

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

The regular Session of the 92nd General Assembly will please come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks? Will our guests in the galleries please rise? Our prayer today will be given by Senator Geo-Karis. Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

(Prayer by Senator Geo-Karis)

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

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

SENATOR RADOGNO:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Radogno)

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

We have numerous TV stations that request permission to film: WGEM News, WCIA-Channel 3, Illinois Information Service and WLS-TU {sic} and ABC-Channel 7. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. And we have a request for still photos: the Associated Press and The State Journal-Register. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. And also, the Governor has lunch prepared. It's out in front of his office, and they'll start serving at noon. Everybody is welcome. Reading of the Journal. Senator Wendell Jones.

SENATOR W. JONES:

Mr. President, I move that reading and approval of the Journal of Monday, May 27th, in the year 2002, be postponed, pending arrival of the printed Journal.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

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

SECRETARY HARRY:

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

the House of Representatives has refused to concur with the Senate in the adoption of their amendments to a bill of the following title, to wit:

House Bill 1975, with Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4.

We have a like Message on House Bill 4974 {sic} (4975), with Senate Amendment No. 1, and another on House Bill 5874, with Senate Amendment No. 1.

All nonconcurrent in by the House, May 27th, 2002.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

While we're standing at ease, it would be the intention of the Chair, as soon as Rules Committee comes in, read in that report and then we have one bill we're going to amend, and then we're going to have a Republican Caucus. I'm assuming that you'll have a Democrat Caucus.

(SENATE STANDS AT EASE/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

The Senate will come to order. Committee Reports.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Weaver, Chair of the Committee on Rules, reports the following Legislative Measures assigned: Re-referred from the Appropriations Committee to the Rules Committee - House Bills 6056, 6060, 6061, 6065, 6066, 6067, 6068, 6071, 6075, 6083, 6084 and 6089; referred to the Committee on Education - the Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1930; re-referred from the Executive Committee to Rules Committee - House Bills 539 and 2381; referred to the Committee on Executive - Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2291, Amendment 1 to House Bill 822, Amendment 3 to House Bill 4453, Amendment 1 to House Bill 5168, Amendment 1 to House Bill 5450 and the Motion to Concur with House

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2017; referred to the Committee on Judiciary - the Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1936 and the Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 4 to Senate Bill 2155; to the Committee on Transportation - the Motion to Concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1880 and the Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1907; and Be Approved for Consideration - House Bills 539, 2381, 6056, 6060, 6061, 6065, 6066, 6067, 6068, 6071, 6075, 6083, 6084, 6089 and Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 5240 and the Motion to -- Concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1975.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

The Chicago Tribune has asked permission for still photographs on the Floor. Leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Karpriel, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. To announce a Republican Caucus immediately upon adjournment -- or, upon recess in Senator Philip's Office.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

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

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

It's Bob Molaro again. I mean, he can't keep his hands off of stuff. Just while I'm up, let the record reflect that Senator Clayborne is still absent.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

The record will so indicate. We'll stand at ease until after the Republican Caucus. I hope it would be less than an hour, but who... We will -- we will stand in recess till the call of the Chair.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

(SENATE STANDS IN RECESS/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senate will be in order. Committee Reports.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Weaver, Chair of the Committee on Rules, reports the following Legislative Measure assigned: Referred to the Committee on Appropriations - Senate Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2390.

Senator Klemm, Chair of the Committee on Executive, reports House Bill 4605 Do Pass; House Bill 5150 Do Pass, as Amended; Senate Joint Resolution 69 Be Adopted; Senate Bill 2017 - the Motion to Concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 Be Approved for Consideration; Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 822 Be Adopted, Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1215 Be Adopted, Senate Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2291 Be Adopted, Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 4453 Be Adopted and Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5450 Be Adopted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

WSIU is requesting permission to videotape. Is there leave? Leave is granted. What purpose does Senator Rauschenberger arise?

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. On the conclusion of today's -- or, this -- this Floor action, the Senate Appropriation Committee will return to its recessed meeting. We still hope to hear from the State Board of Education, as well as the Board of Higher Education, on the Governor's budget proposal, and also, beginning at approximately 6:30 tonight, we will be in a position to take testimony -- or, to hear the -- the contents of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 2390, which represents some minor modifications to the Governor's introduced budget from last night. So, Members who are not busy and want something to

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

do, would like to enjoy themselves, are interested in stale bagels, you're welcome in Room 212.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Please turn your attention to the Supplemental Calendar No. 1. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, on the Supplemental Calendar, Senator Rauschenberger, do you wish 539 to advance? Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 539.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Thomas Walsh on the Floor? Do we have leave to return to that? Leave is granted. Senator Philip. Senator Philip, on 4605, on the Supplemental Calendar. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 4605.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Lauzen on the Floor? Do we have leave to return to this? Leave is granted. Senator Philip, on 6056? Do you wish the bill read? 6056? Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 6056.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Philip, on 6060. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

House Bill 6060.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. 6061. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 6061.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. 6065. Senator Philip. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 6065.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. 6066. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 6066.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. 6067, Mr. Secretary. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 6067.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. 6068, Mr. Secretary. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 6068.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Philip, on 6071. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 6071.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. 6075. Senator Philip. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 6075.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. House Bill 6083. Senator Philip. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 6083.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. House Bill 6084. Senator Philip. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 6084.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. House Bill 6089. Senator Philip. Read the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 6089.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. ...FLD-TV, from Chicago, requests permission to film. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Senator Walsh, do you wish to move 2381? Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 2381.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. Senator Lauzen, on 5150. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 5150.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Have there been any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

3rd Reading. What purpose Senator Rauschenberger seek recognition?

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

I'd like to just restate my earlier announcement. It appears as if we've about completed the work. If Members would go directly

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

to Room 212, we're going to reconvene the recessed Appropriation Committee. Everyone who is not on the Approp Committee, of course, is welcome. We have some bagels left from this morning. There's a few doughnuts. At about -- at the completion of hearing State Board of Education and the Board of Higher Ed questions, or at about 6:30, we will take up Senate Amendment No. 2 -- or, Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 2390. So, I'd appreciate the Members going directly to the committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

What purpose Senator Karpiel arise?

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Well, Mr. President, actually, I hate to contradict what the Approp Chairman just said, but before we go to the Appropriation Committee, I understand we will be having a very brief, short caucus in Senator Philip's Office.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

There will be a brief Republican Caucus immediately in President Philip's Office. For the benefit of the Membership - if I may have your attention - we will reconvene after the Appropriation Committee is finished this evening. What time would you reckon, Senator, that we might be back on the Floor?

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

It is my fervent hope, assuming that the caucus is relatively short and I -- ten to fifteen minutes, that we need about forty-five minutes to an hour to complete State Board of Education and Board of Higher Ed, I would guess about twenty-five or thirty minutes for people to explain the changes in the -- the simple changes in the amendment we've got to offer, and hopefully that would mean that right about 7 -- between 7 and 7:30, we'd be back on the Floor in a position, if the Chamber so desires, to consider final passage of a budget.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

The Senate will then stand at ease, at the call of the Chair.
Approximately 7:30.

(SENATE STANDS AT EASE/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Committee Reports.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Rauschenberger, Chair of the Committee on Appropriations, reports Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2390 Be Adopted.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Smith, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen. I'd like to announce that the -- there will be a Democratic Caucus in the Office of Senator Jones as soon as we open.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator, do you have any idea how -- the length of time?

SENATOR SMITH:

I would say a good half hour. One hour.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

That -- that is certainly in order. The Senate will stand at ease until your caucus is over with. The sooner the better.

(SENATE STANDS AT EASE/SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Members still in their offices please come to the Floor. We are preparing to do some final action. Chair will note that most

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

of the Democrats are quietly sitting in their chairs, as always. Is that duct tape? If the Members would turn to the top of page 6 of your regular Calendar, to the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, for the purpose of recall. Senate Bill 2291. Senator Weaver seeks leave of the Body to return House -- Senate Bill 2291 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 2291. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senator Weaver.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Amendment No. 1 provides that if two or more organization licenses {sic} consolidate, the licenses {sic} shall thereafter retain and be entitled to all the rights, benefits and powers under the Act that would otherwise have accrued to each individual pre-consolidated organization. So, basically, Sportsmen's and Hawthorne have an agreement to merge, use the same track, Hawthorne, for races in the Chicago area. They would still be going individually to the Racing Board to obtain racing dates for each of the now existing tracks. I don't know that there's any downside to this. We're trying to strengthen horse racing in Illinois. Consolidation - the Racing Board has suggested to these two tracks that they do consolidate for the benefit of horse racing throughout the State. I'd be happy to answer any questions that anyone has. Appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? Senator Emil Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Senator Weaver, we discussed this in committee and I want to make it crystal clear. There's a provision in here that says that all the license from the dormant license, that the -- the slots that they will -- oh. Oh. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Go ahead. Go ahead. I'm sorry.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you. A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you. Does this amendment mandate the Illinois Racing Board to allocate racing dates or host track days?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

No, it doesn't.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? If not, all those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

3rd Reading. The middle of page 7, in the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, is Senate Bill 2390. Senator Rauschenberger seeks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 2390 to the Order of

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is Senate Bill 2390. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 1, offered by Senators Philip and Rauschenberger.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Floor Amendment No. 1 is the Governor's proposed budget for the State of Illinois as presented last night most eloquently in the House Chamber during our Joint Session. I'd appreciate the Body's leave while I adopt the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Excuse me, Mr. President. No, I will pass. And it's our understanding there's Amendment No. 2, and we'll have discussions on that amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

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

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senators Philip and Rauschenberger.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

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

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

Floor Amendment No. 2, as approved in the Senate Appropriation Committee, makes a hundred and thirty-six million dollars' worth of minor adjustments to the Governor's 22.7-billion-dollar General Revenue introduced budget. I'd appreciate its adoption. Be very happy -- further explain it on 3rd Reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Senator Rauschenberger, you said there's a hundred and thirty-six million dollar -- worth of changes in this language that you have here. What we have gotten, and we just got, well now, I guess about two hours ago, were those programs. There was twenty-seven separate pieces of action that you've got in this bill. As we discussed it -- or, as we did not discuss it at that time, are we going to discuss it now, or are you going to wait till we get on 3rd Reading? Because I -- I would like more details on what's going on here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

It'd be my preference to debate it on 3rd, but I'll be happy -- very happy, at whatever time you'd like, to go into detail or whatever you feel is appropriate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Senator Rauschenberger, as you are well aware, we've been meeting since last November in trying to find a -- a solution to

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

the situation that our State is in at this particular time, and during those many months and many hours that we met, we had agreed at some times to agree to disagree, but we certainly many times and most times came to at least a consensus. The proposal that you have put before us at this particular time, I believe, is -- is not a -- an agreed proposal. Certainly no consensus whatsoever is here. And because of that, I would like to vote No. I'd like the Members on this side to vote No, and we can discuss it on this amendment. But if it goes to 3rd, we'll have further discussions at that time. And -- roll -- roll call vote on this, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any... Senator Trotter has requested...

