

84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

REGULAR SESSION

JANUARY 9, 1936

PRESIDENT:

The hour of noon having arrived, the Senate will please come to order. Will the members be at their desks and will our guests in the gallery please rise. Our prayer this afternoon by the Reverend Hugh Cassidy, Blessed Sacrament Church, Springfield, Illinois. Father.

REVEREND CASSIDY:

(Prayer given by Reverend Cassidy)

PRESIDENT:

Thank you, Father. Reading of the Journal, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Thursday, November the 7th; Friday, November the 8th; Tuesday, November the 12th; Wednesday, November the 13th and Thursday, November the 14th, in the year 1935.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

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

PRESIDENT:

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

SECRETARY:

To the Honorable President of the Senate. Sir - In compliance with the provisions of the Constitution of the State of Illinois, I am forwarding herewith an enclosed Senate bill which the Governor vetoed in part and reduced. Signed, Senator James Edgar, Secretary of State.

PRESIDENT:

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 has concurred with the Senate in the passage of a bill with the following title:

Senate Bill 994 with House Amendment No. 4.

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

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

House Joint Resolution 124, and it is congratulatory.

PRESIDENT:

Consent Calendar. If I can have the attention of the membership. The Chamber is graced today with the presence of a special guest and to introduce our special guest I'll turn the Podium over to Senator Kenneth Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. We are indeed honored today to have present with us and it's my pleasure to introduce to you Miss Jilanne Klaus. Miss Klaus was recently selected Junior Miss of Illinois. Please join me in welcoming Miss Klaus to the Illinois Senate.

MISS KLAUS:

(Remarks given by Miss Klaus)

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you. We also have...her lovely parents. Now would you mind coming up, we want to make a picture. And...and she's from Belleville, Illinois, by the way. The garden spot of the world.

PRESIDENT:

Resolutions, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

The following resolutions are all congratulatory.

Senate Resolution 602, Senator Lemke.

603, Senator Lemke.

604, Senators Demuzio, Rock and all Senators.

605, Senators Dudycz, Kustra, Geo-Karis, Mahar and Topinka.

606, Senator Etheredge.

607...608 and 609, Senator Zito.

610, Senator Kelly.

611, Senators Lechowicz, Rock and all members.

612, Senator Savickas and all members.

613, Senators Hall, Rock and all members.

614, Senator Mahar.

615, Senator Mahar.

616, Senator Dudycz.

617, Senator Dudycz.

618, Senators Rock, Philip and all Senators.

And the following resolutions are all death resolutions.

619, Senators Rock, Philip and all Senators.

620, the same sponsors.

621, Senators...Senator Weaver and all Senators.

Senate Resolution 622 is by Senator Savickas and it's congratulatory.

PRESIDENT:

Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 623, by Senator Weaver.

Senate Resolution 624, by Senator Netsch.

And Senate Resolution 625, by Senators Rock, Philip and all Senators.

PRESIDENT:

Executive. Introduction of bills.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 1490 introduced by Senator DeAngelis.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill 1491, Senator Rock...introduced by Senator Rock.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill 1492 introduced by Senator Etheredge.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill 1493, Senator Kelly.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill 1494, Senator Kelly.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill 1495, by Senators Topinka and Dudycz.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill 1496, Senator Collins.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill 1497, Senator Collins.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill 1498 introduced by Senators Marovitz, Berman, Degnan, Chew and Smith.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill 1499 introduced by Senator Marovitz.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill 1500 introduced by Senator Keats.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

Senate Bill 1501 introduced by Senators Marovitz and Lechowicz.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bill.

PRESIDENT:

Rules Committee. Right now. Senator Philip. Senator Vadalabene, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR VADALABENE:

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

PRESIDENT:

That request is in order. Senator Rupp.

SENATOR RUPP:

Also be a...Mr. President, a Republican Caucus in...the...Senator Philip's Office immediately following this.

PRESIDENT:

All right. There's been a request for a Democratic Caucus in the Office of the President immediately and a Republican Caucus in Senator Philip's Office immediately. The Senate will stand in Recess until the hour of one-thirty.

RECESS

AFTER RECESS

PRESIDENT:

The Senate will please come to order. With leave of the Body, Channel 20 has requested permission to videotape. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Resolutions, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

The following resolutions are all congratulatory.

Senate Resolution 625, Senator Topinka.

626, Senator Topinka.

627, Senator Topinka.

628, Senator Topinka.

629, Senator Topinka.

630, 631, 632, 633, all Senator Topinka.

Senate Resolution 634, Senator...Donahue.

Senate Resolution 635, Senator Vadalabene.

Senate Resolution 636, Senator Jeremiah Joyce.

Senate Resolution 637, Senator Jerome Joyce.

And 638, Senator Jerome Joyce.

And Senate Joint Resolution...106, Senator Macdonald.

PRESIDENT:

Consent Calendar on those resolutions. Introduction of bills, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 1501 introduced by Senator Geo-Karis.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1503, Senators Dawson, Jones and Poshard.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1504, Senator Vadalabene.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1505, Senators Dawson, Jones, Savickas and Welch.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1506, Senators Sangmeister and Rock.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bills.

PRESIDENT:

Rules Committee. Messages from the House, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate the House of Representatives adopted the following joint

SB 994
nonconcurrency

resolution, in the adoption of which I am asked the concurrence of the Senate, to-wit.

House Joint Resolution 126, and it's congratulatory.

PRESIDENT:

Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY:

And House Joint Resolution 128.

PRESIDENT:

Executive. All right, if you will check...we will begin on Supplemental Calendar No. 1. All right, Supplemental Calendar No. 1 on the Order of Secretary's Desk Concurrence, Senate Bill 994, Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I'm going to move to nonconcur in Senate bill...Senate...House Amendment No. 4 to Senate Bill 994. It is technically flawed and we would seek a Conference Committee to have 994 read in a...in a fashion that would allow for us to properly put House Amendment No. 4 into 994 as well as to work on, I think, a technical matter that was brought to the attention of the Department of Revenue by elements in the telecommunications industry.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Bloom has moved to nonconcur in House Amendment No. 4 to Senate Bill 994. Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you...thank you, Mr. President. Senator Bloom, as I understand it, the idea is to get this back in a Conference Committee so that the sequency of events can be straightened out. You do not intend to have before us today a Conference Committee report that is going to be voted on though...isn't that correct?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

I am reliably informed that the Conference Committee report is prepared and, of course, it awaits the pleasure of the Senate. However, I have...I have asked that you, Representatives Hastert and McPike be given copies of that to peruse so that we all are talking about the same thing.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

I just talked to one of the parties who was interested in some of the things that we were attempting to do earlier in this...in Senate Bill 994 who did indicate to me that there was no great urgency; that is, we could wait until the next time we were back here if it did not work out that it could be voted on. I mention that only because I think I understand that all of the things that are in there are what we had earlier agreed to, but it always makes everyone more comfortable, particularly on a major piece of legislation, if there is enough time for staff to be able to go through it with a fine-tooth comb. That's the only reason...I have no objection to the procedure that you are initiating.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

I quite agree and made it abundantly clear to those who communicated with me that staff on both sides of the aisle should have ample opportunity to digest it. I think that staff has had some input in the formulation of the Conference Committee report, but I repeat, I strongly urge them to touch bases with you and Representatives McPike and Hastert and other interested parties.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Senator Bloom has moved to nonconcur in House Amendment No. 4 to Senate Bill 994. All in favor indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senator Netsch, are you ready? All right. On Supplemental Calendar No. 1, Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1037, Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Mr. President, staff just said could we hold a minute. There is one technical point they need to take a quick look at in the Conference Committee report. May we hold it just a moment and...

