

SENATE FLOOR DEBATE

SPECIAL SESSION

DECEMBER 15, 1972

1. PRESIDENT:

2. Senate will come to order. Prayer by the Chaplain, Reverend
3. George L. Morelock, Pastor of St. Agnes Catholic Church of Springfield.
4. Father Morelock.

5. PRAYER:

6. PRESIDENT:

7. We're now in the Special Session. Reading of the Journal. Moved
8. by Senator Kosinski that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with.
9. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. Motion pre-
10. vails. When the motion to adjourn was made we were on a motion by
11. Senator Laughlin and Senator Laughlin can explain his motion again.
12. For what purpose does Senator Knuppel arise?

13. SENATOR KNUPPEL:

14. I'd like to offer an amendment to his bill. I'd just like to
15. see the whole package voted on. Let's call the whole package back
16. 1, 2, 3, 4 all of them because they are a package. If we're going to
17. vote on discharge, let's vote on all of them. Let's don't play games.
18. And I'd like to move to amend it to his motion to include all of the bills.

19. PRESIDENT:

20. Well. . . Senator. . . Senator Laughlin.

21. SENATOR LAUGHLIN:

22. Well, Mr. President, Senator Clarke is the sponsor of these bills
23. and he has no objection to the suggestion made by Senator Knuppel at
24. all. So if you want to change the motion to discharge the Committee
25. from all of them, it's agreed by Senator Clarke, who is the principal
26. sponsor. I made this motion on my own and he's the sponsor of the
27. bill so if that's what you want, fine. All I'm trying to do is get
28. some action.

29. PRESIDENT:

30. What are the numbers now so that we're in agreement. One through
31. Seven. Is this what we're talking about Senator Knuppel and Senator
32. Clarke? Alright. If there is no objection, the motion is amended in
33. that way. Senator Laughlin.

1. SENATOR LAUGHLIN:

2. I accept that amendment or will rephrase the motion or however
3. you . . .

4. PRESIDENT:

5. I think we'll just journalize it and I think we'll just. . .
6. The motion is to discharge committee and that takes 30 votes. Senator
7. Laughlin is recognized on his motion.

8. SENATOR LAUGHLIN:

9. Well I stated it briefly yesterday. I made the statement that
10. I didn't know why the last two meetings of the Revenue . . . Joint
11. Revenue Committee weren't held and I place no blame on anyone. I
12. still don't know. I do know that one of the things that was to be
13. done by the . . .

14. PRESIDENT:

15. Just a moment. Senator Laughlin is entitled to be heard. Proceed.

16. SENATOR LAUGHLIN:

17. . . . that one of the things that was to be done was that this
18. legislation was to receive thorough study and I thought at this Session
19. of the Legislature. I thought that's why they went to those committees.
20. And I had the feeling that unless a motion to discharge was made that
21. there wouldn't be anymore hearings. Now maybe that's not justified
22. but certainly so that if there was a possibility of any action on a
23. tax freeze before this General Assembly adjourns sine die that we should
24. find out about it. I'm aware that there are proponents and opponents
25. of this bill. I am aware that there are complexities in the bill.
26. I'm also aware of the fact that yesterday afternoon, I'm not completely
27. irresponsible, I talked with Maurice Scott of the Taxpayers' Federa-
28. tion and I asked him prior to the argument whether or not if Senate
29. Bills 6 and 7 are the appropriate bill received an amendment limiting
30. the freeze to one year and, with other amendments that he had suggested
31. and had in mind, whether or not we could have the first step in the
32. ultimate control of property taxes on a more rational basis and a
33. positive indication on the part of the Legislature as to how local

1. communities might use their revenue sharing funds. I also understand,
2. and if I'm wrong about this I'll stand corrected, that some of the
3. units of local government are now in the process of constructing
4. budgets and the Governor-elect, I think, said during the campaign
5. that when you do this you gave everybody a chance to jack up their
6. budgets in anticipation that a tax freeze might pass and it would
7. be a legitimate logical thing to do unless the Legislature were to
8. act in some way now on this matter. So, with just one other comment
9. which I can't resist, I've been a member of this body for 12 years.
10. I hope I leave it the way I came in. I have never, to my knowledge,
11. taken off on any member of this body personally and I'm just remind-
12. ing the Senate President pro tem, my dear friend for whom I have
13. the utmost respect, that I didn't particularly appreciate his remarks
14. directed at my pension status yesterday.

15. PRESIDENT:

16. Senator Palmer.

17. SENATOR PALMER:

18. Point of information. This... these bills were referred to a
19. joint committee, committee from the House and the Senate. I'm
20. wondering if his motion is proper to discharge this committee. What
21. happens to the committee that was appointed by the House? May I
22. have an answer on that?

23. PRESIDENT:

24. The bills themselves were not referred to a joint committee,
25. but a joint committee was created so the Chair would have to rule that
26. the motion is in order. Senator Partee.

27. SENATOR PARTEE:

28. I don't know what I said that nettled the Senator yesterday but
29. it certainly wasn't anything intended to be in any way unkind and what-
30. ever it was, I'm very sorry that you misunderstood it. I'm concerned
31. here, though, in this whole proposition, about the entire State of
32. Illinois. One of the things that I have always believed in, perhaps
33. sometimes to my own undoing, is that we are not local officials in

1. contradistinction to being State officials. We have an obligation
2. to serve the entire State. It does not escape my notice that we
3. must necessarily do what people in our districts think is proper
4. in order to obtain a rather essential part of this whole business
5. which is reelection. But in the overall sense are notions, ideas,
6. and attitudes should relate to the problems of the entire State and
7. the problems of the entire State should in every instance preponderate
8. our parochial kind of approaches to our own individual districts,
9. which is one of the reasons why I suggested doing the reapportion-
10. ment hearings, that it would be nice if we could draft districts which
11. had three components: a part urban Chicago; a part Cook County out-
12. side Chicago; and a part, what is referred to as downstate Illinois.
13. I would have liked to see us, couldn't do it of course, within the
14. guidelines of the Supreme Court for contiguousness and that sort of
15. thing. But it would have been interesting to me to see Legislators
16. who represented districts of equal part downstate, Cook County, and
17. Chicago because I think for the very first time they would have had
18. a real in depth relationship with what this is all about in terms of
19. being a Senator for the people of the State without derivation and
20. without divisional geographical considerations. In this vein I would
21. point out that I read the testimony of those persons who appeared
22. before the Committee on the Revenue. . . the Joint Revenue Committee
23. which were to study these bills and I, in reading those, have come to
24. understand that in Cook County the subject matter of these bills has
25. already been fulfilled. In other words, there is already a tax freeze
26. in operation in Cook County and I think perhaps Cook County could,
27. under these bills, live with a great deal more ease than many other
28. parts of the State. There are many other parts of the State where
29. this would create a rather chaotic condition where this would cause
30. a great amount of frustration and upset, dismay and chagrin on the part
31. of those people who are expecting services from various governmental
32. units. Now I suppose it is not in my overall best interest to say
33. that I am going to take an adamant position on leaving these in a

1. committee until such time as they can be properly and adequately
2. heard and amended. To precipitously bring them from the committee
3. is not, I think, in the best interest of the people of this State.
4. And although it may imagine me as being opposed to what is a fine and
5. wonderful program, although it may indicate to people by this vote
6. that I am opposed to this freeze because however the media treats it,
7. however it is communicated to people, I may be unjustly accused of
8. being in the opposition to what is described to us as progress. But
9. I must say to you that in honesty and all candor I cannot permit my-
10. self to vote to bring this out of committee knowing full well that
11. it is not in the position and it's not likely to be in the position
12. where to pass it would be meaningful and where to pass it would be
13. the kind of legislation which would be constitutional and which would
14. at the same time be embracive of all necessary concepts to see to it
15. that people had the kind of tax situation and structure that the State
16. deserves and that the Constitution contemplates. So, Mr. President,
17. I am still taking the position I did yesterday that this should remain
18. in committee and I certainly wish that we had perhaps gone about this
19. in a different kind of way like perhaps a study commission or a group
20. not necessarily composed of Legislators. Perhaps one of the faults
21. with the Joint Revenue Commission was the fact that only Legislators
22. were on it. It doesn't bring me any joy to say to you, and I say this
23. without any rancor, but it does not bring me any happiness to realize
24. now that the person who served as its chairman made the statement
25. immediately after his appointment almost that they were going to come
26. out with a do pass recommendation. This, without the hearings, this,
27. without having the input from people from all over the State who
28. extensively desired to contribute, who wanted to have the rest of
29. the State know their attitudes and feelings and beliefs concerning
30. this very sensitive and very difficult subject. And then when hearings
31. were scheduled and there was a group heard at one hearing in Springfield
32. and then unceremoniously this Chairman said there would not be those
33. in Chicago and then they scheduled some in Springfield and he said no,

1. and they called them off here and many people from all over the
2. State had no opportunity to discuss this question, had no opportunity
3. to impart to the membership how this would affect them, what the im-
4. pact of revenue sharing would be on this program, what the impact
5. of all of the various taxing programs would be and how they could or
6. could not be correlated within the framework of this program. We
7. have not that information and this is a very serious subject and
8. I think without that information we are not in a position to cast
9. an intelligent vote.

