

82ND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

REGULAR SESSION

DECEMBER 3, 1982

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

The hour of ten having arrived, the Senate will please come to order. Will the guests in our galleries please rise. Prayer by Rabbi Barry A. Marks of the Temple Israel, Springfield, Illinois. Rabbi Marks.

RABBI MARKS:

(Prayer given by Rabbi Marks)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Thank you, Rabbi. Reading of the Journal. Senator Nega.  
SENATOR NEGA:

Mr...Mr. President, I move that reading and approval of the Journals of Wednesday, December the 1st and Thursday, December the 2nd, in the year 1982 be postponed pending arrival of the printed Journals.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

You've heard the motion. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries. A Message from the House.

SECRETARY:

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate the House of Representatives has adopted the following joint resolutions, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the Senate, to-wit:

House Joint Resolutions 130 through 135 and they're all...they're four congratulatory and one death.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY:

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate the House of Representatives has concurred with the Senate in the passage of a bill with the following title.

Senate Bill 1667 together with House Amendments

1 and 4.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Resolutions.

SECRETARY:

Senate Joint...or Senate Resolution 695, offered by Senator Donnewald, Rock and all Senators. It's congratulatory. All these resolutions are congratulatory.

...Senate Resolution 696, 697, 698, 699, 700 and 701, offered by Senators Bruce, Rock, Donnewald, Savickas, Hall, Johns and all Senators.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Consent Calendar. Senator Maitland, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, Mr. President. It was brought to my attention yesterday afternoon after the Session that my vote...my Aye vote on House Bill 93 was...was not recorded. The Body, indeed, knows how I felt on that. Evidently in my...with my enthusiasm, I didn't push my switch hard enough and I'd like the record to show that I would have voted Aye had the switch been pushed hard enough.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

I noticed that and the electronic marvel will so record your intent. Senator Johns, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR JOHNS:

I'd like leave of the members to be shown as hyphenated co-sponsor of Senate ...House Bill A-2501 on 3rd reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Is there leave? Leave is granted. We will stand at ease till the call of the Chair. May I have the attention of the Body. We will stand in Recess until the hour of two, and with the cooperation of the House, hopefully be finished a little after three. So, the Senate stands in Recess until the hour of 2:00 p. m.

RECESS

AFTER RECESS

PRESIDENT:

The Senate will please come to order. Messages from the House.

SECRETARY:

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate the House of Representatives has concurred with the Senate in the passage of a bill with the following title, to-wit:

Senate Bill 501, together with House Amendment 19.

PRESIDENT:

Secretary's Desk, Concurrence. Committee reports.

SECRETARY:

Senator Vadalabene, Chairman of the Committee on Executive Appointments, Administration and Veterans Affairs to which was referred the Governor's Message of November the 30th, 1982 reported the same back with the recommendation that the Senate advise and consent to the following appointments.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes...yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I move that the Senate resolve itself into Executive Session for the purpose of acting on the Governor's appointments set forth in the Governor's Message of November 30th, 1982.

PRESIDENT:

You've heard the motion as placed by Senator Vadalabene. Any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries. It's so ordered. The Senate is now in Executive Session. Senator

Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. With respect to the Governor's Message of November 30th, 1982, I will read the unsalaried appointments to which the Committee on Executive Appointments, Veterans Affairs and Administration recommends that the Senate do advise and consent. And after reading those appointments, I intend to ask leave to consider all of the unsalaried appointments on one roll call unless any Senator has objection to any particular appointment.

To be members of the board of Banks and Trust Companies for a term expiring January 1, 1985, Walter D. Fackler of Chicago and John R. Morris of Robinson.

To be a member of the Lottery Control Board for a term expiring July 1, 1985, Barbara Proctor of Chicago.

And to be members of the International Trade and Port Promotional Advisory Committee for a term expiring January 17, 1983, William J. Guyton of Wilmette and Vincent J. Cannella of Chicago.

And to be members of the Agricultural Export Advisory Committee for a term expiring January 17, 1983, Virgil V. Bachtel of Peoria and Carl R. Hansen of Mt. Prospect.

And to be members of the Illinois Racing Board for a term expiring July 1, 1988, Charles E. Schmidt of Barrington Hills, Cecil Troy of Chicago and Ray Garrison of Flossmoor.

And to Public Administrator of Richland County for a term expiring December 2nd, 1985, Jerry D. Miller of Olney.

To be Public Administrator, Guardian and Conservator of Marshall County for a term expiring December 2, 1985, Ross M. Canty of Wenona.

And to be members of the Illinois Environmental Facilities Finance Authority for a term expiring June 30, 1983, Nicole W. Foster of Chicago.

And to be members of the Environmental Facilities Finance

Authority for a term expiring June 30th, 1984, Norman M. Gold of Chicago and E. Kenneth Wright of Chicago.

And, Mr. President, having read the unsalaried appointments, I now seek leave to consider those appointments on one roll call unless some Senator has objection to a specific appointment. And I might say at this time, Mr. President, that Senator Hall has objection to the appointments of...Nicole W. Foster of Chicago, Norman M. Gold of Chicago and E. Kenneth Wright of Chicago, to be members of the Illinois Environmental Facilities Finance Authority for a term expiring June 30, 1984 and for Nicole W. Foster of Chicago, for her term expiring June 30th, 1983. That was the sole objection in the committee. So, Mr. President, will you now put the question as required by our rules.

PRESIDENT:

All right, you've heard the request of Senator Vadalabene. Is leave granted to consider these on one roll call? Discussion? Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I would like to explain what my objection was. The Statute requires that no more than two members of the Illinois Facilities Finance Authority shall be of the same party. All three appointees list themselves as Independents. However, other sources have reported that Nicole Foster is a Republican and no other information has been forthcoming on the other two appointees. Thus, the statutory...the statutory balance is really difficult to determine, and I...I feel that we should not have...approve these people at that time since all three list themselves as Independent.

PRESIDENT:

Any further discussion? All right, Senator Vadalabene has asked leave that all these be considered on one roll call. The question is, does the Senate advise and consent to

the nominations just made. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 55, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Channel 5 and Channel 17 have requested permission to film the proceedings. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Before...I just wanted to give you a chance to get on TV, Sam. Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, Mr. President, I now move that we arise from Executive Session and here I am, cameras.

PRESIDENT:

You've heard the motion. All in favor signify by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The Senate does now arise. If you turn to Page 2 on the Calendar, we'll begin with House Bills 3rd reading. House Bill 900, Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Mr. President, I'd ask leave of the Body to take Senate...House Bill 900 back to 2nd for the purpose of amendment.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator...Senator Davidson requests leave of the Body to return House Bill 900 to the Order of 2nd Reading for purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 900, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Davidson.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Mr. President and members of the Senate, Amendment No. 2 to House Bill No...900 strikes everything after the enacting clause. There's been a information sheet passed around to you. The amendments are being passed now, I thought they'd been distributed earlier. But this is what most of you know as the speed up the utility tax payment bill which will increase the State revenue thirty-four million dollars one time. It changes from the present collections of paying in forty-five days for the utility to be paying four times a month. This has been an agreement within the industry. The municipal utilities are exempt...excuse me, will continue to pay under the present affair. Also has a threshold of ten thousand dollars on it which marries it with the threshold on the sales tax on businesses now in the other parts of the Revenue Act. If there's no questions, I'd ask the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 900.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Davidson has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 900. Any discussion? Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Just a question, Senator Davidson. You said that the explanation had been passed out earlier, and I think none of us has it on the desk. We have now the text of the amendment but not the backup.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Well, I...I could be in error, but I was assuming since one was laid on my desk in the last ten minutes, which was not of my doing, I figured it had been passed out by the leadership to everybody of the...of the Senate. I will have a Page bring over my copy to you, if they will.

PRESIDENT:

Any further discussion? All right, Senator Davidson has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 900. No further discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Netsch.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, I will withdraw that. It...the explanation had been passed out earlier, but after discussing it with Director Johnson, he has said that he would...just as soon not have it at this time, and so in deference to his wishes, I will withdraw the amendment.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Amendment No. 3 has been withdrawn. Further amendments, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Lemke.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LENKE:

What...what this amendment does is to the utility and messages tax. Eliminates the insenses of the schools paying the utility tax to the State and then the State back returning it...in regards to assistance. I mean this is...we passed these bills out last year and someplace they got lost in the maze in the House. And I think now is the time to give a little financial assistance to the schools in the State of Illinois who are going to be facing an increase in heating costs. I think this is a good bill and I don't think the revenue loss is great, because it's...it's going to be made up, whatever they save on heating costs is less money



they're going to get from the State in aid. So, I mean it's...it's ridiculous to pay money in aid and then also take it back in the way of tax. I ask for its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Mr. President, I haven't seen a copy of the amendment, but I would ask for a ruling of the Chair to see if this amendment tracks with the amendment which was just adopted, please.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Davidson, the Chair is prepared to rule that it...it was...it does track, it was written with the adoption of your amendment in mind. Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Then I have...another question of the sponsor, then. In his...

PRESIDENT:

Indicates he'll yield. Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

...in his amendment, he proposes this applies only to messages and to gas, you do not want it to apply...you're not asking it to apply to electricity then?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lenke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

That is correct, we're talking about heating of...schools and so forth.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

How much will this tax relief be and what will the financial ramifications of it be?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

Well, last year we had an estimate from the...of the department, a fiscal note on it. The actual loss they stated as regards to about four million dollars, but that is not actual loss, because what you're doing in some of the area is you're paying State Aid money to schools, and then the schools are paying back the State Aid money to the State in the form of a utility tax. What this amendment does is not lose revenue to the State, but what it does is get rid of some of the bureaucracy and ridiculousness of this present Department of Revenue.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Senator Lemke, as I read the amendment, it...it's a little broader than just public schools. You talk about we giving it back to...to the public schools, that's true in what we rebate, but it also says church or religious denominations to be used exclusive for religious, education or charitable uses and purposes such other public school districts. So you're adding churches and religious denomination onto this which is far and beyond the public school...what was in the opening explanation about we gave it back to them when we refunded to them the cost of...of their...their operational on...whatever amount of money we give back to them, you have broadened this quite far.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

We had both of these bills and both of these passed out. The school loss was less than, I think, in the fiscal note on one bill was less than five million and on the church they said it was the...the Department of Revenue said it was

infimtable, a very small amount of loss of revenue to the State. And what we're trying to do here is to treat all schools in the same category in regards to these taxes to help them and give them a little assistance so they can heat the schools at an adequate temperature so the kids can get a proper education, and all kids are treated the same. And with the speed-up, I think it's time now that, you know, since the multiplier was...we're trying to hurt the schools with the multiplier, that this is just a little way of helping them at least pay the heating costs this winter for the kids. And I don't think it's very much money.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? If I can have your attention, Channel 20 also requests permission to tape. Leave is granted. Senator Grotberg.

SENATOR GROTBORG:

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

PRESIDENT:

Indicates he will yield, Senator Grotberg.

SENATOR GROTBORG:

Senator Lenke, all fifty-nine of us that are left here realize that we could ask you for a copy of the amendment. But I would ask you, first of all, in the interest of time, what do the bill do? What does your amendment do? None of us really know, you...you've made a couple of remarks, but in your genius for description you failed to tell us exactly what it does.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lenke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

It just takes off the two percent State utility tax that schools pay to the State on utilities and messages, that's all it does. It's...the other tax that the utilities pays is still there, this only takes off the schools percentage of

the tax.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Grotberg.

SENATOR GROTBERG:

Well, thank you, Mr. President and fellow members. This is the amendment that was defeated in the House...last year. At this late date in the Lame Duck Session, it's no time to introduce controversial things on what is prepared to be an agreed resolution to the State finances, the budgetary problems that we have, the income and the expense items have both been treated, and I...would certainly recommend the defeat of this amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Senator Lemke, I have a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDENT:

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Would this exempt bingo halls that are on church property?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

What would you...you say bingo halls? This would exempt those facilities that are owned by churches and schools and...and it's geared to help pay some of this excessive heating costs that's caused by the inflationary times of the present administration in Washington and by the Governor of the State of Illinois, and I think you guys are asking for something in regards of helping the State and helping the Governor out, and I'm asking something just to help the little kids that go to school and the little old ladies that

go to church and play bingo. I'm not trying to do anything wrong, but if you want to be cruel and harsh and not give a little money to these poor people, well, that's your privilege and that's your privilege on the second floor, but my privilege is here. As far as being agreement, I was not a party to any agreement, I have not been consulted by anybody to agreement, and I'm sure that there's probably a majority of fifty-nine Senators that have not been confronted by the Governor and asked for an agreement and party to the agreement, they don't even know what's the problems are 'cause they haven't been fully explained. You know, we were told prior to November 2nd there was no financial crisis. I'm just trying to help these...these schools...and churches and that to be able to pay their heating costs a little bit, that's all I'm trying to do. So it's a few million dollars, I mean, we're giving the Governor a chance to operate, that's all I'm trying to do.

