

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Speaker Greiman: "... Having arrived, the House will be in Session. Members will be at their seats. Those not entitled to the floor, please withdraw. The Chaplain for today will be Father Frank O'Hara, Pastor of St. Peter and Paul Catholic Church of Springfield. Father O'Hara is a guest of Representative Michael Curran. Will the guests in the gallery please rise for the invocation? Father O'Hara."

Father O'Hara: "In the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. May the Holy Spirit inspire them. May their God watch over them. May their Savior guide them. May the Saints protect them. May their ears be open to hear His voice. May their eyes be open to see His ways. May their lips be open to be His voice. May their hands be ready to do His work and may their feet be free to walk His way. In the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from DuPage, Ms. Cowlshaw, to lead us in the Pledge to the flag."

Cowlshaw - 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: "Roll Call for Attendance. Mr. Piel, are there any absences on the Republican side? Piel, Mr. Piel."

Piel: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the record show that Representative Davis, Representative Hastert, Representative Ropp, Representative Slater and Representative Hasara are not here today."

Speaker Greiman: "Let the record so reflect. Mr. Matijevich, are there anyone on the Democratic side?"

Matijevich: "Yes, Representative Leverenz, due to illness;

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Representative Shaw, due to a death in the family;
Representative Woods Bowman and Jim Keane, due to business.
Those are the only ones I have reported so far. Nelson
Rice."

Speaker Greiman: "Let the record reflect that they have been...
that these Members are absent. Yes, Mr. Harris, for what
purpose do you seek recognition?"

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For some reason my 'present'
button is not working, and I am turning my key. The 'yes'
and 'no' work, but the 'present' apparently does... Thank
you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Have all Members acknowledged their presence?
Mr. Clerk, take the record. 103 Members having answered
the Call of the Quorum, a quorum is present. We will be
going to Conference in the... not quite yet, but in the
next few minutes. So that the Members who are in the
Capitol Complex should come immediately to the House floor.
Ladies and Gentlemen, the Conference Chair of both sides of
the aisle have advised us that they wish to go to Caucus at
this time. The Democrats will go to Room 114. The
Republicans to Room 118. We should proceed directly at
this time. The Caucus will probably be at least an hour.
So, those who will not be appearing, at least intend to be
here by... back by 10:30 or at the Call of the Chair.
Those Members who are still in the Stratton Building in
their offices, we are going to Caucus at this time.
Democrats 114, Republicans 118, immediately. The House
will stand in recess till the Call of the Chair. The House
will be in order. Members should be in their seats. We
are going to begin to conduct our business. Your attention
is drawn to Supplemental Calendar #3. On the Order of
Conference Committee Reports appears Senate Bill 1565. Mr.
O'Connell in the chamber? Mr. O'Connell. We'll take that

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

out of the record. For the moment HB 2630 is out of the record. House Bill 3351. Mr. Hannig, are you prepared to proceed? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3351, amends the School Code. Conference Committee Report #1."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. As is often the case this time of year, Bills which start for one purpose end up in another purpose. This Bill initially... excuse me, Mr. Speaker. I need to make a Motion, I think, to hear this Bill, the Clerk informs me. So, I would move, pursuant to Rule 74 to suspend Rule 79(e) and place the Bill on the Calendar on the Order of Concurrence for Conference Committee Reports."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hannig, has moved to suspend Rule 79(e) so the Bill may be placed on the Calendar on the Order of Conference Committee Reports and take it from the table. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'... yes, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "To the Motion, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "We stand in opposition to that. Ask for a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, we would have to have a Roll Call vote in any event. Mr. Hannig, you were seeking recognition?"

Hannig: "I just have a parliamentary inquiry. How many votes would this take?"

Speaker Greiman: "71 votes to remove it from the table, Mr. Hannig. Mr. Hannig, perhaps we'll return to you. We'll take that out of the record. Representative Giglio, in the Chair."

Speaker Giglio: "House Bill... House Bill 2630 on Supplemental 3 Calendar. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2630, amends the Illinois Pension Code."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Conference Committee Report #2. Third Corrected Copy."

Greiman: "Thank you, Speaker."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "By way of an introduction, on July the 2nd or so, we closed the Illinois House of Representatives and the Illinois Senate and a miraculous occurrence had happened. For the first time since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, no pension Bill was passed by the Illinois General Assembly. It was an unheard of moment in Illinois history. We did, however, develop during the course of the last four years a policy to provide us with sensible restraint in the development of pension plans, to listen to the systems and to provide the communities tht will have... the taxpayer bodies that will have to pay for these an opportunity to have their voice heard. Every effort has been made to stay true to those principles. Important in the development of this pension Bill was a provision that deals with investment in South Africa. The language that you see before you has been developed by a number of people. The Illinois bankers specifically wanted to have great input into it and to restrict it and to attempt, as best they can, to emasculate this kind of language so that they could go without concern. They apparently are satisfied that it has been sufficiently emasculated that even they would be willing, at this moment, to restrict investments in South... in companies doing business in South Africa. One does not have to be very astute in America today, or in the world today, to know that pension trustees ought not to be investing in South African companies, that those who handle our money ought not to be doing that either and that American companies, also, who wish to have their stock and their securities and their loans handled by our pension funds, which is sort of

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

quasi-public money know that they ought not to do that. We say this because to be American is to be against apartheid. And if we cannot learn to use our economic strength, then we have learned nothing. The South African provisions is prospective only. It is not a divestment... or divestiture Bill. It says that we ought not to take new monies and put it into a South African venture, describes certain ventures. It says also that our depositories, our fiduciaries prospectively ought not to purchase and require South African ventures and make South African loans. Much of this has been rendered mute by federal legislation. It provides... There is a question - I will give you the intent as one of its drafters - as to money that's rolled over, it applies prospectively to those funds which come into the hands of the trustees, which is money originally given by the systems so that if there is a profit, if there is turnover, those funds ought to not be put into South African investments."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Greiman, excuse me."

Greiman: "Yes."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative McCracken, for a point of order."

McCracken: "As I understand it, we're acting on a Third Corrected Conference Committee Report. My understanding is it hasn't been printed or distributed. And I object to proceeding at this time."

Speaker Giglio: "Alright. We'll take it out of the record."

Greiman: "We think it's out. But why don't we let the Clerk see? Is it out or not?"

Speaker Giglio: "The Third... We're on the..."

Greiman: "Alright. Well, fine. Well, we'll be here tomorrow morning. We can do it tomorrow morning just as easy. Okay."

Speaker Giglio: "It will be up... It will be up momentarily."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

It's on its way up from the printer. We'll get back to it.
Alright, on the Supplemental Calendar #3 appears Senate
Bill 1004. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1004, amends the Nursing Home Care
Reform Act. Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to yield to
Representative McGann to present the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Greiman in the Chair.
Representative McGann."

McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Assembly. I
would move to accept the First Conference Committee Report
on Senate Bill 1004. It has been explained in the
Amendment which became the Bill, and it was accepted by...
signatures of all, both sides of the aisle. And I would
ask for its movement in regards to Senate Bill 1004."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McGann, moves that
the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to
Senate Bill 1004. And on that, is there any discussion?
The Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to briefly join
Representative McGann in asking that this Conference
Committee Report be adopted. It as a result of some hard
work and negotiation. I think the result is appropriate in
some... a very important area of developmental disability
and mental health."

Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First
Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1004?' All
those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote
'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. The Bill
requires 71 votes. 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 100 voting 'aye',

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1004. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #3 on the Order of Conference Committee Reports appears Senate Bill 1164. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1164, an Act in relationship to fees and pesticide registration. Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Pangle."

Pangle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this Conference Committee Bill is about is that from the City of Kankakee to the Manteno Veterans' Home there is a water line that has been in existence for 50 years. It is in need of repair. The City of Kankakee... I mean, the water company of Kankakee has agreed to take over that water line, refurbish it, supply a bulk rate water supply to the Manteno Veterans' Home if, in fact, the water line, the pumping facility is granted to the Kankakee Water Company. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Kankakee moves that the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1164. And on that, the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Hallock."

Hallock: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

Hallock: "Representative Pangle, what's the approximate value of the property that's being given away in this instance?"

Pangle: "I'm sorry. What is the approximate what?"

Hallock: "The value of the land."

Pangle: "What we're really... we're talking about an easement with a water line running through it."

Hallock: "Well, what's the position of CMS on this Bill? Have you talked to them?"

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Pangle: "CMS position was that they would grant the facility but not the easement right-of-way on that property. The water company says that if they're going to repair that pipeline and repair that pumping station, that they certainly should have right to the property upon it so they don't have to come to the state to repair it every time they have to do it."

Hallock: "So you're saying the Department of Central Management Services is against this, but they do have some reservations in stating that opinion."

Pangle: "Well, I can only tell you this. If you feel that you would want to wait a year so that we get a supplemental Bill from the Department of Veterans' Affairs to repair that water line and additional money every year until that, because the state's going to have to continue to repair it, and if you feel that we shouldn't give a better bulk rate to the Veterans' Home's water and if you feel that the state should be in the water line business, then I would only suggest to you that you vote against the Bill. And next year, if it doesn't pass, we'll just wait for the supplemental to come in."

Hallock: "Well, the people who are the recipients of the property of the Kankakee Water Company, is that a public or a private agency?"

Pangle: "That's a private agency, and I must explain to you that there's no babbling brook running through that property and there's no lake or golf course on it."

Hallock: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Mr. Hallock."

Hallock: "We have here a situation whereby we are being asked to give away property in the form of easement which is worth over two million dollars to a private company in this part

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

of the state. It's a bad idea. It's a bad precedent. I urge it be defeated."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. Mays."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Representative Pangle, would you mind temporarily taking this out of the record so we can discuss this a little bit further?"

Pangle: "No, I think we should..."

Mays: "I apologize."

Pangle: "No, I think if we're going to save the taxpayers of the State of Illinois some tax dollars, I think we should vote it up or vote it down."

Mays: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McNamara."

McNamara: "Will the Sponsor yield for questions?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

McNamara: "Representative, on this water pipeline, what is the condition of that pipeline right now?"

Pangle: "It's in need of repair. It's a 50 year old pipeline that's completely rusted out with water running out of the sides of it."

McNamara: "It's my understanding that if this pipeline is not given to the private company in order to repair it, the state probably next year will have to repair it and recoup the cost for doing that, is that correct?"

Pangle: "There's no question about it."

McNamara: "So, in reality, this is a tax saving measure, because it alleviates the cost of the state of repairing something and it allows private industry to repair it and provide the service and gets the State of Illinois out of the water line business."

Pangle: "That's correct."

McNamara: "Thank you very much."

Pangle: "Mr. Speaker..."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Speaker Greiman: "Yes."

Pangle: "I'll take the... take it out of the record for a short period of time."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright, out of the record. Mr. Ronan, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Ronan: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Greiman: "You have to stand up, Al."

Ronan: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I think that we've got a impasse right now caused by some atmospheric conditions. So, why don't you let everybody go have lunch for maybe an hour? You know nothing is going to happen. The food in the Capitol is horrible. Can't we taken an hour off and go eat?"

Speaker Greiman: "Al, I'm trying to go on a diet, and you're interfering with my diet. Turn on Mr. Ronan. Mr. Ronan."

Ronan: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, if it would be possible, I'd like to get a copy of that diet, for gosh sake. I'm thinking about trying out for Sumo wrestling next year, and I'd like to follow some of your advice."