SENATOR TROTTER:

I'm sorry. Not a roll call vote. Too many voices going on in my head. I'm sorry.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Thank you, Senator Trotter. Any further discussion? If not, all those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved?

SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

3rd Reading. In the middle of page 6, in the Order of Senate Bills 3rd Reading, is Senate Bill 2291. Mr. Secretary, read the bill, please.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 2291.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. As I just explained, this amendment that I explained becomes the bill. And as I said, it provides that if two or more existing organization licensees consolidate, the licenses {sic} shall therefore remain -- retain the existing rights, benefits and powers under the Act that would otherwise have accrued to the individual pre-consolidated organizations. This has been worked on by the Racing Board, recommended by the Racing Board for a number of years, and, finally, the -- the two tracks, Sportsmen and Hawthorne, have gotten together and agreed to merge and agreed to go to the Racing Board for racing dates at Hawthorne for both tracks. If there's any questions, I'd be happy to try to answer 'em, but I would appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? Senator Viverito.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

Sponsor yield to a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Viverito.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

Yes, Senator, when you say that there's been an agreement, I'd like to know, how does that affect the -- Cicero, which Sportsmen is in? How does that affect Stickney now? The -- the revenues from those, where -- where will they go?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Both tracks would retain the rights and benefits that each track now are provided.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Viverito.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

No. The question that I'm asking you, where does this put the local villages, in terms of the revenues that they've received over these particular years? A lot of money comes to Cicero from Sportsmen. Stickney is dependent on Hawthorne as a revenue source. How will that affect each village?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

In the bill, Senator, each track would retain the same benefits and the same benefits would flow to the existing organizations -- or -- or communities that now host these two tracks.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Viverito.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

Senator, maybe I'm not making myself clear. My concerns are what effect this will have on the village of -- or, the City of Cicero and what effect it will have on Stickney - revenues, the money that goes to the local entity. How will this affect us? Because if...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

...closing. One park is closing. Will all the revenue then go to Stickney, which, you know, I live in Stickney, so -- I mean, but still and all, we're concerned for Cicero as well? And what will be the development when that race track is closed?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

I don't think there will be any change in the revenue flow over -- I mean, I -- it'll be the same revenue flow. I don't know

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

what the future would hold for Sportsmen. I understand that racing will be -- from both entities will be at Hawthorne. So, I don't think there'd be any change in that which is granted to the -- the existing communities.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Viverito.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

Yeah. I think, Senator - and I have the utmost respect for you - I think maybe you just don't -- or, maybe a staff person -- someone has to realize that there -- these are two different tracks in two different municipalities, even though they're side-by-side. Cicero is totally different from Stickney. Stickney -- Stickney, I think, is the one that the track is -- going to be. So, we'll lose the Cicero tax. They will not have a tax. Are they going to do something in regard to -- to -- to helping that community out?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

When you asked the question that -- what will happen to the Sportsmen's -- property, I think that they're -- they talked a little bit about -- the community, that it may be redeveloped, and that revenue from that development would go to the host community.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator...

SENATOR WEAVER:

I -- no one has raised that question, Senator, and so I -- I can't totally answer your question as to whether track revenues would be the same to the former community and Sportsmen, but if it's redeveloped, there'd be real estate taxes paid from the Sportsmen's property to the community. And I -- I really don't know that that question has ever been asked, because not knowing

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

what they're going to do with that property is an unknown right now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Viverito.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

Thank you. Thank you. I don't mean to be redundant, but it's extremely important that we understand the local tax issue to both of those communities is really important. And I do feel we need a clarification. Maybe, Stan, we could -- Senator, maybe we could hold this until we get a little bit better -- a clarification. I'm sure that both mayors are -- are -- are questioning what we're doing here today with a great deal of anxiety, because I know, from the perspective of the Village of Stickney, they have been dependent on that development for the past fifty, sixty, seventy years. And Sportsmen has -- turned millions of dollars into that track that they're closing. So, obviously, this is going to have a great effect on the municipalities. And maybe you could hold it a bit, until we get a better clarification, 'cause I don't know how we could vote -- I hate to ask that everyone vote No on this issue because of the clarification, but I must say, at this particular time, I'm not certain what is being proposed. And I think we've got a couple of days to clarify this. If this is going to benefit the people and benefit the race tracks, we also have to give consideration to the villages that are involved.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

I appreciate your concern, Senator Viverito. We don't have much time. This has not been -- this is a Senate bill going to the House, which will have to be read three times. I -- I just want to reiterate that there are certain activities going on at Sportsmen that the revenues generated from that community -- or,

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

that track would revert to Cicero. And I just hesitate to say -- it's not that I wouldn't accede to your request, but time is short and this is a Senate bill going to the House. But I -- I did -- not heard anything from either community as to having any concerns as to a loss of revenue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Viverito.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

Senator, I can only tell you that I am very, very familiar, in Stickney Township, as well as in the Sportsmen track area, and I can tell you that this is not only a great revenue for the Village of Stickney, it also gives a great opportunity to a lot of people to work the security at the track. This gives a lot of people opportunities to go to work every day - electricians and -- and many other -- particular people in the field there. But I do think that this, to be rushed through, when you yourself can't basically tell us what development is going to take forward after this decision is being made, I would have to urge a No vote on this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Maybe I could help a little bit, if I could, being a former mayor of a municipality that had a racing track. If you're talking about economic development, Senator Viverito, that's an issue which I think there should be some concern with. As far as I understand it, unless the law has changed drastically since -- which I don't think it has, really the only -- the only tax revenues that the municipality receives is the admission tax. And if that be a problem, both municipalities, through intergovernmental agreement, could take care of that problem. And, you know, if there's a concern with

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

jobs and et cetera, that's something I think you would have to address separately. But I think this is a pretty good procedure, and I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Tom Walsh.

SENATOR T. WALSH:

Thank you, Mr. President. And in -- in the question of jobs, I think, which would be a legitimate question, Hawthorne and Sportsmen's were never open at the same time. One track would be open and the other would be dark, regardless if they were running the harness or the thoroughbreds. And so, the -- the jobs in the community - one track is usually open all year long, and so that will continue to be the case. And I -- I -- I think that any concern that Senator Viverito -- and I understand, although the tracks are right next to one another, which doesn't seem to make sense, the Racing Board is certainly in favor of this consolidation. They're the ones that are going to be approving the racing dates. Any of the concerns that you would have about the jobs, there aren't going -- I would think there would be more jobs created with -- with this bill, and there -- there -- there won't -- there certainly won't be any people that won't be working because of -- because of this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Viverito, for a second time.

SENATOR VIVERITO:

And again, this really will be a bonanza for the Village of Stickney. This is absolutely something that's going to benefit me and my Village of Stickney. So, if you do pass this, it's really going to benefit Stickney Township. I just feel that I had a conscience. I felt that I had to make you aware of the situation, and I think it's going to have some devastation on the Cicero area, which already has some serious problems. And I'm sure that

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

other race tracks are not in favor of consolidation. I don't believe that a lot of them have even known about this particular issue. And I rest my case. Thank you very much for your patience.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Further discussion? Senator Molaro.

SENATOR MOLARO:

...you -- thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. First, I just want to point out that in committee today, in the Executive Committee, the Illinois Racing Board, which is the Board that we created to look at the industry and best come up with a situation, has, for years, wanted Sportsmen's and Hawthorne to combine and consolidate. For those of you who don't know, Hawthorne and Sportsmen's are right next to each other. What Senator Viverito is talking about is there's a line right through these two pieces of property. Cicero's on the left. Stickney's on the right. So, they're in two distinct villages, even though they happen to be right next to each other. It makes no economic sense whatsoever, and it hasn't for forty years, to have two race tracks right next to each other operating. That makes no sense. The Racing Board, as well as us in Illinois, have always said it made no sense. The problem we had, since we gave 'em this license -- you know, maybe only when Stan and Pate were around, when we gave 'em these license eighty years ago, we can't take it away. We never were able to talk sense into these two families and say, "You guys are nuts. Get together, consolidate these tracks, become more powerful and let the State of Illinois reap the benefit of your consolidation." Well, there's been a few bad times at Sportsmen's Park. They made a little bit of bad decisions, which we won't get into here. And finally they've come to their senses. And now Sportsmen's Park has talked to Hawthorne, and they come and consolidate. Now, when they

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

consolidate -- you know, one of the major issues here: Each racetrack in Illinois has five OTBs. So, you have -- so, you have Sportsmen's with their five OTBs and Hawthorne with their five OTBs. They don't want to consolidate -- and they have these two companies that are worth X amount of dollars. They don't want to come and consolidate and they're worth less. So, they have to come to us - and the Racing Board has been trying to force this for forty years - they come here and say, "We need a change in legislation that allows us to keep the ten OTBs. We are going to consolidate. It's going to be better for racing." As I've said many, many times, we're in -- partners with gaming. We -- we set their taxes, we set their operation, and our governing agency, the Racing Board, has come up and said this is a great idea, this is good for racing, this is good for the bottom line, for the State of Illinois. And I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? If not, Senator Weaver, to close.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President. We were assured in committee today that all employees of both Sportsmen's and Hawthorne will be retained. The activities at Sportsmen scheduled are for various events that will bring in money, revenues, to the community. So, I -- I think it's a win-win situation for all concerned, and I think it's a win situation for horse racing statewide. So, I appreciate your favorable vote on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 2291 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 wished? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 32 Ayes, 15 Nays, 4 voting Present. And Senate Bill 2291, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

