92nd Legislative Day 3/26/2004

НВ3833	First Reading	131
HB4022	First Reading	128
нв4067	First Reading	129
нв4176	First Reading	128
НВ4266	First Reading	129
HB4271	First Reading	129
HB4310	First Reading	128
HB4452	First Reading	128
HB4491	First Reading	129
HB4493	First Reading	131
HB4495	First Reading	132
HB4506	First Reading	129
нв4560	First Reading	128
HB4610	First Reading	128
HB4621	First Reading	132
HB4779	First Reading	132
HB4856	First Reading	129
HB4976	First Reading	128
HB5061	First Reading	132
HB5069	First Reading	128
HB5562	First Reading	129
НВ6564	First Reading	129
HB6618	First Reading	132
нв6740	First Reading	128
HB6841	First Reading	129
SB0948	Out Of Record	114
SB0948	Recalled	114
SB2188	Third Reading	114
SB2271	Third Reading	120
SB2499	Third Reading	121
SB2567	Out Of Record	122
SB2567	Third Reading	122
SB2607	Third Reading	122
SB2676	Third Reading	123
SB2858	Third Reading	124
SB2878	Postponed	129
GD 20 21	Consideration	_
SB2921	Third Reading	2
SB2924	Third Reading	3 8
SB2926	Third Reading	
SB2933	Recalled	10
SB2933	Third Reading	11
SB2944	Third Reading	13 15
SB2946	Third Reading	
SB2961	Third Reading	15
SB2962	Third Reading	16
SB2968	Third Reading	18
SB2978	Third Reading	24
SB2981 SB2982	Third Reading	20 26
SB2982 SB2988	Third Reading	26 27
SB2988 SB2989	Third Reading Third Reading	27
	_	
SB2995 SB3004	Third Reading	30
SB3004 SB3007	Third Reading Third Reading	31 125
SB3007 SB3013	Recalled	31
		32
SB3013	Third Reading	5 ∠

92nd Legislative	e Day	3/26/2004
SB3014	Third Reading	37
SB3021	Third Reading	38
SB3021	Vote Intention	47
SB3026	Third Reading	39
SB3027	Third Reading	45
SB3027	Vote Intention	47
SB3037	Third Reading	47
SB3053	Third Reading	49
SB3069	Third Reading	51
SB3077	Third Reading	56
SB3085	Third Reading	57
SB3090	Third Reading	63
SB3091	Third Reading	70
SB3107	Recalled	71
SB3107	Third Reading	71
SB3109	Third Reading	74
SB3111	Third Reading	74
SB3112	Recalled	77
SB3112	Third Reading	78
SB3129	Third Reading	81
SB3130	Third Reading	82
SB3140	Third Reading	127
SB3166	Third Reading	82
SB3174	Third Reading	83
SB3183	Third Reading	83
SB3186	Third Reading	87
SB3188 SB3189	Third Reading	88 89
SB3190	Third Reading Third Reading	89
SB3190 SB3191	Third Reading Third Reading	90
SB3191 SB3192	Third Reading Third Reading	92
SB3193	Third Reading	92
SB3194	Third Reading	93
SB3195	Third Reading	93
SB3196	Third Reading	93
SB3197	Third Reading	94
SB3198	Third Reading	95
SB3199	Third Reading	95
SB3200	Third Reading	95
SB3201	Third Reading	96
SB3202	Third Reading	96
SB3203	Third Reading	96
SB3204	Third Reading	97
SB3207	Third Reading	97
SB3208	Third Reading	98
SB3208	Vote Intention	99
SB3211	Third Reading	99
SB3219	Third Reading	104
SR0475	Resolution Offered	128
SR0476	Resolution Offered	128
SJR0068 SJR0068	Adopted Resolution Offered	133
SJR0068	Resolution Offered	133
Senate to Order-	Senator Halvorson	1
Prayer-Pastor Pa		1
Pledge of Allegi		1
Journal-Approved		1

92nd Legislative Day	3/26/2004
Messages for the Governor Message from the House Resolutions Consent Calendar-Adopted Message from the President Adjournment	132 132 133 133

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The regular Session of the 93rd General Assembly will please come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks? And will the guests in the galleries please rise? The invocation today will be given by Pastor Paul Davis, from Calvary Temple Church here in Springfield.

PASTOR PAUL DAVIS:

(Prayer by Pastor Paul Davis)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Please remain standing for the Pledge. Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Link)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Madam Secretary, Reading and Approval of the Journal.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Journal of Thursday, March 25, 2004.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Madam President, I move that the Journal just read by the Secretary be approved, unless a Member of the Senate has additions or corrections to offer.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Haine moves to approve the Journals just read by the Secretary. There being no objection, so ordered. We are going to be going directly to 3rd Readings. Will all Members please come to the Chamber? Senator Burzynski, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Madam President. Just for purposes of an announcement. I'd like for the record to reflect that Senator Syverson will not be here today. Now, this is very important, so I want to know this. You know, we always have our softball game in May, and Senator Syverson is back home getting a little work done on his shoulder today so he'll be prepared to go. So we'd like the record to reflect that he'll be out of commission today.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Thank you, Senator. Hopefully everybody that can hear the bell and my voice will be here shortly. We're going to 3rd Readings. For those of you in the Body who want to get started, we will be -- starting where we left off last night on page 10 with Senate Bill 2924. Just so everybody can get ready to go. On the Order of 3rd Reading, page 10, I was off by one bill. We're going to start at Senate Bill 2921. Senator Cullerton. Miss -- Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 2921.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. This bill amends the Illinois Housing Authority Acts. It corrects an unintended consequence of legislation we passed last year dealing with fingerprinting. This bill would make it clear that Illinois housing authorities will not have to fingerprints of their pubic housing residents to the Illinois State Police unless the resident requested for the purposes of clarifying a report of a criminal conviction or if the Housing Authority desires to conduct a fifty-state criminal background check, which housing authorities are not currently required to do under federal regulations. The bill ensures that the background checks currently performed by housing authorities will continue to be no different than those performed by private-marketed landlords, ensure an equal protection under the law for public housing residents. I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

You gave a very rapid explanation of the bill, and frankly, maybe I'm dull-witted today. But I don't get exactly what the difference is. What does your bill do that has not been done?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Senator. Last year we passed a bill for the State Police dealing with fingerprinting. It was their request to come in contact with -- or -- or -- come in conformity with federal law. We -- it had the unintended consequence of affecting the public -- the public housing authorities, the Illinois Housing Authorities Act, which was an unintended We don't -- we don't believe that the housing consequence. authorities -- should have to submit fingerprints of their public housing residents to the State Police, unless they request it. We -- we -- we want backgrounds checks that are currently performed by the housing authorities to see whether or not convicted people are living there. They should -- they should continue, but they don't have to do it by doing fingerprinting. And this is a request of the housing authorities themselves.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Cullerton, do you wish to close? On that question, shall Senate Bill 2921 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 2921, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Clayborne, on 2924. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 2924.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Thank you, Miss -- Madam President. Senate Bill 2924 is similar to a bill that we passed out of here twice, one -- one time during the spring Session -- once during the spring Session and once during the Veto Session to override the Governor's I have changed the language to actually tighten the language up and it requires -- basically this is same bill where if you want to bring development in, you have to create a You have to do that by way of a public business district. You have to submit your plans, and then once all that's done and it's approved, then a municipality can negotiate with the developer or vice versa and they can impose up to a one-percent sales tax for an amount agreed to for a specific time until that -- that money is recovered. Again, this is permissive. You don't have to do it. The -- the assurances that -- are in place with the public hearing, to make sure that the public is aware of what's going on. I have made changes. I've expanded it to include food and beverage, as well as hotel beds. For some areas in southern Illinois where people are passing through the highway, by the -- exits and entrances, they can obviously declare that as a business district, and the people who would actually pay the tax would not be the local people but probably be more likely the people who are traveling through. But one of the changes that I made was that in this fund, if there's any excess money, it has to go into this business district fund that will go into a general corporate fund, and it requires that -- municipality to immediately pass an ordinance ending this tax. So, that's basically the bill. We voted on it several times. Revenue was opposed to it - I think they're neutral now - because they did not want to collect But I think we're working that out. And -- and -this -- this -- there's a counterpart bill in the House that will probably come over with some changes, and I'm confident that -- that hopefully we get this signed into law this year. I'm open for any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator Clayborne, what economic theory suggests to you that raising taxes on an area is going to make it more attractive to do business and -- and -- and be a better -- better place to be?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

First of all, this -- it's not a tax -- it's not a tax What happens, Senator Roskam, this tax is not on the It's on a specific business if that specific whole -- area. business -- if the municipality doesn't have the money and they desire to have it. So, for instance, in your area, in Wheaton, if -- if there's a -- an area that has been left out, economically depressed, and there's a need to have a Walgreen's there and -- and they negotiate with the municipality and say, "Okay, we need two hundred thousand dollars for site clearance, preparation and so forth" and they say, "We don't have the money," well, then, they would be allowed to -- they can impose up to a one-percent sales tax until they collect that two hundred thousand dollars, and then it goes away forever. This is an alternative to TIF, because once the business is open, that money goes to the General Revenue Fund. It doesn't go to a special -- well, it goes to -- it -- it -- the taxes from that business will go to the General Revenue Fund. It won't go to the TIF fund. So this is actually an alternative to TIF. So, we're trying to create other opportunities that -- in areas urban, rural that have traditionally been left out.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, is this a tax that is currently being imposed? Our analysis says that this is a new tax. And I just want to make sure that -- that the Members on both sides understand the nature of -- of what you're presenting. I -- and I didn't -- I didn't quite understand it. Could you explain whether it's a new tax or it's a current -- I guess the -- the question is, is

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

it a new tax or is it a new use for a current tax? Is that a fair way to characterize it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Well, it's -- it's a new way to -- create economic development, Senator Roskam. It's -- it's -it's alternative to TIF that hasn't worked it many areas. It's -it's an -- it's a -- for instance, in some areas, Chicago or downstate, where they have these old strip malls and they don't have the money to -- to redo the facade and to make it look like it should to be more attractive, they can negotiate with the municipality and they can impose up to a one-percent sales tax. And what we're talking is, we're talking -- if it's a dollar -if it's one percent on a hundred dollars, we're talking a dollar on one hundred dollars. So the average person who goes in to buy something, toothpaste or whatever it is, won't even see the tax. But it means a lot to that -- that developer, that -- that business owner to -- to -- to help them recoup some of their costs that they originally -- the municipality may not have had. In fact, if you look at the -- the supporters, the retailers, the Municipal League, they're all in favor of it, because they know in these certain areas, it's very difficult to create economic opportunities. I hope I answered your question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Roskam, your time is up. So, please, bring it to a close.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

You didn't come close to answering my question, which is why you are so good at this. The -- I guess, for Members on our side of the aisle, this is clearly a local economic development issue, but these -- this is what we in politics traditionally call tax hikes. So those of you who do not want to raise taxes, watch your switch. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator John Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

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

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Senator Clayborne, isn't this almost identical to the bill that you passed last year and the Governor vetoed that bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Yes, that's correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Thank you. I -- I supported that bill last year and I've supported this bill in committee, and I intend on supporting it today. But, you know, I -- I think in -- in a lot of areas throughout the State, this could be a very good economic development tool, you know, especially for an area that you represent. We need all the help that we can get. But I made a suggestion to you in committee because I think you told me that you have no assurance that the Governor's going to sign this again this year. And -- and my -- my suggestion to you is, and I hope that you would try to amend this over in the House, but I think the problem with your bill is, is that you say that this is a sales tax. And the Governor has repeatedly said, although we disagree with him, that he will not increase income tax or You know, fees are taxes as far as I'm concerned. But I think if you would just amend this bill to say sales fees instead of sales tax, I think the Governor might sign it. Okay? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Thank you, Madam President and Members of the Senate. Senator Clayborne is doing this actually for -- for a -- for a person -- or, for a community in my district who requested this. I think they've gotten some language from the -- State of Missouri that does the same thing. You know, it is permissive. I think it's something that can help them, for a short period of time, develop some infrastructure and in the process, you know, increase the business in -- at in interchange or something like that. So, I -- I really think it's a -- even though, I -- I'm

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

not -- not for -- a lot of taxes and I think my record shows that, this one, I think we -- I -- I -- at least I will support. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Clayborne, do you wish to close?

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Yes, I do. I -- I -- I appreciate the two previous speakers. And just to say that this is permissive. It's not mandatory. It doesn't go into effect whether it passes or not. It's just another economic development tool that a municipality may desire to use. So, I would ask for your favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 2924 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 45 Yeas, 12 voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 2924, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Collins, on 2926. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 2926.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you, Madam Chairman -- Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 2926 basically is a trailer bill. It amends the DCFS Act and the Child Care Act. This bill was brought to me by DCFS. It revises the definition of youth transitional housing and adds the definition of a partially exempt child care program. These definitions were omitted from the legislation passed last year. And I'm open for any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Garrett. Oh -- okay. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Thank you, Madam President. I just rise in support of the bill. The bill passed out of the Senate's Health and Human Services Committee unanimously, and would urge an Aye vote from our side of the aisle. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 2926 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 2926, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Garrett, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR GARRETT:

On a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

State your point.

SENATOR GARRETT:

I'm happy to be able to introduce Richard Jones, who is a Page for a Day. He currently is a sophomore at Royce More School in Evanston. He lives in Chicago. And I hope that we can give him a warm welcome today. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Welcome to the Senate. Senator Harmon, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HARMON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

State your point.

SENATOR HARMON:

I, too, am pleased to welcome to the Senate today a young man from my district, Aaron Lesser, who's serving as an Honorary Page for a Day. His dad, Dan Lesser, is a regular around here, and I'm very pleased to have him with us on the Senate Floor. Hope you'd join me in welcoming him to the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Welcome to the Senate. Senator Roskam, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Point of personal privilege.

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

State your point.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to introduce my Page for the Day, Chris Levine, a sixth grader at Glen Crest Junior High. My constituent -- or, maybe Senator Cronin's constituent, but he's mine today. And his father, Howard Levine, is in the gallery.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Welcome to Springfield. Senate Bill 2932. Senator Haine. Madam Secretary -- no. 2933. Senator Haine. On the Order of 2nd -- on the Order of 2nd -- oh yeah. On the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Readings, Senator Haine, do you wish this bill to return for purpose of an amendment? Senator Haine seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 2933 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 2933. Madam Secretary, are there any amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the This was a -- a -- this bill is a result of an initiative from the County Clerks Association, which is an encouragement, an incentive for election judges to They've been having a difficult time, particularly downstate, in encouraging men and women to serve as -- election judges. This amends the Election Code by requiring election judges to give twenty days' notice for requests for time off for election day. The employer may not penalize the employee for the time off other than a deduction in salary for time taken. Allows the employer to limit the number of employees that may be absent. The Illinois Retail Merchants Association added an amendment -or, requested an amendment, which was added, which is what we just did, which includes a provision that allows an employer to exempt employees from this duty by stating that they are

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

necessary for the business to run efficiently. And they are now on board. I don't know of any objection to this. It's a -- a bill to encourage people to serve. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Haine moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2933. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration? SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

3rd Reading. Senator Haine, on the Order of 3rd Reading. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 2933.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Madam President. I would -- I would ask for an Aye vote from the distinguished Members of the Senate. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator Haine, the analysis says that -- that while on the one hand an election -- an employee is -- has the ability to serve as an election judge, on the other hand the employer has the ability to limit the amount. Can you just explain to us how those two conflicting tides come together?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Thank you very much, Senator, for that -- that question, and I'm not certain. Although the County Clerks, they want to encourage people to serve, I believe they do not want to place a burden on business, on small business here. And that's some of what we're seeing here. And there is somewhat of a contradiction or a tension, but I believe it's weighted in favor of the employer, given the fact that they are necessary for the business. But the purpose of the bill is to encourage people to serve and to encourage employers, as much as possible, to let them serve without being a burden -- on them. I hope that's helpful.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

It really didn't make a lot of sense. I think that there's got to be -- and you can tell. By the time you finished that sentence, you knew that it didn't make sense. It started out, you were taking us over the mountaintop and then we followed the brake lights right off the cliff. My suggestion is that whoever picks this up in the House, come up with some -- some clearer indication of who gets the priority, because I don't think -- I don't think the bill, as drafted, does that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Wendell Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Thank you, Madam President. I'd just like to say that the Local Government Committee did pass this unanimously. And with -- with regard to Senator Roskam's notes, we would still like to see this pass, because we believe it's in the best interests of the people of Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you. Just to the bill, Madam President. You know, I don't -- I don't know how -- you know, small business in Illinois -- I remember in my accounting practice, if a person had left for just half a day, I remember the crimp that it -- it put in. I don't understand why we force businesses. We're already taxing 'em hundreds of millions of dollars more. Now

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

we're requiring that they agree for somebody to take time away from the business. It just -- it seems like, once again, this is something that hurts maybe not the big employer, but the little employer. And once again, we mandate something that should be done out of a spirit of civic duty.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Haine, to close.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you, Madam President and Senators, for your comments, and I will take these back to the County Clerks Association, especially Senator -- Roskam's comments, and hopefully they'll be able to tighten this up when it -- when it goes to the House. I -- I would appreciate an Aye vote to help our -- our election process. And thank you for your time. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The -- the question is, shall Senate Bill 2933 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 Yeas, 4 voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 2933, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Rutherford, on 2944. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 2944.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Rutherford.

SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Thank you, Madam President. It's kind of a unique reason that I bring this bill forward. There was a small community in my district that had their senior citizen nutrition program cut out because of the budget, so the local senior citizens in the community decided that they were going to put together a community potluck. No charge, free, all the seniors bring in a covered dish, have it in the church hall and invite in the seniors on a Sunday evening dinner. The local public health

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

inspector closed 'em down. And as we started to learn more about this, there was not an objective reason but more of a subjective reason that local public health inspectors could do this. And it's occurred at different parts of the State. So we've introduced legislation now that would allow groups that gather to share food - no compensation, no charge, not conducted in a commercial enterprise - to be able to enjoy their community potlucks without having the Department of Public Health local health inspectors close them down. As it was amended to define potluck, we now have the support from the State Department of Public Health.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Wendell Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. I got a note at my desk - I think a lot of you did - yesterday called the "death of common sense," and if you read that, you'll realize why this bill is a good bill. It's just common sense that we wouldn't interfere with potlucks in Illinois. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Rutherford, do you wish to close?

SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Well, just that, you know, my concern was how far could this go? You know, you have the hot wings and the meatballs for the Super Bowl party in the neighborhood and perhaps the local public health inspector could close you down. The first potluck in America was the Indians and the Pilgrims getting together to share festive moments together. I would ask that all join in for a bit of common sense in protecting what's been an American tradition for quite some time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 2944 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 Ayes, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 2944, having received the required constitutional majority, is

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

declared passed. Top of page 11. Senate Bills 3rd Reading. Senator Harmon, on 2946. Madam Secretary, read the bill. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 2946.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Madam President. Last year we enacted the Illinois Civil Rights Act of 2003. This bill is in the nature of a trailer bill. It provides for some modest improvements including eliminating punitive damages against municipalities and taking out the troubling words "affirmative action." I think Senator Cullerton summarized it best in the Judiciary Committee. Whether you were for this bill last year or against it, this bill makes it better. I know of no opposition. It came out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Madam President. Very briefly. Senator Harmon did characterize Senator Cullerton by saying that whether you were for the original bill a year ago or not, this makes it -- it makes it better. So, I rise in support of it. Whether I like the underlying provisions or not, this makes it better than the -- the Act from a year ago.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Harmon, would you like to close? On that question -- shall Senate Bill 2946 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 2946, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Emil Jones, on 2961. Senator Schoenberg will be presenting. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 2961.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 2961 extends the sunset of the Business Enterprise for Minorities, Females, and Persons with Disabilities Act to -- extends the repeal date to September 6th, 2008, instead of September 6th, 2004. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2961 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 2961, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Schoenberg -- okay. Madam Secretary, read the bill. Senate Bill 2962. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 2962.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 2962 extends the sunset of the Women's Business Ownership Act from September 1, 2004, to September 1, 2008. This is an initiative of the President's and Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity supports it. There's no opposition. Be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Risinger.

SENATOR RISINGER:

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Yes. This bill passed unanimously out of the State Operations Committee and I urge this side of the aisle to vote Aye.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 2962 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 2962, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Welch, on 2966. Madam -- Senator Winkel, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR WINKEL:

Thank you, Madam President. Point of personal -- privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

State -- state your point.

SENATOR WINKEL:

If I can spit it out. We've had a great season at the U of I this year. It's now time for March Madness. NCAA tournament We've won two games. We've got a big game is in full swing. tonight. Hopefully we'll be out of here on time. We can watch that game at 9 o'clock tonight. And what -- Senator Kirk Dillard and Larry Bomke, Debbie Halvorson and I, we got together and thought, you know, hey, how can we share the enthusiasm and share the spirit? My tie didn't quite live up to it today. I mean, it's not quite as orange as it should be. So, we have for each Member of the Senate, an orange T-shirt that says Illinois. We've got various sizes. We'd invite each and every one of the Senators to get a T-shirt to wear today. You can wear it under your sport coat or however you wish to wear it. But celebrate the day. I mean, Bruce Weber's had a great, great season this year. So -- so has the team. They've had their early rocky moments, but they've come around. They've peaked at the right time. And you know what? We're going to beat Duke tonight.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Go Illini.

SENATOR WINKEL:

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

And I do -- I do want to thank President Jones for allowing us to make these available, but $I-L-L\dots$

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

I-N-I!

SENATOR WINKEL:

Great. All right. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Where are the shirts, Senator?

SENATOR WINKEL:

Shirts are at the back of the Chamber. Senator, we'd be glad to - come by, pick out your size. We have various sizes. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Thank you. I think we'll all be there for Illinois to beat Duke tonight. And, please, since I'm not there to pass out the shirts, you guys go over there and get one. Okay. Senator Welch. No. After all that about Illinois, you didn't want to call your bill now, huh? Senator Clayborne, on 2968. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 2968.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank you, Madam President. This is similar to a bill, House Bill 623, that we passed out of here in November. I refiled this bill because the Speaker's holding it, and -- and we're trying to negotiate and come up with something. But basically what this does, this amends the Neighborhood Redevelopment Corporation (law). And it -- and it -- what it does is, it allows a municipality, particularly in St. Clair County, blighted municipalities, to hire out or do an RFP to create a -- a -- contract out with a redevelopment corporation. And this corporation, based upon the RFP, would have exclusive rights to develop a certain area, and the carrot to that is tax abatements. This is designed to help develop the East St. Louis riverfront. Just across the river, the State of Missouri has

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

done this over the last twenty-five years. And if you've been to St. Louis, they have Laclede's Landing that has been developed the same way, by a redevelopment corporation. It takes politics out of it, and regardless, it -- it -- it -- development comes about. I'm open for any questions. And it passed...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator, I was trying to get you to move a little faster while they were busy getting their shirts. Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Madam President. Question for the sponsor. There were several -- there were several No votes in committee and there were those -- reflected concerns on -- in a couple of different areas. Is it true that this is a mandatory abatement for twenty-five years? The first ten years it's a full abatement of property tax, and in the fifteen years after that, it's a fifty percent?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

That's correct, Senator. And the county that this applies to have signed -- they've signed off on it, because the land -- the land that we're targeting, the riverfront, most of it is owned by the railroad. It's not on the tax rolls right now anyway.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

And then I know that we've -- we've -- you've worked very hard on this bill in going through a number of different amendments. You know, I -- I -- I've thought that it needed a lot of amendments, but it's the same concern, with the neighborhood redevelopment corporation, of giving extraordinary power to just three individuals and one of them can be from out-of-state. Can you assure the Senate that under the eighth main power of neighborhood redevelopment corporations, where it says that they can acquire real property by exercise of power of eminent domain, that that won't be used somehow to favor certain

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

individual businesses maybe owned by those two out of three people who form this redevelopment corporation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Clayborne.

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Senator, I didn't amend that portion of it. That already exists in the law. I just made changes concerning the tax abatements, concerning a municipality contracting out with a redevelopment corporation and creating this governing body from five to seven. The eminent domain pieces already exist in the law.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

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

SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

I -- I would ask for your favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 2968 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 46 Ayes, 6 voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 2968, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Harmon, on 2974. Senator Sandoval, on 2978. Senator Lightford, on Senate Bill 2981. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 2981.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Madam President. Senate Bill 2981 creates the Homeowner's Emergency Mortgage Assistance Programs. Foreclosure is on the rise in many communities across the State and I believe it's time for us to take action in assisting individuals who are losing their homes. What this bill would do is create a self-funded, not subject to appropriations, Mortgage Assistance

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Program under the administration of the Illinois Housing Authority. It would provide emergency mortgage assistance on behalf of the borrower who cannot meet the terms of their mortgage due to unforeseen and material changes in circumstances through no fault of their own. The program is funded by a five--dollar annual fee to borrower and through monies deposited by to satisfy their federal community reinvestment requirement. We spent a lot of time working on this bill with the United Power group. The Illinois Bankers Association, the Community Bankers, the Illinois League of Credit Unions are all proponents of this legislation. And I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Lightford, I want to ask just a few questions. There's a lot of noise and a little chaos in the Chamber and everything like that. And this bill came out of committee on a partisan roll call and in hopes we'll go through the bill carefully here. Can you explain for me a hypothetical of, as a practical matter, how this will work? I mean, you know, Joe Homebuyer takes out a mortgage -- I mean, walk me through it for the Chamber, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Madam President. Basically, for all new purchasers, they will have the opportunity on their mortgage forms to fill out and -- and sign for a five-dollar annual -- annual fee that they will support in this fund. For all of us who already own homes, the mortgage lenders and banks will send in -- out a notice indicating that this program has been created, and if they'd like to take part in it, that all they would have to do is submit this five-dollar fee to the Illinois

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Housing Authority. Once you are a part of the program, yearly it would -- it would show up on your tax statement where your five dollars will go. So every year you can actually renew yourself. Some unforeseen circumstance happens, you've fallen behind in your mortgage, you're about to lose your home, you apply into this program for the amount that you need to bring your mortgage back to current standings.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Okay. Now, I know everybody's excited about Illinois playing Duke tonight, but we need to keep it down a little. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Madam President. Appreciate your words. Senator Lightford, so is it the borrower, the person taking out the mortgage, who is paying the five dollars into the fund? Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

And is -- for people who are mortgagers right now, people who own homes right now and are paying on them, are they going to chip into the fund as well?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

They have the ability to. The Illinois Housing Authority will make known across the State that this new program exists, and if they have a desire to participate, they can, too, submit the five dollars to the fund.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Lightford, one of the issues I know was discussed in committee, and this has been a few weeks, was the notion of whether or not there's any income threshold here whatsoever. I

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

mean, if I'm pulling down two hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year and what I've simply done is I've just overextended myself, I've just reached out and bought that two-million-dollar home that I couldn't quite make the payments on, under this legislation I could apply for and receive assistance even though I'm making a quarter million dollars a year. Is that -- could that happen under this legislation?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Well, it has to be the median income of that general geographic area. So if there's -- many homeowners in that area are all millionaires and this individual happens to fall in the median of that, then he, too, would apply.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter, please bring your...

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Last one.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

...remarks to a close.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Madam President. Okay. Median income. If the median income in the area is a hundred thousand dollars a year - I mean, the issue that you're trying to address is someone who just can't make the payments. And what I'm asking you is, is there anything in the bill that sets forth any criteria of why the person can't make their payments? I mean, is it because they've had a -- a death in the family with regards to one of the income earners or because they lost time on the job, or is someone who simply didn't make a very good decision here and overextended themselves going to be able to access this money as well? Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Senator, there is a provision in the bill that defines what a financial hardship would be and some of the areas not limited to would be loss of job; salary, wage or earning reductions of a member in the household; injury, disability or illness; divorce

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

or separation; death of a member; or a major unanticipated household expense.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Further discussion? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator Lightford, this is strictly a voluntary program right now, as I understand what you've described. Are you intending in the future to seek an appropriation to fund this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Madam President. No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator -- is there any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2981 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 42 -- Yeas, 10 voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 2981, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we're going to go back to Senate Bill 2978 now that Senator Sandoval is in his seat. So, Senate Bill 2978. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 2978.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Sandoval.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 2978 is a vehicle bill as it relates to insurance. I ask a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Roskam.

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, what are your intentions with this bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Sandoval.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Have discussions concerning, perhaps, some possible legislation to -- relates to the insurance being provided to folks who are unlicensed and uninsured in the State of Illinois. To prevent that type of insurance of those types of people.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

You said it clearly. I just didn't understand what you were saying. Could you repeat it for my benefit?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Sandoval.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Potential piece of legislation that will look at and direct the issue of car insurance of people who are unlicensed and uninsured.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any further discussion? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

What aspects of that are you looking to do? What -- what problem are you trying to remedy? Are you trying to create an obligation on the part of insurance companies, for example, to sell insurance to people that don't have driver's licenses or -- what -- what direction do you think you're going to go?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Sandoval.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

No. Just the opposite, Senator Roskam. I was aware that - I know that in the State of Illinois, it's -- it's against the law to drive without a license; yet, in the State of Illinois, the Department of Insurance of the State of Illinois has

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

licensed two insurance companies to sell insurance to those who don't have licenses. I've got an issue with that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 2978 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 33 Yeas, 23 Nays, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 2978, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Haine, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR HAINE:

A point of personal privilege, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

State your point.

SENATOR HAINE:

Madam President, I would like to introduce to the Senate a -- an exchange student from the Republic of Austria, Stefanie Steiner, who's in the gallery. She's visiting a family, Mr. and Mrs. Hopkins of Alton, Illinois, and they're in the gallery observing democracy in Illinois. If they could -- if we could welcome them, I'd appreciate it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Will our guests in the gallery please rise? Welcome to Springfield. Senate Bill 2982. Senator Harmon. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 2982.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Madam President. Senate Bill 2982 creates the Uniform Limited Partnership Act. This is an initiative of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, a part of the ongoing process to modernize our business laws. It is -- has the full support of the Secretary of State's Office. Passed out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously. I'm aware of no opposition and I ask for your Aye vote.

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2982 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 2982, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Collins, on 2988. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 2988.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, Senate Bill 2988 creates the Residential Tenant Rights to Repair Act which allows tenants to make necessary repairs and deduct the cost of those repairs from their rent if their landlord fails to make the repair in a timely fashion. It was presented to the Judiciary Committee. It passed out unanimously. And initially we did have some issue -- or, the Illinois Association of Realtors had some issues with the legislation. We went back to the table and worked out their concerns. And we put in -- requirements that appease the concerns levied by the Realtors and now we have their support on the legislation. Some of those changes wanted to ensure that this legislation would not allow tenants to abuse the law and also protect those landlords who were abiding by their lease and were conscientious. So, I will be open for any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2988 pass. Those in -- well, there was no light. Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

New information, Madam President. The Realtors, I am told now, are neutral on this and they prefer it to the House version. On our side of the aisle, you can make up your own

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

mind. But the Realtors are neutral and they prefer this version to the House version. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Winkel.

SENATOR WINKEL:

Just a quick comment. I appreciate all the work that the Senator has put into this bill. I know you had something of a rough hearing in the Senate Judiciary the first go-round, got it out, but you committed to work through and address the concerns. Thank you. Appreciate your efforts. I think it's a muchimproved bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 2988 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 Yeas, 2 Nays, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 2988, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator DeLeo, on Senate Bill 2989. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 2989.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

Thank you very much, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. You've heard this story two hundred and fifty times the last two days, but this is the continuing. This is a shell bill. There's nothing in it. There's a -- there's a conflict between a local brewery and a local distributor. They've been in the negotiation table. They're still negotiating. Want to keep the bill moving. There's absolutely no language, and I think they're very, very close to an agreement. So I'd like to move this over to the House and they can continue their negotiations. So I'd ask for an affirmative roll call in 2989, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Is there any discussion? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, what area are -- are you thinking may need to be changed? And what's the position of the Associated Beer Distributors of Illinois?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

Well, that's -- let me just tell you what the situation is. There's a local -- brewery in Chicago on Goose Island, a very small, little, family-owned brewery. They want some distribution rights outside Chicago and they're working with their distributor right now to -- to change that agreement. And I think they're very, very close to an agreement. So it's just a small, family-owned brewery.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Are you saying that you're not going to move this beyond until there's complete agreement on all the parties and everybody that's involved in this business is totally on board?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

Yes, sir. That's correct. We won't -- until there's an absolute love fest, this bill will never see the Governor's Office.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 2989 pass. Those in -favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open.
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are
55 Yeas, 1 voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill
2989, having received the required constitutional majority, is

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

declared passed. Senator Righter, on 2995. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 2995.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate Bill 2995 is a simple initiative to help encourage school districts who are interested in consolidating to do so if they are wishing also to engage in new construction in the new district. Quite simply, as the law is now, if two school districts have school construction program applications pending, they'll obviously each get grant indexes, or the designation of how much money they'll get from the State of Illinois. In many instances, two school districts or more school districts who may be interested in consolidating will have different grant indexes, and the one with the higher grant index may be hesitant to consolidate because they will have to go into a joint district that has -- that would then have a watered down or a lower grade index. This bill would simply provide that if that situation occurs, that the highest of the two grant indexes will be the grant index, or the amount of State funds, to come to the school district for the new district. It passed out of the Education Committee unanimously and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

(PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator del Valle.

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

Thank you, Madam President. I just rise in strong support of this bill. We have a good system in place and this legislation makes it even better. So I urge a -- an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 2995 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 2995, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Harmon, on 3004. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 3004.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Madam President. Senate Bill 3004 amends the Ticket Scalping Act. The General Assembly originally enacted this Act in 1923, which prohibited the resale of tickets at anything above face value. Much more recently we amended the Act to permit ticket brokers to resell tickets in excess of face value. This bill continues the modernization of the law to permit citizens to resell tickets through an online auction site registered with the Office of Banks and Real Estate. That in —in and of itself provides significant parallel consumer protections. It also permits not-for-profits to sell tickets, say, at a silent auction or a charity auction. It passed out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously. I'm aware of no opposition and I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3004 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 3004, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Cullerton, on Senate Bill 3007. On the top of page 12. Senator Garrett. On Senate Bill 3013, Senator Garrett, do you wish this bill returned to 2nd Reading for the purposes of an amendment? Senator Garrett seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 3013 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Reading is Senate Bill 3013. Madam -- Mr. Secretary, are there any amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 1 {sic}(2), offered by Senator Garrett.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Garrett, to explain the amendment.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Thank you, Madam Chairman. Amendment No. 1 {sic} deletes the bill and becomes the bill. When a -- and so here's the bill. When a public water district or a water service district or a water authority or a water commission issues a boil order, temporary water shut-off for commercial users or other Tier 1 notification pertaining to the potability of safety of water, such entity is mandated to notify in writing any certified local health department that provides service to an area subject to the order or warning as soon as is practical, but not later than two hours after the entity learns of the violation or situation. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Garrett moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 {sic} to Senate Bill 3013. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

3rd Reading. Senator -- Senator Garrett, On the order of 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 3013. Mr. Secretary, read the bill. ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 3013.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

I'd be happy to answer any questions. The amendment became the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Radogno.