Speaker Greiman: "On Supplemental Calendar #3, on the Order of Conference Committee Reports, appears Senate Bill 1565. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1565, amends the Unified Code of Corrections. Conference Committee Report #2."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate... the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1565 alters the current law dealing with narcotic substances, specifically as it relates to cocaine. Many of you are familiar with the current epidemic of usage of an illegal substance called crack. This is a Bill that was developed by the Cook County State's Attorney, Richard M. Daley, to address this epidemic. The distinction between

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

crack and other illegal narcotics or controlled substances is the unique availability of the narcotic and the small substance that can be ingested prior to either addiction or serious disablement of a person using it. And compounding the problem is its easy availability. Dealers have been taking the pure substance of cocaine and reducing it into this substance called crack. The problem that the State's Attorney's Office in Cook County and elsewhere determined was that the normal gram levels of controlled substances was much too high in order to have any relevancy to the usage of crack which is a cocaine. Rather than identify criminal penalties as it addresses crack, we address the substance of cocaine in and of itself which should address the problems unique to crack. Specifically, what we provided was that the delivery of 15 grams or more becomes a Class X Felony. Currently, the law provides that delivery or possession with intent to deliver of 30 grams or more of cocaine is a nonprobationable Class X Felony. We've reduced it to 15 grams. We've also provided that a delivery of more than five grams but less than 15 is a nonprobationable Class 1 Felony. Presently, the law provides that a delivery of more than 10 but less than 30 is a nonprobationable Class 1. We also provided that delivery of less than one gram is a Class 3 Felony. Current law is that delivery of 10 grams or less is a probationable Class 3 Felony. So, the net effect of these penalties is to lower the level of grams that are delivered before the... before a particular level of felony is incurred. As I said, the reason for the lowering of the penalties... the raising of the penalties, rather, and the lowering of the grams needed is because of the unique addiction... additional qualities of crack which is a part... a form of cocaine. We also provided several other

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

things in the Conference Committee Report #2 dealing with the solicitation... the involvement of minors in the delivery of cocaine. Present law... or not just cocaine, but any controlled substance. Present law provides that a person commits solicitation when, with the intent that an offense be committed, he commands, encourages, or requests another to commit that offense. What we did in this Conference Committee is to provide that a person who violates the delivery of controlled substance statute or the calculated criminal drug conspiracy statute by, quote, 'using, engaging or employing a person under 18 to deliver a controlled substance is subject to a discretionary prison term of up to twice the time otherwise authorized for delivery of a controlled substance'. This is a significant departure from current law because we are addressing the drug dealer who will use a minor, a person under the age of 18 to provide for the delivery. This gives a Judge the discretionary latitude to increase the criminal penalties by up to twice the amount. I should point out that the Bill does not address cannibus in any way which was the original... part of the original Conference Committee Report #1. In talking to other Members, it was decided that the urgency of this measure should be focused on crack and that alone. I would suspect that the cannibus alterations will occur in the next General Assembly Session, but it does not... it is not involved in this particular Conference Committee Report. There is also several things that are somewhat unrelated to the offense of crack but do have some involvement with controlled substances. It provides that Department of Children and Family Services shall adopt rules and regulations mandating staff training in screening techniques to identify persons to be referred to alcohol and drug abuse treatment programs

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

and shall include recommended evaluations in case plans. Also, in the Department of Corrections, we have provided that DOC will develop a master plan for screening inmates with substance abuse problems. Also, the Department of Alcohol... Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse Authority... we have provided them authority to conduct training programs for expanded... to be expanded to specifically allow for the training of hospital emergency room physicians and nurses in the recognition of alcohol and drug abuse signs. We do not mandate that the physicians report such patients that they have observed these addictions. We've got also, in addition to the delivery of cocaine, we have addressed the laws as it relates to the possession of heroine, cocaine and morphine. Current law has it the possession of 30 grams or more of heroine, cocaine and morphine is a Class 1 Felony. Possession of less than 30 grams is a Class 4 Felony or Class 3... strike that - it is a Class 4 Felony if it's cocaine. It's a Class 3 if it's possession of less than 30 grams of heroine and morphine. What we provided for in this Conference Committee is that a possession of 15 grams or more would constitute a Class 1 Felony and possession of less than 15 grams would be a Class 4 Felony if it's cocaine, or a Class 3 Felony if it's heroine and morphine. The net effect of these changes is to raise the penalty for possession of between 15 and 30 grams from a Class 3 or 4 to a Class 1, depending if it's cocaine or whether it's morphine or heroine. There's also a significant change, important change, that is directed to the sentencing for juveniles. Recently, there was a Supreme Court ruling which provided that a Judge... strike that - that there's nowhere in the law that prohibits a Judge from sentencing a delinquent to a determinent sentence when he is brought

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day,

December 5, 1986

before the court. What this Conference Committee provides is that a Judge, when sentencing a juvenile, would be given the authority to provide a sentence with an indeterminate sentence that would be in effect until that juvenile reaches the age of 21. That's a clarification. The Department of Corrections had been under the impression that they would treat juveniles under an indeterminate sentencing provisions. The Supreme Court raised doubts about that in October of 1986. This simply provides a more definitive statutory statement. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Connell, moves that the House adopt the Second Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1565. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Like most large packages, there are things in here that I like, and there's things in here that I don't like. I have no problem with increasing the penalties for these narcotics, for cocaine delivery expenses... offenses, but I don't understand why we have to remove discretion from Judges in giving out their sentences. I don't... don't feel that there's a whole bunch of liberal Judges running around letting people loose on the street. I think that on a rare occasion a period of probation is appropriate, and we are removing that discretion from the Judges. I don't think that's a good idea. However, I'm going to support the Bill because of the last point that Representative O'Connell spoke about. This Henry County case that was decided basically said that a Judge in a juvenile offender case can set... send that juvenile to jail for a determinate period of time. There are seven juvenile institutions in Illinois which have a population

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

of a little over a thousand. If this was... this recent case was allowed to stay the law, we would have Judges starting to send prisoners, juveniles, for a set period of time, thus removing from the Director of the Department of Corrections the discretion when to... when to let that juvenile out. The loss of the discretionary release ends up in eroding the Department's ability to motivate good behavior by juvenile delinquents who are behind bars. And in addition, we would have so many extra prisoners, we would have to then, once again, come in and build another juvenile facility. So, that case was argued by John Breslin from the State's Attorneys' Appellate Service Commission and, unfortunately, they didn't win the case and so, as a result, we're here with this statute now to try to correct... go back to the current practice and avoid this potential serious problem. So, for that reason, I'm going to support the Bill and urge everyone else to."

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

McCracken: "I rise in favor of the Bill as well, and I agree with Representative Cullerton that the latter provision makes sense when applied to juveniles and that it's more consistent with the current capabilities of the Department of Corrections. I also am in favor of treating the delivery and possession of this new and dangerous drug differently than it would otherwise be treated under the law if not amended. So, for those reasons, I also stand in support of the Bill and ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, Mr. O'Connell, briefly, to close."

O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll simply reiterate the main focus of this Conference Committee Report was to give our prosecutors the tools needed in which to address a growing and dangerous drug usage of a substance called

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

crack. I would commend State's Attorney Daley and his staff for bringing the matter to the attention of the Legislature and working with the Legislature to provide for a reasonable solution, at least in terms of the courts, to this growing problem. I would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the Second Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1565?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. This is final action. Currie... Alright, 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 104 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present', and the House does adopt the Second Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1565. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports, Supplemental Calendar #3, appears Senate Bill 1164. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1164, a Bill for an Act in relationship to fees for pesticide registration. Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Pangle."

Pangle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll just ask for a 'aye' vote on 1164."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Pangles, moves that the House do adopt the Second Conference Committee Report... No, I'm sorry, the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1164. And on that, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. With an..."

Speaker Greiman: "What is your inquiry, Sir?"

McCracken: "With an immediate effective date, does this require

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

71 votes for passage?"

Speaker Greiman: "If it has one, it would. But let's look and see what the Bill provides. It has an immediate effective date. It would require 71 votes. Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1164?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open and this is final action. Mr. Pangle, one minute to explain your vote."

Pangle: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to put this on Postponed Consideration, please. Can't do it?"

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Pangle, under our rules, you cannot put this on Postponed Consideration. It could be reconsidered later on today, but it could not be put on Postponed."

Pangle: "That would be fine, but I'd still like to explain my vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, proceed, Sir. One minute to explain your vote."

Pangle: "This piece of legislation is one that is going to be beneficial to the taxpayers of the State of Illinois simply because of the cost factor that's going to be incurred probably within the next 12 to 24 months putting in a new pumping station, putting in new water lines, putting in a new holding well. There's a lot of expense that's going to be incurred by the state. It's very important, of course, to the Manteno Veterans' Home to have a water supply. This is also, I think, should be considered if we are fortunate to reconsider this Bill before the day is over. We've got 147 residents or patients at the Veterans' Home. I think that their safety and their health care is being jeopardized presently from the flaws... the problems and the flaws that we've had in the water line in the last 12

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative
McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This isn't an issue of just White Sox or not. It's actually an economic interest and we should take a look at it on its economic basis. What do we have? We have the White Sox that are going to be spending four million dollars in rent per year and, for that, they will get the revenue from the sky boxes, the parking, the concessions, also the door gate and everything else. We have five million dollars to be expended, supposedly, by the City of Chicago. And, out of that, that will be raised through a two percent increase in hotel tax which can actually ruin business for the state and its coffers. They also have the parking tax, and they also recoup all of their investment. Then we take a look at the State of Illinois' investment in this. The State of Illinois is investing five million dollars, but that five million dollars is per year. Over the life of the bonds of twenty years is a maximum liability of 100,000 dollars, maybe it's only four... 100 million dollars. Maybe it's only 40 million dollars because it's a sinking fund situation. But that is total revenue lost. The only one investing in the White Sox is the State of Illinois. All of our taxpayers in our districts are investing into the State of Illinois this money which is coming out of our districts. It's reducing our business, will reduce the amount of revenue we get or that we will lose from the conventions and revenue. It would also make another reduction in the third way that that five million dollars that was originally in the state's hotel/motel tax fees could have been used to entice more business into the state and now is being dedicated totally for one, single purpose. This is a loser for Illinois. This is a bad concept. The

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

White Sox should remain in Illinois. But there is one thing - we cannot afford this price to pay for the White Sox to remain in Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Contrary to some statements that were issued earlier, the last privately-owned stadium to be built in the United States is being built today in Dade County, Florida. The reason they're building that stadium in Dade County is because they know they can make money. As a matter of fact, if you look at all the stadiums in the United States today, you'll find that those that are owned by municipalities or other government agencies to the last are losing money. Those that are owned by private enterprise are making money. There's a reason there. There's a profit motive. My prediction for the stadium that's going to be built for the White Sox, should it be built, will certainly lose money. And they will come to Illinois, they will come here to the Legislature year after year, when the five million dollars isn't enough, for us to bail them out. We're sending a message to business, not to come to Illinois, but beware, because we continue to raise your taxes. Under the guise of saving sports and the economy that it draws to Illinois, we are raising other business taxes. We are telling conventioners don't come to Chicago. Don't come to see the Cubs or the Bears or the Sox or the Bulls, because you won't be able to afford the rent at the hotel room. We can't afford to raise taxes on a continual basis in Illinois. It's pretty much considered a proven fact that the rate of tax increases are the most direct... most directly related to the decline of the economy. Illinois is sending a poor message to the rest of the world. If,

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

indeed, we want to bring business to Illinois, we should be cutting taxes, Mr. Speaker, not lowering... not raising taxes as this Bill asks for. The message is clear. If we need to keep the Sox in Illinois, and I believe that we should, the message should be let the Sox build their own stadium. Let's help with bonding authority. But let's not ask the taxpayers that happen to be passing through the City of Chicago to bear the burden. And let's not ask the taxpayers from southern Illinois to bail out another fiasco in Chicago. What will happen if this stadium... the construction, something goes wrong again? The contracts aren't signed? Illinois will be faced to bail them out again, Mr. Speaker. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Daley."