passed. Middle of page 7, in the Order of House -- Senate Bills
3rd Reading, is Senate Bill 2390. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 2390.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate.
Senate Bill 2390, with Amendments 1 and 2, now contain a modified
version of the Governor's presented budget from last evening.
Before I go into details, I think it's important we talk just a
minute or two about how we got here. It's easy, in kind of the
rush and the passion, as you kind of argue about the last hundred
million dollars in a twenty-four-billion --
twenty-four-billion-dollar-high pile of -- of decisions, but it --
I think it's important to reflect on how we got here. We left
here last May with what people thought was a pretty reasonable
budget. The budget projected eight hundred and seventy-five
million dollars in revenue growth. We were coming off the end of a
nine-year expansion that was unprecedented in American history.
The State of Illinois had had three record revenue years in a row.
We had capital projects going on all over the State of Illinois.
It was a wonderful time to be a Member of the General Assembly, in
many ways. As we left this building, though, the beginning of
trouble was beginning to -- to -- to show on the horizon. We got
to the summer revenues in June, and they were a little bit
nerve-racking as the fiscal year ended. In July of last year,
revenues were down a hundred million dollars below projection, and
that was below the previous fiscal year, which didn't have the gas
tax, because we had the -- the -- the gas -- the sales tax -- the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

sales tax holiday on gasoline to deal with the high prices. August was down again, forty-five million dollars below the previous year, even though the gas tax wasn't included. In September, we had the tragic events of September 11th, and revenues plummeted a hundred and fifty million dollars below. The warning signs were all over. When we got down here to Veto Session, it was apparent that we had some problems with the budget. And to its credit, this Body tried to act. There were many in this Body who said it -- we needed a Special Session. There was calls for immediate action. The Governor was trying to figure out a way to adjust the budget. No one -- none of us, I don't think, imagined the magnitude or the size of the problem. This Body took up a bill to give the Governor extraordinary authority. Unfortunately, it did not pass and our problem grew larger. As it went through the fall, revenues kind of stabilized, but they certainly didn't grow. As we got into January, we again took up legislation and tried to give the Governor extraordinary authority, and this Body passed that bill to the House. In the House, our colleagues again failed to act. Revenues plummeted ninety-one million dollars, again below the previous month of January. February was down eighty-nine million dollars, and still no action from the House. March, again, saw a hundred and forty-nine-million-dollar underperformance of the previous fiscal year. As we looked at March, we were looking at underperforming the previous fiscal year by as much as nine hundred million dollars, and it was only one Chamber that was engaged. Now, that's not a good process. The Governor made an attempt in introducing a budget to try to deal with the crisis. Unfortunately, they shot too high and missed the mark. The budget that was presented to this Body in February, for the first time since I've been here, was not passable because it didn't have enough revenue to support the spending plan in it. So, we come

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

here in extraordinary circumstances, but we come here, at least as this Chamber, trying to act proactively to move forward. And I hope tonight we can have a discussion, talk about small disagreements and then how we finish the allocation, but, hopefully, send a bipartisan document over to a very, very difficult Chamber, a Chamber that's rent by things that -- passions that -- that aren't, hopefully, alive and well in this Chamber and give them some leadership so that we can move on. The biggest tragedy that we could probably inflict on the State in these uncertain times, when people are trying to decide what's going on, is further uncertainty. If this General Assembly goes into overtime because we can't come to make adult decisions about allocations, if we can't even manage our own process, I don't know what that says about where we are today in the United States or, in particular, in the State of Illinois. It's not easy. It's not fair. A lot of us wish we could have had one more year like the last three we had, but we're confronted by the realities of the economy as they exist today and by the stewardship, the seeds we've planted, in the last three budgets. We've had three very good, expansive budgets, and, unfortunately, now is the time to make hard decisions. To its credit, Members of this Chamber brought forth a -- brought out a -- a financial plan and -- and -- and tried to -- to -- to demonstrate some leadership both to the House and to try to engage the Executive Branch. And -- and our colleagues on the other side made some proposals that we certainly all tried to take a look at. So, there has been progress in this Chamber, and I hope tonight we can talk about the Governor's attempt to solve this problem, I think, in many ways, based on the work of -- of this Body, and -- and we'll walk through the adjustments that -- that the Republican Members feel are critical to this. But most of all, let's not lose sight of the fact that this is the first step in a delicate process to try to engage our

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

colleagues in the House who are in a situation very different from our own. They're in a situation where they don't spend as much time focusing and understanding the budget. They're in a situation where there's twice as many of 'em, where the Leadership roles are different. So, I hope, as we go through this budget, that we can keep in mind -- you know, criticize or argue about the -- the scope or size of the decisions or the adjustments, the last five hundred thousand dollars of this or the last two-hundred-and-forty-thousand-dollar grant to that, but let's keep in mind that the bill before us - the bill before us - is ninety-eight percent precisely the same as was introduced into this Chamber in February. The adjustments that we're making tonight represent less than two-tenths of one percent of the General Revenue portion of the budget. We're not talking about massive change. We're talking about a bill that was filed, I guess it's now a little over twenty-eight hours ago, which is not abnormal in the General Assembly process, particularly on a budget. Most of State government really is the same year over year. We talk about the margins. So, let's tonight try to talk about the changes we believe in, maybe disagree on some of the elements, knowing full well, as we send this bill to the House, that the House is going to work its will on this and we will see this bill back again. I fully expect the House, in one way or another, will amend this bill and we'll see it again on Concurrence. And a word or two about the revenue picture before we go further. The Governor set out a financial plan last night, and I think that was important. It's the first time we've really heard a way to kind of bring this whole thing to closure. I don't think that that was a consensus plan last night. It wasn't a consensus bill that he introduced, but it was certainly an attempt at leadership, to try to move us past the point. And what I think's important is -- is to take a look at the scope and the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

size of what we send over, and we, as Senators, need to take a look and monitor the actions of the House. If they exercise restraint, we can put together the financial plan necessary, the revenues, I think, in this Body, with consensus work, to send this on to the Governor and to give the State of Illinois a balanced budget. But make no mistake, the House has got to act reasonably and predictably over the next three days. So, I think one of the important things we can try to do is try to keep our rhetoric down, to take a real look at our responsibilities, to know as much as we're frustrated -- and I can't imagine anybody is any more frustrated than I am with the process that we've engaged in. Senator Trotter has put in countless hours. We have had more meetings on this budget in the last nine months than we had in the three previous budgets that -- that I worked on. We began engaging the Bureau of the Budget back in September. When numbers became kind of interesting, there was a retreat with the Bureau of the Budget. We were in meetings in November. Senator Trotter and I spent, I think it was, six days in December together, while the rest of the Chambers were out, with the Bureau of the Budget, trying to work through solutions. So, make no mistake: There's no surprises in this to those of us who do appropriating. There's frustrations anytime in this kind of budget. But very quickly, the scope of the State budget essentially is very similar to what was introduced by the Governor. You heard a lot about it last night, and hopefully you've had a chance to read through your analysis. It makes an effort to fund education at a level basis with the previous fiscal year, which is difficult to do in a year when your revenues are compressing. It makes an effort to try to manage the rest of State government. The Governor proposed, initially, large cuts in the Medicaid program. Our cash flow was -- was -- was putting providers in a position where they were waiting ninety, a hundred twenty, a hundred and fifty days to be

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

reimbursed. The budget plan the Governor has given us solves a lot of those problems. So, I think we need to keep in mind -- I think we started this process with what I would call five important goals. As we saw the February budget, I don't think there was any support in this Chamber for the kind of cuts that were made to the community grants and the community agencies that deal with our fragile populations that are mentally ill and that are developmentally disabled. This budget, as amended, solves that problem. It restores that funding. Doesn't give 'em a COLA. Doesn't grow it. But it restores that funding to a responsible level at the '02 level -- the -- the Fiscal Year '02 level. We knew, when we saw the February budget, that ten-percent Medicaid cuts across our entire Medicaid program might quickly solve our financial problem but wasn't responsible to the providers who struggle to deal with the clients that we tell them they have to serve. This budget makes progress on that. It's a fifty-percent restoration of the Governor's proposed cuts, something that, although is not the ideal in any sense, is certainly serious -- progress. It adds three hundred and thirty million dollars of new resources to the people who provide the services that we mandate. This budget extends the school construction program that at least forty Members in this Chamber have talked to me about over the last three or four weeks. We know we've got big challenges in K through 12 education, and we know we have an aging infrastructure. This budget, as amended, allows a re-expansion of the school construction program, a billion-dollar authorization, five hundred -- five-hundred-million-dollar appropriation for each of the next two years. It will fund all of the entitlements that have been received by the State Board of Education as those projects are ready for construction. As we've worked over the last three years on education budgets, we've all developed, I think, an appreciation for the fact we need to keep our commitments in K

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

through 12 education. And I know a goal of many people in this Chamber were to maintain our foundation level and pay the bills that we have promised to pay for K through 12 education. This budget does almost all of that. It funds the -- the -- the foundation level we have, in a very tough budget year, and it -- this, as amended, will fund ninety-four percent of our mandated categorical obligations to those school districts. So, we're paying our mortgage payment before we decide to go to the movies. It's responsible, in that sense. I would have been prouder if we could have found a way, without smoke and mirrors, to reach a hundred-percent funding of mandated categoricals, but we got almost all there. And finally, what was really important to me and I think really important to everyone of us when we go back to our districts, this budget includes enough resources to do short-term borrowing so that we can manage our cash flow through the next fiscal year so we are not further inflicting -- pain on those people that we require to provide pharmacy services and -- and services in long-term care and services in hospitals. There's enough resource in here, fifteen million dollars appropriated, to allow the Executive Branch to borrow enough to manage its payment cycle and pay it off within the fiscal year. To the specific changes that the Senate Republicans made in committee, I would like to just briefly run through them. As we took a look at the State Board of Education budget, a principle that seemed clear to us is in this tough year, although we know the Governor feels strongly about 'em and many people support the establishment of universal preschool, we thought that was a growth that was not achievable this year. So, we reduced 5.8 million dollars to universal preschool. Although mentoring and induction is the goal of many people that -- that believe it'll help in retention of teachers, we didn't believe we could afford ten million new dollars out of the State Board of Education budget to have a new

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

mentoring and induction program in the State of Illinois. I will remind you, though, that our federal cousins out in Washington, D.C., have mailed us, or made a twenty-million-dollar commitment to a mentoring and induction program that I hope will reasonably take its place for the -- the Governor's people on education. We eliminated the Waterford Reading Program, a program that many of us felt very strongly about, but that, too, was a new initiative that we didn't feel we could sustain in a difficult year. And although the Golden Apple Scholars Program is well respected by people in this Chamber, has been a part of the State budget, I think, for over six years, we said it couldn't grow either. We needed to -- to meet our obligations first. We took those eighty-three million dollars in eliminations -- in addition, we eliminated the payment from our school -- our K through 12 State Board of Education budget to the Chicago Teachers' pension system, a pension system that we've reported here over and over again is ninety-nine-percent funded. We took those eighty-three million dollars' worth of resources, and I'll explain how we reallocated them. We did three things. We know that the Chicago Teachers' system was looking for resources to deal with the health care of their teachers. We -- we establish a forty-million-dollar grant to meet that -- that expectation, because they were counting, in many ways, on that sixty-five million dollars. We'll deal with their primary need, I think, in a -- in a respectful way with a forty-million-dollar grant for health care. We take ten million dollars and expand Early Childhood -- the Early Childhood Block Grant. That -- that, hopefully, for those people who believe in universal preschool, they'll feel comfortable that that money plus a little bit more went back in to -- to children to prepare them for school and to give them the best possible chance to succeed. And we took the remaining thirty-three million and we drove the level from ninety percent to ninety-four percent on our mandated