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

SENATOR RADOGNO:

I'm sorry. Senator Garrett, could you just sort of walk through what -- what we're doing? I -- one more time for me.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

What we're doing is saying that if there is any kind of a boil order or any problem with water at all, that the local health departments have to be notified. And, by the way, this is an agreed-upon bill supported by all the health departments. And -- and they have to be notified within a two-hour period of time, which is in alignment with how the EPA does their notification process.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Radogno.

SENATOR RADOGNO:

So the two-hour time doesn't present a problem for the local health departments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

No, it doesn't. They are actually all on board with this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Garrett, you and I had a -- a somewhat lengthy discussion of this during committee and I just want to walk through some those points very briefly on the Floor again. The -- you said this is agreed-upon bill. When you mean that, what you mean is all the public health departments are agreed to it, not necessarily all the -- because they're the ones who receive the notice. The people who have to provide the notice are -- I mean, have they all agreed to it? Because we've gotten some

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

indication from, like, the Rural Water Association that they're not thrilled about this legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Well, I have not heard of any opposition, so this would be news to me.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Can -- and I want to ask the question again I asked in committee. Did you have any contact with any of the entities who will be required to provide the notice about maybe their objections to the bill, whether or not -- I know that the -- that the two-hour time frame that you've outlined in the bill was something that the public health departments said should be the standard. Did you consult with any of the people who actually have to do the work to provide the notice within the two hours, whether or not that would be a problem for them?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

The reason the two hours is in there is that this is identical to the statute that requires the same kind of notification from the EPA. So, it's just a way -- if there is any salmonella issue or boil order problem, we need to make sure that it's done in the quickest possible way, and since two hours has already been formalized through the State of Illinois, they just are following suit.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

I'm -- I didn't catch -- did you say two hours is already
in statute with regards to notice to the EPA?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

The -- yes. When the EPA has to receive information on similar type problems, they are -- their requirement is a two-hour period of time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

I'm -- I'm not an expert in this area of law, Senator Garrett. Are you saying that right now if there's a boil order, that whoever is issuing the order has to within two hours notify the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Right now the water districts need to notify the IEPA and the health department. The IEPA requires two hours. Now the health department will also require the same amount of time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Last question. Thank you, Madam President. Senator Garrett, there is in the bill two -- two issues that we discussed in committee. One was a temporary water shut-off to a commercial user and the second has to do with what's referred to the bill as a Tier 1 notification. I asked in committee if you could tell me what a Tier 1 notification was and I don't know that you had the answer. Can you tell me what that is and also why the public health departments need to know about a temporary water shut-off to -- to Wal-Mart?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Well, a Tier -- Tier 1 is, the most, I guess, high-level issue. And then the commercial can be a restaurant. It doesn't necessarily have to be a business. And when restaurants have boil orders, they have to temporarily turn off their water, and that's why that's in the legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Couple questions of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Senator Garrett, is this a shell bill? I mean, is this -- is this bill designed to do something else?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

No, this is not a shell bill. This is actually a -- an agreed-upon bill that has been in the making for the last couple of months.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Are we to be concerned that -- that -- that a water agency that's trying to notify all of its residents to boil their water is not, in a matter of course, notifying health departments? Are we -- is there a specific problem that you can cite that this is dealing with?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Yes, I can. At least in northern Illinois, there have been some restaurants that have had to be closed down because they've had problems with their water. And so what happened, what became apparent was that the health departments weren't necessarily required to receive that notification, and that's when the health departments said they needed to be on that list, in addition to the IEPA.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

I thought in testimony you just said to another question that they already are on the list be notified if there's a boil order.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

If I said that, it is incorrect. It's the IEPA that is on the list to be notified. This would now allow for the health departments to also be included in that notification. The health departments want to be included.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, Senator Garrett, do you wish to close?

SENATOR GARRETT:

Yes, I -- I would just ask for a favorable vote and let you know that the Northern Illinois Public Health Consortium, the Lake County Health Department and the Metropolitan County Association of Health Departments are all in support of this legislation. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 3013 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 3013, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Dillard, on 3014. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 3014.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Madam President. And go Illini. This bill is an initiative of the Women's DNA -- it's called the Women's DNA Initiative and it's also an initiative of the Chicago Police Department, and it stems from the fact that Illinois has a backlog in mandatory DNA testing. We have about a thousand untested rape kits that are -- that are backlogged, at last count, in Chicago alone, and states like New York have no backlog. Just last week, there are two newspaper articles from the Chicago Sun-Times, "DNA Breaks 11,000 Cases" and the "Police Track a 1988 Murder." Everyday you read about how DNA solves

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

crimes - not only rapes but also murders. And all this bill does is it requires once a year that we get a report, the General Assembly gets a report to inform lawmakers of the status of the backlog of our DNA testing so that we can figure out how to get the appropriate funding to have these DNA tests completed. And last week, DNA testing solved the Lincoln Park rapist case in the Chicago area. It is the fingerprint of the twenty-first century. And we cannot allow a DNA backlog to happen in Illinois, especially when states like Virginia and New York have no backlog. This solves crimes and we want to be updated as to what the DNA backlog is in the State. I'd urge a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3014 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 3014, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Lightford, on 3021. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 3021.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 3021 amends the Illinois Credit Unions Act regarding community credit unions, guest travel reimbursement, member removal and suspension. They're basically wanting to make changes in just upgrading their Board and the availability to provide for distressed communities. Initially, Community Bankers had some opposition. They worked it out, and there's no opposition to this bill. And I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Are the credit unions for it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lightford, I believe she said, is the credit unions for it? Credit unions.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

It's -- it's their legislation, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Rutherford.

SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Thank you, Madam President. Madam Chairman, the earlier version had a provision in it that had a eligibility for credit union participation by, like, a pre-membership. Sixty days, ninety days. And for that reason, there was some opposition to it. My understanding is that your amendment clarified or took that portion out and now that this is something that is -- is acceptable by all parties.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

That's correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

On that question, there are -- shall Senate Bill 3021 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 3021, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Lightford, on 3026. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 3026.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the This is a new Act that creates the Youth Service I found this to be important. Scholarship Program. Governor, in his proposal for education, said that community service should be a graduation -- it should be included in graduation, that participation in community service. And I seem to just differ from that thought. I believe it's important that we encourage young people to be involved in the community, but it should not be tied to graduation. I also believe that our high school dropout rate is extremely too high, and when you have those borderline students, you run the risk of losing them. And then there's a lot businesses who say, "Why are you sending me this child who do not want to be here?" So, I thought that this legislation would create a situation where students between ninth and twelfth grade have the opportunity to still be community-based driven. Upon completion of one hundred hours of community service, that they would earn a five-hundred-dollar scholarship so that it's incentive-driven, and the pupil may redeem the scholarship if they enroll in a private or public post-secondary or vocational institution in this State. requires the ICCS {sic}(ICVCS) to submit to the General Assembly a study of the efficiency of the program by July 1, of 2008, and the Act is repealed on January 1, 2010. It is subject to appropriation and I will be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates she'll -- yield.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Lightford, I'm -- I'm not familiar with this piece of legislation. What -- you said that it's subject to appropriation. But can you give me an idea of if funds were appropriated from this -- first, I would assume they'd be General Revenue Funds. And second, what kind of money you'd be

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

looking for to put together a program that you think would really be effective.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lightford

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Well, I did not apply for a fiscal impact notice on this. I just feel that when we're looking to make changes in education so drastically, that one area that I acknowledge Governor's proposal that I clearly disagree with is attaching community service to graduation. So this is a bill that I presented couple years ago that I thought I could bring back to the table to kind of give an alternative to the Governor's suggestion. Whatever monies come available through whatever means, if the Governor decides -- he has the ability to veto it. But if he decides okay later that this is a good option to what I'm willing -- wanting to do but also completing his focus and goal, then maybe he would just take this into consideration. I'd just like to put it out there so that there will be a choice.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Senator. You do deserve credit for the fact -you're willing to stand up and say, you know, if we're going to
put this program, it'll cost money, as opposed to some on the
second floor who just say, oh, we'll just do this and it'll be
free. Does this program envision that any of the people who are
involved in it will be paid? I mean, that's one thing that
we've seen in -- in -- in the last couple of years is, that we
talk about volunteer community service and then there's a
compensation attached to it, which doesn't make much sense. I
mean, can you help me with that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

I'll do my best. The way I'd hope to have it draft was that it's the intent of this legislation to provide youth with opportunities to give back to their communities, to enhance their access to a college education, to develop skills and

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

understandings critical to their development as workers and community members and to develop a lifelong ethic of I also thought it would help to deter juvenile delinquency by providing the State's youth with afterschool and intersession alternatives that promote public service. thought that it would create a partnership between schools and community organizations dedicated to building responsibility and broadening higher education opportunity. And, finally it, would mobilize youth in service that meets the critical needs of their communities. So I just feel that it should be more incentive-The dollars will compensate their ability to want to participate with the community organization, and they would only earn the five-hundred-dollar scholarship once they complete a hundred hours of community service. And then they have to show within a two-year period after completing high school, that they are going to attend a private or a public university, junior college or some sort of vocational learning. So it's also encouraging advanced education beyond high school.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter, last question.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Yes, Madam President. Thank you for your indulgence. I'm sorry, Senator Lightford. I guess my -- my question was whether or not they're going to be paid. And I did hear you in that answer use the phrase that the funds are going to be used to kind of incentivize them giving back to their community. Is it fair to say that they're going to be paid for their volunteer service? I mean, just -- that's all I want to know.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

There is a five-hundred-dollar stipend that will be issued to them through ISAC among a hundred hours of completed service of community service that will go directly to a university, junior college or vocational institution after two years of completing high school.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Thank you, Madam President. To the bill: I think the -the previous questions have been pretty well put out there on the table. Again, you know, this is another one of those pieces of legislation that we all say, "Oh it's -- it's great, it's got a -- a good purpose. It's -- it's designed to help keep kids in school. It's designed to help keep kids going towards higher It's designed to help kids get involved in their It's to teach them volunteerism. communities. It's to teach them civic responsibility." The problem is, it's a bill that builds expectations from this General Assembly and from the dollars that we have in our State's budget. You know, when I was in the House, I didn't mind voting for bills, it seems like, that -- that cost money. The -- the only problem -- and, you know, that were subject to appropriation. Let me put it that That were subject to appropriation. But in light of today's fiscal condition, in light of recent reports from the --Ec and Fiscal Commission that revenues are down tremendously from where the Governor's Office had projected, we cannot afford to keep building expectations for our citizens out there in the State of Illinois that there is no way that we can comply with. I would urge a No vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

I want to, of course, Well, thank you, Madam President. speak in support of this bill, but I -- I want to commend Senator Lightford for really beginning a process of -- of -- of defining community service and -- and giving it a definition that ensures that youngsters will benefit. We've had community service requirements in Chicago for some time, and I can tell you that some of those experiences amount to very little. That's why we need to connect kids with community organizations. We need to connect kids with programs where they're going to really develop the kind of experience that'll make a difference in their lives. Learning occurs in the classroom and -- occurs outside the classroom in the community. That's what this bill is all about, along with the incentives that are necessary to make sure that kids understand that as they provide a community service, as they're learning, they're also going to be rewarded

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

and they're going to be appreciated and they're going to be recognized for the value of that service that they're providing. So I hope that you will support this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Radogno.

SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you. Question for the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield.

SENATOR RADOGNO:

Senator, is there any means test in this? I mean, does any child that fulfills the community service, are they eligible for the money?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

It requires that the program be made available to consortiums of school districts and community-based organizations that then select pupils to earn scholarships while they are enrolled in any grades nine through twelve in a public school.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Radogno.

SENATOR RADOGNO:

So there is no economic need that has to be demonstrated in order to receive this money?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

No. I believe all of our children are our future and we need to invest in all of them. So, regardless of your income status, if you are a student between ninth and twelfth grade, you should be -- have -- have the opportunity to get involved with community organizations and receive this benefit.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lightford, to close.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I really appreciate the dialogue, but I'd just like to

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

quickly deflect back to Senator Burzynski's remarks. It is our responsibility to take on a challenge in saying not only do we recognize our youth as our future, but we want to let them know that we encourage them to get involved with public service and not that it's a mandate towards graduation. I think academics is what's important towards graduation and we should not put on our children that you have to come work for a community organization free of charge, no incentive, no encouragements towards higher ed, but if you do, then you can graduate from high school. I think we're sending mixed signals to our youth. I'd urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 3026 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 39 Yeas, 14 Nays, 3 voting Present. And Senate Bill 3026, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Lightford, on 3027. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 3027.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. In the future I'll know not to have these all filed back to back. This is the -- it amends the Illinois Banking Act regarding State bank deregulation. And let me just quickly say that this has been something that has been discussed and discussed and discussed and we've tried to work on this legislation. I know Senator Rutherford would like to give input. But the Illinois Bankers Association feels that they need more ability to allow national banks the opportunity to merge with the State of Illinois and to create new branches and be more attractive than other states, that we have taken a loss in the State of Illinois by some of our other larger banks over

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

the last year - and I'm sure many of you are familiar with that - because we didn't have an attractive enough system to compete. So I'm hoping that you-all would just listen to debate, and -- and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Rutherford.

SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Thank you, Madam President. First of all, Senator Lightford, I think we've both got to be pretty happy and proud with the staff we have that have worked on this. Your side of the aisle and ours have done a very good job with this. Let me do a couple of questions, in part to help put some things in for legislative intent. One of them is, does this amend -- does this amendment to Section 5(25) of the Banking Act provide the Commissioner of Banks and Real Estates here in the State of Illinois with the ability to limit the authority granted to the banks by this Section?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Madam President. Yes, it does, Senator. The Senate Amendment 2 actually addressed this Section, which is 5(25). It is subject to rules of the Commissioner and -- which means that the Commissioner may impose limits through rulemaking on the authority. This provision grants to banks that any time that the Commissioner believes it is in the public interest to do so.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Rutherford.

SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Great. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator Lightford. This, in part, addressed some of the concerns in regards to prepayment penalties. Let me progress with another question, then, that's presented to us to help clarify for our - our Realtor Association colleagues with the Illinois Bankers. Question is, would this bill allow an Illinois bank to import any federal preemption of State licensing laws?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lightford.

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

No, Senator. In fact, this bill does not in any way do that. It does not affect the State licensing requirements of Illinois State charter banks.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Rutherford.

SENATOR RUTHERFORD:

Thank you, Madam President. And with all of this on the record now, Senator Lightford, I would stand in support of our legislation and encourage our -- our Body here to pass it over to the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lightford, to close.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you. I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 3027 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 49 Yeas, 4 Nays, 1 voting Present. And Senate Bill 3027, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Lightford, you didn't vote for your own bill.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

You got it, Madam President. I'd like to be recorded as voting Aye on Senate Bill 3027.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The record will so reflect. Senator Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

For the same reason, Madam President. I intended to vote Yes on Senator Lightford's bill and credit union's 3021. And I guess when I -- I didn't press hard enough. So, please record me as Yes...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The record will so reflect. Thank you, Senator. Senator Viverito, on 3029. Senator Viverito, on 3030. Senator Trotter, on 3037. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Senate Bill 3037.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Madam President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 3037 provides a necessary technical language change, amending existing statutory language to delete reference to an obsolete federal program, AFDC, and make reference to the new federal program, TANF. It also eliminates the requirement that DCF {sic} be reimbursed for eighty percent of their emergency assistance expenditures claimed under the Temporary Assistance and -- Needy Families Program. There is no fiscal impact as a result of this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3041 {sic} pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Okay. It's on Senate Bill 3037. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 Yeas, 1 voting Nay, and none voting Present. And Senate Bill 3037, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Righter, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Point of inquiry, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sure.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Madam President, I -- during the presentation of that bill, which I guess was 3037, 3041 was on the board and then when you called the vote, you said Senate Bill 3041. And then the board changed to 3037. So I don't know, I mean, I don't know how many people over there, but I'm not sure everyone knows exactly which bill they were voting on. Whether -- depends on where they were listening or whether they were looking at the board and looking at their analysis on the computer.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Thank you, Senator. The record is reflecting the correct bill, 3037, on the vote we just took.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Right. My concern, Madam President, is -- is that if 3041 was on the board, wouldn't that be what's on the system?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

No.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Okay. So what was on the computer was 3037. So for those who were perhaps looking at their computers rather than listening to the debate, which would be hard to believe, you're -- confident that they're okay, too, on the vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

I am very confident. Thank you, Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Great. Thank you, Madam President. I appreciate that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Okay. 3041, Senator Luechtefeld. Senator Luechtefeld, on 3042. Senator Luechtefeld, on 3043. Senator Link, on 3053. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 3053.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Madam President. This removes the prohibition from manufacturers and distributors of alcohol liquor who may not be licensed if the manufacturer or distributor is to hold local office thereby allowing manufacturers and distributors to run for local office. This would still prohibit them for running offices, such as mayor and a chairman of a county board, where -- that would be in charge of a liquor license. Be more than happy to answer any question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing -- Senator Righter. SENATOR RIGHTER:

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Link, I -- I'm not sure I understand what new authority we're giving to the locally elected officials with this bill. Can you -- I mean, maybe if you walk through a hypothetical for our Members, that would be helpful.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Link.