Daley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in support of this legislation. The Chicago White Sox have been a part of the City of Chicago for 76 years, and this agreement will make sure that they continue to be part of our city and of our state. I know many of the Members of this Body have enjoyed attending games in this stadium. However, it's time to go on to a new stadium. It is a old, historical park, but it's a new day and we need a new stadium. This agreement will make possible the construction of a new stadium right next to the old. But the difference is that the city and the state will save millions of dollars in infrastructure because it is next to an existing expressway and there are ramps and the CTA is adjacent to it. I urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I didn't grow up in the City of Chicago. As a matter of fact, grew up over in Indiana, but even from that far away, we liked to come to Chicago and see Major

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

League baseball games and I've seen a lot of ball games in Wrigley Field and a lot of ball games in Comisky Park. As a matter of fact, there was even a gentleman from my hometown who played Major League baseball and was a manager of the Chicago White Sox one year. So, I have a fond spot in my heart for the Chicago White Sox and I wish them well in the City of Chicago. But I am aware of the fact, as is everyone else, that in the last 76 years that the Chicago White Sox have been in the City of Chicago they have changed like other sports franchises from a sporting venture to a business venture. It's quite clear that professional sports these days are businesses. We all know that. And it's nice to provide incentives to businesses and to attract them into our state and to encourage those who are already here to prosper and flourish, and I think we should do that. But I don't think we should tilt the State Treasury in the direction of one business and tell the others that we're not going to do anything for them. There must be machine shop operators and injection 'moulting' plants and small parts manufacturers and all kinds of large and small industries on the south and southwest side of Chicago who could use a little help and who would like to get that help without submitting their financial statement to the taxing authority of the State of Illinois. They would like to come to State Government and come and say, 'If you don't help me, I'm going to pull out of the State of Illinois and I'm going to take jobs with me and business. So, you'd better jump to my tune, come to my aid, help me, give me money. But I don't intend to tell you whether I need it or not. I don't intend to tell you whether my plant needs remodeled or whether it needs torn down or reconstructed. And I don't intend to tell you what my income projections are for the future because, if you

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

build a new facility for me, I'm not going to... I'm going to say I'll pay rent to you for four million dollars a year, but I'm not going to submit to you any specific plan about how that rent is going to be paid. And what I want you to do is to build this new factory for me and don't put the construction out for bids. Make sure it's a turn-key operation and then I want you to ask the people of the State of Illinois and their children and grandchildren to pay for this manufacturing plant of mine.' If a business came in and said that to us, we'd laugh them right out the door. We're losing prospective. We're losing sight of what we're about in the State of Illinois. It used to be that we would stop and grind to a halt and we wouldn't say, 'What is the deal?' We would ask whether there should be a deal. Seems like we've forgotten the first step on our thought process. We're struggling here with what form this deal should take, not whether there should be a deal at all. Just in the last 48 hours, I received two calls back home which don't relate to this issue in any direct way; however, I think they bring a lot of things to the fore. One call was from a taxpayer who is entitled to a refund of state income tax. I have been told by someone in the Department of Revenue - and I hope it was not someone with authority, that if I suggested that the matter was a hardship case, the refund could be accelerated; otherwise, it would have to wait and the refund, of course, is more than six months overdue. I also received a telephone call from a local grocer, an independent businessman who recently purchased another store in my town, got private financing, had no governmental aid, he had a heart bypass surgery, he's trying to recover from that, has his son running his grocery store, and he called and said he is in the WIC Program. And the State of Illinois is not current

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

with him only to the tune of 4,000 dollars. He needs that money for cash flow to keep his business going. What can I tell people like that who are struggling to keep a business going in an area that has difficult economic times, one who needs 4,000 dollars, one who needs 600 dollars? What can I tell retired teachers when we won't fund their pension program? What can I tell the poor, the mentally ill, the children if I vote for this Bill, no matter how much I might like the Chicago White Sox, no matter how fond I might be of that team, no matter how much I might like to watch professional sports, no matter how much I might dream that I might have been a Major League baseball player or one of my children or grandchildren might be? We must back off and think about why we were sent here. It is not our business to invest state tax dollars to single out one business just because it happens to be well known, popular, in a large city and subsidize that to the detriment of other businesses right in the same city and all across this state. This is something we should not do. If we set this precedent, we may bring the roof down upon ourselves. It may be a matter... it will be a matter of time, but I think it will come. The taxpayers will revolt if we do things like this. I think we should send them a signal right now that we're turning the corner not away from responsibility, but toward responsibility. We should reject this legislation and ask the Chicago White Sox to stay in the City of Chicago and be a part of the City of Chicago as they have been these many, many years and to do it on their own two feet. I urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Friedrich: "Representative Greiman, I don't see an effective date on this Conference Committee Report, and I... I say I don't..."

Greiman: "That's correct. No effective date."

Friedrich: "And the Senate passed it by 30 votes. What, in your opinion, if it passes the House, will it become effective, when?"

Greiman: "It would become effective July the 1st under our laws and it would require 60 votes in this chamber."

Friedrich: "July the 1st, 1987. So, actually what will be done today won't mean anything for another seven months. Is that right?"

Greiman: "That's when July 1st, 1987 is, yes."

Friedrich: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Nash."

Nash: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this piece of legislation. This project is going to bring a whole lot of joy to senior citizens and to young kids in the State of Illinois and the City of Chicago who go out to the ball games, especially the ones who get free passes from the White Sox. It'll also bring a lot of revenue to the State of Illinois and to the City of Chicago. It's a good project for the people of Illinois and the City of Chicago, and I urge an 'aye' vote on it. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Bureau County, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Mautino: "Representative Greiman, I see where the local distributive fund provides for a 5,000,000 dollar infusion of funds by the City of Chicago on a one-twelfth basis, and

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

I see that under the Build Illinois provisions for the hotel/motel tax, the additional 5,000,000 is pledged by the State of Illinois, is that correct, for a total of 10,000,000?"

Greiman: "That's what the extent of liability would be, yes."

Mautino: "On page 29 of the Bill, on line 24, it says, 'Provided that the maximum so transferred in any fiscal year shall not exceed 15,000,000 or such lesser sum.' Where does the other 5,000,000 dollars come from?"

Grieman: "The 15,000,000 million includes what would come from the 2% increase in the motel/hotel tax, so that's an outside limit on debt service when you take all of the figures taken together."

Mautino: "I respectfully... who's... I don't know who your staff person is there. The provision for the funding for the hotel/motel tax, and this is very important, is the 60% left over from the Build Illinois Fund. That 60% includes the motel/hotel tax and the provisions are 10,000,000. I just want to know where the fifteen... the other 5,000,000 comes from that you're using in that Section."

Greiman: "Yes, apparently... we had a... I will tell you that there was a person for the Bureau of the Budget present at the Conference Committee meeting. Apparently, there are sufficient funds over the amount necessary to cover that obligation. So, that what you have is a sufficient amount to cover and support the bonds that have already been issued... or are to be issued on the Build Illinois programs as well as... as well as this revenue stream."

Mautino: "If I may, Mr. Greiman, what is the figure, is it 15,000,000 or is it ten? The legislation says 15,000,000. Is the legislation incorrect or is it correct? What is it? What is it?"

Greiman: "Apparently, it all goes into a single fund. The new

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

money from the hotel/motel tax, the money from the city, the money from the other... all goes into a single fund for repayment of the bonds. So that, what that is is essentially directions for accounting more than limitations... statutory limitations and that's what really we have."

Mautino: "I have another question then. Of the provisions that go into Build Illinois, the first 40% goes into Build Illinois, the second 60% is what you're talking about for the 5,000,000 dollars. Does that mean that the funds going into the Build Illinois automatically go into this as a priority and is upfront money taken away from the Build Illinois projects?"

Greiman: "As I understand it, there's no prioritization like that at all. So, the answer is no, absolutely no."

Mautino: "What you're saying is that the money go..."

Greiman: "No..."

Mautino: "...It does not take away from any Build Illinois authorization that has already been established."

Greiman: "That is correct."

Mautino: "Okay. I find it rather interesting though that we would include an overage of 5,000,000 dollars into a fund that is supposedly not to cost more than one and a half million dollars a year as per your statements in the Conference. I think many of us would find that to be a very difficult provision if, in fact, it includes 15,000,000 instead of the ten that has been presented, and I don't understand where the other comes from."

Greiman: "Well, let me take this opportunity then to at least give you some kind of outline of what the possibilities might be. The maintenance on an every day basis is covered by the White Sox. They will do that. The extraordinary, down the line maintenance indeed might have to be done by

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

the Authority, but the Authority is not going to have a lot of costs that are in question. They will not be paying the salaries of the people who clean up the place; they will not be paying the salaries of the set up people; they will not be paying the salaries for the folks who do the initial, for the folks who do the plumbing and clean up the johns and all the other things that go up and down. They won't buy the soap flakes to clean the floor, the ammonia; they won't be doing that. The Sox will be bearing increases of inflation. So, the truth is that in this case, the Authority's costs are relatively stable and relatively predictable. Once the interest rate on the bonds is determined, plus a sinking fund for future expenses of a million dollars, you're talking about, roughly, about 13,000,000 dollars a year. Those are the expenses and those are expenses... and those are expenses that are fixed expenses. They are not subject to change up and down. They are fixed expenses. Now, to pay those fixed expenses is a seven and a half million dollar hotel/motel tax. A 4,000,000 dollar White Sox rent is 11,000,000. So, we're talking about a million and a half dollars coming from the City of Chicago and the State of Illinois, maybe, 2,000,000 dollars. You know what? We have... we have taken the worst case scenario, and I've listened for an hour to it all, the truth of the matter is, that it's unlikely that there will ever be more than a million or 2,000,000 dollars taken out of this Fund. The question is, whether we're willing to say no to 130,000,000 dollars of economic impact because we wouldn't spend a million and a half dollars of state monies. That's the real question. That's the question that the Members of this Body will have to decide. Do we blow the 130,000,000 dollars of economic impact because we don't want to spend

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

2,000,000 dollars of state money? And I think it's worth it for the people in Spring Valley, for the people in Cairo, for the people in Athens and every place else in this state."

Mautino: "That's a great response. I was just addressing the line items in the Bill. Well, I mean, you know. You also have the million dollars for the sinking fund on page 30 which provides for the use as I read it, under the Illinois Sports Facility Act, which provides as... another figure I don't understand is, it shall not exceed 5.5 million dollars in any one fiscal year. Would you explain that one to me? That's Section 28... Section 8.25-3."

Greiman: "Yes. Yes, that's a good question. I'm glad you asked me that question. It requires, as I said before, a deposit of a million dollars a year for replacements and repairs that would be the landlord's obligation. Now, in the early years, certainly we can anticipate there won't be any repairs or replacements of an extraordinary fashion. So, what we've said is, rather than see 20,000,000 dollars go in there over a 20 year period, when it gets to be five and a half million dollars, because there have been no call on that for... extraordinary repairs, you ought to return it to the state taxpayers and to the city taxpayers, and that's precisely what that's about. It says, you can't squirrel the money that's the taxpayers of Illinois and the taxpayers of Chicago for 20 years. All you need is a reasonable reserve, and that's what this sets up, a reasonable reserve. I am glad you asked that."

Mautino: "Now, where in the legislation does it say it's transferred back to the General Fund to the State of Illinois? You've established the sinking fund; you've established the sports facility operating account and the bond account. I see no language that says whatever is not

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

used in operational expenses comes back to the State of Illinois. If someone could point that out to me, I would appreciate it."

Greiman: "Representative Mautino, I have this high paid staff here, we'll have to wait a second while they dig it out. Well, I'm glad you asked that question."

Mautino: "I'll bet you are."

Greiman: "On the bottom of page 28, it explains where it goes."

Mautino: "What page? What page?"

Greiman: "That one half... look down there at lines 28, 29, 30, etc, and it says that half the excess goes to the GRF of the state and the other half is returned to the City Tax Fund."

Mautino: "I'm sorry, what page did you say? What page did you say?"

Greiman: "The 28th, bottom of 28."

Mautino: "Fine, thank you very much for pointing that out. I couldn't... I didn't see it before."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The... Representative Flinn from St. Clair. Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Giglio: "Thank you, Representative. That won't be necessary. There's only one person requesting, and we'll let her talk, and that's the Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question, please?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Greiman, in the Bill I see the language that devotes a portion of the remaining 60 percent of the hotel/motel tax after the Build Illinois funds have been reserved. As I understand it, we are currently also reserving 10 percent of that hotel/motel tax to go back to local communities for promotion, tourism and conventions,

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

et cetera. Is it your intent that this 5,000,000 dollars that would be diverted or possibly be diverted would, in any way, infringe upon that 10 percent portion of the hotel/motel tax that is currently dedicated to the Tourism Promotion Fund?"

Greiman: "I'm advised it's the original 10 percent, and it stays just exactly where it goes and, in fact, would be 'prioritized' over these expenses. That's my understanding, so that those... that money would be available for local communities like Champaign-Urbana."

Satterthwaite: "So that in essence we're saying that if 40 percent comes out for Build Illinois, then another 10 percent would still come out for the tourism promotion, and so the 5,000,000 that we're talking about in the language in this Bill would come from the remaining 50 percent."

Greiman: "Right, first. Yes."

Satterthwaite: "I think this language does not make that specific but, perhaps, other language in another Section of the statutes does, but I think that it is important to our downstate communities to know that that money would be inviolate."

Greiman: "I just wanted to at least correct or make clear. Apparently, there... the projections are that there is more than adequate funding in this, but the first... because these are bonds and this is a bond program, they could call on these bonds for... for payment of the bonds first if it ever came to that, but apparently, the projections are that it's just not even near there and never would be near there. So that, it would be unforeseeable, as a practical matter, that local communities would lose their 10 percent share, but it obviously is a worse... terrible worst case scenario possible."