PRESIDENT:

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, Senator Lemke, I'm not so sure that...that a lot of us would not support something for the schools, but a couple of things. First of all, we didn't get a copy of the amendment. When you...when you explained the amendment, you...you explained it as if it was a nice bill for the schools, now we find out that it includes a lot more things than just the schools. Now the purpose of this bill or this amendment, at this particular time, is to take care of a very urgent problem in government. And just like Senator Netsch had what I thought was a pretty good amendment. But I think we ought to defer any of these other things, particularly when we haven't seen it, particularly when there's more in there than what's indicated by the sponsor, and we ought to go about the business of taking care of the serious financial problem and

leave what amendment was put on there to be the only amendment in order to get this nasty job done.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Well, I...I would rise in opposition to the amendment. The amendment in discussion has been going on for several days once you'd been down here was to get this utility tax into this once a week collection, get the one shot importance to help out the cash flow situation. And I would respectfully ask that this amendment be defeated.

PRESIDENT:

Any further discussion? Senator Lenke, you wish to close?

SENATOR LEMKE:

Well, you know, we're talking about the crisis of the State in regards to emergencies when we're told there was no crisis, and we look at this isn't the time to take care of any other crisis. Well, there is a crisis. Everyone of these schools, whether they be public, private, everyone of these churches is at a crisis and a crisis has been there. And it's time to ask to try to help these people. Only...it might be only a few thousand dollars to them and you're used to spending millions and billions. But to them this is very important, because a dollar here and a dollar there keeps the school open and keeps the kids from having the proper heat and so forth. So that's...all we're trying to do. I'm not trying to disrupt the State crisis, but I think the complex of the man on the second floor, he should try to take care of all crises and especially in all educational and all these other fields. And if you don't want to do it, fine, but there's been no deal. I'm here to speak for the people in my district and people in the State of Illinois, and they have a crisis in their schools and they have to pay this ridiculous

utility tax out of money that they get back from the government, from the State of Illinois, that they could be using this money for pens and pencils and books and so forth for the school children. That's all I'm asking for is just a few pittance, it's Christmastime and I just want to give a little few pittance to the kids.

PRESIDENT:

The question is the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 900. A roll call has been requested. Those in favor of the amendment will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 26, the Nays are 28, Amendment No. 3 fails. Further amendments, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I did...I did have an amendment, it's not drafted right now, to elect the members of the Commerce Commission. I assume when this bill gets over in the House that Mr. Stuffle or someone over there might generate enough support to pass that bill, and perhaps it can come back to the Senate for concurrence. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Special order of business, Sunday at noon, okay. 3rd reading, I'm sorry. On the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading is House Bill 1047, Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Thank you...thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I ask leave of the Body to take House Bill 1047 from the Order of 3rd Reading, return to the Order of 2nd Reading

for purposes of amendment.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Joyce requests leave of the Body to return House Bill 1047 to the Order of 2nd Reading for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 1047, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Buzbee.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is the amendment that we spoke of yesterday dealing with freezing the multiplier at the 1981 level. The specific language of the amendment is that notwithstanding any other provision to the contrary for the 1982 assessment year only, it's a one year freeze only, the department shall not certify an equalization factor for any county higher than the equalization factor certified for such county for the 1981 assessment year. So what this does is it imposes a one year cap on the multiplier for the year 1982 based on 1981's...1981's assessments. It's very simple, it isn't...it will give us an opportunity in the following Session starting in January to address the whole problem of the multiplier of school finance, of local government finance, and if you've seen the preliminary report from the Governor's Tax Reform Commission, you have seen that one of the recommendations that they are making is that fifty percent of the current school support that comes from property tax, that is that portion that comes from property tax for local school districts now, that fifty percent of that be done away with and the burden be placed on the State. Now, whether you like that idea or whether you don't, whether you think it ought to be more or whether you think it ought to be



less, this simple amendment right here would give you the opportunity next year to implement those kinds of changes. It's...it's no panacea, it has never been billed as being an answer to all of the ills of property taxes and in particular the property tax multiplier, but at least it will buy a little time for us to be able to address what is obviously a very, very serious question in this State, and I submit to you that's it's a good amendment and that it ought to be adopted.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Buzbee has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1047. Discussion? Senator McMillan.

SENATOR McMILLAN:

First, let me make sure what amendment we're talking about. Is this the one you distributed yesterday, and can you give me the...I presume we're still talking about the same one, but nothing has been distributed today.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Yes, it is the one that was distributed yesterday. It's LRB8203608GLDV, as in Victoria, AM, as in Mama, O2.

PRESIDENT:

Senator McMillan.

SENATOR McMILLAN:

I have a copy if everybody else does, that's...that's no problem. I have a couple of objections to it which I'd...which I'd like to mention. I suppose the Body is going to do as it...as it pleases. But the worst kind of approach to dealing with whatever your particular objections happen to be with the multiplier is to place this kind of a cap on a multiplier that...that makes even worse than what they may already be the inequities that exist between counties.

Because what this does is say that any county that happens to get itself into line and therefore is in a position of having its multiplier reduced or eliminated altogether and therefore gets its assessments up where it should be is going to end up carrying a substantially greater share of the burden in that school district or in that community college district than that...than that particular district that...that hasn't been doing its job. And so, it appears to me that...that there are a lot of districts...a lot of taxpayers, for instance, who happen to be in...in parts of overlapping districts that are going to find themselves taxed very, very unfairly as a result. Whatever your objections happen to be with the multiplier, the way to deal with it is not to lock in some counties that happen to be poorly assessed and to let assessments increase in...in other areas where they naturally go up and would get a...a lower multiplier as a result. Take a look at it, consider what it would do in your counties where there are overlapping districts, and I'll think you'll find some of your people are going to get it stuck to them by this particular amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I'm afraid, Senator Buzbee, you're a little late. I've been informed that the Department of Revenue has already certified for seven counties their multiplier. The county clerk in those areas, I have been led to believe, has already extended the tax rates. They have tentatively already agreed to seventy other counties their multiplier. So there are seventy-seven counties that have already either been certified or are in the process of being certified. If you'd look at what the freezing of the multiplier would do for the State Aid Formula, the shift...and I'm surprised that you're not

informed about this, one of the biggest gainers would be the City of Chicago. The second largest gainer would be suburban Cook County, some 6.8 million dollars. The collar counties, which I represent, would lose 3.8 million dollars. The biggest loser downstate is Lake County, 14.3 million dollars. And if you'd look at all the large school districts, downstate Illinois are all losers. It's ill-timed, it's a bad idea, and it's too late, and we should defeat it.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Sommer.

SENATOR SOMMER:

Thank you, Mr. President, just a question. Going from memory, I don't have it in front of me, Senator Buzbee, in...in my county, I believe the multiplier for '81 was 1.1 and now the tentative '82 is about 1.0. Would your...would...would you have the...would your proposal have the effect of raising the taxes for the people in my county?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

I don't think so, Senator Sommer, because what my amendment says is that it cannot be raised but it can be lowered, the...the multiplier can be lowered. So, in your situation, if it's going down, you're fine.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Grothberg.

SENATOR GROTHBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President and fellow members. I'm just reminded of yesterday's rhetoric and I thought there was quite a bit of it. And it seems to me now we have a lot of people that think that we should have the multiplier done in with, according to the Governor's language. Now we have a...a lot of people that want to hang onto it for dear life, that said they wanted to abolish it completely. And the

dichotomy of the whole thing is almost preponderous, what...how does that...is Senator Bloom here? Is it preponderous? Yes. And what can we do with a motion like Senator Buzbee's, who wants to lock in a...okay, preposterous, I will buy that, a preposterous suggestion that we freeze in the inequities, that we allow everybody to do their thing up to a certain point, meanwhile, Reverend Tom Johnson, the manager of Public Affairs for the world of assessment and equalizers is still the dictator, he moves it up or down depending upon how the facts come in. Real estate sales transfers may very well be up or down, nobody has ever factored in the fact that real estate prices have gone down. It just doesn't add up, Senator Buzbee, that you could possibly be for a condition that you're offering when you are against a straightforward appeal to get the assessment procedures worked out. So I don't know how anybody could vote for your thing, but I'm sure about...a number of people will but not on this side of the aisle if I can help it and not my vote in particular. Let's kill it before it ruins this good bill that you're hanging it onto.

PRESIDENT:

Further...

SENATOR GROTEBERG:

We got something going here.

PRESIDENT:

...further discussion? Senator Nimrod.

SENATOR NIMROD:

Thank you, Mr. President. A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDENT:

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Nimrod.

SENATOR NIMROD:

Senator Buzbee, what affect would this have on the ability of schools to increase the real estate property tax or their share, their...their money...the...that they receive on

the real estate property taxes?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Well, the only answer that I can think of to give you, Senator Nimrod, is that it would...it...it would prevent them from increasing their tax levies to take advantage of that increased size of the multiplier.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Nimrod.

SENATOR NIMROD:

So, in effect, it...it would prevent the ballooning that could take place and some of the other things, but also it would limit them from increasing. How about home rule units, such as cities or villages...what affect would it have on...on their ability to increase taxes?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

None.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Nimrod.

SENATOR NIMROD:

So this would have no affect on the cities or villages to be able to increase their taxes, so we're really not talking about a bill that, in fact, is giving us any real kind of real estate property tax relief. It's addressing only one phase of that function, and certainly if it were addressing the total problem, doing something meaningful there, I think we could support it, but since it's only addressing one part of this and going right back to the same units that were here yesterday fighting us, the schools, the park districts and the libraries then I think this does not do the kind of job that it's intended to do.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator...Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Senator Buzbee, I have a sheet that indicates that our State School Aid shifts would result from that, and that at least in Peoria, we would lose about 1.1 million. I wonder, are those figures accurate?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BLOOM:

How would that...

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Well.. are you speaking of the...the Distributive Aid Formula now, from...from the State, the impact it would have on the distributive aid...Distributive Aid Formula?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Yes, I believe so.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

I would point out to you that this would not affect the distributive aid that goes to the schools from the State until Fiscal Year 1985. So that's the first time it has an affect on the distributive aid is in...in Fiscal Year 1985. Again, I have not billed this as a panacea, I have built it...billed it as another bandaid, if you will, which will buy us a little time until we can get at the whole question next year.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

So, in other words, today you didn't like our bandaid but

you like yours, that's what I hear you saying. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Yeah, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I would like to correct one thing that Senator Buzbee said, he said that this will buy time. I have to disagree with that, Senator Buzbee. This goes into effect immediately, what really bought time was the bill that you voted against yesterday because that had no fiscal impact till '84, this has an immediate fiscal impact for next year. Now, it's been mentioned already that freezing the multiplier freezes in the inequity. Yesterday I heard a discussion, a very eloquent one that the assessors raised, all the way from incompetent to incapable, to not being able to square away assessments. What you're really doing right there is allowing the assessor to further underassess, because if he does or she does, the multiplier is not going to go up. And not only are you compounding the inequity, you're, in fact, encouraging it. There is one redeeming value to this particular amendment, however, it's strictly political. For those of you who might catch the heat the other way from those people in your district who have now learned what you have done, this gives you an opportunity to go back and add another snowball to the snowing affect that we have when it comes to the calculation of property taxes.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Thank you, Mr. President, just very briefly. You don't have the necessary votes, we don't have the necessary votes, what we are saying is, let's work on this problem, this gives us the opportunity to do that, that's all. You knew this was coming, we tried to do this in the spring, and I ask for your

support.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, we couldn't do anything yesterday, now today we're coming out with another bandaid, and I hate to tell you but this bandaid can be a very, preposterous is the word, Senator Grothberg, and disasterous bandaid on Lake County. It can ultimately lead to a fourteen million dollar loss and I certainly speak against it.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Is there any further discussion? Senator Buzbee may close.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to say that there are bandaids and then there are bandaids. The bandaid that you were proposing yesterday would have had to be a rather large one and I think it was a very defective one. This is a small bandaid and it's a...it's a very effective one. As far as the political question is concerned, Senator DeAngelis, I think that has already been established. We had this proposal before us last spring, we had your proposal that you went with yesterday before us last spring, we all had cast our votes on that...Senator DeAngelis, I certainly hope you're listening because I'm directing this at you. We had all cast our votes on these two questions, and then the voters were given an opportunity to cast their votes on us on November the 2nd. Now in my campaign, my vote against your proposal yesterday, which I cast in June, was used against me and I got fifty-seven percent of the vote in my district, Senator. Now, you know, you can keep on bringing up these old sops about political, political, political; well, the...political folks spoke on November the 2nd and there's



going to be thirty-three here on this this side come January the 12th. Now, I don't know what your point is about continuing to bring up the fact that we're trying to protect our political hides. We had done all of the...we had done all of these votes last spring, and the voters had a chance to express their opinion about us and they did. Now, as to these figures that are being bantered about around here, I don't know where those figures came from, but I do know that this is one way of getting at a problem. Now as far as the seven counties that Senator Philip talked about that the multiplier has already been assigned for, I am told...in fact, I am told that as of this morning the director of the department said that those seven multipliers could be called back in if this bill were to pass and could be capped at last year's level if necessary. There have been no tax bills that have gone out yet and that is the critical point is when the tax bills start to go out. The fact that the department has already assigned multipliers to seven counties could be very easily undone. And so, Senator Philip, the point that you tried to make is, in fact, a non-point, it carries no water, it has absolutely no efficacy. And on that point, I would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDENT:

The question is the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 1047. Those in favor of the amendment will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 25, the Nays are 29, 1 Voting Present. Amendment No. 2 fails. Further amendments, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Nimrod.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Nimrod.

