

84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

REGULAR SESSION

DECEMBER 5, 1986

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

The hour of...nine o'clock having arrived, the Senate will come to order. Our guests in the gallery will please rise. Members will be at their desks. All unauthorized personnel will please vacate. Prayer this morning is by the Reverend Anthony Tzortzis, St. Anthony's Orthodox Church in Springfield. Father.

REVEREND TZORTZIS:

(Prayer given by Reverend Tzortzis)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Reading of the Journal.

SECRETARY:

Thursday, November the 20th, 1986.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Mr. President, I move that the Journal just read by the Secretary be approved unless some Senator has additions or corrections to offer.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. You've heard the motion by Senator Kelly. Are there any corrections or...discussion? If not, so ordered. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Mr. President, I move that reading and approval of the Journals of Tuesday, December 2nd; Wednesday, December 3rd and Thursday, December 4th, in the year 1986, be postponed pending arrival of the printed Journals.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. You've heard the motion of Senator Kelly. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. Motion carried and it's so ordered. All right. Senator VadalaBene, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and...and members of the Senate. There will be a Democratic Caucus immediately in President Rock's Office, a Democratic Caucus immediately in President Rock's Office. Senator Rupp.

SENATOR RUPP:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. A Republican Caucus immediately, Senator Philip's Office. No, immediately.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Democratic Caucus in Senator Rock's Office, Republican Caucus in...in Pate Philip's Office...immediately...immediately. So, the Senate will just stand...in Recess at the call of the Chair.

RECESS

AFTER RECESS

PRESIDENT:

The hour of one having arrived, the Senate will reconvene and come to order. Mr. Secretary, Messages from the House.

SECRETARY:

A Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

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

House Joint Resolution 247 and 248, both congratulatory.

PRESIDENT:

Consent Calendar. Resolutions, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 1317 offered by Senators Jones, Collins, Smith, Hall, Newhouse and Alexander. And it is congratulatory.

PRESIDENT:

Consent Calendar. If I can have the attention of the membership, WHOI-TV in Peoria,...WAND-TV, Channel 5 and Channel 7, have requested permission to videotape the proceedings. UPI would like to take photographs as would the Chicago Tribune. Without objection,...and Channel 2, how could I forget you? Sorry, Mike. Without objection, leave is granted. All right. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, it's one o'clock on Friday afternoon, my suggestion is we move right through the Calendar. If you'll follow along and pull out your Calendar, we'll start on page 4. On the regular Calendar, on page 4, on the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading there is an appropriation bill which will be the bill for the executive's supplemental. Then we'll move to page 6. Senator Newhouse has requested early action on a joint resolution which has to go back to the House for concurrence. Then we'll move to the Secretary's Desk concurrence on top of page 7, and then the bottom of page 7 we will begin with Conference Committee reports in the order in which they appear. All right. Top of page 4 on the Calendar, on the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading is House Bill 3101. Senator Carroll seeks leave of the Body to return that bill to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of House Bills 2nd Reading, House Bill 3101, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Carroll.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Amendment No. 2 would be our suggestion for the supplemental appropriation of the November, December Session. What we have attempted to do of the several hundreds of millions of dollars of requests that came before the appro-

priations process, House and Senate, we asked a question of what had to be done before we are back January 13th that cannot be dealt with at that time, what are true crises and emergencies where it would be counterproductive to government to not do them at this time. We limited, therefore, the supplemental request of those and those only. I believe everybody has a list, they are such things as the corrective monies necessary for the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities to...keep Ludeman, Howe and Elgin open, to keep ISPI open and to fund the providers as agreed to in the various discussions that were had on how to make Mental Health an effective agency. They are the difference in what the Governor requested and what we had overridden on the homeless shelter, the necessary audit and transition funds for the incoming State Treasurer, some Federal dollars that we would loose if we don't capture them this month for Department of Employment Security, some flood relief funding that ESDA needs in its account where it is deficit at this point, repaying the postage for the Constitutional Amendment, some capital projects that if not started now will not start or be ready on time, et cetera. We have also allocated the stripper well money in the manner that it had been agreed to on the second floor so that the schools will, in fact, be able to get the monies for the purposes intended. If there are any further questions, I would be willing to answer. I'd move adoption of Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 3101. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, the amendment is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY:

No further amendments.

112 of 233
See's sleek-Resolutions

Page 5 - DECEMBER 5, 1986

PRESIDENT:

3rd reading. Senator Carroll, you wish leave to get back to that bill a little...thank you. All right. If you'll turn to page 6 on the Order of Secretary's Desk Resolutions. Senator Newhouse has requested early action on House Joint Resolution 233 as amended in the Senate. The bottom of page 6 on the Calendar, House Joint Resolution 233. (Machine cut-off)...bottom of page 6 on the Order of Secretary's Desk Resolutions, with leave of the Body, House Joint Resolution 233, Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Thank you, Mr. President. House joint resolution creates a task force for Senate involvement in urban education. This has been up once before. All the bugs have been worked out, I understand everybody is on board, and I'd appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDENT:

Any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

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

PRESIDENT:

Indicates he will yield, Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Senator Newhouse, we agreed to the discharge a committee on this resolution and you've been working with Senator Maitland, who doesn't happen to be here at the present time, but my only question is whether or not he's on board on this issue now.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

The...Rick...Capriola worked with us on this, I understand from him that it's okay.

PRESIDENT:

Any further discussion? If not, the question is the adoption of House Joint Resolution 233. Those voting Aye...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? Senator Poshard, will you get Senator Berman on this roll call? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. House Joint Resolution 233 having received the required constitutional majority is declared adopted. Top of page 7. On the Order of Secretary's Desk Concurrence is Senate Bill 1442. Senator Sangmeister...or Mr. Secretary, I beg your pardon.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 1442 with House Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Sangmeister.

SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. As you can see from the Calendar, this is on our...Calendar as a concurrence. The House has taken a bill and...and stripped it over there and put into it a solution to a problem that seems to have arisen whereby we have a Liquor Appeal Board that's composed of one member of the city and two members of the State and there's confusion as to who's going to pay for those members when they're called into a...a hearing. And it's been now determined that the State will pay those people at the amounts that are listed in the...amendment, which I do not have in front of me right now, but, anyway, it's to resolve a problem over there. I'll try to answer any questions; if not...would request concurrence in the...Senate bill amended by the House in Senate Bill 1442.

PRESIDENT:

Any discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1442. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1442 and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. I beg you pardon, 53 to nothing. On the Order of Secretary's Desk Concurrence, Senate Bill 2116, Senator Weaver. Mr. Secretary, please.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 2116 with House Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is also an amendment that becomes the bill. It is from the Commissioner of Banks Office that would provide that after a change of ownership of a State bank occurring after January 1st, 1985, and upon certain findings by the commissioner the holding company which acquired the State bank may merge such bank with its bank and this bank then becomes a facility. But prior to this merger occurring, the commissioner must find that...circumstances exist and should...that would require that expeditious treatment by the Federal Reserve System, that the purpose of the merger is necessary for the protection of the depositors or the creditors and that the bank's capital is impaired and that business is being conducted in an unsafe or unsound manner and the bank is...unable to continue operation. So, it's kind of an emergency measure that the commissioner feels he needs. And if there are any questions, I'll try to answer them.

NB 2486
C.C.

PRESIDENT:

Any discussion? Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. I wondered if Senator Weaver could disclose which banks we're talking about or a bank.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Well, this basically has to do with an Evergreen Park facility that has been acquired.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Is there any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2116. Those in favor will vote Aye. 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 52, the Nays are none, 2 voting Present. The Senate does concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 2116 and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Senator Weaver, are you ready on the bottom of page 7? On the Order of Conference Committee Reports. Bottom of page 7, there's a Conference Committee report on House Bill 2486. Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

I have the second...second corrected Conference Committee report on House Bill 2486.

PRESIDENT:

Is...it is the first corrected report.

SECRETARY:

It is...it is the first report, the second corrected copy.

PRESIDENT:

Correct. All right...Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I think all of us know what we're dealing with in this Conference Committee report. It represents some reform in the Horse Racing Act, it represents some relief, it also expands intertrack wagering to two locations per track. The funding mechanisms, I think, have been gone over by each caucus. Maybe in order to save time, I'll try to answer any questions anyone has but it's been thoroughly discussed. We've been working on this for probably two years. We've tried to meet everyone's concerns and I think in a great part we have. So if there are any questions, I'll be happy to try to answer them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Discussion? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. For I think the fifth time in two years, Senator Weaver and I stand before you asking your support of a measure to help the racing industry in Illinois and at the same time cause to happen a substantial reinvestment in our State. This is, in fact, economic development as will be the subsequent Conference Committee report, economic development. No one underestimates the importance of the rebuilding of that facility to the industry at large. We have insisted that the industry at large be treated fairly and equitably. I think after many months and hours of negotiation the Conference Committee as represented on House Bill 2486 accomplishes our purpose. There is no impact this fiscal year but, ultimately, it will benefit not only the industry but the citizens of Illinois in terms of the return that we expect to realize. I would urge an Aye vote for the first Conference Committee report on House Bill 2486.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I concur with the statements made both by Senator Weaver and Senator Rock because the most important thing to consider is jobs for Illinois. I've had querries almost daily from legislators and others from the State of Wisconsin wondering what we are going to do because they are contemplating doing something to attract a track of Illinois to Wisconsin. So I certainly support this bill and as far as track wagering goes, I think we should we should legalize off-track betting and I...I think it's...it will provide for more funds to Illinois for the various purposes we need. I support the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Sangmeister.

SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

Well, I don't like to throw any damp water, I'm sure this is going to pass anyway, but I think somebody has to say it and that is we all want jobs for the State of Illinois and I recognize too that the racing industry is very important, but I feel rather badly that we weren't able to come up with a better solution than have to go to off-track betting parlors at this time. There is no question, and I think you all know it, that eventually the State of Illinois one way or another is going to have to pay for the social consequences of opening up those kind of parlors, and I think we ought to think very carefully what we're doing.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President, members of the Senate. Just briefly, I rise in support of this very important bill for the economy of the State of Illinois and for my area.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Mr. President and members, I...I too, rise in support of this measure. However, I think it should be noted that we're failing to achieve with this measure the true economic development potential that this project might have had for this State. It is important that we pass this bill because I think it's the only game in town and because it will do what is necessary to assure the future health and vitality of the horse racing industry in this State, but if we really wanted to be serious about economic development, we would not only be assuring the redevelopment in...in some fashion that brings prosperity to Arlington Heights but we would be doing for the racing industry that which is necessary to bring this track to the area that it had been promised it in northern Lake County. And...and I say that not only selfishly because I represent an area near where the track would be located, I say it also because it would certainly be the finest track of its kind and...and also because it would bring jobs to a part of the State that desperately needs them. So, I think as we pass this measure today, as indeed we should, it should not be forgotten that we are...we are leaving out a part of the State that had been promised something that is today, at least, not being received and that we are not reaching and attaining our...our full potential in promoting the economic development of Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. It's...it's a sad situation where...a lady who brought this matter to our attention quite vividly is unable to speak...in behalf of Arlington Park, and that's Senator Macdonald. But if you recall the statement that she made

initially when she pleaded with this General Assembly for supporting the economic development of an area and providing an industry, the premier track in the State, with some relief so that the money could be reinvested in that section of the State and also bring in additional tax revenue dollars in the Agriculture Premium Fund. Virginia Macdonald, I believe, stated her case quite vividly and quite well a few months back. But if you don't recall the impact, let me just refresh your memory as far as the economic impact that the racing industry throughout this State has in employment opportunities for many people who would be unemployed also on our tax rolls, also as far as the hotels that are used within that...respective area in bringing people from throughout the State, in providing not only a sportsman's relief but a taxpayer's relief in bringing additional money into this State. This is not the panacea that we've all been looking for but it's really a step in the right direction where the industry got together and hammered out over a two-year period of time what they think that they need on the minimal basis in order to provide racing in this State as it should be conducted where people want to participate, where it's properly supervised, where the money is properly allocated and there's enough prize money to attract the best horses from throughout the nation. This, in my personal opinion, is a good work product, it deserves your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President and members. I think there's many good things in this bill that are...that are very positive, but I must stand and say that I also agree with the concerns that have been raised by Senator Sangmeister. I think that as over the...the weeks that this bill has been put together and the discussion I've heard and the things

I've read in the media that one particular element in off-track betting is that local municipalities would have the opportunity to opt out if they did not wish a parlor in...in their...in their boundaries. And as the bill is prepared and before us today, that is not the case and, in fact, intertrack wagering may be only in areas which are zoned for commercial or manufacturing purposes or in areas for which a special use has been approved. Well, that means that any parlor can go into a central business district and if they have an agreement with the owner of that property, there's no way that a local...municipality can keep them out.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I have been communicating this week with Senator Macdonald. As you know, she has a serious operation, she's home convalescing and I have spoken to her on more than one occasion. She's very happy with the way this bill has been handled, the condition it's in and she certainly, through me, encourages everybody to vote for it, it's good for her district, good for Illinois and we ought to give it a lot of green lights.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Weaver may close.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. I think that everyone understands, I just might point out that a municipality may ban by ordinance the location of these parlors in their community. So...there is...a way to ban them in any municipality in the State of Illinois. So I'd appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. The question is, shall the Senate adopt the

HB 3162
cc: [unclear]

second corrected first Conference Committee report on House Bill 2486. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed Nay. The voting is open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Last time. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 37, the Nays are 16, none voting Present. The Senate does adopt the second corrected first Conference Committee report on House Bill 2486 and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. If you'll flip over to page 8 on your regular Calendar...is House Bill...all right...House Bill 3162, Mr. Secretary. Page 8, House Bill 3162.

SECRETARY:

(Machine cutoff)...Conference Committee report on House Bill 3162.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. First let me say at the outset, in regard to House Bill 3162, I got a call this morning from Whitey Herzog the manager of the St. Louis Cardinals, who is a close friend of mine and he wanted me to assure you here today that I am still a loyal supporter of the St. Louis Cardinals. He also...he also told me to pass on to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that nothing would please him more than play the White Sox in a World Series. And he said it would make him happier if they would play that World Series in a new stadium. And so, my colleagues, I would appreciate a favorable vote on House Bill 3162.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Kustra.

SENATOR KUSTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. It's

a tough act to try to follow my good friend Senator Sam. I came down to Springfield this Fall Session with every intention of providing some support for the Chicago White Sox in their quest to stay in the City of Chicago. I thought I was going to do that with some kind of infrastructure funding which I think fits in nicely with Build Illinois, the goals and objectives the Governor of this State set for those businesses, industries who need help to rebuild...begin the process of rebuilding the State. This bill, however, goes beyond infrastructure. It provides for a subsidy, it provides for five million dollars a year to come out of the General Revenue Fund of this State. It also creates an authority and in essence it puts the State of Illinois in the stadium business. That is unprecedented. It's really almost unprecedented nationwide with the exception of New Orleans. All other stadia tend to be financed through a combination of local and regional revenues. I think what this bill does and what worries me is that it redefines the relationship between the State of...State Government and privately held businesses who happen to own sports franchises. What I am afraid it will do is create a precedent we don't want. It will establish a line of sports folks all of whom will want to come after the White Sox to benefit from this new largess that we have opened up here today. On the other hand, I...I arise with some trepidation because I honestly believe that we ought to be working toward a solution to the problem the White Sox have. I think what we really ought to be doing is establishing a bipartisan task force at this time and with that task force sit down and try to work out a new financing mechanism in place of that money that now comes out of the General Revenue Fund if this bill were to pass. If we were able to do that, I think you can get the votes you need to pass a proposal like this. But to come before the General Assembly with this particular package including the subsidy

the same week, the same week, that we told the homeless and the adult education folks and the dropouts and the truants and the retired teachers that there wasn't enough money to take care of their needs, and now to get into this business, I don't think we want to go down this road. But let's create a task force, let's try to help them solve their problem, let's join hands with the City of Chicago and its mayor and on January 13th, there's no reason why we can't provide a new financing mechanism that will give them what they need.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Degnan.

SENATOR DEGNAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Kustra's remarks are well-taken but the fact is, Senator Kustra, this is the last of the ninth for the White Sox. Let me, if you will, go through briefly what House Bill 3162 is. It creates the new Illinois Sports Facility Authority whose purpose is to build a nondomed, single-use baseball park for the Chicago White Sox. The stadium's capacity will be approximately forty-five thousand. It will be on seventy acres around the existing facility existing today. The board will be created with seven members, three appointed by the Governor, three by the Mayor of Chicago, one, the chairman, being appointed by the Governor with the mayor's approval. All of the Governor's approvals must have consent of the Senate...Senate. The cost for the facility is a hundred and twenty million dollars. It would be financed by bonds over approximately a twenty- to twenty-five-year period. The cost is supported by a two percent increase in the hotel-motel tax in Chicago only; in addition, four million dollars in rent per annum by the Chicago White Sox; also, if necessary, five million dollars...up to five million dollars equally from both the State and the City of Chicago. With your help, we can have the Sox in a new stadium in 1990 and I ask for that

assistance.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to ask the sponsor, what was the intent of this legislation before the Conference Committee report was offered?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Well, what was the original bill, Senator Kelly? I'll yield to Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

(Machine cutoff)...Sam.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well...

SENATOR NETSCH:

Well, the...it...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator...Senator Netsch, do you have the answer to this?

Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

I'm told it's...it was the DuPage Airport Authority, but understand, Senator Kelly, that...that this deletes everything and begins over again, so it is a new kind of State created agency. If you're getting ready to raise the question of germaneness, I suppose that anytime the State is creating a...an agency the...it is within the subject matter of the bill. But all of that has now been stricken from the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Senator. The point I'm making is not concern-

ing that. My point that I'm making is that the total intent of this bill was changed around, it's far exceeded what the initial intent was. And this is just another example of where a Conference Committee report in a short period of time takes a totally different direction. I resent using what is known as the Fall Veto Session to come in here with major legislation which should be considered in an orderly fashion during the Spring Session of the General Assembly to come in here with program after program to have the Legislature look at and to provide support to. We have time to do this during the regular Session, not during the abbreviated Fall Session. I'd like to ask the leadership to please consider in the future to not...misuse or not to use these bills for Conference Committee reports nor to use the Fall Session for anything but addressing the Governor's actions on legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President, members of the Senate. If you think back to January 26th of 1986, it was a day that a lot of us will remember, the Bears won the Super Bowl and it was a very great day for our State, we all felt very unified, it was a great feeling. The winter of '85 was warmer because of the Chicago Bears and the feeling that was created throughout the State, and I mean that. You think back to the summer of '84 when the Cubs won the division, there was a great feeling in the City of Chicago and throughout our State, and millions of dollars were pumped into the economy of our city and our State because of the playoffs. The same thing in the summer of '83 when the White Sox won the division, millions of dollars were pumped into the city and the State because of the White Sox winning the division and the playoffs then. It would be a tragedy to loose any of our sports teams, it creates a negative aura for our city;

and for our State and regardless of your affinity in baseball whether it's the Cubs, the Cardinals or the White Sox, all teams are a valuable asset to their State and their city. A very substantial amount...number of the fans that come to White Sox Park come from around the midwest and add a substantial amount of money to our economy of the State of Illinois. Imagine how you'd feel if the Cubs left or the Cardinals left, Sam Vadalabene. When one of our teams wins, we all win; and if any of our teams leave our State, we're all losers in that case. No one really wanted a hotel-motel tax, we all realize how onerous that tax is, but there wasn't a better alternative. Everybody asked and looked for a better alternative. Can you imagine taxing people's food to build a sport's stadium, I don't think that's a very good idea. And I think it taxes our constituents much more onerously than this particular tax. This is a positive step for all the people of the State of Illinois and this is the cheapest way to do it. One of the previous speakers said that this goes beyond infrastructure, this doesn't even involve infrastructure. Last spring on the Table was a bill approved by the Governor of the State of...Illinois to put...to commit forty-two million dollars to a new stadium for infrastructure. There is no money here for infrastructure because the stadium is being built across the street from the present site. So we don't have to commit those kinds of dollars for a new facility. This is being done as practically and as cheaply as possible. This is a momentous opportunity for all of us to bring to fruition something that's been a dream for a long time and will benefit all the citizens, all the citizens, of the City of Chicago and the State of Illinois and help our economy.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, may I ask the sponsor a few questions? Because I'm sure we all want to help the Sox, and I...I guess I'd like to clarify in my own mind some things. Yes?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

...sponsor indicates...