Satterthwaite: "I guess what I'm concern..."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Greiman: "I wanted to correct that. I... I... correct myself."

Satterthwaite: "Okay. Okay. I understand that point, but I guess I am also concerned as to the language of the dedication of that 10 percent to the Tourism Fund so that it is not diminished in some way by this 5,000,000 being removed earlier."

Greiman: "Right. I understand. That's... that's... it's not... nothing diminishes that, except, obviously, the dynamics between the funds themselves, that obviously could."

Satterthwaite: "But is it your intent if, in any way, this language would diminish that Tourism Fund, to come back with corrective language to assure that the full amount is retained for the local tourism promotion?"

Greiman: "As long as it wouldn't impair the bonds, yes."

Satterthwaite: "Right. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Greiman, to close. Would you give the Gentleman your attention, please?"

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, again. Ladies and Gentlemen, I thank you for your attention to this debate. I would have just a couple of remarks. To the Gentleman from Decatur, I would advise Mr. Dunn that once upon a time, there was a team called the Decatur Staley's. They were a great professional football team, but Decatur didn't do enough for the Decatur Staley's, so they moved to Chicago and became the Chicago Bears. Now, maybe if Decatur, Mr. Dunn, had done something for the Staleys, they might have stayed in Decatur. Maybe, that's the lesson that you should have learned in Decatur. The Gentleman from Fulton has suggested that he's concerned and rightly so, as I am, that the White Sox might leave Chicago, that some city in its predatory way might say, 'We'll pay Chicago; we'll pay the fee... the rent. We'll pay your 4,000,000 dollars a year. You come... come on over to Denver, wherever.' So, we're

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

asking and insisting that their franchise be collateralized, that it be hocked so that no matter what they're lured to do, they cannot go; that the franchise stays in Chicago, and the League will have to consent to the franchise stay in Chicago; and, if they don't, then they'll be back in Comisky Park because we won't build the stadium, and that's the truth of it. I heard one Member say he would rather tax Illinois residents than nonresidents. I don't know who elects him, maybe he's elected at large by nonresidents. I want to protect my constituency. I think this make sense. This is the one funding source that does make sense for this. It's the one that's tied to and connected to tourism, to entertainment, to coming into Chicago, to conventions. It make sense to put these two together. Now, let's talk about this subsidy. I don't trivialize a million or 2,000,000 dollars. That's a lot of money. But what I do suggest to you that in the 20,000,000,000 dollars, it's worth a million or 2,000,000 dollars. And I'll tell you something else and this will be the last thing I'll tell you, maybe forever. I sit on this floor and I watch a lot of Members vote for exemptions for this little industry and exemptions for that one, and we've got to give these guys a little loophole and those are exemptions from taxation. What do you think exemptions from taxation are? Don't you think those are subsidies? Those are subsidies. Those are subsidies you give to businesses when you reduce their taxes, and my guess is we'll probably hear something about that in the next hour or two. When you reduce the taxes, that's a subsidy. Now, this is a million dollar subsidy, a 2,000,000 dollar subsidy to get 125, 130,000,000 dollars in economic impact. No, to keep it, I think it's a bargain."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

that there is a prohibited legal conflict of interest exists, although one could possibly be construed, and no threat to my independence of judgment exists, I have and will continue to abstain from action on this matter based on my personal ethical standards and my respect for public confidence in this legislative process. I vote 'present'."

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

Greiman: "Poll the absentees."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman asks for a Poll of the Absentees."

Clerk Leone: "A poll of those Members not voting. Berrios and Stange. No further."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Stange. Representative Stange votes 'aye'. On this question there are 54 voting 'aye', 46 voting 'nay', 4 voting 'present', and the Motion fails. The Motion fails and the House refuses to accept the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3162. Does the Representative from Cook, Representative Greiman, request a Second Conference Committee?"

Greiman: "No, we do not."

Speaker Giglio: "I will now return to Supplemental Calendar #3 Conference Committee Reports. Representative Greiman, House Bill 2630. Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Yes, I, with my Senate Sponsor of this Bill, Senator D'Arco, wish to express our own concern for what has happened to this Bill, this pension Bill. It is... there are some emergency aspects to it, some very critical things for teachers and their health program that we apparently are not going to get to. There are some timing vocations that we are not going to get to, and I am deeply troubled by that. The other benefits, none of which are very significant, none of which are so critical that we

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

months alone. So, if we are fortunate enough to reconsider this piece of legislation, I would certainly would hope that people would consider the Veterans' Home and the cost to the state. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "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 58 voting 'aye', 34 voting 'no', 9 voting 'present', and the Motion to adopt the Conference Committee Report fails. Supplemental Calendar announcement."

Clerk Leone: "Supplemental Calendar #4 is now being distributed."

Speaker Greiman: "We all know that there is life after the Legislature. Judge Danny O'Brien is here with us... served from the Roger's Park area in the Twenties. No, it seemed that way, Dan."

Clerk Leone: "I've been asked to inquire if somebody left their glasses at Representative LeFlore's desk, pair of glasses, prescription glasses."

Speaker Giglio: "... Come to order. On your desk is Supplemental Calendar #1, Conference Committee Report, appears House Bill 3162. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3162, amends an Act relating to municipalities. Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I'll defer to Representative Greiman on House Bill 3162."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill has... this Conference Committee Report has been adopted in the last few moments by the Senate, after rather full comprehensive and thoughtful examination. If this were a Bill that only helped a baseball team, I would not be one of its Sponsors, nor one of its supporters. There

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

was discussion that said, 'Well, we have to help the Sox. They're historic.' They're this. They're that. The truth of the matter is, this is only good if it's good for the people of Illinois and good for the economy of Illinois. If it helps the White Sox and their owners and their players, so much the better. The test for us is that it helps the people of Illinois and the economy of the northeast region of our state. Clearly adequate examples of the impact, both direct and indirect, of the continuance of a professional baseball team is apparent. It is not just fantasy that cities are vying for this team and for other teams, that all kinds of inducements and lures are provided to professional athletic teams to come to this city or that. But some cities have proceeded to build stadia before they even have a team. We have a team, two teams in Chicago that play baseball. One team indicates that it may leave, that it can no longer sit in its facility and provide the kind of first class baseball that it wants to do. There are those who say maybe we should do a different kind of deal, maybe we should let them go, maybe they won't go, maybe they will go. I'm not prepared to play sudden death with 120 million dollars or 130 million dollars annually of economic impact on my community. I want to make sure that I have anchored the salaries, the spending, the purchase of goods and services that I know are important and critical for that economy. And so we come to House Bill 3162 which creates an authority of seven persons, three appointed by the Governor of Illinois, three appointed by the Mayor of Chicago and a Chairman appointed by the Governor with the consent and approval of the Mayor. It gives that authority a jurisdiction over a particularly defined area at 35th and Shield... in the 35th and Shields area. It keeps the White

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Sox where they are and where they have been for all these years. It ensures that by keeping that site, that the infrastructure expenses will be minimal. It then directs that a stadium be built. The stadium itself to be built is to be an undomed stadium, single source that will cost, hard and soft costs, about 120 million dollars. It will be financed by bonds. The debt of those bonds, as well as the retirement of debt and the maintenance of the... and the cost of it will be annually borne by a four million dollar figure of rent to be paid by the White Sox, the imposition, in Chicago only, of a tax on hotel and motel rooms and let us digress for a moment there. There are many things that we or other authorities could tax. And so we look and we say, 'Which taxes are hardest and which taxes are easiest?' And, make no mistake, there are difficult... more difficult taxes. It would be difficult for us to put, for example, as was suggested, a tax on food so that kids going to cafeterias would be paying this, so that people at the lowest level of our society would be paying for this. I think this is important as an economic tool. I said that and that's why I am prepared to go forward, be forthcoming with a tax on hotels and motels. That would be... finance in part. The balance of it, to ensure the appropriate revenue stream, would be by a five million dollar commitment... up to five million dollar commitment by the state and up to five million dollar by the city to be ratably spent. The estimates are that there be... that there would be probably a million to two million dollars out of those five million dollars that each would put forward so that one can anticipate reasonably that there will not be an exhaustion of the state and city contribution. I am concerned, as you, I'm sure, are concerned, that the White Sox be there for as long as the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

bonds are outstanding. I would not want to see and you would not want to see an inflationary period where the four million dollars is just another expense or where some city says, 'We'll pay the four million dollars in rent, come to our city.' And so, we have been advised that... in the management agreement, which is another key document in this arrangement, there will be a pledging of the franchise and that the franchise will stand for the continued security of the lease as well as their placement in Chicago. And on that, the League will have to consent and agree. These are the basic issues. There are those who will ask, 'Could we build it differently? Could you bring all the sports teams together and have a wonderful sports complex?' All of these have been explored and all of these have been found to be unworkable, perhaps not because they are inherently unworkable, but because the parties can't come together, because it would be silly for us to build a sports complex without knowing that we have tenants, because we have valuable assets that other people are trying to lure and so this is what we are doing now for people there. I think that the statement that goes out is that Chicago remains and Illinois remains and Cook County remains a good place to stay. I believe that. When I heard that Diamond-Star was coming to Bloomington, I believed - not everybody agreed with me and my party - I believed that it made sense because it sent a message to the world that this was a good place to come to and a good place to stay. I think that's the message that we send to the world as we vote for this Authority. And I would be prepared to answer questions, if I am able."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

House. Representative Greiman is always a hard act to follow because he speaks so eloquently and, certainly, in the remarks that he's just made, has adequately described for you the contents of this legislation. As Legislators, we look at Bills like this, and we look at the revenue stream and, we look at who has the appointment authority and issues like that. But I would remind the people in this chamber who will vote on this issue in a few minutes that there really is a whole group of people out there watching us today that will not know or really be very concerned about the revenue stream and those people are the fans, the fans who want to see the White Sox stay in Illinois, who want to see the White Sox stay in Chicago, the people who watch the games on television, who want to see this team continue to compete and excel as it has in the history, at least certainly in my lifetime. I say to you this legislation represents an historic agreement for the State of Illinois; because, as Chicago goes, so goes the State of Illinois; as the White Sox go, so goes Chicago. We have to keep the Sox alive. We have to keep this team functioning. We have to give them the facility in which to operate, in which they can compete in modern day... in this modern day industry. We have to pass this Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. I encourage your support for this legislation and ask the Members of this chamber to play ball. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative Hawkinson."

Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I agree that this is an historic piece of legislation, but what I worry about is what the history is going to show. If you look at today's Chicago Sun-Times, you will see that the Chicago Bears have already announced that they will be coming to this chamber

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

in January seeking site improvements from this chamber for the Chicago Bears. We've heard talk about the Cubs and their needs and desires. We have the Blackhawks, the Bulls, the Sting. How in the world will this chamber find any justification to say no to the Bears or the Cubs, although it's done a pretty good job of saying no to the Cubs, unfortunately? What will be our rationale when they come to us asking for another two percent on the hotel/motel tax and another two percent on the hotel/motel tax? What kind of message will that send to the retailers for... who want to come in for their shows or the other people who want to come in for their shows and stay in Chicago when that hotel/motel tax goes sky high and the people are taxed perhaps another five million dollars, potentially, a year off that tax from the state guarantee? I think it's a dangerous precedent. We all agree that sports are important to this state. As fans, we don't want to lose any of those teams. They're all important to Illinois. But all those fans are also taxpayers. And are we sending the right signal when we say to you as taxpayers that you will pay for the White Sox today, the Bears in January, the Cubs next year and so on and so forth? I think not. To argue that the other things have been tried and rejected because the teams do not want to play in a multi-purpose stadium, I think, doesn't answer the question. If they want to be funded with tax money to build their stadiums, they ought to be willing to agree to play in a multi-purpose stadium that makes a lot more sense and will avoid this constant coming to the General Assembly and asking for tax dollars to fund them. At a time when we have to say no to some of our commitments in education and we say no to some of our needs in mental health, when we say no to our seniors on Medicaid in nursing homes as to

