86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

- Speaker Greiman: "The hour of 10:00 having arrived, the House will be in Session. Members will be in their seats. The Chaplain for today will be Father Kevin Laughery, Assistant Pastor, Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception of Springfield. Father is a guest of Representative Michael Curran. Will the guests in the gallery please rise and join us in the invocation? Father."
- Pather laughery: "God of the universe, You call Your people to work not primarily for their own self-interests, but for the interests of the whole human family. Lift up our desires and our vision beyond selfish concerns and even beyond the interests of our state. Give us an ever deeper concern for the needs of all people in distress throughout the world, for although we do not often see them, they are still our brothers and sisters. Help us find within ourselves the generosity to share our resources, our insights and our lives, for we have received our lives from You as a gift, and further giving glorifies You all the more. We make this prayer in faith. Amen."
- Speaker Greiman: "Representative Vinson will lead us in the Pledge to the Flag today."
- Vinson et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United

 States of America and to the Republic for which it stands,

 one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice
 for all."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. We'll just stand at ease for awhile.

 Some of the Members seem to be just filing in. We'll take our Attendance Roll Call a little later. In the meantime, we'll stand at ease. Yes, Mr. Vinson."
- Vinson: "I would suggest that we could go ahead and run the Brunsvold Bill right now."
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, we should have a quorum first, Mr.

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Vinson. Mr. Vinson, for what purpose do you seek
recognition?"

Vinson: "Just curious about how long you plan to continue delaying this operation. Is the Speaker back there conferring with God or Stevenson or Vrdolyak or Mayor Washington?"

Speaker Greiman: "Perhaps someone even more important. Mr. Vinson, we will be back to you a little later on this morning. Don't go back to Clinton. I know you want to go to Clinton. Don't do it. Stick around. Yes, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "I'd just like you to repeat as often as you can that I want to go to Clinton so my constituents know that."

Speaker Greiman: "Both of them will know it. Yes, for what purpose does the Gentleman from DuPage, Minority Leader Daniels, seek recognition?"

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, we just called Washington in concern for how long we're going to have to stay in Session, because as you all know, tomorrow night at midnight, the federal tax extension on cigarettes expires. That means that the Federal Government must move to extend that tax by midnight tomorrow night. Congress is presently in Session, and they are moving to the Order of Business of working up federal tax extension on cigarettes. Their anticipation is that they will extend it until December 14. Now. question of you, Mr. Speaker, is in the event that they do that, do I need to advise my Nembers that they have to pack for December 14, and then ad infinitum? Are we going to be kept in Session and held here until Congress extending the cigarette tax? What advice would you give us. Sir?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Daniels?"

Daniels: "Yes?"

Speaker Greiman: "Do you take sage dressing and cranberry with

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

your turkey?"

Daniels: "Yes, I do."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright."

Daniels: "I do."

Speaker Greiman: "Then the Clerk... Mr. O'Brien, mark down Mr.

Daniels is going to have his turkey - Thanksgiving turkey with sage dressing and cranberry sauce."

Daniels: "Right. There are a lot of turkeys around here, so I'm not going to have trouble finding any."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Vinson? For what purpose or purposes do you seek recognition?"

Vinson: "Inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed."

Vinson: "Does the Speaker know how to spell the word *punctuality*?"

Speaker Greiman: "You mean the temporary Speaker or the real Speaker?"

Vinson: "Well, I... You know, maybe you and Mr. LaPaille."

Speaker Greiman: "Pardon?"

Vinson: "Maybe even Mr. LaPaille."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. LaPaille certainly knows how to spell it.

The House will be in order and Members will be in their seat. On page four of the... of page four of the... Roll

Call for... Roll Call for Attendance. The prayer has already been given, and it was a very good one today. It would have been helpful for all of you. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 114 Hembers having answered to the Call of the Quorum, a quorum is present. Yes, Ms. Younge, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Ms. Younge. Wyvetter Younge."

Younge: "Please mark me 'present'."

Speaker Greiman: "Pardon?"

Younge: "Please mark me 'present'."

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Ms. Younge will be added to the Roll Call. Yes, Mr. Stephens added to the Roll Call. Mr. Giorgi, are there any excused absences on the Democratic side?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, please have the record indicate that Mr.

Laurino is absent because of illness."

Speaker Greiman: "The record will so reflect."

Giorgi: "And John Cullerton on official business."

Speaker Greiman: "And that Mr. Cullerton will be excused for official business. Mr. Piel, are there any Republican absences? Well, I think apparently not."

Piel: "No excused absence, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Accordingly, there are 115 Members having answered to the call of the quorum. Now, on page four of the Calendar on the Order of Concurrence, Special Call - State Government appears House Bill 568. And on that, on concurrence for Senate Amendment #10, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 568 was debated yesterday, and Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 14... excuse me, 9, 15 and 20. In our debate on those matters, we discussed Build Illinois technical Amendments for bonding authorizations, farm aid, Arlington Park and cigarette tax, all for the people of Illinois, throughout the State of Illinois, throughout every nook and cranny of Illinois. And in the spirit of House Bill 568 was sent to us by the Senate after quite a bit of discussion, one of the provisions of 568 included funding for Chicago's McCormick Place on the lake. I think we've all been advised as to the compromise regarding the governance of McCormick Place and the oversight mechanism that will be put in place to complete the onstruction of the annex, the construction of an annex that many of us have felt was ill-timed and poorly done, and proceeding

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

ahead with drawings at the same time as construction was proceeding, through a chairman of the board, a chairman the board that was appointed by the Mayor of Chicago, and a board that has traditionally been supported by Chicago. But I think that the McCormick Place Amendments that are here before us now represent a good compromise and a compromise that is fair. And I'd like to take a few minutes to emphasize the reform measures that are contained in this Bill for the operation of McCormick Place. has been said about funding. There has been a lot wrangling about control, and I believe the people back home have never really cared about how many people are on the board and who appoints whom to the board. And for that reason, from the very start, we agreed, on this side of the even number board a long, long time ago, as aisle, to an long as the reform measures and the accountability plan were adopted in McCormick Place. I know, or I do not know that the people back home care a heck of a lot about control of the board, but I do know that they care a lot about reform and about accountability for their tax dollars from this General Assembly. I know there are many green votes, or will be many green votes up there from people who just as soon vote 'no', because they see this as strictly a Chicago concern, a concern for the City where Chicago has turned its back once again on Chicago, the concerns of the people of Arlington Heights and the people on the farms and the nooks and crannies of Illinois, but Chicago has said, 'We will stay united in terms of keeping the funding of McCormick Place solid, and we turn our votes out for McCormick Place funding but nothing else for the rest of Illinois. But I do know that the accountability plan provided in this legislation gives us some hope and some assurance that the tax dollars that we,

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Illinois citizens, send to McCormick Place, a facility which I personally believe is one of the most important economic assets we have in this state. And when we send those tax dollars, as we do every single year in the operations of McCormick Place, the annex on the lake, we now know, if this is enacted into law, that they will be handled in a responsible manner for the first time. The specific reform measures include that the McCormick Place Board must comply with the Freedom of Information Act, the Open Meetings Act. It must develop a three year financial plan, a requirement that they've never had to do before. It requires annual reviews of senior management personnel and contractual services. It requires the board to rules and regulations covering bidding and the awarding of contracts. It requires the board contract bidders disclose individuals having at least a seven and a half percent interest, or normally called the conflict of interest provisions. Ιt prohibits payments for professional services without written contracts. It. establishes an accounting system to be approved by the Auditor General of Illinois, and it requires monthly reports on the progress of expansion construction. submit to you that this plan for accountability is a good plan and a plan that this Assembly for the first time, for the first time since McCormick Place was authorized, Assembly can exercise control over the tax dollars that the citizens of Illinois send to McCormick Place each and every Consequently, in reviewing the action of this Body and the action of the House Republicans in calling for the McCormick Place investigation and plan for accountability to begin with, I have determined that it is in our best interest to concur in this Amendment, that in spite of the feelings of many Members on this side of the aisle,

November 13, 1985

86th Legislative Day

Place."

on the other side of the aisle, and namely many of you Chicago Democrats, have turned your back on the citizens of Illinois, have turned your back on the farmers of Illinois, have refused to concur in a reasonable farm Amendment nothing less in its Amendment than what was in there, what Bill you have put in under the subterfuge to try convince the people of Illinois that the Democrat Party is indeed helping the farmers. And yes, I'm asking for a concurrence in spite of the fact that Arlington Heights is not assured that a reasonable economic asset to that community will be rebuilt. And yes, turning your back on the cigarette tax for children of Illinois, for our education commitment that we made last year, last Session, I am asking that we concur in the McCormick Amendment. I am hopeful that you will realize that you, on the other side of the aisle, that this is necessary. for you downstate Democrats, I would ask you to join us in

supporting McCormick Place as an important asset to this

Amendments #10 and 13, which both deal with McCormick

Therefore, I would like to concur, Mr. Speaker, in

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels, moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendments #10 and 13 to House Bill 568. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have reviewed very carefully the report of the Select House Committee of Investigation on McCormick Place Expansion Project, and I want to commend the Members who served on this Select Committee for their very thorough and illuminating report. I note, in the report, reference to 'Shawl HcCue', the construction manager for the project. In addressing the issues raised in this complex matter, I

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

make known to this Body and to public generally, that my law firm has performed legal services for clients include some of the principals in 'Shawl - McCue'. Those services were performed on matters totally unrelated McCormick Place, and those two construction companies. With an abundance of caution, and in order to dispel possible question which may arise in the future as to this issue and my relationship with some of the principals of this firm, I wish to declare and disclose my law firm services in these matters, again, which are totally to McCormick Place which will, in no way, bear upon my considered judgment of the merits of the Bill had argued that this Amendment ought to contain additional provisions, to wit: That there ought not to grace period before the RFP requirements would da y come into place so as to permit those currently under contract at McCormick Place to seek to be renewed by the new board without being subject to the RFP requirements. provision is not contained in this Amendment. Τn addition, I had argued that in addition to the cap on the salary of the trustee, that there ought to be a cap on the That provision is not contained trustee's expenses. The Amendment does provide that there will this Amendment. a cap on the salary paid to the trustee, but the Amendment is silent on the question of trustee expenses. had argued that the trustee expenses should also be capped. This Amendment does not contain that provision. However, the Amendment does constitute a good step forward in resolving the issue of completion of the project; because of the reasons enunciated by Mr. Daniels, I plan to support Mr. Daniels' Motion to concur in these two Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Ms.

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Braun."

Braun: "I have a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman indicates he'll yield for questions. Proceed."

Braun: "Representative Daniels, Amendment #14 was put on in the Senate, which had to do with affirmative action at McCormick Place, and in your Motion, you..."

