PRESIDENT:

Second bill . . . Senate Bills on 2nd reading. 62. Senator Rock.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill No. 62.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Any . . . any amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senators Netsch and Hickey.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Mr. President, this is an amendment that I think everyone more or less expects by now, which Senator Hickey and I are offering. What it would do is to recast the definition of claimants who are eligible to file for this additional grant. It does not change the Circuit Breaker part of the basic statute in any respect, but it eliminates that provision which excludes the additional grant or prohibits the additional grant to people who, for example, live in Chicago in Senior Citizen Housing Projects and other subsidized housing. In Chicago alone, and there are many such projects in other cities in the State of Illinois, that is, nine thousand one hundred and fifty senior citizens. All of whom are in the very lowest economic brackets or they would not be eligible for those projects to begin with. The fact that they do not pay property tax or do not live in projects that pay property tax is totally irrelevant because, as the Lt. Governor said and as the sponsor of the bill has said, this is sales tax relief not property tax relief. To me, it is absolutely unconscionable to deny this form of relief, if it is to be granted at all, to a large

number of people, who are the most needy of all senior citizens. This bill would remedy that basic defect in the bill.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Hickey.

SENATOR HICKEY:

I'd like to say Mr. President, that I think that many senior citizens in this State do not realize the omission of people living in public housing, in this bill. In Rockford, and there are lots of public housing developments in places outside of Chicago, Senator Netsch. I saw the little yellow postcards that came from the Lt. Governor's office signed by people living in public housing who had faith in the fact that this would help them. I'm still not sure that they are aware that Senate Bill 62, as it is now constituted, would not, without this amendment, so as far as I'm concerned, this is simply a matter of clarification and of coverage which was originally intended. I'd like to add that I had after twenty-seven fifteen that still not . . .

PRESIDENT:

May we have the attention and Mr. Sergeant at Arms, remove the persons in the back, we can't hear from back there. There's a lady outside.

SENATOR HICKEY:

I'd like to say that as soon as this Session began, when the Governor had not yet acted on HB 2715, I had prepared a similar, an amendatory bill, similar to the one which is before you now, is Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 62, so immediately we could put that into this Body and give the kind of coverage which I think most people thought was in the original bill. I can't imagine that anybody in this Body would be opposed to this amendment whether they're for or against Senate Bill 62, and I earnestly implore your favorable consideration. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Knuppel.

SENATOR KNUPPEL:

We oughtn't to have sales tax on food and drugs for anybody. I sponsored such a concept in the Constitution. It's reprehensible. It's the most regressive tax there is. I'd have to support this amendment because it broadens the bill.

PRESIDENT:

Yes, Senator?

SENATOR SOMMER:

Senator Netsch.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Sommer. Senator Sommer desires to ask a question. Will you yield?

SENATOR SOMMER:

Thank you, Senator Netsch. Is your amendment the one that deletes line 32 and 33?

SENATOR NETSCH:

Yes, that is correct.

SENATOR SOMMER:

I have a question, perhaps you can't address yourself to this, but perhaps you can. In your amendment, and so also in the bill the word disabled is used and how do you define that?

SENATOR NETSCH:

How do I define it?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Sommer, I think she does not understand what you are saying. Would you repeat your question?

SENATOR SOMMER:

I think I have the answer, Senator Netsch. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Got the answer before you got the question, that's pretty good. Senator Wooten.

SENATOR WOOTEN:

Simply to follow up on the questions I ask in the Committee of the Whole, I join with Lt. Governor Hartigan in urging people to send in postcards. It's one of the ironies that I . . . I, myself, do not understand that most of the people who responded in our area were not eligible. It was an oversight on my part, and looking at the bill originally, and I hope that we can correct that now, because I . . . I feel that we certainly have a fair number in my community, as many of you have in yours, and since this will not change Senate Bill 63, the amount will stay the same and will broaden this to include all senior citizens. I, certainly, heartily endorse the adoption of this amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

May I ask the sponsor of the amendment a question?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Berning desires to ask a question. Will you yield?

SENATOR BERNING:

Is it your interpretation of this amendment that and I'm quoting you, public housing, but does that also include rest-homes or nursing homes?

SENATOR NETSCH:

That was not a . . . an issue in this particular form of the bill. That . . .yeah . . . Senator Rock is also answering behind my . . . over my shoulder. Under the Circuit Breaker as it . . . as it exists right now and exclusive of the bill we are acting on right now, with certain qualifications, the people who live in nursing homes or retirement homes are eligible for the Circuit Breakers, so they were not excluded under Senate Bill 62. It was only the people who lived, in some circumstance, under which they were not charged with paying any property tax. And that would be people in subsidized housing, the senior citizen

projects or elderly people who lived with their families and certain other categories of that sort. The nursing home residents were eligible and remain eligible.

SENATOR BERNING:

Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Any further discussion? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is the same concept that was discussed back in November when Senate . . . when HB 2715 was under discussion. This is not, obviously, an objection to the current bill it . . . it is rather an expansion of the program. And it . . . and it covers about four to five percent of those, otherwise eligible, and I have no objection. I would urge the adoption of Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDENT:

The question is, shall Amendment 1 . . . No 1 be adopted? All in favor say Aye. Opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Any further amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Netsch.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Mr. President, Amendment No. 2 is not just simply a filling up one small gap in the bill, it is filling up a fairly major gap in the bill. What it is directed to, is the, my premise, that senior citizens are, indeed, entitled to a form of sales tax relief. But, that the basic reason why they are, at this point in time, also, makes it necessary or at least desirable, that that form of sales tax relief be extended to others who are in exactly the same economic circumstances, in terms of their income bracket. This bill would extend the . . . the same form of tax relief,