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

whether they can go to 50 dollars a month allowance, when we have all kinds of communities around this state who are unable to finance the water and sewer projects by the federal deadline, how can we go back to those taxpayers and say we're going to fund a stadium for the White Sox this year and the Bears next year and so on and so forth? I don't think we can, and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In the best of all possible worlds, we could have negotiated a better deal with the White Sox. We could have negotiated a deal where the White Sox came up with upfront money. There are a lot of provisions in this Bill which could have been better. But this is not the best of all possible worlds. This is a world where we're competing with other cities to keep this team. And I think the people in Chicago and the people throughout Illinois want to keep the White Sox playing baseball in this state. They want to keep the White Sox playing baseball not only because the White Sox are an exciting team, but because of the revenue they generate for the State of Illinois. I think the projections are that the White Sox bring in about 100 to 120 million dollars a year in revenue for the state and for the state economy. It's a good investment. And that's, I think, why cities like Denver are offering to take over the White Sox and to give them free rent, because they see the benefits they can derive for their economy. We've seen a community, the community in the 11th Ward, say 'We want to keep the team,' and we've seen another community out in Addison say, 'We don't want the team.' So, we've got a Bill here which is not perfect. We can pick all kinds of holes in it. I think each one of us can suggest improvements, but this is what's on the table. And

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

we're dealing with a private enterprise that there's nothing that keeps them here. They can pick up and go. So, I'm going to vote for the Bill. I'm for the legislation because I want to keeps lights in Comisky Park and no lights in Wrigley Field."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think it should be pointed out and we should be reminded that the last privately built stadium was in the early 1900's and there are a number of communities which have stadiums ready to go and they'd be very, very happy to take the White Sox in on that... into their stadiums. What we're talking about is keeping an economic resource that we have. We do a lot to attract new resources. We've got the Diamond-Star plant. We made a very big state commitment to get those people here. Compare that to the modest commitment that we're making to keep an economic, as well as a sports team, in our community and in our state. This is not only good for the 11th Ward; it's not only good for Chicago. It's good for the entire state. And if you've seen these studies that have been done and the economic impact that the loss of this entity would have on our economy, it is very significant. The modest contribution that the state is backing up at this time is a reasonable investment for us to put forward at this time. I can't tell you what's going to happen next year or the following year in relative to... in relationship to other teams. But I will say this - if the deal that comes down, if one does from the other team, is as good as this one, we will have done very, very well. I urge an 'aye' vote on this legislation."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Fulton,

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All of us, whether we represent a district that's in or near Chicago or downstate, want to see the White Sox stay in Illinois and hopefully in the City of Chicago. But at the same time, we also have some responsibilities to those constituents we represent to make certain that any effort put forth or commitments made by the state have certain minimal safeguards. I would submit to you that based upon my reading of this Bill and the questions that I've asked of the Sponsors and others, that this measure falls woefully short. And let us not be too quick to forget the mistakes that have been made in the past when we've rushed to judgement on these matters and the not too distant past McCormick Place, for example, and the assurances that we were given at that time, only to find out that the legislation was inadequate. Let's look at this Bill. The Bill provides no bidding requirements for the facility. We're talking about a turn-key, fixed-rate project. No requirements that 120 million dollar project be bid. No requirements that the interest rates be held in conformity with all the other legal limitations throughout the statutes at 125 percent of the GO bond rating. No provision in this Bill, although we've heard reference to it, to any requirement by the Sox to pay any rent. All that we have is some sort of intergovernmental agreement at this point in which the state is not even party between the city and the Sox that there will be a four million dollar commitment. Then some discussion here about pledging of the franchise which won't appear anywhere at all in this legislation, and we don't even know what that pledge of a franchise is if it gets into the final agreement. Is it going to be a pledge that the Sox will pay four million dollars a year for the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

lifetime of this contract? What's to keep the Sox, if that's the case, from deciding to move to another city and continue to pay that four million dollars and the State of Illinois and the City of Chicago being strapped through this authority with a building in Chicago that can be used for no other purpose and by none of the other sporting teams? I would submit that there are many questions that remain in this legislation, and we should not rush to judgement in this eleventh hour to bind our constituents to something we may well regret. And, yet, there are those who are saying, 'Well, it's only five million dollars a year and, at most, you're committing the people to five million dollars a year for the life of the bond issue.' And, yet, how many times have we heard before that there is a limit to how much we're going to be committed only to find that six months, a year or five years down the road the matter is back before us because of some unforeseen situation in which we now have a building or a part of a building constructed and being asked, 'What do you want to do with it? Do you want to give us more, or do you want to just let it lie there?' And, of course, by then, as you know, it's too late. It was too late for McCormick Place. It'll be too late, at that point, for this White Sox Park. Let's not also forget the fact that by raising the hotel/motel tax two percent, we're going to be putting the City of Chicago out alone above all other cities in this nation and major trade centers in terms of that tax. Twelve percent would rank Ill... would rank Chicago above San Diego, who is seven percent, above Los Angeles, who is ten percent, above Las Vegas, who is seven percent, above New York City, which is 10.375 percent. And I think at some point you're going to find conventioners and people looking to hold conventions taking a look at which city has

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

the most prohibitive rates and we're going to find it is counterproductive. I would just simply say that if we're going to do something for the Sox, I don't think we've got it in front of us, and it would behoove us, I think, to take a little longer look at this, and I would urge you to join with me in casting your 'no' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the White Sox legislation also. I come from Chicago. I come from the north side of Chicago and, to tell you the truth, I've never been out to Sox Park in my life. I'm a Cub fan. But the White Sox provide a lot of business for Chicago. If you've traveled up I-55 on a Friday night when we're coming home from Session, you'll see the cars going up to Chicago with Missouri license plates on - they're people going up there to watch the Cubs and Sox play ball. They're people that are coming into our state to spend money, to generate sales tax money for our people and for our programs in Illinois. If you go out to the ballpark and look at the parking lots around the ballpark, you'll see cars from Iowa, Wisconsin, Indiana, Missouri, from states all over the midwest. Many people come to Chicago just to see professional baseball. I know some may argue that they don't always see good professional baseball. They at least see Major League baseball teams. These people create employment for our citizens and they spend tax dollars in Illinois that our citizens won't have to spend. So, I'm very much in favor of seeing this Bill pass and seeing the White Sox stay in Chicago and hopefully seeing a World Series in a few years between the White Sox and the Cubs, although that may be far-fetched."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

shouldn't have passed this Bill. The South African provision that is of extreme and critical importance and the making of a statement about what this country is about, I'm sorry that won't be before this Body, but I'm advised that the Senate has not passed this. And accordingly, I would... there has been a request for a Second Conference Committee, so accordingly, I also would ask that a Second Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman requests a Second Conference Committee Report to House Bill 2630. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Second Conference Committee Report is requested. On Supplemental Calendar #3 appears House Bill 3351, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is a Motion that I filed that I think is necessary to... for immediate consideration of that Bill, and if there are no objections, I would move for immediate consideration."

Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman moves for the immediate consideration of House Bill 3351. Representative Hannig moves to take House Bill 3351 from the table. All those... and suspend Rule 79(e) and place the Bill on the Calendar on the Order of Conference Committee Reports. Does the Gentleman have leave? All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. To take from the table, yes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this... Capparelli 'aye'. Flowers 'aye'. Doug Huff 'aye'. Clerk will take... Van Duyne 'aye'. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 101 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present', and this Bill is taken from the table. Now, the Gentleman asks that House Bill 3351 be considered. It now appears on

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3162?" All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to set the record straight about what the City of Decatur did do for the Chicago Bears was A.E. Staley, the owner of Staley Manufacturing Company, sent them to Chicago with a 5,000 dollars stipend in the early twenties on the only condition that they call themselves the Chicago Staleys for one year, and that enabled the... George Hallas to take the team to Chicago, call themselves the Chicago Staley's for one year and then change their name to the Chicago Bears. So, I think Mr. Staley, the City of Decatur and the Staley Company were quite generous and played an important part in the founding, development and organization of the Chicago Bears franchise."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from DuPage, the Minority Leader, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, from the onset of discussions in this Legislative Session concerning development of a new sport stadium in the City of Chicago, I have asked another Legislator to take responsibility on our side of the aisle for this matter. I have done so to avoid any possible conflict of interest. I have previously disclosed this to interested parties in the media and wish today to put it in the record. I have chosen to abstain from participation in this matter as I am a close, personal friend and business associate of one of the principal owners of the Chicago White Sox, a potential user of such a new Chicago Stadium. In addition, the law firm of which I am a general partner has represented it and continues to represent the White Sox generally. While I do not believe

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

First Conference Committee Report. Gentleman asks that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3351. Mr. Hannig, on the Report."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. The Bill initially dealt with the proceeds of bonds, but as is often the case these last waning moments of the Legislative Session, the Conference Committee changed the entire outlook of the Bill. So, basically all the Bill does at this point is provide that a member of the Chicago Board of Education can serve on the Economic Development Commission of the City of Chicago. Now, unless we pass this Bill, it would be impossible for an individual to do that. It's been indicated to me that the City of Chicago desires that. I have no objections to it. It passed the Senate unanimously and all Members have signed off on the Conference Committee Report, and I would simply ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman asks that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3351. And on that question, the Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Gentleman a question, please."

Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman indicates he'll yield."

Pullen: "In view of the noise level and the label on the board, I want to help you clarify something. Is it the fact, Sir, that nothing of the original Bill remains other than the enacting clause?"

Hannig: "Yes, that's correct."

Pullen: "And that what the Conference Committee Report provides now is simply that a member of the Chicago School Board can serve at the same time on the Chicago Economic Development Commission?"

Hannig: "Yes, that is correct."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Pullen: "And there is nothing further in this legislation?"

Hannig: "That's correct as well."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Representative Hannig, to close. The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3351?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes', those opposed 'nay'. The voting is 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 87 voting 'yes', 15 voting 'no', and 3 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3351. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think a lot of people in the audience and the media are still here waiting for the horse racing Bill. Is the Chair going to call that Bill?"

Speaker Giglio: "I'll... the Chair will take your request under advisement, Representative McCracken, we're on Supplemental Calendar #4 right now. Supplemental Calendar #4 appears House Bill 1540, Representative Cullerton. Supplemental Calendar announcement, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Supplemental Calendar #5 is now being distributed."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. My first... I first would like to move to suspend Rule 79(e) and 74(a)."

Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman asks leave to suspend House Rule 79(e)... Gentleman asks leave to suspend House Rule 74(a) and 79(e) and place on the Order of Concurrence. Does the Gentleman have leave? Representative McCracken, the Gentleman from DuPage."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Motion. I object to the Motion and ask that the court, the court... ask that the Chair hold that this Motion requires 71 votes because to suspend 79(e), which is a tabling Section of the rule for Bills of this nature, requires pursuant to 74(a) an Extraordinary Majority of 71 votes. So, I'm asking for that ruling."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Cullerton moves for the..."

Cullerton: "Sure, we'll just... we'll just have a Roll Call."

Speaker Giglio: "...To suspend the rule. All..."

Cullerton: "I... I didn't under... maybe, we should debate it too. I didn't understand. Did he give a reason why he objected to the Motion or maybe there's some technical thing we can clear up here?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "I'm just asking whether this requires 71 votes or not."

Speaker Giglio: "Yes."

Cullerton: "That's what I thought."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "All those in favor of the Motion vote 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 71 votes. Mr... Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, I didn't realize we were going to go right to the vote without having a debate on the Motion, and I wonder if Representative McCracken could explain why he opposes the Motion, that's all. I didn't understand. You don't wish to state what your... verbally what the opposition is. Okay. That's good because... it's a good idea because maybe you might be in... of a mood to change your mind in a few minutes and you wouldn't want to have anything on the record... It's just not timely, that's all. I think that's the problem."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 56 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no', and 10 voting 'present', and the Motion fails. Supplemental Calendar #5. Representative Breslin in the Chair. Representative Braun. Is Representative Braun in the chambers? Supplemental Calendar #5, House Joint Resolution 233."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Joint Resolution 233 has... was passed from the Senate this afternoon by a unanimous vote. It simply expands the composition of the Urban School Improvement Council to give each of the leaders an additional appointment. In addition, the reporting date is contemplated to be late spring or early summer in 1987. I encourage your support."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady asks that the House do concur to House Joint Resolution 233. And on that question... Hearing none, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The voting is 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 100 voting 'yes', none voting 'nay', 5 voting 'present', and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 233, and the House does adopt the Resolution. ...Order ...saw on your desk is Supplemental Calendar #5, Conference Committee Reports. ...in Order. Supplemental Calendar #1, House Bill 3162, a Motion has been filed, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Yogi Berra once said, it's never over until it's over. I filed a Motion so that we can go into extra innings. My Motion is to reconsider the vote by which the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3162 lost. I have changed my mind

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

because I think the State of Illinois would have too much to lose, and I also thought that... I've been a Cub fan since, let's see, I'm 59 years old Christmas, and I guess I was 7 years old when I became a Cub fan, and all my Cub fans would take my vote to see that I was bias against the Sox. You know, you've heard of people say I'm a Cub fan, but I'm a Sox fan too. Believe me, if you're a Cub fan, there's no such animal. So, I think that we got to keep the Sox so that we Cub fans have somebody to hate and keep them in Chicago where they belong, because it really does do a lot for the economy and; therefore, that is why I file my Motion, and I would urge the Members to... those who have voted 'no' to reconsider. All we have to do is get a few more sluggers to hit some home runs, and we'll win this game yet."