Daniels: "We aren't on 14 right now."

Braun: "I understand that. I just have a question of you. In your Motion, you failed to mention Amendment 14 as it passed from the Senate and came over here. And my question to you, Sir, is, is it your intention to call Amendment 14 also for concurrence?"

Daniels: "I don't know."

Braun: "Pardon?"

Daniels: "I don't know."

Braun: "You don't know. Alright, well, thank you. I would hope..."

Daniels: "Do you intend to vote for these two Amendments?"

Braun: "I would hope that..."

Daniels: "Do you intend to vote for these two Amendments?"

Braun: "Well, Representative, we're going to have a minute...

you'll see that in about a minute, but, yes, I do intend to
support your Motion."

Daniels: "Okay, then I have a better idea."

Braun: "I intend to support your Motion, Representative Daniels; however, my question to you again is that I would hope, or my statement would be, I would hope that you would not forget this important element of the entire McCormick Place debate when we come to Amendment 14."

Daniels: "I won't."

Braun: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question or two?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for a question. Proceed, Sir."

Mautino: "Amendment #13, as I peruse it, authorizes the additional bonds for the completion of McCormick Place. Is that correct?"

Daniels: "Yes."

Mautino: "And that amount is \$56,000,000, approximately?"

Daniels: "The construction limit is increased by 54 million. The bond authorization is increased by 47.5 million."

Mautino: "Thank you. What is the... Can you tell me what gross revenues..."

Daniels: "Can you speak louder?"

Mautino: "Could you tell me what the gross revenues of McCormick Place is?"

Daniels: "No."

Mautino: "Can anybody tell me what the gross revenues of McCormick Place is?"

Daniels: "I don't know if they can or not. The Committee... The Committee, in investigating this, did not review operations, is the reason that I would assume that the gross revenues are quite a bit."

Mautino: "That includes, I would assume, parking and all fees, et cetera?"

Daniels: "Yeah."

Mautino: "And we really don't know. There's nothing that I have ever seen. I'm listening to Representative Currie, but I don't know if that's the right answer. You know, she says 25 million or so. I find that to be very low."

Daniels: "Twenty-five million of the gross revenue. That's in the range."

Mautino: "It's in that range? What... What is in this Amendment

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

that addresses the question of responsibility as it pertains to how the cost overruns occurred? Yeah. What is the area of responsibility for the overruns? We've all read the news articles. We've all evaluated the blue copy of the report, but there's... the Amendment is silent upon basic responsibility. And we are basically, by this Amendment, saying we will continue on. It'll be a new board, but there's no provisions for responsibility as it pertains to cost overruns on construction and capital accounts."

Daniels: "Well, there are several reasons that I m Cochairmen Ryder and Currie will be happy to discuss with you as to the cost overruns. None the least of involved what we think is improper bidding mechanisms and failure to award or specify contractual provisions would hold the subcontractors responsible for any cost overruns were not adequately defined. These are. general terms, some of the reasons for the cost overruns. I can tell you that some of the other reasons that the looked into and found out was excavation of the site which developed that after the excavation started, that this was the area where they put in the debris from the original Chicago fire. The soil boring test did not tell that, did not discover that until the excavator got in you can then say that maybe the soil boring Now, tests were done improperly. I leave that to a higher authority or to an investigative body that may look into the question. But overall, we felt that the plan of accountability that we have now presented will prohibit and discourage future cost overruns. And as you know, we can only deal with future matters and not past matters."

Mautino: "Well, what is built in the Amendment that would provide that those situations would not occur again?"

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Daniels: "Well, we have several provisions built in from Freedom of Information Act to the Open Meetings Act to a requirement of the McCormick Place Board to adopt rules and regulations covering bidding and the awarding of contracts which they were not required by state law to do now. requires the board to provide for sanctions under contractual provisions for professional services, requires contract bidders to disclose individuals having a conflict of interest, prohibits payments for professional services without written contracts. Prohibits persons providing feasibility studies from subsequently working to implement such studies, which is a conflict position that we found to have occurred in the board. It requires the Metropolitan Fair and Exposition Authority to create an accounting system which is approved by the Auditor General And the list goes on and on and on in terms of the accountability plan that this House has worked out through its mechanism of its investigation and reform."

Mautino: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Sir."

Mautino: "What we have before us is, I guess, an attempt to say that the State of Illinois has issued bonds and, in fact, the construction of that facility, McCormick Place, did not adhere to the initial authorization that this General Assembly provided. It is one more link in a long line of cost overruns, whether that be in the area of corrections, mental health, but most specifically in the area of this facility. There is no provision embodied in this Amendment that allows for a real tightening, in my estimation, of the procedures by which we go into capital expenditures under the Metropolitan Exposition Authority Board. I don't see any real movement and protection for the taxpayers of this state who are footing the bill based upon the debt service

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

that will be paid on this outstanding bond issue as well as the new authorization. I think that the decision makers and the guidance counselors, whether that be attorneys or consultants to the existing board, have walked away from a situation where they were given responsibility. When. fact. a facility or a building is built, someone has to call a halt as it pertains to cost overruns, consultant contracts, professional artistic provisions that, in most cases, don't do anything to add to the construction dollars being used to the best extent. I stand in opposition to Amendments 10 and 13 because I, for one, believe that somewhere we have to stop and say there's responsibility in the area of capital construction. It is not embodied in In my 'estimation, it's another smoke this legislation. screen, just as the whole expansion has been a boondoggle, and I cannot support what I don't think is an Amendment with any teeth in it to stop the past practices. recommend a 'no' vote on the combination Amendments 10 and 13, if that is the Minority Leader's Motion on these Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Jersey, Mr. Ryder."

I'd like to also stand in Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. support of the Minority Leader's Motion in this matter, and I'd like to review for you for just a moment, if you the situation in which we found ourselves last June when we received notice of the problems in McCormick Place. Αt that time, this Legislature was asked to produce the dollars and without any reform, cents without contingencies, but simply to pay the money, turn their head and decide that what had been going on was well enough. The Legislature, at that time, responded and responded well. We investigated this matter at long hours in a bipartisan nature. We investigated the costs, the reasons,

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

and what we discovered was an impossible situation. have \$205,000,000 invested in this expansion. Now, I would daresay that most of the folks in my district, in many of the folks in downstate Illinois would indicate that 205,000,000 should simply stay there. finish the project, and it should be as a monument to folly of man for attempting to construct this. But you and were elected to be responsible people. You and I were elected to do responsive things with the money that the... the taxpayers of the State of Illinois have given us. discovered that errors had been committed. If you read the report that was issued by the House Investigating Committee. you will see those. But the impossible situation is to either allow \$205,000,000 to go to attempt to salvage, as best we can, a project drain or that is going to bring pride to the State of Illinois and a project that is at least going to return some dollars on the amount that's been invested. This is not a perfect solution, by any means, but it is a solution that is going work, and it is a solution that is going to attempt to solve the problem. Even though I might indicate that we're talking about a bipartisan effort, and I was proud of the results that were given by the Committee, it was the House Republicans that led the charge on this issue. Ιf memory serves last June, it was the House Republicans, and we were dealt with a wall of silence, a wall of silence throughout the summer when the House Republicans were initiating and working on this issue. And even with that, we agreed and came up with a compromise - an even-handed compromise - a compromise that did not take from the City Chicago any of their abilities, did not take from the City of Chicago any of the seats - there's still a And the end result is that we have a chance to there.

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

finish this project. It's not the perfect solution. It may not even be the popular solution, but we have to be responsible. Now, if your definition of responsibility is to allow \$205,000,000 to go down the... down without any value whatsoever, so be it. You may vote accordingly. My idea of responsibility is to try to get something of value for the taxpayers, and that's the reason that I support the Minority Leader's Motion."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brookins."

Brookins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for questions. Proceed."

Brookins: "Yes, Mr. Sponsor, I'm sorry I did not fully understand what you were saying concerning Amendment 14. Did you say that you will sponsor that later?"

Daniels: "Well, the Amendment was sponsored by Senator Newhouse.

The Body will have an opportunity to act when we get to it."

Brookins: "You asked my colleague, will you support that Amendment when it's sponsored?"

Daniels: "I don't know yet. I have to see what the party or what
the place does on these concurrence Motions before we know
how we're going to act on other ones. But you know, there
are some concerns with that which I'm sure you know. That
Amendment certainly is not drawn very well, and there's
some difficulties, but let's see what happens when we get
to it."

Brookins: "Thank you. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Sir."

Brookins: "Mr. Speaker, on last evening and all last week, we argued about funds for other places in the city... in the state. We argued about bailouts for other communities.

Today is the day that we should argue about bailouts for

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

the inner city and the south side and the west side of City of Chicago, where certainly it looked like war zones, where certainly poverty is abundant, where certainly welfare is spent. We're talking now concerning jobs, concerning employment of these minority people. Speaker, I'm asking that Bill #14 be considered and considered along with others so, therefore, we will where we stand. I'm sorry, Amendment 14. We need this opportunity to employ these minorities so that they come off welfare, become taxpayers instead of tax eaters. I must know that Amendment 14 will be supported by colleagues, if I am to support these outrageous sums of That is my position, and I hope that is the position of others on this floor."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff."

Huff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support the previous speaker. You know, if if the previous speaker sounded a little paranoia, he's got a good reason to. One of the things that I'm sure Representative Ryder will agree to is that. in investigating this cost overrun, we discovered that the board didn't even hire the affirmative action officer, Ladies and Gentlemen, until after every contract had been Now, as a Representative of a minority, stand here and vote on a pig in a poke. As the Minority Speaker has said, he doesn't know about Amendment #14, then I can only reciprocate and tell him I don't know about Amendment #13. You know... Another thing that becomes patently clear with the people who were charged dispensing this money that now has been categorized as money spent down a hole, I would agree with that. would you say to a board that spends \$20,000,000 without securing executed contracts with the people they gave the

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

It's clear that these board members thought that money to. they were above the people. They certainly thought they were above the Legislature, and they certainly gave me the impression that they were above the law. And I think that if we vote with this Amendment 13, we would be sending a message to these people that they were correct. That money did not accrue any benefit to the people in my district and in the surrounding districts of Chicago where it... Where that money went, no one really knows, and I'm not going stand here and vote in the dark without knowing how my people are going to benefit. I urge a 'no' vote. the proper time, I'd like to make a Motion that we hear both 13 and 14 together."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken." McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that it's not proper at this time to consider Amendment 14, but I can see handwriting on the wall, so let me address that subject and put some minds at ease. The current law, under which the board is operated, has an affirmative action plan in place. Now, Representative Huff was one of the many people who was interested enough to come down and participate in the Committee hearings, and we heard that there was not adequate compliance with this plan. But let me stress something to those Members who are worried about this. Ιt is in the law now. It is in the law for minorities female businesses This Amendment - Amendment 14 now. would change the law. The law would be changed to make it a goal of the authority that up to 30 percent of the contract awards be made to minority businesses. there is no mention of female businesses in Amendment #14. It is our counsel's opinion that if we were to adopt 14, we would unwittingly deprive the female minority business entrepreneurs of an adequate opportunity to participate.