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yeah. First of all...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

...that he will yield. Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Very fine. Why is it that there are other stadiums that have been built around the country and apparently they're...they're significantly larger, at least twenty thousand seats more, at least, and they've all cost less than what is being projected here, why is there a lesser seating and why is that costing us more? I guess having been on the McCormick Place let's look see committee, I'm a little bit gun-shy in terms of construction around here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Netsch indicates that she has the answer to that...to that question. Senator...Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

The first question was, why is it at this size? At forty thousand...to forty-five thousand, I mean. Is that correct? All right, Senator Marovitz, if you want to answer the question, go ahead. Go ahead.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well...Senator Vadalabene, do you wish to yield to anyone?

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yeah. I'd like to yield to Senator Marovitz, Senator Degnan or Senator Netsch. Tinkers to...to chance.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well,...I...I...I am sure if we had a caucus of three we would be here the remainder of the afternoon. Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Well, there's several reasons for that. First of all, many of the stadiums that have been built recently have been built in downtown areas with no parking surrounding it, and so the land costs have been substantially less because they have not needed or haven't provided for surrounding parking and the purchase of land in...in the areas which is provided in this package. If you take a look at...at Indianapolis, if you take a look at Minneapolis, those stadiums were...there is no parking provided and so substantially reduced land costs. Also, it's cheaper, believe it or not, in terms of construction to be able to go...to build down and excavate down into a stadium, and in Chicago because of the water tables you cannot do that. Many stadiums, when you walk in you will...you will realize or notice that you're walking down into the playing field. You cannot do that in the City of Chicago because of the water tables, the water levels, and therefore the construction costs are higher when you have to build up for support of construction. And that...those are the two main reasons why the construction costs are higher. Plus the fact, those stadiums...many of those stadiums you're talking about were built...the last single source stadium was built in 1969. Now, you're talking about seventeen years ago...costs of seventeen years ago. The...other stadiums which are multisource do not provide parking and therefore the land costs are less.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, Senator Topinka, does that answer your question?
Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Well, I...I...I think it will do. I...I don't know that

it answers a hundred percent because we still wind up with a stadium that's twenty thousand seats less and I think still costing more and you're going to have to take all things into consideration in the building anyway. You know, the cost is the cost is the cost. But let's go on to the next one 'cause I thought that was kind of interesting. Does this indeed set a precedent for other teams who might want to have a stadium? Do you feel that they will be lining up and this...this gives them the avenue?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

The answer is yes, and I will add one more thing to your prior statement. League rules require a minimum of thirty-five thousand. The demographics of both this area and the franchise indicate that between forty and fifty thousand is the appropriate seating capacity for a stadium to be built there...to be built and rebuilt at Thirty-fifth and Shields. So that is the reason for it. It is basically an economic demographics combination and balance.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Did...I did hear you say though that, yes, this does provide the precedent for other teams to now come to us with similar proposals in the future?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well...Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

No, I don't think it does, but you know if they want to do it, they're going to be here anyway. It seems to me that...well, I would be expressing a purely personal opinion if I expressed my feeling about what the others ought to do. But...but if they choose to come here, they will come here

anyway. It does not mean, Senator Topinka, that we have to build another stadium or stadia anywhere else.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

...Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

I'm not trying to hog this, but I...I've just written a few little things here for myself. Is...is the American League in agreement with this or a party to the lease arrangement?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well...Senator, you're...you're throwing all these curve balls, I don't know who's hitting them over...Senator Degnan.

SENATOR DEGNAN:

The...the American League will have to approve the lease agreement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

And if the American League does not approve the lease agreement, where are we from our standpoint with the State? And I'm not trying to throw you curve balls, really, I'm trying to just understand how you're going to do this and what you're going to do with it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Degnan.

SENATOR DEGNAN:

Okay. Well, it's been done before, I would...I would...if it is not done in this case, we have no stadium.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

All right. And what are the guarantees that the team will not bail out of any lease agreement that we have?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Degnan.

SENATOR DEGNAN:

The team is on the hook for the term of the bonds to the tune of four million dollars a year. If they want to leave town they still must pay the four million a year, I suggest.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch, for the addendum.

SENATOR NETSCH:

They're also going to be required in the agreement and through the bond documents, in effect, to pledge the franchise. And we are told that has been done before. What it means is that they are committed to the rent at the expense of lawsuits plus the pledge of the franchise itself. Again, if the league did not accept that, no deal, but we believe that it will because it has done so before, we are informed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

My last question. What is the investment of the White Sox ownership in this whole proposal?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

(Machine cutoff)...who's up...Senator...Senator VadalaBene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yeah, I think Senator Topinka just throwed a sinker ball.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator, there...Senator Degnan.

SENATOR DEGNAN:

Well, since their rent payment is a minimum of four million dollars a year over twenty years at least, that is more than they would have to pay in any other jurisdiction who is trying to woo the White Soxs now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Have they put any up-front money now, is there any kind of a lead-in commitment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Degnan.

SENATOR DEGNAN:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

One final.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, if this is your last one...otherwise, I'll come back to you. Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

One final thing. If the stadium is built, do we have any guarantees that it will not be designed by Helmet Yun?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, I'm sure that that's a rhetorical question. Further discussion? There are several other speakers. Senator Sangmeister.

SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

Will the sponsor, the real sponsor, stand up and answer a question? I see he's going to the telephone, so apparently not.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

He's coming back.

SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

I would like to establish a little legislative intent on this, if I can. I...I think there's still a lot of people...apparently the Werts' and the...MaKaski's and the other owners of these professional teams do not want their own fiefdom and do not want a...a closed dome stadium of any

kind but I really think that that does not express the will of the fans in the area, and my question to the sponsor of the legislation is, obviously there would have to be additional funding to build such a stadium, but will this authority have the right to build the type of stadium that they want or are they going to be under the dictates of the White Sox and have to build the type of stadium that they want?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, Senator Sangmeister, Senator Netsch indicates that she will...she can answer that question. Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

No. The...the authority will build the stadium, the authority will own the land, the authority will own the stadium. The Sox will be in it as lessees. They will be...and under a management agreement, but the Sox will not be building the stadium. And it...will be a turnkey operation, and the turnkey contractor will not be the White Sox. If you read into the text of the Act, it is...it is written so that they cannot be the turnkey contractors. So the stadium will actually be under the control of the authority but built by someone else on a turnkey basis.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Sangmeister.

SENATOR SANGMEISTER:

Well, then I would strongly suggest to the Governor and others who will appointing this authority that they convey to those people that maybe the...the fans' interest ought to be taken into consideration, and I think once that such a 'stadium was built I think the pressure from all the Hawks and the Bulls and the Bears and all the other teams would be enough that they would finally decide they ought to use such a facility and would encourage the authority to take that into consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Being one of those back-room negotiators, I might suggest this to you that it would be possible for that commission to recommend a multifacility. The problem is they have to come to us to get the bonding authority. All we've given them is...is a hundred and twenty million, if it costs more money they'd have to come back to the General Assembly and ask for more authority. I would suggest if this comes to be that they make a study. You know,...if this bill passed, it doesn't go into effect till July 1 of 1987, anyway, that they'd look at that and by us passing this bill does not lock us in to building a Sox stadium on that site. They could certainly have public hearings, come back to us before July 1...or after July 1 and make a recommendation on a different location and a different facility and, quite frankly, it might be the smart thing to do. Once you build the White Sox, then it's done, the multistadium will be gone forever. Be then, you know what you're going to have, the Cubs will want help, the Bears will want help, the Hawks will want help, everybody will want help. And they'll be coming to that commission for more money. And, quite frankly, I think the idea of a multipurpose stadium is a good idea. The only stadium in the United States that comes close to making money is New Jersey where they have horse racing, football and baseball. And wouldn't it be nice to have a world premiere stadium in the City of Chicago where we could have the Super Bowl? Boy, that would be fantastic. You'd find a lot of support for that idea in the suburbs, believe it or not.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Jeremiah Joyce.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Senate. I once

heard the late Arthur Rubloff who was a partner of Jack...say, real estate developers should not be allowed to own sports' teams because the first thing they start to think about is how they can use this to make some money. And I think we should have in the public record here today a recognition...indication that we recognize what has gone on here in the City of Chicago with these two, for want of a better term, hustlers. They have learned how to manipulate this process and they will have succeeded when we pass this, as we will, in using this to the detriment of the White Sox fans, to the detriment of the people of Chicago and the State of Illinois. And if we were able to do it, which I am told we cannot, we should look to find some way to take them out of the ownership before we go forward and hand them this bonus on the light of what the city council did a couple of years ago investing millions and millions of dollars into that park that will hit the wrecking ball.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is going to be a tough vote I think for everybody, and it's going to be tough because everybody wants to see the White Sox stay in Illinois. And I guess when you decide how you're going to cast your vote you're going to say this will keep them here, or you can vote No and say maybe there's a better way to keep them here and take the calculated risk. I have great difficulty understanding recreational people, there's a few of them up in the stands right now. But, you know, I really think they aren't recreational people, they're basically business people that are selling sports. And for a long time when I was a little kid I used to collect those baseball cards and I could never believe that baseball was a business. I always thought it was a lot of fun and everybody in this

room wanted to be a baseball player. I mean, the most precious item I ever possessed as a child was my baseball glove. But the fact is, ladies and gentlemen, it is a business. And if you don't believe it, look at some of the salaries some of the baseball players make. And the American dream has been enlarged from playing baseball for fun to either winning Lotto or being a super star. And if you look at it from that standpoint, then you have to say, is this a good business deal for both people, 'cause a deal that's bad for one ultimately is going to be bad for both. I have run businesses and there's always a tendency to look in the other guy's pocket. And I'll tell you, when I ran my businesses, I only looked in my own; and if I was satisfied that I was getting what I wanted, I really didn't care what the other person got. I've had the opportunity to work on the negotiations to a limited degree 'cause ultimately things of this type end up at a higher level. But I can tell you this proposal is quite different from the way it was initially introduced. And I would like to think there's a better way of funding this; in fact, we've looked at alternatives, even some as far reaching as taxing DuPage County to make sure that the team didn't go back there, but we have not come up with an alternative. And so I guess what you have to vote on, is this the best show in town or it isn't. I don't like the process but you know what? We all don't like it but we all participate in it. And to think that a Conference Committee report with something different than the original...look at the horse racing bill, I think there was something quite different on that one too; but, anyhow, whatever vote I'm going to throw, I'm going to be throwing two votes today, one recorded and one not recorded, and the one that's not recorded, and I would like for this to be on the record, is that if this passes, we quit beating up on the hotel owners because a lot of our activities are justified on the basis of attracting people into

