

84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

REGULAR SESSION

November 12, 1985

PRESIDENT:

The Senate will please come to order. Will the members be at their desks and will our guests in the gallery please rise. Prayer this afternoon by the Reverend Anthony Tzortzis, St. Anthony's Hellenic Orthodox Church, Springfield, Illinois.

REVEREND TZORTZIS:

(Prayer given by Reverend Tzortzis)

PRESIDENT:

Thank you, Father. Reading of the Journal.

SECRETARY:

Wednesday, October the 30th; Thursday, October the 31st; Friday, November the 1st; Monday, November the 4th; Tuesday, November the 5th and Wednesday, November the 6th, in the year 1985.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I move that the Journals just read by the Secretary be approved unless some Senator has additions or corrections to offer. Mr. President...

PRESIDENT:

You've heard the motion as placed by Senator Vadalabene. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries and it is so ordered. Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I move that reading and approval of the Journals of Thursday, November 7th and Friday, November 8th, in the year 1985, be postponed pending arrival of the printed Journals.

PRESIDENT:

You've heard the motion as placed by Senator Vadalabene.

*No 568
Amendment*

Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries and it is so ordered. Top of page 2 on the Calendar, on the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading is House Bill 568, Mr. Secretary. Senator Philip.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 11 is offered by Senator Philip.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Philip on Amendment No. 11. Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

I certainly would do.

PRESIDENT:

I beg your pardon. Senator Kelly, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR KELLY:

Is there an LRB number on this amendment?

PRESIDENT:

Amendment No. 11 has already been adopted. My understanding is that Senator Philip wishes to reconsider that. That's the technical reordering amendment and he wishes to offer it at the end.

SENATOR KELLY:

Okay.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I would like to Table Senate Amendment No. 11, it's technical in nature. It simply puts the...the amendments in order. Hopefully, we'll reconsider this same amendment after we get everything else on to put them all back in order.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Philip having voted on the prevailing side moves to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 11

was adopted to House Bill 568. Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Mr...Mr. President, just a quick question...if we fool with this amendment, what does this do with any other amendments drafted that might be sitting on the Secretary's Desk?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

To my knowledge, it doesn't do a...a thing at all. We're going to put another amendment exactly like Amendment No. 11 after everything is on, it'll put everything in the proper order. So it'll be technically correct.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Is there something new on everything as to what everything is?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Well, obviously, we don't know what everything is. If...if you get something on that's unusual, you have to have another look at it.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Philip having voted on the prevailing side, moves to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 11 was adopted to House Bill 568. All in favor of the motion to reconsider indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The vote is now reconsidered. Senator Philip moves to Table Amendment No. 11. All in favor of the motion to Table indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries. Amendment No. 11 is Tabled. Further amendments, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY:

HR 568
Amend # 13

Amendment No. 13 offered by Senators DeAngelis and Philip. The LRB number, LRB 8402545RLCSAM.

PRESIDENT:

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 13 on House Bill 568 is the amendment that creates the governance, the financing, the reforms and the technical amendment from McCormick Place. I think everybody knows what's in this amendment. It is essentially the same thing that was introduced previously by both sides with one exception, and that is that after the interim board of three and three with the trustee, a permanent board will be established on June 30th, 1987 consisting of twelve members, six gubernatorial appointees and six mayoral appointees. It would take a vote of the majority of the permanent board or seven to take action including the election of a chairman. Be happy to answer any questions before we move for adoption.

PRESIDENT:

Any discussion? Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Mr. President, I'd like to ask the sponsor a question.

PRESIDENT:

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Senator DeAngelis, the trustee, whom you indicate under this concept, whom would he be appointed by?

PRESIDENT:

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

The same as Senator Rock's amendment and my previous amendment, the Governor.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

And his responsibilities would be the same under all concepts, under Senator Rock's or under Senator Philip's and yourself?

PRESIDENT:

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

The same as been previously indicated in those previous amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Okay. Now, you've got six appointed by the Governor and six appointed by the mayor of Chicago and from that they will select a chairman. In other words, it will require seven votes to determine who the chairman is?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Yes, but that's on the permanent board.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

How is this different from what Senator Rock had proposed last week...or at least he had explained was the agreement that he had between the Governor and...and himself at least? How is this different from that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, if I recall, on Senator Rock's first amendment, there was no permanent board. On the second amendment that he offered there was a permanent board, but it did not take seven votes to elect a chairman nor did it indicate who would

choose the chairman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Weaver, for what purpose...Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. Is Amendment No. 13 which deals with...McCormick Place germane to House Bill 568?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Weaver, Amendment No. 13 to House Bill 568, this bill deals with the subject of economic development in Illinois; therefore, Amendment 13 to House Bill 568 seeks to promote the convention and tourism industries of this State by providing for the continued construction of the McCormick Place Annex. Because the subject of the amendment relates to the subject of the bill, the amendments are, in fact, germane. Further discussion? Senator Kustra.

SENATOR KUSTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President. Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Kustra.

SENATOR KUSTRA:

Senator DeAngelis, you have been over the last couple of weeks, I believe, one of the strongest proponents of a...of a strong trustee to get in there and do what is necessary to get McCormick Place moving again. I understand, although I have not read it, that there is an editorial in the Tribune this morning which suggests that the powers of the trustee are not what the Governor and former Governor Ogilvie thought they were going to be. I also think we have an answer for

that, but I guess my question, first of all, is whether or not the language which we are considering in Amendment No. 13 regarding the role of the trustee is any different at all than the language that we considered last week as we in both caucuses debated this particular approach to an interim board solution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Senator Kustra, it is identically the same and yesterday our staff had cause to talk to Senator Ogilvie's attorney and he is satisfied that the provisions that are on this amendment are what is necessary for him to do the job.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes, thank you...continuing on the line...line of Senator Kustra, but first I'd like to ask one question, whether or not your amendment reflect any of the...the alleged agreement by the four...by the Governor and the four leaders.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

I believe that all four leaders have signed off on that, I'm not so sure about the House. I think President Rock and Minority Leader Philip have agreed. I...I have difficulty tracking the House sometimes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. UPI would like to take still pictures. Channel 19 would like to videotape and WAND in Decatur also requests permission to videotape. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Now, then for clarification, so that I...I guess all of

us would like to know what are we getting into. Are we now about to be made aware of what the agreement is about so that we can deliberate on it and have some...an opportunity to know what's in that agreement, or if...if you are...presenting the same amendment that you had last week? And I base it on your question, you're saying that this is, in fact, that agreement...that...that tentative agreement between the leaders.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Senator Collins, it is the same but different. The difference being what I described in the opening comments and that is the six and six with seven votes necessary to take any action or to elect a chairman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Collins. Further discussion? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I rise in support of Amendment No. 13. For many weeks we have been arguing about the governance in particular of McCormick Place. This amendment reflects the agreement that was struck between the principals, namely, the Governor and the mayor. Former Governor Ogilvie, who as I understand it, the trustee designate and will be appointed by the Governor has also agreed. I think all hands are on board and I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis may close.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Roll call, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, Senator DeAngelis moves the adoption of Amendment No. 13 to House Bill 568. Those in favor indicate by saying

Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 13 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 14, by Senators Newhouse, Chew, Collins, Jones, Hall and Dawson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, Senators, this is an affirmative action goals amendment. I think we all know what it's about. Just let me explain one of the rationales behind it, and I wish all of us who are interested in economic development to hear this. What is happening is that the McCormick board people have not met the affirmative action goals in the past. The consequence of which is that there are an awful lot of unemployed youngsters right within earshot of this project who ought to be working and who could be working. This affirmative action resolution is an attempt to redress that situation and let us put some young people who are not now working on the taxpayers' rolls, and I would ask for a favorable roll call on it. I'd be glad to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Newhouse has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 14. Discussion? Senator Jeremiah Joyce. Can we break up the caucus in front of Senator Marovitz, please? Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

I would like a roll call on this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Mr. President, I plan to support this amendment but I'd like to ask the consideration of the Chair to place at least

the name of the sponsor on these amendments. I know we read off the LRB numbers, but it'd be a lot easier to identify these amendments if the name is on...on these amendments. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Yeah, question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator...Senator Newhouse. Senator Newhouse on the floor? All right. Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Senator Newhouse, did you pass this amendment out?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Did I pass it up?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Did you pass it out?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Oh, when you said pass it out, yes; it was...to the Assembly, yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

All right. I have a couple of questions of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Senator Newhouse, what is the percentage dollar amount to be awarded to minority businesses in this amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Thirty percent.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, how about female set-asides?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

They're included within that goal, Senator, that's a goal.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Senator Newhouse, I think you better reread your amendment 'cause I think that excludes them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

I...I...my reading is, Senator, the Minority and Female Business Acts includes females.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, as you know, I helped sponsor that Act and...they are defined differently in that Act, and if you follow the language of that Act, you are excluding them by your amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Senator, it says, "As defined by the Act." I don't how we could be...how...how it could exclude anyone.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, as defined by the Act, but you're defining thirty percent for minority. The minority defined in that Act, but what you're doing is leaving the female out of that thirty percent, which then means that you have a cumulative total of whatever amount it's going to be but pretty soon you'll be running the construction industry with minorities and females.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Senator, I don't...understand your objection at all. We're...the Minority and Female Business Enterprise Act includes females, I don't understand the objection.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further...Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, let me just read you the sentence, okay? "Not less than thirty percent of the total dollar amount of contracts awarded by the authority shall be established as a goal to be awarded to minority businesses," not minority and female businesses, "as defined in Section 2 of the Minority and Female Business Enterprise Act."