10. PRESIDENT:

11. Senator Knuppel.

12. SENATOR KNUPPEL:

13. Mr. President, I've always admired the Senator from the other
14. side of the aisle, and I still do. However, I feel that this is the
15. first time in two years here that I've seen him advocate irresponsi-
16. bility. There's seven bills in this package and among those bills
17. is one which would authorize the issuance of some \$400 million
18. worth of bonds. This Session of the General Assembly has already
19. authorized \$900 million worth of road bonds, 500 and some million
20. dollars worth of bonds for the capital improvement and now we're
21. asked to approve another \$400 million worth of bonds. The use of
22. the funds to be apportioned among those schools according to a
23. formula who have . . . who now undertake to vote a bond issue on the
24. people. Now I ask you and I ask the members of this Body whether a
25. tax freeze just means on operating revenue or does it mean a tax
26. freeze, period. By the inducement, the carrot in front of the rabbit,
27. those districts which have not made capital improvement are encouraged
28. and enticed to vote large bond issues which would raise taxes on them-
29. selves to later be redeemed to the extent of 20 or 40 percent. I don't
30. call this a tax freeze measure at all. Now we've worked through the
31. committee system. It may have failed in this instance and I would say
32. this, that the committee in the House is controlled by Republicans
33. and in the Senate by Democrats. It might have been a bipartisan

1. failure, but there's been a failure in the committee system in this
2. case to report back. I don't know if it's necessarily the fault of
3. the committee. Maybe it's the fault of some of the leadership that's
4. on it. As Senator Partee has said, one of the members or one of the
5. leaders has been. . . had inscribed to him the language that they
6. were going to vote this out Do Pass, whether or not the meeting in
7. Chicago, as I understand it, was postponed largely at the insistence
8. of one of the leaders of the House who was not a Democrat. Now this
9. provides no relief for the taxpayer in 1973. The first relief will
10. be in 1974. It's admitted that there are districts and taxing bodies
11. who have already issued anticipation warrants and that the tax freeze
12. could not be constitutional at this time. I personally feel that
13. there are other constitutional questions under both the Federal and
14. State Constitution. These have not been considered. As I said in
15. my original speech here, I've heard the people on this Floor, lawyers
16. and Senators, complain about the treatment they've received from the
17. Supreme Court of this State in holding many of their enactments
18. unconstitutional. We have not and we cannot as a Committee as a
19. whole thoroughly nor adequately examine these bills and it's irres-
20. possible for us to discharge the committee in an attempt to do this when
21. we do have the time in the new Session in the 78th General Assembly to
22. do this. I'm a vehement, passionate advocate of doing something
23. about reducing taxes and will in the new Session, if nobody else
24. does, propose a bill that says that 50 percent of what a taxing body
25. receives from revenue sharing shall be cut from their budget. It
26. doesn't make sense to say that a taxing body should extend these
27. taxes and then refund them. That's double work. They just cut
28. their budget in the first place. I hope that the taxpayers of this
29. State and the press realize that we are not the ones who create the
30. taxes. We're talking about local taxes. They should elect res-
31. ponsible people to their city councils, their school boards and
32. their other taxing bodies who make up the budget if they are unhappy
33. with the taxes they are paying. And the press nor no one else should

1. blame the high rate of local taxes on the General Assembly. They're
2. asking us to pull their chestnuts out of the fire. They're asking
3. us to protect them against their own local officials, against their
4. own school boards and their own city councils who are spending this
5. money. Now they also, if this tax freeze were to go into effect, it
6. doesn't protect many of those people or take into consideration
7. those people who actually will not share in the revenue funds that
8. are going to be coming back from the Federal Government. For the
9. first time in the State of Illinois we're going to start financing
10. local government through a graduated income tax. Nobody would be
11. so preposterous to stand in this Body and advocate a piece of legis-
12. lation which would raise or pass or charge monies for running schools
13. and cities on a graduated income tax. Yet by indirection this is
14. exactly what's happening. These bills, as has been suggested by
15. the Taxpayers' Federation, dedicated to the protection of the taxpayer
16. require at least 21 amendments and probably more. I have not prepared
17. amendments. I was asked this yesterday, because I assume that the
18. committee would function and come back with recommendations which
19. would put this bill or these bills. . .this package in an acceptable
20. form. I say again that there's things wrong with each of these bills. One
21. of them being. . .the largest one being the \$400 million which hasn't
22. been mentioned in the press. They keep talking about revenue sharing
23. and tax freeze because that's what people want to read about. But
24. will they write in their papers, will they say over the air, will
25. the news media point out that to pass this package would result in
26. the flotation of some \$400 million worth of additional bonds for the
27. State of Illinois, and for our people to use revenue sharing funds
28. that might otherwise be available to pay the interest on those bonds.
29. There's something else that we've been doing in this Body for a long
30. time that strikes me as completely wrong. We pick a date, 1969, and
31. we say anybody that has built schools since 1969 will get help, but
32. anybody that has built before that will not. And what we do is we
33. punish those people who are diligent enough to look after themselves.

1. Those people who have had the courage to vote bond issued for capital
2. improvement and at the same time we reward the loathsome, the lazy,
3. the people who didn't have the courage or the guts, nor the integrity
4. to treat their own children to the type of schools they might have
5. been entitled to. I say if we pass it we ought to amend it to provide
6. that any school that has an outstanding bond issue that is not paid
7. off ought to share in this kind of money. It ought not to reward just
8. those people who started since 1969. We ought not to entice people
9. by a little dribble or a cookie to vote a higher tax rate on them-
10. selves in the form of a bond issue for building purposes and then
11. say we're freezing taxes. We're not doing it.

12. PRESIDENT:

13. Just a moment. For what purpose does Senator Graham arise?

14. SENATOR GRAHAM:

15. I ask on a . . . I'd like to ask a question. Are we conducting
16. a filibuster or are we keeping time on the gentleman from Petersburg?

17. PRESIDENT:

18. We're keeping time and the gentleman is within his time.
19. Senator Knuppel may continue.

20. SENATOR KNUPPEL:

21. I would not resort to a filibuster on this. I think there
22. is too much. The volume that has to be ground here is too great
23. for anybody to say that we should shunt aside the committee system
24. in this instance. I feel that I've talked long enough on this
25. subject, but I think that what has been shown both in the committee
26. with the requirement for 21 amendments, the flotation of \$400
27. million worth of bonds, the rewarding of the slothful as opposed
28. to the diligent. The new concepts that go with revenue sharing
29. would be irresponsible in the short period that we seem to have
30. allotted to ourselves and the further fact that apparently the committee
31. hasn't held the hearings nor come up with the recommendations that
32. might have been expected. They've had a very short time in which to
33. do this on a very complicated subject. I personally feel that it

1. would. . . it is irresponsibility. I'm a. . . as I say, I'm a
2. passionate advocate of a tax freeze and tax relief. I think it goes
3. much further than this. I think that some of these funds should
4. be used to take the sales tax off food and drugs if we're going to
5. give revenue relief. There is the most oppressive tax of all, the
6. most regressive tax. Some of the revenue sharing funds should be
7. going for those purposes. We have to restructure our whole revenue
8. system. We had a Constitutional Convention for that purpose and
9. things changed so rapidly that we cannot possibly meet that demand
10. because decisions in the Sorrento case in California and in Texas
11. and in Minnesota will soon require us to abolish the whole property
12. tax concept. We're talking about something that's going to be going
13. out the window. When I introduce bills to try to do this with the
14. General Assembly, I'm told that it takes a great deal of courage and
15. that even though these are honest bills, nobody can vote for them.
16. I'm referring to 1442 and 1443. We're going to have to vote for them.
17. We're going to have to change our thinking about how we raise revenue.
18. We're whipping an old sack of bones--a dead dog. We're talking
19. about property taxes which will not be the basis nor the way of
20. raising our revenues in the very near future. At least we ought to
21. do this intelligently through a committee designed for the whole
22. purpose to review the entire ambit of revenue and how we raise it
23. and how we spend it. I'm sorry that I'll have to vote against this
24. and that it may be construed as a vote against revenue...against
25. a tax freeze. It is not. I voted for the 50 per cent limitation on
26. real estate taxes last year and incidentally I might report to this
27. Body that that bill, designed to reduce taxes or to limit levies, is
28. being used to raise taxes in some counties because it didn't say
29. not to be in excess of 50 per cent. It said 50 per cent of value
30. and there were counties where it was not assessed at that level and
31. those counties are now using that bill, not as a tax relief measure,
32. but as a tax and revenue raising measure. So I say let's be very
33. careful. Let's be very careful in our consideration of these bills,

1. to see. . .

2. PRESIDENT:

3. The Senator is still within his time limit and may proceed.

4. SENATOR KNUPPEL:

5. . . . to see. . . to see that these bills read the way we want
6. them to read, that they're not used in fact to raise taxes but rather
7. to lower taxes. And we have not had the time nor the opportunity to
8. do this. It's great to sit and holler that I've talked too long, but
9. the answer is we haven't started, we haven't started to use the time
10. we ought to use on something as important as our revenue raising and
11. revenue sharing and we can't do it in this aborted session we have
12. here. This whole thing should be killed or else have the committee
13. report back to the 78th General Assembly, and we should go at that
14. then with a passion to really start solving our revenue raising
15. methods. Thank you very much.