this State particularly for recreational events. A lot of people say, well, people don't come in here from out of town. That's not right; in fact, quite a few of the owners of the White Sox are not from the State of Illinois. So, let's quit doing that and I'd like that to be in the record because when the next thing comes up, I don't want to see our tax going to fifteen percent, twenty percent. I received a very disturbing phone call this morning. I had the opportunity of working on McCormick Place and, contrary to some popular belief, there's some real great people that throw shows in this town that come in from out of town. And one of the guys called and said, Aldo, why? Why are you picking on us? And I said, I really don't know. So, I would like to go on record as saying we will not be picking on those people anymore because we'll end up biting the hand that feeds us. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? The Journal Star has requested permission to shoot still photographs. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Well, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I can...concur with the concerns of Senator DeAngelis about the hotel owners, but if any of you have been in Chicago trying to get a hotel room when...when the McCormick has been busy, it's almost impossible. So I don't think that's too much of a burden to raise that tax. However, there are some things I would like to call to the consideration of this Assembly. First of all, they do have in this bill a turnkey agreement with regard to construction of the stadium which means that a single contractor will guarantee a fixed price for the facility so that we don't get out of the ballpark like we did in McCormick Place. The second thing, it does have in this agreement before entering into a lease for the

site or contract, the...the stadium authority must submit a detailed written report of its findings to the General Assembly and the report must include a detailed plan of the method of funding, acquisition, lease or contract, evaluation, economic consequences, proposed acquisition and an analysis of the reasons for acquiring a site for constructing a new facility. So, which means if we do pass this bill, it still will be in our hands to make any future decision on it once that report is submitted to us. And let's not kid ourselves, I'm not crazy about having the White Sox go out of the State; in fact, they could come to Lake County, the owners of the White Sox live in my county, but they don't want to come to my county. But since they want to stay in Chicago, or...will be induced to stay in Chicago, two things we have to consider; they have to pay a lease of four million dollars a year, but they have to get the American League to come in as a party to the contract of the lease and...and guarantee the State that they will not remove the franchise or allow the franchise of the White Sox to go elsewhere, because even if the White Sox owners pay the four million dollars per year, they could have a flea market in that stadium too if they wanted to. So, all I'm saying to you is, I'm going to support this bill 'cause it will mean jobs, it will make Chicago...bring more additional revenue in for the State of Illinois, and after all, the bottom line is jobs...more...more...and more of them. So, I will support the bill much as I do find some...some problems wrong with it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Jerome Joyce.

SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. As a downstater, many of us are being asked to vote for this, and I don't mind helping...the...Chicago, whether it be the White Sox, the Bulls

or the Hawks, Cubs or the...I have a lot of constituents that enjoy those sports' activities very much. But we live quite a ways away from Chicago and when they drive into town they go to a stadium that they're going to take a chance on getting rained out or what have you, they get a...rain date...rain check, they probably aren't going to get back to use it, so I think I agree with Senator Philip that there is probably a lot of support in downstate Illinois for a facility such as he described, a good domed facility, multipurpose. I think you...we could sell that much easier at least to my constituents than I can for a one, single-purpose facility for one team. And I think that's...that's where I'm probably coming from on this. It just seems to me that if those owners can't get together and the people in Chicago can't get together to talk to them that then...something is lacking here, folks. If...if they get together and present a good case to us, I think that there would be a lot of people that would support it. And I surely think that that's the way to go. If we do this one thing, well, then we're going to be asked to do it again and again and that facility would be gone forever. So, I think you Chicago legislators ought to think of that. If you wanta great facility, if you go for this one right now, you're probably never going to get one.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Savickas.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Well, Mr. President, obviously as a Chicago legislator I'm interesting in keeping the Chicago White Sox in Chicago, but Senator Topinka touched on a subject and I think it was just briefly covered is the involvement of the White Sox themselves in this financial arrangement. It was said that they're putting up four million dollars a year in rent. That four million dollars, to my understanding, comes from after

the...State builds the stadium and builds the skyboxes in it, then the State will say, here, you can lease it out, they will lease it out, take that four million revenue from those skyboxes, pay the State back and use this as rent. In other words, it's just a mere show where their participation is nil. The State can't lease those boxes out themselves, collect that four million without turning it over to the White Sox. But they are in the construction costs, not only are they not putting any up-front money up but they are taking money out. We're talking land acquisition, eight million dollars; site preparation, this includes parking lot development, eight million dollars; a stadium structure, seventy-five million dollars; the architecture cost for bond, then the land relocation contingency, five million and a construction contingency for six and a half million and construction interest if appropriate, if appropriate, for twelve million dollars. Seems awful strange that we're talking if appropriate contingencies for this type of money and...with no...no involvement by the franchise themselves. The State and the city, the State will be guaranteeing five million dollars a year for...how...you know, as long as it takes. And when Senator DeAngelis mentioned good business deals, I think this is an excellent business deal for whoever drew it up, their attorneys or their...the owners themselves, because they are going from a stadium that they claim is uninhabitable to a brand new stadium at no cost with the rent being paid by their...by the State putting up the skyboxes so they can lease them. So they pay no rent out of their pocket and they get a free place to play, a brand new place. I think one of the questions should be...answered is, can the White Sox on the profit and loss statement pay four million dollars out of their own rent without...without the State building something for them to pay the rent with and can they afford to do that? If they can't, I think there's a serious question whether we

should be building this, giving them a free stadium, giving them free rent and allowing them to stay here. If that is the condition, I think we should do what we can to keep them here but not give away the store and in debt our...our legislative process to that amount of money for the next twenty and twenty-five years.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I suppose virtually all of us have our minds pretty well made up as to how we intend to vote on the Conference Committee report on House Bill 3162. Let me just point out, while I agree in part with Senator Kelly, I think it's fair to say that in the closing days of last Session we made every legitimate attempt to keep the White Sox in Illinois, in Chicago, and there were drafts of reports circulating, as I recall, even when we left at three o'clock in the morning. So, I don't think anyone was unaware that we were confronted with a situation where it was determined by the owners that it was economically nonfeasible to remain in that stadium and they had to consider other alternatives. They went so far, as a matter of fact, as to acquire, at least by option, property at Addison, Illinois. And it got so far down the road that there was even a referendum, which as I understand, it failed by some...or won by some forty-five or forty-six votes to say that, no, we really don't want you out here. So now it's up to us having again been prompted by the Mayor of Chicago and the Governor of Illinois to make every effort, General Assembly, they said to us, make every effort to keep the White Sox in Chicago, to keep the White Sox in Illinois. And I suppose if we had another caucus we could attempt, at least, to reinvent the wheel and say, well, we really ought to have this mammoth dome stadium like Indianapolis or

someplace, and we just ought to tell all these franchise owners, you better play here or you're not going to play anywhere, and that's really not a bad idea except for the fact...the fact that over the past four years there have been at least six groups of interested citizens, developers, who have gone to the various franchise owners and said, we have a plan, how do you like this? We must have considered five or six different sites, I even saw a rendering with a double roof. And the fact is all those franchise owners said, nope, Mr. Werts wants to stay in the stadium, the Cubs want to stay at Wrigley Field, the Bears at one point at least wanted to stay at Soldier's Field, I'm not sure where they are anymore; but the fact is you can't force any of these private enterprises into a stadium that we would love to construct as a showplace for the rest of the world. So we really are not in a position to reinvent the wheel or find that better way. We are confronted with the fact that we had better do something or perhaps the people of Illinois will be bereft of this professional baseball team and this seems to me to be a logical alternative. Let's keep the Sox in Chicago. And for the record, Mr. President, I would ask for a ruling from the Chair as to how many votes are required for the approval of this Conference Committee report.

END OF REEL

REEL #2

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. In response to Senator Rock's...inquiry, Conference Committee Report No. 1 to House Bill 3162 will require the affirmative vote of thirty Senators for Senate passage, first, because the report has no expressed effective date nor extraordinary majority is required under Article IV of Section 10 of the Illinois Constitution; second, no extraordinary majority is required under Article IX, Section 9 because no State debt, as that phrase is defined in the Illinois Constitution is incurred under the report. The bonds are not secured by the full faith and credit of the State, also the bonds are not required to...to be repaid out of tax revenues since annual appropriations are necessary so as to not to obligate future General Assemblies. The only thing the report requires is a transfer of State money from one fund to another fund; and, finally, the Illinois Sport's Facility Authority is a unit of local government because of its composition and powers and its obligations are therefore excluded from the definition of State debt. Therefore, the report will require thirty votes for passage. Further discussion? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President. In closing, let me just add that in the previous consideration we have just put thirty-seven affirmative votes on the proposition that we want Arlington Park rebuilt. It seems to me we ought to have the same number to keep the Sox in Chicago. I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. President Rock, you're absolutely correct as far as your scenario and the timetable that's been transpiring on this stadium. And you're correct when the ownership of the Sox...even were...was ruled to DuPage County and appealed to DuPage County were even...just about evenly split whether they should be there or not. The difference is that in Bridgeport, in the 11th Ward, the White Sox...it's always been the home of the White Sox and the people in that community are looking forward to the help that's contained in this measure. The people in the 11th Ward and that community took the leadership role when Mayor Daley was alive as far as providing adequate parking within that area...to attract people, to participate and come to the ball park. I believe that this measure as is provided in this Conference Committee report is a viable solution. It's not the panacea as far as the...the dome stadium that we want to have, but in all reality, it's impossible to get these other owners together. These are business people who would have their own business techniques that they want to preserve. Senator Joyce mentioned as far as Rubloff, I know in my discussions with Arthur Werts, he was quite candid when he told me that at one time he and Rubloff were very, very close on many business deals but when it came to the acquisition of the Blackhawks, he...wanted to run his own business and the Blackhawks as he saw fit. And the same thing happened with the Bulls, the same thing happened in Chicago Stadium. There was a difference of opinion of...how to promote and instill championship teams in the City of Chicago. It's very important that we do everything in our power to remain...having the White Sox remain in Illinois and this is one worthwhile provision that will be able to do so. I strongly encourage an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Vadalabene...all right. Senator Degnan, for a second time.