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

is the law now. To the extent there was noncompliance - and I stress this - to the extent there was noncompliance, it was not by virtue of a lack of effort on our part. It is currently the law to have an affirmative action plan and to implement it in the construction of this project. Amendment #14 would change that. We think it's poorly drafted, and unintentionally does not include women as a minority business enterprise. I think that you want to include women as a minority business enterprise, and I submit to you that Amendment 14 is defective in that respect. So, let's not get too hung up on law. Let's look at the merits of this currently in the issue. The merits are pretty clear. Auditing is compliance with the Auditor General's requirements. **A11** reports relative to that have to be delivered both to the General Assembly and to the Mayor and to the Governor. We will have a trustee with powers to get this thing built within the allotted monies. Иe have given, in mу experience on the Committee, an amount of authorization which is the minimum amount requested by the board. There were ranges of shortfalls estimated. The most conservative range was \$54,000,000, the amount we are authorizing So we have done fiscally what is prudent. have not been excessive, and in return, we have created reform measures that are far reaching. Prior to this Bill, there are no signed contracts with architects or engineers for this program. There have gone back and forth between the parties 22 or 23 drafts of contracts, all of which have varying amounts of money at stake, none of which was executed. Everybody was operating a \$205,000,000 project on a handshake. The board was hamstrung from signing these contracts, in some cases, because they were unauthorized to dedicate funds above a certain amount. Иe have an

obligation, I submit, to finish what we have started. We are doing so at a minimum of cost. We are doing so with safeguards, and I support Minority Leader Daniels in this

effort."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Because of the posture that this Bill. OF this Amendment, comes to us in and the Bill comes to us in, there's a lot of factors, obviously, that enter into somebody's vote, including mine. But I think one thing ought to be clarified, notwithstanding the posture that it's in, and that is the process by which we approach McCormick Place issue. I served, as many of the previous speakers did, on an eight person Legislative Investigating and went through a whole series of productive Committee, hearings on this issue in Chicago, and I guess at least one in Springfield. And notwithstanding what the Speaker indicated previously, everybody who attended those meetings, attended those hearings, would agree to at this - that the Republican Membership on that Committee, assistance with some from Democrat Members. were consistently those who were the most probing in their questions of witnesses, who were the most determined to get to the bottom of inefficiency, of corruption and to various other aspects of the addition to the expansion project and McCornick Place generally, and w ho consistently, throughout those hearings, called for reform, called for those various elements that are part of this package to bring efficiency to McCormick Place, called for public scrutiny and the various other things that are now embodied, for the most part, in this reform package. And anybody who tells you anything other than that either wasn't at the hearings or didn't listen when they were I'm not saying that this is strictly a partisan there.

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

issue, because it's not. What I am saying is that Republican House Minority and the four Members of that Committee are at least 90% responsible for the reforms, the increase in efficiency and the various other aspects of this program. And for somebody to stand on the floor of this House and tell you that they wanted more reform, wanted more oversight, they wanted more of the other aspects of this program that they say they didn't get is just absolutely pure hogwash. It's the most ridiculous statement that I've ever heard made, and I challenge anybody who was at those Committee hearings to say anything that. I'm unhappy that it comes to us in the posture that it does, but the reforms that were brought out are ones that we initiated, we forced and we forced circumstance of our questioning and our proposals, and ultimately, the product that we came out with."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. For downstater, this is a very easy vote, because one could say, 'Well, we get nothing from this particular issue.' particularly, when an issue that did have some concern to downstaters was rather orchestratedly presented to us in opposition and failed yesterday, would give one a lot concern to say we don't need to support McCormick Place. But I guess I would have to look at it in a little broader context than those who oppose certain of those issues, in that McCormick Place will, in fact, provide an opportunity many people out of state to come into Illinois and to leave dollars to our state that will certainly help our coffers, and I think that's one of the primary objectives of providing an outstanding exhibition center which world renowned. I'm also a little bit concerned about those who say that we need to help people get off of

96th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

welfare, and this is going to do that. Let me assure those of you who say that, that the way you get off of welfare is not by building McCormick Place, but by going to school and graduating from high school and college, to become prepared and well-equipped both mentally and physically for the jobs that come at hand. This is how you get people off of welfare, not necessarily by building McCormick Place. fact is that in Illinois we had that opportunity to provide for more money for many people who live in Chicago so that they could go to school, and on your side of the aisle, chose not to support those extra dollars that we need in a very important educational reform program that we have here in Illinois. So, I'm saying that we ought to support this particular package, because it is a kind of courageous thing that we need to show as a unified effort for all Illinois. It does provide benefits certainly far more for the Chicago area than it does for downstate, but being Representative in central Illinois, I think it encumbers (sic - encompasses) all of the State of Illinois, intend to support it, and I urge others to support it, too."

Speaker Greiman: "The Chair has received a Motion to amend the present Motion pending on the floor. That... Mr. Clerk, would you read the Motion?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion. 'I move that the Motion to concur in Senate Amendments #10 and 13 be amended as follows: That the House concur in Senate Amendments #10, 13 and 14 to House Bill 568.' Signed by Representative Huff."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Vinson?"

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, first of all, I..."

Speaker Greiman: "Let me just make one statement for the record to the assemblage, as far as the Chair is concerned."

Vinson: "Fine."

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Should the Motion carry, in fairness to people who would wish to address the issue of Amendment 14, the Chair will... will allow people who have already spoken to speak, to again address the Chair... address the Body so that no one would be foreclosed from having an opportunity to express themselves because of the rules of the House.

Now, Mr. Vinson, proceed."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Greiman: "Sure."

- Vinson: "Initially, I would object to the Motion or the Amendment to the Motion, however it's cast, because the Gentleman has made a Motion, and nothing else is in order until his Motion is voted upon by the Assembly."
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, Rule 72 of our rules allows for an Amendment... precedence of Amendment, and so, the Motion itself is within... is in order. Moreover... Let me finish. Moreover, Rule 12 of Roberts Rules of Order would allow him to make this kind of Motion. Mr. Madigan, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, to request that the Body stand at ease for just a few minutes. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Vinson, you don't have any objection to that, do you? Alright, we'll stand at ease for a few moments. No. Mr. Daniels, we're at ease, but certainly your words are always welcome."
- Daniels: "Just to inquire how long we're going to be at ease? Is this a matter that will take some time? If so, then I will... then I will ask that the Members be able to retire to their offices. I don't know how long the Speaker's going to stand at ease and what the purpose is. Is there a Democrat Caucus?"
- Speaker Greiman: "I think we'll all hang in in the floor. We can't stop you from leaving the floor, of course, but let's

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

just relax. Mr. Madigan."

Daniels: "Then there'll be reasonable... "

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, it's my judgment that if we stand at ease for a few minutes, we may avoid a... a parliamentary mess on the floor. On my part, it will be a very short delay. I would suggest that the Members just stay in their chairs and not retire to their office, and this action is being taken in an effort to provide that the Bill can move along in orderly consideration. I don't think there's any need to get upset about anything."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Leverenz, for what purpose are you seeking recognition?"

Leverenz: "A squeal and an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Now?"

Speaker Greiman: "Not at this time."

Leverenz: "You keep screwing up the lines, you know? You're supposed to say, 'Not now.'"

Speaker Greiman: "Well, the difference is that I'm the guy with the jokes and you're the straight man, but you haven't learned that yet."

Leverenz: "When I realize that, I will be better off. Right?"

Speaker Greiman: "Right."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "House will be in order. Members will be in their seats. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Huff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to withdraw my Motion with regards to the Notion to concur."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff, withdraws his Hotion with respect to the consideration of these Amendments. Mr. McCracken, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Leave is granted for the withdrawal of that

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Motion. Mr. McCracken?"

McCracken: "We withdraw our Motions just filed."

- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Alright. Is there further discussion on the main Motion of Mr. Daniels? There being none, Mr. Daniels, to close. Mr. Daniels."
- Daniels: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's been a lot of work put on the McCormick Place reform, and I would like to add my thanks to many Members of the House and the Investigation Committee co-chaired by Mr. Ryder and Representative Currie, and thank the other Hembers for all of their hard work which has lead to the realization of an accountability plan that I think is good for the people of Illinois. Consequently, I'd move for concurrence on Senate Amendments #10 and 13 to House Bill 568."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #10 and 13 to House Bill 569?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

 Voting is now open. The Lady from Cook, Ms. Braun, one minute to explain your vote."
- Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As a matter of legislative intent, we are voting to support this Motion of Representative Daniels because we believe that McCormick Place is vital to the economic health of this entire state. We believe also, and have confidence, that in the administration of the McCormick Place construction annex project, that minorities and women will be given equity and parity in competition for the construction and contracts to be let at that facility."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Hr. Pangle, one minute to explain your vote."
- Pangle: "Thank you, Ar. Speaker. Maybe our new tally board should read, 'McCormick Place plus \$60,000,000. Illinois

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

farmers minus \$25,000,000, and free legal assistance to

file bankruptcy.*"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Daniels, one minute to explain your vote." "I think I have explained every feature of this Bill. I Daniels: would suggest that it's important that we complete the McCormick Place work so they can move on to complete annex. And it is, in fact, encumbent on every Chicago Legislator, every single one of you to be up there with an 'aye' vote. And Mr. Speaker, this is your city, your You've got to annex. put those votes up there. Speaker. It's time, time to pass this very important funding mechanism."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, one minute to explain your vote."

Madigan: "In response to an earlier remark, the scoreboard clearly indicates my position on the Bill, and I think that we ought to move away from this division that has come on this issue and the division that is used constantly in this House. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Brookins, one minute to explain your vote." Brookins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm voting in favor of this Bill because I've been ensured that in this Bill there is control and there is minority participation as one of the legislative (sic - Legislators) outlined in a previous conversation. Also that the women was left out, and certainly we must have women and minority in this participation. I know, I know that with the control of the board in the hands of the Mayor, with the affirmative action in there, that they will be enforced, and that we can look forward to participation in this board. I earlier said that it's a matter of not just a job. It's a matter of who eats and who do not in the City of Chicago. matter that if we're participating, we will remove people

86th Legislative Day

from the welfare rolls. We will help aid the City of Chicago. We will save money for the State of Illinois.