PRESIDENT:

Sure, we'll be here tomorrow. On the Order of Item Vetoes, Senate Bill 134. Senator Hall, are you ready? Motions in writing, Mr. Secretary, on Senate Bill 134.

SECRETARY:

I move that the item on page 26, lines 13 through 18 of Senate Bill 134 Do Pass, the item veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Signed, Senator Hall.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Would you sound the bell, Mr. President? Thank you, Mr. President. This is support for the veto override of the 6.4 million to provide welfare...welfare grant increase. I know all of you remember while we were discussing all of these additions that there were many other things that were included in the bill such as a marina, such as race tracks and et cetera. Now what this simply meant that there are approximately eight hundred and forty-five thousand persons in this State, one of every thirteen citizens of this State each month receives some cash assistance. I looked at the

television the other day and when I saw it come on and here it had the famous singer who was singing America, and they were showing the American...they showed the flag and they showed the Statue of Liberty and they were singing from sea to shining sea. You know that when I look around this room and when I think that some year close...over nineteen years ago there are some of us who came here and there are many of you who have joined us. One of the great things about being a member of the Legislature is that you get to meet people from all walks of life, some from every nook and corner of this great State is represented right here on this Floor. And all this was asking that we live up to the American dream, that what we were trying to do is to give fifty-two percent of need; and I'm not going to stand here and take up a lot of the time because I think that Senator Netsch and others here are going to talk on this matter, and I know Senator Carroll and others. So at this time I will yield to Senator Netsch and then I'll go back to the closing of it when others have finished, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEBUZIO)

All right. Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. There are several points to be made about the motion to override this line item veto in Senate Bill 134. The first has to do with the merits of the issue in...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEBUZIO)

Well...pardon me, Senator Netsch. Could we have some order, please. Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. The first has to do with the merits of the issue itself, that is the substance of the issue, and in that respect I would underscore and emphasize what I think Senator Hall has already referred to. What the

6.4 million dollars does is to prevent a sliding from fifty-two percent to fifty percent of the basic standard of need for all of those on public assistance. I would emphasize two points in that; one is, we are not talking about a standard of need that is pulled out of the air, we are talking about a standard of need that, in fact, is determined by the State, by State agencies and it's defined in terms of the minimum cash resources necessary to maintain a subsistence level of living. That is about as basic and low a standard a living as you can devise. This amount of money would maintain that standard of living at fifty-two percent rather than fifty percent...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hall, I understand that this motion is not on the public aid restoration, that this motion is in reference to the female and minority business grants.

SENATOR HALL:

There should be two up there...you...you...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well...

SENATOR HALL:

Which one are we...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

...we are...we are taking them one at a time.

SENATOR HALL:

All right. Well...okay, let's...let's back up, I was...I was confused. Yeah, we'll go to the restoration then.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Just...just a moment. Senator Hall, it's been suggested that we take this one out of the record and that we file a

SB 1037
2nd C.C. Report

new motion so that we can proceed in an orderly fashion. With leave of the Body, we'll take it out of the record. Take it out of the record. Senator Vadalabene, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, while there's a lull here. On a point of personal privilege, I would like to make an announcement.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Could we have your attention, please. Senator Keats. Senator Bloom. Could we have some order, please. Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. The American Legion has their 1985-1986 Department of Illinois Directory of office...commissions and committees. I would like for the Democrats on this side of the aisle to come over and pick one up and Senator Adeline Geo-Karis will handle the Republican side. And I would like to warn you that they're going like hot cakes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Geo-Karis to rebut.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

No, Mr. President, not to rebut but to ask...all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle to come and get a booklet which has the complete mailing list of all the American Legion...no...I've got them right here...Frank. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. All right. With leave of the Body, we will come back to the...to the item vetoes. On Supplemental Calendar No. 1 we will move to the Order of Conference Committee Reports on Senate Bill 1037. The second Conference Committee report, Senator...Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1037 is...which is my bill had originally nothing to do with what is about to be its subject matter. It was the prior year EAV bill but it was a convenient vehicle in which to take care of several matters that I gather needed to be taken care of. The first and the reason why I was willing to put 1037 up for auction in a sense is that when we passed the farm bill in November, there were two I think partially unintended or unplanned for repercussions from it. One was a total inadvertence in preparing the bill, the Legislative Reference Bureau had eliminated what was believed to be an obsolete section and the effect of it was totally to withdraw the tax delinquency dates for property taxes paid in Cook County. We normally pay on March 1 and August 1, those are the dates that the delinquency starts...that authorization has effectively been eliminated and it would have a really devastating effect on the whole tax collection process in Cook County. There's absolutely no controversy that that needs to be restored. The second part that Cook County in particular had asked the Legislature to address was not a matter of inadvertence at all but something which they felt they did not have sufficient notice on. In the farm bill we changed a whole series of interest rate charges from eighteen percent down to twelve percent. Some of you may remember that it was approximately four years ago that we raised most of those to eighteen percent. The...in the case of Cook County the estimate from the county treasurer is that that provision only as it applies to the penalty on delinquent property tax...on delinquent property taxes would cost the county some 8.7 million dollars. That is a sum of money that they did not expect; it is, in effect, budgeted into the county budget, there is no way really for them to take that into account and to plan for it at the present time and so they have asked us if we could restore that. The compromise that was worked out among a

number who looked at it was to do this, to propose that the twelve percent penalty interest rate on delinquent taxes remain for all farm property throughout the State of Illinois because it was farm relief that was really the basic thrust of the bill that was passed in November but that we restore to eighteen percent the penalty interest rate on delinquent taxes for all other property Statewide; and my own personal suggestion is that we take a look at that again in the spring and see whether we need to make a permanent adjustment but that we not take the counties by surprise at this point. That is basically what 1037 was intended to deal with. At the request of the Governor's Office, it has two other provisions. One is to authorize the transfer of 3.5 million dollars from the General Revenue Fund to the Agricultural Premium Fund in order to cover all of the outstanding obligations on ag. premium which my understanding is there is not sufficient revenue to meet at the present time. The second is that it allows appropriations to be made from the Farm Emergency Assistance Fund to IFDA for payments from both the farm relief program and the payment adjustment program, or to put it more simply we passed two farm relief programs, one was the Governor's and one was "ours" and...but the appropriation could run only from ours, not from the Governor's. This would allow the amount of money, which is not being increased, to be spent from either of the programs. I'm not sure I would give the Governor that but that was at least the request that was made and I gather it was agreed to by some of those who had been involved in the process. That is what the bill does. I will answer the questions that I can. I may not be...be able to answer all of them on the Governor's part of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate adopt the second Conference Commit-

tee report on Senate Bill 1037. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 54, the Nays are 2, 1 voting Present. The Senate does adopt the second Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1037 and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. All right...Senator Hall. Senator Hall, are you ready to proceed? All right. Supplemental Calendar No. 1, item vetoes, Senate Bill 1034, motion. I'm sorry, Senate Bill 134. Mr. Secretary, the motion.