which is in Senate Bill 62, to everyone in the State. It would not confine it simply to those who are over sixty-five or disabled. Now, the first question, obviously, that arises is how much would this cost? I think Mr. Hovey of the Bureau of the Budget, anticipated me this morning by indicating that figure, and I will repeat it for you now. On the basis of one hundred percent participation of everyone who might be eligible for this form of . . . of obstensible sales tax relief on an annualized basis, the cost would be one hundred, forty-seven million dollars. That would be contrasted with the fifty million dollar figure that represents one hundred percent participation on an annualized basis for Senate Bill 62 without the amendment. Now, obviously, there is a difference in cost between fifty million and a hundred and forty-seven million. My own feeling is that what we really are about right now, what we ought to be about, is not just an immediate and even temporary answer, response to the high cost of inflation, which heaven knows is a serious enough problem for senior citizens and also for families that are in the same low income bracket, but, I think, we also, as long as we have got this kind of thing in front of us, we ought to recognize that what we really need to do is to make a permanent form of tax relief available in this . . . in this State, recognizing that we still have a tough tax structure with a flat rate income tax, high property taxes and a flat across the board five percent sales tax. We have needed to do this for a long time, many of you were sponsors or co-sponsors of legislation that took this form of approach in the last Session and, unfortunately, it all got bogged down. It seems to me that we ought to . . . to seize this opportunity, if we are going to do anything about tax relief at all, and say, by golly, it's time to start redoing the structure so that people in the lowest income brackets, in this State, do get some relief from our tough tax structure. This is a device that is intended

to respond to that need. If you tell me that the Governor has already vetoed a thirty-four million dollar, which actually turns out to be a fifty million dollar form of tax relief on the ground that the State does not have the funds, my response would be, right. He's already vetoed that one. I don't have any reason to think that he is going to be any more likely to veto one that does, indeed, also direct itself to the other problem that he raised in that Message, and that was that it was not generally applicable to all citizens of the State. So, it seems to me, that this addresses itself, at least, to one of the objections in that Message. And the fact that we don't know what the Governor is going to do with any of these forms of tax relief is, I'm afraid, just a circumstance . . . that the budget has not come in, we have not heard the Revenue estimates, and we don't really know where we are. But, I would suggest that this endangers that no more than the original bill because, at least, it corrects one of the problems raised in that Message. I. . . I believe it is the right thing to do, I think that what is absolutely right for senior citizens is, indeed, also right for those people who have children, and an awful lot of kids to feed, when the highest part of the inflationary rate is attributable to food right now. I think it is just and right, I think it makes a . . . a bill a much better bill, and I would, obviously, urge that people vote for it.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in opposition to Amendment No. 2. The program, indeed, probably does have some merit down the road. I would strongly urge Senator Netsch to introduce a bill, which will then be assigned to the Revenue Committee, and which will handle this problem. I would not, however, urge the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to this bill. If, in fact, as we have heard from Director Hovey and . . . and certainly, the Governor

himself, that he has trouble finding thirty-four million dollars for this program which I sponsor. He will certainly have consternation finding a hundred and forty-seven million. For that reason, if. . . if. . . if only that reason, I would urge the nonadoption or the defeat of Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I rise in support of Amendment No. 2 for one reason and one reason only. Every day in my district office in Carbondale, I told my secretary the other day, we're going to be seeing more and more of this as recession gets worse and worse, unemployment rises and so forth. But, every day I have people coming into my office saying - the Public Aid people tell me that we're not eligible for aid, I can't find a job or I've got x amount of income, which happens to be a very small amount, and they just simply cannot get by. Sometimes these people are senior citizens, at other times, they are a forty year old head of a household with two or three children. So what I'm really saying is, Mr. President and members of the Senate, is that senior citizens in this day and age are having it very tough, but they're not the only ones. And I think this amendment would broaden tax relief to that lower middle income or just the lower income persons to the point where there would be more people eligible. There would be more people who are able to get some relief from their taxes. I don't know what a . . . what we're going to be able to do at the State level, overall, to help the unemployment picture or to help the underemployment picture, which is probably almost as bad in my area as unemployment is, but I think this is the beginning, this is a start to broaden this base of tax relief for more than just seniors to include everybody who has a limited amount of income. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

The Chair has recognized Senator Knuppel, Senator Soper, Senator Carroll and Senator Hynes, all on this motion. Senator Knuppel.

SENATOR KNUPPEL:

I agree with Senator Rock. These people have asked for a bill similar to this. I've introduced one for each of the last two Sessions. I assume, now, that these people who generally speak with the Governor and for the Governor, with his support, the old Senate Bill 118 and 119, that I introduced two Sessions ago, will go right on through, just like the slide . . . are agreed that at least I'll count on eight votes on this side of the aisle.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Soper.

SENATOR SOPER:

Mr. President and members of the Senate, I rise to oppose this amendment. We're going to give senior citizens a relief that we desire to give them. I don't think we ought to get this all fuzzed and mixed up with the proposition of a . . . of this tax burden that we say we have on people who can't afford to pay sales tax. When we can't afford to relieve the whole sales tax of a hundred and forty-seven million dollars, if you want to have no taxes at all, I'd suggest that we just put through a bill and nobody pay any taxes, that's about as responsible as this amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll. Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President. I, too, rise to oppose this amendment. I think what I see happening here is, though maybe unintentional, an attempt to scuttle a very worthwhile and necessary program. Many of us have worked long and hard for Senior Citizen Tax Relief. Many of us, in addition to that, have those people within our districts who are of the income

levels, in general, that they too need some type of a relief. We know that. When we read a Governor's Message that vetoes a piece of legislation that may have been as much as thirty-four million, probably as low as twenty million, in expenses to our State and see people trying to tack on a program of a hundred and fifty million, I think they're just inviting him to use that pen to veto once again. These programs that are proposed now do have quite a bit of merit and if we can afford them, we need to help that segment of our society. However, I would think that an appropriate and responsible approach would be to offer separate legislation, not to allow the Governor to use this ruse to veto this essential Senior Citizens Tax Relief. I would ask the sponsor to withdraw the amendment and offer it as a separate piece of legislation so that we can get about our business.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Hynes.