SENATOR LINK:

Thank you, Madam President. Basically what it is, is someone that holds a -- a -- like a liquor distributor right now is ineligible. Like your local beer distributor right now, today, is ineligible for running for a local trustee or local alderman. He's prohibited from doing that today, but this bill would allow them to do that. Now, they can -- run for local school boards, they can run for park districts, they can hold all this. What we're doing is saying that they can run for this, but they cannot -- run for an office that would administer -- would -- would okay the license, such as the liquor commissioner, which is mayor and chairman of the county board. They still would be prohibited from running for that office.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter. No. Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, I think you've got a drafting error that needs to be cleaned up in the House. I know you're brokenhearted about that. On the amendment, it's page 3, down at the bottom and it -- rolls over onto page 4. There's an omission where you've left out incorporated towns. In other words, you've enumerated all these -- all these folks that can participate, alderman of a city council and so forth. In order to make this in parallel with the Liquor Control Act, there needs to be an insertion to

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

cover incorporated towns. I think it's something that can be easily cleaned up in the House. I bring it to your attention. I think we should all -- you know, if people are otherwise disposed to support your bill, I think we should support it, but it's something that I -- I think is a drafting error that should be addressed. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Link, to close.

SENATOR LINK:

I will be more than happy to work with my colleague, Senator Roskam, on doing that in the House if that is -- needs to be corrected. And I would ask for affirmative vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 3053 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 Yeas, none voting Nay, 1 voting Present. And Senate Bill 3053, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Jacobs. Senator Bomke. 3069. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 3069.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. 3069 creates the Carnival Ride Operators Registration Act. Simply would require a background check of carnival ride operators. If it were determined, after that background check, that they were a previous sex offender or had a warrant, they would not -- allowed to be employed in Illinois. After the amendment, which I explained on the Floor two days ago, came out of committee unanimously, I did make a commitment that I would work with the -- the House sponsor to amend it to change the background check to upon employment rather than annual. Be happy to answer any questions.

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Sandoval.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of Senate Bill 3069. I believe that the sponsor has hit it right on the head. As it relates to public safety of our children of the State of Illinois, I'd like to remind the Members of the Senate that carnival rides exist -- the greatest number of carnival rides that exist in the City of Chicago and the State of Illinois are in areas that are socially, economically deprived and disadvantaged. The greatest number of carnivals in the City of Chicago exist on the southwest side and the Latino and African-American neighborhoods on the south side. I support the bill because we have had -- also had a number -- a numerous amount of people being violated, cases of molestation of people -- of children in our community. I rise in support of this bill and ask Members of this side of aisle to support and vote green. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Wendell Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll -- he'll yield.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Senator Bomke, I had a gentleman from my district, who is a carnival ride operator, ask me to ask you why this bill only affects carnival ride operators and doesn't affect anybody else involved with a carnival who may be coming into town. seems to me if we're going to pass a bill like this, we ought to -- we ought do a background check on everybody, not just the carnival ride operators. I mean, there could be somebody running carnival game or some other kind of a carnival situation where you have a -- one of those jumping places for little kids or something like that. We're going to check out the carnival ride operator, but we're not going to check out the carnival ride -- other vendors. And I was wondering, since these people do come in from out of town and maybe out of state, they have records of various criminal activity, why not just check 'em all

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

out if we're going to do this, rather than -- single out the carnival ride operators?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

Thank you. Thank you, Senator Jones. Actually, it does include the games. It would include that jumping thing you referred to. It is amusement and carnival ride operators. So it would include what you -- what you just mentioned.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Wendell Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

So it -- it does include more than just the carnival ride operator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

It -- it includes the amusement. Inclusive in that amusement will be carnival ride operators, game operators and whatever that other jumping thing you mentioned.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Thank you for that clarification, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Viverito.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

Thank you, Madam President. I, too, rise in favor of this bill and want to commend the sponsor of this bill. We, too, have experienced the same type of sexual predators on our young people, and I know he did an awful lot of work on it. I've talked to a lot of different police chiefs that are very, very happy about this, and I'd like to congratulate the sponsor on the hard work he's put into it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Madam President. First of all, certainly I -- I appreciate and commend the sponsor on the intention of the bill,

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

and perhaps the amendment addresses some of the practical concerns about this. But can this even be done, from a practical standpoint? Can employers actually fulfill this regulation? And can you describe again why it's not discriminatory on just that sector? But the first piece is, is it even practically possible to complete this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Bomke.

SENATOR BOMKE:

I don't understand why it would not be practical. Now, I would agree with you. And it was a misunderstanding on my part. I understood that the ten categories for which we request a background check, I thought it was done annually. I've since learned that is not the case, that it's done upon initial employment. So, I would agree, it would be more difficult if it were done annually. I think if it's done on initial employment, as long as they have a long-term employee, they only have to get that background check done once. However, I -- I think the fact that the law, if it passes here, passes the -- the House, doesn't become effective until January 1 would give ample time for any carnival coming to Illinois - and I don't know, but I would guess there aren't too many -- carnivals in Illinois between October and -- and April or May, I would guess - I think it would give them ample time to -- to comply with the law. Now, as far as discriminatory, we -- unlike a -- children are not necessarily attracted to a lemonade stand or a hotdog stand, but they are to amusement and rides. And we -- we somewhat discriminate now under the ten categories for which we require background checks. For instance, we require background checks to school district employees, not teachers; nurses, not doctors or other staff members. So, maybe we do that now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in strong support of this legislation. Senator Bomke has done a great job with it. I have no -- I don't understand some of the questions about discriminating against anybody. We're targeting some people who have access to our children, and some of you should have been in

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

committee to hear the mother's testimony and hear -- and feel her tears. She wasn't -- it wasn't an act. She wasn't crying just to impress anyone. She was crying out of pain for what her daughter went through. And Senator Bomke has said that he will work with us on the long-term employees, not having to do a background every year, and I'd urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is -- or, Senator Bomke, would you like to close? SENATOR BOMKE:

Well, just very quickly. I don't -- I don't want to delay this. But I think that the Chief of Police from Burbank, Illinois, called me in support of this. I'm not sure whose district he's in, but he indicated to me that back in 1988, they had a carnival in town. Carnival operator solicited young, I think, boys to come to the carnival, gave 'em free tickets to ride the rides and ended up sexually assaulting one of the boys, was charged and convicted. From that point on, Chief Radowicz said, we now do background checks. We started this. We're a home rule community. We do fingerprinting. We do background checks, and as a result, we have found numerous individuals that are with a carnival that have been -- had previous sex -previous sex offenders, many of them pedophiles and many who have warrants. So, I think he said it better than I ever could, and that's a good example of why we need to pass this legislation. Would appreciate an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 3069 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 40 Yeas, 15 Nays, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 3069, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Lightford, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

State your point.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Members of the General Assembly, I am pleased to introduce to you the River Forest Troop 4523. I have with me today Alison Cougar. She's eleven years old, in the fifth grade at Roosevelt Middle School, and Emmit Dwyer, who's ten years old, in the fifth grade at Roosevelt Middle School. I'm an eternal Brownie. I never made it to Girl Scout. So, this is really great. Please welcome them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Welcome to Springfield. Top of page 13. Senator Brady, on 3077. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 3077.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Brady.

SENATOR BRADY:

Thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen. 3077 with an issue regarding insurance requirements on properties owned by individuals. Seems to be an issue on whether or not a lending institution can require an owner to insure for both the improvements and the land. This clarifies that they could only require them to insure for the improvement. They cannot require them to insure for the land. The land cannot be destroyed in fire or otherwise. Therefore, this clarifies that. The Bankers had an issue they wanted to resolve with an amendment. It didn't make it out of Rules. The Bankers have agreed, along with the proponents of the bill, that we should move it over to the House, attach the amendment and deal with it in a timely fashion. I'd be happy to answer any questions and ask for your favorable support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3077 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, there are 56 Yeas, none

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 3077, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Schoenberg, on 3085. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 3085.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate Bill 3085 is a revised and modified version of the comprehensive Tollway reform bill. You may -- there are some slight changes to what the Governor had amendatorily vetoed yesterday -- last year, which, unfortunately, the House declined to consider. The highlights of that are that the -- the twentyyear financial plan has been removed. The lien, which many on the other side of the aisle -- on -- for those who are violators over five hundred dollars, that has been removed through the amendment to the bill. The Inspector General provision that gives the Inspector General subpoena powers, the necessary change was made to lift the objections from the other side of What the bill does contain is, the Inspector General does have subpoena power consistent with State and federal law, that there's an expansion of the I-PASS program so that I-PASS can be used for the Chicago Skyway, the O'Hare/Midway Airports, as well as for -- for consumer purchases at the new Tollway oases. There's greater accountability through the veto power that the General Assembly would have over certain expenditures over that which cover the bonds. There are tougher ethical provisions on financial interests. One of the new provisions also is an -- this would create a statutory authority for the Tollway to be able to offer an amnesty -- a sixty-day window for amnesty, and there's also civil adjudication of fines. This should have addressed some of the concerns that were out there previously. I'd be happy to answer any questions. Urge your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Is there any discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Madam President. Senator Schoenberg, you and I have discussed this bill at length, and last year there was a debate here on the Floor over this legislation. And two of the provisions that -- that were objected to from our side of the aisle, one has been lifted, the other has not, and I want to go over that provision with you. On page 4 of the legislation, beginning on line 22 through 30, there's language in there that says that an employee of the Authority who is also a member of a labor union has a right if they are being questioned by the Inspector General for criminal misconduct - so we're not talking about someone who, you know, came in late to work or something like that - criminal misconduct, like someone -- theft of funds, that they have a right -- a right to have their labor union representative present during the criminal investigation questioning. Now, in case law - and I know that you're aware of this, Senator Schoenberg - when language is used that you have the right to counsel present during questioning, that means that a criminal suspect can say, "I don't have to answer questions till my attorney is here," and the police have to abide by that. This language is exactly the same as that. So, are we in a situation now where a person, because they don't have their labor union representative present, has a right not to ask {sic} questions from investigators with regards to criminal misconduct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

First of all, let me point out that the issue that was -the issue that was raised about how the subpoena powers for the
Inspector General were to be defined, the -- the underlying bill
was drafted in error with a provision that was featured. The
references that were incorporated in error were omitted -- I

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

should say deleted by the amendment. I say that as a precursor to -- more directly answering your question. This is permissive. We're not -- we're not equating someone's ability to have representation from their union with their legal representation. It's simply permissive. But the larger issue is whether or not I have fulfilled the commitment that I made during the committee to correct the drafting error and -- and come back with a cleaner version, and I have done just that. So, the Tollway Authority has signed off on this version, and I, frankly, don't see what the issue is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Okay. You say it's permissive. Let me read the language and see if anyone here thinks -- takes this as permissive. Concerning misconduct that is criminal in nature, the person "shall have the right to be notified of the right to remain silent during the investigation or inquiry and the right to be represented in the investigation or inquiry by a representative a labor organization that is the exclusive collective bargaining representative of employees of the Authority." That's not permissive language. That is an unmitigated right, Senator Schoenberg, and let me put to you, 'cause my time is out, a hypothetical for you and the rest of the people here in the Chamber. Oftentimes in a criminal investigation - let's say the theft of funds - there's more than one criminal suspect, and in those cases, almost exclusively, the authorities want to question those suspects separately. Why? Obviously because they don't want to hear what the other person -- they don't want those suspects to hear what the other one is saying. If one of the suspects is the labor union representative, Senator Schoenberg, this bill prevents enforcement authority from questioning those Now, I appreciate all that you've done to try to separately. clean up the Tollway, but this is a huge, huge problem in this legislation. And I hope that you and the rest of the Body will consider this and at least consider committing to this Body that this legislation, before it becomes law, will be amended so that at least we don't have that situation, because otherwise you are

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

creating a block for law enforcement to investigate criminal misconduct in the very entity that I know you're trying so hard to clean up. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator Schoenberg, my favorite movie of all time Godfather I and Godfather II together. Godfather III, as you know, was junk. The Coppola girl shouldn't have been in it. She couldn't act. But there's a great scene in Godfather III, and that's where Michael Corleone is trying to make the family business legitimate and at one point, right before he has his collapse, he says, "I'm trying to get out, but they keep dragging me in." Now, it seems to me that there is sort of a "Michael Corleonesque" sense to this bill, in that what you're doing is you're dragging people in to the governance questions about the Toll Highway Authority that really don't -- don't have to be involved so much. And as a suburban legislator who has I-88 and who has a district previously that had I-355 go through it, I'm -- I'm really concerned that -- that your veto provision of the Toll Highway's expenditures is dragging people in to this conversation and empowering people in to the conversation that -- that aren't going to benefit the toll payers that I represent. What's your response to that, in terms of the governance and the way that you're changing the structure of the expenditure portion and, from what I understand, the entire operating budget of the Toll Highway Authority?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

First of all, you may not have liked Sophia Coppola in <u>Godfather III</u>, but I think she did a great job in Lost -- in directing and producing <u>Lost in Translation</u>, Bill Murray, which is one of my favorite movies and should have won more Academy Awards. Now, to the bill and to your question: As a suburban

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

legislator, I have long felt that these are public funds and that we need to have greater accountability for the Authority's The reason why this has been spending practices and policies. drafted in this particular fashion, as I've indicated earlier, don't want to jeopardize the because we bonds, outstanding seven hundred and eighty-four million dollars in So as to give us more of a voice in how outstanding debt. spending policies and practices are determined, that's why this veto provision which protects the bonds, as has long been asked for by those on your side of the aisle - which, frankly, I always thought was a bit of a red herring to avert any kind of meaningful reform, but I'm willing to revisit it - that's why we have this in the bill. These are public funds. Toll dollars that hardworking people leave through the I-PASS or leave in the basket, those are public funds, and we are stewards of public funds and that's why we should have additional oversight.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Roskam, please bring your remarks to a close. SENATOR ROSKAM:

Well, I've spoken for about thirty seconds. So -- and this is an enormous piece of legislation, Madam President. We've not been dilatory today, and I will wind it up. But let's -- let's get serious.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Well -- well, there are other speakers, too.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Okay. The -- you know, if you take -- if you take the Majority's position over the past eighteen months and the activity on -- on how -- how badly damaged the -- the transportation funds are - and, you know, one of the Senators yesterday was trying to create a remedy to restore some of those funds - you can get a sense of real reluctance on the part of people up in -- up in my district that when -- when you come, basically, and say, "Hi, I'm here, and I'm here to help," I mean, there's a level of skepticism about the -- the manipulations and so forth about where this is going. So, it -- it seems like after -- after creating turmoil in the transportation fund already, you're about to create turmoil and get more people involved in the -- in the governance issue,

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

which is already fairly confusing, and I - and I just -- and I'm very deeply concerned about the consequences of this. I think you're going to draw downstaters into this -- into this debate, and I think over time they're going to develop ownership. And for those -- those Senators who are downstaters, I would really urge a sense of caution on taking on this responsibility, because if you start to do the -- the process of vetoing the Toll Highway's budget, you develop ownership, and then, over a period of time, heaven help us, in terms of the obligations. I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Wendell Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Thank you, Madam President, Members of the Senate. As you know, I live in the suburbs and I use the tollway frequently. would submit that when Senator Schoenberg calls these public funds, that I would respectfully disagree. These are not public funds. These are tolls. These are fees that we pay when we go through and drop our money into the tolls. When the -- when the Senator sponsoring this bill was in the House, he wanted to eliminate the toll road. I couldn't agree more. eliminate the toll road. This bill takes us just the other direction and puts the toll road under the -- under the aegis of the General Assembly. If we're going to have this under the aegis of the General Assembly, we might as well eliminate the Toll Highway Authority. Let's just eliminate the Toll Highway Authority. We seem to be doing that around here. We don't like something the Gaming Board does, we eliminate the Gaming Board. Why not eliminate the Tollway Board, eliminate the tolls and let the people ride free in northern Illinois instead of having to pay two taxes - one when they drive and one when they pay for their gasoline?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Schoenberg, to close.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

There's a great -- since Senator Roskam brought movies into this, there's a great movie out now called Eternal Sunshine of the Spotless Mind, featuring Jim Carrey, where the principals in the film can have scientifically removed certain life

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

experiences and parts of their memory. I won't dwell -- in the interest of time, I won't dwell on how -- on the checkered history of the Toll Highway Authority and the commitment that's been made to clean it up. I would -- if you want greater accountability, if you want to bring about reform, if you want to provide for amnesty so that we can have this agency more fiscally solvent, I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 3085 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 32 Yeas, 24 Nays, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 3085, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Harmon, on 3090. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 3090.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Madam President. Senate Bill 3090 is in the nature of a tax validation measure, which means I'm having a real difficult time coming up with an appropriate movie reference. A school district in my home district ran a referendum, a successful referendum, to increase the education tax rate by sixty cents. It was passed by the voters. result of a technical drafting glitch, the rate resulting from the referendum will be far less than the -- the rate the voters I know that I've spoken with many of you and I know approved. that there is some concern that by doing this, we are somehow frustrating the will of the voters. But, in fact, I believe we are implementing the will of the voters, and I want to be very Even when we pass this Act, the rate -- the extended rate actually paid by the voters will be less than the rate that appeared in the referendum. It's important to a school district

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

in my home district. I'm happy to take any questions, but I'd ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of this piece of legislation. This impacts a school district and community that I did represent previously for about ten years. I'm familiar with many of the challenges that they have in this community and these neighborhoods up along Mannheim Road. This school district, for many of the kids that grow up in the community, is the best educational opportunity they're ever going to get, frankly, and I -- I hope that -- that that is meant with the proper intent that it's a wonderful school district. And when they debated this issue about the -- they debated this issue about the referendum and the increase, it was clearly understood, if you look at newspaper articles and you look at literature that was distributed during the campaign, it was understood that the increase that they were seeking was a sixty-percent increase. Problem is, is that the operative language on the ballot for that referendum did not accomplish it. It was technical legal language. The lawyers were mistaken. The lawyers have since been fired, and I'm sure there's a problem there that will be resolved down the road. The point of the matter is, is that I am comfortable that the intent of the voters was to do exactly what this bill is seeking to do today. I urge your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield for some questions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

You know, Senator Harmon, we had some discussion on this in committee, and I understand the quandary that you find yourself in; however, I also understand that what you're attempting to do is to increase a tax rate without referendum. And, you know,

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

that's -- that's something that we don't normally do here and support. So, what is the rationale, once again, that you want to keep on raising this rate? And -- and also, you spoke to the fact that even with the increase, or with this legislation -- Madam President, it's very noisy.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Excuse me. Could we please keep it down so the speaker can hear?