SECRETARY:

I move that the item on page 159, lines 2 through 8, and on page 159, line 9 of Senate Bill 134 Do Pass, the item veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Signed, Senators Hall, Smith and Carroll.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, this is the fifty-two percent of need and...the welfare grant increase. As I said before, that what we're simply asking is that we give people in need...whether they have to make a choice to pay rent, to pay for heat, to buy clothes and to buy shoes and other necessities of life, whether there's going to be food in the home. This is a veto that should be overridden and I'm going to yield at this time to Senator Dawn Netsch.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. I...I think I've been here before but I will sort of start over again. I think there

are a couple of very basic points that need to be made about the attempted override of this item veto which is the...the public aid 6.4 million dollars in Senate Bill 134. First of all is the...the need; that is, the merits of the bill, the need for that amount of money. I think Senator Hall has already referred to that and I am sure others will. But let me just underscore one...or two points on that. What we are talking about is the amount of money that is necessary to keep the percentage of need from dropping from fifty-two percent to fifty percent. Now what does that mean? The State sets a basic standard of need for minimum subsistence for those people who are in need of public assistance. It is a minimum...subsistence level; that is, the actual definition is...let's see if I've got it here...the...to provide a livelihood compatible with health and well-being. The amount of money that we appropriate takes care of a certain percentage of that minimum subsistence standard. What we are saying is that if this 6.4 million is not included, that percentage will drop from fifty-two percent to fifty percent. Now, yes, admittedly there are food stamps and energy assistance that get added into the package and so it does not mean that all of the people who are on public assistance are going to be kept at exactly a fifty percent level, but that is still a minimum subsistence standard that we're talking about. And bear in mind that of the people on public aid, five hundred thousand are children, two hundred and fifty thousand are their parents, two hundred thousand are aged and disabled and there are about a hundred thousand unemployed adults. So, it is a...it covers all of us, it hits every district and every kind of population group. I would also point out that cost of living increases, if you want to call it that, have been effectively given to every other agency of the State including all of our employees and indeed many of ourselves at at least a five percent level. This comes nowhere close to

meeting that kind of an increase for those on public assistance. The second thing that I would like to point out to you is that the override movement is strongly urged upon us by the Campaign for Family Stability, and the Campaign for Family is another thing that really affects all of us. And if I may put it this way, this is not a group of lake front liberals if that would offend some of you, but listen to some of those who are part of the Campaign for Family Stability, the Salvation Army of Peoria, the Suburban Cook County-DuPage County Health Systems Agency, United Methodist Church, United Way of Chicago, the Child Care Association of Illinois, Catholic Charities of Joliet and on and on. These are all of the agencies that deal with the people who are our neediest and they are urging us to restore this extremely modest sum of money. The last thing that I would like to make is a point that really does not have to do directly with the merits or the need for the 6.4 million dollars and it has to do really with the legislative process and the integrity of our institutional system. When the Governor came into the Fall Session, he asked for some three hundred and eleven million dollars of supplemental appropriations. Some of that was probably quite appropriate and necessary, some of it was not and some of it was certainly not of an emergency nature. When the package was finally worked out at the very end of the Fall Session, there were items which, at the urging of the Republican side and the Governor, were kept in that by no stretch of the imagination were emergency matters and some of us voted for that supplemental appropriation knowing that there were nonemergency, nonessential items because it also included a matter such as the 6.4 million for the supplemental appropriation for public assistance. I would suggest to the Chief Executive that a deal is a deal, Governor. If you are going to...you and other members of your party are going to get some of us to vote for the things that we do not

think have to take place in a Fall Session, then you'd better not go back on what we believe is a commitment and veto out only one item, the public assistance part of the package. The marina for Waukegan or Zion, the Dana House, and I think the Dana House is a great idea, all of those other matters which are not emergency matters you approved. The only thing you cut out was 6.4 million for public assistance. I would strongly suggest that if you want any help from the General Assembly in the future, you ought not to be renegeing on what we believe to be commitments. And we do believe this to be a commitment and so do all of the others who saw that money go into the supplemental bill in the fall. Governor, I would strongly urge you not to work against an override of this; and to my colleagues on the other side I would say, to a very considerable extent the integrity of our institution and our process is at stake. Please support the override.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Discussion? Further discussion? We have in the following order, Senator Smith, Senators...Carroll, Geo-Karis and Newhouse. Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. President and members and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. It has already been stated the facts about this override and I stand to strongly support the override of Senate Bill 134 and the item which embraces the general revenue on page 159 of the special budget, item two...line items of the veto of six million four hundred thousand dollars that was given and to be provided for the people who are on general assistance and those who are on welfare, aid to dependent childrens. In the Fall Session, there was a commitment that we would be able to have this amount of money providing for persons who could not help themselves but are solely dependent upon this general assistance for their survival. And we went along with some of the

things that our...the beloved Governor wanted and wanted to provide...his constituents; yet, we found that we were totally surprised that he had vetoed this commitment. I stand here this afternoon and I say to my colleagues that we as people here in the State of Illinois should never forget from whence we came, that we should not be insensitive to people who cannot help themselves. 6.4 million dollars is merely a drop in the bucket when you come to think about the luxury that is going to be offered to people who really do not need it, they need it in their particular areas of livelihood but their total sole survival is not dependent upon it. I merely stand here this afternoon to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and those of us here on this side of the aisle, that we join in a unified effort and stand and cast our vote to override this veto so that people who are dependent upon us for their survival here in the State of Illinois will know that this legislative Body is sensitive to their very needs. I stand in support of this override.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEBUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I, too, rise in support of this motion to override as I had risen in the past to place this into various pieces of legislation. I think the record has to be clear as to what this is and what government is about. In dollars we're talking about a hundred and forty-five dollars a month maximum to reach this fifty-two percent of need to pay for rent, to pay for shoes, to pay for clothes, to pay for food, to pay for heat, to pay for everything that a person in need has to pay for other than that which other government agencies can help provide. Even if we pass this, it has been determined that we will be at about eighty-five, maybe eighty-six, maybe eighty-seven percent of the very minimum standard of need for

a person to maintain themselves, the minimum standard, nothing lavish, nothing extravagant, the very minimum that health allows at eighty-eight percent of that if we approve this cash portion. That means taking in energy assistance, food stamps and everything else, you're still at eighty-eight percent at most of the very minimum standard of need. My God, what is the cost to this State of health care for those who cannot even meet this minimum, who then become ill and fall within our public aid system of providing health care? A lot greater than the difference between what they're getting now and the hundred and forty-five dollars a month cash maximum in the highest area of cost, a hundred and forty-five dollars a month cash. A half a day in the hospital is more than what we're giving them in total. Ten minutes in the emergency room will cost more than this increase to fifty-two percent of need. And what are we talking about in total? The Governor came in for three hundred and eleven million dollars in a supplemental appropriation and does not have six million, two percent of that, to provide for those in need. What are State taxes for? People of Illinois pay tax for government to provide service. These are the people most in need. A six million dollar price tag out of a twenty billion dollar budget, a six million dollar price tag out of a three hundred and eleven million dollar request for spending, if we cannot have heart for two percent of the people...two percent of the dollars, eight hundred and thirty-five thousand people in need, then we have no business being here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion. Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Well, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I take issue at the statement that the Governor of this State approved fourteen million dollars for the new beachfront mariana in Zion with a harbor; he approved of a