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Senator, our lawyers see no conflict at all. The definition in the Act and the definition includes females. I don't understand this argument.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator...Senator Pawell.

SENATOR PAWELL:

Just a question of the sponsor. Are...are we talking about ninety-five and ninety-six? It's ninety-six we're talking about on...on...on the...the LRB number was not read. Ninety-six? Okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Yes, we're talking about ninety-six, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, I think ninety-five would have been the correct to...to utilize, but anyway I'd like to ask a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

What is the definition of a minority business and how will that be defined in...in trying to accomplish your goal here?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

I don't have the Act before me, Senator, but I...I would assume it has the same language as in past Acts which would include minority groups and females.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

So, in other words, as long as there's a principal owner or someone that's involved in the business is considered a

minority, then these...these particular businesses will qualify. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Senator, that is not the intent. Now it...it...for those kinds of businesses, there is a sanction in the law right now. I know that there has been some abuse in the past and we certainly want to eliminate that abuse, and I appreciate you bringing it up.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Absolutely, there's been considerable amount of abuse in this area where people just bring in a minority simply to...to comply with the Act and be able to bid on these projects. I just don't think this is a good idea to do this at this time and we're going from ten percent to thirty percent. That's a considerable jump and I just think that State dollars could be spent better. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Pawell for a second time.

SENATOR PAWELL:

Thank you. I apologize for raising a...a second time but according to this amendment, are we talking about the thirty percent of the remaining contracts must be given to minority and female contractors for the completion of McCormick Place? Is that what this amendment is attempting to do and...and nothing else?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

That's it, Senator, that's the goal.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Pawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

So we are not extending this to all State contracts, it's just for McCormick Place.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

This is a McCormick Place amendment, Senator, yes, only McCormick Place.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Just a question of the sponsor, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Senator Newhouse, how many prequalified minority owned or female owned contractors are there in the State of Illinois?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Senator, I...I really can't answer that question, because we...that's...to my knowledge, there is not such a listing.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Well, does the board require prequalifications of bidding contractors?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

I can't, of my knowledge, answer that question. I think the answer is yes, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

I was just going to say, everybody knows what this amendment is. There's no one on the Floor who doesn't know what the amendment is. You know if you're for it, you know if you're against it, let's shut up and vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Senate. I stand in support of this amendment. I think it's long overdue and since we have been in so much discourse about the McCormick Place and having served on the committee, I see the need for this to be...become a part of the total bill of the McCormick Place Center. I stand in support for it and I ask that we give a...favorable vote on this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Newhouse may close.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Senators. Let me make very clear what the purpose of the bill is. We have an asset at...at 22nd and...and...the...and the expressway which is adjacent to a community with a very high rate of unemployment. We have within earshot of that facility two training facilities; one is Dunbar High School which has been a historically great training ground for trades people; the other is the Dawson Skill Center. This sits in Senator Smith's district where the unemployment rate is high. We have youngsters there who ought to be qualifying and ought to be working every day, ought to be on the tax rolls and ought to be off the rolls of those of our social services. I would urge an Aye vote with hope we get a unanimous roll call on this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

HB 568
2nd Reading
Amend. # 15

All right. A roll call has, in fact, been requested. Senator Newhouse moves the adoption of Amendment 14 to House Bill 568. 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? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 27, the Nays are 25, none voting Present...Amendment No. 14 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 15 offered by Senator Macdonald.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Macdonald.

SENATOR MACDONALD:

Thank you, Mr. President. Last week when we were all together trying to deliberate what we should do about Arlington Park, I offered an amendment for all of the breakage that is the State's share which would not impact any individual track at all be given to Arlington Park. That was not acceptable to my colleagues on either side of the aisle, so today I am coming before you with this amendment and it is the amendment...the LRB number ends with AM29, and this, of course, again, is involved with breakage and with the Race Track Improvement Fund which statutorily is established for the sole purpose of reconstruction of grandstands or any part of a race track improvement that should need it. So we are now currently asking only fifty percent of such revenues that are deposited into the Race Track Breakage Fund to go to Arlington Park. Again, I reiterate, and as I was home over the weekend it became even clearer and clearer to me what a tragedy and what an important issue the rebuilding of Arlington Park is. Again I state to you that it is a premiere track not only in the border...within the borders of Illinois and one of the main and fundamental tracks for

thoroughbred racing in Illinois but it is also an internationally known track, and to...for Illinois to lose this when we are seeking to bring in other businesses and other industries and we would let a two billion dollar industry deteriorate because of lack of rebuilding of this fine facility would be just tragic. And I say to you, for what we have done for other industries coming into this State, certainly this is a small, small amount to ask for an...an...a race track of the magnitude of Arlington Park. So I ask for your support of this amendment and at least give them half of what they were asking for. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Senator, approximately how many dollars are you talking about and for what period of time? Are you talking about indefinite?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Macdonald.

SENATOR MACDONALD:

2.25 million for a period of five years.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

That's 2.25 million per year, right?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Macdonald.

SENATOR MACDONALD:

That's correct, Senator Collins.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Senator Macdonald, what was the profit last year of Arlington Park race track?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Macdonald.

SENATOR MACDONALD:

I don't have those figures, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

You indicated in your opening remarks that this breakage is needed...so that the funds can be used to build race...stands and et cetera. Now if you don't know what the profit was last...last year, why should we, the members of this General Assembly, be giving this to Arlington Park?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Macdonald.

SENATOR MACDONALD:

Senator Jones, the racing board would be able to give you in detail, I do not have that particular amount of money. I know that for the first time since these owners have taken over Arlington Park there was a profit that was made. I hesitate to give you the actual dollar amount because I really do not know. I know that...over the years...the...the last couple of years, they have poured back all of the money into their Arlington Million which is now known as the Miracle Million which is an international race which has helped all race tracks in terms of advertising thoroughbred racing in Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

...Senator...pardon me, Senator Macdonald. Senator Jones, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR JONES:

No, I was asking the sponsor a question of a...of a bill she presenting to us and seems as though she doesn't know the answer. See, I'm just one of the spear carriers, I wasn't in the meetings that took place as a...as a...as a legislator to who was going...going to vote on something of this nature. If we, the members and the...I would say a fifty...fifty-seven...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Pardon me, Senator Jones. If we could have some order, please. Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

You see, there was no hearings on this. I...some back room deal that was closed, I think the membership should have the right to know when you're talking about giving someone some money. Now...and we talking about eleven million dollars, that's not chump change. So, what I'm asking you and I think we're entitled to know...that is, you present a bill to us about the breakage funds going to Arlington Park. Does the breakage funds come from all the race tracks in Illinois that are going to be going solely to Arlington Park, am I correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Macdonald.

SENATOR MACDONALD:

The...the breakage that would...half of the breakage goes to the tracks, all of the tracks would keep that. Arlington Park contributes about a million eight hundred and eighty thousand dollars nine hundred and forty. This is about twenty percent of the breakage; that is...they contribute twenty percent of the breakage and they are asking for the

State's share. They were...in my first amendment, that was the share they were asking for. It does not disturb the breakage that it goes to the other tracks.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Channel 7 has also requested, out of Chicago, to...to...videotape the proceedings. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Well,...well, Senator, evidently, you are presenting a bill to us that you don't know anything about which is really terrible, because we...we, the members, and I, for one, would have liked to have an opportunity to bring the...all this in to sit down to discuss so we could know exactly what's what. Actually, what you want us to do is buy a pig wrapped in a blanket, and I as a...as a legislator who represents a constituency in the State of Illinois am not accustomed to voting that way. The track improvement funds that come...that goes to all track, will Arlington Park still benefit from the track improvement funds other than this breakage that you are asking for?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Macdonald.