16. PRESIDENT:

17. Senator Clarke.

18. SENATOR CLARKE:

19. Mr. President and Senators, I'm a little amazed at the last
20. Senator taking out after the bonding provisions when he's the one
21. that asked that they be included in the discharge motion. As the
22. sponsor of these bills, I did not intend that we discharge any
23. but the two tax freeze bills that Senator Laughlin originally in-
24. cluded. Let me just say this, that the issue here is complex and
25. the matters have far ramifications. Senator Partee says that they are
26. taken care of in Cook County. I think that some of the other suburban
27. Senators might disagree. They may be taken care of in Chicago but
28. there are many outlying areas where the tax bill is primarily...
29. entails schools that are fast being a problem that is not being
30. taken care of by the rebate from the County and the City. We are
31. only talking here about a discharge motion from committee. We
32. adjourn for a number of days in order to give a hearing to these
33. bills and I had a conversation with the Senate Chairman of the

1. Revenue Committee last night and I know that he is blameless in
2. terms of a lack of thorough hearing. On the other hand I have
3. heard of no plans to have further hearings in the immediate future.
4. We are in a Special Session. It is my suggestion that we bring
5. these bills out of the committee that we set a hearing of the Whole
6. because all of the Senators have not had the opportunity the Pro Tem
7. has to review all of the testimony that was given at the one hearing
8. and we may well decide just what has been said by the previous
9. speaker. But at least we are seriously, as an entire body, then
10. addressing ourselves to a conclusion of this Special Session. As a
11. sponsor of these bills, I am the sponsor as the Republican leader,
12. not because I am necessarily the advocate of the bills, I think
13. there are serious questions that need to be answered and I'm speak-
14. ing only of the tax freeze bills, not the bonding bills. I think
15. there is a serious question as to whether a lame duck Legislature
16. should act on a program when a new Governor is coming in where he
17. might have input that he wants to make or changes that he would want
18. to make. I think that there is a serious question as to whether the
19. time limit should be as extended as these bills provide rather than
20. maybe a short one year period as has been suggested by the Taxpayers'
21. Federation. I think there are a lot of questions and I am not sure
22. and I'm not proposing and I don't think many of our members may be
23. proposing that because we are asking for this motion to bring it
24. before the full body that we are therefore asking for a final vote
25. on these bills as they stand or maybe a final vote at all at this
26. time and in this Special Session. However, we are in a Special
27. Session; time is running out. We're in a regular Session and there
28. are other issues that are still considerably vague in terms of their
29. definition and that has to do with the potential salary increases
30. for judicial, for executive, compensation of Legislators, and that
31. entire subject is still very vague. But I think we have to either
32. go forward or decide that we're not going to go forward and I think
33. that if we are not willing to say we're going to have a hearing at

1. this point in time with the Senate Revenue Committee if the House
2. won't have a joint hearing, if we're not going to vote these bills
3. out of committee so we can have a hearing of the Whole and maybe
4. decide to do nothing or maybe decide there should be amendments,
5. then let's decide something. Let's go forward and try and conclude
6. this matter and really that is the thrust, I think, of Senator
7. Laughlin's motion that we should assume our responsibilities to do
8. something more than sitting around waiting to see who wants how much
9. on a salary increase and then we'll tell the people we'll wait
10. until next year on these bills. I would hope really, because we
11. don't have the votes on this side. I would hope that there would
12. at least be 10 to 12 members on the other side that would be willing
13. to bring these bills to the Floor. I would hope that we could have
14. a . . . maybe a hearing of the Whole the first of the week and we
15. could then delineate what are these issues, what are these problems,
16. what are the amendment necessary, and possibly we could then better
17. be in a position to debate what the previous speaker was really
18. debating and that was the issue rather than the procedural question
19. we are addressing ourselves to at this point.

20. PRESIDENT:

21. Senator Cherry.

22. SENATOR CHERRY:

23. Mr. President, and members of the Senate, in all of the years
24. that I've been here I have never had to consider anything more com-
25. plicated than what we are discussing in these series of bills.
26. There's an old cliché but I think very applicable in this particu-
27. lar consideration and that is that haste makes waste. I don't
28. think there is any man here that is in opposition to the concept,
29. give the taxpayers a break. I think our taxes are outlandishly high
30. and I think the taxpayers of this State as well as the taxpayers
31. of our nation are entitled to have a strong look at our tax program
32. today. How much more are we going to take from the people and
33. shouldn't we give them some relief and I think we're all for that.

1. I talked about complications. I don't think all the members here
2. know of all the implications in these bills. Of all of the opposition
3. that has been raised in the Committee meetings that have been con-
4. ducted so far. As a matter of fact there's only been two bills so
5. far that have been considered by the joint committee. Only two out
6. of this entire package. We're talking as has been said about a 400
7. million dollar program. And there's been much opposition to those
8. particular bills. And during the debate, or during rather the testi-
9. mony that has been presented by the joint committee which consisted
10. of about 6 hours, only the first two bills were considered in the
11. entire package, in the freeze and in the capital bond issue. The
12. Governor said in his address to us on November the 27th that the
13. capital program would advance state support for education and pro-
14. vide state aid in an area where many local schools have been extended
15. to the limit. Now here's one of the complications and here's one of
16. the things I'm sure that not every member of this body understands;
17. that most of the 400 million dollars, 300 million would be earmarked
18. for the development and construction of capital facilities which
19. consists of building structures and equipment, for the acquisition
20. and development for land for these purposes. The other 100 million
21. would be used for debt service on school district bonds issued for
22. these same purposes after January 1st, 1969. The initial appropria-
23. tion of the Capital Development Board for grants to local districts
24. be 100 million dollars. 75 million for new school construction and
25. 25 million for principal and interest payments on existing debt; the
26. existing debt of local school districts. And then a separate bill
27. appropriates 9 million dollars for the first interest and principal
28. payments on the state bonds. We had a witness from the Illinois
29. Education Association who noted that both the tax freeze and the
30. bond program are linked to the availability of federal revenue
31. sharing money. And there obviously exists a discrepancy between
32. actual school needs and actual available revenue sharing dollars.
33. We don't know what that is at this moment. And they went on, the

1. witness went on to say that he's in favor of the state providing
2. greater assistance to the local school districts. But according to
3. the structure of these bills there is little relief to the school
4. system themselves in the existing proposals. The state's portion
5. of federal revenue sharing next year will be about a 100 million
6. dollars. That really lists just to give you an idea about how com-
7. plicated this issue is; but 47 million of this 100 million is already
8. committed to Public Aid, which leaves a total of 53 million; and to
9. make up the estimated revenue losses from property tax exemptions
10. which have been granted by our Bodies, by the Legislature in the
11. last two years, some 69 million dollars in state aid would be needed
12. and passage of the tax freeze would push the losses up another 60
13. million dollars. There's been some critics that have stated the
14. rating system by lumping the State's three types of school districts
15. together discriminates against high school districts. And they
16. argue that separate ratings systems should be presented for each
17. type unit. And the units, I understand, are the grade (kindergartens
18. through twelve), and the elementary (kindergartens through the eighth
19. grade), and high school (the ninth through twelfth). There was a
20. witness who said he favors the state participation in building pro-
21. grams but the bills have some problems that needed to be worked out
22. and he stated that amendments will be presumed to be offered to
23. eliminate the discriminating factors. And Don Eslick, Associate
24. State Superintendent of Public Instruction for Governmental Relations
25. said that the formula was defective. And he further went on to say
26. that high school districts generally have fewer students than grade
27. school districts covering the same area, but the assessed valuation
28. is identical for both units. That's the law now. Thus dividing
29. fewer high school students into assessed valuation yields a higher
30. figure than the same computation made with the grade school pupils,
31. and makes the high school less likely to add or to qualify for large
32. percentages of state aid for capital projects. These are some of the
33. complications that have been voiced and some of the criticisms that

1. have been voiced with respect to these bills. I am in receipt
2. of two letters, I have received more than two letters, but two
3. particular letters that I'd like to comment on before this Body.
4. One is from the Wheeling Park District and I don't know if that's
5. Senator Mohr's district or Senator Graham's but, nevertheless, these
6. gentlemen who represent these districts should be aware of the
7. position of the Wheeling Park District. And in substance this letter
8. says that the Wheeling Park District over five years of the proposed
9. freeze would lose an estimated 420 million dollars in revenue if the
10. dollar freeze is passed. And goes on to say our community, as well
11. as others, in the Chicago suburbs are growing in our assessed valuation
12. and population and while realizing that some sort of relief is
13. necessary to the home owners and land owners we feel that special
14. interest districts should be exempt or that a tax rate freeze should
15. be discussed. Another letter from the Village of Wilmette, that's
16. presently represented by Senator Arrington, states to us that the
17. Board of Trustees of the Village of Wilmette recommends that they
18. wish to follow the recommendations of the Illinois Municipal League
19. that this proposed legislation be defeated or deferred to the next
20. General Session starting in January. Now, I know we've passed bonding
21. issues in haste in the past but I think that where we have involved
22. the education of our youngsters in this state and I think with the
23. other complications of changing the rating system and so forth, I
24. think with the possibility of lessening income from the revenue
25. sharing to certain communities in our state, I think requires much
26. work and much input which the revenue committees of both houses
27. are considering at the present time, and hearing only six hours of
28. testimony from prop. . .from opponents to these bills and as yet
29. not having heard from the people who support these bills, I think
30. it would be completely irresponsible and ill advised on the part of
31. this Body, at this moment, to accept the motion that has been made
32. and even to have a hearing of the whole Senate to consider this
33. most complicated issue that has been identified and characterized

1. as a political gimmick by some of the members of the Senate some
2. week or ten days prior to an election. I just don't think that we
3. need to follow that kind of recommendation that has been made to us
4. by the Executive Branch of this Government of this State, to act in
5. haste. And I think we need much more input. And I think that the
6. incoming members of both the Senate and the House should consider
7. this most important legislation and act, after deliberation, and
8. after all of the dialogue necessary to be put into this kind of a
9. concept, a package of legislation. And that we certainly should
10. not do it within two or three hours where so many complications exist
11. and there are so many intricacies involved in this new concept. That
12. I just think we should defeat this motion and certainly have the
13. necessary dialogue, the necessary input, the necessary information
14. and statistics so that we know where we are going with this important
15. legislation.