SENATOR NIMROD:

Yeah, thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This amendment is one that you should be familiar with since it is Senate Bill 1521 which is on 3rd reading here on the Senate Calendar. It's also one that went through the Revenue Committee and was heard and passed favorably out of that committee. It's also a bill that was discussed a few years back and has had a great deal of discussion and certainly considered favorably in the...Senate Revenue Committee. Allow me to quickly review just some of the provisions for you, because I think this is really the only bill that we have ever had that really gives true property tax relief and at the same time allows us the provisions and allows us the ability within this Senate in the future year to take whatever action is necessary without really hurting anyone and helping all of the real estate property taxpayers. Now the bill does three things, first of all, it will do, is it will...may I have some order, Mr. President...Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

Yes, Sir.

SENATOR NIMROD:

May we have some order?

PRESIDENT:

Certainly. May we have some order, please. Senator Nimrod.

SENATOR NIMROD:

Okay. The first item is that, in fact, it will freeze the assessment at the 1980 level. That would mean that an average payment of taxes would be...the taxes would be reduced an average of ten to twenty percent. At least that's the way it comes out in Cook County. Downstate, you didn't have as high as increases so it will be in the neighborhood of around five or ten percent. So there is a reduction in

real estate taxes and not...one that will not hurt, in fact, the taxing bodies that are presently counting on that money. Secondly, it addresses the problem...addresses the extension of the...of the property tax, not...the dollars and not the multiplier, not the assessment and not the rates and it includes home rule units. So what we're doing is getting across the board, across the whole State of Illinois, addressing ourselves at the total dollars that are paid in real estate property taxes. It will...because of Cook County having a quadform...a quadrennial assessment, we are presently in the second quadrant, and in order to equalize that between the third and fourth quadrants, it will maintain the same amount of dollars for the next two years. In other words, there could be no increase in any of the taxes until the 1984 tax or the 1985 payment, at which time there would be a cap on all governments which would allow you two or three years here within the Legislature to come up with any plan or program you want, and if you didn't, at least there could not be an increase in the property tax of any more than three percent in any one year or twelve percent in the quadrennial. Now this would do two or three things I think that are very important. One...one, it would certainly allow young people or anyone else who is interested in buying a home to be able to with...with all sincerity know that when they buy a home they don't have to be worried about their real estate property taxes going up a hundred percent or fifty percent or two hundred percent in the following years. Secondly, it would certainly allow senior citizens who are being forced out of their homes by the increasing and accelerating property taxes to, in fact, be able to look at that bill and say, I don't...I know my taxes won't go up any more than three percent in...in any one year, I can afford to live here and they don't have to sell their homes. So, I think what we're doing is encouraging home ownership and allowing

people who have spent their life savings in that area a real chance to go ahead and work that. Here is something where our present formula, which is made up of three parts; the assessment, which is the county and the township; the multiplier, which is the State; the rates, or the levy, which is the local governments, we...we...those three units of governments are all each blaming the other for the real estate property tax. When you address the extension or the total dollars, you eliminate the blame from any one of them. And here's your chance for...for the first time to stand up and...and take the kind of support, I think, and encouragement and endorsing a bill that has certainly been heard, discussed and had a chance to be reviewed in committee, and you can give some real property tax relief now to the taxpayers and at the same time afford the opportunity for the Legislature to address this problem without doing any serious damage. I would be happy to answer any questions pertaining to this bill...this amendment. If not, I would certainly ask for your support.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion? Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Mr. President, a ruling of the Chair. On Page 3, line 30, it says, "through the 1934 assessment years." I ask is this amendment fatally flawed or that...

PRESIDENT:

If that is your only objection, Senator, the Chair is prepared to rule the amendment is germane and in order. Is there any further discussion? If not, Senator Nimrod has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 1047. Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Yeah, I...I think we ought to just point out here that if you thought my idea was a bad one because of the potential

loss of...of revenue to...to school districts and to park districts and so forth, then this is a whopper. I...I mean, this one is...this is going to put them out of business, folks. You know, if that's what you want. Oh...oh, you want...oh, okay. I just wondered if anybody was aware, 'cause I don't claim to be any expert by any means in the field of revenue but this is kind of scary.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Nimrod has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 1047. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 1, the Nays are 44, none Voting Present. Amendment No. 3 fails. Further amendments, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY:

...Amendment No. 4 offered by Senator Buzbee.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Thank...thank...thank you, Mr. President. I'm...I'm sorry I spoke on the last amendment, I...I didn't realize I had that kind of power over the Body yet. You don't mind if I put out a press release at home saying that, do you? This is...this additional amendment...this additional amendment is a combination of two things. First of all, it is a combination...no...got...we...all right, we're getting the signal straight now. I didn't have the proper script. Okay, this is a different...a different approach altogether. This is the language that was contained in the original bill, House Bill 2485, which was...passed by both Houses of this General Assembly and sent to the Governor's Desk, which he then amendatorily vetoed with the...and then we dealt with that

whole problem yesterday. The fact of the matter is the language considered in the original House Bill 2485 was good language, it's needed. Here's basically what it does; it gives downstate taxpayers, and this affects only downstate, by the way, the authority to...appeal a valuation to the State Property Tax Appeals Board where Department of Revenue or board of review equalization factors, that is the multipliers, cause an individual assessment to exceed the statutory level. That's the first thing it does. The second thing it does, it requires certain notices to be given to downstate taxpayers regarding their local median level of assessment, their right to be assessed at that level and the method of complaint to get to that level. The third thing it does is, this weighs the equalization factor or multiplier in downstate counties according to the percentage of valuation of various types of property, specifically vacant lots, residential, commercial and industrial. Now, again I would point out that this bill, as I recall, passed out of this Body 59 to 0 or 57 to 0 or something to that effect. It is an amendment that has been asked for by the Taxpayer's Federation. It is simply a method of giving downstate taxpayers some more information on their tax bills and I think it ought to be adopted.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Buzbee has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 1047. Any discussion? Senator McMillan.

SENATOR McMILLAN:

Mr...Mr. President and members of the Senate, I would rise in support of the amendment. It is almost exactly as Senator Buzbee has indicated, and it is substantially the bill that we, not only passed out of this Body, but voted on I think a second time with some...on concurrence with some amendments. About the only difference is that there was a provision in here with regard to redefinition where we had

put in a...a sunset provision saying that there can't be any redefinition for a certain number of years. That was taken out so that it really says there can't be any redefinition. I frankly think it strengthens the bill and it's probably in better shape than it was when it was here before. So, I...I would support, strongly this bill. It is giving us a chance to enact essentially the same legislation we enacted almost unanimously last spring.

PRESIDENT:

Any further discussion? Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

I just...since this...

PRESIDENT:

Paul, can you...

SENATOR BRUCE:

I was just wondering, the...the language on Page 5 about appeal to the board of review, how does that impact upon the board of review completing their business, since it says that you would have a chance to appeal if there's an equalization process? Is that of the application of the multiplier to equalize? And if you could appeal after that, it would...it would mean the board of review's work would never be finished, they would never certify the assessment.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Well, I am told that that problem was raised before when this was in front of us the last time. And there is, I guess, simply no answer to that, Senator Bruce, at this point, because there is no way of telling how many appeals there might be.

REEL #2

PRESIDENT:

Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Thank you, I would defer to Senator McMillan on that. I think he has a better answer than mine.

PRESIDENT:

Senator McMillan.

SENATOR McMILLAN:

With regard to the amendment on...or the portion to be amended on Page 5, what that really says is that it makes it absolutely clear that the appeal can be made to the State Property Tax Appeal Board. That is the practice now, but evidently, there is some question about whether or not...or not that would be continued, and it does write it into the law and make it clear that the practice we're going through now shall be continued. In other words, it makes it clear that the taxpayer does have the right to go ahead and appeal the multiplier to the Property Tax Appeal Board. It is the way it's being done now. So, it would not provide any delay in the way certification now occurs.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Joyce, Jerome.

SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I...I see that with the sunset provision left out, I can feel the hand of the Taxpayers Federation working in conjunction with the utilities to mess up those several counties that have this problem, and that is several counties with a large utility generating station, whether it be nuclear or otherwise. Now, I...I just don't know why the sunset provision was left out if, in fact,...if the other part is put in there. I'd like to get



an answer from that, Senator Buzbee.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

I, again, am told that this bill does not deal with property tax classification. That problem has already been addressed in another bill and it's, in fact, the law of this State.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield to a question?

PRESIDENT:

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Amendment No. 4, does it apply to Cook County?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

No, it does not.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

That answers my question, thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. Simply to clarify the point that Senator Jerome Joyce raised. There was indeed another provision in the bill as it passed this Body, in 2485. It had to do with clarifying the, in a sense, the freezing of the definition of personalty and realty that we had also incorporated in an earlier bill. And it made clear that

it...it referred to as that property had been defined in a particular county, which is quite important because there is varying practice from county to county. And it also did contain a sunset provision. It was, in our judgement, a very important clarification of what ultimately became House Bill 1296. And I for one regret very much that it is not included in this amendment because I think it was a critical part of this bill.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Grotberg.

SENATOR GROTBORG:

A question of the sponsor if he would, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Grotberg.

SENATOR GROTBORG:

Senator Buzbee, although your answer to Senator Lechowicz was correct, it does...deal with classification, within one of the portions of the amendment is that within the counties in their own way of classifying vacant, commercial, industrial, et cetera, are there not some limitations that...that...that guide the overall assessment? If they've only got two percent vacant property in the county, they can't have more than two percent of the adjustment on the vacant, et cetera. Is that true or false? Within this amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Senator, I, again, am going to defer to Senator McMillan on your question.

PRESIDENT:

Senator McMillan.

SENATOR McMILLAN:

I don't think it has anything to do with it whatsoever.

This deals with whether property would be classified as real estate or personal property. It doesn't have anything to do with the classification of property into residential or...or whatever. This only deals with whether or not property would be judged real estate or personal property.

