

Speak to the issue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Please proceed.

#### SENATOR BRADY:

Thank you. Senator Jacobs and I just had a brief conversation. The -- the awareness of the rapid fire of what we're doing today has created some confusion. I don't think there's any intention on anyone's part. Both sides of the aisle apologized when they've been moved accidentally. Senator Jacobs and I have extended our agreement, to our understanding is that these pension bills will be moved to 3rd Reading but will not be moved off of 3rd until they have a review by the Pension Laws Commission. We agree to abide by that, with Senator Jacobs, and I apologize if there's any inconvenience from our part.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senate Bill 1049. Senator Larry Walsh. Senator, the fiscal note has been filed. Do you wish to proceed? Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1049.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 1064. Senator Crotty. Senate Bill 1070. Senator Ronen. Senate Bill 1073. Senator DeLeo. Senate Bill -- 1103. Senator Jacobs. Senator Jacobs. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary. While we are waiting, with leave of the Body, we will move to page 60, Secretary's Desk, Resolutions. Mr. Secretary, Senate Joint Resolution 3. Senator Shadid. Read the resolution, Mr. Secretary. These are not going to be up on the board. We can do these by voice vote while -- we can -- we can reveal the vote, but we can't show it on the board, is

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

-- is our problem right now. So, just keep in mind it's Senate Joint Resolution 3, on page 60. Senator Shadid.

#### ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Joint Resolution 3, offered by Senator Shadid.

No committee or Floor amendments, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Shadid, on the resolution.

#### SENATOR SHADID:

Thank you, Mr. President. This urges the U.S. Congress and the Administration to strongly support any proposals to increase funding for public transit systems.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all of those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution 4. Senator Bomke. Read the resolution, Madam Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Joint Resolution 4.

No committee or Floor amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Bomke.

#### SENATOR BOMKE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Joint Resolution 4 is --does as the Calendar indicates. It names the 4th Appellate Court Building in Springfield the Justice Ben Miller 4th District Appellate Court Building. Thank you.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? All those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution 24. Senator Watson. Read the resolution, Madam Secretary.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Joint Resolution 24.

No committee or Floor amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Watson.

### SENATOR WATSON:

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. I'm glad we got to this resolution before the month was over. This proclaims the month of March 2003 as American Red Cross Month, I think which is very appropriate, in fact, that many of our men and women are being served now by American Red Cross in the services they provide overseas. So, I would appreciate your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Thank you, Senator. Is there any discussion? If not, all those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The amendment {sic} is adopted. We're going to hold the rest of the amendments on the Secretary's Desk for resolution. We are passing out a Supplemental Calendar No. 1. With leave of the Body, we'll go to Supplemental Calendar 1 -- No. 1. Is there leave? Leave is granted. On Supplemental Calendar No. 1, Secretary's Desk, Resolutions. House Joint Resolution 28. Madam Secretary, read the resolution.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

House Joint Resolution 28.

There are no committee or Floor amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Sandoval. Your microphone working, Senator? Are any of the microphones working? Ladies and Gentlemen, we're having a problem. We are going to try to read... All right. I believe we can proceed. Joint House Resolution 28. Can we put it on the board? All right. Senator Sandoval.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I'd like to take a moment to commemorate a great American of this great country, Cesar Chavez. As we near the commemoration of his birthday, I'd like to say -- take a few moments out of this hectic and frolicking afternoon to commemorate the life of a great American. As Illinois prepares to celebrate Cesar Chavez Day, we remember not only his life, but also his famous words: "Si, se puede." "Yes, we can" - words that continue to inspire Illinoisans each and every day. Born on March 31st, 1927, Cesar Chavez began his life on a small farm near Yuma, Arizona. When his family lost their farm during the Great Depression and moved to California, Chavez, at the age of ten, became a migrant farm worker, laboring in fields and vineyards, much like the fields

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

and vineyards of the great State of Illinois. Chavez's experiences gave him the determination to create an organization to ensure protections for farm workers. This organization developed into the United Farm Workers of America, the largest farm workers' union in U.S. history. And much like our President, President Emil Jones, Senator Emil Jones, Cesar Chavez worked to promote fair wages, medical coverage, pension benefits and adequate living conditions for workers. Because of leadership, hundreds of thousands of farm workers, especially here in Illinois, today are able to live their lives with respect, dignity and a decent wage. But even in light of the progress spurred by Cesar Chavez, more work remains to be done before we can see his dreams for every worker, farm worker, fulfilled. As we celebrate Cesar Chavez's birthday, I hope that all of us, as Illinoisans, will take time to -- to learn more about the life of this dedicated American. Together we must continue to work towards Cesar Chavez's goal of unity, equality and justice for all Americans. Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Viva, Cesar Chavez.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Thank you, Senator Sandoval. All in favor of the resolution, vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted. On the Order of 2nd Reading, Supplemental Calendar No. 1, House Bill 2626. Senator Emil Jones. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 2626.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