SENATOR HYNES:

Mr. President, the comment has been made that . . . the present Senate Bill 62 does not provide needed tax relief across the board. That is obviously true, it is not intended to do that. It is an effort to provide relief for a specific class of persons, namely the senior citizens of this State, individuals that I think are entitled to that kind of consideration and relief. The same commentary that followed the offering of this amendment could have been made with respect to the Circuit Breaker Law that is already on the books, and in numerous other programs that are in operation. But, I think the . . . the point is that we are dealing with a program for senior citizens and that's what it should remain. This amendment will cost a minimum of one hundred million dollars, and, in fact, will bring about the defeat of this bill. We know, at this point, that the State is in a fiscal position to afford this program as originally introduced. We knew that in December when we passed it,

we know it now. We've had testimony to that effect. We cannot, at this early stage in the Session, pass an additional one hundred million dollars of tax relief without getting the latest and most accurate projections, as to State Revenue, without seeing what other new programs are going to be introduced. We have not yet seen the Governor's Budget Message. We know that the existing program in Senate Bill 62 is within the capability of the State. I'd like to make one further point, and I. . . I'd like to reduce it to simple terms because very often legislative procedure tends to obfuscate what is really happening. It tends to mislead the average person who is not familiar with what is going on. To reduce it to its simplest terms, a vote in favor of this amendment is a vote to kill Senior Citizens Tax Relief for this Session, and it's that simple, no other explanation has any substance at all. A vote in favor of this amendment will bring about the ultimate defeat of this proposal in this General Assembly. So, I would urge every member of this Body to vote No, on this amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Wooten.

SENATOR WOOTEN:

I really want to respond to some allegations which have been made, since I intend to support this amendment. I am amazed that people can look into other people's minds and read their motivations that clearly. It seems to me that not only the operations of this process, but human life, itself, admits of far more complexities than that. If you persist in taking a simpleminded approach to life, I believe that your solutions will always be on that level. The reason that I am supporting this, without, I must confess, much hope of success is because I suspect that by addressing this matter now, and there have been good arguments seduced to dire. . . to addressing it now, I feel that we are not going to have an opportunity to address the subject of tax relief

realistically at any point in the 79th General Assembly. As I have said before, I feel that the economics that we face in '75 are going to, in a large measure, preclude any opportunity to deal with any kind of tax relief realistically. This seems an opportunity to make a good try at it. I certainly accept that I may be wrong in my judgements, but I think the least I can request and insist on from my colleagues is the same courtesy I extend them, and that is, that thy judgements are the product of my own thinking.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

Mr. President and members, I think the obvious is clear. I'm surprised that the Governor and the sponsor didn't realize that we would realize what they're up to. You know, this reminds me of the television program that has a tape that after they get their instructions, it self-destructs. That's what this amendment does. If we adopt it, it self-destructs. The only thing it does is destruct this bill. I urge our people on this side of the aisle to give this the decent burial that it so rightly deserves.

PRESIDENT:

Any further discussion? Senator Johns.

SENATOR JOHNS:

Mr. President, I think an element's been admitted here that is not really relevant. I don't think the Governor had any part in this, but I do have some questions about Amendment 2. If you remember, Comptroller Lindberg said that the ability to pay for the Senior Citizens Act, which we propose here today, hinges on our action on all other legislation, on our priorities, on all other bills - that's one of the most important things to remember. Mr. Crabb, in his testimony, stated that part of the senior citizens problems that is always overlooked and which is why I can't buy Amendment No. 2, is the fact that senior citizens cannot be and

are not included in the job market. They cannot go out and find jobs as people can in these other categories in Amendment No. 2, and that's why I would oppose Amendment No. 2. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I wholeheartedly agree with those who are opposing this amendment. The time to act is now. The legislation for the senior citizens has been going around this legislature for over two years. If there's . . . other types of legislation that they want to add onto this bill, like Senator Rock said to Senator Netsch, introduce your own legislation. Let's take care of the senior citizens now and beat this amendment. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Netsch may close the debate.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Mr. President, the kind of argument that I just heard from several Senators is exactly the kind of argument that I . . . suspected might occur, and I want to label it for what it is - phony. There is no attempt, whatsoever, to kill the concept of Senior Citizen Tax Relief by proposing this kind of an amendment. I fully expected someone would make that argument, I resent it and I deny it, but I am not going to let that stand on the record, and I will, therefore, withdraw the amendment, but I want to add one thing and this is just as real as that other comment. If this bill goes through, in this form, without any recognition of the kind of tax relief needed by other people, I feel just as strongly that that, for all time, at least in this next Session, will kill any possibility of tax relief for other people than the senior citizens and I think that is very unfair. I'll withdraw the amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Netsch asks for leave to withdraw the amendment. Is

leave granted? Leave. Any further amendments? 3rd reading.

SECRETARY:

No.

PRESIDENT:

. . . moment. Senator Harris.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Well, I just want to make certain that the understanding that Senator Rock and I discussed last week, in which he and I have discussed privately, so that there's no misunderstanding by the Senate. The bill will be recalled to 2nd reading tomorrow for consideration of any serious amendment, and we can have an appropriate discussion on it at that time. That . . . that is correct, I believe.

PRESIDENT:

Yeah. So the record's clear, we . . . we understand this, and I'll take Amendment No. 2 out of the record, and you now have another amendment?

SECRETARY:

Amendmemt . . . Amend . . . Amendment No. 2 . . . .

PRESIDENT:

Here comes another Amendment No. 2.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 by Senator Nimrod.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Nimrod.

SENATOR NIMROD:

Mr. President, it's my understanding after having presented the amendment to the sponsor that he wants to study this, and we. . . he will call the bill back tomorrow for consideration, being as there was some question that was brought up about it, and . . . and then, we can go ahead and do it at that time. Now, it will then withhold the amendment until tomorrow, if that understanding is clear.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Well, I did indicate to Senator Nimrod that I did have a firm agreement with Senator Harris that prior to calling the bill for passage, I would, in fact, call it back to 2nd reading to consider his amendment. If Senator Nimrod wishes to proceed at this time, however, I am prepared to, as I indicated, resist your amendment. I can resist it today or tomorrow or whenever.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Nimrod, your pleasure. Which . . . which day do you prefer to be resisted?

SENATOR NIMROD:

Well, I only . . . presentation is this is that I think there is some serious question about it, and I understood the sponsor wanted some additonal time. And I would be happy to wait until tomorrow so that he has a chance to study the amendment, and understand it's ramifications because there really is an unfair, what we are doing discriminating against the homeowners of senior citizens. And really I . . . I think it's an oversight in the preparation of the bill, and I would hope that we would wait until tomorrow and if you'd like to do it today, I'm just as willing to do it today, but the . . . the circumstances of the evidence doesn't change.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Rock, Senator Nimrod has indicated he would prefer to wait until tomorrow. If that is the . . . thats . . . if there's no objection there, . . . we'll just withdraw it and . . . and re-present it tomorrow. Unless . . . unless it's going to be argued today, then there's no sense in filing it today. We'll withdraw it, and we'll file it tomorrow when . . . at the next hearing. Let the records show the amend. . . amendment is withdrawn, the bill goes to 3rd reading, with the understanding

that the bill will come back from 3rd reading to 2nd reading for this and Senator Harris' amendment. Yes, Senator Nimrod.