loan of fourteen million dollars. And I take issue with the gentleman from the Coalition of Political Honesty who wrote letters to the editors, the Tribune of Sunday and the Sun Time saying the same thing, he ought to get his facts straight. I say this, the reason he approved a loan of fourteen million dollars which is being...going to be paid back starting 1990 to the State of Illinois at the rate of two million dollars a year is to provide not only recreational facilities but jobs, jobs which are very needed because our area is distressed in North Chicago, Illinois and in Zion, Illinois. And if you provide jobs, you can take people off the welfare rolls and put them on the payrolls. So I take issue when you...state a statement saying we approved a fourteen million dollars to be given to the marina. We did not, we approved of a loan to...create those jobs. And...I'll tell you one more thing, that shoreline, if they don't start working on it in...in next year...in this year as a matter of fact, in October, it's going to erode further and we'll...we'll have nothing to build a basis for jobs. So I say to you, the Governor should not be attacked, that's his judgment. My judgment may differ from his but I think it's wrong when we have to attack the Governor simply because he's making his own judgment on an issue just like us. My colleagues are making them on the other side and I'll make my own independent judgment on this issue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Thank you, Mr. President. Let me just adopt by reference almost every speech that's been made up to this point. I'd just like to make one point for...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Newhouse, I've been attempting to get that all afternoon. Senator Newhouse has requested some

order. Can we break up the conferences. All unauthorized personnel please vacate the Floor. Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to talk for a moment about what happens in human terms in the event that this increase is not permitted, and as a matter of fact, this increase is not going solve all the human terms problems. What we're talking about here by and large is what's going to happen to our children. And if we do have any single obligation in this legislative Body, it's to assure that our children do have a future in this State, that they can become productive, and I say again, productive citizens of this State, that they do become contributing taxpayers and that they do become those kinds of citizens that...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Harovitz. Can we have some order. Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

Shall I start from the top?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Take your pick. Senator Newhouse.

SENATOR NEWHOUSE:

What we're really talking about, Mr. President and Senators, is a plan that at minimum, at minimum, will help some of our children to survive and have a productive life. Now let me tell you what's happening right now and I think most of you know it already. Utilities are being cutoff so that heat is not available to many families with the temperature in the below zero range, I think most of us know that already. I think this is probably not restricted to Chicago nor to the County of Cook, I suspect that there are similar problems elsewhere. Now if you want to go from the human problem to the fiscal problem for just a moment. Senator Carroll pointed out the dollar cost of one visit to an emer-

gency room. We know that the flu epidemic is coming, we know that some infants will not survive that. I'm not suggesting that this fifty-two percent standard of need is a cure-all, and I'm not suggesting that for everything I've mentioned it's a panacea, it's not. But what it can do...what it can do is reduce the damage. All fifty-two percent is a damage controlled instrument; it certainly isn't that instrument that's going to prepare our kids to compete in the top bracket of...as...as in other states to be productive as in other states. They will be because there are the kinds of supports we're talking now. I would urge us to look at the dollar amount because it is a piddling dollar amount and add that dollar amount back into the kinds of money that we're about to spend out of some nineteen billion dollars that is budgeted for this State for the next fiscal year. I would urge your support for an override of the...Governor's veto.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. WCIA-TV has requested permission to videotape the proceedings. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Further discussion? Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

Well, thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. It...it appears that I must assume the role of designated hitter, one I do not relish but one nonetheless we have to discharge as a part of the process. Lots have...has been made about this both in the substantive context and in the context of the process. I think two points must be said in response. One, as one who served on that Conference Committee, let me make it clear that throughout the process of putting together the supplemental appropriation the representatives of the Governor's Office said repeatedly we do not support the fifty-two percent of need; and, indeed, the practicalities of the process were such that it went in over the objections of the office. And I'd point

out that those who raise the...raise the issue of...spending this on one project or another are mixing apples and oranges as in the context of capital projects are different than operations projects. And finally, conspicuous by its absence from the comments of those who would...move to override this item reduction is the fact that we're not really talking 6.4 million dollars, we're really talking about 25.9 million dollars out of current operations. And I think that all of us...and this point was made repeatedly during the Conference Committee process when you're talking about that kind of expenditure, it is not something that comes in at the Conference Committee level. The issue had been debated in the spring in the appropriation's process, and when it was brought in to the Conference Committee level, you don't make those kinds of twenty-five million dollar expenditure commitments in a room with ten conferees, you do it in a...fuller process in the appropriation's process. So, it is not, I repeat not, some kind of slap in the face to AFDC or general assistance but it's very prudent and reasoned approach to government. And I would suggest to those who would say in a more impassioned context that we have to look at it that way if we are going to discharge our obligations, because we...all of us, I would remind you, share this concern, and during the discussions in the Conference Committee we repeatedly made that point that you do not bring this up at a Conference Committee whether it be the 30th of June, the 1st of July or at a supplemental Conference Committee, that this thing should be done out-front, openly with a fuller discussion of the context in which it happens. Therefore, I would suggest that we all of us should not override this particular item veto. Thank you.

REEL #2

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, further discussion? Senator Chew.

SENATOR CHEW:

Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr. President. Everybody knows what it is. Very few people would agree with the Governor. It seems that his veto said, the hell with the small people if they can't help themselves, so we're not going to help them. Now this Body passed this bill and sent it to him, and anybody with any compassion of what is need would have signed this bill. I cannot understand, regardless to what his messages were, his feeling on this veto. I think we, as legislators, ought to use the option that's left to us and that is when we think that the Chief Executive is wrong is to correct him as we so frequently do and override his veto, and we will be saying to the people of the State of Illinois, we are looking out after your interest as we are sent here to do; and in spite of his attitude toward these people, it's not a racial situation, it's not a black and white issue, it's a people's issue and we're here to represent people, and one of the best things we could do today would show our willingness just as we did to pass the legislation is to say once again, we're going to stand and represent these people as they should be represented because we're all they got. So, I would urge an Aye vote on 134.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Hall may close.

SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I think that it's been thoroughly discussed and the points have been broke...brought out, but I must say to Sena-

tor Bloom that he knows full well that the chairman of Appropriation II in the House, Representative Woods Bowman, Senator Carroll and myself repeatedly brought this up that what are you going to do about the people who cannot help themselves and to now say that it should be brought to light. Can you imagine if you wake up in a home without any heat, without any...go to bed at night hungry? Children cannot really function well in school because they don't have proper food? What we're doing today...and it's just appalling to think that here we are in this great land of liberty...it's appalling to think that we consider if you're poor, we have no time for you. It's wonderful to take care of all of these things, highways, roads and all, but our primary concern should be to take care of the poor, the indigent, the senior citizens and others who cannot help themselves. No one likes to live in poverty. There's no one on this Floor I would say that...that has their gas cut off at their homes, they don't have their children coming up worrying about food. The essential thing in life...the essential thing that we should do, as Senator Chew has so clearly stated, is to be about the business of people. Now for you to say, because it's going to cost twenty-five million, so what? What's more important than a life? Tell me, what's more important than we save a life? You spend millions. All you got to do is pick up the paper every day and they rushing to try to bring a heart to somebody or they try to bring some organs. Our first primary concern should be that we're here about the business and the people's business, and to say that we're going turn our back on them. This would be a day of infamy if we do not override this...it's human to error and the Governor has errored. Now there's no...and you cannot stand on this Floor, Senator Bloom, and say...when this bill went out of here because we put on that 6.4 million dollars. That's why it went out of here. It would never have gotten our votes for all these

other things, but the thing is that we thought at long last that we're here to look off...after the people. We spend over fifteen thousand dollars a...every year on...on a person incarcerated in an institution and we can't spend...monies to help people who are in need. We wonder why today that we got so many people in universities that cannot fill out applications, who have...read at a fourth and fifth grade level. The reason is that down somewhere somebody is failing to do that, but yet we appropriate all this money. I'm for education and I'm for all these other things, but when you think...with a budget as large as this State has had, that you could spend almost two and quarter million dollars every day for a year and you wouldn't spend a billion, and we have a budget of a...nineteen and a half billion and then come back here with another three hundred million? I don't know...I don't...it's just...I'm just flabbergasted to think, what are we doing to ourselves? You tell me that you can say that we should tell people who are hungry, wait; people who are cold, wait; people who not have the...life. What we're doing, we're raising people today who because of what they're being denied now, who will wait and grow up...there's malnutrition, it's going to cost the State much more later on. I would say to you today, I implore you, I beg of you, what we need to do is when the errors and the error was made and can you imagine if I walked over to you, Senator Bloom, and said you don't need to eat, telegraph your stomach and tell you that you're going to have some food. I'm...I'm shocked at you, Senator Bloom. I've been reading all about you in the paper. I see all the things you're running around here doing, but the point that happens is that you're telling me that you believe that you want to see people hungry, that you want to see people continue in this...I'm just shocked. I ask you, and this isn't a Republican or Democrat, this is something that we owe the people of this State. We owe the right...it's a duty, that's

*SB 134
Attempted Override*

why we're here and we should override this Governor's veto.
I ask for your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

The question is, shall the item on page 159, lines 2 through 8, and on page 159, line 9 of Senate Bill 134 pass the item veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 29, the Nays are 26, 1 voting Present. The motion fails. All right, motions.

SECRETARY:

I move that the item on page 115, lines 8 through 14 of Senate Bill 134 Do Pass, the item veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Signed, Senator Lemke.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lemke.

SENATOR LEMKE:

I ask for an...I ask for an override of the Governor's itemized veto. This is money for a needed police jail which will be needed in the...in the next year because they're building a new court system in southwest Cook County which is District 5 which is near Palos Hills and all the State police bring their prisoners to hold them overnight to...to trial. I think this jail is necessary so there's no overcrowding and there's no inconvenience for bringing prisoners from this area back to Cook County then back in the morning to...to the facility at the 5th District. I ask for an override.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Discussion? Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and...I'm sure it wasn't me. Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen

of the Senate. This is nine hundred and sixty thousand dollars direct grant to the City of Palos Hills, Illinois. We have never done it before. It may be a good cause. If you start here, every municipality in...in Illinois is going to be in here and say, the State ought to build our jails. It's a bad policy to start. I suggest we vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Lemke may close.

SENATOR LEMKE:

That is probably true if this was a normal jail, but what we're talking about is the City of Palos Hills is...going to be enfacéd with an increase in retaining prisoners because a new court in the 5th District is going to be built on a 103rd and Harlem. This facility be...will be down the road about a 103rd and Kean. What we need this facility for is very simple. The prisoners are brought here by the State police from the tollway system. They're all brought to five. They're brought as far as Harlem and...and Stevenson. They're all brought to the 5th District for detention on DWI's, sexual...abuse and waivers on the tollway authority facilities, homosexual activity on the...on the...activities on the tollway and other things like that that normally isn't in a normal village, but because they're at the foothill of 95th and...street exit of the tollway, they're brought there and the State brings everybody there. It's...it's going to overcrowd the...present jail which isn't enough to...to...to presently take care of the problems in the City of Palos Hills, but the...the jail in Palos Hills is not going to be able to accommodate these people. Either the jail is going to be a...overcrowded, the prisoners are going to have to be...arraigned, brought to...to 26th and California facility and then brought back again for...for a hearing before the judge on the preliminary. This is not something that's...that's a normal thing for a...a city or a town to be

involved in and I think it's a need emergency allegation were...appropriation and we need it now because if this new facility will be built sometime in...in the end of '86 or '87 of the new circuit court facility and this will help them to build their facility and to take care of this law, and I ask for an override.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is, shall the item on page 115, lines 8 through 14 of Senate Bill 134 pass, the item veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Senator Donnewald...Treasurer Donnewald...have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 25, the Nays are 27, none voting Present. The motion fails. All right, with leave of the Body, we'll go to the second Supplemental Calendar which has been distributed. Supplemental Calendar No. 2, Conference Committee report, Senate Bill 1345, Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. The Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1345 is the second Conference Committee report. It deletes everything after the enacting clause at the request of the Illinois Community College Board and the Board of Higher Education. What happened...this is technical in nature, inadvertently was typed in...Fiscal Year '83 instead of '84, so that change is made. And it also provides a technical change concerning the distribution of repair and...and renovation grants from the Build Illinois Bond Fund. If there are no questions, I would move for the adoption of Conference...Committee Report No. 2 on Senate Bill 1345.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Senator Dunn.

SENATOR DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I, too, agree that this is a good bill. It's a codification change and it's been changed quite a bit and I certainly concur with the chairman and urge an Aye vote on the...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Luft may close.

SENATOR LUFT:

Move for the adoption, please, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1345. 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 54, the Nays are none, none voting Present. The Senate does adopt Conference Committee Report No. 2 to Senate Bill 1345 and the bill having received the required constitutional majority is declared passed. Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The House has just successfully passed Senate Bill 1249 with some House amendments. That will be coming over and that will reflect itself on Supplemental Calendar No. 3. The Message is not yet here, as I understand it, but the fact is that it is of some importance that we deal also with that one. So, in the meantime, I would...I would ask leave of the Body to go to the Order of Motions in Writing. We have some motions filed with respect to the rules change that Senator Philip and I have discussed and agreed upon and there are some additional motions I'm told.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, on the Order of Motions in Writing, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY:

I move to amend temporary Rule...5 by deleting Rule 5C and substituting in lieu thereof the following. Senator Rock.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The motion to amend temporary Rule Senate 5 sets up the schedule, if you will, for the 1986 semester. As you know, as we have done in the past, we have established dates certain as deadlines for conclusion of our business and we have further provided, as we have in the past, that all bills introduced and all bills pending in the Senate shall be referred to the Rules Committee and the Rules Committee shall refer to the Committee on Assignment of Bills only appropriation bills implementing the Governor's budget and administration or other bills deemed by the Rules Committee to be of an emergency nature or of substantial importance to the operation of government. The timetable...a copy has been distributed to all members. The timetable calls for April the 11th as the final day for introduction of bills and then it sets up the sequence for bills out of committee, out of the Senate, out of the House and calls for final action on 3rd reading and passage of House appropriation bills on June 25th which in the opinion of the leadership, and we met this morning, will afford us, we hope, ample time to conclude our business in an orderly fashion on or before the thirtieth day of June. The deadlines are not new to anyone. The only hitch this year is that as you well know there is a Primary Election on the eighteenth of March and Easter is early. Easter is the last Sunday of March. So after the Governor's Budget