SENATOR MACDONALD:

Of course, the track will...benefit from the...the same, equally as all of the other tracks will; and in addition to that, we are asking that they get half of the...of the State's share of the breakage for Arlington Park, half of the four and a half million dollars...or 4.5 million.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Jones, your time has almost expired. Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Gee, I...I thought I had at least ten minutes. I...well, actually...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, Senator Jones, we would be glad to come back and pick you up on the second opportunity. Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES

...I...I will conclude because...as I indicated in my remarks, something of this magnitude should have been heard by members of this Body. I don't think any deal of this nature that was closed in some back room should be brought before the members of this Senate and have us vote on it to give...to give the people at Arlington Park the amount of money that the sponsor is asking for. I feel that as a legislator who want to vote...intelligently on the subject matter, we should know certain facts. Did...did Arlington Park make money last year? Each one of the owners are millionaires, they're not paupers. If we...how much profit did they make? Is it a corporation? Maybe the corporation lost money last year but how much salary did the four owners make, the chairman, the...the president, the vice-president and the...and the chief executive...officer? Were they paid a salary of five hundred thousand dollars a year? A million dollars at...year last year? We don't know this here, no member in here knows the exact...figures as to what's going on...on at Arlington Park; and when you talk about the breakage funds, all the tracks across the State contribute to the Breakage Fund but these funds will go directly to Arlington Park, these...half of the funds will go to Arlington Park. And on top of it, another thing that is quite disturbing to me is what...what is happening to all the insurance money for the race track? No member in here other than maybe yourself, Senator, and maybe a couple of other individuals who sat down in a back room deal to cut this deal for Arlington Park, we, the members, have not been privy to that, and you can't even give us the answer to such but yet and still you come here and ask us to give these poor little fellows who haven't got

any money, give them all these benefits and ask us to vote for something like that. It's very...unfair to each and every...one of us on this Senate Floor, and I think this amendment should be defeated.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Thank you, for being brief. There's about one, two,...about eight or nine additional speakers. Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I think we better get realistic. If that track is not rebuilt, there's nine hundred jobs out on the line, there are twenty-seven hundred breeding industry jobs now at risk; and I might inform my colleague, whom I dearly love, on the other side that we're not here to insult...the sponsor of an amendment that is very critical. The amendment reduces the demand, the...request that was made by the track by half for only five years. I might also remind all of us that in support of the rebuilding for Arlington Park Race Track are the teamsters' locals, the carpenters' locals, the operating engineers' locals, the laborers' locals, the glaziers, the painters' district council, ironworkers' district council, IBW and a whole flock of union organizations besides the business organizations. In...in addition, let me tell you something, the rebuilding the track will mean the...the...the existence...continued existence of another four or five thousand jobs that are springoffs from the track operations. What you don't realize, perhaps, is the fact that the track finally has come out of the red but not much, because these people who own the track at the present time, and I might say the main owner of the track lives in Illinois, plowed their money back in to improve the track and its conditions and also to...to make it more palatable for the people. I can tell you right now, when you consider the income the track

brings in to the State of Illinois for its Agricultural Fund and what have you, what we're asking here, what...Senator Macdonald...is asking here is minimal compared to what we will be taking in. I urge support of this amendment because I think it's necessary...for us to keep in mind, we need jobs, jobs, jobs and we shouldn't try to eliminate them, and I support this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Friedland. Senator Friedland. Senator Friedland at Senator Mahar's desk.

SENATOR FRIEDLAND:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I rise to support the sponsor in her efforts to promote the continuity of nine hundred vital jobs in her area, very, very many of which are minority. You know, this twenty...a little over two million that she's asking for to help reestablish a premier track in our country, it wouldn't keep the aldermen in cigars in there, and I'm sure they spill that much about once a week in McCormick Place. So do the right thing, support this amendment, you'll feel better about it tomorrow. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I have a parliamentary inquiry. Mr. President, Amendment No. 15 deals with the horse racing industry in this State, and can we have a ruling as to the germaneness?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Weaver, House Bill 568 deals with the subject of encourage in economic development in Illinois. The amendment...Amendment No. 15, that you have mentioned, seeks to encourage the development of horse racing in this State via

various tax surcharges and breakage proposals. Because of the subject of the...amendments relates to the subject of the bill, Amendment No. 15 is, in fact, germane. Further discussion? Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Well, thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Well, remarks of some of the...prior speakers I think should be put in context. The question was asked how much do the principals of this operation make; I think it's safe to answer, lots, but that begs the question. The sponsor of the amendment was called the...a spear carrier and, indeed, she is, and the person making the remark has himself been called a spear carrier as we all have for our districts, and we have to put that into an economic context when we say that. And certainly there have been references to a back room deal, I would suggest that perhaps we all ought to support the amendment if only to get a picture of our colleague, Ginny Macdonald, in a brown derby and a panatela. But I think in a more serious vein, this is part of economic development and certainly there was no harm in supporting this amendment, because, as you know, it's a bicameral Legislature and the case must be made in both Houses. And it's my judgment that something that generates as much by way of jobs and the ripple effect throughout the economy of that part of our State should be supported by us, because a very important part of jobs is job retention and something that sometimes get lost...gets lost sight of in the context of Mitsubishi and other issues. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DENUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Berman. Senator Berman. Senator Berman, we're having trouble with your mike, at Senator Dawson's desk.

SENATOR BERMAN:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he...she will yield. Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

All right. Senator Macdonald, last week I think I was disturbed and a number of our colleagues were disturbed that as soon as the four and half million dollar amendment on breakage went down, a press release was issued by the park saying that they're not going to rebuild. Can you tell me the position of the owners as to whether that press statement has been withdrawn? What is their position today as...as we stand now? Are they going to rebuild or they not going to rebuild?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Macdonald.

SENATOR MACDONALD:

Senator Berman, as I understand it and as I observed to one of the press corps, the gentlemen who are owners of Arlington Race Track are not politicians, they are businessmen, and I would say to you that they have stated as recently as this weekend that as things stand now there is not an incentive for them to rebuild. However, as all of us know in this Body, we...many of us will accept a lesser amount or a half a loaf. It is my hope that in passing this amendment we will certainly offer an incentive. While it was not in your hearts or in your best judgment to offer them all of the breakage, which statutorily does goes for the rebuilding of any race track that would be imperilled as Arlington Race Park is, I believe that at least we must offer these people...the owners of this track an incentive to come; and while it is only half of what the full breakage would be, the percentage of the breakage, the fifty percent breakage that goes to the State revenue, at least we are in this amendment offering them half of that amount. It will have to be their judgment at that time. This amendment had not been on this

package when we talked to them over the weekend.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Berman, your time has almost expired. Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

...it was a long question to a short...a long answer to a short question. Then, Senator Macdonald, am I correct that you have no commitment from the owners of Arlington Park that even if this bill...if this amendment is adopted and passed on and signed by the Governor that they, in fact, would rebuild. Is that correct?

SENATOR MACDONALD:

That is correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Macdonald. All right. Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Well, let me tell you, it bothered me...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

...Senator Berman, may I interrupt you for a moment? WCIA-TV has requested permission to videotape. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Yeah, it bothered me last week with their press release response to what I think was a fair deliberation by this Body. We have given Arlington Park...and many of us value them as an industry in this State. We passed a substantial amendment that gave them benefits to rebuild, and then when we turned...turned down a request for four and a half million dollars out of general revenue, in their pique, they issue a press release and said they're walking out of Illinois. On top of that, they come back this week with this and without even a...a fair, good faith response to say, give us this, we need this and we'll stay. I'm not prepared to vote for this unless I know what their position is going to be. So until I

know that, my vote is going to be No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Coffey.

SENATOR COFFEY:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. I rise in favor of this amendment. As a downstater and taking a look at this whole program, it seems to me if there's one thing we could do in the best of the State is support this amendment. And, Senator Jones, the...my understanding is that the...the building of the...to rebuild Arlington Park would be used from the insurance money, but that insurance money can be used...to be invested any place, either in the State or outside the State and I think that's what the discussion should be about. Is it important to the State of Illinois for that...to be rebuilding Illinois and is a reasonable amount of profit...do they deserve a reasonable amount of profit? And I think that's what the question is all about. I think it's...and if we want to have...to come down to testify in Arlington Park, I would say that maybe we ought to have some of them come down and testify the McCormick Center, except I don't think we have that much time; because since I've been here for twelve years, that's what we've done is throw money at McCormick Center and it seems to have not solved the problem and, yet, something here when we see a fifty, sixty million dollar reinvestment into the State, we want to turn our backs on it. I think it's a good amendment, I think we ought to support it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to clear up a couple of points. First of all, Senator Jones, there's nothing sinister about this amendment. The place burned down after we got out of Session. This is not a mushroom amendment kept

in the dark and fertilized, it's an open amendment. It's been discussed previously. What's different is the dollar amount. As I pointed out last week, if you have four apartment buildings and one burns down and the person is ask to rebuild at a much higher cost without getting any greater income than what the other three do, that's a serious consideration. But what I would like to add, as it happens in those apartment complexes, if one doesn't get rebuilt, there goes the neighborhood. It could conceivably be that if Arlington doesn't get rebuilt, there goes horse racing.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Chew.