Speaker Giglio: "On that question, Representative Braun, the Lady from Cook."

Braun: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion. John Matijevich said that he was asking for extra innings. Well, it's for sure the bottom of the ninth on this vote. We have to keep the Sox in Chicago. We have to pass this Bill. This is probably the most important piece of economic development legislation we have seen in this General Assembly this year. I would like to say... That too. I would like to say that this is the year that the General Assembly distinguishes itself, that the Governor's leadership, the leadership of our side of the aisle was just demonstrated by giving the support to these important parts of the sports industry. I encourage your support for this Motion, and I encourage your support for the underlying Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Will,

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a kind of unique situation. I'm... I'm really not too sure whether the Gentleman's Motion really is in order; because in my interpretation of Robert's Rules of Order and on the prevailing side, the Gentleman doesn't seem to be like... seem that he is in the prevailing side. Even though the negative voters seem to have won the battle, there was 54 'yes' votes against only 46 'nays', and Mr. Matijevich voted with the 'nays', so I'd like to have, not necessarily a ruling from the Parliamentarian, but I'd like to have him more or less prove it to me by something in writing that when you are 46 and somebody else is 54 that you are on the prevailing side."

Speaker Giglio: "Your point is not well taken, Representative Van Duyne. The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn. Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "I'm sorry, then you've forced me to move to table the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Giglio: "Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the Gentleman's Motion to reconsider lie on the table."

Speaker Giglio: "Is there any discussion on the Gentleman's Motion to table the Motion to reconsider the vote? Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "What's the vote necessary for that to succeed, Simple Majority or Constitutional Majority?"

Speaker Giglio: "The Majority of those voting on the question."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "All those... The question is, 'Shall this Motion be... the Motion to reconsider be tabled?' All those in favor... Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Once again, did

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Representative Matijevich vote on the prevailing side?"

Speaker Giglio: "Yes, he voted 'no' on the prevailing side.
That's the prevailing side."

Mulcahey: "Thank you. Well, you didn't answer that before.
Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "On the Motion to table, those in favor signify
by voting 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all
voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On that Motion,
there are 19 voting 'yes', 72 voting 'no', and 3 voting
'present', and the Motion to table fails. On
Representative Matijevich's Motion, Representative
Matijevich moves to reconsider the vote by which House Bill
3162 failed. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye',
those opposed 'nay'. The voting is open and this Bill
requires 60 votes, this Motion. Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "If this Bill receives 60 votes, I request a verification."

Speaker Giglio: "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 66 voting 'yes', 29
voting 'no', and 5 voting 'present'. Representative Dunn
requests a verification. Representative Dunn, do you
persist in your Motion, Sir? Representative Dunn. Mr.
Clerk, poll the affirmative votes."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Barger. Barnes. Black.
Braun. Brookins. Jones. Capparelli. Churchill.
Countryman. Cullerton. Currie. Daley. DeLeo.
Didrickson. Ewing. Farley. Flinn. Flowers. Virginia
Frederick. Dwight Friedrich. Giglio. Giorgi. Goforth.
Hallock. Hensel. Hoffman. Huff. Kirkland. Klemm.
Krska. Kubik. Kulas. LeFlore. Levin. Martinez.
Matijevich. McAuliffe. McCracken. Morrow. Nash. Myron
Olson. Robert Olson. Parke. Bernard Pedersen. William

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Peterson. Piel. Regan. Rice. Ryder. Satterthwaite.
Stange. Steczo. Stern. Sutker. Tate. Turner. Wait.
Washington. Weaver. White. Williamson. Wojcik. Wolf.
Anthony Young. And Hyvetter Younge. No further."

Speaker Giglio: "Questions of the affirmative?"

Dunn: "Barger."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Barger. Representative Barger is
in his chair."

Dunn: "Representative Barnes."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady's in her chair."

Dunn: "Representative Black."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black is in his chair."

Dunn: "Representative Countryman."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Countryman is in his chair."

Dunn: "Representative Dwight Friedrich."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Dwight Friedrich. Representative
Dwight Friedrich. Gentleman... Yes, he is. He's in the
back."

Dunn: "Is he here? I didn't hear."

Speaker Giglio: "He was in the back. He waved his hands. He's
in the wash room."

Dunn: "Okay. Representative..."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative... Excuse me, Representative
McMaster, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

McMaster: "Will you please change my vote from 'present' to
'yes'?"

Speaker Giglio: "Change the Gentleman's Motion from... vote from
'present' to 'yes', Representative McMaster. Further
questions?"

Dunn: "Representative Hensel."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hensel. Representative Hensel in
the chamber? He's back by the window."

Dunn: "Representative Robert Olson."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Speaker Giglio: "Olson is in his chair."

Dunn: "Representative Piel."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Piel is in his chair."

Dunn: "Representative Tate."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Tate is in his chair."

Dunn: "Representative Washington."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Washington. Representative Washington in the chamber? Representative Washington. How is the Gentleman recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Dunn: "Well, don't... no since removing him..."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Washington has returned. Return him..."

Dunn: "No... No further questions."

Speaker Giglio: "Return him to the Roll Call. No further questions. Mr. Clerk, what's the count?"

Clerk Leone: "67 voting 'aye', 29 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'."

Speaker Giglio: "On this Motion there are 67 voting 'yes', 29 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. Motion to reconsider is adopted. On Supplemental Calendar #1 appears House Bill 3162, Conference Committee Report, Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It appears that my RBI's may have increased in the last half hour. I have no intention of delivering and opening the oratory again. We all heard a long and fair and a thoughtful debate in this House, the merits and the demerits of 3162, and I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman asks that the House do adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 3162. And on that question, hearing none, all those in favor signify by voting 'yes', those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. The

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House the previous comments made and the previous vote on this Bill be incorporated into the vote on this Bill. I vote 'present'."

Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 64 voting 'yes', 33 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present', and the House does adopt Conference Committee #1 to House Bill 3162. Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 3162 was adopted."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Greiman moves that the Motion lie on the table. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Motion lies on the table. Supplemental Calendar #2. Supplemental Calendar #2, Conference Committee Reports, appears House Bill 2486, Representative Stephens. Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes..."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the..."

Cullerton: "Pursuant to Rule 74(a), I move to take House Bill 2486 from the table, suspend Rule 79(e) and place on the Calendar on the Order of Conference Committee Reports, House Bill 2486."

Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, Roll Call. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This will require 71 votes, Ladies and Gentlemen. It's a Motion to take from the table. 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative Cullerton. Representative Cullerton. Representative Cullerton moves for the Poll of the Absentees. Mr. Clerk, read the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of those not voting. Berrios. Deuchler. Preston. And Terzich."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Stephens, for what purpose do you rise, Sir? Representative Stephens. Representative Stephens, Gentleman from St. Clair. I think you're on. Try it."

Stephens: "A request of the Speaker to poll the absentees."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hallock. I believe we have. Representative Barnes. Change the Lady from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Hallock. Change the Gentleman to 'aye'. Representative McMaster. Change his vote to 'aye'. Mr. Clerk. Representative Williamson. Change her vote to 'aye'. Any further changes? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 73 voting 'yes', 23 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present'. The Gentleman's Motion carries. On the Bill, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, Speaker Madigan appointed me the Chairman of a Special Horse Racing Investigative Committee, Representative Kubik was the Minority Spokesman and we took testimony, actually went out and visited a race track. As a result of that... those hearings, we passed legislation out of this House by an overwhelming vote to bring some reforms into the racing community. As a result of... and those reforms are incorporated in this Conference Committee Report. The most significant reform, of course, is the fact that we'll be the only state in the nation that allows horse racing that will require security barns for all horses prior to a race.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

The horses' blood will be tested by the Racing Board, and we will... it will be tested right on site. This will send a very strong signal to the people who are interested in betting at the races that the races are not in any way fixed. There is included in this legislation as well, language dealing with pari-mutuel clerks, parking attendants and security guards, giving the Racing Board authority to police those fields of employment. We have an affirmative action program included in the legislation, and also, a very significant piece of the legislation is the requirement that the tracks file affirmative action plans as a condition to be a licensee and to follow up with compliance reports. We also have a provision that allows for the race tracks to hire nonunion employees. With regard to the teletrack parlors or the offtrack betting parlors, there will be 14 total in the state. There will be a two and a half percent surcharge on all winning wagers, that will be split between the host municipality and the host county. In addition, there will be a two dollar optional admission fee to get into the teletrack, something which I might point out is not unusual in that we now have admission fees to get into the teletrack parlors or intertrack parlors right now. We have... I can promise... I know I would promise Representative Frederick that we would have DuQuoin language in this Bill and sure enough, we got to it. There will be... this Bill will allow for pari-mutuel license to be awarded to the DuQuoin State Fair. With regard to charity racing, charity racing raises about 350,000 dollars a year. It's been declining, as has the entire handle at race tracks. We have changed the procedures by which charity racing is handled to abolish racing dates to set up a fund of 500,000 dollars for the charities to come to the Racing Board and ask to be

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

reimbursed as well as the 250,000 dollar amount to be spent towards the problems of helping people who are chronically addicted to gambling. We have... with regard to the location of the facilities, we have been very careful, as careful as I could possibly draft the legislation. The sites are chosen by the race track owners, and each one will be able to operate two, but the sites may not be within 500 feet of a church or a school or a residence. They must receive specific zoning approval from the municipality and the municipality can clearly pass an ordinance which would prohibit this form of gambling within their city limits, if they so wish. We do allow two provisions that apply specifically to Arlington Park; one, is to allow them to go and apply for property tax rebates from their existing taxing district. And on races that are conducted at the teletracks that are run at Arlington Heights, they would be allowed to have an additional two and a half percent surcharge placed on the winning bets. We have indicated... I have indicated as well that there shall be funds that will come from the teletrack parlors that will go to the nine museums that are found in Chicago and Cook County as well as money that will go to the Home Economic Extension Council, which is a project which is right now funded through the Agricultural Premium Fund. We reduced the graduated pari-mutuel tax down to a flat two percent rate, except for downstate tracks with handles of less than 400,000, which would have a one percent flat tax. We also allowed for the tracks, the ontrack bet... bettors... the tracks to impose a one percent surcharge on winning wagers for ontrack bets. I'd be happy to answer any questions that you may have. I'd appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from St.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Clair, Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is an important Bill, and I certainly want to congratulate Representative Cullerton, Kubik, Ryder and all the others who worked on this piece of legislation. I think it's important to note that horse racing is more than the glamour of the betting window. It's more than the honor of the winning circle. It's more than the industry that we see depicted oftentimes in movies and on television and the shadier side of life. Horse racing is people and horses, it's agriculture, it's Illinois, it's jobs and it's economic development that is important at every end and each corner of our state. The people of southwestern Illinois will support this legislation because of the jobs that it means on the back side of the track. Those people that get up at 3:30 and 4:00 in the morning and go out and feed the animals and care for them, the veterinarians that make their rounds, those people that provide all the service that don't get any of the glory of the winner's circle, except maybe once or twice in a lifetime, but they continue to devote their life to a pure enterprise, an enterprise that is clean and often misrepresented. Horse racing is important to Illinois. It's as important as any other industry that we have. Again, I want to congratulate Representative Cullerton for his fine work, and I would urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Ryder: "Representative, there are many questions on this side that I've tried to answer; but, for the purposes of placing it into the record, I'd like to ask you if, in your

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

opinion, the Bill allows nonhome rule units of government to prohibit the location of the offtrack facilities within the boundaries of that nonhome rule unit?"

Cullerton: "Yes, this Bill allows nonhome rule units, if they so choose, to prohibit the location of intertrack wagering facilities and the regulation of the location of offtrack facilities and gambling as a local amusements which is clearly within the powers of home rule units and nonhome rule units."