SENATOR DEGNAN:

Well, thank you, Mr. President, and I apologize for rising a second time. All the issues in this bill have been debated now. This, again, is the bottom of the ninth for the Chicago White Sox as we know it. We appreciate your consideration, we'd appreciate your Aye vote, let's play ball.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Vadalabene may close.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Since this legislation provides for the construction of this facility in Senator Degnan's district, I was going to yield for him to close, but I guess you've closed already, Senator Degnan, is that correct? I am honored to be the Senate sponsor of House Bill 3162 and...just let me have one minute here...you know, I have a bicycle trail named after me and I have a nature trail, I have a towboat, I have got two race-horses named after me, I have a park, three streets, a waterline and finally the SIU Multipurpose Building in Edwardsville. I...I've been given assurance by the conferees of this enormous and historic bill that in no way...no way will this be called Vadalabene White Sox Park. This will help the economy of the State of Illinois. I think it's a great piece of legislation and I would appreciate a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. The question is, shall the Senate adopt the first Conference Committee report on House Bill 3162. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? You haven't heard

HB 2630 Conf. Comm. Rpt.

me? Have all voted who wish? All right, last call. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 30, the Nays are 24, none voting Present. The Senate does adopt the first Conference Committee report on House Bill 3162 and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes,...having voted on the prevailing side.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Vadalabene having voted on the prevailing side moves to reconsider the vote. Senator Lemke moves to Table. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. So ordered. All right. The next order of business is House Bill 2630. House Bill 2630 on page 8, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

I have the Conference Committee report...I have the first Conference Committee report on House Bill 2630, the third corrected copy.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator D'Arco. Can we break up the conferences. We are...we have a lot of business yet to conduct. Senator D'Arco.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

Thank you...thank you, Mr. President. The third Conference Committee report on 2630 provides for many changes in the pension systems in the State of Illinois. There are some...there's about twelve different systems that are affected by this bill. One of the major provisions of this bill provides for disinvestment of all State pension monies in the State of Illinois from any company that is doing business in South Africa. It is prospective in nature only. It does not affect the current money that is presently invested

in companies that do business in South Africa. It was a compromise provision. It...it's a good provision, we all are against apartheid. We all believe in the principles of democracy and, therefore, this is our statement to tell that government that it's got to change its act in order to do business with this State. I will ask...I will answer any questions on any of the pension provisions in the bill. Let me say there...most of these provisions are for survivors and people on fixed incomes. Most of these provisions are no cost items. There are a few that do cost some money, but in those instances for the most part, the level of funding in those systems is quite adequate to absorb any fiscal impact from the increase in benefits. With that, I will ask to adopt Conference Committee Report No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Kustra.

SENATOR KUSTRA:

Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Senate. Again, when I came down here this Session the one thing that I thought I would be able to do is bring home an increase in pension benefits for our teachers...our retired teachers. They deserve it, they're not adequately compensated and they ought to get it, that's the good news. The bad news is that while the teachers are in here, just about everybody else is in here too, including...I could go through the provisions. I know some of you have your own bones to pick with this proposal, but there's one in here that let's judges retire and go into private law practice and come back on the bench and retire again to go to private law practice and back on the bench and they collect their...their years of compensation and cost of living increases like...they were there all the time, 'cause of course we want to take care of those judges after we just gave them seventy-eight to eighty-two thousand dollars a year, whatever it is anyway. This time of year we

all wonder when the Christmas season begins. I'll tell you when it begins. It begins when enough green lights go on that board to pass this bill, 'cause this is a Christmas tree package for just about everybody. We ought to send this back to Conference Committee and on January 13th give the teachers the increases they need without giving away the store to everybody else in town. I vote Aye...No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. The Economic and Fiscal Commission has been given some responsibility for analyzing pension costs of particular bills and also for developing some long-range recommendations if not solutions to the problem of our underfunded pension systems. This bill in a sense deals with both, although the only immediate concern is the cost of the bill and some of the principles that it is bringing into play. I would call attention to the members, which I believe they know, that if this bill passed in its present form, it would increase the accrued liability of a series of pension funds to the tune of 408.8 million dollars...about four hundred nine million dollars. In addition, the annual increase in cost would be...to the same pension funds would be 67.8 million dollars, almost sixty-eight million dollars in increased annual costs. That is a very significant increase in commitments on the part of the State, and many of these commitments are not to people who...did retire a long time ago when indeed the amount that they were paid and still are being paid was clearly inadequate and to whom I think we do have a continuing responsibility. In addition, I would point out that there are some principles being established here, for example, computing pension...liability on the salary on the last day of service...the last day of service which is I believe, unheard of except for I'm told one pen-

sion system in the State. It has enormous potential for abuse and for manipulation as well as for cost. That should not be adopted probably ever and certainly not in a pension bill in a Conference Committee report which has not been thoroughly dissected and thought about for a long period of time. There are a lot of very serious commitments involved in this bill and a very substantial commitment of public funds for which adequate funding has not been made available. It should not pass, I would urge a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Well, I, to some degree just wanted to echo Senator Kustra's comments. I, too, felt very strongly about the need for us to do...address some of the problems of retired teachers and met with their groups and, frankly, very concerned. It is regrettable that that very worthy cause has been used as a shield for the rest of this bill and I would suggest to you the rest of this bill in part borders on burglary and sets some precedents that we ought to think about long and hard. A senior member told me when I first got down here, never vote for a pension bill after June 30th. That's generally pretty good advice but, in this case, it is excellent advice. I'd like to see us come back next year and address those legitimate concerns that are contained in this bill in an...orderly deliberate process. This is not the way to address pensions, this is a bad bill and deserves either a No or a Present vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

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

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

He indicates he will yield.

SENATOR WATSON:

Senator, I've been called off the Floor by several of the groups that are represented in here and the analysis that we have says that this is an annual cost of sixty-eight million dollars roughly, and I'm told by the people that are concerned and interested in this that the actual cost is seventeen million out of General Revenue Fund or a State obligation. Can you identify that and correct that if necessary?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator D'Arco.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

Well, I don't know where you got your figures. You're saying that the total cost is only seventeen million? Who told you that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

The representative from the AFSCME Group told me that the actual cost was only going to be seventeen million dollars out of State obligations...State requirements. But what we see on our analysis is that the annual cost is sixty...roughly sixty-eight million...67.88 is what we're told.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator D'Arco.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

Well, some of...some of these systems...you talking about the State...cost to the State of Illinois? Okay. The cost to the State of Illinois...the...the cost to all the systems is sixty-seven million dollars. The cost to the State of Illinois would be a lot less than that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Okay, you answered my question. Then what...let's say that's seventeen million dollars, is that based on sixty percent of payout like we normally fund or is this a full...full funding? What...what basis is that seventeen million or the sixty...even the sixty-eight million for that matter?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator D'Arco.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

The cost of this...the State would be based on sixty percent of payout. If that's...if we fund the system at sixty percent of payout then the cost would be based on that figure. For the other systems, it depends on what percent the municipality is basing their cost of payout on.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Then...then am I to understand that the cost figures that we have are based on sixty percent payout?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator D'Arco.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

For the State you're talking about, right? Right. Yeah, right.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Mr. President, Senators, I have several concerns with this bill, one of which is...I wonder if the sponsor would yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

He indicates he will.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

...do the provisions in this bill call for the pension to be based upon the last day of service for some of these pension funds?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator D'Arco.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

...there's only...there's only one system in this bill that provides for last day of service and that's the downstate police system. Now the downstate firemen already have a provision in the law that allows them to retire based on last day of service. So we're talking about parity between those two systems.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Mr. President, I...I...I simply want to point out two things. One is that that is...that precedent that we're about to follow just opens the gateway to all kinds of terrible practices. If I understand this bill correctly, there are provisions for twenty-five year service and out plan and what that means is that we'll have some people back in the labor market at age forty-five, forty-six who will be drawing very large pensions and who will be in competition with those seeking jobs elsewhere and who would normally have a shot at jobs that will not now be open. I think that's the kind of thing that we need to look at very closely, particularly when you look at the demographics are going...I wonder if I could get your attention, please. Mr. President, I'd like to...I think we...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Let's have a little order there, Senator Kustra, Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

...I think we ought to understand that when we vote on

this bill that we're looking at some demographics that are absolutely shocking and at some point we're not going to have any pensions to pay anyone. The demographics are these; that is, the labor market force, that is those who are coming into the labor market force and those who are eligible for higher education, constitute a shrinking pool, most of whom...most of whom are unprepared for both the labor market and for higher education, that's the shrinking pool. On the other end of the pipeline, we have a rapidly escalating elderly complement, elderly people who are mushrooming in numbers, elderly people who are living longer than ever before. So we're going to be paying out pensions for folks from forty-five to ninety, for forty-five years, and during that time there is not going to be a sufficient number of tax producers on the other end to bear that burden. When we cast a vote for this bill that's the disaster that we're looking at somewhere down the line and I don't see that disaster as being far off. So when we cast a vote on this measure, I think we ought to understand that we're doing a short-term palliative that's going to have some long-term results that could be absolutely disastrous and I don't think any legislator in this Body wants to have that as a legacy. I...think we ought to just tube this bill and get it out of the way and start all over again.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I think you will remember that all of the pension bills that were introduced this year in the Senate were held in the Senate Rules Committee. We didn't have a hearing on any Senate pension bills, many of them...maybe we should have, but here we are at the last minute inculcating into this Conference Committee report all of those bills plus many other items that have never had a

hearing in the...in the Senate and I think it's a mistake.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. It's beginning to sound like this might be overkill, but I want to make two points. First of all, Senator Newhouse, I guess you and I are not well known as voting together on a lot of issues but...but you're absolutely right on this and...and the point I want to make is this. When...when we give a new pension benefit to one group, just expect that we're going to get that same benefit for everybody else. Now, there's one provision in here that Senator Newhouse mentioned and that is allowing the State police only to retire after twenty-five year's service. Now that's a very small group, so the cost of doing that is relatively minor, but how many policemen are there in Illinois? How many correctional officers are there in Illinois? If we give it to the police and correctional officers, you think the firefighters aren't going to want it and deserve it? We have to be careful about what we do here by a way of setting precedent and this is a bad precedent that's being asked for. The other thing I want to speak to is...is what I think is a...is a procedure that we all ought to be ashamed of. We have retired teachers in Illinois who...who receive a pittance and they...have been coming to us year after year and you and I have been promising them help and we've been trying to help them, but now...it appears to me that this is largely the...the product of the Speaker of the House, comes back to us with that provision in it, of course, putting us all in a box but also asking us to vote for a lot of other things that hadn't ought to be in here. I think we're going to have to ask the teachers to wait a little bit longer; hopefully, we could come back with another Conference Committee report in January and take care of the teachers and do

the thing we ought to do, but let's not do the rest of this, let's reject this report.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? If not, Senator D'Arco may close.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