16. PRESIDENT:

17. Senator Palmer. You're on the list, Senator. Senator Palmer.

18. SENATOR PALMER:

19. Mr. President, and members of the Senate. According to some
20. of the notes I have here, I'm not going to burden you by repeating
21. the importance and the complications of this issue, but in all
22. sincerity I would like to say this. That I have the highest respect
23. for Senator Laughlin, who made this motion, and I know he has an
24. enviable record in the 12 years. And I would like to suggest and
25. urge him that in order for him to maintain that record before he
26. leaves this honorable body that he...I urge him and suggest to him
27. that he withdraw this frivolous motion. The motion itself is frivolous
28. and the manner in which it was made, and I am surprised the way it
29. was made, it was frivolous. If you remember yesterday the honorable
30. Senator arose and said, "I did not attend the meetings, I don't know
31. what happened, I wasn't there but I asked that it be withdrawn and
32. taken from the committee", and the only reason that he presented to
33. this Body that he would like some action. Now you have heard, again

1. I say, I'm not going to repeat, you have heard the importance
2. and the complications of these issues. And even Senator Clarke
3. has given some very, very good arguments and reasons why this
4. should not be taken from the committee. Now does, and I'm sure
5. that the honorable Senator Laughlin would agree with me, that the
6. proper action here is a full study of this matter and these complica-
7. tions and not, and not a debate by Senators who are not fully informed.
8. Thank you very much.

9. PRESIDENT:

10. Senator Graham.

11. SENATOR GRAHAM:

12. Mr. President. I'm sorry that Senator Laughlin has turned
13. out to be such a rascal in the eyes of some, but he hasn't changed
14. in my eyes. I doubt that the genial gentleman from Freeport ever
15. made a motion that was frivolous, in his mind. I'm also glad to
16. learn today from the distinguished gentleman from Petersburg that
17. there's a difference between lawyers and Senators. I always thought
18. that was true, now I'm finding it out. I think what we are forgetting,
19. with regard to this, that we're not going to get any input into this
20. package as long as it remains in committee. I was one of the few who
21. attended that committee meeting, and I sat there for six and one-half
22. hours. We heard the taxusers arguing with the taxpayers. We heard
23. our village officials who have not, up until now in most cases, had
24. the courage to publish what their communities were getting as a
25. result of the 12 percent of the income tax. They want that to be a
26. deep, dark secret. And some of the mayors have some of the members
27. upset a little bit, and I conducted a little survey by the way of a
28. newspaper ad in the Copley Press Elgin Courier News, and I found out
29. as a result of this survey that there are a lot more taxpayers than
30. there are mayors. Now, if

31.

32.

33.

1. no relief is forthcoming in 1973 as was subscribed by one of the
2. members here, and I think that's probably true, I don't think
3. the taxpayers are going to run out of the country because they
4. think they are going to get some relief in 1974. And some of
5. the municipalities who think that we are stripping them of their
6. funds with which they may operate their communities in their
7. own merry way are not precluded from the fact that they, if
8. they need money, can have a referendum. So if it is such dire
9. need and the taxpayers want it so badly, some of these proposals,
10. then what is so wrong with a referendum? Sure it's a complicated
11. piece of legislation, and I'm not so sure that I can favorably
12. consider the bond issue bills now, but Maurice Scott from the
13. Taxpayer's Federation said to us in Committee over in the House
14. of Representatives that day, that he thought four or five amend-
15. ments to the tax freeze bill could get it in pretty good shape
16. and I think Maurice Scott knows what he's talking about. Now
17. I'm not particularly impressed by some of the schools and the
18. bleeding hearts that are telling how badly they're going to be
19. affected when, as a result of the schools' increase in State
20. funds as a result of the passage of the income tax, one big
21. school in my District spent 82% of those funds for administra-
22. tive costs, not for the kids, not for the classroom, but we have
23. got a lot more administrative assistants than we used to have,
24. and I'm not so sure that's what the taxpayers want. Now I think
25. that if we really are serious about addressing ourselves to this
26. and I've got a feeling that some people are not, let's get that
27. thing out on the Floor of this Senate where we can deal with it.
28. Where we can call Maurice Scott where we can have his proposed
29. amendments printed, where we can deal with the park districts,
30. where we can do these things. But I'm telling you lady and
31. gentlemen of this Senate we're not going to be able to do any-
32. thing with them as long as they are residing the hands of the
33. Chairman of the Joint House Senate Committee on Revenue, and I'm

1. not so sure the people back home care where they are, but they
2. want us to act. And I am going to support Senator Laughlin's
3. motion. Get those bills out here in front of God and everybody.
4. What's so wrong with that, are we afraid? I'm not.

5. PRESIDENT:

6. Senator Horsley.

7. SENATOR HORSLEY:

8. Mr. President and members of the Senate. For some of us
9. here today, we're coming to the close of our legislative careers
10. and we have matters that we have to consider, I think at this
11. stage, purely and simply from the standpoint of our constituents, not f
12. the standpoint of any votes or what may happen to us in the
13. future because of our long careers that are coming to a close.
14. There will be no more votes to worry about. But we still have
15. to worry about people. We still have to worry about the poor
16. people. We still have to worry about children in our school
17. systems. I have recently gone through a situation here where
18. we defeated a bond issue by two to one. Now there were many
19. outside elements involved, but one of the elements was this
20. pending legislation. The uncertainty. I have studied these
21. bills. I think some of them need some amendments, but I think
22. there are people in this Body who are able to draw amendments.
23. I think that Maurice Scott of the Taxpayer's Federation, who has
24. the interest of the taxpayers at heart, certainly can help pro-
25. tect the public, protect the taxing bodies to see that no harm
26. can come by amendments. But I think that in the minds of the
27. public it is most unfortunate because right now the one thing
28. that is making the headlines is a salary increase for you
29. gentlemen who are going to stay behind. Also, the matter of
30. increasing your take-home by way of expense monies. I've lived
31. around here long enough that my \$2.10 a week doesn't amount to
32. a great deal. It doesn't buy lunch very often. It gets a head-
33. line every election time because I do collect my \$2.00, maybe

1. it's 20¢, I've forgotten, a week, because I live at seven miles
2. out and that's the same as if I lived in Jacksonville and I'm
3. entitled to that no more, no less, and I take it because I'm
4. entitled to it. I'm going to miss that \$2.10 every week when
5. we're in Session, but I do bleed for some of you people who
6. have to leave Rockford who have to come down here the long
7. distance and pay hotel and meals, it's unrealistic to think
8. that the mileage you get this day and age can pay your ex-
9. penses. But I'm also realistic enough to know that if you people
10. who are going to remain here get a salary increase and get your
11. expenses increased between now and January 10th, the poor tax-
12. payers are going to be left forgotten come January 10th, when
13. the new Session meets, on the matter of lowering or holding the
14. line on real estate taxes. I'm just that realistic enough to
15. know that when the time to bargain is at hand do your bargaining
16. and don't wait until the birds have all flown. And in connection
17. with bargaining, I happen to have only one vote to cast, and I
18. can say to you quite frankly that if you're not going to give
19. the taxpayers a break on their real estate taxes, you're not
20. going to get a vote from me on expenses or anything else. It's
21. just that simple. Now I've heard the argument, rightfully so,
22. that a freeze on dollar amounts is wrong. I agree with that.
23. If you're in a growing community like some of us are in with
24. subdivisions coming up overnight, there shouldn't be a dollar
25. freeze, there should be a rate freeze to be increased only by
26. referendum and if the people want to vote more taxes, that's
27. their right and their privilege. But the day is coming to a
28. close when the little bungalows are going to entirely going to
29. support your school systems and support other matters. We've
30. got to have general revenue to help, and that's what is proposed,
31. that general revenue will pick up the burden by people who don't
32. own houses. It's just that simple. And I also feel so strongly
33. about it, and I still have enough energy left, I'd like to see

1. one more good filibuster in these legislative halls before I
2. quit. And I'd like to ask my good friends Denny Collins, Hudson
3. Sours, Ebbie Groen, Ev Laughlin and some of us who've been
4. through some of these battles, let's join. Let's give 'em
5. one more good filibuster like they've never seen, and say when
6. you're willing to come forth with relief for the taxpayers, then
7. we'll increase your expense allowance that will be good for two
8. years, unless the Court sees fit to let you serve for four years,
9. and I hope they do. I hope you people who are elected for four
10. years get to serve four years, and I hope you get your expenses
11. increased. Because as long as they're going to keep you meeting
12. here every day, every month, in annual sessions, the people
13. don't want it, but some of the powers that be seem to put it on
14. you. I can't even get the House to let the public vote on doing
15. away with annual sessions. And I'm going to have more to say
16. about that maybe tomorrow or the next day or early in January.
17. The Speaker is sitting over there on the amendment refusing to
18. call it, refusing to let the people vote on whether they want
19. to do away with this monstrosity that's been created. I think
20. maybe he'll unfreeze it before it's too late. I hope so. I hope
21. I can walk out of here on January 10th and see that Resolution
22. which we passed in the Senate adopted by the House. I don't want
23. to say any unkind things at this time in the hope that he may,
24. in his generosity, see fit to call it. And talking about gen-
25. erosity I've just seen some bills introduced here in the Senate
26. that would amend the Senate procedures to correspond to the
27. House. God forbid, gentlemen, that you'll ever give one man the
28. power to sit in judgment, and only one man appoint committees
29. and get himself reelected because he has that power, and one man
30. determine whether you're going to call a bill or whether you
31. don't call it. I don't care whether that man's my best friend
32. or who he is, he doesn't deserve that power. You have democratic
33. process in this great body now. Don't ever surrender that to

1. anybody. So I'm here to say I'm going to vote to take these
2. bills away from Committee, and I'm further serving notice right
3. now that if I have to conduct a one-man filibuster, I live here.
4. I've got a change of shirt and I don't care how long we stay,
5. I'm willing to vote you some additional expense money because
6. you deserve it, but let's give the taxpayers relief or you're
7. not going to get my vote.

8. PRESIDENT:

9. Senator Sours.

10. SENATOR SOURS:

11. Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the Senate. I look
12. upon the members of this Chamber as being sophisticated, alert,
13. knowledgable...