PRESIDENT:

Any further discussion? Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Guys, this is when we get in trouble. Now, the language that is going to be put on page 1 of this bill says that once anything has been classified as real property in any county, it shall be assessed as real property in every other county. Now, it may be a joke to some of you, but people that have like the Zion Nuclear Plant and the Newton Generating Plant in Jasper County, where Jasper County stands to lose fifty-seven percent of its assessed valuation over that one power plant, and Grundy County and several of the other counties where a power plant is located, nuclear or otherwise, this is big medicine. This is major, major changes in the way we assess utility property in the State of Illinois. And we're talking about a hundred or two hundred million dollars. Now, I don't know what the assessor in Peoria County or any other county assesses a circulating pump, but in Jasper County we are down to the mat with CIPS on circulating pumps, on piping, on the generating plant itself, on the burners, on whether those things are real property. And one utility in the State of Illinois tried to say that the entire facility was not attached to the ground and was, therefore, personal property. Sixty percent right now of every power plant in the State of Illinois escapes taxation as real property. That's the ratio right now in Jasper County, sixty-forty. This thing, if they can get one assessor in any county to say one of those four hundred thousand dollar circulating pumps, high pressure steam circulating pumps, is personal property,

I'm going to lose it in Jasper County. I don't want to lose it. We've got the case before the Property Tax Appeal Board with CIPS. I'm willing to go in with them on each and every item in that plant. I don't want this bill, though, to say that some assessor in Lake Wobegone is all of the sudden saying those circulating pumps are...are real...personal property. Let's run this one through the committee one more time. Those three words, you know, three little words are not going to help a lot of people in this Chamber.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I certainly concur with the prior speaker one hundred percent. Because if we want to rake the public some more of the residential property and give it all to the utilities, just vote for this...rotten amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you. Senator Geo-Karis, this one helps, if anything, your circumstance. I have...I will correct the statement I made earlier, because my understanding was that this version of the amendment left out entirely the language that the Senate had passed originally in 2485. That is not the case. What it does is to pick up the Governor's language...our language as the Governor amendatorily vetoed it. So, the qualification in any county is still in place. The sunset provision which was part of our original amendment has indeed been eliminated. But the restriction to in any county is there. That was designed to try to meet, in part, the problem that you have and that Senator Joyce has with respect to the utility plants. It does not hurt anyone else. It went through this Body, and...on two occasions, as a matter

of fact, and it even got through the second floor, and you know how rare that it these days.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Buzbee, do you wish to close?

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Well, Mr. President, yes. As I said when I started this, this was...I thought this was noncontroversial, I...this was...I was asked to handle it. There, obviously, it a lot of confusion on it, and I don't intend to do anything to disrupt the ability of those counties that have those kind of plants in it to be able to stay in business. So, at this time, I'm going to withdraw the amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Alright. Amendment No. 4 is withdrawn, Mr. Secretary. Are there further amendments?

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

Amendment No. 5 offered by Senator Joyce.

PRESIDENT:

Wait a minute. Amendment No....would that be 4? 4 was withdrawn, so this would be...yeah, yeah.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. FERNANDES)

4...Amendment No. 4 is correct.

PRESIDENT:

Well, change the board, will you. Yes, thank you. Amendment No. 4, Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Amendment No. 4 combines the two amendments that Senator Buzbee has done so well with. Amendment...the second part of an Amendment No. 4 is 2485 that we passed out of here. Also contained in Amendment No. 4 is the language freezing the multiplier...putting a cap on the multiplier for one year. Debate was closed with the idea that this was a totally par-

tisan, political question. That is not the case. What we are asking, what the Assessor of Cook County is asking, what Senator Netsch has asked, what many of the members of the Revenue Committee have been asking for the past six months is that we sit down in a reasoned fashion and come up with an answer that really solves the problem of the multiplier in the State of Illinois. And I ask for the adoption of Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 1047 at this time. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Alright. Senator Joyce has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 4 to House bill 1047. Is there any discussion? Senator Grotberg.

SENATOR GROTBERG:

Thank you. Senator Joyce...a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDENT:

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Grotberg.

SENATOR GROTBERG:

What is the reason...are you forming a commission, or a committee, or a sit down reasonable thing, I don't have a copy? You got the freeze but you got a sit down...your very kind, Senator Joyce. What page?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Senator Grotberg, it is...that amendment, Amendment No. 4, is the...is a combination of the amendment that Senator Buzbee withdrew, which was Amendment No. 4 and Amendment No. 2 which was the amendment Senator Buzbee offered with respect to the...that would have put a cap on the multiplier for one year.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Alright, Senator Joyce has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 1047. All in favor signify by saying Aye. All opposed. A roll call is

required. The question is, the adoption of Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 1047. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 19, the Nays are 33, none Voting Present. Amendment No. 4 fails. Further amendments, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. On the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading is House Bill 2501, Senator Bruce. Senator Bruce, 2501.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Yes, I'd like leave of the Senate to return 2501 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Alright, Senator...

SENATOR BRUCE:

...to be offered by Senator Maitland.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Bruce requested leave to return House Bill 2501 to the Order of 2nd Reading for purposes of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 2501, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Maitland.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This Body passed out of here last spring House Bill 2505 which assured farmers the first...right of priority in the event of an elevator bankruptcy. The language as we saw it at that time also included, in that first right of prior-

ity, lenders who also held a legitimate warehouse receipt. The bill passed, the Governor signed it, and then there became some questions...there were some questions that arose from some of the banks that part of the language wasn't quite clear enough, and so, during the summer, all the major farm organizations and the banking groups got together and did draft, I believe, more definitive language and, I think, more accurately describes the purpose of...of House Bill 2505, and that's the amendment that's before us today. It also further clarifies what, really, grain assets are. For example, with hedging accounts where there is net equity, that clearly has to be considered a grain asset. That protects both the farmers and the lending institutions. We think this is also an improvement in the bill. I would be happy to answer any questions, and I would move for the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 2501.

PRESIDENT:

Alright. Senator Maitland has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 2501. Is there any discussion? Any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. On the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading is House Bill 2517, Senator Schaffer. Amendments?

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Yes, we need to bring it back from 3rd.

PRESIDENT:

Alright. Senator Schaffer asks leave of the Body to return House Bill 2517 from the Order of 3rd Reading to the Order of 2nd Reading for purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd



Reading, House Bill 2517, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senator Schaffer. It's the larger amendment, Senator Schaffer.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAPPER:

Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Amendment No. 1 makes this agency subject to the administrative action and review as prescribed by the Illinois Administrative Procedures Act and was one of the amendments we agreed to in the committee meeting yesterday.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Schaffer has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 2517. Any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Schaffer.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAPPER:

Amendment No. 2 removes the requirement for a lump sum appropriation to allow a line item appropriation as we generally require for agencies of this type. Also committee agreed to amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Alright, Senator Schaffer moves the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 2517. Any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. Senator Davidson, we'll go back to the top. On the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading is House Bill 900. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

House Bill 900.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Mr. President and members of the Senate, this bill now is the amendment which was discussed on the amendment stage. A simple explanation, it speeds up thirty-four million dollar one time...help the cash flow of the State of Illinois. If there's no questions, I'd appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDENT:

Any discussion? The...question is, shall the House Bill 900 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 50, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. House Bill 900 having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Is Senator Joyce on the Floor for 1047? You're just going to let it sit, okay. On the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading is House Bill 2501. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

House Bill 2501.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Thank you, Mr. President. The major portion of this

bill, which I will explain, comes a little later, but Senator Maitland has put on an amendment which relates to clarifying the...the rights of farmers and lending institutions having certified grain receipts. But the major portion of this bill has been in the works for about eight years, and that relates to the Dixon Experimental Station. We have an experimental station operated by the University of Illinois on five hundred acres or more of United States Forestry Department land they gave to us over forty years ago. Federal law and State law prohibits us from giving and constructing State buildings on Federal property. And what this bill will do is swap land via the University of Illinois that presently operates it back to the Federal Government. They're not able to sell land, they're able to deed it over. They will deed it over to the University of Illinois and the conservancy group, and the University of Illinois will then convey other property to the Federal Government, some of it located in Jasper and Cumberland Counties, areas in my district that the University of Illinois has...had deeded to them and through estates that they've collected, will allow them to operate the Dixon Experimental Station on a continual basis and the State of Illinois will be able to expend money on those buildings because we will then own the underlying five hundred and thirty-five acres. So, it's a...the United States Congress is willing to make the swap. The United States Forest Service, the University of Illinois, all the agricultural groups support it.

PRESIDENT:

Any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 2501 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 51, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. House Bill

*S.B. 1248  
Concurrence*

2501 having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. On the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading is House Bill 2517. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

House Bill 2517.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAPPER:

Mr. President and members of the Senate, this bill merely implements the Executive Order No. 2 which we passed earlier this year and phases out the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission and replaces it with the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. As amended, the two amendments we just adopted. I don't believe there's any opposition. Be willing to answer any questions, but don't think it's controversial.

PRESIDENT:

Any discussion? Senator Keats. If not, the question is, shall House Bill 2517 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 51, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. House Bill 2517 having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. On the Calendar on Page 2, on the Order of Secretary's Desk Concurrence is the revisory bill. Senator Bruce. On the Order of Secretary's Desk Concurrence, Senate Bill 1248. Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 1248 with House Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Thank you. This is our 1981 general revisionary bill. It has been revised and it was revised again. It's back from the House with their amendment which runs a couple hundred pages. Those of you who'd like to have copies can read it after we adjourn here. But the publisher needs it to start working with the galleys for a publication of the revised Statutes in January. So, I'd ask for your favorable vote, and if you find anything in it, this is for the lawyers to make sure we have updated Statute books. I ask for your favorable consideration on the concurrence.

PRESIDENT:

Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1248. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 46, the Nays are 2, none Voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1248, and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Supplemental Calendar No. 1, I understand that has been distributed, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Yes, sir.

PRESIDENT:

Senate Supplemental No. 1. The Chair has been advised that the titles to both bills, Senate Bill 501 and Senate Bill 1667, have, in fact, been changed by House amendments. So, the titles as reported on the Calendar are not correct. Senator Donnewald on 501, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 501 with House Amendment No. 19.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Donnewald.

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

Well, what the amendment to Senate Bill 501 attempts to do is to extend the reporting date from October 1st, '83...from April 1, '83 to October 1st, '83. Now, it is different...under a different title as we had you explain, Mr. President, and I...I think this is my last bill in this august Body in December. So, I would appreciate your favorable roll call.

PRESIDENT:

Any discussion? Senator Rhoads.

SENATOR RHOADS:

Mr. President, I promised Senator O'Keefe that I wouldn't ask this question, but I really do have to. Since the title of the bill was changed in the House, are we meeting...question of the Chair, are we meeting the constitutional requirement that the bill be read by title three different times in both Chambers?

PRESIDENT:

That question has been asked properly before and properly answered, and the answer is, yes.

SENATOR RHOADS:

Alright, well, inasmuch as it's Senator Donnewald's last bill, I'll vote for you.

PRESIDENT:

Just wait til next Session. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No....No. 19 to Senate Bill 501. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 52, the Nays are none, none Voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendment 19 to Senate Bill 501, and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is

declared passed. On the Order of Secretary's Desk Concurrence, Senate Bill 1667, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate...excuse me...Senate Bill 1667 with House Amendments 1 and 4.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1667 is a bill that will bring the State of Illinois in compliance with Federal regulations as to the registration of bonds issued by local governments and municipal corporations. It is imperative that we come into conformity almost immediately so that local governments may issue bonds and that they be registered in conformity to the Federal regulations. If there are any questions, Senator Netsch can answer them.

PRESIDENT:

Any discussion? Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just briefly, what Senator Weaver says is correct. It is essential and it is an emergency because, as of the moment, December 31st is the date by which individual registration has to be done with respect to a wide range of municipal securities. If they are not in a position to comply, that is some of our units of local government, they are effectively precluded from issuing any securities. While that has some tempting aspects to it, it would be irresponsible to do at this time, and so this is essential. If it does not quite meet the bill, we'll clean it up next year.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 1 and 4 to Senate Bill 1667. Those in favor will vote Aye.

Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 50, the Nays are none, 1 Voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendments 1 and 4 to Senate Bill 1667, and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. If I can have the attention of the membership, my understanding is that there are only about three, possibly four, maybe five, matters yet remaining. We have one of the four or five in this Chamber in the...or in the Conference Committee report which has not yet been acted upon by the House. The House is in Recess and both parties are having conferences. So, we are literally unable to move forward until the House begins to move forward. So, my suggestion is that we stand in Recess until five-thirty. And, if we can come back here at five-thirty, hopefully, by that time the paper will have begun to move. The Senate stands in recess until five-thirty.

RECESS

AFTER RECESS

PRESIDENT:

If I can have the attention of the membership and those in your offices, the House has just now commenced. I am told the Conference Committee report on the supplemental appropriations is in the final drafting stage and will shortly be circulated. So, we will stand in recess, again, until the hour of seven o'clock to afford the members an opportunity to get something to eat. Hopefully, we will be then in a position to move ahead. Seven o'clock.

RECESS;

AFTER RECESS

PRESIDENT:

The Senate will come to order. Resolutions, Mr. Secretary.



SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 702 offered by Senator Carroll, congratulatory.

Senate Resolution 703, by Senator Nimrod, it's...congratulatory.

Senate Resolution 704, by Senator...Senators McLendon, Rock and all Senators, and it's congratulatory.

Senate Resolution 705, by Senator Jerome Joyce, and it's congratulatory.

Senate Resolution 706, by Senators...Senator Newhouse and all Senators, and it's congratulatory.

And Senate Resolution 707, by Senator Lenke and all Senators, and it's a death resolution.