SENATOR CHEW:

Thanks, Mr. President. I was a little disturbed at the ultimatum that was issued by the owners of Arlington Park, 'cause I voted for the legislation that Phil Rock floated through here with good faith. But I thought maybe the people of Arlington Park would have learned a little lesson from those stupid statements that were made by the board at McCormick Place, that we just don't scare down here and maybe if they would have shut their mouths, they would of had the goodies before now. So when you issue these threats as to whether you will or will not build if we don't give you the entire State of Illinois, well, the fact is, we don't really care whether you rebuild or not, because I hear that we're going to build a track in Chicago if those millionaires do not want to build in Arlington Park. And the other thing to the gentlemen who said we were out of Session when Arlington Park burned down, well, I'd like to serve notice on you that we should not sit around here waiting for a crisis to happen in order to put some money into it. That's not what we were elected to do and since we went on record in helping a few down and out companies to revive themselves, every time you have a fire in a two-flat building, there's a group of people

running down to try and get money from the revenue fund. Well, that's not the purpose of the revenue fund, the State is not in the business of racing, because if we were to give up everything to Arlington Park and according to what they generate in taxes, one would wash out the other, so nobody is doing anybody any favor and I'm prepared to vote against this amendment, and I think that people on this side should do likewise. All...all good thinking people should do likewise and that includes the other side.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes, thank you, and I...I apologize for rising a second time because I've listened here to all of the speakers, but I think there's something very fundamental that this whole Body is missing in this whole debate. I don't think it's a question of whether or not the State of Illinois or we, as legislators, are to assume the responsibility for providing incentives and, yes, outright support to...or maintain businesses...or to encourage businesses to come to Illinois. But I think this whole issue has gotten out of hand here. We're not talking about that. Given the fact that no matter how crude the questions were raised by Senator Jones, those were valid questions. The question is, if whether or not Arlington Park, in fact, needs additional monies added to the insurance policy in order to rebuild that track. A question has not been answered. I don't even think it's been raised not even once among...those persons who are adamantly supporting providing support to them to stay in Illinois. It seem to be more than...than whether or not they should stay. It...it seem to be...well, it doesn't matter how much it costs no matter what our losses may be, we're not even interested in you making up our losses. We're interested in your paying us or we will seize this opportunity to get some money

out of the State for you to support us to further ensure...a...a...a greater return on our investment. And it is not a question of whether we need the money or not, it is a question of whether or not we take the insurance money and invest it in another state or whether or not we stay here in Illinois. I think that is unfair and I think that is the key issue that we ought to...seriously think about when we...before we vote on this amendment. The other...other thing that I...I would just like to clarify here for the record, someone indicated that there were nine hundred jobs. There no proof that there are nine hundred jobs out there and...and the same speaker indicated that most of those jobs were minority. Well, I think his...his figures of nine hundred jobs are probably as pathetic as they are mostly minorities, because we all know that that is not true. So I think you ought to really, really defeat this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the presence of the Attorney General, Neil Hartigan, on the floor, welcome to the Senate. Further discussion? Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I would imagine that the only thing that really disturbs the people of Illinois that we're still in Session and, basically, we're supposed to be gone two weeks ago and, unfortunately, this debate has lasted on this subject and three or four other subjects an extraordinary length of time. But maybe it needs to be said, needs to be done, and I would hope that the people of Illinois would realize that there are members in this Assembly that are trying to address the issues as they see would benefit all the people of Illinois. The lady's amendment does exactly that and what she's trying to say that, yes, she had an amendment last week that was

defeated because this Assembly thought that the amount of money was quite excessive. It was approximately forty-five million dollars going to one track over a ten-year period of time. What this amendment does, it provides eleven million dollars in tax relief in a five-year period of time, a...a substantial difference between the two amendments and the approach; and for that reason, I...I believe this amendment should be adopted. It's a...approach that Arlington Park has justified to many members here with the packets that you received. If you had an opportunity to read it, as I did, you would see that this is the bottom line that they're looking for in relief and I would hope that they would remain in this State and provide the necessary revenue and employment that they have. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Can we have some order, please. Further discussion? Senator Jones for a second time.

SENATOR JONES:

Yeah, thank you, Mr. President, and I apologize for rising a second time and to my...my good friend, Senator Macdonald, let me say this. My remarks was not intended to be personal toward you as a person, because you know the respect I have for you; but in speaking as one of the members in this Body, I feel that to intelligently vote on a subject of this magnitude, once you have the opportunity to at least question the partners and discuss this issue, I wish the minority leader and...had come to the President and you yourself appoint a special select committee to hold hearings on this issue, because it's not a question...it's not a question as to whether or not they're going to build here or go elsewhere; the question is whether this is needed for them to stay, and...and these additional dollars as has already come out in testimony that they don't need these additional dollars for them to stay in Illinois. They are

multimillionaires, you...and you did not tell us whether or not they lost money last year. From reports that I've read, they were supposedly have lost a million dollars last year, but that may be the corporation may have lost a million dollars but the owners drew their salary 'cause they have made three or four million dollars. But had we had the opportunity to look into this, then we could vote intelligently on this subject matter. I received a packet from Arlington Park. I read the packet but, by the same token, I don't believe everything that I read. I should at least have the opportunity to question this private enterprise...it's not a public enterprise, it's a private enterprise and not only will they get this money, they're going to make maybe three or four million dollars in profit off the bets that will be made to Arlington Park. And what are they going to do with their insurance money if they get this money, 'cause the insurance money is supposed to rebuild Arlington Park? What are you going to do, put it in their pockets?. I don't know this here and anyone voting on this subject matter cannot vote intelligently on this subject matter. I intend to vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAPFER:

Well, not that anybody really follows the debate in this Body or the other Body and perhaps they shouldn't, but it's kind of amusing to me that we...we seem to today have a tail of two facilities, one that generates no tax money to the State of Illinois and has cost us vast sums of money that has been mismanaged, and that we see...hopefully, some hope in the future, but most of us aren't too optimistic, that's in the midst of a major disaster that they caused, that they brought upon themselves from mismanagement. On the other hand, we see another facility that has a problem that was not

of their making, that was beyond their control, a facility which doesn't normally cost the State a dime, that generates tax money, and they're asking for a portion of the breakage that they in large part or an largest part generate back. It seems like a reasonable request. It seems like a small dollar request, it's a fraction of what we're about to put in the cesspool by the lake. It is a mistake to let this facility go. Who cares...when they say they are going to go to another state? That's laughable. What they can do is they can sit on their money and sell that area for a shopping center or an industrial park and five or ten years from now it'll be developed and who will lose? Well, the State will lose. The State will lose the money that that premier race track generates and for us to sit by and let that happen for whatever motivation, and most of the motivation I detect is less than candid would be a mistake. This is a facility that will continue to generate money to the taxpayers of this State and...continue to provide funds for causes we all vote for, and without it, maybe a few people in some of the other race tracks will prosper but we as citizens of the State will not, and there's no reason in the world why this reasonable compromise should not be adopted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Rock. Can we have some order please.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I rise in support of Amendment No. 15, and as I indicated last week when we successfully adopted Amendment No. 4, the question is one of incentive, an incentive to assure or ensure a reasonable return on one's investment; and, by the way, Senator Schaffer, it's not quite fair, in my judgment, to say that McCormick Place does not generate any tax revenue. It's been roughly estimated that, at the

moment, it's worth about forty-five million dollars in tax revenue to the State of Illinois, and with the expansion we hope, obviously, that will double because the floor space will be doubled, that's another issue. The point is, are we to afford an incentive to the rebuilding on that three hundred acres out in Arlington Park? The people of Arlington Heights, the people of the northwest suburbs have made it clear, I think, by virtue of the petitions they circulated that they want to...afford an incentive and what is the incentive. The incentive is a reasonable return on an investment, whether you're going to invest seventy million or a hundred million, one ought to be in a position, much the same, I might add, as...as the kinds of incentives which we afforded to the Mitsubishi Corporation. A little later this afternoon I hope we'll be voting on a supplemental appropriation request. Part of that request has a flat four to eight million dollars to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs for Mitsubishi. What we said I think we said correctly last week, forty-five million dollars over ten years, that's too much. This is not at all unreasonable and this, I hope, will move the whole package off the dime and over to the House. I urge an Aye vote on Amendment No. 15.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Macdonald may close.

SENATOR MACDONALD:

Thank you, Mr. President. Through a tragedy that was of an enormous magnitude, the premier race track of Illinois which is Arlington Park, burned and it is true that the insurance money for that track can rebuild the track; but this is a business, a two billion dollar industry in Illinois and running a race track is a business, and without the insurance...or without the incentives other than the insurance that they have that will rebuild the track, it would be

impossible for these collection of investors to reinvest in that Arlington Park facility. The most they can make with all of the incentives that we have given them would be a little over a million dollars. I would like to read you what Arlington Park alone generated in Illinois in 1984. We cannot use 1985 because those figures are not available since the track burned in the middle of the year. The privilege tax generated to the State twelve million one hundred and fifty-one thousand dollars. The real estate tax locally generated one million two hundred and sixty-one thousand and the total was exactly that. The breakage of uncashed checks was one million two hundred and six thousand, State payroll was five hundred and forty-one thousand, sales tax, four hundred and sixty-four thousand total, sixty-six thousand locally; admission tax is a hundred and twenty-eight thousand three hundred and nineteen total. Now, the license fees were forty thousand dollars. These figures do not include the taxes that were generated by the nine hundred jobs, Senator Jones, that are at Arlington Park and with the rebuilding of the track, it will multiply and become much more than nine hundred jobs; otherwise, the Illinois AFL-CIO, the Chicago Federation of Labor, the Illinois Building Trades Conference and the Chicago Cook County Building and Construction Trades Council would not have been so strongly behind the rebuilding of Arlington Race Track. This rebuilding of this track means jobs to Illinois. When that is one of the biggest issues in our economy today is to generate jobs, to deliberately because of pique or pettiness allow this facility to leave Illinois would be unconscionable and I ask for your support. It is only half of what our original request was for them and I urge your support and your vote for this very important money as an incentive to rebuild the premiere race track of Illinois, Arlington Park Race Track.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DENUZIO)