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Even -- you -- you made the comment that even if we approve this bill, the rate will be less than what it was approved at on the -- on the ballot, but what you failed to recognize is the fact that it can creep up past the rate that was passed on the ballot by the taxpayers. So, you know, what -- what's the rationale for going to the sixty cents, instead of -- I believe it was forty-nine, if I remember correctly?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Let me try to address all of your questions. First of all, this is not new territory for the General Assembly. There's more than two pages in the Compiled Statutes of similar tax validation measures. There's even a section in the LRB Drafting Manual about how to draft one of these bills. So, we're not doing anything we haven't done before. With respect to the -the -- doing this without a referendum, there already was a referendum. The -- the voters approved a sixty-cent increase, and in the -- in the end, because of the technical glitch, they got a forty-one-cent increase. There was confusion in the -- in the language between the maximum rate and the extended rate. -- I disagree with your notion that the rate can creep past it. We are implementing the maximum rate set by the voters in -pursuant to this bill. The extended rate, the rate that is subject to caps, will be less with this bill than the rate in error put forth in the ballot.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Tell me how the voters approved a sixty-cent rate increase if it was forty-nine cents on the ballot?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Did I miss something there?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Yes, Senator, and I -- I apologize if I -- if I glossed over it too quickly. The -- the -- the -- the school district sought to increase their maximum rate by sixty cents. The ballot used the extended rates, the actual rates in application, and showed a sixty-cent increase on the -- on the ballot. So, it showed sixty cents. The way it was interpreted by the clerk, they discount the extended rate a second time, essentially, to the reduced rate of forty-one.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Burzynski, please bring your remarks to a close.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Sure. Who approved the language that was on the ballot? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

The -- to be fair, the district approved it. After asking counsel several times, counsel insisted that it was correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

So, has the district tried to recover anything from their counsel? Perhaps that's where they need to have their remedy.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

They are seeking that remedy. They have already lost that difference for a year, and I know that they are pursuing that from counsel. However, the -- the long-term ramifications of this error are -- are too -- too large for that law firm to make whole.

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Burzynski, this is it. Your time is up.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Last question. One last question, then. Then why don't they go back to the voters with the appropriate language on the ballot and pass that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Because the voters did pass a referendum, and I believe it's unfair to ask the voters in -- in this school district to bear the cost of a second referendum when they very, very clearly evidenced their intent to increase their school rate by sixty cents.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Harmon, I -- I appreciate your effort on this, and you and I have talked about this. This is a pretty confusing issue, and I think it's important that -- for Members of our side of the aisle to listen very, very carefully to what the voters, for those who read the referenda, thought they were voting -- approving and what the change you're seeking to make is. Now, you're saying that there was a drafting error or confusion between the terms "extended rate" and maximum rate." Now, first, extended rate is what the school district wants to put in place presently. The maximum rate is what the school board could ultimately raise it to without going back to the voters. Is that fair to say?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

I'm not sure that I agree, but -- let me try to -- if I say it differently, you tell me if you agree. The extended rate is

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

the -- or, is the rate that is permissible under the tax caps based on the maximum rate. It reflects that -- that cap discount. Are we -- are we in agreement on that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Okay. Now, I mean -- I mean, I'm here with our staff and our staff is telling me, no, the extended rate is what the school board is saying that actually is extended, that that is what they're going to collect, whatever that is per hundred dollar assessed valuation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Yes, and that can grow towards the maximum rate, but always subject to the tax cap.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Okay. We're at first base here. Now, what is the difference -- what is the confusion that you're trying to correct? Here's the concern we have, and just lay it out here, is that the voters were told in this referenda that the maximum rate could be -- whatever per hundred dollar assessed valuation, and you're seeking to increase that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

They were also told that the current maximum rate was much lower than it actually was. Both numbers were wrong - the starting point and the ending point.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Okay. So then, what I said -- what I said before, then, was correct. You're -- you're saying that -- that whoever wrote the referenda language made a mistake in both what they said the extended rate would be and what the maximum rate would be. No. That's not right. Okay.

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

They made a mistake with respect to the current maximum rate before the referendum, and the proposed maximum rate after the referendum.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Is it fair to say, Senator Harmon, that if this bill becomes law, the maximum rate per hundred dollar assessed valuation will be higher for those taxpayers than what their reading of the referendum would be? You see what I'm saying?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

I -- I do, and I may owe an apology to Senator Burzynski if I misspoke. The -- the maximum rate subject to this bill will be higher than the number that appeared in the ballot. The differential will be exactly what appeared on the ballot, and the actual extended rates the voters will pay will be less than appeared on the ballot.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Madam President. And I appreciate your honesty, Senator Harmon. Just to the Members of our side of the aisle, I -- please be very careful what Senator Harmon's telling us. I appreciate that he's doing something for his district here, but what he's telling us is, is that the stated dollars-and-cents figure for the maximum rate per hundred dollar assessed valuation that was on the ballot is going to be changed. That maximum rate's going to be changed if this becomes law. And so, over time, if they go to that maximum rate, those taxpayers will be paying more per hundred dollar assessed valuation than what they thought they were in approving this referendum. Thank you, Madam President, for your indulgence.

SENATOR HARMON:

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Thank you, Madam President. I appreciate the -- the debate and the -- the goodwill in which it was entered. Let me say one thing in closing: The campaign was run on the basis of increasing the rate by sixty cents. The campaign did not discuss the -- where we start, where we finish. The voters believed they voted for a sixty-cent increase. I would like to be able to implement the will of the voters living in my district, and I'd ask all of my colleagues to help me do that, on both sides of the aisle. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 3090 pass. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 36 Yeas, 18 Nays, 1 voting Present. And Senate Bill 3090, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Watson, on 3091. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3091.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you very much, Madam President. Senate Bill 3091 allows a joint agreement made up of school districts or a regional superintendent on behalf of schools and programs -- operated by the regional office of education apply for a waiver of the School Code similar as to what we have for the Illinois State Board of Education rules.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3091 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 Yeas, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 3091, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed.

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Senator del Valle seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 3107 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of --amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 3107. Madam Secretary, are there any amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Yes. Floor Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator del Valle.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator del Valle, to explain the amendment.

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

Thank you, Madam President. The amendment changes the title of this Act and also requires the participation of doctoral degree granting institutions on the Board. And I'll talk about the entire bill after we adopt the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator del Valle moves the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 3107. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

3rd Reading. Senator del Valle, on the Order of 3rd Reading, Senate Bill 3107. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3107.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

Thank you, Madam President. This bill is an initiative of the Illinois Board of Higher Education. It creates the Diversifying Faculty in Higher Education Program {sic}, and basically what it does is that it combines two existing programs, the Illinois Consortium for Educational Opportunity and the Illinois Minority Graduate Incentive Programs. The purpose is to strengthen the program. It's a program whose main

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

purpose is to produce minorities for faculty positions in higher education in the State of Illinois, including the Illinois community college system.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, for the benefit of those of us who are not on the Education Committee and so forth, can you just spend a minute or two and tell us what this -- this program does - I'm just not that familiar with it - and how it works, just -- just sort of in a nutshell?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

Yeah. This is a program that is -- is in the budget, has been around for -- for some time. What it does is that it provides annual stipends for full-time students and part-time students who are in graduate school, minority students in graduate school, with the understanding that once they graduate, they will then work in Illinois for a period of time institutions of higher learning. The purpose of the programs, from the very beginning, has been to increase the number of minority faculty members in our Illinois universities, both public and private, and our community college system. And so, there's been a -- a forty -- about a forty-five-member board. What this bill does is that it kind of reorganizes that board. It produces a twenty-one-member board. Rather than having each individual university have a member of that board, it allows the Illinois Board of Higher Education to select people in different areas in order to strengthen that board, because one of the things they found in an evaluation of the program is that we're not doing a good enough job of -- of hanging on to people once they've participated in that program. Many have gone out of State. And one of the things we want to do is in the evaluating of the initial applications, we want to deal with that issue,

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

because the purpose of the program is to produce minority faculty members for our universities. So, this is an attempt to strengthen a good program.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you, Senator. You know, I -- I think it's a great program and a great idea, and I just want to put a -- a concept out there that you'll -- you'll think I'm sort of teasing and I'm sort of joking, but I'm not. There's been a lot of discussion in the national news lately - this is nothing that you're going to be able to address on this particular bill, but it's a concept - and that is to -- to start to explore the notion of diversity beyond our traditional notions of diversity on college campuses. We all kind of go into our default positions of thinking in terms of racial groups and gender But it seems to me, based on national groups and so forth. studies - and I'd be happy to talk to you about this at length is that it would be good to have more philosophical diversity. There's -- there's not many conservatives, in fact, in a lot of college campuses today, and it seems like if what we're trying to do is have a holistic experience for college students and we want to attract and -- and retain broad-minded people, in the very best sense of the word, then I think that that -- that we Now, that's not ought to move sort of into that direction. going to happen on 3rd Reading very late in the day, but maybe you could address that in your closing comments. And I appreciate your -- your answer to my previous question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator del Valle, to close.

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

Well, I -- I -- having met some of the participants in the program, I can tell you that there's philosophical diversity among the current participants, but I -- I understand the point you're making and I'll be glad to talk more with you about that. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 3107 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 3107, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator del Valle, on 3109. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3109.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

Thank you, Madam President. This bill is for the purpose of making sure that school districts are accurately recording the number of individuals who drop out. It requires verification of students who transfer and it sets a time frame for that verification. The bill was amended to change that time frame from ninety to a hundred and fifty days in order to allow for summer periods to occur. So, the purpose, again, is to deal with what is really a national problem and that is the accurate reporting of the -- of graduation rates, because many times students who -- who are recorded as transfers are really dropouts. So, we want accurate data, and that's what this bill does. I'll be glad to answer questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3109 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 Ayes, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 3109, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Walsh, on 3111. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3111.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Walsh.

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

SENATOR WALSH:

Thank you, Madam President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 3111 amends the Illinois Diseased Animals Provides that the definition of "animals" include only those wild animals in captivity that are intended for livestock production. Provides that any person who organizes a livestock swap meet within the State must provide the Department Agriculture with information regarding the meet maintain records detailing the kinds of animals at the meet and the transfer of any animals. This is an initiative that came to me from the Department of Agriculture. Afterwards, the Illinois Pork Producers and the Illinois Beef Association and others found that there was some vagueness in the bill. We did not get an opportunity to get an amendment drafted. I would like to ask my colleagues to move this over to the House. This is an initiative that we want to try and do just basically the swap meets for exotic animals. We're not talking about production animals, such as -- as hogs and cattle. So, we're going to clean it up if we move it over to the House. I'd be glad to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator John Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Senator Walsh, you and I talked yesterday about this bill, and I -- I stand in support of it. But I -- I do know we need to amend it when it gets over to the House. We -- we didn't quite have time to do it here. But I -- I want to -- to ask you a question, and I wanted -- my Members on my side of the aisle to understand that right now there is -- there's several opponents to the bill - the Farmers Union, the Pork Producers, the Beef Association, the Animal Owners and the Illinois Farm Bureau - and I think the amendment would probably take care of their concerns.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Walsh.

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

SENATOR WALSH:

Thank you, Senator Jones. You are absolutely correct. The -- the -- the vagueness of the bill was what caused the concern because what we were trying to do was to -- to watch for this bio homeland security issue in regards to exotic animals. A lot of birds and exotic animals are -- are swapped at some of these swap meets, and that's our intent. Our intent is not to do with livestock production, as I said, of actually cattle, hogs, sheep, et cetera.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Senator Walsh, also, is -- are we going to address the issue of slaughterhouses and auction barns?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Walsh.

SENATOR WALSH:

I'll make that commitment to you, Senator, if that's -- if that's an issue that -- that we need to bring up. I think, yes, sale barns -- sale barns was one of the issues that the Pork Producers had an issue with. So, I don't know who's going to pick this. Maybe Senator -- or, Representative Reitz might pick this -- this bill up over there, and if he does, I'll be more than glad, working with you, Senator, to make sure that all the issues that we need to address are taken care of before it comes back here, which then we will vote on as a concurrence.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR J. JONES:

Thank you, Madam President. Just to my Members on this side of the aisle, I -- I want you to -- to understand that the -- the amendments will correct all the concerns of the Farmers Union, the Pork Producers and the Beef Association and the Animal Owners and the Illinois Farm Bureau, but this is a bill that we will get corrected. It'll come back to us over here and -- and should be a good, clean bill then. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Walsh, to close.

SENATOR WALSH:

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Thank you, Madam President. And -- and to Senator Jones, I thank you for those questions. And -- and, actually, we did have an amendment that was ready to be placed on here that was going to correct a lot of the concerns. I'm glad that Senator Jones brought up the issue about the livestock sale barns, because I think that's one other issue that we need to make sure that's clarified in there. So, I'm -- I'm very positive that when this bill comes back, it'll be cleaned up to everybody's satisfaction. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 3111 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 Ayes, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 3111, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Garrett, on Senate Bill 3112. Senator Garrett seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 3112 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 3112. Madam Secretary, are there any amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Yes. Floor Amendment No. 3, offered by Senator Garrett.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Senate Amendment No. 3 permits dairy trucks to transport water in bulk.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Garrett moves the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 3112. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments reported, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

3rd Reading. Senator Garrett, on the Order of 3rd Reading. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3112.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Yes. Thank you. Senate Bill 3112 addresses concerns by introducing a licensing and inspection regime for water-bottling plants. It requires in-State bottled water plants and private water sources to be annually inspected and licensed by the Department of Public Health. Requires out-of-state bottled water producers to register annually with the Department of --Public Health. Creates guidelines on equipment used to process and transport water in bulk and institutes a fee of a hundred and fifty dollars to cover the cost of inspecting and licensing water-bottling plants and private water sources. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates she'll yield.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, you and water. Where's it coming from? I'm not aware, seriously, of -- of the issues and the concerns. Are there -- is -- is there something that's -- that's driving this? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

Yes, Senator. We have bottled water companies selling water in our State at a very dramatic increase, and the Department of Public Health does not know who all the bottled water companies are. So what -- really what this bill does is say that if you're going to sell water and process water, bottled water, in the State of Illinois, that you simply

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

register and receive the permit. The permit is a hundred and fifty dollars. And then it allows the Department of Public Health to inspect, on an annual basis, any processing plant, and it also provides information that we need to have.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

So, the problem is out-of-state bottlers that are selling in -- in Illinois. Don't they have -- isn't there somebody else that has jurisdiction over them? The Department of Agriculture or...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Garrett.

SENATOR GARRETT:

The FDA actually has oversight. Their oversight is to inspect. The inspections come probably every five to six years. We held hearings on this. This is an agreed-upon bill, again, by the -- let me tell you, the -- Illinois Retail Association, the International Bottled Water Association, Illinois Public Interest Group, and it's -- the Soft Drink Association is neutral on it. It's...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3112 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 Ayes, 4 Nays, 1 voting Present. And Senate Bill 3112, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Maloney, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR MALONEY:

A point of personal privilege, Madam President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

State your point.

SENATOR MALONEY:

Madam President, from Senator Collins' district, she was nice enough to allow me to do this. She will have a few words to say in a moment. But we have with me -- if they can make their way over here. We have the head coach of the Leo Lions, the

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

State Class A Basketball Champions, and the two captains. I'd like the Senate to welcome them. This is Coach Noah Cannon, and... PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Welcome to the Senate.

SENATOR MALONEY:

I -- I -- I am a proud alumnus of Leo High School in the City of Chicago. Coach Cannon, in his first year of coaching, led this team to the State Championship. He has distinguished himself as being the youngest head coach ever to win a State Championship. I went to Leo just a couple years before he did. He is also an alumnus of Leo as well. And I -- what's terrific about this team is that -- that he has molded this team, again, in his first year of coaching, and Leo High School continues to -- continues to survive and thrive with over ninety-five percent of their students attending college. And so, I'm really proud to be an alumnus, proud of the coach and the team. They did a great job. And I'd like to have Jacque Collins say a few words. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you very much, Madam President and Members of the Senate. I turned over the introductory remarks to someone who understands sports. I'm very limited on that part of the proclamation and the recognition of them, but let me say that I'm very proud to be their Senator. My nephew also attends St. Leo, and I think I want to speak about the spirit of excellence in education that this parochial school offers young male black men. They've done a wonderful job, and this is an example of what can be done when we invest in our youth, believe in them. And I'm very proud, and I want to join with everyone in congratulating them wholeheartedly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Congratulations. Senator Cronin.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Yes. Madam President, from this side of the aisle and from a fellow Chicago Catholic League alum, just wanted to know that -- let you know that we're very proud of you. We followed you, and I followed you, and many of my colleagues wish you the very best, and congratulations. Go Leo Lions!