PRESIDENT:

Consent Calendar. Resolutions.

SECRETARY:

Senate Joint Resolution 117 offered by Senator Donnewald.  
(Secretary reads SJR 117)

PRESIDENT:

Senator Donnewald moves to suspend the rules for the immediate consideration and adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 117, the adjournment resolution, which calls for us, when we finish today, tonight, to return on January the 10th at 10 a.m. Any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The rules are suspended. Senator Donnewald now moves the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 117. All in favor signify by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted. On Supplemental Calendar No. 2 there is a Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1127. Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. On Senate Bill 1127 Conference Committee report to amend the policemen's article to prohibit a widow who marries after the

first of January, '82 from receiving two widow annuities. This Conference Committee report, Mr. President and members of the Senate, has, in my opinion, less than a majority of the support of the Body. Consequently, I would ask that we vote to nonconcur and send the matter back to the House so that we can establish another Conference Committee to straighten out the matter.

PRESIDENT:

Alright. Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1127. Those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 3, the Nays are 29. The Conference Committee report is not adopted, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. WBBM and WCIA have requested permission to tape. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Egan, for the purpose of the Message for the House, you will request, I am sure, a second Conference Committee be appointed.

SENATOR EGAN:

Yes, please. I...that's I thought was...

PRESIDENT:

Automatic, okay. Okay. Resolutions. Mr. Secretary, any...you have all been distributed a copy of the Resolutions Consent Calendar. In addition to the ones printed thereon we have had House Joint Resolutions 130 through 135 and Senate Resolution 695 through 707, all of which I am reliably told are congratulatory or death. Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, was there anything done on House Joint Resolution No. 129?

PRESIDENT:

It...it's on...we're going to adopt it momentarily here.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Okay.

PRESIDENT:

Alright. Any objection...no objections having been filed...Senator Bruce...oh, Senator Buzbee, they all look alike.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Senator Bruce is the good-looking one.

PRESIDENT:

I see, okay.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

I'm wondering, I would like to ask Senator Vadalabene since he's the sponsor, who is...where did you get Senate...House Joint Resolution No. 129?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

I got it from one of the Pages. It was put on my desk just like it was put on yours.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. I was just going to remark that it seems to me absolutely appropriate that after all the years during which Senator Mitchler blessed us with his many resolutions, that we would now have a resolution in honor of Senator Mitchler.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Given the fact that we are in somewhat of a holding pattern here, I...I would like to request that the Secretary read House Joint Resolution No.

129.

PRESIDENT:

Well, it's going to take awhile to get it up. (Machine cutoff)...Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, Mr. President and members of the Senate, in regard to the House joint resolutions that you are being...that you are seeing now, I asked Senator Mitchler, our former colleague who was introducing these resolutions in the Senate, when he was in the Senate, why now...the resolutions are being introduced over into the House with Larry DiPrima as the sponsor, Representative DiPrima. And I might add that he gave me a very good, intelligent answer, and he said, the House resolutions print better resolutions than the Senate resolutions, and that's why he wants those resolutions now to start over in the House.

PRESIDENT:

(Machine cutoff)...Egan, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR EGAN:

Mr. President, there is a motion filed to take from the Committee on Finance a bill which we would like to get on 2nd reading. Senator Demuzio filed it, and it's been filed and it's been on the list of things to do today. If it's...there is no controversy to my knowledge. What it does is allow a vehicle for the safety deposit box operation to co-mingle with the...properly with the...

PRESIDENT:

Alright, I just assumed everybody was sitting waiting with baited breath to hear the Senator Mitchler resolution.

SENATOR EGAN:

I thought it was an opportune time. There is no controversy that I know of. Of course, what do I know.

PRESIDENT:

Alright. We will get to the Order of Motions in Writing.

Read the resolution, Mr. Secretary. On the Resolutions Con-  
sent Calendar is House Joint Resolution 129 congratulating  
and commending a former colleague on his service to his  
country. Read the resolution, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate...or House Joint Resolution 129. Senator  
Vadalabene is the Senate sponsor.

(Secretary reads HJR 129)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Well, I believe now all of us have heard the resolution.  
I believe it is a bit of historic work. I...I feel that  
being the sponsor of House Joint Resolution 129 and hearing  
it now for the first time, I move for the immediate consider-  
ation and the adoption of House Joint Resolution 129 for our  
former colleague, Robert Mitchler. It's a touching resolu-  
tion and I believe that we all should give him a favorable  
vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

The motion is to adopt. Discussion of the motion? All  
in favor say Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it, and the  
amendment...and the Joint Resolution 129 is adopted. With  
leave of the Senate, we will go to Conference Committee  
report, Senate Bill 1652. Is Senator Bloom on the Floor?  
Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1652 has been dis-  
tributed to the membership. Senator Bloom is recognized for  
a motion.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President and fellow Senators.  
Senate Bill 1652 which started out as a modest wall certif-  
icate bill is now the emergency budget act of 1983. I would  
like to thank Senator Carroll and the House members of the  
Conference Committee as well, as the Senate members, for the

hard work they put in, and for their suggestions, Senator Bruce and Senator Buzbee. Essentially, House...or Senate Bill 1652 creates an emergency power to reduce the current Fiscal Year 1983 budget. I don't think this Body is unmindful of the cash flow problems facing the State of Illinois. I think President Rock stated it rather well in a recent news conference where he said, "We're all in this together and we've got to do something about it." The suggestions from the other side of the aisle were incorporated into this, and, basically, it allows the imposition of up to a two percent reduction in GRF and common school funds for grants to both higher and elementary and secondary education. It allows the imposition of a two percent total reduction in general revenue funds for all other agencies of State Government but not more than five percent can come from any one agency, and not more than two percent from Personal Services. It allows other constitutional officers in the General Assembly and the Judicial branch of government to impose the same two percent GRF reduction. The sum of the appropriation reductions authorized is established at a hundred and sixty-four million for FY 1983. This will enable us to continue to operate State Government. I would try to answer any questions you may have. Otherwise, I'd urge your favorable vote on this measure. It's not an easy task for any of us. Nobody like to do this, but I think if we're going to keep faith and do what we say we're going to do, we have to do this. And once again, I'll answer any questions you may have.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

The motion is that the Senate adopt the first Conference Committee report. Is there discussion of the motion? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President. A question of the sponsor if

he will yield. We understand, Senator Bloom, do we not, that this is applicable only to Fiscal Year 1983 and that there is a dollar limitation imposed on the Chief Executive, and there are percentage limitations imposed for certain lines, particularly, Education and Public Aid, is that not correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Senator Rock, that is correct. This expires by its own terms on the 30th of June 1983. There is a straight two percent limit on both Higher and Lower Education and Public Aid. There is a clear directive to the Executive branch telling them that by the 10th of January they have to identify where they want to establish their reserves, and by the 10th of February...they have to...okay, I think you have another question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

No, the 1st of February, as I understand it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Thank you, it is the 1st of February. They have to establish where the line items are. This imposes very strict controls on the Executive branch, and it is painful but necessary. There is a one sixty-four cap on this as well, I believe you asked a question about that. So, strict...strict two percent on the three areas mentioned. A cap, it dies of its own weight, by its own terms the 30th of June, and it tells the Executive branch to give us the whole picture by January. And the other constitutional officers and the General Assembly are covered as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I rise in support, albeit reluctantly, but in support of Senate Bill 1652 which now contains the Emergency Budget Act of 1983. I think some of us were pretty well aware back in March when the Chief Executive issued his budget recommendations to the public and to us in joint Session that the Economic and Fiscal Commission had predicted, and rightfully so, predicted some dire times for our State, unfortunately. The latest figures indicate that we will face...do face in this State a shortfall, a cash shortfall, of roughly two hundred million dollars. And, frankly, it could be worse...could get worse. The latest economic forecast that we have indicates a...an unfortunate downward trend so that we may very well in the first of April or the first of May readdress this subject and afford the opportunity for even deeper cuts if, in fact, the economy does not righten itself. This is tough medicine for everyone, but I think it's absolutely essential. And I would suggest to my colleagues that it has to be done realistically. There has to be some belt tightening because everyone admits, the Bureau of the Budget, the Economic and Fiscal Commission, the joint leadership, the Governor's Office, everyone admits that we simply are short in terms of revenue to the tune of two hundred million dollars, at least. And what...if we don't adopt this, what is the alternative? The alternative, I suggest to you, is not a very palatable one for those of us who sit in both Chambers. The alternative, obviously, is a special Session during which we would consider...or reconsider, if you will, the FY '83 appropriation bills in a reduced amount. And that would be very, very, I suggest, painful to all of us to have to again consider the Higher Education budget, the Elementary and Secondary Education



budget, the Public Aid budget, and each and every code, department and agency in a reduced amount. This, I think, will afford the Chief Executive, in consultation with his Bureau of the Budget and after properly notifying the majority and minority leaders in both Houses, the opportunity to cut a hundred and sixty million dollars out of the existing budget. And with the action we took a little while ago with respect to the infusion, the one time infusion of some thirty-four million dollars by virtue of the speed up of the utility tax, we can, I think, make it. So, I would suggest to all that you seriously consider an affirmative vote, as I will be voting affirmatively for the Conference Committee report, the second Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1652. It is unfortunate but it is absolutely essential.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Rupp.

SENATOR RUPP:

Thank you, Mr. President. One question I would like to have...or like to have an answer to get on the record, whether or not this at all affects motor fuel tax distribution or other local distributive funds or entitlement programs.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Senator Rock, it...it does not. And one of the reasons the...Conference Committee report was constructed in the fashion it was was to make it as painless as possible, not only in this area but...I mean, Senator Rupp, I'm sorry...as well as other distributive grants and reimbursements and things.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Further discussion? Senator Buzbee. Senator...Senator Demuzio, did you...Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate the Senator from Peoria saying that some of us worked hard on this, that is true, we did work hard on it and there were at least two of us, I think, as members of that Conference Committee, myself and, I think, the present Presiding Officer who worked hard on it knowing that the probability of this thing passing was pretty good, and so we ought to get the best we could out of it, but at the same time, knowing that we were going to be opposed to it whatever came out of the Conference Committee. And we, in fact, Senator Bruce and myself, did refuse to sign the Conference Committee report, and I am going to stand in opposition to the Conference Committee report and plan to vote No on it for several reasons. One thing that we are doing by doing this is assuring the State of Illinois with a sufficient available balance at the end of this fiscal year...wait a minute, that...that's not quite exactly right...we are promising...we are saying that we're going to assure that available balance. In fact, we really aren't. We're saying that we're going to maintain a sufficient available balance at the end of this fiscal year so that we can go to the bonding houses in New York and tell them that, yes, once again we are showing good fiscal responsibility in the State and, therefore, our triple A bond rating ought to be maintained. Now, let me tell you how we're doing that. We're doing that on the backs of elementary and secondary education districts all over the State, and we're doing it on the backs of higher education employees who, in fact, are going to forego any kind of pay increase during this fiscal year. You'll recall that the Governor in his Budgetary Message of last March requested no pay increase for higher education employees in this State during Fiscal Year '83. I was one who sponsored legislation through the appropriations process that assured them of a four percent pay increase

starting in January. The Governor reduction vetoed that to three percent. Now, I submit to you, by doing what we're going to do here tonight, that they will not get any pay increase during Fiscal Year '83. So, we're going to say to the bonding houses in New York, the State of Illinois is capable and should continue to receive the triple A bond rating, but at the same time, we're telling the elementary and secondary school districts in the State and the community college districts in the State, any money you borrow you're going to have to pay three, three and a half, four percent more than the State of Illinois does because we're going to take funds away from you and your rating is not going to be very good. We're going to do this by maintaining an available balance, or by saying that we're going to maintain an available balance at the end of FY '83 in the State Treasury which will show the bonding houses that we ought to maintain a triple A rating. I'm like everybody else, I want to maintain a triple A rating too, but at some point or another we've got to stop kidding ourselves and stop kidding the taxpayers and the service providers in this State. Now, the fact of the matter, as Senator Rock pointed out, the fact of the matter is, we're going to have to readdress, and I use his term, we're going to have to readdress this whole question again in April or May, because we all know that the two hundred million dollar shortfall that Economic and Fiscal Commission is talking about and the Bureau of the Budget is admitting to is an extremely optimistic figure. It's my understanding that the Governor has talked about figures as high as perhaps three hundred and fifty million shortfall. So, we're going to have to readdress this whole question in April and May...or May again, no question about it. Something that I think should have been in this Conference Committee report which is not, which I plan to introduce in January, is that if the available balance in the State Treas-

ury as of June the 29th exceeds a given figure, and I don't know what threshold to put that given figure at right now should be, let's say it's twenty million, or fifty million, or whatever, that if the available balance in the State Treasury as of June the 29th exceeds that available...that available balance, then we're going to, in fact, give those dollars back to elementary and secondary and to higher education on June 30th. One other point I'd like to bring out...two other points I'd like to bring out in closing. We have put the two percent limitation on all the agencies under the Governor's control. Two percent on Personnel lines. That's not by Personnel line item, by the way, it's by Personnel lines in the aggregate, which means, and I sub it to you that that's one of the reasons for this request of legislation, which means that in the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities, as an example, that he can take whatever those Personnel lines across that agency amount to and he can take it all out of one Personnel line item. Which means, he's going to be closing more hospitals. It's...it's in the book, as the old song of years ago used to say. It's going to happen, he wants legislative authority to make it happen. He's going to close institutions under the authority of this legislation. It will happen, he's going to close institutions. Now, whether you believe that's good or bad is a philosophical question for you to decide, but it will happen. The last point I would like to make is that the Governor's Tax Reform Commission, which I referred to earlier today in debate, has issued a preliminary report. It was my hope, and I kept saying this all during my campaign, by the way, that we would not come back into Session right after the election and try to do patchwork, try to do bandaid attempts on the State's revenue picture but we would wait for that report from the Tax Reform Commission, and given the outstanding membership that they had on that commission, and