14. PRESIDENT:

15. Just a moment. They may be sophisticated, alert and know-
16. ledgable but they're not listening.

17. SENATOR SOURS:

18. Is there anyone so naive or so credulous or so dull-witted
19. to ever believe that this new money is going to be used to
20. alleviate the pangs and the anxieties and the financial troubles
21. of the beleaguered taxpayer. While we're talking about it today,
22. city councils, park boards and you name the entities, any of
23. them and all of them are devising new and novel ways to hoodwink
24. the poor devil on the street, Westbrook Pegler called him the
25. "poor stiff on the street" like you and me who pays the taxes.
26. They're devising new ways to find the proper cubby hole or the
27. pigeon hole to raise this one's salary, so that the general in
28. the front office can have two or three more dog robbers and brief-
29. case carriers who will carry briefcases for the briefcase carriers
30. all the way down the line. If the taxpayer is ever going to get
31. any relief, I'm convinced it won't be from a city council, it
32. won't be from a park board and afortiori, it won't be from a
33. school board, especially the big one whose labor problems are

1. always settled by one man, the autocrat, the chairman. If
2. we're ever going to solve some of the anxieties of the people
3. who pay our salaries it's going to have to be pretty soon.
4. Now we've got a new administration coming in. I make no comment
5. on the pre-election assurances. I'm rather guided by what has
6. been the historical tradition that after the new broom has
7. swept a little clean, things begin to happen. I have watched
8. the real estate tax rate in the City of Peoria, and I have some
9. knowledge of this because I file matters in the Board of Review
10. every year and I file matters in the Circuit Court of Peoria
11. County every year. I have seen the tax rate go from \$3.12 per
12. one hundred dollars equalized assessed valuation to \$5.30 in
13. five years. Now, that's almost double and I can assure you
14. that the services haven't been that much better, as good as
15. they are, and I can assure you that I have seen an entity of
16. government develop from one or two people in the office to 43.
17. Now, that's what's going to happen to this new money and, if
18. you don't believe it, I'll come back and tell you the first day
19. of April. This ought to be heard. It ought to be aired. The
20. people are entitled, gentlemen, not to have that bill suffocated.

21. PRESIDENT:

22. Senator Laughlin may close the debate.

23. SENATOR LAUGHLIN:

24. Mr. President and members of the Senate. I happen to be a
25. great admirer of Dick Ogilvie. I realize he's a politician. Cer-
26. tainly, the Governor-elect is a politician, a very successful one.
27. I can't say that there was no political influence in calling the
28. Special Session. Of course, I can't but I can say I think there
29. was sincerity in it at the same time when revenue funds became
30. available. Now, I think it's been correctly pointed out here
31. that, if the Legislature should act on the matter of a property
32. tax freeze at this time, relief would not become effective until
33. 1974 but I'd also tell you as I understand it...for example, my

2. information is that they're currently passing 1973 appro-
3. priations tax levy ordinance effective January 1 in the
4. City of Chicago and for some of those units so, if nothing
5. is done until next year, there will be no relief until
6. 1975. Now, Senator Palmer, bless your heart, you are undoubt-
7. edly the most serious-minded member of this Body. I've had
8. occasion to note that in the short time you've been here
9. and I'm sorry if I've offended you with my frivolity. I
10. don't think I've become noteworthy because of it but it's
11. a tribute. At least now I know I have a sense of humor. I'll
12. let the record speak for itself. Enough comment for
13. something like that. I was concerned, as a lame duck mem-
14. ber, that something happened...some action taken...I cer-
15. tainly said just that, Senator Palmer, and as Senator Sours
16. just now said it...he said it better than I could...he
17. didn't want this matter to suffocate. And that is exactly
18. what has happened. That is what is intended. And I think
19. that is a disservice from a Legislature who sent the bills
20. to a committee and then to a joint committee so that they'd
21. hold hearings. Now, I have at no time uttered one word of
22. partisanship in my remarks. I agree that each and every mem-
23. ber of this Body should vote his conscience. If you think
24. it's unwise to discharge the committee in good conscience you
25. should vote against my Motion. On the same hand you should
26. give me the same privilege if I in good conscience think
27. that the Motion should prevail and I support it. I'm going
28. to make just one or two other comments and I'm through.

2. It's become obvious to me that nobody intends anything
3. to happen with property tax freeze until the new Legis-
4. lature meets. So the Special Session should end now as
5. soon as you have defeated this Motion. There's no utter
6. excuse. There's no reason really to have the joint committee
7. meet because it contains members who aren't going to be here,
8. and who aren't going to be able to participate. And it will
9. effectively postpone any relief. But if this discussion has
10. had any value, I hope it has. I hope it has put the oncom-
11. ing, the new General Assembly on notice that they had better
12. do something. And that they don't get by with sending it to
13. a committee and say that they don't understand and it's too
14. complex and meanwhile the revenue sharing funds are distri-
15. buted; the budgets are raised accordingly and the taxpayer
16. doesn't get any relief for another four or five years. I
17. challenge you to accomplish tax reform in the new General
18. Assembly, those of you are coming back here. And the last
19. comment I have is this. I have come to the conclusion, and
20. I'm sorry I have come to the conclusion, that State govern-
21. ment doesn't mean much anymore. And I ask you to refer back
22. to the votes we've taken in the last couple of years. I
23. don't care if it's Implied Consent, Billboard Bill, or you
24. name it. Congress is making the policy and it's really
25. strange, it is to me, that at a time when their chief func-
26. tion of the Legislature is the appropriation of funds and the
27. levying of taxes that the Legislature has to meet annually and be
28. here most of the time. For the life of me I can't understand it.
29. But seriously I ask you to support this Motion.

2. PRESIDENT:

3. Secretary will call the roll.

4. SECRETARY:

5. Arrington, Baltz, Berning,

6. PRESIDENT:

7. Senator Berning.

8. SENATOR BERNING:

9. I wonder are we working today? Is this on?

10. PRESIDENT:

11. That is on.

12. SENATOR BERNING:

13. I merely want to reiterate that we are voting on a Motion
14. to take this from committee. We are not voting on the measures
15. themselves. Hopefully, everyone will give the opportunity to this
16. Body to then get to the crux of the matter the bills themselves.
17. Stating that, let me also point out that the revenue sharing dollars
18. are starting to arrive. And they will be appropriated and we had
19. jolly well take action that may help the taxpayers by providing some
20. measure of relief taking these revenue sharing dollars into considera-
21. tion. Therefore, I vote aye.

22. SECRETARY:

23. Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke,
24. Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan,

25. PRESIDENT:

26. Senator Dougherty.

27. SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

28. In commenting upon some of the remarks I heard today I would
29. like to state this: When this meeting was called a few days ago
30. I was one of the handful of Senate members present at the hearing.
31. And when I say handful I'm quite correct in saying handful. And
32. at the call of the meeting why the Chairman of the Revenue Committee

1. was not present nor was the Vice-Chairman who subsequently arrived
2. later. So I agreed to act on behalf of the Senate Revenue Committee,
3. and consented to a quorum only for the reason that I thought it would
4. be fitting and proper to hear those people who wished to address
5. themselves to the bills. They started out the proponents of the
6. bill consisted of three people, as I recall. Mr. Scott, of the
7. Taxpayers Federation, who spoke in behalf of the bills, very glowingly
8. I might say. But he too expressed some doubt as to the mechanics
9. of the bills themselves. He did suggest that there should be some amend-
10. ments. Mr. Baldino of the Civic Federation, his line his speech was
11. quite along the same lines and he did but he did make some compari-
12. sons as to Chicago. Then we were subject to a bit of abuse by a
13. young man named Kevin Wolf, from they call the CAP, the Citizens
14. Active Group and he was quite abusive of this Body. Now, we heard...
15. for six hours, as Senator Graham has said, we sat there and we heard
16. testimony. The proponents were three, the opponents were many...
17. I wouldn't attempt to count the number of people who spoke against
18. these bills., but there were representatives of the Mayors, of Mayors
19. representing their municipalities. There were City Managers I
20. recall particularly the City Manager of the Village of Oak Park. There
21. were representatives of the Sanitary Districts, other Park Districts
22. and of the other units of government. They all were in opposition
23. to these bills, at least to the point that they to each going to
24. their own particular unit they should be amended out, which would
25. be impossible. I come from an area which has a very high industrial
26. complex, but it is primarily a residential area and the relief to
27. those people would be appreciated by them but at the same time knowing
28. the people that I represent they still want services to continue.
29. Now, we know all the demands are being made on govern....units of
30. government that have to do with the ecology and the environment. We
31. have a great number of people who are demanding the acquisition of
32. open space, open land, and this is thrust upon them. We have the
33. CPA and we have the Federal Government making demands on this

1. here. They have no way of knowing what the future demands will
2. be. Therefore, they should not be constricted. I talk about re-
3. ferendums. I have been informed that in the last couple of years
4. there have been 43 new park districts been brought into being
5. as the result of the referendums. So people are willing to tax
6. themselves to obtain the things that they need. As a matter of
7. fact though I want to find out if Senator Graham is correct that
8. we heard testimony only as to two bills, House Bills 1 and 2 and
9. Senate Bills 6 and 7. That's the so-called tax freeze bills. We
10. heard absolutely no testimony on any nature, whatsoever, having
11. to do with the so-called bonding issues. And this is a complete
12. to bring these in here would not be fair to the program I might say.
13. I believe that we are acting in haste if we were to take this away from
14. committee. And I will site some of the reasons for this so-called a-
15. bandonment of these hearings...the cessation of hearings. At the
16. close of the testimony on this particular day I suggested to Senator
17. or to Representative Randolph that it would seem to me the day was
18. very bad. The weather was very bad and some people had difficulty
19. getting down here, some of the proponents. I might say opponents
20. ...