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Madam President. As we all know, everyone loves a winner. Well, the coach actually is my constituent. So, the schools is -- and I'm very proud of him, and the team as well. Keep up the good work.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Congratulations again. Senator Watson, on 3129. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3129.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you. I want to echo the remarks of the previous speakers; however, Leo beat my Breeze Central Cougars. But I do wish them well and congratulate them, especially in the fact that they do so well in sending their -their students on to college and further their educational opportunities. Senate Bill 3129 is legislation that was impacted last year when the law was revised to provide the same housing property evaluation process of Section 42 low-income housing tax credit properties that have been placed for Section 15 housing. However, the change last year inadvertently removed the provisions regarding Section 15 housing. And as the Legislative Reference Bureau synopsis -- indicates, we are simply restoring that valuation procedure for low-income housing developed under Section 515 of the federal Housing Act as they existed prior to January 1st of 2004. There's no opposition to the legislation, and I'd appreciate your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3129 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, none voting

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 3129, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Harmon, on 3130. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3130.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Madam President. Senate Bill 3130 amends the Criminal Code. As you know, we prohibit the unauthorized videotaping of people without their consent; however, the law has not kept pace with technology, and this is an amendment initiated by the Attorney General's Office to capture all forms of video recording and live video transmission. I'm aware of no opposition and I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3130 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 Ayes, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 3130, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we'll return to 3140. Senator Sandoval. 3150. Senator Silverstein. 3166. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3166.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Thank you, Madam President. This bill is brought to us by the Department of Human Services. Basically what the bill does, it requires that all examiners -- I'm sorry, it was required to make mental conditions of sexually violent persons to be known.

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

It would require written reports to the Department within thirty days of examination of a committed person. Apparently, there is some confusion the way the law is written. I have no opposition. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3166 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 Ayes, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 3166, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Silverstein, on 3174. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3174.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Thank -- thank you, Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the jury. Again, this -- of the Senate. This bill is brought before the -- to us by the Department of Human Services. What this bill does is the disclosure of records of a -- of a mental health or developmentally disabled client is authorized during the course of an evaluation mandated by the Abuse of Adults with Disabilities Intervention Act. I know of no opposition. This is an administration bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3174 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, none voting Nay, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 3174, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Hendon, on 3183. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3183.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Madam President. This is a vehicle bill for the continuing advancement of the movie industry here in Illinois, and I'd appreciate an Aye vote. I'll be happy to answer any questions, but it's a vehicle bill, going over to the House, and a House bill is on its way over here. We just want to continue with productions here in Illinois. We have a lot of movies coming right now because of what we did, and we want to continue that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Is there any discussion? Senator David Sullivan.

SENATOR D. SULLIVAN:

Thank you, Madam President. Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Sponsor indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR D. SULLIVAN:

Senator Hendon, is -- is this bill leading up to a staring role for you in Barbershop III?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Actually, this is for the Governor of California. And for Roskam. We -- we definitely have a role for Senator Roskam. I can see him playing Denzel Washington or Luther Vandross. I'm sure he'd do a great job.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Madam President. Just a comment on the bill. So, to the bill: First of all, I appreciate the work that you're doing, Senator Hendon. It is a shell bill, for those on this side of the aisle and that side of the aisle that are concerned about shell bills. And secondly, hopefully, when we repeal tax credits for research and development in -- in Illinois, on job training in Illinois, and then even not -- net operating loss carryforward and carryback, that rather than

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

filmmaking credits, we put into place these other, perhaps, even higher priority credits in our Tax Code.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you, Madam President. To the bill. You know, we --I think we really do need to be cautious about this, and here's why. Senator Lauzen touched on it a minute ago. Last May, late in the evening, the administration moved through the General Assembly a -- a tax credit that was really cynical, and here's I spoke to a group of research and development what happened. software people who were absolutely amazed, when they came up and I met with them in the -- you know, the fifty-sixth floor of the Bank One Building, a bunch of big shots. Fifty of 'em were up there, and they were really -- they were amazed. And they said, "How is it that the Governor took away a research and development tax credit for companies based in Illinois," which was valued at fifteen million dollars, "and he gave a tax credit to Hollywood out in California to come in?" And then they said, "We're amazed. We don't understand politics. How come that I said -- I'll tell you exactly how come that happened?" happened, because what's going to happen is the Governor, at a future time - maybe he's already been there - he's going to go out to Hollywood, and -- and I'll paint the scene for you. scene that's going to be 7 o'clock in the evening and it's going to be at a five-million-dollar home with flagstone patios, and the Governor's going to be two steps up. He's going to have khaki pants on and a blue golf shirt, and he'll have the suntouched -- kissed face. He'll look like a million bucks. He'll look fabulous. And he will be an event out there, and it's going to be filled with people of -- of his persuasion that are going to want to support him and -- and the great things that he's doing here in Illinois. And he's going to say this -they're going to be drinking -- they're going to be drinking Chablis and some very nice Merlot, and he's going to -- and he's going to say, "I did everything I could to bring business to Illinois. I am committed to you to come into Illinois." Well, let's not be a part of that scam. Let's not -- let's not get all caught up in -- in -- in being enablers of that hustle,

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

because we have companies in Illinois that are shutting doors. We have companies in Illinois that got the shaft on the research and development tax credit. And let's not enable this person to go out there and to be empowered to do this. This is a great idea. I'm all for tax credits. I'm all for bringing people in, but not when the exchange is pushing our own people under the bus in a very cynical moment. Vote against this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Viverito.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in favor of this particular new movie <u>Barbershop III</u>. Thank God it's not Barbershop -- or -- or, <u>Godfather V</u>. It's refreshing to me, being that was my profession at one time, about thirty years ago, and I want to know -- and I have a contract from Rick that I'm going to be in <u>Barbershop III</u>. So, I encourage everybody to vote for this particular bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

Senator Hendon, to close.

SENATOR HENDON:

Well, I -- I -- I would just appreciate an Aye vote. The bill has to come back with some meat on it. I'm just surprised Senator Roskam is -- I thought I was very theatrical, but you're the most theatrical Senator here now, and you always are quoting the movies so I don't know why you would be against -- movie production in Illinois has increased tenfold since we passed that tax credit. And I've never seen a Republican against a tax credit, so this will be a first for me. I urge an Aye vote, and we will bring it back and it will have some substance in it and make it good for all the people of Illinois. Thank you, Viverito.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HALVORSON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 3183 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 33 Ayes, 24 Nays, none voting Present. And Senate Bill 3183, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Hendon in the Chair.

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Thank you very much, Madam President. Senate Bill 3186. Senator DeLeo. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3186.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 3186 simply creates a civil rights violation for people who -- discriminate against people speaking their native tongue. This bill simply includes discrimination based on speaking a language -- or, speaking a language spoken in the place where -- in which a person or his or his {sic} ancestors were born in the definition of "national origin." I ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates that he will. Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, how is this bill different than what Senator Sandoval moved last year and is there a different scenario, or could you just speak to that, where this is procedurally? I thought this was an issue that was addressed previously.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

I don't know the difference with this bill and Senator Sandoval's bill, but I know this -- this amends the provisions in the Human Rights Act. And I don't know what changes from Senator Sandoval's bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

What scenario are you trying to correct, or what -- what has brought this to your attention? What's the issue that prompts the change?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

I -- thank you very much, Mr. President. I believe there's been -- some recent incidences, it was reported in the press, of people being discriminated in -- in their workplace and going into businesses and having a language problem, and we're going to try and make that -- change the law so that people will not be discriminated for using their native tongue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

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

SENATOR DeLEO:

I'd ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 3186 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 50 voting Aye, 7 voting Nay. Senate Bill 3186, having received the required votes needed for passage, is passed. Senator Lauzen, for what -- no. Senate Bill 3188. Senator DeLeo. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3188.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Thank you, again, Members of the Body, for letting me have the honor of sponsoring Senator Demuzio's bills this afternoon. This is a -- once again, this is just a shell bill. It's for DECO (DCEO), and there's nothing in the bill. And it's

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

just a bill out there in case we need some substance at the end of Session. So, I ask for a favorable roll on Senate Bill 3188. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3188 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, there are 36 voting Aye, 21 voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 3188, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3189. Senator Shadid. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3189.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Shadid.

SENATOR SHADID:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President. This amends the Illinois Vehicle Code to authorize the Director of the Illinois Emergency Management Agency, rather the Commerce and Economic Opportunity, to make grants of monies from the September 11th Fund.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3189 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, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 3189, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3190. Senator Shadid. Madam -- Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3190.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Senator Shadid.

SENATOR SHADID:

Thank you, Mr. -- Mr. President. This bill amends the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity Law to repeal the Technology Innovation and Commercialization Grants-in-Aid Council. It amends the Rural Diversification Act concerning the powers of the review committee. It's effective immediately.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Roskam. Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3190 pass. All 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, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 3190, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3191. Senator DeLeo. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3191.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

Thank you, again, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Once again, this is a Senator Demuzio bill. It's an administration bill. It's just a -- it's just a shell bill at this -- this time. Makes a technical change in the Administrative Code of Illinois. Ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will. Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, for the benefit of everybody, you -- you stated that these are vehicle bills. Do you have an intention for it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

Not at this time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Just sort of anticipating the next three bills, through 3194 on the Calendar, is that -- would you have a similar response to them all? I'm just trying to save a little bit of time. My sense is that those are all four vehicle bills. You would intend to move them. You don't have any plans for them currently. Can you confirm that, and then we can move this along?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

Thank you very much, Senator Roskam. Not only can I confirm that on the next four, on the next fourteen. All the way down to the middle -- the middle of page 15. These are all shells.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

What's the last that's a shell bill on -- on page 15, Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

Senator, the shells will go to 3204, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you. You know, maybe we can just move the roll calls along and not -- why don't you get up and explain 'em for the benefit of the record, but we'll just move the roll calls along at that point.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

That'd be greatly appreciated. Any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3191 pass. All

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

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, there are 31 voting Aye, 25 voting Nay, and 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 3191, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator DeLeo, on Senate Bill 3192. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill -- 3192.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3192 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 30 voting Aye, 27 voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 3192, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3193. Senator DeLeo. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3193.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. This is an administration bill. They're working on the reorganization of the agencies now. We will have language at the end of Session.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3193 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 30 voting Aye, 26 voting Nay, and 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 3193, having received the constitutionally required majority, is

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

declared passed. Senator DeLeo, on Senate Bill 3194. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3194.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3194 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 30 voting Aye, 27 voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 3194, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator DeLeo, on Senate Bill 3195. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3195.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3195 pass. All 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, there are 30 voting Aye, 27 voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 3195, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator DeLeo, on Senate Bill 3196. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3196.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3196 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

the record. On that question, there are 30 voting Aye, 27 voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 3196, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator DeLeo, on Senate Bill -- Senator Burzynski, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Purposes of a verification. Things are just moving really quickly right now, and we'd just like to have an idea of where we are.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Verification has been requested on Senate Bill 3196. The Secretary will read the affirmative votes.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

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

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Mr. President, I thank you for this opportunity to congratulate your Members on -- on being here, working diligently to do the people's business. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

We've learned from you, sir. On the verified roll call, there are -- 30 voting Aye, 27 voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 3196, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator DeLeo, on Senate Bill 3197. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3197.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3197 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye.

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 30 voting Aye, 27 voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 3197, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator DeLeo, on Senate Bill 3198. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3198.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3198 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote -- Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 30 voting Aye, 27 voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 3198, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3199. Senator DeLeo. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3199.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3199 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 30 voting Aye, 26 voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 3199, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator DeLeo, on Senate Bill 3200. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3200.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3200 pass. All those... The question is, shall Senate Bill 3200 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 30 voting Aye, 26 voting Nay, and 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 3200, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator DeLeo, on Senate Bill 3201. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3201.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3201 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 30 voting Aye, 27 voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 3201, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator DeLeo, on Senate Bill 3202. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3202.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3202 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 30 voting Aye, 27 voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 3202, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator DeLeo, on Senate Bill 3203. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3203.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3203 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all -- take the record. On that question, there are 30 voting Aye, 27 voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 3203, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator DeLeo, on Senate Bill 3204. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3204.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator DeLeo.

SENATOR DeLEO:

For the -- thank you very much, Senate President and Ladies and Gentlemen. This is the last of the shell bills. This is "James Bonds" last bill. Bonds. James Bonds.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3204 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 30 voting Aye, 27 voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 3204, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're now on the top of page 15. On the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 3207. Senator Welch. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3207.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Welch.

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill is an initiative of the Attorney General. What she has done here is changed the name of the division within the Attorney General's Office. The way this Section currently reads could require amounts recovered by her litigation be put in a fund and she would not be able to use any of that as far as expenditures for operation of the combined division. So, it's a -- it's a minor change. I would be glad to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3207 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 voting Aye, none voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 3207, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Hunter, on Senate Bill 3208. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3208.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Hunter.

SENATOR HUNTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. 3208 creates the African-American Family Commission. The Commission expands its focus from child welfare issues to all issues that encompass health, mental health, criminal justice, education and economic development and all other activities that impact African-American children and families. In October of 1994, Governor Edgar created the African-American Family Commission This bill creates the Commission by State executive order. statute. The purpose of the Commission is to coordinate and be an advocate of the interests of African-American children and families. The proponents are Urban Solutions, Chicago Area Project, Jefferson County NAACP, Women Employed, National

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Council of Negro Women, Black Nurses Association, the Black Social Workers and South Central Community Services.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3208 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 voting Aye, 1 voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 3208, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Harmon, on Senate Bill 3211. Madam Secretary -- I'm sorry. Senator Cronin, for what purpose do you rise, sir? I'm sorry I didn't see your -- your light earlier.

SENATOR CRONIN:

Yes. I just inadvertently pressed the wrong button there. I intended to vote Yes on the previous bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The record will so reflect. Senator Harmon, on Senate Bill 3211. Madam Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3211.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 3211 creates the Right to Breastfeed Act. It essentially creates an affirmative right for a mother to breastfeed her baby in any location, public or private, where she and the baby otherwise have a right to be. It provides for a religious exemption. It creates a private right of action for enforcement but does not allow any money damages. It also requires insurance coverage for lactation consultants. I realize that there is some late and still-forming concerns about the insurance provisions. I am happy to work with interested parties as the bill moves through to the House. I'm aware of no opposition and I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Is there any discussion? Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will. Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Harmon, there's a couple issues that I want to cover with you. First has to do with the -- the religious exemption in the legislation. It's my understanding that the legislation says that anyone who wants to breastfeed in a place of worship has to conform to the norm of that place of worship. Can you tell me what you contemplate with that language?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Yes. We would expect that a nursing mother would behave in a way consistent with the place of worship in which she finds herself. Obviously, the only remedy here is -- is a -- a cause for injunctive relief. I certainly believe that that language would insulate a church if they were, in fact, sued based on their -- their request that she not breastfeed her baby in -- in church.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Harmon, would it be your intent through this legislation to define "norm" to mean what the church wants or what the religious facility wants, what the board of elders or the minister or whoever? I mean, I guess what I'm asking you for is some assurance that you're going to let that religious facility make the call on what it wants in its facility, as opposed to some kind of court dreamt-up right there may be to do something else.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. It is not my intention to mandate those norms for an individual church or for a denomination. I believe the way the bill is structured it

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

provides that protection, and I am not envisioning the court imagining or instituting new norms from -- from the bench.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Your -- your intent would be to allow - that's what I'm asking - the -- the religious facility to set the norm. They're going to define the norm. Is that correct, Senator?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Yes, that would be my expectation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. I appreciate that. The other issue I want to discuss has to do with the term "certification" in the insurance mandate. It's my understanding that lactation consultants are not licensed at all by the Department of Regulation right now. And assuming that's the case then, when you say they're going to be certified, by whom are you requiring them to be certified in order for this mandate to apply?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. As I understand it -- and, again, because this late concern arose, we are still doing some investigation. But it's my understanding that lactation consultants are licensed by the International Board of Lactation Consultant Examiners. Some lactation consultants are also practical nurses, and in those cases, they are licensed as nurses by the Department of Professional Regulation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Briefly, to the bill: It -- it's my understanding that that's -- that's what was testified to in committee, and I appreciate Senator Harmon's answers. There's nothing in the bill that requires certification by that entity

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

that he described and certainly not by the State of Illinois in order to be reimbursed according to this insurance mandate. I would just advise caution to the Members that there is an insurance mandate here. There's a requirement that they be certified in order to get that, but there's no definition or outline in the bill about who they need to be certified by. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will. Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator, is there a single subject issue with this bill? One is essentially creating a -- sort of a human rights deal, and the other is -- the other is an insurance mandate. Is that a problem?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Roskam, I'm very glad you did not have a movie analogy for this bill. I don't believe that there's a single subject issue. Both -- both subjects clearly deal with -- with breastfeeding and nursing mothers.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

I notice on one of the amendments that the -- the places where you're -- you're saying that this right will exist, you enumerate several of them. One of them that's not -- that you have not enumerated but you're using by example, but not limitation language, is schools. You've addressed that issue? And if so, could you just tell us how you've addressed it? I can see how this may be a little bit complicated in a school.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Senator, are you looking at Amendment No. 4?

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

You know, Senator, I'm not sure 'cause I've got it on my computer screen, and I'm not really sure. Why don't you just --could you just tell me how this would work at a school? In other words, can a school say, "Hey, you know what, that's really distracting and not helpful"?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Senate Amendment No. 4 was filed as a precautionary measure, for lack of a better expression. There was the potential to use an existing statutory framework to provide this right. We elected not to do that. I think that's where the school reference may have come in.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

I'm told that Amendment 4 is not on the bill. Okay. So, here's -- here's my question. Does -- does your bill contemplate a school principal telling a nursing mother, "Could you not do that here because it's causing -- it's causing a disturbance," or "The boys are laughing," or -- that type of thing? Are -- are schools a part of this, or -- or -- is that -- surely this has been discussed, and I just -- I want to know the answer when I go back and talk to my school districts.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Senator, for a good question. I'm not sure that a -- a school would be a public place where -- or a private place where the mother and the baby otherwise have a right to be.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Roskam, could you...