I've read the preliminary report and I believe that their preliminary report is, in fact, right up in keeping with their abilities, that they, in fact, have done a good job, that we would take that Tax Reform Commission report and we would start to address all of the major problems of revenue in this State for State and local governments. I wish we would do that. We have time to do that. We could do that in the early days of the next Session. Now I know there are all kinds of other reasons why some people say that cannot happen, but I wish we'd do it that way. I wish we'd take that report and we'd start to implement some of their recommendations. I really regret to see us, at this hour, take the...the option of putting yet one more bandaid on the State's revenue picture. We put the bandaid on of...of saying we are not, under any circumstances, going to increase any taxes, we're not going to shift any tax burdens from one party, or one group, or...or...to another. We're going to apply yet one more bandaid, and we're going to apply that bandaid on the backs of elementary and secondary school districts, we're going to apply it on the backs of mental health institutions, we're going to apply it on the backs of community colleges and higher education, and we're still not going to get the job done. Because we've got to come back in April or May and do it all over again, again. I wish we would take the responsible position of saying, let's really get at what has to be done and go about getting it done. Perhaps not this...not now, perhaps not in January, perhaps not in February, but in March or April anyhow. And on that basis, Mr. President and members of the Body, I oppose the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1652.

REEL #3

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes, Mr. President. I have a question to ask of the sponsor, if I may. I understand that last night that Doctor Mandeville readily admitted that given this passage of this legislation and...based upon our best estimates in terms of...of revenue projections that the State of Illinois, if this passes, would have a hundred and eighty-seven million dollar available balance at the end of the fiscal year, is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

I don't recall that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

All right, then based upon the best revenue estimates and the passage of this bill,...what is the projection for the State of Illinois to have an available balance at the end of this fiscal year?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Consulting with our staff and an eyeball consultation with staff on your side of the aisle, we don't know.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

No, no further questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I listened very closely to the debate on this issue, and I believe all of us really know the responsibilities that we have as being a member of this fine Body, but especially to the people of Illinois in being truthful in what our interpretations are of the budget...balance of this State, the revenue sources of this State based upon our best judgment that is received to us from a number of different sources, and may I review to you the sources that we have at our command, the Bureau of the Budget, Economic and Fiscal Commission, our respective staffs on both sides of the aisle, and yes, the newspapers and the media who also review not only the conduct of the General Assembly but the conduct of the Executive Office. And I believe if you take a picture of the State of Illinois and make a comparison to the other states of this nation, this General Assembly has a lot to be proud of. And, yes, if I have to say so myself, the Executive Officer and the Bureau of the Budget also has a lot to be proud of. When you talk about making comparison of New York, when the State of New York is a billion dollars in debt and is really on another bank of bankruptcy, the State of Illinois is asking you for a commitment; a commitment to give the Executive Officer the extension that we've already granted under the code agencies within his department, in three different areas for a period of one year. In my personal opinion, the President of this fine Body is absolutely correct. We should be supporting this issue because it's the best issue at the present time in order to make a collective judgment in the coming year of what really this State needs in the overall revenue picture. And to stand here on the floor this evening and say this matter should not be supported because there are three other State agencies that are not under the control of the Governor or the Bureau of the

Budget at this time is sheer hypocrisy. I strongly recommend that the membership of this Body do its duty and make the evaluation properly and support this compromise measure. Please vote Aye.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Bloom may close.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Well, thank you, very much, Mr. President and fellow Senators. I wouldn't even attempt to improve on the remarks of Senator Lechowicz or Senator Rock. This is the second Conference Committee report. Given the alternatives, we have no choice but to act responsibly. And a responsible vote at this hour, at this time, in this Body is Aye. And I would urge all of you to vote Aye. Thank you, very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Question is, shall the Senate adopt the second Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1652. Those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 37, the Nays are 11, none Voting Present. The Senate does adopt the second Conference Committee report to Senate Bill 1652. If I might have the attention of the Body and go back to the Resolution Consent Calendar. We adopted the one Mitchler resolution but in our haste forgot to adopt the remaining. No objections have been filed, the Presiding Officer at the time clarified that, and if there is no objections, Senator Lechowicz moves to adopt the resolutions on the Resolution Consent Calendar. On the notion to adopt, all in favor say Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. The resolutions are adopted. If we can have a Page come to the Well, we have a new Calendar we would like to have distributed. The Secretary is distributing Supplemental Calendar No. 3 which has two Conference Committee



reports contained on it. Message from the House.

SECRETARY:

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate the House of Representatives has acceded to the request of the Senate for a second Committee of Conference to consider the difference between the two Houses in regard to House Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1127, and the Speaker has appointed the members on the part of the House.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

If I might have the attention of the Body, on the regular printed Calendar, on page 2, at the bottom, is Senate Bill 1324 which has come back for a concurrence motion and Senator Grothberg is recognized.

SENATOR GROTHBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President. The need for Senate Bill 1324 in the days ahead is rather urgent, it being the only bill that we can handle some items on in the area of...capital. In the coming Session, I'd like to move to nonconcur on amendment...House Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

All right. The motion is to nonconcur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1324. Discussion of the motion? All in favor say Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Just for the record, I'd like to know what House Amendment No. 1 was. My recollection is that was a pretty nice amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Grothberg.

SENATOR GROTHBERG:

That's a matter of opinion, Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR GROTHBERG:

I don't mean to be bold, Senator Rock is asking...there was a nice simple bill that Senator Grothberg sent over to the House, a housekeeping bill, it came back with the prevailing wage amendment on it for all forms of government service, and I would move to nonconcur, in any event. Thank you for the roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Rock. Any further discussion? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

I just wanted to make it clear for the record that the Senator was not in favor of that House amendment and I, for one, am.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Motion is to nonconcur. All in favor say Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it and the Senate noncurs with House Amendment No. 1, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senator Egan, will you be handling 1127? Senator Buzbee, will you be handling 1678? Senator Rock will be, all right. We have distributed to the desk of the members the second Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1127, and Senator Egan is recognized for a motion.

SENATOR EGAN:

Yes, in the absence of Senator D'Arco, I'm happy to present this Conference Committee report to the members of the Senate. It does two things. It allows for the Chicago police and the Chicago fire the opportunity for the...their pension boards to provide sufficient funds necessary monthly for the difference between the Medicare provisions...the Medicare amount of money paid and the Blue Cross/Blue Shield pickup difference so that the pension board will pay that difference in premium for the retired police and fire. It does nothing more than that...other than one provision, it

increases the post increment retirement from one and a half to three percent, which is a standard provision now after several years. Almost all of the systems have that, I don't know of any exceptions. In any event, it contains nothing further than that. There are no windows for legislators and there are no provisions for any other beneficiaries than the police and fire in the City of Chicago, both systems of which have approved this and have demonstrated, I think satisfactorily, that there'll be no need for an increment increase in the tax. And so the systems are willing to accept the responsibility for the payments and it...it...and that's the entire package.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Is there discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Egan.

SENATOR KEATS:

Senator Egan, the question I...I know what you just said and I have no trouble with the bill and I have no problems supporting it, it's not a bad idea. I just want to make sure so it's on the record again. I know that one window was removed, I just want to make sure, I can't find anything in the bill, but I'm not a lawyer, I'm just a run-of-the-mill little businessman, there's nothing else sneaky in this bill that we're missing. There's no legislative things of any kind, no pension buy-ins for four years of high school presidencies, nothing like that in here that we've missed. I just want it on the record.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

No, I...I think your question is absolutely perfectly

put, and my answer is perfect put, no. I...unless...unless...to the best of my knowledge, and I've read it, no. Senator Keats, we took that out of the first Conference Committee report. This does what I said and nothing more.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Further discussion? Senator Schaffer. Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. One of my questions has been answered, Senator Egan. The other has to do with the...the group insurance benefits that this bill either authorizes or mandates, and I'm not, frankly, sure I haven't had time to determine which it does. Does this bill simply now make it possible for the City of Chicago to provide group health insurance benefits for retired persons or does it mandate that coverage?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

Well, it...it permits the system to make the premium payment, and...that's what their request is, they...they shall, henceforth, provide the premium payment for the retirees, for the annuitants.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, then...then this is a mandate to provide group insurance benefits for retired persons. We're mandating on the system then an...apparently an additional cost. What...what is the...what is the circumstance as far as the present funding level of that pension system? Can the system afford it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

They claim they can. They are not asking for any tax increase to provide the necessary funding. The system itself has requested this change.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, I'd like to speak to...to this report, Mr. President. As I said, we've had very little time to study this matter. Apparently, there have been no hearings on it that I'm familiar with. There were none in the...in a Senate committee that I recall during the past year. We did something like this for retired State employees, but as I recall, we didn't mandate that the cost be paid out of the system which is already underfunded. And it appears to me that that's probably what we're doing in this case, that...that the General Assembly, rather than making this coverage permissible, is, in fact, mandating additional costs on the system which the system probably can't afford. And I'm concerned about the...the continued promises that are made by this General Assembly to a lot of pensioners in this State, and all of these bills are going to come due someday and we're not going to have the money to pay them, and that...that's a concern of mine, and I'd like to hear you address it, Sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

...your request is totally legitimate, but I just pointed out that these are all city funds. We don't have State funds involved. The system has requested this. They claim they can afford it and this is totally within the limits of the City of Chicago to resolve. And so there are no State funds. The

system has made the request. I suggest that that system is responsible enough to make that afford and I would ask for your consideration and your...your vote in favor of their request.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Well, to my good friend and my seatmate, I'm...I'm going to say to him that I'm going to follow the...the David Regner rule on this. I...I take him at his word. When Senator Egan says that he's convinced that there's nothing in here that is out of the ordinary, however, he did say he had read it, and I'm not sure when he read it because I had dinner with him and he didn't read it during dinner. And so, I'm just going to vote No on this because I...I paranoia reigns supreme in my mind on...on any pension bill that comes before this Body at nine o'clock on the last night of the Session. So I'm just going to vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

I...I just...Senator Egan, I wonder if...if there just a couple of questions. One of them is on the three percent increase on page 2, is it the clear and legislative intent that this three percent shall be based on the fixed payable monthly annuity? If you read down through the first lines, it's one and a half percent of the fixed annuity, one and a half percent of the first fixed annuity, increased an additional one and a half percent on the first fixed annuity, then we get down to the new language and that says three percent. It is...it is your intent that you would...treat this pension system in the same manner as every other pension system and that three percent relates to the first fixed annuity and not to three percent of it's then present

annuity? That's the first question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

Yes, that would be my intention, Senator Bruce. I did not draft the Conference Committee report, but that would be my intention. Now, you and I can argue semantics all night long, I...this does nothing different, in my estimation, than all of the systems that have this provision currently. All right.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

The other thing is on...it is clear by the...the Statute then, if we flip to page 5 then, moving to the group insurance that this is a requirement that the police and fire board offer health insurance. They shall contract with a carrier to provide group health. I'm told that this is going to be approximate...three million dollar cost the first year escalating pretty dramatically. Exactly what contribution is there from the annuitants to pay for a three million going to eight, to twelve, to fifteen million dollar increase?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

They have not...there is no annuitant contribution but the system has taken the responsibility to make this payment without a tax increase. So they feel that they are actuarially sound enough to provide the funding.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Is there further discussion? Senator Bruce. Senator Bruce, did you wish to continue?