Message and after the primary, we will effectively begin our business on the first day of April and so the deadlines established by virtue of this motion reflect that timetable. I...I know of no objection and I would move that temporary Senate Rule 5 be amended as...as set forth in the motion and request a roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not,...oh, Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

A question of the President. You know, there are three more rules amendments. Will they be heard next? I do not expect them to be lengthy, but I assume we'll hear them, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

I've been looking forward to it all day.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Question of the President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

He indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Mr. President, the Senate earlier passed a resolution and sent to the House that would speed up these deadlines by thirty days under a resolution presented by Senator Sangmeister and DeAngelis. Do you know what the posture is of that resolution and the chances that the House might act?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Posture in limbo, chances slim to none. The House has...has adopted, at our suggestion, the same days for dead-

lines so that our action will be concurrent and when Governor Sangmeister presents his plan again next year, it might meet with better favor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

On the motion just read by the Secretary, those in favor will indicate by voting Ays. Those opposed will 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 55, the Nays are 1, none voting Present. The motion on...having received the required majority vote is declared adopted. Senator Smith, for what purpose you seek recognition?

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you, Mr. President, I'm asking the indulgence of this Body to do me this courtesy, please. On Senate Bill 1037 when the vote was...I'm asking...I'm first...this is the first one, please. I was in conversation with someone and...and got...cast my vote wrong. I wanted to be registered as a No vote on 1037, and then when we got...I was talking to Mr. Constantine, I'm so sorry. On 1345, I would have voted Yes on that. If you'd do me that courtesy. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

The record will so indicate. Further motions?

SECRETARY:

I move to amend temporary Senate Rule 5 by deleting Rule 5C and substituting in lieu thereof the following. Signed, Senator Keats.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Thank you, Mr. President. And in speaking to Governor Sangmeister's resolution earlier, this is sort of a hybrid. The Senate has passed a slight move up of the Calendar in the

past and passed it with fairly overwhelming majorities. What this...what this particular rules change offers is moves the schedule up one week. As you know, one of the great complaints of the membership is really the Conference Committees start in those final days and sometimes we don't quite have enough time to give the full whatever we would want. This simply says instead of starting Conference Committees the twenty-fifth, we move it up a week to the eighteenth and all the other deadlines would be moved up one week to the eighteenth. Now for some of the members who are not listening I just want to stress, numerous of you have said in various conversations, we really ought to have another week on Conference Committees, we really ought to since the whole Session comes down to the final week anyway. Perhaps we should be sure that maybe it isn't just a couple of days and that when all the major business is being done, which is in the final week of the Session, we would perhaps set ourselves up to have a little bit more time, this would give us two weeks to deal with Conference Committees and everything else would be moved up one week so that all the deadlines would be one week earlier, thereby allowing us to have two weeks for Conference Committees and so instead of doing all the business of the Senate in one week, we would have all the business done in two weeks. I would appreciate an affirmative vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? While...before we call for the further discussion, the Chair would like to recognize Governor Stevenson talking to Judge Darrow on the Floor. Governor. Is there further discussion? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I rise in opposition to this motion and I will rise in opposition to the subsequent two motions that Senator

Keats has filed unless he will agree, as I hope he will, to refer these immediately to the Rules Committee for their deliberation. This matter has not been, frankly, discussed with the leadership. I supported, as you recall, as you did as I remember, Senator Sangmeister's resolution calling for an abrupt halt to our business at the end of May. The House has not looked upon that with any favor. I suggest they will not look upon this either with any favor and I think we...we at least owe a duty and a responsibility to ourselves to be realistic. This just isn't going to cut it. What's going to happen is we'll get in mid-June and things will be all bottled up and we'll have to make a motion to amend or suspend the rules and we really ought not do that. I think the...the prior motion that was adopted overwhelmingly sets up a realistic set of deadlines or realistic schedule and one that I hope, frankly, in...in all honesty, we can...we can conform to. I don't like to stay here beyond June 30 anymore than anybody else does, but I think we have to be realistic. We are a bicameral Legislature, not a unicameral one and so we have to also take into account what the actions of the other Body are. I would urge opposition to this motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? If not, those in favor...oh, Senator Keats wishes to close.

SENATOR KEATS:

I just close 'cause I think everyone is now more aware. I think some people missed the first part. I just want to say, it's true this had not been directly discussed with the leadership, but this issue has been discussed for about the last ten years that I've been a member of the General Assembly and to be quite frank has not...the leadership has never quite listened on the issue of saying we need more time at Conference Committees. The reason I don't want to put it in the Rules Committee is because...I think we all understand

that. I don't think that needs to be explained. On the last point of being realistic, this is realistic. The entire Session takes place in roughly a week at the end of June. This at least would say the entire Session takes place in two weeks at the end of June instead of one week. I would appreciate your affirmative vote and I think come the end of June you would all be more than happy that you had given yourself a little more time to look at the business that we're dealing with.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Keats moves the adoption of the motion read by the Secretary. Those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Those...oh, roll call has been requested. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 20, the Nays are 25, none voting Present. The motion having failed to receive the majority...constitutional majority vote is declared lost. Are there further motions?

SECRETARY:

I move to amend...Senate Rule 43 by deleting Rule 43DIII and substituting in lieu thereof the following. Signed, Senator Keats.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Excuse me, could I clarify which amendment...you know, I'm sorry, I didn't catch which one it was.

SECRETARY:

Okay, it's the one on Conference Committees...members. Okay?

SENATOR KEATS:

Thank you. What this...what this does is establishes a Senate Rule that the members of the Conference Committees

should come from the committees of jurisdiction. I think we've seen occasionally that bills that went into Conference Committees sometimes came out looking slightly differently and this would at least be sure that the members of the committee, the individual members of the Senate...perhaps some of you feel strongly that you should have...at least some minor input in some of the Conference Committee action. What this says is the committee members of a committee upon which this bill went through would be on the Conference Committee. These people would at least allegedly be much better informed than simply picking a Conference Committee out of the blue. In many cases, this is done now. As you know, in the Appropriations Committee, getting on an Appropriations Conference Committee and not being a member of appropriations, your chances of that are slim or none. The same should be afforded to a member of the Judiciary Committee or should be afforded to the members of whatever committee you serve on 'cause allegedly the reason they're on...that committee is 'cause you know something about it. I would appreciate an affirmative vote and it would give the individual members more input in the final action.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? Senator Rock. Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

I had a question on this, Senator Keats. As I read it, the sponsor of the bill would not then be a member of the Conference Committee. If the...unless the sponsor happened to be on the substantive committee from which the bill...excuse me, came?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

The...in the...far as having the sponsor himself a member, that has tended to be a traditional thing and nor-

mally...I'm going on my memory, is normally he is...he or she is simply appointed as...as a member of the Conference Committee. This sets up the other members, period, beyond the sponsorship of the bill. I think what you're talking about is covered under a different rule but that has been a traditional value...here. What this would say is, you've got a sponsor and...and then you have X number of members from the specific committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Bloom...oh, Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Thank you. I think you are incorrect about that, Senator Keats, because I believe the only language that covers it now is what you have in this proposed rule and it just says, flat out, "Conference Committee members must be assigned from among those members of the committees of jurisdiction from which the bill was reported." I am not as wildly enthusiastic of...about this one as about some of the others, although I think the basic idea is very good, but I think you better go back to the drawing boards on this one.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

...Mr. President, if she is correct...if we could ask the Parliamentarian, the distinguished gentleman to your left, if that's correct, my understanding was it was not and if it's correct, I'm going to withdraw it because...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

The Parliamentarian indicates that Senator Netsch is correct that...