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

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

Ryder: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Rather recently in this elongated negotiations of this matter, I was called upon to come in and do some work. I discovered much to my surprise that horse racing is a major industry within the State of Illinois. I further discovered much to my dismay that in the last 18 months, horse racing is deteriorating rapidly within the State of Illinois, that the amount of revenue derived by the State of Illinois is decreasing rapidly, that the quality, the number, the kinds of horse races is decreasing and that it's necessary to do something to make this agribusiness, this huge part of... within the State of Illinois, healthy. I applaud Representative Cullerton and his Committee, including Representative Kubik, for the work that they have done concerning the reforms, but today we have to consider a package of Bills, which I think is safe to say is one of the normal packages of Bills that comes before the Legislature in that it contain some things that a lot of us don't like. There are parts of this Bill that I'd prefer not to see here. I'm certain there are parts of this Bill that Representative Cullerton would prefer not to see in there and he's expressed as much; nevertheless, this is the package that

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

we have, a package that I think will help to make horse racing a healthy business, will help to make the Agriculture Premium Fund, which is so important to downstate Illinois, healthy once again, will help to make some local units of government, some within the City of Chicago, some within Cook County and some outside of those localities, have some necessary means of income. As I said, there are not all parts of this Bill that I like, but it is a Bill that is a result of negotiation, a Bill that I think the interested parties have indicated that they can live with and more importantly, the major reason that we decided to talk about this Bill was to rebuild the premier track within the State of Illinois. If the Indianapolis 500 were destroyed, I think Indiana would want to rebuild it. If Churchill Downs were destroyed, I have a hunch that that state would want to rebuild Churchill Downs. When the premier track within the State of Illinois won with the value far in excess, I believe, of most of the other tracks, if not all of it, has been destroyed, we need to replace that one. I urge your support of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. When I was first elected to the Illinois General Assembly in 1977, this state faced a major scandal, and for those of you who don't remember, that scandal involved offtrack betting. And... well, we ended up being preoccupied with in 1977 was the result of that scandal, and what happened was that this Legislature saw fit to change the provisions of the law to eliminate the loopholes that had allowed the offtrack betting when the people in the state rose up and said, 'Enough was enough.' And in 1977, we recall our former colleague, Mike Holewinski

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

sponsored the legislation that plugged that loophole, that did away with offtrack betting. Here we are again, 10 years later and we want to bring it back. There are many provisions in this Bill, I think, are good. The reforms of the racing industry are good, but I can't vote for this Bill for one very important reason. I can't see us bringing back offtrack betting. We rely already too much on gambling for the revenues of this state. This is just going to expand it even more. Today we already have people who can't afford the gambling, the poor people being the ones that are shouldering more than their fair share of the burden because of their involved... interest in gambling. This extends that. You know, I could vote for this Bill without the offtrack betting provisions, but with offtrack betting in here, I've got to vote 'no'."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a Vice Chairman of this particular Committee, I spent countless hours investigating the horse racing industry with Representative Cullerton. I would like to compliment Representative Cullerton on his leadership on the issue, and I'd also like to compliment Representative Ryder on his leadership on this particular issue as well. It looks like we've got a lot of tough votes tonight, and I realize this is a tough vote for a lot of people. And you know, when we consider this Bill, we can consider a lot of things. We can consider Arlington Park, the rebuilding of Arlington Park, the reforms of the horse racing industry, the affirmative action program in this particular Bill, the cut in the pari-mutuel tax and a provision for all the horsemen. Those are the provisions that we can consider, but I think we all know that the major portion that we're all interested in and that the major portion that has created the most opposition is the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

provision for teletrack, teletrack. Now, we don't call that teletrack when we're talking privately, we call that OTB. And Ladies and Gentlemen, I submit to you, what's wrong with OTB? You know, this state has... I don't think there is a Member of this chamber who hasn't been to a race track, and perhaps, placed a bet on a horse. I don't think there's a Member of this chamber who hasn't participated in an office pool on the World Series or the Superbowl. That's gambling. I don't think there's a Member in this chamber who probably hasn't bought a lottery ticket. We don't play the game of lottery. We bet on a lottery. It's betting, Ladies and Gentlemen. The lottery is betting. The only difference between the lottery and offtrack betting is that the odds in offtrack betting are a hell of a lot better than if you bought a lottery ticket. How many of us have bingo games in our district? I would submit that we all have senior citizens' groups that have bingo. That's gambling. That's call gambling. A lot of people wouldn't call it that, but it's gambling, Ladies and Gentlemen. And finally, we had a Bill that went through on Third Reading with 93 votes this year in this House. It was called the Las Vegas Night Bill. And, if we looked in that Bill, we'd be shocked, absolutely shocked to find that it allows us to play poker, and it allows us to play blackjack, and it allows us to play roulette for charitable gaming purposes, but that Bill went through with 93 votes. So, what we're arguing here, Ladies and Gentlemen, is semantics, and I would submit that offtrack betting is just a matter of semantics. Make no mistake about it, this state has made it a public policy to allow gambling and this is just another extension of that policy. And I might remind those who would... who would criticize that particular provision, that the horse racing industry brings

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

in between 45 and 70,000,000 dollars a year in revenue to our state, 45 to 70,000,000 dollars a year. And I think under this provision, we will see even more revenue coming back to this state. I also think it's significant when you get the President of the United States on the eve of the Superbowl talking about the fact that there will be over a billion dollars bet on the Superbowl. Now, we all know that can't all be bet in Las Vegas. So, let's face it, gambling is with us, and we ought to make sure that the state runs it cleanly. And I think under this Bill, it does run it cleanly. And I think the... there are enough good provisions in this Bill. As Representative Cullerton pointed out, no track will get a betting facility until the Racing Board approves that facility. Likewise, there is a local, a local provision to prevent any offtrack betting or teletrack facility going into a community that doesn't want it. I think there are protections. I think it's a good start, and I think as Representative Ryder pointed out, we're talking about a major industry, a billion dollar industry in this state, not only up in Cook County, but all over the state with the farmers and the 25,000 jobs that are created by this state. I think this is a good Bill. I think it's a Bill we ought to pass, and I think it's of vital importance to the racing industry, and I would urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pedersen."

Peterson: "That's Peterson, Mr. Speaker. Anyway, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Hardly any piece of legislation that we look at down here is exactly what we want. The bottom line on this Bill is jobs, not only keeping jobs that we've had in the past, but increasing them to higher levels. Up until now, Illinois

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

has lagged behind other states. Today, Illinois can once again be competitive with other states in the horse racing industry. We'll be able to compete effectively with New York, New Jersey, California and Kentucky. More importantly, this legislation will allow the agricultural and breeding industry to be strong and viable in Illinois. In addition to labor, agricultural and the breeding industry, local municipalities are winners under this legislation. Local governments will receive an estimated 32,000,000 dollars in additional revenue under this package. Now, naturally in our area, we hope that Arlington Park will be rebuilt where it was. There are many advantages to that, no problems with zoning, the infrastructure is there, it's being... it'll be financed and rebuilt with private funds; but, even if they don't rebuild it in the old location, I would still support this Bill because it's good for Illinois. It restores this little piece of tourism to the picture we put together back in 1984, which I also supported. So... and I urge that you vote 'yes' on this important legislation. Thanks."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor. Representative, is there any prohibition in this Bill against televising races from out of state?"

Cullerton: "No, and you should know that..."

Harris: "Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the catalyst for this package was the burning and the fire that occurred at Arlington Park about a year and a half ago, as you full well know. Back then, Arlington Park came to us and wanted a series of economic... or a package of economic incentives to rebuild. Those economic incentives primarily centered around a cutting of the racing privilege

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

tax, the pari-mutuel tax, a freezing of property taxes, a breakage tax break, other economic incentives. Those were good ideas, and I won't belabor the time of the House, because I know this Bill was preordained to pass, but I think a couple of comments are appropriate. Something has crept into this Bill, which Arlington Park didn't need to rebuild, which was never asked for by Arlington Park, and it should be kept in mind when we're talking about specifically Arlington Park, and we have this fancy term for it and we call it intertrack wagering or an intertrack wagering location and you call it that, and maybe... maybe, we try to put that in the legislation, but the people out there... our constituents call it offtrack betting and the press calls it offtrack betting and we know what it is. Over the past ten years, at least nine attempts have been made to pass offtrack betting in this state. And my distinguished colleague from Winnebago County has probably been a... probably been a Cosponsor probably of all of them, but the point is, of these nine attempts, not a single one has passed, and the reason it hasn't passed is because the people of the State of Illinois, as represented by us here in the General Assembly, do not want offtrack betting. It's that simple and that straightforward. If offtrack betting is so good, why don't we have it in Florida, Maryland, New Jersey, Kentucky, California, other states that have very healthy and viable and productive racing industries. We don't because the people there don't want it. They don't want it in Illinois either. If offtrack betting is so good, why are we paying a quarter of a million dollars a year now to Gamblers Anonymous? I mean, that's silly. We're saying, well, we need trouble.. we have trouble with the gamblers. We got to break them from their habit, but we're going to give them more

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

opportunity to bet. Yes, you can say the lottery is betting, there is no question but that it is, but you've got to draw the line somewhere. And the people have said, 'We don't want offtrack betting.' That's one place we want to draw the line. Again, I won't take up much of your time, but you hear a lot of talk about the help and the benefit this is going to be to the agribusiness industry in the State of Illinois. My distinguished colleague from Chicago just answered the question. There's no prohibition against televising a race from a track out of state. Let me tell you something. If the horses run in California or if the horses run in Maryland or if the horses run in Kentucky or in New York, it doesn't help the agribusiness industry in the State of Illinois. The horses have to run in Illinois to benefit us here. If we're televising races from somewhere else, it doesn't do us any good. This is a fatal flaw in this Bill. I'm all for economic incentives. The best part is certainly a cutting of the pari-mutuel tax, perhaps other advantages in the reforms that have been worked on in this package, but offtrack betting, the people don't want it, it fatally flaws the Bill. The Bill deserves a 'no' vote because of that. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Arlington Park Race Track was the jewel in the crown of the northwest suburban area. In that area, we have a growing convention of tourist trade. If we allow Arlington to be rebuilt, it will become an anchor for the significant... convention of tourist trade in the whole northwest area of Chicago. In my area that I represent in the northwest suburban area, we lost hundreds of jobs when Arlington burned down. If we allow it to be rebuilt, those

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

hundreds of jobs will come back and many more hundreds will be added to that new race track. In that area, we have many hotels and restaurants that will benefit because of the tourism dollars that will be brought in by this race track. I envision that this grand old lady, Arlington Park, will rise like a phoenix out of the ashes and will become a world class racing facility in the northwest suburban area of Illinois. Yes, there is going to be tradeoffs with this legislation and there is going to be parts that a lot of us are going to have trouble voting for, but overall, this Bill is good for the State of Illinois and we need to pass this Bill. I ask for your support and I ask for your 'yes' vote on this meaningful and significant Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in support of this Bill because I have to admit that I am elated that we finally have reached a compromise. A compromise that has been so needed and deserving for the area that I represent. A compromise that will be good for not only the northwest suburban area, but it will be good for the City of Chicago. Oftentimes, you sit here, and we've been debating this issue for about a year and a half, and you just think, 'My God, will we ever come to a conclusion?' Well, today we have... and I must say that I'm happy to see the tourism get generated again. I'm happy to see the golden corridor get awoken, and I'm happy that we're finally going to put this to bed. And I'm more than happy to say I do support this legislation."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move the previous question."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye,' opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the debate is off. Representative Cullerton, to close."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I empathize a little bit with those of you who are opposed to the Bill. I do have a speech prepared to give to be in opposition of the Bill, but I'm not going to give it tonight. I would, however, like to make some responses to some of the issues that were raised. We have, in the past, considered offtrack betting, but believe me, it was in a much different form than what is in this Bill. We... the Senate, a couple of years ago, passed an offtrack betting Bill that would have provided for 400 of these parlors throughout the state, and you're absolutely right, the people, perhaps, don't want them. That's why we put in this legislation - clear language that allows for a municipality to prohibit them, and there's only fourteen that can go in the entire state. We are going to generate 28,000,000 dollars estimated for local governments. We are going to give some money to museums. We do have reforms in this package that the horse racing industry did not want, the breeders and the owners did not want, and yet, it's in there. So, I'd like to distinguish between some of those previous efforts and this one. I would also point out that for those of you who are curious, there's no dog racing in this Bill. And our former Representative Vinson is happy today because he passed his stadium Bill, so maybe he's not so sad that the dogs aren't here. I think when you look at the reforms, look at the money for the local government and the museums and you look at the limited form of the offtrack betting, it comes out as a fairly... fair and a good proposal. I'd appreciate your support."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman asks that the House adopt Conference Committee #1 to House Bill 2486. And on that question, all those in favor signify by voting 'yes', those opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This measure requires 60 votes. On... Representative Hawkinson."