All right. Senator Macdonald has moved the adoption of Amendment 15 to House Bill 568. A roll call has been requested. Senator Macdonald moves the adoption of Amendment No. 15 to House Bill 568. 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 30, the Nays are 24, none voting Present...Amendment No. 15 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 16 offered by Senator DeAngelis and the last four characters is AM32.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

...Senator Rock, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR ROCK:

I was going to...ask the gentleman if he would be kind enough to withdraw that one.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

I will be so kind.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator DeAngelis withdraws Amendment No. 16. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 16 offered by Senator Philip. The last four characters on the LRB number is AM30.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. As you know, during the last Session, the General Assembly in its wisdom passed a bill allowing the voters of DuPage County to conceivably put on a one-quarter cent sales

tax for the purpose of City of Chicago water. As you know, our voters acted at the last election and better than two to one it passed. Unfortunately, what we did was also include the quarter-cent sales tax to apply to food and drugs. As you know...to be consistent, we ought to have it the...same as the State. What this does is remove that quarter-cent from food and drugs which we intended to be. It's some two million dollars a year. I suppose the water commission could spend it, but if there's any questions, I'd be happy to answer it. I move the adoption of Amendment No...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

16.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Well, whatever it is. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Weaver, for what purpose...Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Once again,...once again, Mr. President, I question the germaneness of Amendment No. 16 to House Bill 568.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, Senator Weaver, we've looked long and hard at this amendment. This bill deals with the subject of economic development. Amendment No. 17 deals with the subject...16...Amendment 16 deals with the subject of providing water for DuPage County which is necessary for industrial development. The amendment, therefore, is relevant to economic development, is therefore germane. Further discussion? If not, Senator Philip has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 16 to House Bill 568. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 16 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 17, by Senator Rock. The last four char-

acters, AM04.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is again a technical amendment, it does three things. It allows the bond proceeds from general obligation bonds to be used by the Capital Development Board for public library facilities. It expands the purposes for which the Build Illinois bonds may be issued, and although current statutory provisions do not expressly authorize the above expenditures, we included these categories in the appropriation. This is a technical cleanup. I know of no objection and I would move the adoption of Amendment No. 17.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? If not, Senator Rock has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 17 to House Bill 568. Those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 17 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 18 offered by Senator Keats. The last four characters are AM50.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Keats.

END OF REEL

REEL #2

SENATOR KEATS:

I am not going to call the amendment at this time but I was going to mention, that amendment was on the Floor the other day when we adjourned and I...I didn't want to raise a lot of trouble about it right now because we sort of are rolling along; but I found it interesting that an amendment that was on the Floor was withdrawn and moved to the end of the list without ever checking with the sponsor or the members. It's an interesting procedure that we've often followed and I don't know that I accept it, but for the moment, I'm not going to make a lot of noise.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, Senator Keats, there was an amendment prior to yours when Senator...of Senator Newhouse's when we adjourned so...all right. You...you wish to have this amendment considered or withdrawn? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Just leave it for the time being...in case the bill comes back to this reading and...the way thing's going we may hear it again on 2nd reading.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Keats...all right. Senator Keats withdraws Amendment No. 18. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 18, by Senator Marovitz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Marovitz. Amendment No. 18. You want to give them the LRB number, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Last four characters of the LRB No. is AM01.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Marovitz, there were, in fact, two amendments withdrawn that's why we are now on Senate Amendment 19.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Oh, so this is it. Okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

...Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Okay, fine. Thank you, very much. I was under the impression it was Amendment 20 but now I understand. Okay. Amendment No. 19 essentially does...a similar thing that we did last year with the Public Utility Act, and it extends the conflict of interest provisions which are already in Senator DeAngelis' and Senator Philip's amendment. It extends that to former board members for two years after the effective date of the amendatory Act and two years after they ceased being a member of the board, so that not only would current board members not be able to have a conflict of interest or profit from contracts, et cetera, but former board members for two years would have the same restriction. We did this last year in the Public Utility Act; in fact, we even went further, we prohibited employment by members of the Commerce Commission, we're doing that here with former board members, and if, indeed, we want to really clean up the system, I think this will do that and it will...it will ensure the public that those...thus...those individuals that were members of the board during which time this crisis arose will not be able to be in a position of conflict of interest for two years from the date their term ceased. I would ask for adoption of this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? If not, Senator Marovitz has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 19 to House Bill 568. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it.

Amendment No. 18 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 19 offered by Senator Philip.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Philip, Amendment No. 19. The LRB No., Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

...last four characters, AM98.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is once again...Senate Amendment No. 11 is now Senate Amendment No. 18...severability clause and puts all of the amendments in order. Move its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator...Senator Philip has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 19 to House Bill 568. Any discussion? If not, those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 19 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

3rd reading. Resolutions, Mr. Secretary. With leave of the Body, we'll go to that order of business. Senator Hudson, for what...what purpose do you arise? Senator Hudson.

SENATOR HUDSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I do have a motion filed and I wondered if you were on that...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, we'll get there...we'll get there directly...leave of the Body, we'll go to the Order of Resolutions. Is leave

HB 568
Recalled

granted? Leave is granted. Resolutions, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Resolution 588 offered by Senator Lemke. It's congratulatory.

589, Senator...Senator Zito. It's congratulatory.

590, by Senator Zito. It's congratulatory.

And 591, by Senator Berman and it's congratulatory.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Consent Calendar. Leave of the Body, we'll go to the Order of...of House Bills 3rd Reading. Mr. Secretary, House Bill 568.

SECRETARY:

House Bill 568.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator...Senator Philip. All right...Senator Carroll, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR CARROLL:

If we could have leave to go to the Order of Motions, I have filed a motion with the Secretary.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, Senator Carroll, we have moved House Bill 568 to the...Senator...Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

For the specific purpose of discharging a bill from Appropriations I that was on the Order of 3rd Reading so we can put it in place to move those requests of the Governor and others for supplemental appropriations. I have caused to be filed a motion that the Senate Appropriations I Committee be discharged from further consideration of House Bill 526, and that it be placed on the Order of 3rd Reading. If we could have leave to go to that order for that purpose.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well...let's take House Bill 568 out of the record for a few moments while the discussion is...is proceeding. Take 568 out of the record, Mr. Secretary. Senator Carroll has moved to discharge the Appropriations Committee I from further consideration of House Bill 526 and that it be placed on the Order of the Calendar of 2nd Reading...3rd Reading. That is where it was recommitted from. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. House Bill 526 will show up on the Calendar on the Order of 3rd Reading. Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Well, while the amendment is being distributed we'd like to give everybody the opportunity to glance at it for a few minutes, at that point then we will recall it to 2nd for purposes of an amendment with leave of the Body.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Is there leave of the Body to get back to this when the amendment is distributed? Leave is granted. Senator Bloom, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR BLOOM:

A question of Senator Carroll.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Is the amendment that is in the process of being...distributed the same document a copy of which has been distributed to our staff quite recently today? Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

...the answer is probably yes, and I think they should look at it quickly, it should be exactly what they have seen. There are no surprises to my knowledge and it is...in line

with what the conferees had specifically approved of and nothing they had not approved of and nothing additional on which there were phone calls but not a meeting. So it is exactly what would have been signed had the House began its typing and sent over the Conference Committee report for signature.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

For the record, Mr. President, there were some issues that were left open that were to be discussed basically bucked up to the leaders, and at least as late as Friday there were several versions of this particular document. So, I...I'm suggesting it puts us at a disadvantage because as far as...as far as I'm...concerned, I am unaware of any agreement that has been reached at least involving President Rock and Minority Leader Philip and His Excellency, the Governor, on some of those issues that we left open, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well...the amendment I...I assume is being distributed. Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Yes, I think as you'll see it, you'll see it is what the staff had received. The issue...and we can go through it more directly when we actually discuss the amendment, but the...issue of farm aid that we had left to the leadership, the leadership has gotten back to us, at least in this Chamber, and indicated that the bill that would be leaving the Senate would be the version we would be using and that was added to the...this amendment that had been left to the leadership at the Conference Committee level. It is my understanding that those other issues that we had discussed that we had suggested the leaders get back to the conferees, they have indicated that there have been no such agreements

HB 568
Revised

and those are not included and can be done at some other time if agreements are ever reached, but it shouldn't hold up everything else while we await. And, again, I would suggest as you go through them and as we get to that order of business, we can discuss it in much more detail.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Well, I understand but it...it...it appears to be...you know, it appears to be a little one sided and there are some things...well, let's wait till the bill itself is...up...we've engaged in...some degree of foreplay but it was our understanding that perhaps leadership...well, I guess what I'm suggesting, Senator Carroll is, what, no foreplay?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Philip, are you ready to proceed?
Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I have another amendment coming up. Evidently there has been some confusing...confusion on when...where the sales tax from the cigarette is supposed to go. Evidently what we have drafted does not put all of it in this Common School Fund. I'm going to have an amendment to change that to put the entire amount of money in the Common School Fund. So it should be up here shortly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right.