Thank you, Mr. President. There's been a lot of discussion about the negative features of this bill, but let...let me say something to you. Number one, sure, it's important to help those retired teachers and, let me say this, not only are they in this bill but you've got retired State employees that are in this bill too and you've got retired university employees that are in this bill. They need help too and they're in this bill, and when you talked about...Senator Kustra talked about judges who can retire and come back and retire and come back, the fact is, these are judges that have already maxed out, they've already got twenty years of service in already and they're doing the public a service by coming back especially with all the problems the judiciary is having today. Let me also point out to you that there are emergency provisions in this bill that must be acted on immediately. There must be an authorization for the Medicare tax, that has to be passed immediately. There also must be an insurance provision for downstate teachers that must be passed immediately. Those are emergency provisions that have to be taken care of. Let me point out to you that everyone is worried about the unfunded liability of these systems and I'm worried about them as well, but the unfunded liability depends upon the ratio of the funded to the unfunded liability and it depends upon the ratio of a vestment income to employee contributions and employer contributions. These...these factors will determine the investment solvency of these systems in the future. I'm not going to pretend gloom and doom for the future pension systems in

the State of Illinois. I'm not going to stand here and do that, because these systems will be funded proportionately as time goes on and nobody is going to...nobody is going to find that their employee's retirement check isn't going to be there at the end of their career service. That's not going to happen to anyone in this State, we're not going to let that happen. And let me say this to you, most of these items are noncost items, that judges' item that Senator Kustra spoke about is a total noncost item. And if you're talking about the State police and you're saying it's horrendous, twenty-five and out, let me say this, two State policemen have just recently been killed in this State, that's how hazardous and dangerous the activities that they are involved in to protect the public in the State of Illinois, and the State police now patrol the City of Chicago and...and they're patrolling East St. Louis. Don't put those State policemen down, ladies and gentlemen, they're doing a great job for us in the State of Illinois and they deserve that provision. And they maybe deserve it more than anyone else, and if anyone else wants it, we should reject them on the basis of the hazardous activity that the State police are involved in. This is a good bill. There's a lot of provisions in there that are going to help people that are retired and are on fixed incomes and need that extra ten dollars a month or twenty dollars a month to live on, that's what you're talking about in this bill. That's what's important, not the other miscellaneous and ancillary provisions that you're so hard on putting us to the test. This is a good bill and I ask you to vote Aye on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

The question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee report on House Bill 2630. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the

record. On that question, the Ayes are 15, the Nays are 24, 11 voting Present. The Conference Committee report is not adopted and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senator D'Arco.

SENATOR D'ARCO:

Yeah, I ask that a second Conference Committee be appointed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

A request that a second Conference Committee be appointed. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On Conference Committee reports, our next order of business will be Senate Bill 416, Senator Marovitz.

SECRETARY:

The second Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 416.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you, very much, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 416...Conference Committee Report No. 2 merely removes the...the mandatory bifurcation period in divorce proceedings whereby after a long period of wait, oftentimes as long as four years, the grounds for divorce are proved up. Right now in the law there's a mandatory waiting period of forty-eight hours that said even after that long waiting period, after you prove up the grounds, you have to further delay in order to...before you prove up and distribute property. All the judges in the divorce divisions, all the people, all the experts in the divorce field feel all this does is cause further acrimony, further delays. It allows the individual with...with the property and the money to say, well, now I have my divorce, you wait for your half, you wait for your property. There's no necessity to do that, it's been mis-

used. All this does is make it permissive with the judge instead of mandatory. I know of no objection to it at all and that's all...that's all it does and I would ask for adoption of Conference Committee Report No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you, very much. Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

He indicates he will.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Why are we doing this now? Why didn't we ever put this through committee?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

All I can tell you is that this was sent to us by the chief judge of the divorce division, and I know what your concerns are. Passing this Conference Committee report meets your concerns, because if a divorce occurs, then the...if we don't pass this, the...the...the man with the property, the husband, can say, well, now...now that I have my divorce, you wait for your property, I'm not going to proceed at all, even though there's been a four-year waiting period before the divorce. This says it's up to the judge, there doesn't have to be a waiting period after the grounds are proven and the divorce is granted before the property is distributed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Geo-Karis...Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

I still don't understand why didn't we put this through the committee process? Why are we trying to do these kinds of things at the last minute? You know, I have not checked

with my bar association, I haven't checked with any of my judges, I get down here, the first thing I see is this thing...I'm on that committee, I've been on that committee a number of years, I've never seen this before. Why do we do these things on Veto Session? That's all I'm asking.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I'm the minority spokesman of this committee. There's nothing wrong with this conference report. What...why we didn't bring it up...committee, I guess no one thought about it, but I can tell you it's legitimate. What it really means is that the judge has discretion as to whether or not to provide a waiting period after the divorce grounds have been entered, and sometimes you have some of these greedy husbands who get their divorce and then they say...they find excuses through their attorneys to delay the time as to when their property is going to be distributed and how it's going to be distributed. I recommend favorable passage of this conference report.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yeah, question of the...sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

He indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Senator, did...will this bill take care of the problem...and if you recall, both you and Senator...Geo-Karis was on the committee which I had a bill that attempted to address the...the property settlement and to take away the...the need for...bifurcation in cases where the...the custody had been awarded and...and...to the spouse with the family domicile.

Okay? And, at that point in time, it was my understanding that there would be a committee established and...you know, and...to work out the whole problems of the whole bifurcation system. And will this...issue now as it is before us resolve the issue of the domicile? Because my major concern was that in...that if in the bifurcated trial process that the divorce had been granted and the kid is somewhere dangling not knowing where they were going to live or who was going to be awarded the...the home that they were currently living in. Will this bill now address that issue?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Yes. This...this bill should address that issue by making sure that at the same time the...the divorce is granted, the property rights will be determined, that will be up to the judge. Right now it's mandatory that there be a forty-eight hour waiting period; now it will be up to the judge and he will be allowed to make those same determinations at...at the date that the divorce is granted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

So...so you saying that it is up to the discretion of the judge?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

As chairman of Judiciary, I rise in support of this, even though this concept have not gone through the committee process. This is something I...I talked about when we passed the initial Marriage Dissolution Act that when we separated status and property from the divorce decree and had two hearings that this would happen, and this is what happens; most

of the time a wealthy spouse can hold up the property or...a vindictive spouse can go into bankruptcy and tie up their property and...decrease the value of the home. This provision protects, Senator Fawell, mostly women who...have the least funds to get proper representation in court. This is a good provision, but this is...also should remind us ever since we passed that initial great Marriage and Dissolution Act that we were against and we'd passed without committee approval, we've had problems with marriage and dissolution in the State of Illinois. So...should remember that if we're going to put together any uniform Acts, we should take our time. It shouldn't just be put in at the wee hours of the moments and then passed in a couple of months. It should lay on the Calendar for a year and gone over specifically by the lawyers before this can happen, and I'm sure that we wouldn't be in these circumstances coming back and forth. This is a good bill. We...most divorced women need this bill, this protects them and it protects more than...more important children that must live in that marital home that...that's divided up after the divorce. I ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Marovitz may close.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Just very briefly, the...the...the urgency of this is that the tremendous backlog of cases in Cook County caused the chief judge...Judge Comerford to appoint a blue ribbon panel to come up with ways to reduce the backlog. One of the suggestions that they made recently was to remove this bifurcation provision. That is exactly what we're doing. I ask for your Aye vote.

PRESIDENT:

The question is, shall the Senate adopt the second Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 416. Those in favor will vote Aye. 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, there are 47 Ayes, no Nays, 2 voting Present. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 416 and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports, there's a Conference Committee on...report on Senate Bill 1004, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

The first Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1004.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Senate. The first Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1004 was...drafted in conjunction with the Department of Public Aid to enable the establishment of a specific rate methodology to meet the unique needs of the campus facilities such as those operated by Misericordia, notwithstanding the new rate category; the campus facility would still have to negotiate the rate with the Department of Public Aid. This Conference Committee report does not guarantee a rate for campus facility. The report only allows for a special consideration that may result in a deviation from existing standards, particularly with respect to allowable rates for facilities which provide intermediate care for the developmentally disabled. This is legislation that is designed to deal with the problem they are having at Misericordia. Many members in this Chamber have had the opportunity to go to Misericordia, Misericordia South or Misericordia North, and to observe for themselves firsthand the love and concern that is a part of that establishment. This bill passed out...this Conference Committee report was

adopted in the House by a vote of 100 to zero about an hour and half ago, and I would ask that the Senate repeat that.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Any discussion? Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to reaffirm the wonderful work that this institution is doing, they're just great people and I urge its support.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

I rise in support of this...piece of legislation. This will benefit my grandson when he ages out. This is an important piece to keep something like this open for the disabled. I ask an Aye vote.

PRESIDENT:

The question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1004. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1004 and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports, Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1010, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

The first Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1010.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

Senate. The Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1010 does the following four items; one, deals with legislation on handicapped access to polling places to allow for minor impediments if the board has provided for a method to alleviate that minor impediment; two, provides for referendum on questions of public policy on...contiguous combinations of precincts in the City of Chicago; three, allows newly established political parties to merge into other existing established political parties and, four, authorizes referendums of voters not scheduled to vote on any candidates when other voters in the political subdivision are scheduled to vote on candidates in addition to referendums. I would ask for adoption of the Conference Committee report. The obvious interest is in the merger of the political parties. I would be willing to answer questions, would ask for your favorable consideration.