This is why a 'yes' vote is so important at this time.

Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing, one minute to explain your vote."

"Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ewing: explaining my 'yes' vote, I would just comment that there are approximately 26 Republican votes for this Bill. Republican is elected from the City of Chicago, and yet, over 50 percent of our Members have seen fit support the reform, to support this institution in the City of Chicago which is so important for the people of that I think the other votes on this should come from the other side of the aisle, the Majority Party. This is their program. They want the \$60,000,000, and I would ask for some more green votes from some of the downstate Democrats who don't seem to wish to bite the bullet like many of have for accormick Place, for the State of Illinois, for the people of Chicago, and for jobs."

"Mr. Vinson, one minute to explain your vote." Speaker Greiman: Vinson: "Yes. Mr. Speaker. I find a strange hypocrisy in this chamber when people who have not been in favor of reforms McCormick Place claim that they are, and then, when they attempt to tube the Bill by keeping off votes on that they could put on. It's clear that Leadership on the other side of the aisle could put votes on this Bill. It's clear that they're keeping those votes I wonder what more they want. I wonder why they're trying to kill McCormick Place as they killed aid to education and farm aid. It really puzzles me."

Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the

36th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

record. Yes, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Would you poll the absentees, please?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Clerk, poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "There are no absentees."

- Daniels: "It said... The board says there are 4. Mr. Hicks hasn't voted. Is he here?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Hr. Hicks and Ms. Zwick are absent today.

 Representative Cullerton and Laurino are excused today."
- Daniels: "Okay, so there are 4. Okay? Done everything we can do. Mr. Speaker, you want to announce the results, and then I have a new Motion."
- Speaker Greiman: "Okay. On this question, there are 67 voting 'aye', 42 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present', and the Motion to concur fails. Hr. Daniels, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have now found ourselves at a loss for the funding of McCormick I suspect that there is some difficulty that has arisen because of farm aid, Arlington Park, cigarette tax and other matters. It's apparent that there is a division in this Body that apparently now has developed a certain resentment over actions of certain people in this Body. Therefore, in order to try and attempt to keep this I would move to nonconcur with the remaining Amendments and ask that a Conference Committee appointed. I guess the Senate has to ask for the Conference Committee if they refuse to recede; therefore, I would move to nonconcur with the remaining Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels, has moved that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments #10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18 and 19. And on that, the Gentleman... And Amendments 3 and 9. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan.

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Give the Gentleman your attention, please."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I plan to oppose the Gentleman's Motion for nonconcurrence and for a request for a Conference Committee. My purpose in opposing the Notion is that, as the Bill sits now, we have all of the issues still not resolved before us, and we have the option to simply renew Motions on any of these issues in the event that we were to so desire. And so, my judgment is to leave the Bill precisely where it is, and to suspend consideration of the Bill for a time. For that reason, I would stand in opposition to the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly, I rise in support of Mr. Daniels! Motion. I rise in support of it because if any Member of this chamber cares about any of the issues this Bill comprehends, then you've got to move it to a Conference Committee to make progress. If you care about farm aid, you've got to move this Bill to Conference Committee to make progress. And if you care about aid to education and the cigarette tax, you've got to move this Bill to a Conference Committee to make progress. If you care about the future of McCormick Place, you've got move this Bill to a Conference Committee to make The only thing that arresting the progress Bill would do - and that's what the Speaker would suggest that we should do - the only thing that that can accomplish is to really create a legislative deadlock. It is a deadlock he has produced for whatever his agenda encompasses. And that's the only purpose that voting in support of him would accomplish. I rise support of the Gentleman's Motion to nonconcur so that we can try to make some progress for the kids in Illinois,

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

that we can try to make some progress for the farmers in Illinois and so that we can try to keep McCormick Place out of mothballs. I would urge an 'aye' vote on the Gentleman's Motion to nonconcur."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels. Mr. Daniels, this was your Motion."

Daniels: "This is to close, if there's no other debate."

Speaker Greiman: "No, there's lots of people who haven't talked.

Mr. Friedrich, the Gentleman from Marion."

Friedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I've been around here a long time, and I've seen all kinds of games played, but if the Speaker of the House, who has the votes to pass or beat anything he wants to beat, wants to beat McCormick Place, farm aid, aid to education, he ought to just come out and say, "I'm against them, and call the roll and vote it down. But play games with us for a month and keep us up here at the taxpayers expense is absolutely unbelievable. I've never seen this before in all the times I've been here. The Speaker of the House has the responsibility to do something, or else kill the Bills and we'll go home. Иe could have done that a month ago if he'd have told in advance that he intended to kill all these Bills. He should have done it then, not now, after we've wasted the taxpayers' money for a month."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of Representative Daniels' Motion. I think the Speaker of the House, the real Speaker of the House, ought to explain to his Caucus exactly what he's up to. He probably ought to come into ours and explain what he's up to. The Democratic Leader of the Illinois House now wants to just hold this Bill here. We don't know for what purpose, but we all know that any movement that has to occur has to occur in a

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Conference Committee and has to occur today if we're ever going to get out of here. We can be here until December 14, when the extension of the cigarette tax runs out, that's the Speaker's wish. He can keep us here at taxpayer and you know back home, you downstaters on both sides and in the suburban areas, people are beginning to howl about that. But let me just suggest to you one thing: that if the Speaker controls his side of the aisle, he also... he is the Speaker. He appoints three Members to the Conference Committee. And the Democrats in Senate appoint three Members to the Conference Committee. What in the hell is he afraid of? I mean, why hold this Bill here? For what Machiavellian purpose are we... are we being hostage for another day in... in no Motion on this Bill that has to go to a Conference Committee to be resolved? I rise in support of Representative Daniels."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Hembers of the House. I rise to oppose the Gentleman's Motion. There's one issue that's kept us in Springfield this week, last week and the end of the week before. That issue is McCormick Place. It's our responsibility, that building. It's our Metropolitan Fair and Exposition Authority that is engaged constructing this public building. The controlled the majority of the members of that committee over the entire period of construction. The cost overruns are, if anybody's mess, Governor Thompson's mess. I • m prepared today to help the Governor solve that mess. I certainly supported Representative Daniels* to Bill concur in Senate Amendments 10 and 13 to House That's the only issue that we must resolve now, today, before this Legislature can end its Session. The Motion -Representative Daniels' Motion - did fail, but it failed by

36th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

a handful of votes. People on this side of the aisle voted in proportion for that Motion, a larger proportion, Members of this Legislature, of Democrats supported getting the Governor out of the McCormick Place mess than did the Members of the Minority Party. I am hopeful that we can come back to this Bill a little later today and have a second Motion to concur in those Senate Amendments to House Bill 568. We're only a handful of votes away from a solution, a solution that the people of this state require it's our responsibility to provide because we're talking about a public mess and a public building. Motion to send this back to a Conference Committee does not make good sense, and I think would characterize the actions of this Assembly as absolutely irresponsible. The Motion should be defeated."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Rwing: "Mr. Speaker Ladies and Contlemen of the House I

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. in support of Representative Daniels' Motion. Today, today it is clear to everyone who is watching this debate that three of the four Leaders of this General Assembly have and are willing to act responsibly. If the Speaker's objection to this Motion prevail, then let him have that hot in his hands where it should have been for the last two weeks, because we made no headway here. Three Leaders are acting responsible. I think we should pass this Motion, move on with the legislative process. a provision for taking care of Bills in which Houses disagree, and we can work it out. Or shall we hand it to the Speaker to hold till he decides to let us Let's pass this Motion."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think

we ought to remember who brought us into a Special Session.

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Governor Thompson brought us into a Special Session. is the only issue, even though it is now in a Regular Veto Session, this is the only issue, the subject of Special Session call, called by the Governor. This Bill, in its present shape, is supported by the Governor. seen, in this legislative hall, where the Governor supported something and everybody, everybody on your side of the aisle, no one notwithstanding, has supported Governor. On this issue, evidently, all of you on that side of the aisle don't want to support your Governor. Speaker of the House feels that if we send this Conference Committee, it may end up in different shape than presently in. It is close to passage. He doesn't want it to send it... send it to Conference because when you do that, very often, strange things occur, no matter whether you have the Majority or not. This Bill is in a... an agreed form right now. We should not send it to I oppose that Motion. I support Governor Thompson in trying... in this agreement in getting out of the mess that has been created."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAuliffe."
McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAuliffe, moves the previous question be put. Those in favor signify by saying "aye", those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, the previous question be put. There are many people who are seeking recognition. You will all have an opportunity to explain your vote. Mr. Daniels, to close."

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I, too, want to see the resolution of the issues before us,
but I also feel that we have made every effort on this side
of the aisle to bring to the attention of the people of

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Illinois, the resolution of the question of farm aid. Arlington Park, cigarette tax, and yes, McCormick Place There were 26 Republican votes on the funding of funding. McCormick Place, 26 votes, of which only one Legislator from the City of Chicago, and every other Legislator comes from either suburban Cook, collar counties downstate Illinois. Extending to a Tom Ewing from Pontiac, to a Tim Johnson from Champaign, who have been willing to put their votes onto the funding of McCormick Place because they believed in the reform and the accountability was contained in that Bill. But now, we have found that in spite of that, there's been a defeat of this effort as well, along with the defeat of education support of our children. The purpose of my Motion is to move this legislation along and not to allow for a stalemate in General Assembly that has been perpetrated on the people of Illinois by that side of the aisle, perpetrated with the knowledge that you would tie up every bit of legislation with only one goal in mind, and that's to benefit the Chicago Democrat Machine and the Mayor of the City of Chicago. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I implore you to allows this legislation to move forward, to allow this deadlock to end, to allow the people of Illinois to receive support for their children, support for farms and support for the necessary elements that are contained in this program. And, therefore, I move that we nonconcur in the Amendments listed on the board."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments to House Bill 568? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'nos'... Oh, alright. We'll have a Roll Call. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Mr.

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Johnson, one minute to explain your vote. The timer's...
will be on."

Johnson: "The issue is responsibility. Are we going to keep this Bill in this chamber so we can have a series of meaningless votes, because there's not going to be any resolution, and sit here day after day? This is the eighth day that we've been here past the time that we were scheduled to be at \$65 dollars a day. But apparently, people or powers that be in this chamber want us to continue to sit here today and tomorrow and Friday and next week at \$65 a no resolution to this problem and playing little partisan games within our process for the detriment of the people of the State of Illinois. Or are we going to do what's responsible and send this Bill into a Conference Committee and deal with education and deal with the cigarette tax and deal with the farmers and farm Accormick Place so we can finally emerge from this process and have the people of Illinois say we dealt with the issues in a responsible way rather than wasting their taxpayers' dollars at the rate of \$65 a day to sit here doing nothing?"