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

categoricals. We put thirty-three million dollars more into paying our obligations to the school districts for statutory programs that we've passed and have failed to repeal. I think that was the right thing to do. So, that's what we did in the State Board of Education. And I will remind people here that none of those things are new. We have been talking as a Body about universal preschool for a long time. We have been talking about whether we're comfortable about a new mentoring and induction program for a long time. We have been talking, and it's been controversial in this Chamber, for as long as I can remember, whether we ought to be using State Board of Education funds to subsidize the Chicago Teachers' pension system. So, maybe we've got a compromise here that can last for a long time. We'll deal with them -- we'll deal with the Chicago system on their primary need, which is health care, and then we can stop arguing about pensions and maybe move onto a new -- new era. In Higher Education, let me list some of the reductions we made in Higher Education. We eliminated 1.6 million dollars from Career Academies. Again, perhaps a worthy program, but a new initiative that, at this time, we didn't believe we could afford. We eliminated the core program for City Colleges. That's a program that I'm sure has got a lot of merit, but this year we can't afford add-on programs or adjustment programs for systems, no matter how good they are, particularly not when they have local resources. We eliminated ten million dollars, five million of which was to go to City Colleges and five million to downstate colleges, which would have taken the Illinois Community College Board above its introduced level for grants to -- to community colleges. At a time when we're asking our K through 12 system to do with less, at a time when we're, perhaps, facing five thousand layoffs of State employees statewide, I didn't believe we could support ten million dollars in expansion, even if that was for

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

good programs at those community colleges. We eliminated the three-million-dollar Governor's proposal for student loan repayment. Although, again, maybe another good idea, not the right year to start a new initiative, and we eliminated operations funding for Chicago State University for a -- for a pharmacy program that is not yet approved by the Board of Higher Education. The total amount of those reductions was sixteen million eight hundred thousand. In addition, let me take you through some other adjustments and I'll explain to you how we reallocated those resources. In the past -- Cook County has got a wonderful program, and I know they've got many correctional challenges, but this year we didn't believe we could afford to fund a million dollars in -- in the Cook County Boot Camp. Over the last few years, we've been helping Audy Home in Chicago, which deals with the -- the youth of -- in the -- in the, I think, probationary system in the -- the Cook County courts. We have been, in the past, able to give them a grant up to seven and a half million dollars. This year we had to trim that grant. It's a five-million-dollar grant this year instead of a seven-and-a-half-million-dollar grant. Although many of us like the Teen REACH program, we didn't believe this year we could have growth in Teen REACH. We trimmed 1.3 million dollars in proposed growth in the Teen REACH program and trimmed three million dollars from the program itself, leaving a fifteen-million-dollar Teen REACH program. Now, those are three-year rolling contracts. Not a single Teen REACH program active needs to be affected. It will simply mean, if we adopt this budget and the House concurs, that there'll be a few less new Teen REACH programs next year, in a year, when we're asking a lot of people to make tough decisions. Rather than allowing almost five million dollars of growth in the Great START program, we're limiting that to about two and a half million dollars of new growth. That's a program that sends out

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

bonuses to people who agree to teach in preschool and early childhood. And that's a good program and there's a lot to be said for it, and we passed it in good times, when maybe we had hoped it could be a real incentive. But this year, I don't -- we -- I don't believe we could support the kind of growth that the Governor requested. We -- we trimmed the -- the Workforce Advantage Program that -- that the Governor's Office had proposed. We -- they have almost two million dollars in their reappropriations. They requested four million additional. We took three million of that growth out, leaving them two million in reappropriations and a million dollars in new spending. We think that they -- they need to work with that money. We -- we need those resources for other things. We -- we found a way, we think, to help the pharmacists the -- in the -- in the -- the pharmacy line in the Medicaid program by trimming fifteen million dollars from our Circuit Breaker program in rate savings by -- by changing some statutory work and putting that fifteen million dollars into the Medicaid program so we can get it matched and deliver it back into the pharmacy industry. So, we made a couple of adjustments there that we think everybody will agree to once they take a look at the mechanisms. And last of all, although originally the Governor proposed thirty-four million dollars for -- for RTA fare reimbursement in an earlier proposal, we suggested cutting it to twenty. The Governor responded by raising it to forty. We've agreed the Governor was probably right in February. We've returned the RTA fare reimbursement to the thirty-four-million-dollar level, freeing up six million dollars in resources. Now, we take those resources together and let me tell you about how we reallocated them so you know. Now, again, I would argue, those programs we've seen in the budget over and over again. There aren't surprises here. But the first and most important thing we did is we've taken a look at the controversy in

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

the Department of Corrections, how, unfortunately, due to the political pressures and -- and kind of the -- the moving revenue targets, that we've tried to force the Department of Corrections to manage on the fly. So, we've established a twenty-five-million-dollar block grant for the Department to work with after we leave Springfield. After the politics are out of the process, let the Governor and the Department of Corrections manage itself. Twenty-five-million new resource dollars for them to really review the proposed closings, to decide what facilities to close and what facilities not to close, if any, to deal with the effects of -- of -- of our prohibition of the privatization in -- in Corrections, to give them a chance to manage their own system, hopefully after we get out of the way. We also restored two million dollars to the C-FAR program. The Governor's reduction of seven million dollars was more than we thought was prudent. So it's a five-million-dollar cut to C-FAR, instead of a seven-million-dollar cut. And last, we establish a ten-million-dollar matching grant program for homeland security for hospitals and health care facilities. It's an other-funds appropriation, so it doesn't affect our General Revenue budget, but it's included in this bill and I wanted you to be aware of it. That's the effect of this, and that's the effect of this on top of a budget you've seen over and over again, that's certainly not without pain and controversy, but certainly been a document that your appropriators, that your appropriation staff have had a lot of time with. So, I hope today that -- you can ask questions. I'll do my best to answer 'em. I'm sure Senator Trotter will, as well. But I hope, after a little debate, we can come to some kind of consensus and try to send a message to the House - okay? - that here's -- here's a first passover, take a look at it, let's get this process moving. We need to provide some certainty and some finality to the budget process in the best interests of the State

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

of Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Before I ask my question, I just want to make a few comments. Senator Rauschenberger, as -- as always, has very eloquently laid out for all of us how we got here today. Also, in his earlier remarks, he talked about the spirit of cooperation that we've been having over the months in trying to really craft a budget that's going to be for the good of all of our people in this State. Also, he mentioned that this is the Chamber of reason, this is the Chamber where we can get together and discuss issues and put things on the plate as a team, and we should do that because the House is a little unorganized. But then today we get this budget, or this proposal, and it's taking out all the things that we as a team talked about. So, with that, I have a few problems, as do many Members over here. So, I would like to ask my question, if the sponsor will yield, at this point.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Right. One in particular, Senator Rauschenberger. You talked about the need for doing the right thing and that's taking sixty-five million dollars out of the Chicago Teachers' pension plan. But what you didn't mention in the budget, that in the Governor's proposed budget, he had already taken out sixty million dollars. The school system in the Chicago public schools said they weren't going to be whole even if we got the sixty-five million dollars, because there was already a sixty-million-dollar cut. Then you also said that you put in forty million dollars, so really you were doing us a big favor. So, even if you gave us

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

forty, that still meant that we were twenty million dollars at a net loss. So, if you could, if you can just expound on that a little bit more for me.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

I'll be happy to, Senator Trotter. The City of Chicago schools have an important mission. They serve more children than any other school district in the State. I think they serve something like eighteen percent of all the children in the State of Illinois. When you take the effect of the State Board of Education budget, when you hold the allocation in '03 the same as you did in '02 and you account for the increased cost of teacher retirement insurance program and the increased cost to the Teachers' Retirement System, all school districts across the State are going to see some decline in State service -- in State resources. I -- I would presume the sixty million dollars that -- that Arne Duncan and the Chicago System have talked to you is their proportionate share of the tension you have any time that you're not able to grow the education budget. But I would argue that's not a cut from the Governor's budget. It certainly wasn't an intentional cut. All of our school districts across the State share that cut. To -- real quickly, to the question of the -- you know, and we -- reasonable minds disagree and I don't ever expect you to -- to tell me I'm right on this, but it doesn't seem to make sense to me for us to take scarce education dollars and fund the -- the pension program in Chicago. I think it's a better choice to really get Chicago to tell us about their needs, as we think we kind of have done, fund their -- their -- their health care program, which is what we kind of, sort of were able to kind of extract from them, and we've added -- Chicago gets two hundred million of the billion-dollar school construction program. We had

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

a couple of other proposals. And I'm not saying anybody over there ought to say, "Boy, Rauschenberger did the right thing or it's the best possible choice." The only thing I would argue is it's a reasonable way to look at it, and this is the first pass of the budget.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Senator Rauschenberger, as you're well aware, and Members certainly are probably aware as well, because we've had these conversations, Chicago public school system and the teachers, to date, have paid into their program. As just for the sake of parity, Chicago feels that the State should also kick some dollars there because they are State taxpayers. We pay the Downstate Teachers' pension fund in a large part. So, there -- there is no parity here. What we've seen -- you said we're ninety-five-percent solvent at this point in time, but we're on that slippery slope of going down. So we're seeing -- or, going to be seeing, in the very near future, that property taxes will be going up in the City of Chicago and that it'll be an extra burden on -- on the citizens of that region, which, as you know, is -- is very important and it's very large and has a very large responsibility. With this, the sixty-five-million-dollar cut that you're being proposing -- that you're proposing right now, a cut -- reduction from the Governor's budget just further exasperates the problem that we know already exists. And if we can go further on down without belaboring that point, we look at some of the other things that we have here on our list, and then that, of course, the Cook County Boot Camp. And actually, when I go down your list, it seems almost as if this is a punishment to Cook County and the City of Chicago, because we're talking about taking another million dollars out of Cook County Boot Camp; two -- two million five