SENATOR NIMROD:

Mr. President, I'm . . . I'm sorry that I'm not sure what time that will come up. I am going to the funeral tomorrow for Representative Juckett, and it might come up while I'm not here and maybe under those circumstances, unless someone else will present or do something, I think I'd better present it today. Are we in Session for tomorrow?

PRESIDENT:

That . . .

SENATOR NIMROD:

I would hope that we could not be in Session tomorrow, so that we could all have a chance to go to the funeral of one of our colleagues, but . . . or else hold a Session late enough so that we can fly back to . . . to Springfield to be a part of this.

PRESIDENT:

Well, that just hasn't been finalized in terms of a decision yet, but a lot of that . . . lot of that depends on what . . . what we do here today. So do . . . so, if you desire, we can go with your amendment today, if not . . . Amendment No. 2. Senator Nimrod. For what purpose does Senator Soper arise?

SENATOR SOPER:

Well, we're talking about Senate Bill 62, aren't we?

PRESIDENT:

Yes, we are.

SENATOR SOPER:

The amendment I have here is to amendment . . . amendment to Senate Bill 63. Now, we're not on 63, we're on 62. Is this your amendment, Senator Nimrod, amends sixty . . . thirty-five million to sixty-nine million, is that your amendment?

PRESIDENT:

No, I think you have the wrong one, Senator.

SENATOR SOPER:

Oh, I don't have the amendment. I don't know what we're talking about.

PRESIDENT:

Well, that'll happen again, but they'll bring you the right one. Senator Nimrod.

SENATOR NIMROD:

Yeah . . . we might . . . I might ask that's it a very short amendment as is . . . so if there is a clarification, I might ask the Secretary might read the amendment, and might not have to pass it around, but if you do want copies, we'll have some made.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2.

(Secretary reads Amendment No. 2)

PRESIDENT:

Senator Nimrod.

SENATOR NIMROD:

Now, Mr. President and fellow Senators, what this basically does is to remove that part that increases for renters from twenty-five to thirty percent. Now, what I would like to do is to call our attention to a fact that what we are doing here, under this present bill, is that we have included, as a part of this renters, is a part of a substitute program which was presented last time, and only half of that program was adopted. What we are, in fact, doing is taking that provision from the Senate Bill 81, which is in now, and you are putting it into this program. What has happened is that you are not just calling this Sales Tax Relief, the . . . you are taking the Sales Tax Relief or the amounts to be given to the senior citizens, then, in addition to that, you are giving the renters an increased amount, and that was to make up for the Homestead Exemption, which was being increased in the . . . and the Circuit Breaker was being increased in the previous bill.

But, you are not increasing the Circuit Breaker, so you should not be increasing the rental allowance, and discriminating against the homeowners. Now, there's one other problem that this would present is that the forms for this program, which you're trying to pass here today, have already gone out to the senior citizens, and, in fact, we would have to then administer new forms and cause a great deal of administrative expense for no reason at all, and this . . . this part of the bill is in Senate Bill 81, and it's rightly a part of that and that's where this ought to remain rather than give a double . . . double reduction or a double advantage to those people who rent and not do the same for those who own their home or own their property. So, all I'm saying is that this part, which was added to 2715 last time, was a part of a substitute program and really should not be a part of this so-called Sales Tax Relief that you're giving to them. What we're doing, and again let me call your attention to it, is giving the renter double the amount of the reduction and not to the homeowner, and I don't believe that was the original intent.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWALD):

Senate . . . what's . . . state your point, Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

I'm . . . Mr. President, I'm confused. I cannot find any amendment that comes anywhere close to what Senator Nimrod's talking about on my desk.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWALD):

Is the amendment passed out, Senator?

SENATOR NIMROD:

Mr. President, I think before we started, I said that it was a short amendment, and if the Secretary would like to read it for everyone, he could read it, and we'd explain . . . if they wanted the copies, we'd be happy to distribute them. But, he does not have it because they were not distributed, and we will do it, if that's what he so chooses.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWALD):

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is Amendment No. 2, Mr. Secretary? Thank you. I rise in opposition to this second Amendment No. 2, and I wish to explain the background and history and the reason for my opposition, and I hope Senator Soper is aware back there in the back row. As House Bill 2715, which was the bill we acted upon last Session, came over from the House, this provision increasing the renters allow . . . or the rental increase from twenty-five to thirty percent was not, in fact, included. It was, however, included at the request of certain members of the Republican side of the aisle who felt that this would be a more equitable approach. It was pointed out to me then, and I will point out to you now that six out of every seven dollars that is awarded under the Homestead or the Circuit Breaker is paid to homeowners, in spite of the fact, as was pointed out to me, that forty-five percent of all seniors are, in fact, renters. I was persuaded by that argument by Senator Soper in particular. We have a lot of renters in our particular districts, and I think the idea was, as amended, to make the program as equitable as possible for everybody. And I think an attempt, at this point, to delete that provision is a self-destruct and I would urge opposition to Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWALD):

Senator Rock moves that Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 62 . . . oh . . . Senator Nimrod may close the debate of it. Senator . . . just a moment, Senator. I . . . I see that there is further debate. Senator Glass.

SENATOR GLASS:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. I wanted to help . . . see if I could get some clarification on this amendment and see if I understand Senator Nimrod's reasoning. Now, as I

understand it, looking at the bill on the first page, all the amendment would do in line 10 would be to change thirty percent back to twenty-five percent. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWALD):

Senator Nimrod.

SENATOR NIMROD:

That's correct, Senator Glass.

SENATOR GLASS:

And then your explanation of it is that without providing that, those who are renters would be getting a double tax benefit. Is that right? They . . . they have this benefit under the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act already, and now, they're . . . they're getting it again in this connection.

SENATOR NIMROD:

That's . . . that's correct, Senator Glass. They would be getting it, only the renters would be getting it and not the homeowners.