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel, one minute.

The timer's on... automatic timer's on."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've heard a lot of political rhetoric during explanation before the vote was taken, but let's put the record straight. 26 Republicans on McCormick Place, 1 from Chicago. We had 25 people outside the City of Chicago, on this side of the aisle, voting for McCornick Place, the responsible vote. On that side of the aisle, 8, 8 people. You want to talk about even break? 25 over here, 8 over there, outside the City of Chicago. Now, if you want to sit here and stall things, don't shake your head 'no', Mr.

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Speaker, because we've got the Roll Call right here. Only

8 Democrats out of the City of Chicago wanted to go with

McCormick Place, but we did the responsible thing because

we want to do the business of the State of Illinois. I

would ask for a 'yes' vote on this Motion."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Shaw, one minute to explain your vote. Mr. Mautino, one minute to explain your vote."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The real issue is whether or not we out here in the trenches will have the opportunity to vote on each Amendment in its proper form individually as opposed to sending this to a Conference Committee and pumping it back out on a one vote coming back to you. And you all know that's exactly what's going to happen if, in fact, you don't vote on them independently. I don't know why anyone is concerned about casting their 'aye' or 'no' vote for the rest of the Amendments. It can be done and it should be done, and we stand in support of the provisions that every Member here has the right to vote on them independently. You're going to have time enough in the next day or so to vote on a Conference Committee. Right now, it's a 'no' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Ryder, one minute to explain your vote.

The timer is on."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The issue was before us. We had an opportunity after diligent investigation to put some votes on the board to do the responsive thing. The responsive thing is to not allow that amount of money to be wasted. And yet, that decision went down the tubes. Now, folks can point fingers on that side or this side as to who's responsible, but I can tell you that the votes are there. I was disappointed that people would indicate that we were so close, and I was in favor of it, and then to go on and say, 'Well, that gives us a little bit more time.'

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

The issue is whether the Speaker of the House wishes to do business. The issue is whether the Speaker wishes to control what's going on for McCormick Place in his city. I suggest that is where the responsibility lies."

Greiman: "Mr. Hoffman, one minute to explain your vote." Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. I'm shocked, chagrined with what has happened here The Speaker of the House, the man today. who has the the man who has control of this chamber is standing gavel, in the way of resolving the issue in an orderly Those who are interested in farm aid, school aid, McCormick Place, these things are all tied together, and we need to go into a Conference Committee and let the Conference Committee come back and give us a chance to vote on these issues in the collective, because it is obvious that we are not going to be able to resolve them individually, understand the comments made by the previous speaker in terms of you're going to get a one vote on a Conference Committee. I think that's what has to happen procedurally for us to resolve this, and I would request the Speaker remove his opposition to this nonconcurrence so we can move on to other issues and let's get this House home because we are being all embarrassed by this process."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McCracken, one minute to explain your vote.

The timer's on."

McCracken: "Thank you. All of those who are in favor of farm aid, all of those on that side of the aisle who spoke up yesterday in favor of farm aid, all of those on that side of the aisle who stood up and voted in favor of the cigarette tax — some of you spoke in favor of the cigarette tax — that is gone forever if you support this Motion. The purpose of this Motion is to pass, ultimately, only McCormick Place. He is scared to put it into a Conference

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Committee because he doesn't want those issues revoted. I believe that we will vote again on McCormick Place if this Motion fails, but that is all that we'll get, a second vote. Everything else will go down the tubes. The Speaker has said he is opposed to the cigarette tax, he is opposed to Arlington Park. The Republican Governor's version of farm aid, he is opposed to. So, we're not going to see second votes on all these matters. We're going to see one second vote on McCormick Place, and that's it. So, all of you in favor of farm aid, all of you in favor of all those other measures which are contained, don't vote in favor of that Motion. Don't be fooled by it."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Countryman, one minute to explain your vote. The timer is on."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Countryman: The issue before us is not McCormick Place. previous speakers have indicated, it's three issues. It's it's education for our children, and farm aid. it's McCormick Place. Now, the only way to get that done is to send this to a Conference Committee, and the only way to do that is to have the House and the Senate get together that Conference Committee and come up with one report, one report that we can vote up or down. But the issue before us is the education of the children in my district, in your district and all of the education for all of the State of Illinois. It's for farm aid. Farm aid - I didn't speak on it yesterday - but farm aid benefits all of us in Illinois. We're talking about agribusiness. We're talking about farmers who buy automobiles from automobile manufacturers, farmers who pay sales taxes on the goods that they Farm aid is an important part of our economy. It's not one issue, Mr. Speaker, and this vote makes it one issue. Withdraw your opposition."

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Hallock. One minute to explain your vote. The timer is on."

Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. know, some Members here may find it amusing to sit here day after day and do nothing, but when I was home over the weekend, the people asked me one question, and 'What in the world are you question was, doing Springfield?' And they can't understand it. And I try to And I've come down here, and there aren't explain it. really a lot of issues this Session to affect my district directly. I've voted for farm aid, and I just voted for McCormick Place. And last night, I voted in favor of cigarette tax to try to extend aid to our schools. come down... have come down here this fall to be willing to be a part of a process to what we have to do for the people of this state. It seems to me that if you vote against this resolution, you are, in fact, thwarting that process. I call on the Speaker to get on with the major agenda of the State of Illinois, pass these Bills and let's go home."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Churchill, one minute to explain your vote.

The timer's on."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise also to urge a green At the beginning of January when we first came here, we elected a Speaker of this House. We did that with votes from both sides of the aisle. We did that because we promised that the politics of this House would be one It would be a politics of compromise, of cooperation. that there would be an orderly flow of the business in this House, but the promises that were made that day have been broken. We have regressed politics of hostage to the taking. Every Bill becomes a hostage in the process. There are Bills that are lost from the House to the Senate. I think this whole Body has regressed to a terrible state,

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

and I think there's only one person to blame for that, and that is the person that we put green votes up to vote for Speaker. And I think at that point when we see what's happening here today, we should go back and analyze our original vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ronan. One minute to explain your vote."

Ronan: "Yeah. I don't want to explain my vote. Let's stop wasting time, fellas. You only got 53 votes, or whatever it is. There's 4 absentees. You're not going to convince anybody. Cut the rhetoric, and let's go onto the next issue. Geesch."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Vinson, I think you spoke in debate, but certainly one minute more we could probably hear."

Vinson: "Just an inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes."

Vinson: "Has Mr. Ronan come back to Springfield to the General Assembly?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Ronan is appropriately on the Roll Call today. The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Ropp, one minute to explain your vote. The timer is on."

Ropp: "Thank you. I appreciate that. Hr. Speaker and Members of House, a leader in my judgment, and I'm sure in all of our minds, is one who is willing to compromise and is... We have seen that over these issues. We have a real Speaker the House who is not willing to compromise. Many of us on this side of the aisle have supported issues we don't totally concur with and in a compromising manner in which to pursue what we think is best for the State of Illinois. This action now is one action that clearly, polarizes Chicago and downstate. I certainly didn't think Speaker of the House intends to break apart Chicago from downstate, as many of our downstaters think

- should happen. I hope that he reconsiders and is in a compromising mood so that we can move ahead and do what's right for the State of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, compromise is important."
- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 50 voting 'aye', 64 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the Motion fails. On the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading, Special Order of Call appears Senate Bill... Excuse me, I'll finish. We'll get to you. I hear you, Mr... Appears Senate Bill 625, Special Order of Call Assistance. Now, for what purpose were you seeking recognition, Mr. Daniels from DuPage?"
- Daniels: "You know the exact reason, Hr. Speaker, as you this House into another Order of Business in your effort to a sham on the people of Illinois. create participating in a sham, and you know it. We are on House Bill 568. Since you defeated the Motion, this Bill is still before the Assembly to act on. Now, if you don't to move on legislation, Mr. Speaker, maybe this side of the aisle does, and the people of Illinois have a right to expect that we will move on legislation in an orderly fashion. Stop the games playing. Stop stalling Stop deadlocking this process. Participate in a reasonable manner and start... stop running roughshod over the Minority Members of this House."
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, Mr. Daniels, frankly, I will... the Chair will advise you that I thought that you had abandoned this Bill by your Motion to nonconcur. We are in fact... We were in fact on that Bill, and you are within your... the rules to continue on that Bill as long as it's in the record. So, Mr. Daniels, we are now on... on what, Mr. Daniels? We have concluded with Motions to nonconcur... to

36th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

concur on Amendments through 13. Did you want to now move on Amendment 14, Mr. Daniels?"

Daniels: "Yes."

Speaker Greiman: "On that Amendment?"

Daniels: "Yes."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright, Mr. Daniels, proceed."

- Daniels: "Okay. But you have to take 625, which you're trying to ram down the throats of the people of Illinois, and get back to 568."
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, Mr. Daniels, the Chair has... the Chair has corrected the record, believing that you were leaving that... abandoning that Bill. And indeed, we will be back to... we are now back on the Order of Concurrences, House Bill 568, Amendment 14."
- Daniels: "It was my intention to ask the House to nonconcur in Amendment #14, because it doesn't protect the women of Illinois."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels, has moved that the House nonconcur in Amendment #14 to Senate... to House Bill 568. And on that issue, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I join the Gentleman in his Motion to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #14."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Braun."

Braun: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion. I would say, however, that the parliamentary antics that are going on and that started this morning with Mr. Daniels' original Motion is very much like Ralph Cramden watching Norton get ready to play the piano. We are all standing around watching Mr. Daniels stroke his sleeves. And I hope that with this Motion we can move on to the business of this House and the people of

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

the State of Illinois."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #14 to House Bill 568?' All those in favor... Did you want to close, Mr. Daniels?"

Daniels: "Yes. I think it's important for the purpose of the record in the event that somehow this Bill miraculously appears in some report, that we establish the objections to Amendment #14. Amendment #14 tries to establish a policy for the Affirmative Action Program of the authority. its language does is to create ambiguities and confusion as the authority's program. There is an issue as to whether female enterprises are to be included in the in meeting the goal that's stated in meeting... the Amendment. There's an issue as to whether the value contracts to which a goal is to apply will include those for things such as land, utilities, governmental permits, and et cetera. There is an issue as to whether recognition is afforded to achievement of work force affirmative action There is an issue as to whether the proposed goal goals. applies to individual contracts or to aggregate contracts. There is an issue as to whether the exemptions provided for the Minority and Female Enterprise Act are recognized. There is an issue as to whether union contracts and the available work force are impacted. Amendment fails the legislative drafting test. It does not clarify those issues. It raises issues. We should not add any more issues to McCormick Place, to the plan contained in Amendment #13 that reflects careful thought redrafting to accomplish completion of and accountability for the authority's construction and operations. Amendment #14 does not warrant our support and that is the reason for the movement of nonconcurrence."