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

hundred thousand out of the Cook County Juvenile Detention; Teen REACH, which we know has been a prevention program, not an intervention program, not a after-the-fact program, but -- a program that has worked, which is why the Governor has essentially adopted it over the past four years. For you to take another 4.3 out of that budget, again, is -- is -- what are we going to do? We've heard from Corrections today that incarceration is going down here in this State. So, once again, what we're doing is putting children at risk, by getting rid of a prevention program that we know works. Can you please elaborate on that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Well, I -- I would remind Members of the Body that, although it doesn't say on my plaque up at the Senate President's podium, I am a resident of Cook County. I've lived in -- in the County of Cook for almost twenty-eight years. I'm a Cook County property taxpayer. I am sensitive to Cook County issues. I guess I would argue, in -- in good times, we had enough money to help Cook County with its boot camp. We were able to do a lot of grant programs and a lot of expansions over the last three years. This year, I guess I would tell you, I don't believe we can afford those. Those aren't punitive cuts in my mind. We retained five million dollars of support for Audy Home, and -- and if the House sees the issue differently, we're certainly willing to look at it again. As far as Teen REACH, Teen REACH is a good program, but keep in mind, it didn't exist five years ago. And at a time when we're struggling to make sure that we can have all the caseload of people in the home services program that need it in Department of Aging, when we're trying to make sure that -- that -- that in our Department of Rehabilitation Services, that there's enough access to the home care program, at a time when we're facing State

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

layoffs, I don't think it's unreasonable to say we're going to trim back a grant program when we're talking about new grantees. So, you're right. I think Teen REACH is a good program. There's been a lot of good work done, particularly by the Boys and Girls Club, not just in Chicago, not just in Cook County, but throughout the State of Illinois. And, you know, would that we didn't have to cut anything, in a way. But -- but I would argue that the cut we make here is not disproportionate. Reasonable minds can disagree whether we should cut it at all.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Thank you very much. And -- and I'm very glad that you like Teen REACH, because as you'll probably recall, that was my bill. It wasn't here five years ago. Thing was, is we were looking at revamping the juvenile justice system and how to keep children out of there and we came up with this program, and it has worked. But in light of that we just got rid of Project Success, which -- also where dollars were going to -- to help children at least stay on the right path, and then to make further cuts here, I think is really a travesty. But then we start looking again at some of the prisons and what we're doing, since seemingly this is driven to not keep people out of prisons. But at the same time when we heard from the Director that enrollment is going down -- not enrollment, but incarceration is going down, and then we go back and just give a block grant of twenty-five million dollars to the prison system. But yet and still, we -- we all said we want to have some hands-on and some kind of control of -- of what goes on in that -- in that system, and we -- or, you, at this particular time, have put forth a proposal to give him twenty-five million dollars' pocket money. Can you please elaborate?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

If -- if you want to take a look at how you'd manage a department by the General Assembly, I would ask Members to take a look at the Department of Corrections over the last four months. And if we think that's management, then -- then I guess I wouldn't want you guys running my recliner store. I would argue that that twenty-five-million-dollar block grant is a -- a pressure vent for a department that we've probably overcut, that we've overstressed, that we have forced political decisions onto, when it would be in the best interests of the employees of that Department, of the State of Illinois, of the taxpayers and of the -- the -- the people who are incarcerated there to have that made in a cooler, quieter moment, after the politics of the General Assembly, particularly in a redistricting year, was out of town. Is it a perfect solution to put a lump sum of twenty-five million dollars for the Department of Corrections to manage itself? It's not a perfect solution. In a perfect solution, we wouldn't have been involved in the first place. But, again, I would argue, reasonable minds can differ. It -- it's a way to give them some flexibility. Maybe it's a way to send a message to the House: Let's stop with amendments about your facility or my facility or what's in my district or what's in your district; let's get back to the mission we've got of responsibly crafting a budget and asking the people that we hire to -- to manage it. So, you know, you -- you can certainly criticize it because it doesn't tell them how to spend it, but, in fact, I think that's part of its strength.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Yes. And I -- yes. Senator Rauschenberger, seemingly, we can

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

use that argument when we talk about every agency, because the people who've been coming in my offices have been saying that they need more money as well, and they say that we've overcut, that we've overreduced, that now that they cannot continue the programs that we have invested in over the past three years, that by not investing at this point in time means that you just threw away all of those millions of dollars that we invested into their programs. So, why don't we just block grant education, and why don't we just block grant higher education? Why don't we just block grant and -- and go on down the line? So, I just don't see that this is the right way to do it at this particular time. And if he can comment, if he would.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR TROTTER:

If not, then I...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Senator Trotter, I don't think you're wrong. I -- I think we got to get this bill over there and get our guys in the House going, see what they do. Let's see if we can make it better when it gets back here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Trotter.

SENATOR TROTTER:

Again, I'm not going to belabor this. I believe you guys must have the vote. You know, in committee, we had an amendment as well, and we thought it was a reasonable one because we have reasonable minds on this side of the aisle, 'cause we feel that, one, that we should not take away dollars from those individuals who are -- who are working on their education, take away those MAP

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

dollars and say now that we're not going to help you become a good citizen, a viable citizen, a taxpayer in this State. We felt that you should not, one, penalize our -- our providers and take the dollars away from Medicaid. We felt that should have been one-hundred-percent restored so we can pay for those people who need health care, who can't care for themselves. And -- and for education, we also feel that many dollars and -- and from K to 12, should have been there. We're for putting more dollars into the foundation level. So, we had an amendment, but it was not allowed to be heard on this Floor, and because of that, because our minds over here and our voices were not able to be heard in this process, I would ask everyone on this side to vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Further discussion? Senator del Valle.

SENATOR DEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise in support of Senator Trotter's request for a No vote on this budget. Senator Rauschenberger, you said that you want to send a bipartisan document over to the House and that this is the first step, you hope, in a delicate process, to engage our colleagues in the House; yet, the Appropriations Committee did not afford us an opportunity, on this side of the aisle - and we are your colleagues - you did not afford us an opportunity to present an amendment. Many of us were pleased that the Governor made a second proposal, and there were improvements in that proposal. But with this amendment, Amendment No. 2, what you have done in shifting dollars around, is that you have cut programs on top of cuts that were already made in the Governor's budget. And so, you made a budget that we were willing to look at and kick around and willing to work with you on, you made that budget worse. And so I don't see how you could expect anyone on this side of the aisle to support you and to send over a bipartisan budget. All we can do

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

is hope that the House will improve this budget and send back to us something that we can vote on. Because, certainly, we want to complete this process, but there are deep cuts in this program. There are policy decisions that you're making that, for example, are contradictory. This whole business of twenty-five-million-dollar lump sum amount for Department of Corrections, after we told them that they cannot privatize - and I think you voted to send a policy statement to DOC - and now we're saying, "Well, here, take twenty-five million dollars and do what you want with it," but as you said, there are concerns about proposals to close different facilities. And so, we -- we're contradicting ourselves here. We're sending mixed messages with some of these actions in Senate Amendment No. 2. So I suggest that we vote No on this side of the aisle and that we wait for a better budget to come over so that we can get this taken care of.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. I was going to ask Senator Rauschenberger about that twenty-five million dollars for the prisons, but he explained it and the explanation is -- is really something to behold. We're going to give twenty-five million dollars in a lump sum to Corrections so the managers can manage. Well, one of the things that managers forgot to tell us was that there was a need to close a prison. I asked Director Snyder, when he was before the committee, when he first notified the Legislature, and he said, "Well, I think it was in November of last year. I told the Appropriations Committee." But he couldn't point to any documentation. He couldn't point to any direct notification to us here in the Legislature. In fact, it came as quite a surprise that they were moving to cut a prison, not just to balance the budget, because there were not enough prisoners.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

We don't have enough prisoners to fill all of our prisons. Well, that's kind of odd because every year for the last nineteen years that I've been here, we've had a prison sweepstakes. Many of you in your own districts have been involved in those and know how the Department of Corrections gins up the -- the mill, gets everybody enthusiastic. They've got so many charts that they prove that we need the prison. They've got all of us convinced. They didn't have one single chart to prove they needed to close a prison here. They didn't have one single document to show that we need to close a prison. They don't have the documentation to show we need to close a prison. We've got forty-five hundred people in Cook County in county jail that could be transferred to a State prison. And if they do, guess what? There won't be any need to close a prison, and there's nothing stopping Cook County except for the lack of space, from transferring those people to the State prison. You know, when we talk about letting them manage, you assume that they're going to plan. Well, let's assume they did plan on closing a prison, for a minute. Let's assume that they looked throughout the State of Illinois, decided here's one old prison we're going to close. We don't need it. It's obsolete. Let's close it. And let's say that that was their decision-making process. And you know what they decided? They decided to close the Vienna prison. We're here tonight. We're not closing the Vienna prison. What happened to those managers that you're giving twenty-five million dollars to to manage? They had the opportunity and look what happened. They didn't. They didn't manage. So, what happens? The Governor gave Vienna three months to -- to get organized and they did a great job. They restored Vienna, and then they gave the Sheridan prison less than twenty-four hours to notice -- to be notified that they're closing that prison. Twenty-four hours. Obviously, there was no intention to give them an opportunity to have the same benefit that the Vienna prison workers and

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

communities had. You know, we don't have much experience in closing prisons. We just found out that we needed to close a budget hole, so this was a -- this was a thing that we could do and save some money. It seems to me that -- that as we're closing a prison, it's ironic that we're closing a prison with the understanding that six months later, we're going to open one. We're going to open up the Thomson prison. So, is there really a need to close one to open another one, or is it just a shell game that we're going through by the Governor, which is what it seems to be? The Department of Corrections is run by the Governor, not by the Director of the Department of Corrections. That was made clear in the Appropriations Committee today and yesterday. Donnie Snyder said he reports to three people. There's a chain of command. He's fourth in command, with the Governor at the head. That's where the decisions are made. The Director doesn't make these decisions on closings. He's told what to do. And then giving 'em twenty-five million dollars to manage, when they don't manage, doesn't make sense. Now, to me, it's -- it's obvious that we're going to have a lot of budget cuts, but when you close something like a prison and jeopardize individuals because we have prisoners that are in facilities like in Cook County that are going to be transferred to a State facility and we're not going to have enough space for them to be transferred to the State, it's irresponsible on the part of the State. It is going to end up that we'll probably be in a federal court on this one for overcrowding in State prison, and you may even end up on a different lawsuit on the -- on the State level. Unfortunately, that's what the Department of Corrections has come down to, is management by lawsuit. The privatization, the closing of -- of various prisons - we're going to have more lawsuits. This isn't management. This is chaos. And so now we're shoveling twenty-five million more dollars there, so we'll have twenty-five million more