PRESIDENT:

Any discussion? Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I rise in support of Conference Committee Report No. 1. Like Senator Carroll mentioned, there are several varied parts of this piece of legislation, some apparently are very partisan, others are not. The party...the merger of the Democrat and the Solidarity Party section is a problem incurred by the party of the members on the other side of our aisle and possibly should not be addressed at this time. But, however, it also has good parts to it such as the access to polling places by handicapped citizens who wish to vote and allows for the combinations of precincts to petition for local advisory referenda within the City of Chicago. Now those Republican colleagues of mine, many of you in the suburban and downstate...legislators, you have the same authority with your villages and townships to petition such

as the recent O'Hara Airport Authority referendum you voted on just last month. And this proposal will allow our neighborhoods in Chicago to have the same type of voice in our future, and I encourage strongly all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this Conference Committee report.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Question, please.

PRESIDENT:

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

Senator Carroll, under this legislation, when would Solidarity cease to be an established political party?

PRESIDENT:

Senator...Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

When they file...when the candidates who ran under the Solidarity label file an affidavit with the Democratic Party through its State Central Committee of their request to dissolve the party. They are the only members of that party under existing State law; therefore, the candidates would have to file an affidavit with the party with whom they wish to merge which we would believe to be the Democratic Party.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEREMIAH JOYCE:

And what is the effective date of this legislation?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Immediate. That affidavit would then be given by the State party by the way to the State Board of Election.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Joyce. All right. Further discussion? If not, Senator Carroll, you wish to close?

SENATOR CARROLL:

Just ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDENT:

The question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1010. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. 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 38 Ayes, 5 Nays, 10 voting Present. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1010 and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. The bottom of page 8, there's a...on the Order of Conference Committee Reports, there's a Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1565, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Second Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1565.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

What this second Conference Committee report does on Senate Bill...1565, the comprehensive approach designed to toughen penalties for those who sell and manufacture controlled substance, addressing certain problems that we...occur. We reduced the current law to fifteen grams in the case of manufacturing, the sale and the possession. I think it's a good bill, but most important, I think it's a...a bill going in the right direction which is something I've always been concerned about and that's the provision that any person of...over the age of eighteen who use...uses, employs or engages another under the age of eighteen to deliver a controlled substance may be sentenced to a term of imprisonment

up to twice the maximum amount otherwise authorized. This will get rid of the fegans in society who use young kids to run drugs because we can't protect them, and I think this is the way to go and I ask for a favorable adoption.

PRESIDENT:

Any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1565. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 48...49...49 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1565 and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Before we leave the regular Calendar, we earlier gave leave to Senator Carroll to go back to House Bill 3101, Mr. Secretary, on the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading, for the purpose of the supplemental appropriation. All right. With leave of the Body, we'll go back to the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading, on the top of page 4, is House Bill 3101. Read the bill, Mr. Secretary, please.

SECRETARY:

House Bill 3101.

(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. As we had identified at the point at which we had amended this legislation, these are the appropriations deemed absolutely necessary and essential for the operation of government that could not have awaited the Session of January 13th; and others that will await, that have asked significant

questions that were not issues...the nonfunding at this point in time would critically handle such as Panhandle legislation, DASA, State Police, et cetera will be dealt with at a later time. I think we answered questions at the time the amendment was adopted. I'd be willing to answer questions. This is just over a hundred million dollars, most of which is from other than GR funds, and I would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDENT:

Discussion? Senator Sommer.

SENATOR SOMMER:

...Mr. President and members, what Senator Carroll says is indeed correct. There's none of those items that we are notoriously concerned about in this bill. I would like to point out one small item and that is that we had in June appointed a committee to determine a proper memorial for Senator Bloom. The committee met and has...has decided that a proper memorial would be to plant a tree on the lawn in his honor and also to place a plaque near the tree memorializing him and...in here we havea very modest sum of one thousand dollars to accomplish that.

PRESIDENT:

Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 3101 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. House Bill 3101 having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. All right. The Secretary has informed me that Supplemental Calendar No. 1 has been distributed. It appears at least that we have finished our business on the regular Calendar unless anyone has something they wish to bring to the Chair's attention. And that being the case, we'll move to the Order of Supplemental

Calendar No. 1, there's...on the Order of Conference Committee Reports, Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1164, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

First Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1164.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

Thank you, Mr. President. What this Conference Committee does...one thing it does is conveys a waterline from the City of Kankakee to the water company. This line goes to the Old Manteno Mental Hospital, it goes to the Illinois Veterans' Home there and to Illinois Diversitech Campus, a group that we created here. Now, this line is fifty years old and is in sad repair. The Veterans' Affairs Department is opposing this transfer, I might tell you; they have tried to lease...or not lease, they tried to...well, lease...for no cost to the water company this line and the water company in Kankakee says they cannot fix it if they don't own it. So what I'm trying to do is give this fifty-year-old waterline to the water company so when it does break, they can repair it, and it broke several times last year and there was no cost to the Veterans' Affairs Department because there was equipment out there and...CMS had some people there and they fixed it, but...it's going to cost a substantial amount of money in the future to fix this line. The water will not be...or the water company will not charge a higher rate if they own the line because they are regulated by the Commerce Commission. So we're kind of...a chicken and the egg situation on that one. In...in another part of the bill there is a...the Department of Conservation owns some land along the Illinois-Michigan Canal that...that the City of Ottawa...they let the City of Ottawa use, they are trying to sell this, City of Ottawa is to the Salvation Army for a soup kitchen

and there the Department of Conservation says that this needs to be sent through the General Assembly also. So I'd be happy to answer any questions, if there are any.

PRESIDENT:

Discussion? Senator Rigney.

SENATOR RIGNEY:

A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDENT:

Sponsor indicates he'll yield, Senator Rigney.

SENATOR RIGNEY:

Word reached me just a couple of minutes ago that this bill had failed in the House, this report. Do you know if that's true?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

Yes, that...that was true, but the...the word that I had was that those type of bills were failing until the baseball and race track bill were called over there. So, I'm not privy to what is going on over there, I just thought that we ought to try and pass it here and let the House do what they will.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Rigney.

SENATOR RIGNEY:

Well, I guess my only comment was, I was one of the conferees and one of those that did not sign the report. Our staff had done an analysis of this and pointed out to those folks on our side of the aisle that there may certainly be a problem here inasmuch as we seem to be conveying land without any consideration for it. I thought the procedure around here was that we had things appraised, there was a value established and there had to be proper compensation. So that was the reason that I did not sign the report.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

Okay...I understand that and...it normally is the way but we couldn't get the...Department of Veterans' Affairs or CMS could not get a legal description in time. All it is is an eight-inch pipe that runs down the right of way of Route 50 and they couldn't get this done. Now the water company in Kankakee tells me that they will not be able to accept this, you know, as a gift, if you will, or for anything else after the first of the year because of the new tax law, they would have to pay taxes on it. Now I guess I'm in kind of the position on this bill that it's...I want to be able to say I told you so when the Department of Veterans Affairs comes in here with a large appropriation to...to fix up this pipe. We have an opportunity to give it away to someone who will repair it for nothing and...you know, the department says, well, it...you know, it would cost us more to get a legal description than maybe it would to fix it up and we've got it in our budget. It would be easier to get money in our budget to fix the pipe than it would be to hire a lawyer to get a legal description. So it just doesn't make a whole lot of sense to me. I...do what you will with this, I know we're not going to let that veterans' home go without water. So, you know, do what you want to. I think we have an opportunity to save the State some money is all I'm trying to do.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Further discussion? Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Joyce.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Senator Joyce, does this also have a provision in it that

would allow the City of Ottawa to...convey land that was given to them by the Department of Conservation to the Ottawa Salvation Army?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

...yes, I said that in my opening remarks, Senator, it does.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

I'm sorry, I did not hear that in your opening remarks, but...I don't know when we conveyed that to them from the Department of Conversation, but in...I know in all the recent years when we have given State land to a public body that if the use of that is not used or not for the purpose for which the State donated it, it reverted back to the State. Does this title that...when we gave this land from Conservation to Ottawa have such a conveyance in it reverting it back to us and, if so, how...is this doing away with that procedure?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

Well, as I'm told, and I'm not all that familiar with Ottawa, that the State gave this land to Ottawa for the...oh, for the use of the city of...the people of Ottawa. Now it doesn't seem to me that giving it to the Salvation Army would be a...a very dastardly thing to do. They're going to run a soup kitchen in it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

It may be not a dastardly thing as far as Salvation Army is concerned but I always thought when we conveyed property

to a public body without any fee attached that it had to be for public use. And I support the Salvation Army very generously in this area, but they are not a public use facility that any and everybody can go in and use it. So, I...I don't know whether this is the first or second Conference Committee report, but if it's the first, I think we ought to reject this and let's get it in the right order.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFTI)

Further discussion? Senator Joyce to close.

SENATOR JEROME JOYCE:

Well, I...I think we...we know basically what the things are here and...and I just ask for your favorable support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFTI)

The question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1164. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, please. On that question, the Ayes are 35, the Noes are 12, none voting Present. And the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1164...report is not adopted and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senator Joyce requests a second Conference Committee be appointed on Senate Bill 1164. (Machine cutoff)...on Supplemental Calendar No. 1 is House Bill 3351, Senator Demuzio. Senator Demuzio.

SECRETARY:

First Conference Committee report on House Bill 3351.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFTI)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, Mr. President. The first Conference Committee report...all this allows is for the chairman of the Board of Education in...municipalities of over five hundred thousand

to serve on Economic Development Committee as well. Apparently, there is a prohibition in Chicago that apparently forbids the Board of Education chairman from serving on any other boards or commissions and this is simply to allow him that opportunity to serve as a member also of the Chicago Economic Development Commission. I'll be glad to respond to any questions, but I think that's simplistically what it is in its nature.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee report on House Bill 3351. Those in favor vote Aye. Those opposed Nay and the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, please, Mr. Secretary. On that question, the Ayes are 52, none voting Nay, none voting Present and the Conference Committee report on House Bill 3351...or the Senate does adopt the Conference Committee report on House Bill 3351 and is declared passed. Sorry. Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

On a point of personal privilege. If I had been more alert, I would have certainly voted in the affirmative on my own Conference Committee. I would like the record to so reflect, and also I would like to ask that Senator Newhouse be joined as a hyphenated cosponsor of that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

The record will so reflect, please, Mr. Secretary. On the Supplemental Calendar No. 1 is House Bill 3473, the Conference Committee report, Senator Davidson. Please read the Conference Committee report, Mr. Secretary. I'm sorry, Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Mr. President, I'd like leave of the Body to come back to this a little later, we're not quite ready to move with it at

this time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LUFT)

Is leave granted? Leave is granted.