86th Legislative Day November 13, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "For what purpose do you seek recognition, Mr. Madigan?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, to request that my statement of disclosure which was put in the record relative to Senate Amendment #13 and Senate Amendment #10 be adopted by reference relative to Senate Amendment #14."

Speaker Greiman: "The record will so reflect. On this question... The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #14 to House Bill 568?" All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House does nonconcur. Mr. Daniels, on Amendment #16. The Gentleman from DuPage."

Daniels: "Yes, Sir, Amendment #15 was nonconcurred in..."

Speaker Greiman: "You've already nonconcurred in that."

Daniels: "That is correct."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed on 16."

Daniels: "Amendment #16 is the DuPage water exemption on food and drugs. And I'd move to concur in that Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman... The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr.

Daniels, moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment

#16 to House Bill 568. And on that, the Gentleman from
Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I join the Gentleman in supporting his Motion that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #16."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Ms. Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think it might just interest some of those on the other side who can't figure out why their Leader would do this that this

- Amendment, if it is concurred in, will mean less money for the DuPage Water Commission. And I think that the Gentleman from DuPage is doing the right thing for his constituents in not representing what might be considered special interests in DuPage. This is the right thing for the people of Illinois, and I urge concurrence."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? Mr. Daniels, do you want to close?"
- Daniels: "Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #16 to House Bill 568?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open and this is final action on this concurrence. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'present'... 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'... And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #16 to House Bill 568. Mr. Daniels, the Gentleman from DuPage, on Amendment #17."
- Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to move to nonconcur in Amendments #3 and 9 which were defeated on a Concurrence Motion yesterday. So, that's... 3 is the farm aid and 9 is the cigarette tax. I'd move to nonconcur in those two Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, I'll give you an opportunity to come back. We're on 17. We were going down the list. We'll get back to you on that."
- Daniels: "Oh. Okay. Thank you. Amendment #17, Mr. Speaker, includes a revision of the Build Illinois language that several of my Members have asked questions about. I'd move to nonconcur."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels, moves that the House do nonconcur in Senate Amendment #17 to

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

House Bill 568. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for questions."

Daniels: "Very happily, Sir."

Mautino: "Amendment #17, what are you proposing that we do with Amendment 17, Representative Daniels?"

Daniels: "Nonconcur in it, Sir."

Mautino: "Nonconcur."

Daniels: "Nonconcur."

Mautino: "And you want to take out all those authorizations for all those good projects. Why?"

Daniels: "Oh, I don't think there are any projects in there. I don't know of any. If there are, would you advise me of them? Because our Members on our side of the aisle have been told that there are no new projects in there. But if there are, we'd like to know."

Mautino: "Well, it expands the authorization for building public administration buildings, for purposes of that, adds 40 million dollars for economic development."

Daniels: "The understanding that I have and what... aisles brought to me is that the language is too broad as contained in this Amendment; therefore, they want to redefine it. And when, hopefully, everything is worked out when you release this lock that all of you people have put on this Bill, that we'll be able to draft an Amendment that is a little more specific than what this has in it."

Mautino: "Oh, you added as well, once again, that private operated colleges and universities and hospitals and fire stations in other areas. Is that correct?"

Daniels: "Amendment #! put in the private colleges. So, I think you'll want to look at that, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "It's also in 17, Representative Daniels."

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Daniels: "Yes, but I think that will correct your concern,

Amendment #1 that you cited. And we've concurred in

Amendment #1."

Mautino: "As a final question, what is the impact if an Amendment similar to 17 were to come back? Does that mean that the funding proposals in the Build Illinois would be reprioritized?"

Daniels: "I don't think they'll be reprioritized. There has nothing in here to do with priorities. You know, we're fairly satisfied with the basic Build Illinois program that we fought so hard to pass last Session, and I think that it probably will stand as it is. But if we need a further Amendment, we want to draw on it a little bit more clearly than what this one is."

Mautino: "Well, I respectfully disagree."

Daniels: "Thank you."

Mautino: "This does broaden the authorization. Number one, does allow for additional programs that would be under the and have been instituted under Build Illinois. It has broadened. And I'm just wondering what the priority provisions are when you broaden it. That's all. I think it should wipe it out totally."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Nautino, are you waiting for a response?

Had you concluded, Sir?"

Mautino: "No, Sir. He's... I was waiting for a response, but he danced around it long enough. I'll let him go."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Daniels, did you want to respond or not?"

Daniels: "I thought I had."

Mautino: "My point was, and for the record, you stated there were not new projects, when in fact, there are. There are expanded projects authorization."

Daniels: "Would you... Okay. I'm not aware of the new projects.

Would you educate us as what new projects are contained in

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

this Amendment? Because I'll tell you something, we've been looking hard to see whether or not you guys have slipped in some new projects. If you have, could you tell us what those are?"

Mautino: "Well, number one is, I mentioned, a privately operated colleges, universities, public..."

Daniels: "There's new projects on colleges and universities?"

Mautino: "That is a new program. You need the substantive language once again to establish it. Yes, it is a new program. Let me ask you a question. In prior Sessions and in prior years, did we fund capital development of private colleges and universities?"

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Nr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, may I address myself to the... Mr. Daniels?"

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Sir."

Madigan: "Mr. Daniels, I think you said that you feel that this
Amendment 17 is technically flawed."

Speaker Greiman: "Hr. Daniels."

Daniels: "We said that there was a concern over the broadness of the language."

Madigan: "Mr. Daniels, I would propose that there be no Motion on this Amendment and that the question just not be treated at this time. It is the intent of the Majority to leave the Bill in the House. However, if you persist with your Motion to nonconcur, then I will be required to move to concur. And I would suggest that we can avoid the Roll Call if we just not treat this Amendment at this time."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "I think we need a Roll Call."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do concur in Senate
Amendment #17."

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, has moved a substitute Motion that the House do concur in Amendment #... Senate Amendment #17 to House Bill 568. And on that, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "I just wanted to know if it was a substitute Motion, which you stated it was. So, that answered the question."

Speaker Greiman: "On the Motion, the Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Ar. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. I rise in opposition to the Motion to concur in Floor Amendment #17 to House Bill 568. And I opposition to it for several reasons. First of all, most of the legitimate projects that the Gentleman from Bureau was concerned about have already been included in Amendment #1. What Amendment #17 basically does is to provide a special financing mechanism for Cook County Hospital and for UDAG Grants in the City of Chicago. The Speaker, in my judgment, in abandoning the rest of Illinois has forfeited any opportunity to work cooperatively on something like I think that the rest of the state is going to have to recognize that it takes a cooperative attitude from Chicago's Leadership on problems that affect farmers and school children if Chicago's Leadership is going to expect the rest of the state to respond cooperatively. Gentleman has thrown down the gauntlet. He has refused try to work constructively to resolve all of the problems of Illinois and, instead, has chosen to move ahead on his private personal agenda. And I would urge a 'no' vote on the Motion to concur for those reasons."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Representative Madigan's Motion to concur for a couple of good reasons that I thought I would share with the Members on the floor.

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

When you offer up a project in your district to be done under Build Illinois, and it is a project that they will tell you that it cannot be done because the language isn't there or the bonds cannot be used for that purpose, this Amendment makes that operative. Those projects that are already passed and approved, apparently there is a need for a language change for which bonds can be used or that which you have an agreement to do in your district already will, in fact, fall through the cracks and will not be done. I know that is the case in a number of situations. So, I would hope that you would look over that which you have a commitment on already that has already been passed and vote 'aye' for this Motion and pass it."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Daniels, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Daniels: "On a point of order, Sir."

Speaker Greiman: "Make your point."

Daniels: "To correct the Gentleman's impression. It was the Comptroller of Illinois that asked for a clarification as it dealt with the provision of this, and it was the Democrat Party in the Senate that asked that the rest of it be included."

Speaker Greiman: "That's not a point of order, Mr. Daniels. You know that. Mr. McCracken, the Gentleman from DuPage."

McCracken: "Amendment #1, which was previously concurred in, contained most of the language found in 17. There have been a few changes, a few additions. Those additions relate exclusively to urban and/or Chicago projects which are under consideration, specifically, urban housing development grants and a grant for the purpose of making distribution to local governments for hospital and other health care, particularly the Cook County Hospital. That authorization is new to Amendment #17. It's new to this

86th Legislative Day

- November 13, 1985
- Bill. But the expansion generally of the authorization to take into account Build Illinois was accomplished in Senate Amendment #1. Senate Amendment #17 broadens that beyond the scope of Build Illinois, beyond the scope of the Governor's original proposal, beyond the scope of the appropriations passed relative thereto in the spring. And it is not necessary to have this Amendment. I support the Gentleman's Motion to nonconcur, and I stand in opposition to the substitute Motion."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, to close."
- Madigan: "Simply to explain that I shall support the Motion to concur in Senate Amendment #17."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #17 to House Bill 568?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 42 voting 'aye', 59 voting 'no', 12 voting 'present'. And the Motion to concur fails. We are, Mr. Daniels, on 18... 17? Alright."
- Daniels: "No, Sir, that was a substitute Motion. Now we revert back to the original Motion, nonconcur."
- Speaker Greiman: "And now you wish to proceed on your... on the Motion to nonconcur."
- Daniels: "Correct, Sir."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Daniels moves that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #17 to House Bill 568. Mr. Daniels."
- Daniels: "Just to say that our feelings are concerning about the broadness of that language. And I would ask for a Roll Call."
- Speaker Greiman: "Is there any discussion? Mr. Madigan, the Gentleman from Cook. Yes, this is a Motion to nonconcur.