PRESIDENT:

All right, with leave of the Body, we'll return to the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading. House Bill 568, Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President. I ask leave to go back to 2nd

reading for the purpose of a amendment.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Philip seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 568 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, Mr. Secretary, House Bill 568.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 20 offered by Senator Maitland. The last four characters in the LRB No., AM45.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Last Friday when we debated the issue of the cigarette tax, there was quite a bit of concern expressed by this Body with respect to the six thousand dollar figure that was contained in...in that amendment and there was some sentiment, I believe, to allocate as much as possible all that revenue generated by the new tax for the Common School Fund. And I believe that that's a good idea and think that that might be more acceptable, more palatable and, therefore, would move the adoption of Amendment No. 20 to House Bill 568.

PRPRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Maitland has moved the adoption of House...of Amendment No. 20 to House Bill 568. Discussion? Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of this amendment. This is what many of us have been urging since last June and July. I strongly support Amendment No. 20.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just a quick question of the President. With the bill back on 2nd reading there were several motions filed, are you intending to come to those?

PRESIDENT:

There is only one motion filed and I...if you would be so kind as to withdraw it, we would deeply appreciate it but the answer is yes. Any further discussion on Amendment No. 20? If not, Senator Maitland moves the adoption of Amendment No. 20 to House Bill 568. All in favor of the adoption of the amendment indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Motions in writing, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which Senate Amendment No. 17 to House Bill 568 was adopted. Signed, Senator Keats.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

I would ask that we withdraw it, I just appreciate the courtesy of it being called. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

You are welcome. Motion is withdrawn. Further amendments, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. Senator Carroll, should we proceed to put the amendment on 526? On the Order of House Bills 3rd

Reading is House Bill 526. Senator Carroll seeks leave of the Body to return that bill 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 526, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Carroll.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This amendment incorporates those items that the conferees of the Conference Committee on supplemental appropriations had been dealing with over several weeks. I believe we have caused to be distributed copies so that the members are aware of the hundred and eight sections that are within this bill. Let me just say that where the Governor had asked for some one hundred and ninety-six, almost one hundred ninety-seven million of general revenue appropriations, this would now appropriate about eighty-two million of general revenue and would make the other appropriations from capital development, public utility and Federal funds. We have attempted to capture all Federal funds that are available to the various agencies of State Government and have reviewed the request of operating government with a very sharp eye and pencil to say that those that are absolutely essential because of new legislation or crises or emergency situations should, in fact, be considered and all others should be carried in the March fiction book. We, I think, had met long and hard in trying to develop a reasonable plan. It has been identified that it is quite lopsided and I agree; the Governor got about ninety percent of the money for those projects that are now being incorporated into the supplemental whether they be operating or capital. There is one

item where we must identify the legislative intent and that is the ten thousand for...use in government...Youth in Government for their meeting. That is the intent of the General Assembly that that money be used for lodging. I would answer any questions and ask for a favorable vote. Let me further identify that these are the ones that are in agreement or in which legislation has passed the Senate.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Carroll has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 526. Discussion? Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. What Senator Carroll tells you is accurate insofar as it goes. We have worked long and hard and this does represent most of the items of agreement. However, unfortunately...unfortunately, it is unacceptable still, we don't feel that it is a particularly reasonable document. So we would ask the members on this side of the aisle to resist this amendment or if it does go on, to resist 526 at this point. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDENT:

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

I don't see the marina in Zion. Am I correct in missing it?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

If you'll look out the window and turn left...aside from

that, it is not in this bill, no...no. There are other member projects that are not in...in the opinion of the conferees crises are essential, and I understand that the marina may have been one of those issues. There were many members who wanted us to go to fifty-two percent of need for those on public assistance and starving. We attempted to put that in the budget, the...the Republican side said if that was in the supplemental they would not sign a report and there would be no votes. So we backed off of the demand that people who are starving be given some adequate consideration by merely going six million dollars for the people to get to fifty-two percent of need, we received no support from that side of the aisle and we said, hey, if that's the case, this is an emergency Session...if that's the case, if a true emergency, a true crisis cannot be handled...other things that are capital projects that are things like boat slips can wait a little while. There are six and a half million dollars in that account for the marina that has not yet been obligated, not a dime. The planning has not begun. Why are we worrying about something that's supposed to be constructed next October, I repeat that, next October, when planning hasn't even begun, not a dime of the six and a half million we have already given them has been obligated. Let's see what they do first by way of planning, then we can look at it when we're taking care of the whole needs of government.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Well, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I'm rather appalled to see that the loan, because that's exactly what it is, the loan of funds to the marina has been eliminated from this bill when this money is needed together with the six and a half million dollars to get the plans completed so that we can break ground the coming year. This

means a loss of a lot of jobs in my area, we have had distressed areas from the north end of my county through Waukegan, through North Chicago, which is the south end of my district, and this...this is just absolutely appalling to me because the Senator well knows that there is a need for a marina. You have Detroit that has thousands of slips. We don't have enough slips here in Illinois to accommodate the people who go out and put their boats in Wisconsin and Indiana and Michigan and spend the money there instead of bringing it here and spending it here to improve the economy here. I feel this is very wrong, very, very, wrong. And I do hope that the Senator, for whom I have the highest respect, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, would withdraw this bill and put the amendment on for the marina. You know it means jobs and more jobs and that's the bottom line, that's what we're here for. So I do hope you will reconsider; otherwise, I will be forced to vote against this amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. I have to concur with Senator Carroll, and this matter was thoroughly discussed. The issue is whether you want to spend twenty million dollars for boats and boat owners or have a possibility of providing an inadequate amount of money for public aid recipients. And since we couldn't provide either...money for either project, we thought that the Conference Committee would make a recommendation that the six million dollars that presently is in the budget for planning of that marina would remain and they could obligate that money and use the money for planning, come back to the General Assembly in this coming year, not the Veto Session, not the Supplementary Budget Session but in the normal course of business when it can evaluate the whole

project again after the planning is completed. If you want to be in the same position with this marina as we are McCormick Place at twenty-four percent planning and making projections, go right ahead and do so, but I don't want to be in that position. I want to get all the planning in one hundred percent and see exactly what's involved. If you're interested in having boaters have slips for their boats, then vote this down. But I want you to go back to your people and explain that to your constituency that you vote...you did not vote a supplemental budget because you're interested in boat slips, go ahead and do so. I intend to support Senator Carroll because he's right, and I would hope that you look at it from a very practical viewpoint and vote your conscience.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senator, I'm appalled and the reason I'm appalled is that what has been the eternal question that we have said...and, Senator Bloom, you and...we sat around the table up there for hours and how you can say today that the primary...thing that we should be concerned with is to take care of the poor, the needy, the sick, the elderly. It's fine for all these other things, but to sit here and say that we cannot find six million dollars out of everything that we have appropriated here to take care of fifty-two percent of need. We left here at the close of this Session with a budget of 19.5 billion dollars and all of you are aware that it takes a thousand million to make a billion. And yet, we come back here, and what does the Governor present us with? It started out with three hundred eleven million. We finally came down to where he's getting close to a hundred and ninety million dollars. Ninety percent of that is money that's going to go to be used for things around this State and we

cannot find six million dollars to take care of the poor, the elderly, the indigent, the people who have labored in the vineyards. I don't know, it's just shocking to me to think in this great country of ours today we have people who wake up, no heat in the house, no electricity; children, no food in the house, and we sit here and we're going to do all these other things that you want, buildings, refurbishing, race tracks, all these things, we're supporting those, so far we have, up to a point; but the point that happens is that we have suffered long, long, hours of trying to come to make a meeting of the minds. I'm not happy with everything in here but the point is to give in to other people and say that we have people here in this great State that we care less about because unfortunately they have lost their jobs, have other things. And remember, you can fly high today but that same thing could happen to you; tomorrow you might have to turn and be in that state. So I would say and ask everyone to support and put this amendment on this bill.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, Mr. President, I'd like to ask the sponsor a question, if I may.

PRESIDENT:

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

You know, our analysis here on Section 40 under Capital Development Board talks about a...a reappropriation of twenty some...some twenty-seven and a half million dollars to CDB for school construction projects. Could you explain what that is all about?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Yes, Senator Watson. This is the amounts that we had carried forward as a reappropriations for several years for the School Construction Fund. We had downstate schools and school construction bonds to the tune of some 3.7 million on line and ready to go where the local match had been met. For a long time the City of Chicago had not taxed itself in order to match its portion of those funds that had been earmarked for that purpose. About a year ago, the city did so tax its people in order to create its match. For some strange reason in last year's budget the reappropriation, and I repeat that it was a reappropriation, that had been carried forward for about ten years was not in the budget document as submitted by the Governor. We, therefore, corrected that error both in the Chicago line and in the downstate line allocating those monies on which the locals had taxed to meet their match. The Governor vetoed that and we had attempted to override unsuccessfully and have put it back into the supplemental because once again, this was not new, fresh ideas but rather the continuation of prior commitments in that it was a reappropriation. This would allow about nine schools to be built in Chicago assuming again, which is already there, the local tax, and four schools downstate.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, Senator, I'm under the impression that the downstate schools that were in this 3.7 million are now out and they've been taken care of by another appropriation. Senator Carroll.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