PRESIDENT:

If I can have your attention, we are, again, as always happens at the end, awaiting Messages from the House. As I read my checklist, we are down to probably four or five items, so that we are truly sitting here waiting for House Messages. In the meantime, Mr. Secretary, let's move to the Order of Resolutions. We can adopt the Resolutions Consent Calendar. Resolutions. Mr. Secretary, have any objections been filed to the Resolutions Consent Calendar? This Calendar has been distributed to the members, it is on your desk. The only additions thereto have been this afternoon, House Joint Resolution 247, House Joint Resolution 248 and Senate Resolution 1317, all of which are congratulatory. Any objections been filed, Mr. Secretary?

SECRETARY:

No objections have been filed, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Luft will then move the adoption of the Resolutions Consent Calendar, three pages of resolutions. All in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries and the Consent Calendar...is adopted. I'd ask you, ladies and gentlemen, just kind of stand at ease. I will confer with Senator Philip and we'll find out what the House is about. We're trying quick as we can, honest...honest. The Senate will come to order. Senator Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, it was...with deep regrets that we see one of our colleagues leaving the Senate. I'm talking namely about Senator Jim Rupp and as sponsor of resolution...Senate Resolution No.

1289 to which all the other Senators join me telling Jim that we are going to miss him and we wish him...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Geo, can you hold that Message until the gentleman hits the Floor. I'm sure he'd like to hear it.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I wonder where he is.

PRESIDENT:

...he was working, he was one of the pension conferees, they were working.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I'd be happy to hold it until he gets back. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

Thank you, you're very kind. Senator Philip, for what purpose do you arise, sir?

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I'd like the record to indicate that Senator Maitland is...on...in Washington D.C. on legislative matters and that Senator Macdonald is once again at home convalescing from an operation. Thank you.

PRESIDENT:

The record will so reflect. If I can have the attention of the membership, let me just give you an idea where I think we are and where the consensus thinks we are. The House, as I'm sure everyone is aware, has turned down the first Conference Committee report temporarily on 3162, they are conferring. The fact is that it appears that the Senate as usual has concluded its business in an expeditious fashion, so we are prepared to adjourn until the 13th of January and leave the House to its own devices this evening. There is one additional matter, I made a commitment to Senator Philip that we would get back to House Bill 3473. I'd like to handle House...the Conference Committee report on House Bill 3473,

then we will handle the motion to adjourn until January 13th, at the hour of noon, and I think that's all we have to do. With leave of the Body, because everybody is in a hurry, we will move to the Order of Supplemental Calendar No. 1. Senator Davidson...asked leave to get back to that. Conference Committee report on House Bill 3473, Mr. Secretary, please.

SECRETARY:

First Conference Committee report on House Bill 3473.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Mr. President and members of the Senate, I would urge the adoption of Conference Committee Report No. 1 to House Bill 3473. It has three things in it; one, DuPage Airport which we passed out of here, Senate Bill 1921, 53 to 2; one, DuPage Water Commission which has a limited quick-take for eighteen months which was Senate Bill 2038. The other is...has to do with the National Heritage Endowment Trust Fund Act which is necessary for conservation in the State to be able to create a Natural Heritage Fund so that funds from private foundations can go into this fund. It escrowed...after the fund reaches five million dollars, the interest that is earned from this fund will be appropriated by the General Assembly to the Department of Conservation to buy national heritage or heritage type property. I would urge a favorable vote.

PRESIDENT:

Any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee report on House Bill 3473. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. 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 50 Ayes, 1 Nay, none voting Present. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee report on House Bill 3473

and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Before we put the motion to adjourn and the adjournment resolution...Senator Geo-Karis.

END OF REEL

REEL #3

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDENT:

State you point, ma'am.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I would like to inform our colleagues that our colleague, Senator Jim Rupp, will be leaving the Senate at the end of this term and those of the...those of...those of us who've had the pleasure of knowing Jim and working with him, even when he didn't agree with us and we didn't agree with him, we felt that we want to express our appreciation to him for being the fine gentleman that he is and has been, a good colleague and a very able and astute Senator and wish him and his wife, Florence, well. This is Senate Resolution No. 1289. I not only offered it along with our leadership but every other member of this Senate and we'd like to express to Jim Rupp that we will miss him, we hope he comes back and I hope he'll be the new county chairman of the Republican Party in Macon County, so maybe we'll get some results there because we never win out there, but we want to wish him well. God...God give you good health, happiness, success and prosperity to you and your wife and family. And, Jim, I love you no matter what you tell me.

PRESIDENT:

Well said. Senator Rupp.

SENATOR RUPP:

Mr. President, all I'd ask for is a favorable roll call.

PRESIDENT:

Senator DeAngelis, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Have we moved to adopt our resolution? I want to go to another order of business for just...

PRESIDENT:

Yes....yes.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

While we are...there is another member on our side...

PRESIDENT:

Hold it now. We're trying to wind it up...wind up...wind down.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

...who is also going to be leaving us, and I did not have the privilege of knowing this gentleman till he came down here and in the short period of time he's endeared himself, I'm sure, to all the members of the Body because he is quite a classy person, extremely knowledgeable, participates in his own way in the process and I would just like to say that, Dave Leitch, we're going to...miss you a lot. We hope to see you back here someday and maybe in the near future see you at least back in some other capacity where you could come and visit us, but you've been a real joy. We're going to miss you.

PRESIDENT:

Well said. Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Well, on the same subject, we have one additional member on this side of the aisle who is departing and is sneaky enough not to show up on the thirteenth even though he has assured me he will be here, so...so that we don't miss a chance. I've, along with Doc and Howie and Dawn, served with Senator Sommer lo these many fourteen years and we had a little bit of a chance the other night to get even with him and I thought we did a rather...rather good job of it, but all kidding aside, it is a....and if Bob Madigan were here

I would give him the big shoes treatment. It's a very big set of shoes that...Senator-elect Madigan is going to have to fill and we're all going to miss Roger Sommer and his quiet counsel and rationed...rational debate. He's made an impression down here and he's made a lot of friends and I know we're going to miss him. I doubt he'll be out of government too long, but we do all wish him well. I know that's a very bipartisan wish too.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Well, it has...been one of those who shared this illustrious Body time with Senator Sommer who came with him in the class of '72, who share adjoining district, even had to campaign with him through my home county, been his seatmate, though he almost killed me with his cigarettes, he...we're going to miss him. The whole State is going to miss him. He's the only guy I knew who had the ability to back Howie Carroll up and we certainly need you to come back, Roger, and when we put up a red flag and call out for help, don't question, just come, you'll know that Howie is out of control again and that we'll need you to help us get his attention. I'm going to miss you and I'm sure the whole...wish you well.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Why, thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I, too, would like to rise on this occasion to say a fond farewell to one of, as now Chairman Hall but then Senator Hall used to say, one of the four horsemen...and as one of the horsemen, I can say that Senator Sommer did an unusual and yeoman's work. He was a little bit raucous in committee on...on occasion, spending a lot of...wasting a lot

of our time overquestioning directors and other agency staff; but I can assure you, Senator Davidson, you were right, when we got into that closed room up on the sixth floor he did an outstanding job for your party, so in that sense, I'm happy to see him go because we can break in a new member who will have much less knowledge, much less talent and much less ability. The State will miss you, Roger.

PRESIDENT:

I'd...I would just remind those who are on the airplane, it's five-thirty...the airplane...yeah, right...all right. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the...Senator Sommer, one of the finest things that I've had in the twenty years I've been in the Legislature is when you come to join us in the Senate. I wish you Godspeed and farewell.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Geo-Karis, for the twenty-third time.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Well, I just want to...Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I want to congratulate and commend Senator Sommer, Senator Rupp and Senator Leitch for jobs well done, but I wanted to tell Senator Sommer you're the only one, Roger, who can compete with Ayatollah Khomeini Carroll and I think you were on equal footing with him and he was more afraid of you than he...than you were of him.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Sommer, you want to defend yourself or do you want to wait till the thirteenth? Okay, fair enough. Resolutions, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Joint Resolution 190 offered by Senator Demuzio.

(Secretary reads SJR 190)

PRESIDENT:

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you, Mr. President. This...Senate Joint Resolution 190 is the...the adjournment resolution as read by the Secretary. It calls for us to come back on January the 13th, Tuesday, at noon, 1987, and I would move for the immediate suspension of the rules and adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 190.

PRESIDENT:

All right, Senator Demuzio has moved to suspend the rules for the immediate consideration and adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 190. Calls us...calls for us to return on the 13th of January. All in favor of the motion to suspend indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The rules are suspended. Senator Demuzio now moves the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 190. All in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted. Ladies and gentlemen, you have, as usual, responded magnificently. I wish all of you a very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year, and we'll see you on the 13 of January. Session is...pursuant to the adjournment, Senator Poshard moves that the Senate stand adjourned until January 13, 1987, at the hour of noon. Senate stands adjourned.

REPORT: TIFLDAY
12:35

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PAGE 1
03/29/88

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

DECEMBER 05, 1986

HB-2486 CONFERENCE	PAGE	8
HB-2630 CONFERENCE	PAGE	39
HB-3101 RECALLED	PAGE	3
HB-3101 THIRD READING	PAGE	60
HB-3162 CONFERENCE	PAGE	14
HB-3351 CONFERENCE	PAGE	66
HB-3473 CONFERENCE	PAGE	69
SB-0416 CONFERENCE	PAGE	50
SB-1004 CONFERENCE	PAGE	55
SB-1010 CONFERENCE	PAGE	56
SB-1164 CONFERENCE	PAGE	62
SB-1442 CONCURRENCE	PAGE	6
SB-1565 CONFERENCE	PAGE	59
SB-2116 CONCURRENCE	PAGE	7
SR-1289 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	72
SR-1317 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2
HJR-0233 ADOPTED	PAGE	5
SJR-0190 ADOPTED	PAGE	75

SUBJECT MATTER

SENATE TO ORDER - SENATOR DEMUZIO	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REV. ANTHONY TZORTZIS	PAGE	1
JOURNAL - APPROVED	PAGE	1
JOURNALS - POSTPONED	PAGE	1
MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	2
RESOLUTIONS CONSENT CALENDAR - ADOPTED	PAGE	68
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	76