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

- Mr. Clerk, would you change the scoreboard? Mr. Madigan."
 Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I stand in
 opposition to the Gentleman's Motion."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Mr. Daniels, do you wish to close now?"
- Daniels: "Yes. I would like to point out for the benefit of the Membership and those that are listening that apparently what we have here is an effort by the Speaker to keep this Bill in the House to stop the movement forward. So, we're going to find a flip-flop on Roll Calls because he wants to keep this under his control. Now, for whatever reasons I don't know, but I'll tell you the cigarette tax was due to expire tomorrow night at midnight. Washington, Congress House, has passed it. It's in the Senate right now to extend it for 30 days. And I guess that's part of the reasoning. I guess we can be here on December 15th as well. And we just want to get the work done. So, we're trying to move this along. Re'd move to nonconcur."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #17 to House Bill 568? All those favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. The ruling on this is that it's a majority of those voting the question. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this 57 voting 'aye', 43 voting 'no', 13 voting there are And the House does nonconcur 'present'. in Senate Amendment #17 to House Bill 568. And now, Mr. Daniels, on Senate Amendment #18."
- Daniels: "Can I just say hello to Representative Hanahan? Hi,
 Tom. Welcome back. I wish you were still here. We'd move
 this thing along. Amendment #18 is the two year
 prohibition from anyone that serves on the board providing
 services to the board. And in view of the action on

- 86th Legislative Day

 November 13, 1985

 Amendments #10, 13, and 14, I would move that we nonconcur

 in Amendment #18."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage moves that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #18 to House Bill 568. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, my attention was diverted. Has the Gentleman moved to nonconcur?"
- Speaker Greiman: "He has moved to nonconcur."
- Madigan: "So, I would move a substitute Motion to concur in Senate Amendment #19. Senate Amendment #18 simply provides that if you have been a member of the board at McCormick Place or an employee that you will be barred from business transactions with the board for a period of two years. It would provide that if someone had been an employee or a board member at McCormick Place and left, that they would be prohibited from business transactions at McCormick Place for two years. And for that reason, I would move a substitute Motion, 'do concur'. And once again, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that my statement of disclosure be adopted by reference relative to this Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. The record will reflect that statement, Mr. Madigan. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, makes a substitute Motion that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #18 to House Bill 568. And on that, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."
- Daniels: "Ar. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I erred. The Gentleman is absolutely and correct. I support his Motion to concur."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken. Oh, don't care to speak? Okay. Mr. Johnson, from Champaign, you had your light on. You don't care to speak, either. The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Amendment #18 to House Bill 568? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #18 to House Bill 568. Now, Mr. Daniels on Senate Amendment #19."

Daniels: "Senate Amendment #19 is a reoffering of the order of Amendments, and it's a technical Amendment. So, I would move to concur in Senate Amendment #19."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels, moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #19 to House Bill 568. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I join the Gentleman in his Motion to concur."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #19 to House Bill 568?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #19 to House Bill 568. Mr. Daniels, for what purpose are you seeking recognition?"

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, to move to nonconcur in Amendments #20 and 3, 9, 10, and 13."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage moves that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments #3, 9..."

Daniels: "10."

Speaker Greiman: "10."

Daniels: "13."

Speaker Greiman: "13."

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Daniels: "And 20."

Speaker Greiman: "And 20. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook,
Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "I request a division of the question."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman is within his rights to request a division of the question. Mr.... Did you wish take those in the order of your Motion, Mr. Daniels?"

Daniels: "That would be fine. I think we can take #3."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Mr. Daniels, we are on #3. Amendment #3."

Daniels: "Alright. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, yesterday we debated the issue..."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr.... Excuse me. Mr. Hadigan, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, have we already considered a Motion on this Amendment?"

Speaker Greiman: "Not on 3, we have not. I mean... We have not considered a Motion... We have considered a Motion yesterday to concur, which failed."

Madigan: "Yes."

Speaker Greiman: "But we have not yet considered any other Motions."

Madigan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Is there further discussion? Hr. Daniels, to close."

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we are on a nonconcurrence Amendment to... or nonconcurrence Motion to Amendment #3 which was heard yesterday on concurrence, and that's dealing with the issue of farm aid. Since we are unable to agree on concurrence that this matter should be heard immediately, then I would suggest to you that in order to move this Bill along that we should nonconcur so we can discuss, in meaningful purposes, truly,

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

farm aid for the farmers of Illinois. And we can move this legislation along. Therefore, I move to nonconcur in Amendment #3 and ask for a Roll Call. I get nervous when you and Mike are talking on the phone like this, and you're pointing your finger at him."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 568?" All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'... Yes, I'm sorry. Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Motion. His Motion would lead toward the creation of a Conference Committee. I've stated that our plan is not to move to a Conference with the Bill at this time. And for that reason, I would stand in opposition to his Motion and request 'no' votes on the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 568?' Yes, Mr. Daniels, for what purpose are you seeking recognition now?"

Daniels: "Just to reiterate my request for a Roll Call."

Speaker Greiman: "You'll get it."

Daniels: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 45... 48 voting 'aye', 62 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And the House does... And the Motion to nonconcur fails. Further Amendments, Mr.... Further Motions, Mr. Daniels, with respect to this Bill."

Daniels: "If I move to concur on Amendment #3, can I start with 62 votes? That was a question of the Chair."

Speaker Greiman: "On Amendment #9, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Amendment #9 is the cigarette tax Amendment. And as you know, there were 38 Republican votes on that Amendment

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

to concur to support education in Illinois for our children, for the people of Illinois from the northern part to the southern part, from the eastern to the western part of Illinois, for every child in this state, to create an educated state, so that we cannot turn our back on our necessary obligation of educating children in Illinois. And unfortunately, that was defeated. Consequently, I'm going to move to nonconcur in Amendment #9 and ask for a Roll Call on that, Sir."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage moves that the House do nonconcur in Senate Amendment #9 to House Bill 568. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, again, this Motion would lead to the creation of a Conference Committee. Our plan is to keep the Bill in the House at this time. And, therefore, I would request a 'no' vote on the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Dewitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, inquiry of the Chair. Is the plan of... that Mr. Madigan referred to similar to the plan that has kept Senate Bill 525, the Banking Bill, in the House for several weeks now after final action on it by the House? Is it that kind of plan, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask the real Speaker, what is the plan? That would be very important to know in order to vote on this so that we, too, know what the plan is."

- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage,
 Mr. Daniels, to close."
- Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the plan is either, Representative Ropp. All I know is that we're here to do the work of the people of Illinois. We're willing and we have supported farm aid, cigarette tax, McCormick Place

- Reform, Arlington Park, yes, Build Illinois provisions for the Speaker, and also clarifications of thoseproblems in Build Illinois which would clarify some of his concerns.

 And we've been frustrated every step of the way. And all we're trying to do is move the process along. That's why we've moved to nonconcur in Amendment #9. I ask for your support."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Amendment #9 to House Bill 568?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 48 voting 'aye', 61 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And the Motion to nonconcur fails. Amendment #10, Mr. Daniels."
- Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #10 is the severability

 Amendment for the legislation. And after reviewing that, I

 don't think there's any reason to nonconcur. And I would

 renew my Motion to concur if that met with the Speaker's

 plan, please."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #10 to House Bill 568. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, is this now the second Motion to concur on this Amendment?"
- Speaker Greiman: "That's correct. The Motion was made yesterday, and it is now being made today. Yes, Mr. Daniels."
- Daniels: "The Motion to concur that was heard today on 10 and 13 were joined together. I anticipate the problem was because we joined 10 and 13 together. What I've done is moved 10 separately to concur. It contains only the severability."
- Speaker Greiman: "Yes. That's correct. That's correct. Yes,
 Mr. Madigan."

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, could Mr. Daniels offer a brief explanation of Amendment #10?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "I'd be absolutely delighted to do that. Amendment #10 adds a severability clause which provides that if provisions of the Act are held invalid, that such invalidity does not affect other provisions. It's called a severability clause. It severs the bad provisions from the Bill. It cuts them out and throws them away."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I join... I join the Gentleman in his Motion to concur."

Speaker Greiman: "Then the Chair, of course, was incorrect when it said we considered it yesterday. Time up here seems Alright. like it was yesterday. Further There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #10 to House Bill 568?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote Have all voted who wish? Have all Voting is now open. voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Amendment #10 to House Bill 568. And now, Mr. Daniels, the Gentleman from DuPage, on Amendment #13."

Daniels: "First, I'm very thankful to win one on occasion, and so I'm thankful for the support on Amendment #10. Now, Amendment #13,, we heard before on the concurrence Motion. And as you recall, we offered a majority of Republicans on this side of the aisle in support of that concurrence Motion, 26 out of 51. And it's a little difficult for us. I'm sure you can understand, because many of us lost issues of concern but they were still there to support it. But in interest of moving this along, I would then move to

- 86th Legislative Day

 nonconcur on Amendment #13, which is the provision on
 McCormick Place and which I have consistently supported and
 will continue to support. So, I would move to nonconcur
 reluctantly in Amendment #13."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels, has moved that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #13 to House Bill 568. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, again, this Motion could lead to the creation of a Conference Committee. And for that reason, I would request a 'no' vote on the Gentleman's Motion. In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would renew my request that my earlier statement of disclosure be adopted relative to this Amendment for the second time."
- Speaker Greiman: "The statement will be reflected in the records accordingly. And now, the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #13 to House Bill 568?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 53 voting 'aye', 57 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. Mr. Vinson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Vinson: "For purposes of a... To request a Poll of the Absentees initially, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman is within his rights. Mr. Clerk, poll the absentees."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Vinson."
- Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Vinson, did you wish to be recorded?"
- Vinson: "Well, that's why I sought the Poll of the Absentees, Mr. Speaker. And I do wish to be recorded. And I'd like to be recorded as an 'aye' vote on this Motion."
- Speaker Greiman: "Record Mr. Vinson, 'aye'. Mr. Clerk, is that

- 86th Legislative Day
 November 13, 1985
 the..."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Breslin, Hicks, and Zwick, and Representative Cullerton and Laurino."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. On this question, there are 54 voting 'aye', 57 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And Mr. Vinson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Vinson: "To request a verification of the Negative Roll Call."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman is within his rights. Mr. Clerk, proceed to verify the Negative Roll Call."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Berrios. Bowman. Braun. Brookins.

 Bullock. Capparelli. Christensen."
- Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Vinson, the exodus begins. Mr. Nash wishes leave to be verified."
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I believe the issues are such that we ought to all be in the chamber. And I would deny that."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Nash, have a seat. Proceed, Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Currie. Daley. DeLeo. Dunn. Farley."
- Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me. Mr. Goforth, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Mr. Goforth votes 'aye'."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the Poll of the Negative. Flinn. Giorgi. Flowers. Giglio. Greiman. Hannig. Hartke. Huff. Keane. Krska. Kulas. LeFlore. Leverenz. Levin. Matijevich. McGann. McNamara. McPike. Nash. O'Connell. Panayotovich. Pangle. Phelps. Preston. Rea. Rice. Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman. Shaw. Soliz. Steczo. Stern. Sutker. Terzich. Turner. Van Duyne. Washington. White. Wolf. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge. And Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Vinson, questions of the Negative Roll Call."
- Vinson: "Representative Flinn."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Flinn. Mr. Flinn. Mr. Flinn in the chamber? How is Mr. Flinn recorded?"

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Flinn. Mr.... Restore Mr. Flinn to

the Roll Call. Mr. Plinn has returned."