SENATOR BRUCE:

My handlers are trying to tell me what my answers are and

I...and I do appreciate it, we're late in the day. I just wonder the...the problem I see with the group plan, Bob...Senator Egan, is it...it has to increase the unfunded accrued liability of the system pretty dramatically and it has to increase geometrically, that's the problem. These...these benefits for health...health benefits are going to go up and the great...greatly different fashion than annuity benefits because the costs are just going to go...as Senator Schuneman and I know is...on a group insurance commission, when we first started the commission twelve years ago our annual cost was something a little less than twenty million dollars. We are now looking at a hundred and three million dollar contribution from the State of Illinois, and it...this kind of program can get you in a lot of expenses in a very short time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

I...I appreciate your concern, Senator, but I...I do again state that the system which is not State supported, Senator Bruce, it is strictly supported by funds within the City of Chicago, not by Olney or anyplace else. It's all City of Chicago and they want to take the responsibility. That's my money and Senator Netsch's money, not yours...Senator Savickas, and they are willing to bear the responsibility for the cost without a tax increase. And...and if they want to do it, it's alright with me. I proposed the measure for Senator D'Arco in his absence and...I...I commend it to your favorable consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Bowers.

SENATOR BOWERS:

Sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)



Indicates he will.

SENATOR BOWERS:

Senator...Senator Egan, there's one question over here, reference the State Mandates Act, on page 10, at the bottom of the page, I...we find a recitation in Section 2 that there is a finding that the State Mandates Act does not apply because there's been a request. Now, what is the basis of that finding? Is there a request floating around somewhere that we haven't seen?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

Not that I know of and...but the e is no...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Just...just...just a moment...for what purpose do you arise, Senator Savickas?

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Well, just for the record on that point, the City of Chicago has signed off on this any responsibility for the State as far as the State Mandates Act is concerned...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator...

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

...and to...and to answer Senator Bruce's question, there's a fifty-five dollar maximum contribution. It...it would not escalate. There's a maximum amount of money that in a fund would provide for the police and fire in participating in this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Bowers, you may continue.

SENATOR BOWERS:

...okay, then the letter that I was just handed...I was just handed a copy of a letter addressed to Patrick O'Grady signed by John F. McCabe, dated November 30th, 1982, in which

there is such a request made and that's the letter you have reference to? The letter refers to the first Conference Committee report, can we show that the letter as being amended on its face or have some reference to the second Conference Committee report so that the record's clear?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

Well, the first Conference Committee report was rejected. So, throw that letter away.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Just a moment. Now...now just a moment.

SENATOR EGAN:

You don't have to throw it away, burn it...you know. All I'm trying to suggest, Senator, is that there are no State funds involved in this bill and so the State Mandates Act really doesn't apply, and it has nothing to with DuPage County, and it's just the City of Chicago, and...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Rock, for what purpose do you...let's get some order.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I think, Senator Bowers, for the purpose of the record, it can be elucidated that the letter had reference to the Chicago police and Chicago fire pension provisions, not the provision that concerned itself with the General Assembly, and so, for that reason, I think that letter can be amended on its face, and I will make the representation that that letter is a request with respect to the provisions concerning the Chicago police and Chicago fire that are now contained in Conference Committee Report No. 2 because we rejected No. 1. Yes, and there are...on...in these provision...these provisions, as relates to the Chicago police and

Chicago fire, who have made the request of us, there is no change between Conference Committee Report No. 1 and Conference Committee Report No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

All right, that cleared the board pretty well. Senator Grotberg.

SENATOR GROTBORG:

Only in passing, Mr. President and fellow members, that I found a window on page 8 of the Amendment No. 2, lifting the thirty percent cap for the class that we're benefiting with the three percent increase, and I think somebody should address it from those who are interested. Senator Rock, if you would please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

That is not a window and the same provision applies to both the police and the fire, but it is in no sense a window by virtue of the definition that we use around here for a window. It concerns itself with...with members of those departments who are of a certain stated age that they are not subject to that kind of maximum. It is part and parcel of the agreement, part and parcel of the responsibility that the board has agreed with the policemen...with the police union to assume. Has nothing to do with a window.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Is there further discussion? Senator Egan may...Senator Egan may close.

SENATOR EGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I hope that your answers are all satisfactorily answered...your questions are all satisfactorily answered, but I...I would commend it to you as a matter strictly within the boundaries of Chicago, and please, if you will, accept that and officiously not intermeddle.

AB/1678  
C.C.R.

Thank you, I commend it to your favorable consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

All right, Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

While I again urge my colleagues to support this, I wish to declare a conflict. My brother is a Chicago police officer, and I intend to vote Aye and I hope everybody else does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

All right, the question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee report on House Bill...Senate Bill, strike that, Senate Bill 1127. Those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 37, the Nays are 10. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1127 and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. (Machine cutoff)...Bill 1678. (Machine cutoff)...Committee report...(machine cutoff)...Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. If I can have the attention of the members, I will walk you through what is the work product of about three and a half days of deliberation and certainly all day today. The Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1678 is a hundred and two pages, representing an appropriation...a supplemental appropriation of some one hundred and sixty-two million dollars spread across various agencies of which amount only five million represents an expenditure from general revenue. I will go through, and with some rapidity, and just briefly outline that we are appropriating to the Capital Development Board, three million dollars; to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, twenty-nine million dollars, and most of this, by the way, is Federal money. It

is money which has been made available by the Federal Government which we now are called upon, obviously, to appropriate. For the Department of Transportation some seventy-five million dollars; the State Lottery will receive four million dollars; the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission, there is a transfer contained herein that has no other fiscal impact, no new revenue; the Department of Public Health, ten million dollars for Children Health Services; Central Management Services, a hundred and seventy-seven thousand dollars; the Department of Nuclear Safety, two hundred and twenty-one thousand dollars for the X-ray inspections that we have mandated; the Department of Children and Family Services, a million five hundred thousand for the adoptment already...children program and to restore some cuts that were made in social workers; the Department of Registration and Education, some ninety-six thousand dollars for the Medical Disciplinary Board; the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities will receive seven hundred thousand, four hundred and thirty-eight thousand, and one hundred and forty thousand for its five state facilities; increase, again in Federal...Federal money; the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, six million for the coal...gasification facility; the State Board of Education has five hundred and fifty thousand dollars for the HITS program which is a program designed for disadvantage children; for the Office of the Governor, some eighty-five thousand dollars to pay the expenses of a Gubernatorial Executive Commission and to provide consumer assistance and to pay for the senior action program; for, again, the Capital Development Board, twenty-three million dollars to provide the money to complete the exterior and purchase the equipment for the State of Illinois Building in Chicago and for the Revenue Building in Springfield; for the Department of Human Rights, some two hundred and five thousand dollars in Federal money

for fourteen new positions made available through the Office of Economic Opportunity; for the Capital Development Board, some two million dollars for the Capitol Vocational Center to repair the structural damage; for the Office of the State Treasurer, some one million dollars to pay the debt service on outstanding obligations of the State of Illinois; for the Secretary of State, some seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars for the expenses incurred by the Secretary in mailing out the explanation of the Constitutional Amendment which was successfully passed in November; for the Court of Claims, the most recent awards plus the twelve items that were vetoed by the Governor on the basis that they were out of the wrong funds, we have now righted that; for the Dangerous Drugs Commission, some one hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars for the program called Alternative to Street Crime; for the State Historical Library, thirty-three thousand dollars; for again, the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities, some four hundred and forty-four thousand dollars to provide a program for autistic children, one hundred and twenty thousand dollars to repair the facility at the School for the Deaf in Jacksonville, and fifteen thousand dollars to repair the entrance to the School for the Visually Impaired; the Council on Nutrition has contained herein a transfer; and there is additional money for the Office of the Lieutenant Governor; and there is transition money for the Office of the State Treasurer to pay for the mandated audit that must take place every four years when that office is reelected. The total is one hundred and sixty-two million three hundred and eighty-three thousand dollars, five million of which is General Revenue Funds. I will attempt to answer any and all questions. I solicit your favorable support. Obviously, there are situations that we have argued about over the past few days; everybody did not get everything to which they thought they were entitled, that

is always the prevailing situation around here. We attempted to do the best we could under this tight fiscal circumstances to accommodate whom we could. The money is available from the the Federal Government, it's our obligation to appropriate it. We have acceded to the wishes of the Chief Executive and the Bureau of the Budget, in virtually every instance, and I would urge your favorable support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Sorry I made you mad, Mr. President, by putting my speak light on. I rise on a point of continual obstreperity, I suppose, because...first of all, I would like to point out that the sponsor of this bill, Senator Carroll, who was also the Chairman of the Conference Committee, chose to never call a Conference Committee meeting, and is, in fact, not here tonight and, in fact, had no intention of voting for this with this...the provisions that were in here. He told me this afternoon that he did not intend to call the bill because he did not agree with the provisions that were in it. So, I'm not at all sure that we have a legally constituted Conference Committee report in front of us, since the chairman of the Conference Committee never called a Conference Committee hearing. Secondly, I would like to point out in some things that affect areas in which I have an interest, the first one is not in my district but I do have an interest there, it's in Senator Vadalabene's district. As of yesterday morning, the Bureau of the Budget informed Southern Illinois University that they had made an error...they, the Bureau of the Budget, had made a error in two appropriations that affect SIU Edwardsville, again which is not in my district but is Senator Vadalabene's district, and that what they wanted to do...what they needed to do to be able to expend some capital funds was to make some transfers and they

needed this bill to do it in; no dollar increase whatsoever but just make some transfers from one fund to the other because there were two separate building accounts going on there. And it was, for some reason or other, decided to leave those transfers out of this bill. For what reason, I have not idea, it had no dollar impact whatsoever. Thirdly, in an area that does affect my area, my district specifically, as I had a request in for about five hundred and fifty thousand dollars for Capital Development Funds, School of Agriculture SIU Carbondale for repair and building of a...an agricultural research barn there which was decided to be left out. As Senator Rock said, that happens to all of us, we put some projects in, we lose some projects, we try and so forth. I normally would bow out gracefully on that sort of loss, except that some other members got some things in that in my mind are very questionable, and let me just point out some of those areas that are questionable. Number one, the seventy-five million dollars, the dedesignation of the...of the cross-town expressway for the City of Chicago; seventy-five million dollars of which sixty-four million was to come from the Road Fund and eleven million was to come from Series A bonds. Originally, that was presented to us as, we're going to dedesignate the cross-town and spread it into DOT for their spending where it needed to be spent. Under the language of the Conference Committee report, that is all to be spent in the City of Chicago or in District 1, every last dollar of it. Second thing that I object to, is in the Central Management Services...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Rock, for what purpose...Senator Buzbee, please.

SENATOR ROCK:

Pardon me, Senator, just as a point of order. I...I think you're leaving the wrong impression, and I certainly don't want that to happen. District 1 is the six-county



metropolitan area which contains, as you well know, about seventy percent of the people of...of the State. It does not all go to the City of Chicago, and please don't make that representation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Lechowicz, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, just a point of edification. The cross-town money was money designated by the Federal Government that was reassigned with the agreement between the State and the City, back to Congress, Congress then in turn reappropriated that money, that's exactly what you're voting on here, and in turn, designated District 1, which is the City of Chicago and six suburban areas, as the area to be designated to receive that money, so from Chicago, we have a loss. It incorporates a greater...greater area based upon the action of Congress.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Buzbee, you may conclude.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Well, thank you, Mr. President, I don't choose to conclude. I continue to continue my discussion, because...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator...Senator, you...you...