21. PRESIDENT:

22. Senator will conclude his remarks.

23. SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

24. ...suggest we have a further hearing on Monday. Representative
25. Randolph was in favor of that and then two days later he called me and
26. said he couldn't get sufficient people to come up to attend the meeting
27. then he suggested we call the meeting off. That's why the meeting
28. was called off. He called me and I called Representative Shea and
29. through a meeting of the minds not being able to get a quorum or to
30. get sufficient testimony, that's why the meeting was called off. I
31. cannot vote on this bill.

32. SECRETARY:

33. Egan, Fawell,

1. PRESIDENT:

2. Senator Fawell.

3. SENATOR FAWELL:

4. I'm sorry I have not been here for all of the debate. And
5. it's not too often that I disagree with Senator Laughlin. But I
6. can't vote for this bill certainly in its present form or these
7. bills. I, I realize that, Senator, I heard your remarks. I think
8. if a bill like this were to pass it would literally kill DuPage
9. County, would slaughter us and to me it's the height of folly
10. to seriously suggest that the Legislature should consider a mone-
11. tary freeze on local tax rates especially as one looks at these
12. fast growth areas in suburban Chicagoland. It simply isn't being
13. at all rational. It's putting your head in the sand. In the
14. area from which I come in Naperville based on plats of subdivision
15. which are now pending we have coming into that community which took
16. a hundred and thirty years to get to 25 thousand population, one
17. hundred and fifty thousand people coming in within the next five and
18. six years. Now, to suggest, to even suggest that we should consider
19. a bill that would put monetary freeze on the very form of govern-
20. ment which is closest to the people and which has been most respon-
21. sive and which, in my opinion, has done the best job and has had more
22. obligations cast upon it in the last five years is, is simply not
23. being realistic and perhaps in some areas really toying with the tax-
24. payer, a frustrated taxpayer. And I think that if we are going to do
25. something to help the taxpayer we ought to aim our guns at Washington
26. and at Springfield about tax limitations and tax freezes. Because
27. although all governments like all entities can certainly misspend
28. funds, I firmly believe that the people get more for their dollar
29. at the local level than any place else. And although, certainly,
30. our public schools can be critized and rightly so, they should always be
31. constructively critized. With all of the overkill of criticism toward
32. these public entities, in my opinion the taxpayer gets more for
33. his dollar from public education than any other dollar spent in be-

1. half of the taxpayer. This would literally destroy park districts
2. that are trying to acquire the open space that is needed. The re-
3. latively small amount of revenue sharing doesn't even begin to
4. approach a small percentage of the budget that our cities are ob-
5. ligated to assume because of the ecological challenges of the day...
6. just the expansions in the sewerage disposal plants from the EPA
7. obligations, etc., one could go on and on. Now, if there are some
8. amendments...I could go into other aspects of this bill in regard to
9. the administrative review provision which haven't even, I think,
10. by whoever drafted the bill even remotely thought out as to what the
11. ramifications of such a administrative review procedure would be.
12. These bills are pathetic little attempts to try to help the tax-
13. payer and bridge very close I think to almost a misrepresentation of
14. what they are intended to do. If we want to stay here for the next
15. month and put this into committee I'd be glad to work on something
16. that perhaps could begin to approach it but I'm not about to let
17. a bill like this get out of committee and get on to the Floor even
18. to have any chance of passing it. It just isn't a rational bill in
19. my opinion.. I vote no.

20. SECRETARY:

21. Gilbert.

22. PRESIDENT:

23. Senator Gilbert.

24. SENATOR GILBERT:

25. I think that I probably am as close to Ev Laughlin as anyone
26. in this Legislature having been in law school with him and then
27. sitting here for twelve years. And if anyone sincerely thinks he
28. is frivolous in this, they have misread Ev Laughlin. Ev talked to
29. me about this some days ago. This isn't something that he just
30. whipped up after the committee has failed as it has. He is serious
31. about it. And I assure you downstate Senators that the people in
32. your district are serious about it also. And if you think they
33. aren't you just don't do something very quickly in this and by

quickly I do not mean to not put the bills in proper shape. But if you don't do something you're not going to have many friends back home and when they are talking to me even as a lame duck about what's happening up here and the tax freeze being pushed back. And I think that Senator Dougherty's comments as to the activity of the committee here and the fact that Representative Randolph was unable to get a quorum for the hearing in Chicago which I was considering going to because they were going to discuss the School Bond bills and all as I understood, and the School Problems Commission was meeting the next day. That in itself is reason enough to discharge this Committee and bring this matter out and, Senator Fawell, I don't think anyone thinks that those bills are in good shape. How many thousands of bills have you and I acted upon and how have we worked hard in Education Committee particularly and in Judiciary taking bills and putting them in shape. And sometime we had to send them out on the Floor and have hearings of the whole so that the entire Legislature would know about the matter before the bills were finally amended and voted upon. I certainly wouldn't vote for the bills in their present condition. But I don't think that Senator Laughlin is advocating that either or anyone else here that is voting to bring them on the Floor. But let's let the Legislature know what this about. Let's let the people know that we are concerned for them. I vote aye.

SECRETARY:

Graham.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

Mr. President, just briefly, I think Senator Gilbert touched on this. I think as we so often do we have got our eye off of the target. I, too, have some reservations about these bills. And all Senator Laughlin's Motion is tried ...is doing if we pass on it is to bring them out of the tomb so we can see what they look like in daylight. That's what we want to do. And are we going to stand up here to admit that there are 58 Senators on this Floor that are not smart enough to prepare the correct amendments to put these in shape. If

1.
2. we are admitting this fellows - shame on us. I think perhaps
3. history as we go back and look at these days and as we read
4. history in the future we might also be reminded in some years to
5. come that the general idea of revenue sharing is one of the great-
6. est hoax ever perpetrated on the American public. Because we
7. are leading our people to believe that we have some free federal
8. money. Gentlemen, there is no free money. And I can understand
9. some of the opposition of some people with regard to federal funds
10. because it reminds me of C. L. McCormick's mosquito bill. They're
11. big and they're organized and they're ready to get their share and
12. the other people are not. But all we are trying to do - all we
13. are trying to do is find out who is seriously interested in consid-
14. ering these bills now and I vote aye.

14. SECRETARY:

15. Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel,
16. Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy,
17. Merritt,

18. PRESIDENT:

19. Senator Merritt.

20. SENATOR MERRITT:

21. Mr. President, members of the Senate, I certainly, in my few
22. brief remarks in explaining my vote, know that I'll not change any
23. votes on this matter. I think the die is cast. I'm rather appalled
24. though when we left here on November 29th and I had so much mail from my
25. constituents regarding this subject. I was proud to answer them that
26. we had acted responsibly and it was put in the House Joint House Senate
27. Joint Committee for study. It was reported to us at that time that
28. there would be a hearing in Springfield and Chicago and perhaps two
29. others throughout the State. I felt during those two weeks that
30. a good attempt would be made, only to return here yesterday and find
31. that only one hearing was held. I think it's an insult to the people.
32. And then here so many of us are refusing to even let those bills out
33. of committee knowing full well that the best laws we pass here are a

1. matter of compromise on both sides. Like others I couldn't vote
2. for them perhaps in their present condition. But to delay this
3. is again putting back another year relief to the taxpayers, when
4. they are well aware of perhaps three different bills existing
5. on pay increases to the Judiciary, to the State Officers, to Legis-
6. lators. I could not and I will not in good conscience to my peo-
7. ple see such irresponsible action practically telling them that
8. we're not responsive to their needs, when in many counties in my
9. district assessed valuations have gone up one-third to one-half
10. addition with the hungry local governmental units not willing
11. to reduce the rate, and then the accompanying high burden of taxa-
12. tion. It's been said that it will bring hardships upon local govern-
13. ments. I think in compromise amendments some of that might be relieved.
14. Let's don't always talk about hardships to local government. Let's begin
15. to think about the hardships to those taxpayers that we certainly owe
16. something better to than what I can see going on here today. I'm
17. certainly very proud to vote aye.

18. SECRETARY:

19. Mitchler.

20. PRESIDENT:

21. Senator Mitchler.

22. SENATOR MITCHLER:

23. It is with some regret that I think many of us find that the
24. discussion and the debate and the explanation of votes on the Motion
25. that's before the House got into the bills themselves and the content and
26. what's behind it. I think that we really should just be considering
27. whether or not the Revenue Committee, the Joint Revenue Committee, ade-
28. quately heard these bills as they were supposed to during the last week
29. and that they were ready to report back. It's apparent that this
30. Committee did not carry out that function. Now, so what do we do?
31. Do we give them another week and say try again or keep going and
32. just let the bills die in committee as many bills do, or do we address
33. ourselves to it. Now, that's really the Motion and I intend to vote

1. in favor of the Motion. But I want to also express a few comments
2. as long as others have taken the time of this Body to do so. Now,
3. I've heard a lot of things...apologize for Senator Laughlin's ap-
4. proach to this. And, Senator Laughlin, I'm with you one thousand
5. and one percent, if we get a higher one, I'll go higher than that.

6. PRESIDENT:

7. Just a moment. Senator Mitchler has the Floor.

8. SENATOR MITCHLER:

9. ...but I too come from a fast growing area. And I listen
10. to the people in this area. You know what...there isn't one Park
11. District that can cast a vote for Bob Mitchler in my district, not
12. one Library District, not one Sanitary District, School District,
13. Municipality or County Government. The people of my district vote
14. for me. And let me tell you something my mail in opposition to
15. these bills which came after the election and after the Governor
16. called a Special Session and they saw they were coming to a head...
17. not when the idea was originally proposed...they started to get
18. their backs to the wall...came from these local Governments. But
19. the affirmative views on this Legislation on a tax freeze, and that's
20. what I am talking to, came from the people...a guy that owns a home
21. that's out working for a living. And he's fed up with the real es-
22. tate taxes that has been imposed by the local governments that I
23. mentioned not by us. We've attempt on time and time again to re-
24. duce it. Now, you've got Federal Revenue Sharing. I don't listen
25. to these local governments that is to the point where they dictate
26. my conscience. Because I've got more taxpayers back there that I
27. have respect for. And I have no affiliation in any form with these
28. people who are coming down here and trying to put the pressure. And
29. I think that when you look at it I think I supported as well legis-
30. lation that benefits park districts and many times I was criticized
31. for supporting the Chicago Park Districts...