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Yeah.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Thank you, sir. Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

I will bring -- I -- to a close. I think it absolutely is a place, and if it's not something that you've discussed in the past, surely, you know, mothers -- you know, parents bring their kids in to events at schools, to sporting events, to all kinds of things, to Cub Scout things in the afternoon. I just think it's -- I know what you're trying to do, but I think it's an area that -- that -- that really needs to be discussed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Harmon, to close.

SENATOR HARMON:

I believe in the last committee meeting, there was actually a mother nursing her baby in -- in one of our conference rooms. I'm not sure anyone noticed. I certainly didn't hear any of the boys giggling. And I -- I would -- I think that it -- it really, as we move forward, is probably not going to be an issue. Hopefully, this bill will increase the awareness and diminish any societal barriers something that is so healthy.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 3211 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, 1 voting Nay, and 2 voting Present. Senate Bill 3211, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. President Emil Jones, on Senate Bill 3219. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 3219.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

President Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 3219 create the Illinois Opportunity Fund Act. The proposal is an initiative by the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity to spur the creation of two hundred million dollars in venture capital

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

investment in Illinois, to create jobs across the State and to improve the State's economy. Currently, Illinois ranks twentyfourth among states on venture capital as a percentage of the gross State product, and less than one percent of Illinois venture capital is invested in companies outside -- outside This bill authorizes the Department of Economic Opportunity to create the Illinois Capital Investment The purpose of the Corporation will be to design an investment plan, hire fund managers who will make the venture capital allocations and -- and receive returns from the Illinois Opportunity Fund's investments. The Corporation will have a board of directors to be made up of seven to eleven members appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the The board members will themselves be Senate. investment professionals and venture capitalists who reflects the State diversity, including geographical diversity. The Director of the Department will also be part of the board. The purpose of the Corporation will be to design an investment plan, hire fund managers who will make the venture capital allocations and receive returns from the Illinois Opportunity Fund investments. The Corporation will invest only in other venture capital funds that have a meaningful physical presence in Illinois which will contribute to -- to the strength of Illinois businesses. This translates directly into job opportunities to the people of DCEO will be authorized to issue up to two hundred million dollars in tax credits to investors. These tax credits will only be redeemed if the Illinois Opportunity Fund becomes insolvent. That's the bill in it's gist, and I ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Sieben.

SENATOR SIEBEN:

Well, thank you very -- thank you very much, Mr. President. I rise in support of the gentleman's legislation. I think he's done an excellent job of describing the intent of this Illinois Opportunity Fund. Certainly designed to attract some private capital here to the State of Illinois to make investments in new companies and start-up companies where somebody has a vision, somebody has a dream, but there's significant amount of risk

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

involved so you need this type of venture capital to be involved in that process. I think it can work the way that is described in the legislation. Certainly, it's well intended. I think one of the area of the bill, as the -- as the bill moves over to the House, that could use a little bit of attention to make sure that it truly benefits all the people of the State of Illinois would be to look at the -- the way the board is constituted under the description in the legislation. I'm not sure that we've assured ourselves that there will truly be a bipartisan nature to the people that serve on this either seven- to elevenmember board, since they're all appointed by the Governor. think we maybe want to add just that language a little bit to make sure that we have some true bipartisan representation on that. But I think it does have the potential to provide some significant benefits to new companies in Illinois, and I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Further discussion? Leader Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you very much. There's no doubt that this legislation has some problems and questions. There's no doubt about that, and we'd like to see some of those addressed, and Senator Sieben just mentioned that. But I've got to tell you, in my area and where I represent, Decatur and Macon County in particular, it's one of the highest unemployment counties in the State. Fayette County, the county that we're talking about possibly closing the prison, their unemployment rate right now is eight percent. Could -- and if the prison would close, it'd go to fourteen percent, which would be the highest in -- in the State. And so, we've -- we've got some major, major problems in southern Illinois and south-central Illinois and central And this program has worked well in other states, and Illinois. I think that it's something that deserves consideration. And I'm -- I'm glad to support it, but I do wish there was some changes in the -- in -- that would protect taxpayers, protect the Well, maybe there's maybe too much protection in for some of the investors. But it is something that we need to look at and we -- it we can do anything about helping the people of

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Illinois find quality work, we need to explore it. So, I -- I'm glad to stand in support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Further discussion? Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I certainly agree with the previous three speakers about the intent of this bill being good, and the generation of jobs and commerce is very good. But the bill is so flawed that I -- I believe that it's fatally flawed. I think that the majority of us here are opposed to President Bill Clinton and a Republican corporate welfare. Congress ended social welfare as we know it. This bill becomes big investor welfare bill, and I guess if we were -- going to go to the movie motif that Senator Roskam has started, it would be Gone with the Wind. The problem that we have is, guaranteeing venture capital investments with two hundred million dollars of our taxpayers' money takes the venture out of venture funds. Venture capital has high return because it has high risk. Typically, in these funds, it's not unusual for -- for -- for the investors to expect two-thirds of the money to go bad, thinking that the final one-third will have such an enormous home run, four-hundred to five-hundred percent return, that it makes it all worthwhile. To pinpoint where one of the problems is in this legislation, it's in Section 20 (b), where it says and this is why I don't think that any of us can vote in favor of this is: Qualified investors shall be permitted to invest in equity interests or debt obligations of the Illinois Opportunity Such interests and obligations shall provide for a fixed or variable rate of return established by the Capital Investment Corporation. So, basically, it's a guaranteed return on venture capital. It's almost an oxymoron, in financial terms. DCEO may award contingent tax credits to investors in the Fund that shall be redeemable if the Illinois Fund fails to achieve results sufficient to repay the amounts invested So, when the money is lost, these contingent tax investors. credits -- I mean, that comes from our taxpayers, will make up the difference for these big investors who are attracted into the Fund. We already have examples under SWIDA, the Southwest Industrial Development Authority {sic}, where twenty million

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

dollars of moral obligation bonds have gone belly up, and I think that this just invites more. So, I would advise a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, we need to -- we need to pass a bill like this. Yes, it does have some flaws that can be corrected, but if we want to invite venture capital, we want people to come and spend their money and create jobs over here, this is the name of the game. We've got to have jobs. Labor and business have to work together, and I think the bill is good, in spite of the fact it has some flaws, but I'm sure they can be amended in the other House. I certainly ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Mr. President. A couple of questions on the bill, but first an inquiry of the Chair. This bill seems, to me anyway and not as a constitutional scholar, but to require a three-fifths vote, because this -- this incurs the payment of State or other debt guaranteed in such amounts as may be provided. So, is this -- is this a -- will this bill require a three-fifths majority since we're guaranteeing the -- the debt of this venture capital fund?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

It's the rule of the Chair that this will require thirty votes. Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Well, a question: If -- if this -- if the goal of this really is regional distribution -- we -- we all have a great deal of respect to the Senate President and for the majority -- the Senate Minority Leader, as well as for the Speaker of the House. I guess I'm concerned about why we would allow the -- the -- the leader of this venture capital fund, the -- the Director of DECO {sic}, to recommend to the Governor all of the appointees who are going to make the decisions. Why if we're interested in -- in geographical distribution and making sure

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

that this capital fund fills a need that -- not otherwise filled by the market, why are we permitting the Governor to have all the appointments?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

President Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Well, one of the things that -- it's written into the bill that it will be geographical diversity; however, I'm quite sure that the Director of the Department of -- of -- Economic Opportunity will reach out and grab those persons with the expertise in the field. And I don't know who else could have those appointments - the Governor or -- or the Legislative Now, when you come down to money, that's bipartisan. It's green. And we talk about jobs. That's bipartisan. So, it's written into the bill. It's not a perfect bill, and I do apologize for not bringing a perfect bill to you to deal with this situation, but we do recognize we have a serious problems in Illinois as it relate to venture capital investing in businesses, creating jobs. And the whole thrust behind this piece of legislation is to help all regions of the State of And -- but if -- if it needs to be changed in the House to make it a more perfect bill, I'm quite certain that will be addressed there.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Well, let me speak to the bill, because I can see I'm already on yellow timer from the length of the answers. But --what -- I think it's great to have good intentions. This bill certainly has good intentions. I don't believe this bill achieves the intentions -- intentions that the sponsors have. I don't think it's a good idea for us to get the credit card out and put another two hundred million dollars on the credit card, and with all good intent, turn over to the Director of DECO {sic}, who's already under intense pressure from people for -- for incentives and other things, to go ahead and use Stateguaranteed money to invest in venture capital. I -- we want to attract venture capital. The right way to do that is to attract ventures, and the right way to do that is to lower property

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

taxes, to -- to clean up our workmen's compensation system, to pass tort reform so companies aren't afraid to locate here. What's happened over and over again in -- in our incubator in the medical district, is we start a great company and they get out of town as quick as they can because we have bad State laws. So, I just don't think another two hundred -- two-hundredmillion-dollar charge card is good public policy. support the Senate President if he would consider extending the deadline on the bill, seeing if we can work out a bill that's got the kind of parameters around it that will give us credibility with the editorial boards. I mean, we -- we have been incurring debt down here at a rate that -- that no one's ever seen before and that I'm not sure our children can afford. So, I respect the Senate President's intentions and the -- the desire of downstaters to -- to have economic development. just would tell you, in my judgment, this bill doesn't do it. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would rise in support of this You know, after that last testimony, reminds me of what happened back in the late 1800s, when the Director of the U.S. Patent Office resigned because he said everything worth inventing has already been invented. If we had a venture capital fund here in the State of Illinois when Illinois was the leader in developing atomic energy during World War II, we could have utilized that to create millions of jobs, thousands of In the 1980s, when the University of Illinois developed the supercomputer technology, that left the State of Illinois. We should have the Silicon Valley running from Route 57 North from Champaign to Chicago. Instead, it's out in California. And I don't know how many of you were visited by the -- by the people down here this past week from the University of Chicago and Argonne Laboratory. They see the same potential with the development of microbiology making us the leader, utilizing the advantage we have with Argonne Laboratory in the suburbs. let's not miss this opportunity once again. For once, let's take Let's put the money where it should be and make Illinois the great State it should be. We should be the leader

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

in future technology. This will help us do that, and I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Soden.

SENATOR SODEN:

Thank you. A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will yield. Senator Soden.

SENATOR SODEN:

Thank you. I have a question. You know, I don't want to be Roger Ebert or give any movie to this. This is something that we really need here in the State of Illinois and I'm for it, but I do have a question. I see we're going to hire an investment manager. Where does the State Treasurer come into play in this scenario?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

President Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Well, I couldn't tell you where the State Treasurer come into play, but the State Treasurer has not come forth with any suggestions thus far, to my knowledge. I'm quite certain that she would probably talk to the Director of -- of the Department and may help make recommendation, but these are private money managers who manage the dollars, similar to what we do for our pension system. And we will be looking forward to equal opportunity. So, I don't know where the State Treasurer falls into play.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Soden.

SENATOR SODEN:

Well, I think she should be brought into the scenario someplace, because no matter how you cut it, slice it, these are public funds, public money, and I think that's the Treasurer's role, is to protect the people's money.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

President Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Senator, I appreciate your comment, but we are talking about private venture capital. Only the tax credit would be

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

used if the investment does not make the necessary return. This program is similar to a program that was put together in the State of Oklahoma and -- with tax credits backing it up, but the tax credits were never used because the fund never lost any money. What we are attempting to do with this legislation is to attract the private venture capital in Illinois to invest in businesses wherein we can create jobs and get our people back to work again.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Soden. Senator Soden.

SENATOR SODEN:

I'll get on the air here. Like Roger Ebert, I'll give you a thumbs up on this one.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Schoenberg.

SENATOR SCHOENBERG:

Thank you. I -- I want to address a comment made earlier by Senator Soden. The question's been asked, where's the State Treasurer? Senator Dillard and I passed into law a new law, within the past couple of years, which actually gives the State Treasurer the capacity, in a -- in a program structured very much the same way, to invest a -- a percentage of the State's multi-billion-dollar investment portfolio in venture capital. Despite that capacity, we've seen how private investors have continued to be tentative. This provides further impetus for doing so, but the Treasurer already does have a major role in the venture capital arena. And I would urge support for the bill. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

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

He indicates he will.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Thank you. Thank you. President Jones, I have a question about the operation of the bill. It says -- and I'm looking at page 10, lines 27 through 33, where it says that if the person who puts money into the Fund doesn't get back the return that

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

they were promised, then they're going to get tax credits in exchange for that, but it says the tax credits shall be redeemable not earlier than January 1st, 2010. Now, there's been some speculation in the Chamber - and I'm sure it's just a coincidence - that that date would be toward the end of this Governor's second term in office if he were happen to get reelected, and I'm sure that's not the case. Can you tell me why we picked 2010?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

President Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

It will be the end of his second term. That's the reason why you're supporting him for reelection. I'll tell him that you did that. But why the year 2010? I -- I really cannot say why that year was picked, and the issue didn't come up when we had the Director in -- of the Department in -- in the Exec Committee when he presented the bill. But that issue did not come up, and I don't know why that particular date was picked.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Righter.

SENATOR RIGHTER:

Senator Jones, I -- I appreciate that -- President Jones, and if -- and if -- if you telling him that will help me get any of my Member initiatives released that are being held there on the Second Floor, I would appreciate it very much. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

President Jones, to -- to close.

SENATOR E. JONES:

I just ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 3219 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 51 voting Aye, 6 voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 3219, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're going to go back to the top of the list for 3rd Readings. If you have bills, please, this is it. Please turn your Calendars to page 7. Page 7 of your

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Calendar. On the Order of 3rd Reading is Senate Bill 717. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 948. Senator Lightford. Mr. Secretary -- Senator Lightford seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 948 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 948. Mr. Secretary, are there any amendments approved for consideration?

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Lightford.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Lightford.

SENATOR LIGHTFORD:

Thank you, Mr. President. Can you please take this out of the record? We're still working on the second amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Out of the record. Senate -- Senate Bill 950. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 965. Senator Cullerton. Senate Bill 983. Senator Ronen. Senate Bill 1018. Senator Walsh. Senate Bill 1636. Senator Jacobs. Senate Bill 1637. Senator Jacobs. Senate Bill 1731. Senator Haine. Senate Bill -- Senate Bill 2090. Senator Watson. Leader Watson. Senate Bill Senator DeLeo. Senate Bill 2141. Senator Cronin, are you going to carry that for Senator Demuzio? No. Okay. Senate Bill --Senate Bill 2141. Senator DeLeo. Senate Bill 2142. Garrett. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. Oh! Out of the Senate Bill 2147. Senator Silverstein. Please give the Chair a -- a little better sign or flash or indication or something. Senate Bill 2173. Senator Jacobs. Thank you. of page 8. Senate Bill 2181. Senator Halvorson. Senate Bill 2188. Senator Petka. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 2188.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 2188, with its amendments, would provide retired peace

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

officers and retired military personnel who have at least ten years of military service and have been honorably discharged to obtain a -- a concealed weapons permit. The individual would be required, who fits into that status, to undergo a firearms proficiency test before receiving the permit. There are training requirements in the bill, and it provides that the permit that would be issued would last for -- for four years and that the -- the permit would -- would permit the holder to carry the -- would require the holder to carry that permit at all times and show proof of the permit upon request from any law enforcement official. Additionally, the statute would sunset in 2010. It preempts home rule. That's a brief outline of the legislation. I would be willing to answer questions, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move the previous question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Jacobs has moved the previous question. There are two additional speakers. Senator Meeks.

SENATOR MEEKS:

Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will. Senator Meeks.

SENATOR MEEKS:

Yes. With much respect to the great sponsor, Senator Petka, let me ask you a question. Does this apply to retired military personnel as well?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Meeks.

SENATOR MEEKS:

I -- I understand the concept behind a retired police officer. What is the concept behind a retired military police officer carrying a weapon?

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

Able staffers correctly pointed out that this applies to military police.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Meeks.

SENATOR MEEKS:

Right. And that was my question. What is the reason that a retired military police officer would need to carry a weapon?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

The -- the rationale for that, Senator, is really a public policy rationale. We've had individuals who have been guarding the worst of the worst in military prisons and also required as a result of their duties to -- to guard bases. And these type of individuals are individuals who have shown that they are trustworthy. They have shown that they can honorably perform a duty if called upon, and there is no good reason why we should deny them this opportunity.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Meeks.

SENATOR MEEKS:

Do we think that those individuals, once they are out of the service, are in danger in the State of Illinois? They -- the fact that they were a policeman in the service, now that they're out, they're in some kind of a danger now?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

Anecdotally, Senator Meeks, we've had situations where individuals who, unfortunately -- at detention camps, for example, in Guantanamo, where we've had traitors in our midst, and some of these individuals who may be released, may not necessarily like the fact that they had been incarcerated for a period of time and may use this as an opportunity to ferret out and look for individuals who may have been guarding them. I -- I

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

think that it's something that -- we -- we should afford them the opportunity to defend themselves in this manner.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Meeks, could you bring your questions to a close, please?

SENATOR MEEKS:

I -- I will. And thank you so much, Mr. Chairman and sponsor. Last question. You said that they were basically qualified individuals proven that they -- are we looking, at any point then, to call upon these individuals for some kind of active service?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

Senator, could you repeat that question? I only heard it in part.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Could we have a little quiet in the Chamber? Senator Meeks.

SENATOR MEEKS:

I think you inferred that, if needed, these individuals could be called upon at some -- some time because they had already been trained in carrying firearms. Are we ever looking to need retired military policemen to be in some kind of active service or duty on the streets of Illinois?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

If I left that inference, the answer is, no, that is not the case.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

He indicates he will.

SENATOR HARMON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator, if this bill passes, would a person permitted by this bill to -- to carry a weapon in

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

a concealed manner be permitted to carry that weapon here in the State Capitol?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Harmon.