Hawkinson: "Thank you, Mr Speaker. I wasn't allowed to ask a question, but I think it ought to be noted for the record that we been advised that there is no provision in this Bill that would permit a municipality or a county to turn this down other than zoning, but that it's a matter of general law prohibiting gambling. And many of us on this side feel that the municipalities would not have the opportunity to turn down an OTB facility, and I was going to ask that during debate, but it was cut off, but that's been the explanation to us."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Stern."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to explain my vote on this. I have been more conflicted on this Bill than on any since I been in the House. I am on the Committee, the Horse Race Investigating Committee, and I am pleased with the safeguards and the reforms that we have put in place. I agree devoutly with everything Representative Harris said about offtrack betting, in fact, I will go further. I think that to call offtrack betting 'teletrack' is the ultimate effort to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. I believe it is a very questionable public policy to base economic development on gambling and betting, and I abhor that part of the Bill. And I have had great difficulty coming to a conclusion on this, and frankly, if I weren't afraid my vote was going to make a big difference, I would certainly vote 'no', but because Arlington Park is in on the lip of my district and I know what it means economically to the people of my district and

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

the restaurants and the workers there, I am very ambivalently voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote. I have faith that Representative Ryder and Representative Cullerton will do as I heard them say awhile ago that they will work out any difficulties in this Bill. I, too, join Representative Harris in saying that the provision of offtrack betting is one that many downstate Representatives have some problems with. I heard you say that by ordinance, a municipality can prohibit a track from locating an offtrack betting parlor within the corporate limits of that municipality, and I will trust your good faith to make certain that that is included in the Bill. More importantly, in my district, there are some 35,000 people employed in the racing and breeding industry. As importantly... more importantly than that is in my district, it creates a demand for agricultural products, and we certainly need to do anything we can to not restrict the demand for those agricultural products but, indeed, expand any industry that would increase the demand for our agricultural products which is, hay and grain and straw. As importantly, the racing industry, whether you agree with it or not, deposits some 70,000,000 dollars in direct payments to the State Treasury, and I would remind my downstate friends that the set 70,000,000 dollars that puts on our county fairs, helps the civic centers in many downstate communities. It is for that reason and that reason alone that I can vote 'yes' for the Bill, and again, I am placing my confidence in Representative Cullerton and Representative Ryder in their comments about municipalities being able to, by enterprise or by ordinance, prevent an

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

offtrack betting parlor from being placed in that municipality if the citizens certainly do not want it there."

Speaker Giglio: "Further explanations? The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. A few moments ago, we discussed 3162, and the Speaker at that particular time decided the economic value of the Sox's ball park. Again, this is an economic value. No industry in the State of Illinois possibly employs more people, employs more people than the horse racing industry. Some tracks, especially in the Chicago area are rather fortunate. These people devote their lives to raising and racing horses. But, let me give you an example, if this Bill should pass and the incentives to continue breeding livestock in the State of Illinois. Quad City Downs, at the present time and at the conclusion of their meet, were running for purses of 800 dollars. Basically, that means that the winner of that particular race would receive 400 dollars. Think for a moment, can a man have or become involved in the racing industry with purses of that amount? The State of Illinois at the present time has the largest privilege tax of anywhere in the nation. The State of Illinois at one time was one of the big five. Now, we are diminishing ourselves when we talk about economy and the growth and the health and the stabilization of the economy in the State of Illinois is a necessity that we do something for people that are involved in the industry of the State of Illinois. These people have farmers that contribute, they themselves. Look at the hotel, the motel, any place that there's a locality established, it's beneficial to the community. Also, there is also provisions in here that fourteen areas of the State of

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Illinois are going to benefit by this. We can give those communities additional representation and additional funds to operate. When you look at this vote, please consider what's taking place if you don't go green on this particular vote. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Further explanation? The Representative from Cook, Representative Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, served as a Member of this Subcommittee or the Committee investigating the horse racing industry, and I must truly say that I learned a lot about the industry while serving on that Committee. We had the opportunity to visit a few tracks, and yes, it is true that there is a lot a jobs that's created within the industry. When I think about the hay that the horses eat, I right away think about my downstate farmer friends and what it will do for their economy, but I have a lot of questions about the numbers that were thrown around during our six month study of the horse racing industry. In particular, the 45 to 75,000,000 dollar revenues that the industry should bring to the state. True, the horse racing industry has suffered, but we all know who the real culprit is, and I think it's the Illinois Lottery that is the real culprit here in the horse racing industry. No one wants to admit it, but lottery has done enough... has done a real number to the horse racing industry. I have a lot of reservations with this Bill, especially as mentioned by others, with the offtrack betting provision. Yes, there are only fourteen parlors this year, but I've served in this General Assembly three terms now, and we start this year with fourteen parlors. By June, it ought to be twenty. Next year, it'll probably be a hundred. Anything to increase the revenues, and I have serious reservations about these parlors and

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

especially with the service charge on it. I think that the affirmative action piece was... is very positive, and I guess if the industry was not coming before the General Assembly today, it's an issue that never would have been discussed, but I'm glad that the industry is considerate and willing to take a look at its hiring practices for both minorities and for women. I have a lot of questions again with this OTB piece. I think that what it will do is encourage neighborhood bookies in some of our inner city communities, and I'm hoping and praying that... as we continue to deal with legislative matters in the next couple of years, that we limit our parlors and we keep the numbers down. And I'm hoping that the industry will come back to life. I have questions, too, because the horsemen said that the... the horsemen said that the detention barns was going to keep some of our better horses out of the state, so I have a lot of... there has been a lot of confusion in terms of the discussion. But again, the onsite visit to the tracks tell me that it is a very important piece, and for that reason, I am going to support this Bill and I urge more green votes on the board."

Speaker Giglio: "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 60 voting 'yes', 37 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present', and the House does adopt First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 2486. This Bill, hereby... is hereby declared passed. Supplemental Calendar #5, Conference Committee Reports, Motions, House... Senate Bill... House Bills. Excuse me. House Bill 3101, Representative Capparelli. The Gentleman moves that the House suspends House Rule 79(e) and place on the Order of Concurrence. Does the Gentleman have leave? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. By the Attendance

STATE OF ILLINOIS
94th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Roll Call. The Gentleman have leave. Leave is granted.
On the Bill, Representative Currie. House Bill 3101."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a supplemental appropriation including funding for all agencies whose needs are immediate and urgent. The total General Revenue Fund dollars amount to 23,266,000. Other funds amount to 71,385,000. I would be happy to describe the individual items, but I think all the Members are apprise of those individual needs, individual specifics. I'd appreciate your 'aye' votes and happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady moves that the House concur with Senate Amendments #1 to House Bill 3101, 1 and 2. And on that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

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

Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

McCracken: "Representative, the Public Aid Department has a supplemental appropriation in here, is that right?"

Currie: "That's right, Representative, it's money for the homeless in the amount of 651,000 dollars."

McCracken: "And Mental Health in the amount of 17.5 million dollars?"

Currie: "I believe..."

McCracken: "Both of them from GRF."

Currie: "Yes. Well, actually, the Mental Health total is 19 million 626.6, and of that 18,000,000, 226,000 is from General Revenue Funds."

McCracken: "Alright. And employment security, 1.5 million dollars?"

Currie: "That's right."

McCracken: "Emergency Services and Disaster Agency, 10.4 million

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

dollars?"

Currie: "That's right."

McCracken: "And 2.5 million GRF for state matching funds?"

Currie: "GRF. That's right."

McCracken: "Okay."

Currie: "A 1,000,000 dollars for the East St. Louis Sanitary District to provide flood relief. Do you want to itemize everything else?"

McCracken: "No, I'm just asking so everybody knows what we're voting on."

Currie: "Okay. Ten and a half million dollars to air condition the State of Illinois Center in Chicago, 28,000,000 dollars for funding for school weatherization programs."

McCracken: "Now, of those 28,000,000 dollars from the stripper well oil overcharge reimbursements, are they split between upstate and downstate, Cook County and downstate?"

Currie: "My understanding is that one-third will go to Chicago schools, one-third to Cook County and the other third to downstate."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie, to close."

Currie: "Please, I ask for your affirmative votes."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt and concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3101?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "I'd just like to state for my own purposes in the record. A lot of good things in this Bill, but I just can't bring myself to vote for all that money for the repairs for the air condition in the State of Illinois Building, even if there might be a loss just to recover it. It's just too

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

much for me."

Speaker Giglio: "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 92 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present', and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report... does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3101. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1760, offered by Representative Daniels and Madigan."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich, on Agreed Resolutions."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 1760 is a Resolution by Speaker Madigan and Minority Leader Lee Daniels and relates to the recent District Court... U.S. District Court decision that denied the construction of a chapel in the Capitol Building, and I would ask for the adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House do adopt the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolution."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1761, offered by Representative Berrios - Nash - Madigan - et al, in respect to the memory of Senator Walter J. Nega."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Nash. Representative Nash."

Nash: "Mr. Speaker, will the Clerk please read the Resolution?"

Speaker Giglio: "Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution. Representative Nash, we're going to take that out. We're going to come back. Representative Matijevich moves that the House Regular Session stand in recess until the call of the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

Chair. Third Special Session of the 84th General Assembly will now come to order. Representative Matijevich asks leave that the Attendance Roll Call for the Regular Session be used for the Third Special Session. Does the Gentleman have leave? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Attendance Roll Call will be used for the Third Special Session. The Gentleman... Further Resolutions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution #7. Resolved by the Senate of the 84th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that the Third Special Session thereof the House of Representatives concurring herein, that when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, December 5, 1986, they stand adjourned until Tuesday, January 13, 1987 at 12:30 o'clock, p.m."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. Representative now moves that the Special Session of the 84th General Assembly stand adjourned until 12:30 on January 13, 1987. Now, the Regular Session shall be back in order. Mr. Clerk, Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of House Bill 3101 together with some Amendments, passed by the Senate, amended December 5, 1986. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution, the adoption

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

148th Legislative Day

December 5, 1986

of which I'm asked... I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit; Senate Joint Resolution #190, resolved by the Senate of the 84th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein, that when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, December 5, 1986, they stand adjourned until Tuesday, January 13, 1987 at 12:00 noon."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich moves for the adoption of the Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'yea', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Representative Matijevich now moves that the House stand adjourned until 12:00 noon, January 13, 1987. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The House is adjourned."

01/09/87
12:24

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

PAGE 1

DECEMBER 05, 1986

HB-1540 MOTION	PAGE	48
HB-2486 CONFERENCE	PAGE	57
HB-2486 MOTION	PAGE	56
HB-2630 CONFERENCE	PAGE	3
HB-2630 CONFERENCE	PAGE	45
HB-2630 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	5
HB-3101 CONCURRENCE	PAGE	76
HB-3101 MOTION	PAGE	75
HB-3162 CONFERENCE	PAGE	55
HB-3162 CONFERENCE	PAGE	18
HB-3162 MOTION	PAGE	50
HB-3162 TABLED	PAGE	53
HB-3162 TABLED	PAGE	56
HB-3351 CONFERENCE	PAGE	3
HB-3351 CONFERENCE	PAGE	47
HB-3351 MOTION	PAGE	46
HB-3351 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	3
SB-1004 CONFERENCE	PAGE	6
SB-1164 CONFERENCE	PAGE	7
SB-1164 CONFERENCE	PAGE	16
SB-1164 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	10
SB-1565 CONFERENCE	PAGE	10
HJR-0233 CONCURRENCE	PAGE	50
SJR-0007 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	79

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REPRESENTATIVE GREIMAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	1
PRAYER - FATHER O'HARA	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	78
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	78
HOUSE IN RECESS	PAGE	79
THIRD SPECIAL SESSION TO ORDER	PAGE	79
THIRD SPECIAL SESSION ADJOURNED	PAGE	79
HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	79
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	79
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	80