32. PRESIDENT:

33. Senator will conclude his remarks.

1. SENATOR MITCHLER:

2. ...and some of those. Now, I generally am opposed to taking
3. bills from committee. But I say that in these bills there is the
4. privilege of a referendum. And just this last election on November
5. 7th, Kendall County passed a referendum for a new taxing body to
6. increase real estate taxes to pay for this new Kendall County Health
7. Department. , because they have confidence but at the same time in
8. the other district I have Kane County by an overwhelming margin de-
9. feated a Kane County Landfill Referendum because they lacked con-
10. fidence and that's it plain and simple. And I'll say one thing in
11. concluding my remarks, Mr. President and members of the Senate,
12. I'll not vote to consider any salary increases for judiciary,
13. State Officers, Legislators, whether it be expense, or per diem,
14. salary until we address ourselves and resolve this tax freeze ques-
15. tion. Because I couldn't in good conscience even though I am in
16. the middle after an election and going to serve a four year period,
17. hopefully, could go back to my constituency and face them by con-
18. sidering even whether we pass it or don't any pay increase for any-
19. body without giving them a break on something they want in tax freeze.
20. And I'm going to vote on the question of taking the bills away from
21. Committee so that we can debate them and go into depth. I'm going to
22. vote aye.

23. SECRETARY:

24. Mohr, Neistein,

25. PRESIDENT:

26. Senator Neistein.

27. SENATOR NEISTEIN:

28. In casting my vote on this issue and it's a serious issue, I
29. go along with those that say it needs more study. However, I'd
30. like to make an appointment with my colleague, Senator Merritt, if
31. he's on the Floor, Senator Merritt...

32. PRESIDENT:

33. Senator Merritt is on the Floor.

1. SENATOR NEISTEIN:

2. I'd like to review those hundreds of letters that he received
3. from his constituents, because I made my own survey and it seems
4. there aren't any letters being sent to the Senators. So, I would
5. like to sit with - that's one letter Senator Merritt - not the
6. hundred. But I'd like to make an appointment with Senator Merritt.
7. And I want to compliment at this time Senator Mitchler. I was cap-
8. tivated by Senator Mitchler, not so much by his remarks, but by
9. his new hairdo. And I think it's beautiful, Senator Mitchler. And
10. I want to be recorded as no.

11. SECRETARY:

12. Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer,

13. PRESIDENT:

14. Senator Palmer.

15. SENATOR PALMER:

16. Mr. President and members of the Senate, I'm going to vote
17. aye - I mean no on this - that's right. But I'd like to be very
18. clear - make something very clear; that the fact that I am voting
19. no and my seatmate, Senator Neistein, is voting no and my colleagues
20. here are voting no is not because we are against tax relief, but we
21. are for something that's direct relief, not for a bill that's ques-
22. tionable, and something that may create chaotic conditions. And I'd
23. like to ask Senator Horsley and Senator Sours and all of the other
24. great protectors and guardians of the property owners and taxpayers
25. where they were in the last two years when this great State has
26. received in its coffers over a hundred million dollars...one billion
27. dollars in their treasury, which they never received before. This
28. is a additional receipt in the State revenue. I did not hear Senator
29. Horsley or Senator Sours get up with one solitary bill and say re-
30. duce this tax from five dollars to two dollars or some tax by one
31. percent to two percent or to lower percentage. I didn't hear
32. from Sours. I didn't hear from Senator Horsley. Instead if
33. you remember...

1. PRESIDENT:

2. Just a moment Senator Palmer. If we can get that whole caucus
3. right next to you...Senator Merritt, Senator Donnewald, Senator
4. Neistein, break that up gentlemen. Senator Palmer may proceed.

5. SENATOR PALMER:

6. Yea, instead....

7. PRESIDENT:

8. For what purpose does Senator Soper arise?

9. SENATOR SOPER:

10. ...Point of order. Is he explaining his vote or...

11. PRESIDENT:

12. He is explaining his vote and he has another 45 seconds 'in
13. which to explain it. Senator Palmer may proceed. Senator Palmer.

14. SENATOR PALMER:

15. Not only did you increase the revenue of the State by a hundred
16. million dollars in income tax, but you also increased the gas
17. tax, hotel tax, incorporate tax and other tax and liquor taxes,
18. cigarette taxes. Where were you, Senators, to tell the people
19. and give them a direct relief not a questionable relief. And in-
20. stead, instead there were many, many, Senator Sours, brief case
21. carriers for thirty-five thousand dollars a year and some assis-
22. tants for thirty-five thousand in the same family. I'd like
23. an answer to that.

24. PRESIDENT:

25. Proceed with the roll call.

26. SECRETARY:

27. Partee.

28. PRESIDENT:

29. Senator Partee. Just a moment. Gentlemen, let's settle
30. down. Proceed, Senator.

31. SENATOR PARTEE:

32. Mr. President, I have said principally what I would like to
33. say here. I would add though that lest we be thought

1. of as being just against, I have given serious thought of an af-
2. firmative approach to this problem. That affirmative approach
3. entails two possibilities at a minimum. One of them would be, and
4. I have had it drawn, a Resolution, which would bring into focus a
5. Commission to study this problem composed of an equal number of
6. Senators on either side of the aisle, an equal number of Repre-
7. sentatives from either side of aisle, and an equal number of
8. public members to be appointed by the leaders on either side of the
9. aisle in each House. That is one approach which I am going to
10. withhold until the beginning of the next Legislative Session. Be-
11. cause I feel that perhaps in appointing these people now we
12. may be doing an injustice to persons in the next Legislature. I
13. have another alternative which is a Resolution which I am going
14. to introduce today that calls for sending this question or dir-
15. ecting the attention directly to this question, of a branch of
16. government, which is structured in the main for this purpose. This
17. would be to send this matter to the Economic and Fiscal Commission
18. which has as it's purpose the determination and delineation of
19. this kind of question. I remember when this Commission came into
20. being which was a successor in the main to the Budgetary Commission
21. that it was envisioned that this Commission would have the kind of
22. staffing to do the kind of job necessary in this kind of area. So
23. I'm going to offer this Resolution as a positive step toward ar-
24. riving at the answers that we all need. I hear the bleeding for
25. the taxpayer. And may I point out to you that I too am a taxpayer.
26. I pay more taxes than I thought once in my life I'd ever earn. I
27. pay taxes too. I am equally as concerned but I'm not going to be
28. precipitously motivated. I am not going to move just to make my-
29. self a hero. I'm going to do this intelligently and we're going
30. to do it in a way where the taxpayer finally will have the kind of
31. final genuine relief to which he is entitled. I will not vote aye
32. to take this from Committee. I will not do so.

33. SECRETARY:

1. Rock, Romano, Rosander,

2. PRESIDENT:

3. Senator Rosander. Just a moment, your mike is apparently not
4. working. Can you use Senator Davidson's mike next door?

5. SENATOR ROSANDER:

6. Mr. President and members of the Senate, there will probably be
7. few times that many of us who are lame duckers will have the opportunity
8. to address this honorable Body. But from a sense of history it
9. seems that when we talked about the Boston Tea Party the cry came out
10. as taxation without representation. From all the testimony that has
11. been given here today it seems that it's the tax users today that
12. are overly represented and not the taxpayer. There was a time in
13. the history of England when taxes became oppressive and the tax
14. collectors went out and they levied their heavy burden on the people.
15. And there arose at that time a man by the name of Robin Hood. And he
16. would waylay with his merry men the tax collectors and redistribute
17. this money to the needy and the poor. I don't offer that as a
18. solution to this vexing problem of tax relief. And there was also
19. a time in history in England when under King John when the business men
20. and the people of the land were overly taxed and they finally pre-
21. sented themselves to the King and they came out with a very his-
22. torical document known as the Magna Charta which I think the very
23. foundation of our own democracy came into existence and upon which our
24. former government with the many respects predicated. I think we
25. have in this particular Motion an opportunity for all of us to ex-
26. press ourselves. Perhaps this, too could become a Magna Charta
27. for the State of Illinois and for the other forty-nine States of
28. the Union. They say that, perhaps, we don't have the time or the
29. ability or the wisdom to do the job. Well, when it came for the
30. enactment of the income tax, I know many of you received not hun-
31. dreds of letters but thousands of letters in protestation that we
32. do not enact a State Income Tax. For those in government who knew
33. what the fiscal problems were and realized the deficit that had

1. to be met that there were men in this Body who came to grips with
2. the problem and then did enact a State Income Tax. And of course
3. many of the taxpayers have rebelled. We all know that there is a
4. revolution among the taxpayers of our land, who are protesting a-
5. gainst the increase in taxes. I think we have the wisdom, the
6. sagacity, the capability of coming to grips with the problem and
7. providing a solution. How it will be done when it will be done
8. remains up to this Body to determine. And for that very reason
9. I cast an aye vote to have the committee discharged and bring the
10. matter before this honorable Body. Thank you.