SENATOR HARMON:

One follow-up question then. Would someone so licensed to carry a concealed weapon be permitted to carry a concealed weapon here on the Senate Floor?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

Probably, though we may have rules to exclude them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Petka, to close.

SENATOR PETKA:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. A year ago, when this legislation was called, many of us opposed it. Since that time, there has been negotiations in connection with the legislation. That piece of legislation was a very short piece of legislation. This legislation contains safeguards that were not present Training is required. There is proficiency testing that must be done. The law sunsets in a -- in 2010. individuals who would be asked to -- who would be asking for this permit are individuals who we've already given the -- the honor and the trust of protecting us in society, not only domestically but also, perhaps, foreign. We think that the circumstances which are carved out by the -- by this bill are -are circumstances which we should honor - that is, individuals who are retired police officers, who have ferreted out criminals and who they themselves may be the target of -- of these criminals after these criminals are released. I believe that this is the right thing to do, and I think that the time to do it is now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Senator Petka, I do apologize, but Senator Silverstein did have a parliamentary inquiry. I have to recognize him for that inquiry. Senator Silverstein.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

I have a -- parliamentary inquiry.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

State your inquiry.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Does this -- does this need -- this preempts home rule, does it not?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Yes, it does.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

And how many votes...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Whoa, whoa. Senator Petka, let me -- put that in form of a question. Does it -- present your question one more time, Senator.

SENATOR SILVERSTEIN:

Does the bill preempt home rule?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

It's the rule of the Chair that this takes thirty votes. The question is -- oh. Senator Petka.

SENATOR PETKA:

Mr. President, I would like to correct something I said, and I agreed with the ruling of the Chair. My staff has pointed out that the Section that was preempted does not require thirty-six votes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Yes. Takes thirty votes. The question is, shall Senate Bill 2188 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 40 voting Aye, 13 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 2188, having received the required

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2193. Senator Meeks. Senate Bill 2197. Senator DeLeo. Senate Bill 2203. Senator Jacobs. Senate Bill 2271. Senator Haine. Senate Bill 2275. Senator Shadid. Senate Bill 2287. Senator Link. Senate Bill 2289. Senator Walsh. Senate Bill 2296. Senator Jacobs. Senate Bill 2301. Senator Brady. Senate Bill 2306. Senator Brady. With leave of the Body, we'll go back to Senate Bill 2271. Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you very much for your indulgence, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is now, in effect, a shell bill -- I'm sorry.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Just a moment, please. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 2271.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Haine.

SENATOR HAINE:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is, in effect, a shell bill. I would like to move it with the commitment between the Illinois Medical Society and the Physical Therapists Association that they continue to talk. They're -- they're talking now so there's some life in this. Whether they come to an agreement, I don't know. But if they do, it would appear in the House. They've indicated to me that they are not imminently near an agreement but they are talking. So, I would ask that we move it to the House with a presumption they might come to an -- an agreement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2271 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Aye, 4 voting Nay, and 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 2271, having received

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2323. Senator Shadid. Mr. -- Senate Bill 2349. Senator Crotty. Senate Bill 2350. Senator Welch. Senate Bill 2353. Senator Clayborne. Senate Bill 2354. Senator Clayborne. Top of page 9. Senate Bill 2409. Senator Silverstein. Senate Bill 2414. Senator Haine. Senate Bill 2435. Senator John Jones. Senate Bill 2499. Senator Cullerton. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 2499.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This is currently a criminal law shell bill. I did not have enough time to get the amendment drafted so I'm going to amend it in the -in the House. The bill will deal with adoption compensation. We now have a law called the receipt of compensation for placing out a child for adoption, and we're going to include what are called adoption facilitators as people who would be covered under the prohibition. And we also are going to deal with a concern that has been brought to us concerning these adoption facilitators cosigning loans with biological parents then informing them that they will be on their own to repay them if they don't place the child for adoption, and kind of intimidating these -- these parents. So, that's what the subject matter will be when it comes back from the House. would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2499 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 voting Aye, 3 voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 2499, having received the constitutionally required majority, is declared passed. Senator

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Cullerton, on Senate Bill 2510. Senator Shadid, on Senate Bill 2567. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 2567.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Shadid.

SENATOR SHADID:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 2567 is a vehicle bill, and it'll be used by the Illinois Grape Growers and Vintners Association to attach language changing the composition of the Illinois Grape and Wine Resources Council. The grape growers are currently in negotiations with the distributors regarding this bill, and they've promised to continue working towards a final resolution. I'd appreciate your support with an Aye vote. Oh, excuse me, Mr. President. My boss just told me we're pulling it out of the record.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Out of the record. Senate Bill 2581. Senator Obama. Senate -- Senate Bill 2607. Senator Dillard. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 2607.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Dillard.

SENATOR DILLARD:

Thank you, Mr. -- thank you, Mr. President. Last year, nine hundred thousand citizens accessed the Illinois Sex Offender Registry, and last December, there was created something called ISORT, which is the Illinois Sex Offender Registry Team, which has made significant improvements to our website where you check sex offenders. But sometimes that material is outdated and this bill will make sure that the sex offender registry that nearly a million citizens use a year is updated. We enhanced the felony penalties for violations of the registry. We require that a new photo be taken every year so

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

that somebody's photo is not twenty-five years old. We require that supervising officials upon somebody getting out from prison have fifteen days to make sure that the sex offender has complied. We also make sure that any new information is highlighted for ninety days, that a parole violation warrant is issued when somebody does not comply with this, and, very importantly, we require a hyperlink to the surrounding states. There was recently an Illinois inmate who moved to northwestern Indiana and there was a problem. This bill just makes sure we fulfill our obligations to the public on sex offenders and their registry, especially children. I'd appreciate a favorable vote. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2607 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 2607, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2613. Senator Haine. Senate Bill 2618. Senator Haine. Senate Bill 2664. Senator Garrett. Senate Bill 2676. Senator del Valle. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill. ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 2676.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill is a shell bill. It may or may not be used. We're not sure exactly what may or may not happen in the House. There was a hearing on the teacher certification issue, and maybe the bill will be necessary. So I'd just like to send it over.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2676 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

the record. On that question, there are 49 voting Aye, 5 voting Nay, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 2676, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Bill 2724. Senator Schoenberg. Senate Bill 2729. Senator Senate Bill 2777. Senator Dillard. Senate Bill --Martinez. on page -- on the top of page 10, Senate Bill 2778. Dillard. Senate Bill 2784. Senator Dillard. Senate Bill 2785. Senate Bill 2786. Senator Dillard. Senator Dillard. Bill 2791. Senator Crotty. Senate Bill 2801. President Jones. Senate Bill 2858. Senator Winkel. Mr. Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 2858.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Winkel.

SENATOR WINKEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 2858 amends the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act. It applies to agreements under which an Internet service provider provides service to Illinois consumers for a one-year term that is automatically renewed for another one-year term unless the consumer cancels the service. Essentially, what I'm after here in this bill is, if you're offered a service over the Internet and you can accept it over the Internet, it stands to reason that you should be able to cancel it a year later when the service contract ends over the Internet and not be -- not be required to call 800 or send in something by mail. you're offered over the Internet and you accept it over the Internet, the idea here is that you can cancel over the Internet, and that would be allowed. There's been discussion with the telecommunications industry about this. They had some concerns about it being limited to -- to home and personal use. There is an amendment that's in the Rules Committee that accomplishes that. It's agreed to. We'll take care of that in the House. That's my commitment. Glad to take any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 2858 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? the record. On that question, there are 56 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 2858, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared Senate Bill 2867. Senator Cronin. Senate Bill 2902. Senate Bill 2907. Senator Garrett. Senator Maloney. Bill 2921. Senate Bill -- on page 11 is Senate Bill 2966. Senate Bill -- Senate Bill 2974. Senator Welch. Senator Harmon. Senate Bill 3007. Senator Cullerton. 3007. Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3007.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Last year we passed a bill, Senate Bill 788, which automatically allows for the sealing of arrest and conviction records for certain misdemeanors, and we put protections in that bill by saying that there had to be a four-year wait after the completion of the sentence before the record could be sealed. We limited the offenses so that it could not involve any crime of violence or sex offense or DUI or orders of protection, and we allowed for the State's attorneys to object to the sealing of the records if they wished to. And we worked the bill out with the Illinois Retail Merchants Association. Now, a number of folks have come to us and asked us to expand the list of crimes that can be added to be eligible for sealing. And the first thing I did was to sit down with the Retail Merchants and say, would they be open to this, because they're the ones that have, really, the most at stake. Obviously, the purpose of the bill is to try to respond to the recidivist rate that we have in the State of We have thirty thousand people released from our prisons that go back -- many, back to their neighborhoods that

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

are already high-crime rates and they can't get a job. The studies show that when people can get jobs, the recidivism rate goes down. So, the Retail Merchants agreed to expand this list. They support the bill. It would include certain nonviolent misdemeanors like prostitution and certain Class 4 felonies for low-level drug offenses. The people who are asking for this are the most well-intentioned people. They don't want to have crime come back in their neighborhood. They want people to have jobs. I think everybody here might know of an individual, a person who has made a mistake in their life and they've rehabilitated themselves, but they're still stuck with that stigma. record -- this information of previous convictions is still available to all law enforcement people. It's only the -- the prospective employer that would not know. Be happy to answer any questions and ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I stand in support of this bill. This is an issue, obviously, that is always difficult whenever we're dealing with criminal records and people who've engaged in even low-level drug offenses. It makes us all vulnerable politically. Nobody, obviously, right now in this room, probably, is more mindful of the politics of issues and how he or she votes than I am right now. Nevertheless, I feel obliged to support this bill, knowing that it could cause me problems in a mailer come November, just because, you know, when you look at what we're talking about here, we are really talking about people who have been locked up for possession, not violent crimes, have served their time, have shown themselves to want to rehabilitate themselves currently are just unable to find employment because of -because of their criminal record. And, you know, we have to, given the enormous numbers of people who are now going through the criminal justice system, particularly on drug charges, we have to start taking some steps to give these people opportunity to avoid recidivism and get back on the straight and So, I know these are difficult votes, but I would urge everybody, on both sides of the aisle, to consider this well-

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

thought-through bill and -- and see it in your heart to -- to give people a second chance.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3007 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 30 voting Aye, 24 voting Nay, and 1 voting 3007, having received the required Senate Bill constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3029. Senator Viverito. Senate Bill 3030. Senator Viverito. Bill 3041. Senator Luechtefeld. Senate Bill 3042. Senator Luechtefeld. Senate Bill 3043. Senator Luechtefeld. Senate Senator Jacobs. Senate Bill 3140. Senator Halvorson. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 3140.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Halvorson.

SENATOR HALVORSON:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 3140 was brought to me by the Kankakee Area Metropolitan Enforcement Group, and what this will do is create a rebuttable presumption that the life or health of a child has been endangered where their parent, legal guardian or other person caring for them allows them to be present at the scene of certain drug crimes. What we found, at the very last minute, was the phrase "rebuttable presumption" could possibly be found unconstitutional. So, what we plan on doing when we get it to the House is changing it to "permissive inference." I've had a conversation with Senator Roskam. That is how we could fix this, and I would just appreciate your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 3140 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Aye, none voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate Bill 3140, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 3150. Senator Sandoval. That concludes the Order of 3rd Reading. On the page 20 of your Calendar is the Order of -- Consideration Postponed. Page 20 of your Calendar. Senate Bill 2878. As the bill has already been... Secretary's Desk, Resolutions.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 475, offered by Senator Watson and all Members.

It is a death resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Resolutions Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

And Senate Resolution 476, offered by Senators Sieben and Jacobs.

It is substantive.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Madam Secretary, House Bills 1st Reading.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 4022, offered by Senator Hendon.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4176, offered by Senators del Valle and Obama.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4310, offered by Senator Hunter.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4452, offered by Senator Silverstein.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4560, offered by Senator Hunter.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4610, offered by Senator DeLeo.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4976, offered by Senator Link.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 5069, offered by Senator DeLeo.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 6740, offered by Senator Lightford.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

House Bill 6841, offered by Senator Hunter.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4067, offered by Senator Maloney.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4491, offered by Senator Jacobs.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4856, offered by Senator Collins.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 5562, offered by Senator Collins.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 6564, offered by Senator Collins.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4506, offered by Senator Silverstein.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4266, offered by Senator Welch.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4271, offered by Senator Risinger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Thank you, Madam Secretary. On page 20 of the Calendar -- on page 20 of the Calendar. We're going to page 20. On the Order of Consideration Postponed, Senate Bill 2878. Page 20 of your Calendar. Senate Bill 2878. As the bill has already been presented and debated on the Floor, debate on this bill will be limited to one proponent and one opponent. Senator Sandoval. SENATOR SANDOVAL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 2878 is an initiative of the Attorney General of the State of Illinois. The bill permits the AG to take discrimination claims directly to court. The AG has the resources and expertise to determine whether a valid claim of discrimination exists and also whether to bring a charge under the Human Rights Act. This language in no way facilitates actions being brought by private attorneys. Only the AG may do so. This legislation is necessary because the mechanisms that are currently in place take over one year to investigate any complaint and then up to a second year when the complaint is filed before the Commission. I understand the concerns from yesterday. The AG's Office is committed to working on clarifying the language in the House to

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

ensure that only pattern and practice violations will trigger these provisions. I ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Any discussion? Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you, Mr. President. To the bill. You know, this is a bad bill. Yesterday we collectively rejected this bill. There were some very enlightened folks on both sides of the aisle that said we don't need to empower the government more in these complicated situations. We don't need to create an environment where there are more class action lawsuits in Illinois, which has now become a magnet for -- class action lawsuits. need to have -- you know, the AG's Office has not done a good job, in my view, in terms of this notion of pattern and practice. The bill is silent as to pattern and practice, so the roll call that you're going to be on is going to enable a fishing license for the Attorney General. They have made the representation that this is only going against small employers. There's nothing in the bill that says it's only -- or, it's only going against large employers. There's nothing in the bill that says it's only going against large employers. And finally, with all due respect to the sponsor, he was not able to answer my question yesterday about the statute of limitation questions, and I will tell you that there is no ambiguity in my mind that what this does is it opens up exposure for a statute of limitations for a lapsed claim. And what that means is, it doesn't give business certainty about the final disposition of these claims. It was a bad idea yesterday. It's a bad idea today. I urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Sandoval, to close.

SENATOR SANDOVAL:

I ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 2878 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 31 voting Aye, 26 voting Nay, none voting Present. Senate

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Bill 2878, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Request a verification of the roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

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

SECRETARY HAWKER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

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

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator DeLeo. Oh, no. There he is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator DeLeo is standing next to Senator Shadid.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Senator Martinez.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Martinez is standing there talking to the reporters. Senator Roskam, question the presence of any other Member? Senator?

SENATOR ROSKAM:

No. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

On a verified roll call, there are 31 voting Aye, 26 voting Nay, and none voting Present. Senate Bill 2878, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Madam Secretary, House Bills 1st Reading.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill -- House Bill 3833, offered by Senator Winkel.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4493, offered by Senator DeLeo.

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4495, offered by Senator Link.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 4621, offered by Senator Welch.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 5061, offered by Senator Martinez.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 6618, offered by Senator Watson.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

And House Bill 4779, offered by Senator Risinger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading -- pardon me. 1st Reading of the bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Madam Secretary, Messages.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

A Message for the Governor by Joseph B. Handley, Deputy Chief of Staff for Legislative Affairs, March 5, 2004.

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.

Message for the Governor by Joseph B. Handley, Deputy Chief of Staff for Legislative Affairs, March 26th, 2004.

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 officers enumerated below and respectfully ask concurrence in and the confirmations of the appointments of your Honorable Body.

A Message from the House by Mr. Mahoney, 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:

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

House Bills 3821, 3963, 4132, 4280, 4318, 4346, 4400, 4410, 4505 {sic} (4502), 4688, 4716, 4720, 4914, 5165 and 6906.

Passed the House, March 26th, 2004.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Resolutions.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Joint Resolution 68, offered by Senator Welch.

(Secretary reads SJR No. 68)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Welch moves to suspend the rules for the purpose of immediate consideration and adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 68. Those in favor will say Aye. Those opposed, say Nay. The Ayes have it, and the -- the rules are suspended. Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. The joint resolution says we come back next Tuesday at 12 o'clock. 12 o'clock. We will have committees' meetings on Tuesday, both in the morning and in the afternoon. The Appropriations Committee meets Tuesday morning. The Appropriations Committee meets Tuesday morning. So, everybody be here. I would move the adoption of the resolution. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Senator Welch moves the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 68. All in favor will say Aye. All opposed, say Nay. The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted. We will now proceed to the Order of Resolutions Consent Calendar. With the 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 resolutions on the Consent Calendar? SECRETARY HAWKER:

No, there have been no objections filed, Mr. President. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the resolutions on the Consent Calendar be adopted. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed will say Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the resolutions are adopted. Messages. SECRETARY HAWKER:

Message from the President.

92nd Legislative Day

3/26/2004

Dear Madam Secretary - Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Rule 2-10(e), I hereby establish January 11, 2005, as the 3rd Reading deadline for the following bills:

Senate Bills 717, 948, 1636, 1731, 2112, 2142, 2147, 2193, 2197, 2203, 2287, 2349, 2350, 2353, 2354, 2409, 2414, 2510, 2567, 2618, 2664, 2724, 2777, 2778, 2784, 2785, 2786, 2791, 2800, 2801, 2802, -- pardon me, that was 2801, 2902, 2907, 2966, 2974, 3041, 3042, 3043, and 3150.

Sincerely, Emil Jones, Jr., Senate President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR HENDON)

Pursuant to the Senate Joint Resolution 68, the Senate stands adjourned until the hour of 12 noon on Tuesday, March 30th. The Senate stands adjourned.