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

dollars of chaos. I think this budget is terrible. I think that's a good example of why we shouldn't have lump-sum budgeting. I think it's a good example of why we should have had hearings as to the fact that we're going to close a prison, so everybody knew about it. Nobody had any input on what are the criteria to close a prison. This prison's only forty years old. It's -- it's the third prison in the Chicagoland area to be closed after the -- the -- the Joliet prison, the IYC and now the one in Sheridan. These are all around Chicago. Why are we picking on that area? Is there some great reason for that? Nobody has explained the reason why you want to close prisons close to Chicago. Nobody has explained that. The explanations don't make sense about prison families moving to town. That's -- that's not true. None have moved to the Sheridan area, and they have over fifteen hundred prisoners there. So I think this is a good bill to vote No on. Instead of sending a message to the House, let's send a message to the Department of Corrections, let's send a message to the Governor and vote No on this budget. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Further discussion? Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. A lot of powerful points have already been made. I'm just going to try to amplify a couple. You know, whenever I listen to Senator Rauschenberger, I'm -- I'm overwhelmed with the -- the -- the reasonableness of his presentation. It's hard to resist a guy who -- who embraces us in a bipartisan fashion, says reasonable minds can agree, then, you know, bad mouths the House, something that's always popular on both sides of the aisle in -- in this Chamber. So -- so, you know, I -- I feel a certain kinship when I listen to Senator Rauschenberger. Fortunately, my mind sometimes will override my heart and I actually start looking at the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

specifics, and then I'm troubled. And let me -- let me make a -- an initial point, however. I think that there are some of the changes that have been proposed in this amendment that I would actually agree with, and let me give you one specific example. The Governor had proposed in his initial budget to cut early childhood education and, yet, start a new program of universal preschool. And I think that puzzled a lot of us. If, in fact, we all believe that early childhood makes a lot of sense and that we want to prepare our children as well as possible before we send them to school, why we would take money away from a program that appears to already be working to start a new program probably doesn't make much sense. And so that's an example of something in here that I actually could have supported. The problem is, is that this is not something that was prepared, as I understand it, in consultation with Senator Trotter in a bipartisan fashion. The Members of the Appropriation Committee on this side of the aisle did not have an opportunity to say, "You know, that is a good idea. On the other hand, this other stuff is a bad idea." This is a Republican Senate proposal, not a bipartisan proposal. All right? And -- and so, I just want to be clear that when this gets sent over, this is the gloss, the take that the Senate Republicans have placed on the Governor's budget. If the vote right now was on the Governor's proposal, I suspect that we might see some different alignments. Because I will give the Governor credit, I think he actually tried to come up with a reasonable framework where we could have made some tinkering on this side and on that side but basically send something over that would have been a bipartisan, unified Senate budget and would have forced the House to look responsibly at what was going on. I do have two specific areas that I think make this amendment problematic. Both of them have already been mentioned, but I want to amplify the problem. The first is on the Chicago Teachers' pension fund. This has been

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

a debate that has come up consistently since I've been in the Senate. I -- I want to just make clear, more for the public than for that side of the aisle because I know that everybody's convinced that somehow Chicago is trying to steal money on this, the fact of the matter is, irrespective of the levels that the pension is being funded right now, as I understand it, under the Governor's proposal, Downstate will receive - and when I -- we say downstate, everything outside of Chicago, so geographically not downstate - just districts outside of Chicago will receive eight hundred and sixty-seven million dollars this year in State subsidies for their pension system. That doesn't simply hold constant what they're receiving. That actually represents a hundred-and-ten-million-dollar increase. Senator Rauschenberger, at any point, you're free to dispute these figures. That's my understanding. They are getting an extra hundred and ten million dollars for their pension system. Under the Governor's budget, Chicago would have received a flat appropriation, the same sixty-five million that they have been receiving over the last several years. They wouldn't be getting an increase, which every other district in the State is receiving. They just wanted to be held constant. Still -- so, even under the Governor's budget, this was not a particularly good deal for the Chicago pension system, but we might have had an argument saying, "Okay, you know what? Chicago's pension system is a little bit better funded, so at least they shouldn't get an increase this year. These other systems still have some problems. We still need to do something." But that's not what that side of the aisle decided to do. They've decided not only will we give an increase to the other side, but we'll also cut twenty-five million dollars out of what the Chicago pension system's already been receiving. Now, it's hard for me to understand how you can posture that as fairness for the Chicago school system or for Chicago taxpayers. That -- that is not sort

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

of a reasonable difference. That seems to me a deliberate, intentional effort on that side of the aisle to say, "We don't care about Chicago," which doesn't seem to me a very good way of putting together what we are purporting to present - a united-front, bipartisan budget - to the other side. That's point number one. Point number two, on the prison system. I simply do not understand how it is that when, Senator Rauschenberger, you just said a few minutes ago on the Floor that this has been management by disaster, or some sort of paraphrase like that, that providing a lump-sum payment of twenty-five million dollars that we have no idea how it's going to be spent, particularly you saying that with a straight face, when you are consistently arguing on not giving these agencies blank checks like this, is -- is difficult to believe. One of the -- the problems that I have in providing that twenty-five million is the fact that it seems to me that it comes out of programs like Career Academies, like Teen REACH, like the juvenile detention center, or like the alleviation of the Cook County caseload on the Appellate defenders that might have reduced the number of inmates. That may be a -- philosophical difference on that side of the aisle and this side of the aisle, and I recognize there may be a philosophical difference there. But I'd be a lot more comfortable if you were actually pointing to the twenty-five million dollars that was needed in the Department of Corrections that we're restoring, as opposed to somebody saying, "You know, we think we should throw another twenty-five million dollars in the Department of Correction. We're not sure how it's going to be used. We're not sure if they need it. We're not sure if they've done sufficient management changes, or achieved sufficient efficiencies to ensure that the money that they're already receiving without this twenty-five million is well spent. We don't care about that stuff. We're going to give 'em twenty-five million." It's hard

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

for me to imagine how that's responsible budget making. And let me just make one last, final point. The notion that somehow this is more responsible from the Governor -- than the Governor's budget, or that that side of the aisle has identified a few tweaks that needed to be made because there was a little bit of -- of fat or -- or some -- some add-ons that the Governor had put in that didn't make too much sense, seems to be belied by a couple of additions that I understand is -- are being made by your side of the aisle. Again, you can correct me at any point if I'm wrong. As I understand it, for example, your budget increases the DCCA Main Street program by a million dollars. Now, I -- I have no doubt that that's a nice program. I think we all want to see nice Main Streets, and I'm sure that for the local communities that receive some of these grants for beautification or these other projects, it's probably a useful economic development tool. It's hard for me to argue that that million dollars that is going additionally to the DCCA Main Street program is more vital, potentially, than some of the money that might be going to Teen REACH or might be going to relieve Cook County caseloads, a system that's already overburdened. And as a consequence of that, I am going to be compelled to vote No, but I want to emphasize that had the Governor's budget been presented as is, or had you undertaken the negotiations with Senator Trotter that would have been called for in a bipartisan fashion, I think we, in fact, could have sent something over that was bipartisan. This is not it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Radogno.

SENATOR RADOGNO:

Thank you, Mr. President. First of all, in response to some of the comments from the other side of the aisle, I have to ask why you didn't file an amendment. You know, we all saw this at 7 or 7:30 -- excuse me.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

I beg your pardon, Senator.

SENATOR RADOGNO:

Sometime this morning. That was filed at 7 or 7:30 tonight. We all saw the Governor's proposal at the same time. We were anticipating an amendment, and, frankly, were surprised there wasn't one presented this morning. So I have to ask, knowing that you all know what the time line is, why wasn't it presented? But as many people have pointed out, this isn't a perfect product. I am supportive of this amendment; however, I think we can keep this process moving and still make some changes that need to be made to this program and still have it done by Friday. Specifically, I'm concerned because I've heard from a number of interest groups that have generally been very, very supportive of our process, helped us try to reach some understandings and move the process forward, who still have a lot of concern about one of the items in this budget, which I want to red flag, and that is the proposal -- although it's not specific in the budget, but is, in fact, assumed in the numbers, and that is Public Aid's decision to limit brand-name drugs to four per month. There's still a lot of concern about that. It's relatively experimental. It's been undertaken by only one state thus far, and there have been a lot of problems, particularly with complex and -- medical conditions, with AIDS and mental illness, where there are not a lot of generic drugs. So I would ask for the support of this Body to either through the budget implementation legislation or through directives to the Department, that we go very carefully and slowly before we implement that. I don't think that the savings that are anticipated will, in fact, be realized, and the cost will be very high in terms of what we do to the people that we need to take care of. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

Further discussion? Senator Ronen.

SENATOR RONEN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I -- let me just respond to the previous speaker. First of all, in the issue of an amendment, as -- as you well know procedures, we could not file an amendment until your amendment was filed so we could track with it. That's -- that's a procedural issue. And there's never been a case where any of our amendments have been approved. So, the -- the expectation. So I think that's just really a red herring. And I would also say to the previous speaker that she makes wonderful points about the problems in the -- in this proposal and I would say that's a -- another good reason to vote No on this proposal and another reason that points to the fact that when these changes were made, they weren't made with -- with people in mind, with the needs of -- of citizens of this State, and they really weren't made in a fiscally sound manner. And I think -- I'm really getting tired of being on this side of the aisle and hearing from that side of the aisle how -- how we are not fiscally prudent, and you are always making those -- those decisions for us. And I think this amendment clearly shows where -- where the reality is. The Governor, I think, presented what was a good compromise budget last night. It wasn't perfect, but it was something that we all could probably support and in a bipartisan way, as you say you wish to -- to be, send it over to the House. But instead you had to be tinkering around to show really where your priorities are, and -- and what you showed us very clearly is if a program is operating well, Teen REACH, let's not give it any more money. That -- you know, we want to stop that. But if a program is mismanaged, is overstressed, like the Department of Corrections, let's give them twenty-five million dollars as -- as a -- as a bonus because they're so mismanaged. I would say to you, that is not the way to do business. It is not

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

the way to prepare a budget. It's not the way to express our -- our priorities. A budget is about priorities. It's about what we stand for. And I think it's clear in this document tonight that what the Republicans in Amendment 2 are standing for, they're standing up for the overstressed bureaucrats. But what about the overstressed and stressed-out families in our neighborhoods? That should be the priority. We should be funding things that work, like Teen REACH and some of the other programs that you so callously cut. So I -- I just want to associate myself with my four other colleagues on this side of the aisle and -- and suggest that we all vote No on this document, which has misplaced priorities and is fiscally irresponsible.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Further discussion? Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Last night when the Governor issued his statements with regard to this new budget, one of the things that certainly I disagreed with had to do with the privatization and, you know, I -- basically because I think it's something that doesn't work -- doesn't work very well and I -- I think the -- I really believe that the savings is overstated. I -- I guess I would also like to ask a question of -- of Senator Rauschenberger.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Luechtefeld.