11. SECRETARY:

12. Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours,

13. PRESIDENT:

14. Senator Sours,

15. SENATOR SOURS:

16. I think someone, Mr. President and Senators, hit the nail on
17. the head when it was suggested that this whole opposition is based
18. upon politics. I'd like to read a press announcemen and I'll
19. leave it up to the Chamber who uttered it. "Considering that he
20. is up for election in a few days I think the Governor's announce-
21. ments smacks of opportunism and politics", the Senator commented."The
22. Governor promised tax relief when he proposed the State Income Tax.
23. Nothing was done for four years. Three weeks before the 1972 Gen-
24. eral Election we face a hastily conceived tax relief program to be
25. considered in a brief Special Session". Still quoting. "The Gen-
26. eral Assembly has been in session for a record number of days during
27. the last four years. More than any other time in Illinois history.
28. Yet the Governor asks us in the last few days of the 77th General
29. Assembly to enact the most significant piece of Legislation of the
30. entire 76th and 77th General Assembly. Still quoting. "If the
31. Governor were reelected would he still try to raise the income tax?"
32. That must have been a rhetorical question. "Corporations now pay
33. a 4% income tax while individuals pay 2 and 1/2%, thanks to Demo-

1. cratic efforts three years ago defeating the Governors proposal
2. that both groups pay 4%. If he'd had his way individuals would
3. be paying almost twice as much income tax as they do now", and so
4. on. Now, I think it's time the Legislature came to grips with
5. these taxing bodies. The great Gratian one time, Mr. President,
6. remarked that there were two human institutions that had the
7. largest of all stomachs. Item 1. The church with a capital C.
8. Item 2. The State with a capital S. We seen one go into de-
9. cline in that manner. Now, we see one coming up more than ever
10. before. If anybody thinks any relief is going to be given by any
11. municipality or any Library Board or any Park Board on their own
12. in these days, when they are placating union demands, that man,
13. that person, those people are far more credulous than I'm willing
14. to believe. Now, this Motion is simply to take this bill and put
15. it in the Chamber, rather than keep it in a moribund condition where
16. it will suffocate in the committee. I vote aye.

17. SECRETARY:

18. Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

19. PRESIDENT:

20. Senator Cherry, McBroom, aye. Senator Cherry.

21. SENATOR CHERRY:

22. I haven't voted yet and I'd like to make this further comment.
23. I'm one of the co-sponsors of the Resolution discussed that Senator
24. Partee is going to introduce as the principal sponsor. And I see
25. an area which has not been pursued or considered. I think some of
26. our high taxes that our people of our State pay today are due to
27. the multiplier that exists in the various counties. In Cook County
28. we have a multiplier of 1.59. That simply means...I don't think the
29. taxpayers understand that, but I am sure many members here do. That
30. means...after the assessor of our county puts an assessment on our
31. property, real and tangible, that the State then assesses a multiplier,
32. an add-on. In Cook County that add-on is 59%. In other words for
33. every dollar assessed by the Assessor an addition of 59% is

1. added on to the value as proposed by the Assessor. That creates
2. high taxes. The multiplier that was set for Cook County was ar-
3. bitrary. It was capricious. It was not done with any input. It
4. was merely a figure taken out of the air by the department that
5. sets the multiplier for Cook County. I think that's an area that
6. should be pursued. And perhaps we should put a freeze if not re-
7. duce the multiplier that exists in various counties where the Tax-
8. payers there might feel that it's oppressive and unfair and done
9. without consideration to the needs of the County. In that area I
10. think that this Resolution that is being proposed by Senator Partee
11. has much merit and much value and certainly ought to be considered.
12. I see nothing in this legislation which tends towards an evalua-
13. tion or a reevaluation of our County various counties multiplier.
14. So I think that in that area the proposed Resolution is going to do
15. much good to the taxpayers. And I think that's one of the areas
16. where we could give certain positive relief to the taxpayers of our
17. State. And I am not going to support this Motion to take it from
18. the Committee.

19. PRESIDENT:

20. Senator Laughlin.

21. SENATOR LAUGHLIN:

22. No, I wasn't on the Floor when my name was called. Now, you
23. may have given me credit. There has been a misunderstanding. Maybe I
24. said something but I didn't vote. But of course, I want to vote
25. aye. And I simply want to say briefly in the explanation of my
26. vote that I am glad that we spent at least this day doing what
27. we've done instead of sitting in caucuses trying to figure out when
28. we'd go home or who gets how much by way of a pay raise. That's
29. what we did yesterday around here. I think at least now we focused
30. intent...whatever happens to the Motion in part there has been a
31. gain. Because of the result of this discussion I don't think that
32. the Legislature that convenes January 10th is going to be able to
33. ignore the problem and attack it and I welcome the comments of the

President pro tempore, because I'm sure that the people on this side of the aisle are going to work hard...the new people that are here, the ones that are coming back, together with him. And I don't think that those proposals, frankly, would have come today, from Senator Partee, without the Motion being made, without the discussion, and to that extent and in those two ways I think this has been valuable. And so that everybody gets a chance to vote, would you please call the absentees.

7. PRESIDENT:

8. Request for call of the absentees. The absentees will be called.

10. SECRETARY:

11. Arrington, Bidwill, Bruce, Cherry, Chew, Coulson, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Hall, Hynes, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Lyons, McCarthy, Mohr, Newhouse, Nihill, Partee, Romano, Saperstein, Savickas, Swinarski, Vadalabene.

15. PRESIDENT:

16. On that question the yeas are 23. The nays are 7. The Motion to discharge Committee fails. Senator Clarke.

18. SENATOR CLARKE:

19. Mr. President, if I could have the attention of the President Pro tempore. In the light of the situation that we now find ourselves, I would like to request a Republican caucus.

22. PRESIDENT:

23. Senator Partee.

24. SENATOR PARTEE:

25. Yes, I think that that is indicated. Approximately how long do you envision it might take...just just, you know, off the top of your head.

28. PRESIDENT:

29. Senator Clarke.

30. SENATOR CLARKE:

31. Off the top of my head...I am very fearful because Republicans in caucus talk at great length...

33. SENATOR PARTEE:

1. SENATOR PARTEE:

2. They do not have a monopoly on that...

3. SENATOR CLARKE:

4. They do on the Floor too...I do think though that we would
5. want to discuss matters that go beyond what we've been discuss-
6. ing here. So that it might be an hour...

7. SENATOR PARTEE:

8. Well, it's 12:15 now, would you say...1:30...2:00 o'clock...

9. SENATOR CLARKE:

10. Well, can I make a suggestion?

11. SENATOR PARTEE:

12. Surely.

13. SENATOR CLARKE:

14. Possibly we could have a caucus and...also anticipate giving
15. some time for lunch and come back at 2:00 o'clock or..thereabouts...

16. SENATOR PARTEE:

17. Better make it 2:30.

18. SENATOR CLARKE:

19. 2:30...2:30 is fine.

20. PRESIDENT:

21. Motion that the Senate stands in recess. We're still
22. in the Special Session now...stands in recess until 2:30. All
23. in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. Senate stands
24. in recess.

25. AFTER RECESS

26. PRESIDENT:

27. Yes.

28. SENATOR CLARKE:

29. There's some confusion. We would ask the Republicans to
30. come right up to the 4th Floor for a caucus immediately.

1. PRESIDENT:

2. The Special Session will come to order. The...Senator Partee,
3. you mentioned a Resolution. You want to introduce that in the
4. Special Session or the Regular Session?

5. SENATOR PARTEE:

6. As it relates to a matter which was in the Special Session
7. I'd like to introduce it in the Special Session.

8. PRESIDENT:

9. All right.

10. SENATOR PARTEE:

11. Now, Mr. President and members of the Senate, I have alluded
12. to this Resolution today. It is a Resolution which Senator Laughlin
13. says he was glad to see because it was motivated in part by his
14. Motion to bring this matter out of Committee. And what it does
15. simply is to refer for a specific and special consideration this
16. subject to the Economic and Fiscal Commission. And they are
17. of course, by statute empowered to make economic and fiscal
18. studies when asked to do so by the General Assembly. And it's just
19. simply in keeping with the statutory enactment and duty of this
20. Body to make this study. I don't know of anything else need be
21. said about it. But we are asking them to make a report of their
22. findings and recommendations to the 78th General Assembly not
23. later than the 1st of March. And I would move for suspension of
24. the rules and immediate consideration and adoption of this Reso-
25. lution.

26. PRESIDENT:

27. Is there any discussion? All in favor the adoption of the
28. Resolution indicate by saying aye. Contrary minded. The Reso-
29. lution is adopted. Is there further business to come before the
30. Special Session? Do we have a Motion?...Senator Partee.

31. SENATOR PARTEE:

32. We have been in conversation with the leadership in the
33. House on both sides and I think possibly the Motion for sine die

1. would be in order. But I'd just like to as a matter of courtesy
2. recess it for a half hour or so until they've come back from a
3. caucus I understand they're going to have and then we can per-
4. haps enter into a sine die Motion.

5. PRESIDENT:

6. All right. This is only on the Special Session now...
7. Motion is to recess for thirty minutes on the Special Session.
8. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. Motion
9. prevails.

10. PRESIDENT:

11. ...Senator Partee that the Special Session adjourn
12. until 10:30...Special Session adjourn until 10:30 tomorrow
13. morning. All in favor signify by saying aye. Both at the
14. same time, that's correct Senator Soper. We admire, respect
15. your ability. Senator Harris.

16. SENATOR HARRIS:

17. Did Senator Clarke announce a Republican caucus...

18. PRESIDENT:

19. 9:30 tomorrow morning.

20. SENATOR HARRIS:

21. at 9:30. He did caution the Republican members that we
22. are going to start it at 9:30, he has set it for a half hour
23. later than usual so that when we get there at 9:30 we start.
24. I hope that the members can be there promptly.

25. PRESIDENT:

26. Want to take any wagers on that, Senator Harris? Motion
27. that the Special Session adjourn until 10:30 tomorrow morning.
28. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. Senate
29. stands adjourned.