SENATOR GLASS:

Well, I . . . . I'd appreciate your response to Senator Rock's point, because it doesn't seem to make sense to me, that is, if there are, in fact, fewer renters benefiting from this program because they don't know about it, I don't see why it would help to leave this at thirty percent. You would be benefiting those few that made the claim for relief, they would be getting thirty percent, but if the problem is getting the renters to apply, I don't . . . I don't see how this would . . . would help that problem, and it seems to me what you're doing is . . . is reasonable. I . . . I think it's hard to . . . to understand without having the other bill before us.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWALD):

Senator Nimrod, do you . . . do you wish to close the debate?

SENATOR NIMROD:

Yes, Mr. President, I would. What we are saying . . .

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWALD):

Just . . . just a moment, Senator. I failed . . . I failed to recognize Senator Soper. Would you wish to address the Body?

SENATOR SOPER:

Yes, Mr. President, thank you very much. Senator Nimrod, you're a very good friend of mine, but I have to oppose this amendment. We've discussed this thing, we've gone through this thing and . . . and I think this . . . this amendment would defeat . . . defeat the aid that would be given to renters, and we found out through experience, as Senator Rock explained, that the renters were getting the short end of this stick, and the homeowners, that we should bring them up to the amount that the homeowners would . . . would get, and I think it's . . . it's a bad amendment, and I think it should be defeated.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWALD):

Is there further debate? Senator Nimrod may close the debate.

SENATOR NIMROD:

Mr. President and fellow Senators, I do want to again emphasize the fact that this item that we are adding in here is we are causing an inequity. And the reason that, I believe, Senator Soper originally entered this bill, this amendment was to take care of the substitute bill, which was being presented. Only a half of this was accepted. What we are doing is doing two things here. We are not only giving this so-called sales tax reduction to all the . . .all the senior citizens on their income, but then we are also taking the renters and giving them an additional five percent. And that would amount to what the Circuit Breaker would be increasing it from fifteen hundred to . . . to three thousand. So what you're doing, in fact, is giving the renters an additional hundred dollars. Now, that's not fair. That's not even the issue that was discussed. If we are going to increase the Circuit Breaker, and we are going

to increase the Homestead Exemption, then we are being consistent. But you're doing it to part of the people, not all of them. I don't have any objections to . . . to giving these allowances because they're already in the same provisions in 81 . . . Senate Bill 81, which is be . . . is going to be before this group. But this is not the place to increase it. It's going to cost an additional six million dollars we're giving to renters, and if we suddenly find ourselves giving to one group and not the other. The reason, and of course, the other program is your forms are already out, you're going to cause a great deal of administrative programs. This can be accomplished without having this program, and certainly we should not be passing discriminatory legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWALD):

Senator Nimrod moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 62. All those in favor say Aye. All those Opposed. The . . . the Noes have it. Is there a request for a roll call? He is joined by another, I see. The . . . the question is on the adoption of Amendment No. 2 of Senate Bill 62, shall Amendment No. 2 be adopted? Those in favor vote Aye. Those Opposed, No. The voting is open. All voted who wish? Take the record. On that roll call, the Ayes are eleven, the Noes are thirty-six. The amendment fails. 3rd reading. Are there further amendments? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

I am also requesting that Senate Bill 63 be moved to the order of 3rd reading. I have the same understanding with Senator Harris that I will, in fact, call it back prior to calling it for passage.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWALD):

Is there objection to that? 3rd reading. Secretary will read the bill. For what purpose does Senator Netsch arise?

SENATOR NETSCH:

Just to save my conscience. Could I just let the . . . the transcript record show, I tried to vote No on that amendment. And my key was not in here and it did not record.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWALD):

We'll . . . we'll record you . . . we'll make a note of that, Senator.

SECRETARY:

Senate . . . Senate Bill No. 63.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments. One Floor amendment offered by Senator Harris.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWLAD):

Senator Harris.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Well, it . . . I . . . if Senator Rock has had an opportunity to evaluate it, you would prefer to wait until tomorrow, would you not? Yes. Okay. Tommorrow.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWALD):

Well, you . . . you would withdraw that from the present time, and then, when it's called back, you would then introduce it, Senator, is that . . .

SENATOR HARRIS:

That . . . that's correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWLAD):

That's the understand . . . The Amendment's withdrawn. 3rd reading. Senate Bills on 3rd reading. Senator Bruce. That's Senate Bill 17.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Yes, Mr. President and members of the Senate, I would ask that you briefly follow with me or I would ask that Senate Bill 17 be recalled to the order of 2nd . . . 2nd reading for the purpose of an amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWALD):

Senator . . . Senator Bruce moves to call Senate Bill 17 to the . . . suspend the rules and recall Senate Bill 17 to the order of 2nd reading. Is there objection? So ordered. 2nd reading. Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Yes, as introduced, Senate Bill 17 creates the Capitol Development Board Contributory Trust Fund. The amendment will change, significantly, the bill as introduced. The bill, as introduced, included all State Agencies and Universities. The amendment will make four . . . five significant changes. First of all, it excludes all units of State Government, including Senior Public Universities from the bill. It stipulates that funds may not be required from local districts more than thirty days before the estimated pay out dates. Thirdly, there is a requirement that Trust Fund proceeds be expended only for the actual contract let. Fourth, that Builders Risk Insurance proceeds be used solely to restore the damaged building of project involved, and fifth, that any funds received as reimbursement from Federal sources for construction of buildings be deposited in the Capitol Development Fund. Not the Contributory Trust Fund, but in the Capitol Bond Development Fund, itself. Now, the significant changes, I have mentioned, the bill, now, will make statutory. . . .

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWALD):

Just a moment, Senator. Would the gentlemen over in the corner, please hold it down a little?

SENATOR BRUCE:

If there are questions about Amendment No. 2, I would answer them, otherwise, I would move for the adoption of Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWALD):

Is there further discussion? Senator Rock. He's out of place, but . . .