3rd Reading. Senate Bill 2660. Senator Emil Jones. House Bill 2660. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

### SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 2660.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

3rd Reading. We will now proceed to the Order of Resolutions Consent Calendar. With leave of the Body, all those resolutions read in today will be added to the Consent Calendar. Madam Secretary, have there been any objections filed to any resolution on the Consent Calendar?

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

There have been no objections filed, Mr. President. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the resolutions on the Consent Calendar be adopted. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the resolutions are adopted. The Order of Resolutions. Senator Demuzio, do you wish to proceed on Senate Joint Resolution 29? Madam Secretary, read the joint resolution.

#### SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Joint Resolution 29, offered by Senator Demuzio.

(Secretary reads SJR No. 29)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Demuzio moves to suspend the rules for the purpose of the immediate consideration and adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 29. Those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the rules are suspended. Senator Demuzio moves for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 29. All in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. Senator Demuzio, for what purpose do you rise?

### SENATOR DEMUZIO:

My light was on and -- and I want you to know that you didn't see that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

I've heard this before.

### SENATOR DEMUZIO:

This resolution that we just adopted just calls for us to come back next Wednesday at the hour of 1 o'clock, so everyone should have some -- some notice. And thank you very much, Mr. President, for recognizing me.

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

Senator, before we adjourn, we are going to go to House Bills 1st Reading, with leave of the Body. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Madam Secretary, House Bills 1st Reading. Let me advise the Body that the Senate has completed its business. All that remains is the adjournment, which we are going to do as soon as these House Bills 1st Reading are read in. We'll be back here on Tuesday at -- Wednesday at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, April 2nd. Wednesday at 1 o'clock. Senator Obama, for what purpose do you rise?

#### SENATOR OBAMA:

Purposes of announcement. Just a very brief announcement. You know, technically, when the Health and Human Services Committee met several days ago, as opposed to adjourning, we recessed because we thought we'd be coming back in. My understanding is we never technically adjourned, and I would just -- I would like to make a motion to adjourn the Health and Human Services Committee until next week. Been seconded. Is there leave?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

There's a motion, seconded, to adjourn the Health and Human Services Committee. Is there leave? Leave is granted. The Committee's adjourned. House Bills 1st Reading. Excuse me.

#### ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 59, offered by Senator Maloney.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 92, Senator Cullerton.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of those bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

Senator Demuzio, for what purpose do you rise?

### SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, Mr. President. Don't forget your amendments next Wednesday by 10 o'clock, so please put that down. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

House Bills 1st Reading. Please proceed, Mr. Secretary. ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 115.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

It's offered by Senator Shadid.

House Bill 117, by Senator Viverito.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 300, by Senator Walsh.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 318, by Senator Jacobs.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 353, by Senators John Jones and Sieben.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1161, by Senator Brady.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1195, by Senator Link.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senator Jacobs offers House Bill 1250.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1486, Senator Welch.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1535, by Senator Wojcik.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2205, by Senator Cullerton.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2299, by Senator Maloney.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2332, Senator Cronin.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2515, by Senator Radogno.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2523, Senator Garrett.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2543, Senator Lightford.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senator Walsh offers House Bill 2634.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2653, Senator Haine.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2955, Senator Martinez.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 2972, Senator Garrett.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

27th Legislative Day

3/27/2003

House Bill 2980, by Senator Rutherford.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3001, by Senator Rutherford.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senator Collins presents House Bill 3049.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3063, Senator Walsh.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3066, Senator Wojcik.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3071, by Senator Silverstein.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3072, Senator del Valle.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senator Meeks presents House Bill 3405.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3411, Senator Haine.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3480, Senator Righter.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3489, Senator Demuzio.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3501, Senator Hunter.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senator Clayborne offers House Bill 3508.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3522, Senator Sandoval.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 3526, by Senator Risinger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

And House Bill 3528, by Senator Cullerton.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WELCH)

The House Bills 1st Reading are complete. There being no further business to come before the Senate, pursuant to the adjournment resolution, the Senate stands adjourned until the hour of 1 o'clock in the afternoon on Wednesday, April 2nd, 2003. The Senate stands adjourned.