Vinson: "Mr. Hartke."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Hartke is in his chair."

Vinson: "Representative Levin."

Speaker Greiman: "Ar. Levin is standing at his desk."

Vinson: "Mr. Nash."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Nash is right there on the way next to the

door."

Vinson: "Mr. Pangle."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Pangle is in his chair."

Vinson: "Representative Ronan."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Ronan is at his seat, as always."

Vinson: "Representative Shaw."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Shaw is in his chair."

Vinson: "Mr. Steczo."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Steczo is in his seat."

Vinson: "Representative Washington."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Washington. Mr. Washington. Mr.

Washington in the chamber? How is Mr. Washington recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Washington from the Roll Call."

Vinson: "Representative Hannig."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Hannig is at the rear of the chamber."

Vinson: "Mr. Capparelli."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Capparelli is standing at his seat."

Vinson: "Representative Panayotovich."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Panayotovich is here right at the podium."

Vinson: "Mr. Phelps."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Phelps. Mr. Phelps is at the rear of the

chamber. Mr. DeJaegher... Mr. Brunsvold."

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

DeJaegher: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Greiman: "You are recorded... Mr. Clerk, how is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

DeJaegher: "Record me as voting 'present', please."

Speaker Greiman: "Record Mr. DeJaegher as voting 'present'.

Proceed, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Homer."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Homer. Mr. Homer voted 'aye', Mr. Vinson.
You were doing the Negative Roll Call."

Vinson: "Mr. Mautino."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Mautino also voted 'aye'."

Vinson: "I have no further questions."

Speaker Greiman: "On this question, there are 54 voting 'aye', 55 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And the Motion to nonconcur fails. Mr. Daniels, on Amendment #20."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #20 was put on the request of the House Republican Organization which earmarked nine million dollars to the Common School Fund instead of six million which was in Amendment #9. The Senate acceded to our request. This Amendment would have placed in the Common School Fund nine million dollars out of the cigarette tax. And we've done our best to try to pass that nine million dollars per month, by the way. And we've done our best to pass that. Apparently, we cannot. So, I would move to nonconcur."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels, moves that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #20 to House Bill 568. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, as on previous Motions, this Motion could lead to the creation of a Conference Committee, and

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

therefore, I request a 'no' vote."

- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #20 to House Bill 568?' All those favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. voted who wish? On this question, there are 49 voting 'aye', 61 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #1 (sic - Senate Amendment #20) to House 568. Mr. Daniels, for what purpose do vou seek recognition?"
- Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have been through the Amendments sent over by the Senate and have listened to each and every Motion. But I want recap exactly what's on this Bill at the present time in the House, and that's Amendments #1 and 2. which technical Amendments to Build Illinois; Amendment #10, which is a severability clause; Amendment #16, which is the exemption of food and drugs on the sales tax addition of the DuPage Water Commission; Amendment #18, which is a two year prohibition from serving... or offering services to McCormick Place if you served on the board; and Amendment #19, which is a technical reoffering. What is not on is farm aid. Arlington Park, cigarette tax, and McCormick Place reform. In other words, we have absolute meaningless Bill hanging around in limbo waiting for his Honor, the Speaker, to speak."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Chair now moves to the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading, Special Call on Assistance, and on that appears Senate Bill 625. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Brunsvold. Mr. Brunsvold. Mr. Brunsvold, use one of the other microphones. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill." Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 625, a Bill for an Act to amend

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

Sections of the Metropolitan Civic Center Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Brunsvold." Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 625 now includes Amendment #8 which becomes the Bill, and it includes the following: In Section 2, under the Civic Centers Act, it adds a definition of local bonds; under Section 4, it adds 1993 as well as 1975 in the assessed valuation when using the formula for determining eligibility of funding; in Section 5, it revises the amount held in the Metropolitan Exposition Authority to 125 percent - this change provides assurance that bond holders... to bond sufficient funds will be retained to pay off the debt service - And in Section 8, specifies that bond proceeds be applied to defray costs of obtaining credit mav enhancement for the bond issuance. That was requested by DCCA, DCCA's Bond Council in order to market the bonds for the civic centers. The rest of Amendment #8 includes the package. That was debated on the floor presented by Representative Richmond. yesterday, as with that, Mr. Speaker, I'll move for the passage of Senate Bill 625."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Brunsvold, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 625. And on that, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I stated before, Senate Bill 625 has everything in there on farm aid that House Bill 568 had in it except for, it adds to the farm aid provisions, the employee operated provisions or ESOPS, and the civic center funding mechanism. In other words, it's silly for us to stand around debating who thinks they're going to get credit for passage of farm aid because we all know who's holding up

86th Legislative Day

November 13, 1985

the movement of legislation in this House. So, I'm asking each and every Republican to support this package, so that we can make sure the people of Illinois know that we support farm... farm aid, and the farmers of Illinois even if... even if there's a sham that's trying to be pulled on peoples' eyes on the other side of the aisle."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm very pleased to join Mr. Daniels in support of Governor Thompson's farm aid program. I'm happy that we will be able to consider the Bill today. Hopefully, we will pass the Bill so that we can rush to help the farmers of Illinois. Thank you very much, Mr. Daniels. And thank you very much, Mr. Thompson, for proposing this plan."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think all of you know that I'm a farmer and have always supported farm issues over the 15 years I've been here. But in view of the action that has taken place in this House on House Bill 568, I'm going to vote against the farmers and the farm aid situation contained in this Bill. Those on the other side of the aisle have seen fit to be capricious in their handling of anything that this side of the aisle wants. I don't care whether the rest of you want to vote for this or not. your prerogative. But I am voting 'no' just to point out my objection to the way the Speaker of this House has handled the General Assembly this year. I am not happy at all with the way the Speaker has handled it. And for that reason, as a protest, I am going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Greinan: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Priedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Hembers of the House, even though the

Bill yesterday on farm aid and this one has nothing to do

with farm surplus, I would really appreciate it if the

86th Legislative Day

- November 13, 1985
- Gentleman, the Majority Leader from Madison, would give us his Fourth of July speech again telling us what a mess the Congress has made out of farm aid."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Brunsvold, to close."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to say that we've delayed it long enough in helping... trying to help the farmers with what little we can do here. And I would ask for your support in the passage of Senate Bill 625."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

 Voting is open and this is final action. Br. Vinson, one minute to explain your vote."
- Vinson: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my vote, I just want to assure Mr. Friedrich that we have a tape of all of Mr. McPike's farm speeches, and we'll be glad to play that far and wide in Illinois."
- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'aye', 4 voting... Mr. Brookins, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Brookins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Greiman: "One minute to explain your vote."
- Brookins: "Yes. Few weeks ago, one of the leaders from Chicago came down, the Reverend Jesse Jackson, and explained how the eithers, the city dwellers and the farmers, need to unit to bring about a coalition. And I think this Bill will go towards that. As you notice, all the city folks are on this Bill so that we can help the farmers pull themselves up. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Madigan, one minute to explain your vote.

 Mr. Clerk, take the Roll. On this question, there are 109

- 86th Legislative Day

 November 13, 1985

 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And

 this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is

 hereby declared passed. Hr. Madigan, for what purpose do

 you seek recognition?"
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, to move that we stand in recess until 3:30."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, moves that the House stand in recess until the hour of 3:30. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The House will stand in recess until the hour of 3:30."
- Clerk O'Brien: "May I have your attention, please? The House will stand in recess until 4:00 p.m. The House will remain in recess until 4:00 p.m. Hay I have your attention, please? The House will stand in recess until 4:00 p.m. The House will remain in recess until 4:00 p.m.
- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. Representative Daniels and I have been meeting for approximately an hour. We have made major progress in terms of resolving the issues which remain; however, we will need time to complete the paperwork that would be needed to begin consideration of these Bills. And, therefore, our plan is to adjourn now to 10:00 a.m. in the morning, providing for Party Caucuses at 9:00 a.m. Mr. Daniels."
- Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I concur with you said. And in an effort to give us the necessary time to complete the work, I would agree that we should adjourn until tomorrow morning at 10:00. There will be a 9:00 Republican Caucus in Room 119. All Members, I'm speaking to the Republican side of the aisle, should be here tomorrow. All Members should be here tomorrow. Hopefully, we will be able to resolve the differences and present to our respective Conferences, a proposal which you

- 86th Legislative Day
 November 13, 1985
 will approve, hopefully."
- Speaker Madigan: "There will be a Democratic Caucus at 9:00 a.m. in Room 114. The Chair recognizes... Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 883, offered by Representative Washington; 884, by Pullen and Kulas; 886, by Keane and McGann; 893, by McAuliffe. And Senate Joint Resolution 99, by Harris and B. Pedersen."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Greiman, on the Agreed Resolutions."
- Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves the Agreed Resolutions.

 Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The
 'ayes' have it. The Resolutions are adopted. Death
 Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 885, offered by Representative Stern, with respect to the memory of Gregory N. Sheahen. House Resolution 887, offered by Representative Bowman et al, with respect to the memory of Curtis D. MacDougall."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Greiman moves for the adoption of the Death Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Death Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Mulcahey."
- Mulcahey: "Thank you, Hr. Speaker, Members of the House. I heard the remarks made by the Speaker and by Minority Leader, Representative Daniels, and I was wondering if either one of you would be willing to give the Membership an idea exactly what's being discussed, what the issues are or what the topics are right now so we can go back to our staffs and talk them over to see if we can come up with an agreement."
- Speaker Madigan: "That's a good idea. Why don't you and I talk privately about that after we adjourn?"
- Mulcahey: "Well, that's fine, but some of the other fellows

- 86th Legislative Day
- November 13, 1985
- wanted to know, too. We'll all be back, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Madigan: "Good. Great. See you soon. Anything further?

 Mr. McPike, for the Adjournment Motion."
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the House stand adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 10:00 a.m."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House stand adjourned. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House does stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. In the Special Session, the Chair recognizes Hr. McPike."
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd move that the Roll Call for the Regular Session be used as the Attendance Roll Call for the Second Special Session."
- Speaker Madigan: "Leave is granted."
- McPike: "Nove that the Second Special Session stand adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 10:30 a.m."
- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Special Session stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning."

1	2	/	1	7	/	8	5
O	3	•	2	1			

STATE OF ILLINOIS 84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 1

NOVEMBER 13, 1985

HB-0569	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	4
HB-0568	MOTION	PAGE	21
SB-0625	THIRD READING	PAGE	63

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE GREIMAN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - FATHER KEVIN LAUGHERY	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	3
RECESS	PAGE	67
HOUSE RECONVENES - SPEAKER MADIGAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	67
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	68
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	68
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	69
SPECIAL SESSION	PAGE	69
SPECIAL SESSION - ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	69