SENATOR ROCK:

I'm out of place is right. I would urge the adoption of this amendment. It strikes everything after the Enacting Clause, and in effect writes a new bill. The only request I would have, Senators, that we hold it until the next day, don't try not to call it for passage. I . . . I . . . the amendment is a good one in my judgement and the . . . and the amendment should be adopted.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWALD):

Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Well, in answer to Senator Rock, the only difficulty is, Senator Rock, that the statute requires that we reinstitute this fund within thirty days of the Sine Die Adjournment of the Legislature. That day runs out the 7th of this month, February the 7th. That is why the bill, and I apologize, that's why the bill did not go to committee. It's a significant piece of legislation. If we hold it one more day, we lose a day in the House, and I would just as soon get it over there and have their committee started on it so they could hear it next week and get it out. The Comptroller has agreed not to close out this fund and put it in the General Revenue Fund, which will cause us undue grief with all the school districts.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWALD):

Is there further discussion? Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

Just a point of clarification. I thought I understood Senator Rock to say that the amendment strikes everything after the Enacting Clause, and according to what I . . . I'm sorry. There appear to be several amendments and I have the wrong one. Where are the rest of them?

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWALD):

Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

I think, Senator, you probably have Amendment No. 2 in front of you, at this point.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWALD):

Senator Bruce moves for the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 17. All those in favor say Aye. All those Opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment's adopted. 3rd reading. Oh, strike . . .

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Shapiro.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWALD):

Senator Shapiro.

SENATOR SHAPIRO:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 17 tightens up the bill a little bit further and makes it . . . puts it in much better shape for our local school districts. It requires that the CDB spend their share of the construction's funds first prior to the local districts submitting their funds to the Trust Fund for expenditures. This will allow local school districts to earn interest longer, it will help them in the money crunch that most of them are going through. There will be a small loss in interest earned to the State of Illinois, but I . . . many of us happen to feel that this extra interest earned could better accrue to local school districts than to the State, and I would urge adoption of the amendment. We have specifically excluded junior college districts from the provisions of this amendment. And the reason for doing that is that many of the junior colleges throughout the State have already entered into agreements or contracts with the CDB that their funds be spent first, and we didn't want to restrict them from that option if that's what they choose. So, I would urge adoption of the amendment, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWALD):

Senator Glass.

SENATOR GLASS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to second Senator Shapiro's comments. I think this is an opportunity for us to speak in somewhat of a small but important way in fovor of our local school districts. The money that comes from local taxes that is taken by the CDB early in the contruction period and they hold and have earned interest for them, that just simply isn't equitable. The local districts, it seems to me, are entitled to interest on that money and as Senator Shapiro says, if it must be deposited, then . . . them let that happen to insure that it will be there, but the interest earned in fairness ought to accrue to the benefit of the local district. So, I hope we'll adopt this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR DONNEWALD):

Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Mr. President, I rise in opposition to Amendment No. 3. I will admit that it certainly has some appeal to it for local districts. There's not a local district in the State of Illinois that would not like to keep the money until the project is completed. However, it does create problems for the State of Illinois that are unique to them and not to local districts. First of all, the amendment, and as the bill presently stands, no district in the State of Illinois will lose more interest than thirty days. I will admit that the Capitol Development Board has from time to time requested money too early form local contributory districts. But that has been solved by Amendment No. 2 which states that they cannot request money more than thirty days before anticipated use. If we reverse the field, and say that the State will pay it's seventy-five percent share first, and then, the twenty-five percent share, it means several things. First of all, the State of Illinois will lose more than two million, seven hundred thousand dollars in interest in this year. If the Governor's Capitol Program, as proposed, is

in effect, we would lose many times that much. The fund has had as much as nineteen million dollars in it last year. It presently has four point four million. The difficulty in bonded construction is that the State, if we say that they will provide their seventy-five percent first, they will have to sell the bonds and pay interest on those bonds, whereas, the local districts may be just contributing local revenue and no bonds outstanding. They will lose interest for a maximum of thirty days. The State of Illinois, having issued bonds for the total construction costs, will lose interest, perhaps, over the entire period, two to three years in construction. Good bond management requires that we issue the bonds in small amounts, we use the twenty-five percent that the local district puts up for site development, site surveys and architectural fees. If we put those up and the local district decides not to accept the bid, not to go ahead with the building, who is going to pay for those out-of-pocket costs of the State of Illinois. For all those reasons, the basic sense of fairness. The State of Illinois is going to pay seventy-five percent of the cost of the building. I don't think it's asking too much that the local district come up with their twenty-five percent in the front end.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Senator Harris. Senator Harris.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Well, I just want to join in this discussion. What Senator Bruce had to say is largely just fine, except that in the last two years, we've had the development of almost arbitrary regulations out of CDB that did not exist before. And as a result of their procedural requirements, progress on construction has been delayed significantly. And I . . . there isn't a one of us that hasn't been contacted by a local district or a community college district and expressed to us their extreme frustration. Now, in that period

of time, cost excalations . . . escalations have eaten up whatever the States earnings are, and I just think that there is some real value here. We've got an opportunity to do something about it now and bully for the fact that the State does earn the money on it's share . . . I mean on . . . on proceeds that it does not immediately need, but as a . . . as a recognition of the problem that is resulted from this Capitol Development Board's activities. We've got an opportunity here to provide for some corrective action to make up for the delays that have resulted. And I would encourage the membership, the entire membership to support Senator Shapiro in this motion that . . . in . . . in this amendment which provides that the State's share shall be used first. And we all know that the local districts who exist on property taxes have got far greater problems about raising their revenues than the State does which lives primarily on the income and sales tax product, and they are moving along in a progressive fashion. I think this amendment makes sense and all of us can easily accept its principal and provide some relief and not great relief, at that, but just require the State to get its money up front. I think it makes sense.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Senator Latherow.

SENATOR LATHEROW:

Well, Mr. President, I, too, would like to join in support of this amendment. I have reference to a resolution that I had in before this Assembly last year concerning a community college in my district that has waited for years, and I mean that, literally years for proper action from CDB, and I think it would have been a . . . would have been a disgrace if this amendment could not be in effect for that particular occasion.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Senator Hynes.

SENATOR HYNES:

I wonder if someone could . . . it . . . it may have been answered, I probably missed it. Could I be given the exact annual cost of this amendment to the State?

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Senator Shapiro, will you yield?

SENATOR HYNES:

. . . or what the projected cost is?

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Senator, indicates he will yield. Senator Shapiro.