SENATOR LUECHTEFELD:

You know, there are lawsuits against the privatization. There are also -- this house and also the House of Representatives has voted to -- to stop the privatization issue. Is this twenty-five million, which I think is -- is what they listed as what privatization would cost, I take it that that can be used for -- if -- if the lawsuits, let's say, went out and if our choice here

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

in this Senate and the House, as far as privatization, wins out, that it could be used for that. Is that right?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Yes. In fact, Senator, if we were to pass the much extolled Governor's budget, as we certainly heard a lot about from that side of the aisle, and then if the Governor were to either sign or he were to veto and we were to override the privatization, there wouldn't be sufficient funds in the budget to manage the number of facilities the budget calls for. In part, the reason to put a lump sum is, is to deal with the fundamental question of the -- you know, the unanswered question of whether privatization's going to continue to be a problem or not. So that's precisely one of the main reasons to have lump-sum flexibility in this budget, as long as we're going to have lawsuits and -- and -- and legislative bills that are -- are affecting the management structure. So I'm glad you asked that question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Further discussions? Senator Molaro.

SENATOR MOLARO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just would be remiss if we didn't talk about, again, the Chicago Teachers' pension fund. I do -- I certainly look at this and I do appreciate the forty million that you gave towards the -- the health insurance, because that was a major problem. But, as been pointed out and -- and the argument's always been, there's almost nine hundred million. Nine hundred million dollars is in this budget that we give the Downstate Teachers' retirement system. If you look at the sheet that you passed out, see what Chicago gets. Chicago Teachers' pension fund, zero. The Governor said give sixty-five million. We're now cutting that. We give zero. So we give nine hundred and seventy

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

million to the Downstate Teachers, and we give nothing to Chicago Teachers' retirement system. And the argument is because the Chicago Teachers' pension fund is fairly well funded and the Downstate Teachers' pension fund is not that well funded. Well, I just want to make sure that we know and point out that the funding level is higher, not because the State -- is giving their fair share, it's higher because the Chicago Teachers -- the Chicago Teachers' pension fund is the only district that has a property tax for the pension fund. We tax our people. We put a property tax in. So what happens is, we pay for it to help the State. So instead of going to the State and saying that we're only at sixty-percent funded just like downstate is so give us nine hundred and seventy million dollars, we tax our people. We put a property tax in. So, when the Governor comes to us and gives us a lousy sixty-five million dollars, which is woefully short of what they should give, not only don't we get the sixty-five million, we put it to zero. And again we say it's because we're well funded. We are well funded because we have a property tax. This has been debated -- Senator Philip, we've been debating this for -- for ten, twelve, twenty years. I mean, whether twenty -- whether it should be mandated twenty percent, whether it should be a goal and all this other stuff. I just feel that it's a little rough to come in here and say we are now going to take the sixty-five of the Governor and make it zero. So I just wanted to point out and everybody know that we do tax our citizens for the Chicago Teachers' pension fund.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Further discussion? Senator Lauzen.

SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of this step in the budget process, with a quick observation regarding the Department of Corrections. For the State employees and the people

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

of Sheridan and Valley View, Senate Republicans have offered flexibility and the hope for a solution in the form of twenty-five million dollars in a block grant. Opponents to this proposal offer criticism. Proponents offer cash in the budget. Which would you rather have at this stage in the process if you were an employee or a citizen of Sheridan or near Valley View? Would you rather have criticism or would you rather have a hope for cash in the budget? As I listened to a couple of the opponents argue against the Correction block grant, I have to wonder if they would have been happier if there was no hope and no cash in the budget, if there was no funding put in this budget to possibly protect the jobs at Sheridan and Valley View.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Further discussion? Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you very much. If the Senator will yield for a question, Senator Rauschenberger.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Senator Rauschenberger, very, very brief. You just responded to Senator Luechtefeld about the twenty-five million dollars with respect to the bulk money in the Corrections budget that conceivably could be used for privatization. I -- what -- what's that number on privatization, if -- if it -- if we need it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

The estimate -- the estimates from the Department of Corrections have varied at -- at different times from thirteen to eighteen to twenty-five million. I think it depends on whether they're talking about the privatization of only food service or

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

the privatization of the commissary process, as well. So, the generally accepted upper-end reach of that number is twenty-five million. What it actually is, you know, is -- is, you know, a -- a series of speculations. But what the Governor's budget purports to do is -- he argues that he's taking that savings out of the system. So, by having a flexible block grant, it's not a perfect solution, but that was our intent.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

What would be the restoration of the three boot camps that -- what would that number be if they were reinserted and -- and used out of the twenty-five million?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Between thirteen and fifteen million, depending upon which boot camps or which work camps.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Okay. There's twenty million for privatization, seventeen million for the boot camps, twenty-nine million for Sheridan. I think we're a little short. Also, I noticed yesterday -- we promised it all three times. Yesterday in the Governor's Message, he talked about decoupling two hundred and forty million on the revenue enhancements. Of course, that's -- that's the -- the delay in the -- in the economic stimulus package passed by Congress. Increasing the cigarette tax, he's talking about two hundred and eighty-five million; the transfer tax, a hundred and twenty million; the increase in the gaming tax, a hundred and eighty-five million; the real estate tax transfer, fifteen

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

million; transfer of surplus from other funds, a hundred and fifty million; and the State retaining the photo-processing portion of the sales tax, twenty-five million. Yet, I look at the Governor's appropriation amendment, the analysis that I have, for elementary and secondary education for this year, and I notice that the Governor's original budget request versus where we are now with elementary and secondary education is basically the same. So we're going to be raising all these taxes - and I don't know what they amount up to - and elementary and secondary education remains the same. Doesn't seem to me that elementary and secondary education was treated as fairly as it should have been. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Further discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. President. I've got several prisons in my area and other State facilities. And a lot of these people have come to me in the last several months, during all this debate, about how can we help preserve these positions and these jobs for the people that -- that they -- that they serve with, they live with. Their -- their family, their friends in the same communities, how can we preserve this? And some people have said, "You know what? I'm willing to do the furlough day. I'm willing to do a wage freeze. I'm willing to do whatever it takes to make sure that the individual who serves next to me, his job is preserved." I guess my question to you, Senator Rauschenberger, if you would yield, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

I guess my question to you is, during all this debate, what has the -- I guess AFSCME, in this particular case - although I'm

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

not sure they totally represent the views of the people that they represent; I really don't know that they really, truly do - what has been their attitude about the possibility of a furlough day being made available, take a day off, make that money available, like I think many of us here in the Senate have done and I think people throughout State government have done already, and -- and the possibility of a -- wage freeze? And I think the Governor last night mentioned that most everyone in State government had accepted a wage freeze. What has been the attitude to this point and the cooperation of that particular State employees' group?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

The -- the State's largest State employee group, AFSCME, has not agreed to any changes or concessions in their contract, in their -- their group medical plan, in their wages, in furlough days. The only thing that I think they agreed to was, I guess, the -- the bill which -- which allows a husband and wife not to both join the -- the -- the group health insurance program at the same time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

If a -- if a furlough day was granted, what would be the savings?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

It's the -- the value -- the calculated value is eight million dollars a day for furlough days.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Watson.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

SENATOR WATSON:

If there -- thank you. If there was a freeze on the wages, what would that generate in savings?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

The value of a statewide wage freeze is about a hundred million. If you took just the AFSCME employees, it's a value of about seventy million. Most of the rest of State government's already subject to it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Is that a one-time savings or that's something we could say would be long-term?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

That would be a permanent savings, provided that the next contract was based on that concession.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

What has to happen in order for that savings to take place?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

To the best of my knowledge, the leadership of the AFSCME union would have to agree to enter into negotiations with the Executive Branch that they looked upon favorably enough to negotiate their contract with about twenty short months ago.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

And I'm sorry, one more time. What would be the savings if they took a wage freeze like we have done, and the -- all the elected officials have done, all the merit comp, everybody, I think, except for AFSCME and the Fraternal Order of -- of Police, if I recall right what the Governor said last night? What would be the savings?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

A little more than seventy million dollars for the AFSCME union alone.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

In your opinion, would that help solve some of the budget problems we're facing here today?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Could you be more specific? I mean, could we keep some of the facilities that we're talking about closing? Could we keep those open if, in fact, the largest collective bargaining unit, AFSCME, in this State, would agree to at least open the contract and talk about the possibility of freezing those wages?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

The value of that would open up seven Valley Views. It would open up, I think, three Thomsons. It would probably be enough to open two and a half Sheridan prisons. It would be enough to -- to perhaps avoid any closing in the Department of Corrections. In addition to that, there was a suggestion that State employees that did not move into the managed care system, if we -- if we simply took the quality care portion and adjusted the premiums and increased copays - not for anyone in the managed care system, just for those who elected in the next election period to stay in -- in the quality care program - that was an additional thirty-four million dollars. Again though, that would have required AFSCME to trust the people they negotiated with twenty months ago long enough to open up their contract and discuss it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, I would have to believe that any conversation that I have, and I would believe that if you'd ask that gentleman right there, right there in the President's Gallery, what he would do, what he would do if given the option, that would he give up a furlough day, would he give up his wage increase for one year to save a position for his fellow man or woman, I think - I know - the vast majority of the people out there in this system would say, "Absolutely, I would do that." 'Cause that's what they've told me, and I'm sure that's what they've told you. And not -- for -- for the life of me, I don't understand why they have not taken the first step to open up the contract, but -- and we're willing and I'd be willing to sit down and make sure we limit that contract negotiation to certain parameters. That seems to be the concern they have. Why not open it up? 3.6 percent or 3.7 percent is the -- is the wage increase we're talking about. It's

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

not necessarily a lot of money. Sure it may be to some people, but it's not a lot of money when you're talking about saving a job of the guy or lady next to you who's going to go out the door on being laid off. And I don't think that's anything unreasonable that we're asking at this point, especially when we're talking about seventy million dollars. Seventy million dollars that could go into saving Sheridan and saving the work camps and saving the -- the mental health facilities. This is not a lot we're asking. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Further discussion? Senator Emil Jones.