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Well, Mr. President...now wait just a minute, Mr. President. You allowed a point of order on a point that I had already made perfectly clear that this was to the City of Chicago or to District 1, I did not say just the City of Chicago. Secondly, you allowed a point of edification, which I challenge you to find anywhere in Roberts Rules of Order or in our rules. Now, I am just simply asking for a chance to go through about four more objections that I have on this particular bill, Mr. President. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator...you...just a minute.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

My next one...my next point of...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Just a minute. You say...you may continue...now just a moment, you may continue. You've used up more than your time prior to the interruptions. I'll let you continue, please proceed.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Mr. President, I would ask a ruling of the Chair. How much time is designated under our rules for a speaker to speak?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator, five minutes and you've used eight.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Mr....Mr. President, I would ask you to prove to me that I've used eight because you did not have the light on.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

We had the light on twice, Senator, if you'd observe.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Now, I would like to continue with my points on this particular bill. There is an item for one hundred and seventy-seven thousand dollars for wall certificates to the Department of Central Management Services, fund appropriated for workman's comp and a hundred and seventy-seven thousand dollars for wall certificates. Here we are talking about keeping State Government afloat and we're going to spend a hundred and seventy-seven thousand dollars for wall certificates. The next item I would object to is one hundred forty thousand seven hundred dollars for a Federally court ordered payment for special education payments in Gary B. vs. Joseph Cronen. I think it has been the...the stance of this Body all along that we will decide who's going to appropriate

money, not the Federal courts. The next item I would object to is an eighty-five thousand three hundred dollars for the Gannon Proctor Commission for consumer assistance in senior action programs, eighty-five thousand three hundred dollars. I would point out to you again, this was a commission that came about in Governor Thompson's announcement in a press conference on September the 25th, that he was going to appoint a commission to deal with the problems of women in this State, and if any of you get the notifications as I do about the Women's Commission meetings, they have about four a week right now, and what in the world do we need another commission to bail Jim Thompson out, because somebody feels that he has not provided enough assistance to women? The next item that I would point out to you is a twenty-three million dollar State of Illinois, Chicago and Revenue Building for equipment. No where did that come about until the last day or two, suddenly it's now a major item that's needed. Another item that's needed is two million dollars of capital development for the CAVC structural repairs. I'm sure those repairs need to be made. Again, I would point out to you that all of us have a lot of projects where repairs need to be made, but we're...have not been able to get them. The final item that I would point out to you is that in the...in, pardon me, the Lieutenant Governor's Office, we need one hundred and five thousand dollars for transition. Transition from what? There's nothing there. Why do we need a hundred and five thousand dollars to transfer? Now, again, of this total, one hundred sixty-two million three hundred eighty-three thousand seven hundred dollars, which is in this item, in this bill, five million seventy-nine thousand is GRF. We have just...we have just passed legislation under the guise of saving the State of Illinois from going broke, and yet, we're going to spend five million dollars in supplemental appropriations out of General Revenue Fund, for what?

I vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Gitz.

SENATOR GITZ:

I have a...Mr. President, I have a...question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Indicates he will yield.

SENATOR GITZ:

My questions relate to page 18 and page 19. For the record, the sixty-six million dollars which is being increased for District 1, it is a correct interpretation that all of this is money which is dedesignated from the cross-town?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Yes, Sir, that is my understanding.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Gitz.

SENATOR GITZ:

Then it also would be correct to conclude that, because of an act of Congress, which has agreed to dedesignate the money, that none of this money could, under any circumstances, be legitimately used in other districts?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Well, again, and I can yield to Senator Lechowicz who knows a little more about this than I, but my understanding is that the billion dollar dedesignation contained money for, not only District 1, but for the State department as an entity, and this is only a part of that dedesignation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Gitz.

SENATOR GITZ:

On line 27, there is a three and a half million dollars State-wide. Where is that money coming from?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

As...as I understand it, again, the Federal Government decided that of...of the billion dollar package, that this piece would contain X amount for District 1 and X amount for the balance of the State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Gitz.

SENATOR GITZ:

I am...I would appreciate it, if Senator Lechowicz is familiar with this, some clarification, because I was left with one impression that this could only be used in District 1 and now I'm gathering a different impression. Now, on page 19, "For the Counties of Cook, DuPage, Kankakee, McHenry, Will, from funds authorized by Public Act 81." That is eleven million dollars. I would like to know from what fund that is coming from and where it is going to be used, for what purposes...that is specifies the counties but not the purpose.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Lechowicz may respond.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. I hate to be the bearer of bad tidings, but when the money was returned back to Congress, it's up to Congress to reappropriate it to any State they wish. Through the hard efforts of Senator Dixon and the Illinois delegation, this money...this portion of the money was returned to Illinois and they deserve an awful lot of credit. Now, as far as the exact dollar amount going to Dis-

trict 1 or through District 24, that determination is an agreement...that is recommended by the Department of Transportation, concurred with with the Congress of the United States. That's, and we...we don't have all our money back, we're still owed quite a bit of money, but I want to commend them for the job they've done.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Gitz, your time is about expired.

SENATOR GITZ:

I would still like an answer to the question on the eleven million dollars which is being appropriated prior to the previous Public Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Yeah, those are proceeds from...we authorized additional Class A Bonds and this amount represents the proceeds from the sale of those bonds.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Is there further discussion? Senator Rock may close.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Very briefly, I would like to respond to a couple of things. The hundred and seventy-seven thousand dollars for wall certificates is a program that was embarked upon by the Department of Registration and Education to afford a certificate for those thirty-two, I believe, professions that they, in fact, regulate. This is in the nature of a revolving fund, and they fully expect that the State of Illinois will enjoy about three hundred thousand dollars in additional revenue by virtue of their sale of these certificates. They need this money to buy the paper and get the certificates out on the road. So, I don't think that is money ill-spent. And there is not, frankly, a hundred and five thousand dollars

for transition for the Lieutenant Governor. There is an amount of twenty thousand dollars that is specifically earmarked for transition, and which must be spent, I am told, prior to Inauguration Day which is January 10th and can be expended by voucher certified to the Comptroller. And the primary reason, I am again told, was that if any one of you have been down and seen the Office of the Lieutenant Governor, there is not one iota of furniture or furnishings therein. When the former Lieutenant Governor took his leave, various agencies, departments, boards, commissions and constitutional officers went in there and apparently pillaged everything in sight. There are no typewriters, no desks, no chairs, no anything, and so that money will be spent, hopefully, to afford one of our constitutional officers at least a place to sit. The eighty-five thousand is admittedly for additional personnel, because as you well know, the Speaker of the House, the Lieutenant Governor-elect, at least so far, has indicated that he wishes to assume, and we will, I'm sure, be debating that next Session early on, wishes to assume the duties of the Dangerous Drugs Council and the Department of Alcoholism, and he intends, frankly, to hire additional...a couple of additional people. All in all, I think, as...as I indicated when I began, there are some who are less than pleased with what is in here or is not in here. Each of us have the opportunity from time to time to present our own bills, the matter about which Senator Buzbee was intimately concerned, Food for Century Three, as it pertained to SIU Carbondale, was, I think, brought to the attention of this Body pursuant to the gubernatorial veto. There were other bills around he could have tried to run it on. It did not receive favorable treatment for inclusion herein. But I don't think, given the fact that there's a hundred and sixty-two million dollars of Federal monies herein, that we ought to disregard it out of hand. These appropriations are

important to the agencies involved, and I urge your favorable consideration of the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1678.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1678. Those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed Nay. The voting is open. (Machine cut-off)...voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 38, the Nays are 8. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1678, and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. For what purpose do you arise, Senator Buzbee?

SENATOR BUZBEE:

I request a verification of the affirmative votes and would request the Secretary to leave the roll up there, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

There is a request for a verification. Will the members please be in their seats. Secretary will call the affirmative votes.

SECRETARY:

The following voted in the affirmative: Becker, Berman, Bloom, Bowers, Chew, Coffey, Collins, Davidson, Dawson, DeAngelis, Donnewald, Egan, Etheredge, Geo-Karis, Grotberg, Hall, Keats, Kent, Mahar, Maitland, Marovitz, McLendon, Nash, Nedza, Nega...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Just...just a moment...

SECRETARY:

Well, Nash would be...No, that's right, Nash would be Lechowicz, Nedza, Nega, Newhouse, Nimrod, Philip, Rupp, Savickas, Schaffer, Sommer, Taylor, Thomas, Vadalabene,



Walsh, Weaver, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Buzbee.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I think this is the easiest I've ever done. Senator Becker. Senator Becker is there. Senator Berman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Is Senator Berman on the Floor? Senator Berman on the Floor? Remove his...remove his name from the record.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Senator Chew.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Chew on the Floor? Remove his name.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Senator Collins.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Is Senator Collins on the Floor? Remove her name.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Senator Medza.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Is Senator Medza on the Floor? Remove his name from the record.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Senator Nega.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Is Senator Nega on the Floor? Remove his name.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Senator McLendon.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator McLendon on the Floor? Remove his name.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Senator Newhouse.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Newhouse on the Floor? Remove his name.

SENATOR BUZBEE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I believe that will be sufficient.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

On verification, the Ayes are 31, the Nays are 8, and the...the Conference Committee...just a moment. Senator Rock requests a postponement...consideration is postponed. Senator Schaffer, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

A port...a point of inquiry. Where did all of those Democrats on November 2nd come from?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Lechowicz, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Be...rest assured, they'll be here on January the 12th.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

There are several matters pending in the House, so the Senate will stand at ease for a few moments.

SECRETARY:

Could we have some Pages down at the Secretary's Desk, please.

PRESIDENT:

Messages from the House. The Senate will please be in order. Messages from the House.

SECRETARY:

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate the House of Representatives has concurred with the Senate in the passage of a bill with the following title, to-wit:

Senate Bill 60 together with House Amendments 3 and 4.

PRESIDENT:

All right, on the Supplemental Calendar, Supplemental No.

4, on the Order of Secretary's Desk Concurrence is Senate  
Bill 60, Mr. Secretary.

END OF REEL

REEL #4

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 60. Senator Vadalabene is the Senate Sponsor, with House Amendments 3 and 4.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Vadalabene. Do you want to yield? Senator Savickas.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, I move for the adoption.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Savickas.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Yes, Mr. President and members of the Senate, I would move that we concur with Amendments No. 3 and 4. This...these amendments amend Senate Bill 60 to create a new Act, and it would be an Act creating the Chicago World's Fair 1992 Authority. All it does is create the authority, so that when the Bureau of International Expositions meet in Paris next week, it will indicate that Chicago and Illinois are supporting the concept of having the World's Fair here in Illinois in 1992. It provides for the Governor and the Mayor of Chicago to appoint twelve members apiece to the board or to the authority and to jointly appoint a director. There was a question on taxes and financing; it was taken out by Amendment 3 & 4. And, all it is now is just stipulating that the authority is a body corporate in politics, and it has no specific duties except to show that to the world and to the conference in Paris that Illinois is supporting the Chicago 1992 World's Fair.

PRESIDENT:

Any discussion? Senator Walsh. Okay. Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 60. Those in favor will

vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 39, the Nays are none; none Voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendments 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 60, and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Senator Egan, are you or Senator Demuzio have a motion on 889? You...we were to remind you. Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the Senate. The motion is to discharge Senate Bill 884 from the Committee on Finance and place it on the Order of 2nd Reading. I have conferred with the Minority Leader and with the President. I know of no objection and I would ask unanimous support for that motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Allright. Senator Egan has moved that the Committee on Finance in the Senate be discharged from further consideration of House Bill 884 and the bill be placed on the Order of 2nd Reading. You've heard the motion. Discussion of the motion? All in favor say Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. The bill is discharged and placed on the Order of 2nd Reading. Senator Egan, did you wish it read a second time today? Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

All right. Is there leave to go to the Order of Senate Bills 2nd Reading? Leave is granted. Senate Bills 2nd Reading...House Bills 2nd Reading.

SECRETARY:

House Bill 884.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

2nd reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

Are there amendments from the Floor?

SECRETARY:

No Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

3rd Reading. Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. With leave of the Body, I would like to move to the Order of Consideration Postponed to consider the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1678.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

You've heard the motion. Is there discussion? In favor say Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. We will go out of the ordinary Order of business to Consideration Postponed for consideration of the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1678. We are still on Conference Committee Report No. 1. Senator Rock is recognized for a motion.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I would move you that the Senate do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1678. This, as I'm sure everyone is painfully aware, is the hundred and two pages that contain a hundred and sixty-two million dollars of supplemental appropriations for various State agencies. Timing, I think, is essential, because there are some Federal funds contained herein which if not appropriated and accepted will, in fact, be lost to our State. So I think it's important that we get this done tonight, right now; and we can then adjourn until the 10th day of January. I solicit a favorable...your favorable support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

HB 1678  
P.R.C.

You've heard the motion. Discussion? The question is, shall the Senate adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1678. Those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 43, the Nays are none; none Voting Present. The Senate does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1678, and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. If there is no further business, I would like to commend the membership for their patience and their tenacity and for the good work that we have accomplished this week and wish all of you a very happy holiday season, and will move that we adjourn, pursuant to the resolution, until the 10th day of January, at the hour of 10 A.M.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR BRUCE)

You've heard the motion to adjourn. Discussion? All in favor say Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. The Senate stands adjourned until January the 10th, at the hour of ten o'clock.