This is what's available in that account, that's what's left in the account, the 3.7, and this would allow the hun-

dred percent usage of that allocation. There are other methods of paying for it as we know, but again, this is what was available and we felt it should be used.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, just one final comment. Out of 27.5 million dollars, 23.7 million is going to school districts over five hundred thousand, which I understand Chicago would be the only school district that would qualify. And 3.7 million dollars are going to be going to everybody else. Is that correct?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Over all the years, it was a hundred million for Chicago and three hundred million downstate. Downstate has taken two hundred and ninety-seven, 296.3 million of that three hundred million; Chicago has only used this now request for 23.7. So you are right, that's what's there but that was based on a three to one downstate in favor split, three hundred going downstate, one hundred to Chicago. So...and since Chicago had never taxed itself, it couldn't ever utilize this fund. This was the first effort after Chicago had raised its tax so to do. The downstate have been taking it every year which was the original agreement.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I...I wonder if the sponsor would yield for a question, but before that, I'd like to just set the framework and I'd like to get the attention of the Senators on both sides of the aisle. Today we just did several things which indicate a movement off dead center. We

passed an affirmative action resolution and it was pointed out that that resolution had some problems in that the question was asked about prequalification, and I think that's a legitimate question because it means that the progress in this direction is going to be slowed down considerably. Given that as one of the facts of life, we are moving toward economic development but moving very slowly. If that's the case, then what are we going to do in the meantime? And I would put it to you that we're now not talking about charity, we're not even talking about compassion; what we're talking about is plain common sense. There has to be survival from some area and I would ask you this, Mr. Sponsor, why was the six million dollars for the...for the level of need not in the bill?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Senator Newhouse, as I attempted to explain before and maybe I should amplify, we have on about eight occasions...requested the fifty-two percent in need, some six and a quarter million dollars to start April 1st for the rest of the fiscal year. Believing that this is in the emergency Session, that is a category that clearly that falls within. If we cannot get the level of sustenance up to just a mere fifty-two percent of what the level of need is, what are we doing here? Each time we raised that, either the Governor's Office or our colleagues from the other side of the aisle told us that was the killer upon which no bill would pass, that if we attempted to...take care of starving people, there would be no votes, no signatures and no support from the Office of the Governor. We made this request in the Office of the Governor, we made it at the conference table. We, in fact, had a version of the report that had it in and we were told point-blank there could be no Republican support for

those who were starving regardless of any other issue that was in the bill.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Then, Mr. President, I would suggest to the members of this Body that we're going to pay out more than six million dollars one way or another. We're going to pay it out in corrections, we're going to pay it out in other kinds of emergency services. To say that six million dollars that is going to be reduced from this budget is really going to be a reduction just is a contradiction in terms. It would seem to me that it makes all kinds of logic and common sense for us to put the dollars into the budget for the bare subsistence level. I think there are many in this room who have been reading that series in the Chicago Tribune that's been appearing over the past several weeks. The conditions that it describes in the City of Chicago are very, very real. And I would put it to you that the conditions that are described in Chicago are replicated in many, many other areas of this State, many areas which most of you over there do represent. It seems to me just plain logic and common sense to put this very small amount of dollars in the budget...and to talk about the building of a marina in the absence of that, it seems to me to be obscene. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Any further discussion? Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. As you know, it's been tradition in the General Assembly that the leadership work out some of these supplemental appropriations and, quite frankly, this year it hasn't worked too well; and perhaps the reason is it's a political

year, we have an election coming down the road. If you would look at what...Senator Carroll suggests, it's about ninety percent for you and ten percent for us. I would suggest to you, Senator Carroll, that isn't even close. Now I would suggest that no Republican should support this whatsoever. Hopefully, if it's defeated, we can get together and work out something that's reasonable for both sides of the aisle. I notice DuQuoin is not in, Zion is not in, Dana Thomas House, a lot of other things that the Governor wants. I've been led to believe the second floor does not agree either. And let's sit down somewhere and work out something reasonable for everybody.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Further discussion on the adoption of Amendment No. 2? If not, Senator Carroll may close.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Let's set the record straight if we can, and I know it's tough to do in a General Assembly. Of the...eighty-two million, the overwhelming majority is the request of the Governor, overwhelming. I hate to give a percentage but let's call it eighty-five or ninety percent. If you look at it...and in the capital it's the same way, some eighty-seven percent of the capital requests happen to fall in districts that happen to now be represented by Republicans. I don't know if that's a coincidence or if that's just a demonstration of need; I do know those are the requests the Governor made to which we had agreed. Maybe we agreed to early to some of these but we recognize the need and we attempted to deal with those that were truly life threatening, like the fact that the Governor's Department of Public Health closed the Governor's Department of Mental Health facilities because they didn't have fire alarms, they didn't have smoke detectors, they didn't have life safety needs. Many of those

facilities happen to be in Republican districts. That did not stop us from saying, absolutely, we must, in fact, fund those rebuilding, we cannot elect the Governor...let the Governor's Department of...of Public Health close the Public...the Department of Mental Health, I'll try and get that right, of mental health's institutions even though they're both under the Office of the Governor. We also said a lot of things that members wanted should be in here and a lot of things the Governor wanted for his various departments, and we can go through them one by one, you can look over the list and see, you know, we have money in here..for example, for the downstate civic centers, thirty-two million dollars. Nobody on that side raised that issue, those are all downstate civic centers, none of them are in my area and very few happen to be in areas of members of my side of the aisle, though some are. I don't care if it's a solid gold Futura, which does not run in my opinion in a Democratic district, but in which there had been a demonstrated request and need which we, in fact, put in or Mitsubishi or on and on and on if you want to go through the list: the Wheaton County Courthouse study, the Carl Sandburg Choir, the move money to the One Sears Center, which the Governor said that that three and a half million dollars was an absolute must so that he could move an agency from one building to another on which there were no real hearings and should have been. We can go on and on and on, the Great Western Railroad right of way which is now general revenue funds where they used to be Road Fund because there was a need to use those road funds for others or whether it's grade crossing protection money, on and on and on. I think if many of the members see that we had in here, for example, the Herndon Building as capital, they'll find that most of the wish list is there. Nobody gets all they want. This is supposed to be a vetoish Session, emergencies only, and I think we'd be inclined to

pull a lot of these out if we went back to the table and start over and go with true emergencies like fifty-two percent of need and forget about some of these others. But no, we said let's get this moving, let's get that that all the conferees have agreed to before the General Assembly including the Federal funds, including saving the downstate civic centers and including some of those others, and I've only listed a few out of the hundred and eight sections that have, in fact, been included; and I repeat, in my opinion, I agree this is lopsided, it's about ninety-eight in favor of the Governor. I would ask for its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 526. Those in favor will 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? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 27 Ayes, 29 Nays, the amendment fails. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Schaffer.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAPFER:

My years of legislative experience have convinced me that after this last roll call, Amendment No. 3 perhaps is not germane. It may be germane but I'd suspect it's not passable. My instincts, which have been honed to a fine edge last week sitting around doing nothing, tell me that the point has come in the appropriation's process for me to withdraw this amendment and suggest we sit down and work out a reasonable compromise that we can send to the House so that they in their all seeing wisdom can respond in an appropriate manner.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Amendment No. 3.

SENATOR SCHAPPER:

Defer to my spokesman, Senator Bloom. I withdraw the amendment.

PRESIDENT:

All right. The amendment has been withdrawn. Senator...further amendments, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Hall.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Since that other has been taken off, this is not technically correct, so I'll withdraw the amendment at this time.

PRESIDENT:

Right. Amendment No. 3 also has been withdrawn. Senator Bloom, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR BLOOM:

Well, to make a suggestion, and that would be that Senator Schaffer's amendment addressed certain issues that obviously were of concern to the administration and others. Senator Hall's amendment basically addresses the fifty-two percent of need, and perhaps...I make a suggestion that perhaps an orderly way to proceed is to have some member who voted on the prevailing side move to reconsider that particular amendment and then we put on the two amendments that follow and send it off to the House. It's a suggestion that I would proffer to the Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate.

PRESIDENT:

Are you making the motion to reconsider?

SENATOR BLOOM:

If, indeed, the suggestion appears amenable...to...the...to reconsider he said was acceptable but I...I would make that suggestion, maybe we take it out of the record and come back to it.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Whatever you'd like, there's...you know, again, there's some ninety-five million the Governor wants plus about a hundred and fifteen in capital, I don't care if it doesn't pass. It's his government that you're not operating. Whatever your favor is go ahead and do.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Why don't we take it out of the record for the moment, Senator Carroll, and you can confer. The bill will...remain on 2nd reading having been on 3rd before. The Senate will please come to order. We're on Supplemental Calendar No. 1. Under consideration is House Bill 526, Mr. Secretary. Senator Bloom, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR BLOOM:

Yes...on Amendment No...

PRESIDENT:

2.