SENATOR KEATS:

...withdraw it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

...Senator Keats is wrong. So, Senator Keats will with-

draw the motion. Any...any further motions?

SECRETARY:

I move to amend temporary Senate Rule 43 by deleting Rule 43E1 and substituting in lieu thereof the following. Signed, Senator Keats.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Reading this word for word would be the key parts...key thing to say. "The report of a Conference Committee on a nonappropriation bill shall be confined to the subject of the bill or resolution referred to the committee." We then remove the clause that says, "but shall not be otherwise limited by the scope of the disagreement between the two Houses." Sometimes in Conference Committees, I don't know if any other members have noticed this, but occasionally a bill comes out of Conference Committee and we have a hard time recognizing the bill, in fact, find issues that some of us have never in our entire lives heard mentioned during that entire Session. What this says is a Conference Committee would be limited...would be limited to the basic scope that the bill covered. It's still fairly open-ended. It's the basic scope the bill covered. When it went through committee, anything that dealt with that bill, that area, anything within the scope is covered, but what it says is if you send a bill into Conference Committee about apples, it doesn't come out about oranges, and so it does put a limitation of subject matter...but does not limit anything other than within that subject matter, but what it says is you have to at least stick to the basic intent of the bill. What that helps to avoid is...I think you've seen sometimes an agenda suddenly comes up in the last two weeks. I'll use McCormick Place as an example. No one mentioned to us that they had a single problem and yet in the final two weeks of the Session,

without it ever having been heard in committee, without it ever having been discussed, all of a sudden it's a...it's supposed to be on the Floor and it'll be tacked on a Conference Committee report. Perhaps the individual members have some right through committee hearings, et cetera to at least be aware of what an agenda is perhaps before the last week of the Session. So, what this says is a Conference Committee is limited to the scope of the subject matter but only that limitation which is still a very broad limitation and...but says you just can't substitute things that have absolutely nothing to do with the original bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Senator...I'm yield to Senator Netsch.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

...Senator Netsch. They're not ready yet? Senator Rock.

SENATOR NETSCH:

I am.

SENATOR ROCK:

Are you ready? Are you against...

SENATOR NETSCH:

Go ahead...go ahead...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President. While I'm awaiting Senator Netsch's wise counsel, I rise in opposition to this motion also. The fact of the matter is that from time to time, indeed, Conference Committee or bills are used as vehicles, much the same as we did today by fifty-two affirmative votes. We had Senate Bill 1037 sponsored by Senator Netsch, totally different subject matter, absolutely, unabashedly necessary and from time to time we have to do that. I am opposed and

have been opposed, that's why our rules are so lean. I am opposed to people who have been elected to the public trust to be in any respect circumscribed. If you got thirty affirmative votes around here as a constitutional majority, you can do what has to be done and sometimes it's necessary. This would just circumscribe our action. I do not think we have abused it at all and I think that this motion too should fail. I urge opposition to this motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Bloom.

SENATOR BLOOM:

I would...I would...thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I agree with the comments made by the prior speaker. Sometimes in our headlong rush to effectuate reforms we sometimes give reform a bad name. I think in this instance and in the instance of the prior suggestion, these...this is both ill-advised and really would do a disservice to the operation of the Senate in the context of how we respond to what our constituents need or want or how we respond with some flexibility to situations that develop. This is, I think, no better than the prior motion and probably should be withdrawn. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Netsch.

SENATOR NETSCH:

Well, I don't agree with Senator Rock with respect to the necessity to circumscribe what we do to some extent. I, after fourteen years, have decided we do need to put some restrictions on ourselves and that one of the problems about loose open-ended rules is that they do not always work fairly for everyone involved. But apart from the fact that he just cut my argument off at the knees by pointing out the fact that I was the sponsor of a Conference Committee report on a bill that had nothing to do with the original subject matter

of the bill, I think the problem, Senator Keats, and I...this I am very serious about is not the issue that you raised, but I suspect that you have not successfully achieved anything by this particular version. Number one, you've left the...really the...wide open loophole of subject matter of the bill, and as you know that is really the...the gaping hole through which most of these things travel, so that I'm not sure that you've achieved anything; but beyond that, it seems to me that what we really need to look at, and I promise you I will be looking at this for next year, is on some procedural protections that make sure that when we do use a bill as a vehicle, and there is no question that there are times when it's appropriate and not a matter of dispute, that the...the procedural restraints on ourselves are such that it never happen unintentionally and without full knowledge and virtually unanimous acceptance. I think that is really what we should be looking for rather than just deleting this one phrase of...of this bill, and I will devote my attention to it along with you, if you choose, before we come back to it next year, but I don't think this achieves what you want to achieve.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Keats may close.

SENATOR KEATS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Dawn, I appreciate your ringing endorsement. I want to correct one thing with...with President Rock, and I appreciate his...his comments in terms of...I believe the word you wanted was circumscribed. If we're limiting us by moving the private agenda up by three weeks, Phil, if you can't get organized three weeks earlier, I'm not sympathetic. All this does is move the deadlines up to the first part but in this case saying, if you are going to Conference Committee, all we're saying is, concede your

agenda about two to three weeks earlier. I don't think that's unreasonable and that's where, Dawn, coming back to your saying, Dawn, that...maybe I've left it a little too wide. Dawn, believe it or not, I'm trying to be a little practical. I'm trying to give us enough leeway to say, partially what Phil is saying, if we do have a legitimate problem, this gives us some leeway, but what it says is a bill that deals with apples will come out dealing with mostly apples, and so what we're trying to give some protection to the individual members and particularly protection to our constituents who are never allowed to find out what the agenda was. I mean, when was the last time you had a constituent say...that bill passed June what? And you're sitting there saying, well, it didn't go through committee that's why you never heard about it and the press never heard about, it was never a public thing. This at least puts minor limitations which are probably reasonable. I would hope for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Question is, shall the motion just read by the Secretary and debated pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On...on that question, the Ayes are 7, the Nays are 23, 3 voting Present. The motion having failed to received a constitutional majority is declared lost. Okay, we have Messages from the House. Also, we have from the House the Chief of Staff and representative and point man for Speaker Mike Madigan, Mr. Gary LaPaille, the great 13th Ward Precinct Captain escorting the Governor...Governor Stevenson. Messages from the House.