SENATOR E. JONES:

Pretty soon, majority. No, listening to the debate on this critical issue and listening to the Appropriation Chairman, it make me wonder some time whether we are reading the same documents or are we in the same room. You know, a bad situation is a bad situation, I don't care how -- how you paint it. We all recognize that we do have a serious revenue problem, not only in the State of Illinois, but across this nation. We looked at what other states have done in similar situations that we find ourselves in and how are they going to resolve that problem. One thing the Members on this side of the aisle did not want to do, they did not want the budget balanced on the back of schoolchildren across the State of Illinois, nor do we want the budget balanced on the back of the needy and the poor and the elderly. And in sitting, listening to the debate, we talk about how -- we want to be frugal, we want to take the waste out of -- out of the -- out of government. And listening to the -- the Appropriation Chairman consistently say we should line item every university's budget, quit giving them lump sum at a time when we are so short, when we don't have the revenue, and here you give the Department of Corrections twenty-five million dollars stick in

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

that box and do anything they want to do. That's not being consistent. That's not being consistent. They can take those -- that twenty-five million dollars, hire a few more deputy directors, do anything they want. And you talk about being responsible. You talk about having input. We recognize we have a serious problem. And I heard you mention in debate about doing some short-term borrowing. At the same time, I sat in those rooms downstairs in the Governor -- Governor's Office, and I listened to all the proposals. This side came up with a brilliant idea to deal with it. Securitize those tobacco proceeds, not all of it, but enough so that every school district in the State of Illinois would have a proper funding for their education. You shot that down. "Oh, that's borrowing. That's a Band-Aid approach." Well, we are bleeding. And this -- and this proposal does not help the situation. You can paint it, you can put a smile on its face and you can pretend. The Governor's budget, as introduced a second time around, has some good features. But it's a hundred and forty million dollars in State aid to education to the school districts around -- around the State of Illinois. One hundred and forty-one million dollars. Perhaps you could have taken that twenty-five million dollars and gave it to some school districts where they would have enough money where they would not have to cut programs for the children, at the same time they may not have to have raised their property tax in order to meet the -- the necessary funding for education in those school districts. You didn't think about that. But, actually, I -- I really don't believe you even care about it. So, when you paint this picture, when you paint this beautiful picture of what you're doing on that side of the aisle in what you call bipartisanship, when you're talking about being fiscal responsible, when you talk about making sure that dollars are accounted for, but you reached out and grabbed twenty-five million dollars, said, "Director, do what you think is

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

best." If it were -- was for privatization, then how come you didn't line item in the budget? You're going against your own statements that you made when you indicated you think all budgets should be line itemed. If that's waste in government, I don't know what you want to call it. That's waste. So, again, we tried to resolve that problem on this side of the aisle. Many states have done just what we recommended. Your side of the aisle say it's a Band-Aid, it's borrowing. But you -- you will support borrowing. You indicated it in your opening remarks. Use the tobacco dollars, take a portion of it, securitize those funds, as you, the sponsor, stands here, and you got the bill sitting right in the Rules Committee to do the very thing that we recommended. Why should we hurt people? Why should we hurt the needy? Why should we hurt -- hurt the schoolchildren across the State of Illinois? That's what this budget does. There are some good features in it, yes. But there are many, many bad features that overshadow the entire process. And don't talk about bipartisanship. And don't talk about how come you offer amendment. Don't talk about it when you have the majority and you do not even allow or even attempt to have an amendment heard. Shame on you. Shame on you. We shall not forget.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I think most of us realize that we do have a tremendous budget problem. It all depends on who you talk to, how much it is. I think most of us agree it's about a billion three. Now, how do we get that? How do we get there? The last year that we had more revenue than the previous year was 1955. That's forty-seven years we've been on a honeymoon. And we have -- and I wasn't even here forty-seven years ago. And we have added every year to this

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

budget. We now have a bigger budget than we've ever had in the history of the State of Illinois. And so what -- what are you going to do? Is anybody around here to think that you can cut a billion three? Is there anybody around here that's willing to cut a billion three? You certainly, the other side of the aisle, are not very big cutters. So what -- what did we decide to do? Let's look at it. Try to be objective about this. If we've got a billion three, cut it in half. Cut six hundred and fifty million dollars, which is not easy to do. We've never cut that much in the history of the State of Illinois. If we cut six hundred and fifty million dollars, it will be a record. And try to find some revenues enhancements. Six hundred and fifty million dollars. And what do we pick on? Cigarettes, riverboats, those sin taxes. And if we have some funds that have some year-end balances we could borrow, do it. I think, quite frankly, it's the most reasonable thing I've seen around here in a long, long time. It's a compromise. It's not perfect. If you can't accept that, give me a better answer. There is no better answer, because nobody wants to cut, nobody wants to hurt anybody. And I understand that. Neither do we. But nobody wants a statewide income tax increase or sales tax. That's what my telephone says. That's what my mail says. That's what my E-mail says. So why don't we once in a while -- you know what? The Governor was right on the money last night. Once in a while we ought to stand up to the plate and do what's right. Now is the time. There should be -- there should be 55, 57 green votes up there. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Rauschenberger, to close.

SENATOR RAUSCHENBERGER:

I'm tempted to let the Senate President's closing stand, but let me just point out a couple of things. Let me just point out a couple of things. You can't base the State budget on one sheet of

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

paper and fuzzy math. The State of Wisconsin tried to use securitization to buy their way out of their budget crisis and just had their bonds downgraded. The State of Illinois -- the State of Wisconsin will, for the next five years, pay higher interest rates at least, while it digs out of a crisis created because they couldn't make hard decisions. Now, I heard a lot of talk about that fully funded Chicago pension system and that horrible Downstate pension system that's only sixty-eight- or seventy-percent funded. Let's talk just a -- a quick minute about history. Let's talk about who chaired the Pension Committee during the eighties when we failed to fund our obligation to the Downstate pension system. Let's remember -- let's remember how that pension system didn't get funded. Let's pay attention to the fact that we had to wait till 1994, when -- when Republicans controlled both Chambers, for the first time to put a continuing appropriation to begin to fund that pension system. The reason the pension system payment grows to the Downstate pension so much every single year is we had to put it on a thirty-year mortgage to pay back what wasn't put in in the late seventies and all during the decade of the eighties, when guess who was in charge of the General Assembly, both Chambers. So let's just remember why we're paying for past sins: Because we borrowed and spent, because we wouldn't make hard decisions. That's why the pension -- that's why the pension systems are eating up the State Board of Education budget. And I'm glad the Chicago Teachers' pension system is fully funded. That's why we don't think you need to put pension funding there. We agree, if they've got concerns, we have a forty-million-dollar grant to their health care system. And thank the heavens that I don't live in Chicago and run a hospital that one of you represent. There was not one word about the disproportionate-share hospitals that serve hundreds of thousands of people in your districts. Not one bit of concern about the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

rates those hospitals get paid, or about some of the finest academical -- academic medical -- medical hospitals in the world that -- that practice in Chicago that -- that are underfunded by this Medicaid program that we're trying to drive the funding up on. Not one word of concern. But did Cook County get its boot camp money? Did Cook County get its Audy Home money? Did the Chicago Teachers' pension system get their sixty-five million dollars' worth of juice? I know where your priorities are. And you're right, I was wrong, but I'm not wrong about this budget. I was wrong about talking about bipartisanship in here tonight. I'm embarrassed by the debate in this Chamber tonight. We're talking about a hundred thirty million dollars' worth of adjustments to the budget that your appropriators know they have heard about for weeks. We are the majority over here. We prepared an amendment according to the rules of this Body. We filed that amendment in due time. We posted it for an hour, and we went to committee hearing. Certainly, we had the votes. I have worked for over twelve weeks to build consensus with the majority on this side of the aisle. Every one of these Members has sat through briefing. They know what our problems are. And it's a shame that's not true across the aisle. But let's not let the debate in here degenerate into trying to pretend that there's surprises in here or that this is stick-me-in-the-eye. This is a tough budget, but it's time for us to quit with the rhetoric and do the hard stuff. This budget -- this budget, as tough as it is, with the closures the Governor's proposed, has a thousand more prison beds in it than the budget before. A thousand more beds. Don't tell me this is lack of capacity in the prison system. And you're right, Donne Trotter doesn't -- Donnie Snyder does not run the Department of Corrections. Henry Bayer does, and a St. Clair County judge. And why has that happened? Because we've let politics into managing the correctional system. And we ought to be ashamed of ourselves

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

that we do news releases and lawsuits and run down and do appearances and that we've got gubernatorial candidates that think the way you run for Governor is to -- to run around and prepare and argue to open prisons. We should let them run the place. For heaven sakes, we got responsibilities we're not facing up into here. And -- and before -- and before you guys extol any more virtuously about the Governor's wonderful budget, and how if we only hadn't of messed it up with our amendment, let's own up to the truth. You filed an amendment to that budget that would have added five hundred million dollars of additional spending without any visible source of support. Kind of the -- the Playtex Living Bra of budget amendments. So don't stand up here, with the Executive Branch in -- in the gallery, and tell them you supported their budget. You did, like blazes. That amendment was filed after we recessed the committee at the request of the Minority Spokesman so you could go to caucus. Don't tell me it's a planful amendment that said that you guys wanted to -- to change the -- the direction of State government. I mean, let's get over this whole thing. Let's pass this budget out of here, get the House process going, and -- and quit soapboxing. Thank God that, you know, maybe the cameras won't be here tomorrow and we can return to honest rhetoric.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

The question is, shall Senate Bill 2390 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 30 Ayes, 26 Nays, and 2 voting Present. And Senate Bill 2390, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Secretary, have there been any motions filed?

SECRETARY HARRY:

STATE OF ILLINOIS
92ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY
REGULAR SESSION
SENATE TRANSCRIPT

104th Legislative Day

May 28, 2002

Yes, Mr. President. Senator Trotter has filed a motion with respect to Senate Bill 2390.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Mr. Secretary, the Chair requests that these -- this -- this motion be printed on the Calendar. So ordered. Is there any further business to come before the Senate? If not, Senator Geo-Karis moves the Senate stand adjourned until the hour of noon, Wednesday, May 29, 2002.