SENATOR BLOOM:

...2, having voted on the prevailing side, I would move to...reconsider the vote by which that motion lost.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Bloom has moved, having voted on the prevailing side, to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 2 was declared lost. All in favor of the motion to reconsider indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 526, Amendment No. 2, Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

This is the reconsideration of the amendment that we had explained before. I'd be willing to answer any questions.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Carroll has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 526. All in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Amendment No...Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Senator Hall.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Hall on Amendment No. 3.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Amendment No...3 amends House Bill 526 in the Senate by inserting after Section 107 the following, "In addition to any amounts heretofore appropriated for such purposes, the following named sums are so much thereof as may be necessary or appropriated to the Department of Public Aid to provide income assistance at a minimum of fifty-two percent of the standard of need. For aid to families with dependent children 4.4 and for general assistance two...two million." I move for the adoption of this amendment.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Hall has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 526. Any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 3 is adopted. Further amendments, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Senators Bloom, Geo-Karis and Dunn.

PRESIDENT:

HB 568
3rd Reading

Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 4 appropriates the DuQuoin money and scales down the Illinois State Park money to 6.4 million. And I'd answer any questions, otherwise, move its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Bloom has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 526. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. Yes, with leave of the Body we'll get back to that immediately after 568. Top of page 2 on the Calendar, on the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading is House Bill 568. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

House Bill 568.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President...Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. As you know, we've worked long and hard on 568. Just to highlight a few things to refresh our memories, this makes technical change in Build Illinois, farm aid up...grants up to two thousand dollars per farmer, creates incentive for the rebuilding of Arlington Race Track, increases the cigarette tax by eight cents earmarked for education, authorizes general revenue to be transferred to the

civic centers and, of course, eliminates the quarter cents on food and drugs that the DuPage County Water Commission put on. Nothing is perfect, this is kind of like a Christmas tree, there's something...a little bit of something for everybody. Let's do the right thing, pass it over to the House and let them have a shot at it.

PRESIDENT:

Any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 568 as amended pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. 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, there are 38 Ayes, 18 Nays, 1 voting Present. House Bill 568 having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. On the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading, House Bill 526, Supplemental No. 1. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

House Bill 526.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is the supplemental appropriation bill for this Session as previously described. It amounts to some probably eight-five million now in general revenue, approaching ninety and some hundred and forty-five million in capital and other funds. I would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDENT:

Any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 526 as amended 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, there are 48 Ayes, 9 Nays, none voting Present. House Bill 526 as amended having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Page 3 on the Calendar. If I can have the attention of the membership, the Message on those two bills will be immediately, immediately sent to the House...for their consideration. Now we have a very little bit of business yet remaining. Members have indicated and if any member has a Conference Committee report that they wished called now is the time and then we will obviously have to await House action. Top of page 3, Senator Joyce on 1109. Senator Dunn on 1962. All right. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports, the Conference Committee report on House Bill 1962, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

First corrected copy of committee...Conference Committee report on House Bill 1962.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Dunn.

SENATOR DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Conference Committee Report No. 1 as corrected on House Bill 1962 would propose that the...Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Council be removed from the Department of...of Mines and Minerals and made an autonomous body. Change would make a substantial impact on the operation of the council or the State's...it would make no substantial change on the council or the operation of the State reclamation program. It'd allow the council to streamline its administrative operations. I'd be glad to answer any questions and I'd like a favorable roll call on Conference Committee Corrected No. 1 of House Bill 1962.

PRESIDENT:

SB 212
C.C. Report

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee report on House Bill 1962. 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, there are 56 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee report on House Bill 1962 and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Senator Demuzio on 212. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports, Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 212, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

First Conference...Committee report on Senate Bill 212 corrected.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Yes, thank you,...Mr. President. The Conference Committee Report No. 1 on Senate Bill 212 does two things. First...it makes some minor changes in the Illinois...the Telecommunications Excise Tax that we passed...the Message Tax that we passed this last Session and makes some technical and administrative revisions to that language. Secondly, I guess, and most importantly, it provides that municipalities in excess of a hundred thousand population can impose a...a referendum...a referendum approved one cent a gallon Motor Fuel Tax on retailers. As you recall correctly, this measure was before us...this last...several weeks ago. It applied only to the City of Rockford which, in fact, it only applies to now. At that time it did not have the referendum approved proposal. This, in fact, does say that if the city council makes that decision that it would, in fact, be put to a vote and, therefore, it would be only acted upon and approved by a

AB 1109
C.C.R

vote of those voters in the affected area. These are the only two changes that are involved in 212 and I would be glad to answer any questions.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Demuzio has moved the adoption of the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 212. Discussion? Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

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

PRESIDENT:

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

Is...is there any language in this Conference Committee report that relates to the Use Tax?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Demuzio. Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

My handlers tell me, no, there is not.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Any further discussion? Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 212. 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, there are 56 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 212 and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Senator Joyce, on 1109. Conference Committee report, top of page 3, the Conference Committee report on House Bill 1109, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

First Conference Committee report on House Bill 1109 corrected.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

Thank you, Mr. President. This amends the Election Code. This is the bill that was brought up the other day and there was some controversy about it, and I feel that we've got all that worked out. And this allows...the petition circulator to indicate first and last dates of circulation or to...certify that no signatures were collected prematurely. It also adds a...technical consultant hired by the State Board of Elections to provide computerized election statistics or voter registration...data to categorize the persons...exempt from time restrictions on the length of contractual service, and it prohibits filling a vacancy and nomination sixty days after the General Primary if the vacancy results from a party failure to slate a candidate. And all of the other petitions that you have out are grandfathered in, so this won't affect that. I'd be happy to answer any questions if there are any.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Macdonald.

SENATOR MACDONALD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in strong support of this Conference Committee report. And to those people who were concerned at the last time we brought this up, I want you to be certain that if you're currently circulating petitions, this provision will not in any way cause your petition to be challenged. Therefore, with all the corrections that have been made in this particular Conference Committee, I...I recommend an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

There's further discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate adopt the first Conference Committee report on House Bill 1109. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those

S.B. 1452
2nd C.E.R.

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 57, the Nays are none, none voting Present. The Senate does adopt the first Conference Committee report on House Bill 1109 and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Page 4, Senate Bill 1452. Senator Welch.

SECRETARY:

Second Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1452 corrected.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DENUZIO)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill does three separate things, basically. Number one, there's clean-up language to clarify the intent of House Bill 18. House Bill 18 was signed into law by the Governor which changes the Gross Receipt Tax on utilities from a five percent tax to a tax on thermal unit and kilowatt-hours. What this bill is doing is changing the...not changing the definition of gross receipts but clarifying what has been the rule of the commission in the past and making it clear in law as to which items are not to be charged...as gross receipts so that a tax would apply thereto. Number two, there's clean-up language on Senate Bill 665 and Senate Bill 730, the education reform bill, to...clarify the usage of the Telecommunication Tax as it applies to the education...funding. I might point out that the change in the Gross Receipts Tax is meant to be a revenue...revenue neutral change and was requested by one of the utilities to clarify exactly what they were to pay and to ensure the...lessening of any litigation. The third change concerns a request by the Citizen Utility Board with respect to their dates of election. The current election by the Citizen Utility Board is, I believe, January 1 or December 31

of each year. The confusion caused by the mailing of ballots and Christmas rush has led them to ask for a change of the date for the election to March 31st, a change of three months, and the current board would serve then the extra ninety days until that day pending the election of a new board. There is nothing in this amendment...concerning the Citizen Utility Board, that is the most controversial provision which was...debated in committee, that would be requiring utilities which bill by post card to provide a space for customers to indicate interest in Citizen Utility Board. That is not in this report nor or some of the many controversial aspects of the Citizen Utility Board, this is mainly affecting the elections. I'd answer any questions, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZZIO)

All right. Senator Welch has moved the adoption of the second Conference Committee report. Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate adopt the...second Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1452. Those in favor will 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 57, the Nays are none, none voting Present. The Senate does adopt the second Conference Committee report on House Bill 1452 and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Senator Rock, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President. I have just conferred with Senator Philip, that effectively concludes the business that is before us in the Senate. Now, obviously, we are awaiting House action...and our understanding is that immediately upon receipt of that bill in the House, the House sponsor has indicated he will take it up immediately. I can't tell you

when that's going to be, but the fact is, we are again...awaiting House action. So my suggestion is for the sanity and...and welfare of all of us that we can just as well stand adjourned till ten o'clock tomorrow morning, but I urge people to stick around. I truly don't have any clue as to what the House is going to do or not do.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Rock, we have one housekeeping thing to do. Mr...Mr. Secretary, resolutions.

SECRETARY:

...Resolution 586 was read into the record last week. Senator Berman, Maitland, Rock and Philip.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move to...suspend the appropriate rules for immediate consideration of Senate...Senate Resolution 586. This is the resolution that calls upon Congress in light of our action on the bill that we've just passed out of here dealing with the cigarette tax to consider and give strong consideration to exempting Illinois from any extension of the Federal Cigarette Tax. I would move the appropriate rules for immediate consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Berman has moved to suspend the rules for the immediate consideration and adoption of Senate Resolution 586. Any discussion? If not, those in favor of the suspension of the rules indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. The rules are suspended. Senator Berman now moves the adoption of Senate Resolution 586. Discussion? If not, those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Senate Resolution 586 is adopted. Senator Rock now moves...any further business to come before the Senate? Senator Rock moves that the Senate stand adjourned

till tomorrow morning at the hour of ten o'clock. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. The Senate stands adjourned till tomorrow morning, ten o'clock.