SECRETARY:

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

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate the House of Representatives concurred with the Senate in the

passage of a bill with the following title, to-wit:

Senate Bill 1249 with House Amendments 3, 9, 10 and 12.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

The Pages are distributing our Senate Calendar, Supplemental No. 3. On the Order of Senate Calendar Supplemental 3, we have for concurrence Senate Bill 1249. Senator Philip. Senator...are copies of the concurrence report being distributed to the members now. Are the Pages...are they out on the Floor distributing it? Yes. Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President. While we're affording the members an opportunity to take a look at what the House did to Senate Bill 1249, there are two additional motions that I'm aware of that have been filed to discharge the Committee on Executive. Senator Weaver has one and I have another...that in the interim perhaps we can go to those. They are motions with respect to Senate resolutions. Senator Weaver, I think, has Senate Resolution 629 and I have a motion filed with respect to Senate Resolution 576. Mr. Secretary, read the motion.

SECRETARY:

I move to discharge the Committee on Executive from further consideration of Senate Resolution 576 for the purpose of immediate consideration. Signed, Senator Rock.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The motion before the Body is to discharge the Committee on Executive from further consideration of Senate Resolution 576. This, in fact, was supposed to have been done or should have been done, I suppose, at the time at which we passed the banking legislation. It calls for the

creation of a special Senate committee to study consumer banks in Illinois. One of the things that happened to us last Session was that the bill dealing with the authorization for consumer banks was only introduced in the House, and as a result, the members of the Senate did not have an opportunity to study the issue. It is...it is of some significant importance to a major Illinois corporation, namely, Sears Roebuck, among others, and so I have submitted a resolution calling for the creation of a special Senate committee on consumer banks which will be appointed by Senator Philip and myself to study the issue and report back to the Senate. The reporting date is March 15th; obviously, we'll have to probably advance that...or postpone that, but the fact is that this is something I think that's worthy of our consideration. I would move that the Committee on Executive be discharged and that the resolution then be adopted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Rock moves the adoption of his motion. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries. Executive Committee is discharged from further consideration of Senate Resolution 576. Now, Senator Rock moves for the adoption of Senate Resolution 576. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion is adopted and the resolution is adopted. Further motions?

SECRETARY:

I move to discharge the Committee on Executive from further consideration of Senate Resolution 623 and...for the purpose of immediate consideration. Signed, Senator Weaver.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I've spoken to the chairman of

Executive and the minority spokesman and they agree that this is all right. Now, basically, this directs the Office of the Auditor General to conduct a feasibility study concerning the public benefits of...or the alternative to a State Toxicology Laboratory. We, last year, appropriated fifty thousand dollars to the Auditor General to do this but we failed to pass the resolution for some reason or another.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Weaver moves that Executive Committee be discharged from further consideration of Senate Resolution 623. Those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Those opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries. Senator Weaver now moves for the adoption of Senate Resolution 623. On this we will need a roll call since it deals with the expenditure of money. Those in favor of the...the adoption of Senate Resolution 623 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 55, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate Resolution 623 having received the constitutional majority is declared adopted. Further motions?

SECRETARY:

No further motions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

If everyone has already had...Senate Calendar Supplemental No. 3 distributed, they all have it on their desk, we will go to the Secretary's Desk for concurrence on Senate Bill 1249. Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I have not seen what the House has done. It had not been passed out on our side. I would suggest that we...we stand at ease until we have the accurate information on exactly what the House has done.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

The information has been passed out. We do have some paper work. We have some...some bills to introduce and some resolutions to introduce into the record. While you're checking out the information, we'll have the Secretary...we'll go...we'll go to the Order of Resolutions.

SECRETARY:

Senate Resolution 639 offered by Senator Dunn and it's congratulatory.

Senate Joint Resolution 107 offered by Senator Dawson and it's congratulatory.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Consent Calendar.

SECRETARY:

Senate Joint Resolution 108 Constitutional Amendment offered by Senator Zito.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR SAVICKAS)

Executive Committee. Introduction of bills.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 1507, introduced by Senators Topinka, DeAngelis, Maitland, Kustra, Mahar and Dudycz.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1508, by Senator Barkhausen.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1509, by Senators Dawson and Jones.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1510, by Senators Newhouse, Collins, Dawson, Smith, Jones, Hall and Chew.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 1511 introduced by the same sponsors.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1512, by the same sponsors.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st reading of the bills.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

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

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. There is apparently further discussion needed on the House amendments to 1249 which is perfectly understandable. I suggest, however, that rather than keep all the members that we adjourn until ten o'clock tomorrow morning and would like to call the attention to the members that the Rules Committee will meet at nine in the Office of the President. We will stand adjourned, if the motion prevails, until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right, Senator Rock has moved that the Senate stand adjourned until January the 9th, Thursday at 10:00 a.m. Discussion? If not, those in favor indicate by saying Aye. Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it. The Senate stands adjourned.

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

JANUARY 08, 1986

SB-0134	VETO ACTION	PAGE	9
SB-0134	VETO ACTION	PAGE	15
SB-0134	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	11
SB-0994	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	7
SB-1037	CONFERENCE	PAGE	12
SB-1345	CONFERENCE	PAGE	31
SB-1490	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1491	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1492	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1493	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1494	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1495	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1496	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1497	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1498	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1499	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1500	FIRST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1501	FIRST READING	PAGE	5
SB-1501	FIRST READING	PAGE	6
SB-1503	FIRST READING	PAGE	6
SB-1504	FIRST READING	PAGE	6
SB-1505	FIRST READING	PAGE	6
SB-1506	FIRST READING	PAGE	6
SB-1507	FIRST READING	PAGE	49
SB-1508	FIRST READING	PAGE	49
SB-1509	FIRST READING	PAGE	49
SB-1510	FIRST READING	PAGE	49
SB-1511	FIRST READING	PAGE	49
SB-1512	FIRST READING	PAGE	49
SR-0576	MOTION	PAGE	46
SR-0576	ADOPTED	PAGE	47
SR-0602	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0603	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0604	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0605	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0606	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0607	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0608	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0609	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0610	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0611	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0612	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0613	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0614	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0615	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0616	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0617	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0618	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0619	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0620	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0621	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0622	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0623	MOTION	PAGE	47
SR-0623	ADOPTED	PAGE	48
SR-0623	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0624	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0625	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SR-0625	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	6
SR-0626	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	6
SR-0627	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	6
SR-0628	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	6
SR-0629	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	6
SR-0630	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	6
SR-0631	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	6

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

JANUARY 08, 1986

SR-0632 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	6
SR-0633 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	6
SR-0634 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	6
SR-0635 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	6
SR-0636 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	6
SR-0637 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	6
SR-0638 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	6
SR-0639 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	49
SJR-0106 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	6
SJR-0107 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	49
SJR-0108 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	49

SUBJECT MATTER

SENATE TO ORDER - PRESIDENT ROCK	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REV. HUGH CASSIDY	PAGE	1
JOURNALS - APPROVED	PAGE	1
COMMUNICATIONS - SEC. OF STATE	PAGE	1
MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	2
INTRODUCTION OF GUEST - SENATOR HALL	PAGE	2
MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	6
MOTION TO AMEND SENATE RULE 5	PAGE	33
MOTION TO AMEND SENATE RULE 43	PAGE	38
MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	45
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	50