SENATOR SHAPIRO:

Senator Hynes, I really don't think we could could come up with a cost estimate, but I would say that considering a years CDB bond issue for elementary and secondary and unit schools of a hundred million the cost to the State in lost interest income, I could . . . would say would probably amount to two to three million dollars, considering that the money is going out, it's not held for the . . . for the full year. I don't think it's a significant amount of money and I think if the benefits of that interest lost to the State, which would accrue to the local districts could benefit them much greater. You also have to take into consideration that the according to the way the Grant Index works on Capitol construction that the local share in many instances is as high as eighty percent, whereas the States is only twenty percent and the local share can go as high as eighty-eight percent on the grant program, if the local district requires certain options.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Senator Hynes.

SENATOR HYNES:

Well, I have a couple of questions. First of all, and if this is not correct, Senator, perhaps you could enlighten me. The amendment offered by Senator Bruce, I think removes one of the objections that have previously existed, namely that the Board would be asking for

the money far in advance of the time it would need it. There is still the problem existing of overly technical requirements on the part of the Board which delay construction and thereby cost interest dollars to the local districts. Is. . . is that a correct assessment of it . . . the . . . the amendment does remove part of the problem that Senator Harris referred to?

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Senator Shapiro.

SENATOR SHAPIRO:

Senator Hynes, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, even though we have the thirty day restriction in there in which the Capitol Development Board cannot call in local share any further in advance than thirty days, once that money is called in the interest earned, the interest lost on that particular amount of money is lost for the entire construction period, which could go a year or year and a half. So you just can't say they're going to lose thirty days interest. They could lose a year, a year and a half, two years interest . . .

SENATOR HYNES:

. . . no . . . that . . . that was my point, that this removes part of the problem, the thirty day requirement, the other part is, delays in construction. Well, the question that I have in my mind, with respect to this amendment, is simply this; that the two to three million dollar item is approximately twenty-five percent of the cost of annual amortization of a substantial amount of bonding authority, almost a hundred million dollars, I think, and I just wonder whether that money would not be better spent in broadening the program so that more districts could participate. We had the problem in the last Session of the . . . the bonds that were not authorized or rather that were . . . were eliminated from the . . . the budget, and we're going to be facing that again. That is the only question I have. I . . . I, frankly, would prefer to see this bill on the books without this amendment, and

then take a look at, perhaps, a separate bill with the amendment. I . . . I do not have a hard position on it because I was not anticipating this amendment, but I do have some . . . some problems with it.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Is there further discussion? Senator Shapiro may close the debate.

SENATOR SHAPIRO:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, again, I want to reaffirm all the positive comments made concerning this amendment, and as was pointed out . . . out, it does lead to the loss of a considerable amount of interest monies that could be earned by the local school district, and also take into consideration that there are a lot of start-up costs, initial costs in the form of architect's fees, site development, site purchase and the interest lost on that particular amount of money can extend for a long period of time, and in closing, I would urge approval of Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 17.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Question is shall Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 17 be adopted. All those in favor indicate by saying Aye. All those Opposed. The Noes have it. Senator Shapiro requests a roll call. Roll call. Question is the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 17. Voting . . . those voting in favor of the Amendment, vote Aye. Those Opposed will vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are nineteen, the Nayes are twenty-nine. Amendment No. 3 fails. Any further amendments from the Floor? 3rd reading. Introduction of bills. Introduction of bills.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill No. 89 introduced by Senator Nudelman.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill No. 90 introduced by Senator Nudelman.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill No. 91 introduced by Senator Nudelman.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill No. 92 introduced by Senator Nudelman.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill No. 93 introduced by Senators Sommer, Bloom, Roe, Schaffer, Davidson and Merritt.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill No. 94 introduced by the same sponsors.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill No. 95 introduced by Senator Sommer and . . . Senator Sommer and Bloom.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill No. 96 introduced by Senators Regner, Dougherty, Kosinski and Clarke.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill No. 97 introduced by Senators Regner, Dougherty, Kosinski and Clarke.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill No. 98 introduced by Senators Welsh, Carroll, Savickas, Kosinski, Romano, Rock, Egan, Smith, Hynes and Dougherty.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill No. 99 introduced by Senator Nudelman.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill 100 introduced by Senator Nudelman.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill No. 101 introduced by Senator Nudelman.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill 102 introduced by Senators Partee, Rock, Donnewald and Bruce.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill No. 103 introduced by Senators Glass, Schaffer and Clarke.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Are there any motions? Senator Wooten, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR WOOTEN:

I'd like to seek leave of the Body to replace Senator Rock as principal sponsor of Senate Bill 24 and to be shown as co-sponsor of Bills 8, 9, and 51.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Is leave granted? So ordered. Senator Hynes.

SENATOR HYNES:

Mr. President, I would ask leave to be added as a co-sponsor to Senate Bill 70 and Senate Bill 71.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Is leave granted? So ordered. Senator Morris.

SENATOR MORRIS:

Ask . . . I would ask leave of the sponsor to be added as a co-sponsor of Senate Bill 51.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Is leave granted? So ordered. Are there . . . Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Mr. President, I'd ask leave to be a co-sponsor on Senate Bill 69.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Leave granted? So ordered. Senator . . . Senator Kenneth Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

I'd like to have leave to be added to Senate Bill 70 and 71.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Is leave granted? Show Senator Hall as co-sponsor. So ordered. Are there any announcements? Yeah, we'll get . . . we'll get to that. No announcements. Resolutions.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution No. 13 introduced by Senator Vadalabene. It's congratulatory.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. . . . President. I would like for the immediate consideration of this Resolution and adoption, it's a congratulatory resolution and I would like for all members of the Senate to be named as a part of this resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Senator Vadalabene has moved for the suspension of the rules for the immediate consideration of this resolution. Is leave granted? All those in favor of the adoption of this resolution indicate by saying Aye. All those Opposed. The resolution is adopted.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution No. 14 introduced by Senator Egan. It's congratulatory.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

Yes, Mr. President, members of the Senate. I'd ask leave that all of the members of the Senate be recorded as co-sponsors and ask that we suspend the rules to hear . . . for it's immediate adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Senator Egan has asked leave to show all members of the Senate as co-sponsors. Is leave granted?

SENATOR EGAN:

It's a congratulatory resolution for an Eagle Scout.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Leave is granted. All Senators will be shown. He further moves for the suspension of the rules for the immediate consideration and adoption of this resolution. All those in favor of suspension of the rules indicate by saying Aye. All those Opposed. The rules are suspended. Senator Egan now moves for the adoption of Resolution No. . . whatever . . . what's the number? Senate Resolution No. 14. All those in favor of the adoption indicate by saying Aye. All those Opposed. The Resolution is adopted.

SECRETARY:

Senate Joint Resolution No. 5 introduced by Senators Sommer and Bloom, and it's a Constitutional Amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Executive.

SECRETARY:

Senate Joint Resolution No. 6 introduced by Senators Sommer, Bloom and Bell, and it's a Constitutional Amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Executive.

SECRETARY:

Senate Joint Resolution No. 7 introduced by Senators Clarke,

Course, Hynes, Netsch, Nimrod and Harber Hall and it creates a commission.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Senator Clarke.

SENATOR CLARKE:

Mr. President, I just spoke to the President of the Senate. This is a resolution, joint resolution that re-creates the Property Tax Subcommittee that is, for the last two years, been studying this subject, of both the House and Senate Revenue Committees. One of the recommendations of that group is to . . . we got to do a lot more work. We're going to be coming in with legislation, and this is to re-create the committee. It's the identical resolution as two years ago except the dates have been changed. I'd like to ask for suspension of the rules so that we could have immediate consideration of the amendment in contact.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Senator Partee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

Mr. President and members of the Senate, they . . . a lot of questions have been asked about the schedule and . . .

PRESIDIDNG OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Senator . . . Senator, excuse me. Senator Clarke was asking for the immediate consideration of a resolution creating the joint property tax study information.

SENATOR PARTEE:

Oh, absolutely.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Okay. Surely. All those in favor of suspension of the rules indicate by saying Aye. All those Opposed. The Ayes have it. The rules are suspended. Senator Clarke now moves for the immediate consideration and adoption of Senate . . . Senate Joint Resolution No. 7. Any discussion? All those in favor of the adoption of this resolution indicate by saying Aye. All those Opposed. The Ayes

have it. Senate Joint Resolution No. 7 is adopted. Senator Partee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

Now, Mr. President and members of the Senate, there have been a large number of questions asked, and I felt we may be able to clear the . . . the air by some explanations in terms of our schedule. Our schedule had been, what we thought, inflexible but because of the House situation, we find ourselves having to change it. Now, the House had said to me last week that they were, on tomorrow, going to make their committee appointments and assignments. In the intervening period, one of their members, a young man named Representative Juckett, just forty-two years of age, passed and as a consequence, it is my understanding, that they are not meeting at all this week, which means that they will not be appointing their committee structures this week at all. Now, we had previously scheduled to come back on the tenth and the eleventh, that will no longer obtain and we will be coming back on the thirteenth, the thirteenth, the day after the holiday, which is the day that the Governor has chosen for the presentation of the State of the State Message. We'll be here on the thirteenth and the fourteenth, and after that, we will tell you then when we'll be back next, but the chances are there will be very few meetings after the fourteenth before the twenty-fifth of the month because several of our members will be somewhere else. Well, I guess . . . you know, you heard about that. Now, so we will be here tomorrow, and then, we'll be back on the thirteenth at ten o'clock. The Session tomorrow will start at eleven o'clock. This is to accommodate something that's been requested.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Senator Regner, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR REGNER:

Yes, Mr. President. I'd like to make two announcements and they both . . . revolve around the House scheduling, and that is that the Legislative Information Systems Committee scheduled for tomorrow morning will be cancelled. There'll be further notification

of the next meeting of that because we won't have any House members. And the same holds true for the State Property Insurance Study Commission which was to meet tomorrow evening, but due to not having any House members down here, that'll be cancelled also and then rescheduled at a later date.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Any further announcements. Senators Dougherty or Johns, do you wish to announce concerning your committees? Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Local Government at 2:30 this afternoon in Room 400.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Senator Johns.

SENATOR JOHNS:

Mr. President, members. There'll be a meeting of the Executive at 2:30, Room 212.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Senator Harris.

SENATOR HARRIS:

There will be a Republican Caucus tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m. in Room M-1. Republican Caucus at 9:00 in Room M-1.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

We . . . we do wish to indicate to the . . . your membership, particularly, that we will. . . we are intending to start immediately at 11:00 o'clock. Senator Bell.

SENATOR BELL:

Yes, Senator Mohr, Minority Spokesman of Transportation Committee, is not here on the Floor right now, but I, as a member of that committee, he has asked for the minority members of that committee to meet in his office, and I'd like to remind said members of that committee of that fact. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Thank you, Senator. Senator, when . . . when are you suppose

to meet?

SENATOR BELL:

Well, as . . . as I recall, it was at 2:00 o'clock today. Right. 2:00 o'clock.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

2:00 o'clock this afternoon for the minority members of the Transportation Committee . . .

SENATOR BELL:

In Senator Mohr's office.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

. . . Senator Mohr's, Howard Mohr's office. Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

Point of clarification. Do I understand that there will be no Session on the days of the 18th, 19th and 20th?

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Senator Partee. The question was will . . . will there or will there not be Sessions on the days of the 18th, 19th and 20th of February?

SENATOR PARTEE:

Senator, I can't . . . answer your question absolutely directly because I would have to have knowledge of the posture of the House at that time. Assuming all things will go as we expect them to go, it's entirely possible that on the 18th, 19th and 20th we will not have regular meetings of the House or Senate. It is also possible, however, that there will be joint committees of Appropriations meeting during one of those three days on another subject. I . . . I can't tell you precisely.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Any further announcements? Will the members please be in their seats? Will the members please be in their seats? We are . . . we have under consideration a death resolution. Please be in your seats. Proceed Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution No. 15 introduced by Senators Nimrod, Regner and Glass.

(Secretary reads Senate Resolution No. 15)

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Senator Nimrod.

SENATOR NIMROD:

Mr. President, I would ask leave that all Senators be shown as co-sponsors.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Is leave granted? So ordered. All Senators will be shown.

SENATOR NIMROD:

Will also ask that the immediate suspension of the rules and the adoption of this resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER (SENATOR ROCK):

Senator Nimrod has requested the suspension of the rules for the immediate consideration of this resolution. All in favor of suspension of the rules indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The rules are suspended. All those in favor of the adoption of this resolution, please indicate by rising. The resolution is adopted. The Senate stands adjourned until 11:00 o'clock, Wednesday, February 5.