

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ONE HUNDRED SIXTIETH LEGISLATIVE DAY

JUNE 29, 1972

11:00 O'CLOCK A.M.

THE HONORABLE W. ROBERT BLAIR, SPEAKER

IN THE CHAIR



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The Doorkeeper will see that those persons not entitled to the floor are removed therefrom. The invocation this morning will be by Father James Casey, the Pastor of St. Agnes Church in Springfield."

Pastor Casey: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Let's all say "Our Father". Our Father, who art in heaven, Hallowed be our name. Thy Kingdom come, thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day, our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For thine is the power of the Kingdom Amen. God Bless you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Roll call for attendance. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

M. J. Madigan: "Mr. Speaker. Will the record show that Representative McDermott is excused because of illness."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The Journal will so indicate. Message from the Senate."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives and the Senate concur with the House to pass the Bill with the following title, House Bill 4302, 4437, 4480, 4496, passed the Senate June 28, 1972, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives



of Representatives the Senate exceeded from their Amendment No. 1 to the Bill with the following Title. House Bill 4396. Action taken by the Senate June 28, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Conference Committee Report. Senate Bill 1271. Adopted by the Senate June 28, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Conference Committee Report. House Bill 4135. Adopted by the Senate June 28, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of the minutes of the House of Representatives Bill with the following title. House Bill 1555. Action taken by Senate June 28, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of Amendments of the House of Representatives Bill with the following title. House Bill 1535. Action taken by the Senate June 28, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House to pass the Bill with the following title. House 1668, 1669, 1781, 3743, 3785, 3794,



4158, 4386, 4455 and 4550, 4636. Passed the Senate June 28, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. What is this? Mr. Speaker-I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House in the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to a Bill with the following title. Senate Bill 1056. Action taken by the Senate June 28, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House in the adoption of Amendments No. 1 and 2 to a Bill with the following title. Senate Bill 1542. Action taken by the Senate June 28, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House in the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to a Bill with the following title. Senate Bill 1394. Concurred in by the Senate June 28, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House in the adoption of House Amendment No. 1 to a Bill with the following title. Senate Bill 1524, concurred in by the Senate June 28, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House in the adoption of House Amendment No. 1 to a Bill with the following title. Senate Bill 1525. Concurred in by the Senate June 28, 1972.



Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House of Representatives in the passage of Bill with the following title. House Bill 3798, together with the following title. House Bill 3798, together with the following Amendment. Action taken by the Senate, June 28, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House of Representatives in the passage of Bill with the following title. House Bill 4286, together with the following Amendment. Passed the Senate as amended, June 28, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker

I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House in the passage of Bill with the following title. House Bill 4676, together with the following amendment. Passed the Senate as amended, June 28, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the

House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House in the passage of Bill with the following title. House Bill 4430, together with the following Amendment. Passed the Senate as amended, June 28, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House in the passage of Bill with the following title. House Bill 1318, together



with the following Amendment. Passed the Senate as amended, June 28, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House of Representatives in the passage of Bill with the following title. House Bill 4479, together with the following title. House Bill 4479, together with the following Amendment. Passed the Senate as amended, June 28, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House of Representatives in the passage of Bill with the following title. House Bill 4495, together with the following Amendment. Passed the Senate as amended, June 28, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House of Representatives in the passage of Bill with the following title. House Bill 4648. Passed the Senate as amended, June 28, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. No further messages."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Introduction of Bills."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 4691, Hart and A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "On the order of concurrences, it appears that House Bill 1569, for which purpose the gentleman from Johnson, Representative McCormick is



recognized."

C. L. McCormick: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1569 was the bill we passed, I believe, 142 to nothing, something like that, and with an agreement that we would put on two amendments in the Senate; one of the amendments was adopted and that set back, I believe a year on qualifying for the Grandfather Clause and the other amendment took off the \$100,000 appropriation, and I move concurrence."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? Gentlemen moved that House concur with Senate Amendments No. 1 and 2 to House Bill 1569. All in favor of concurrence, signify by voting 'aye' the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On the question, 102 'ayes', no 'nays' and the House concurs with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1569. On the order of concurrences, it appears ... it appears House Bill 4211, for which purpose the gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Henss is recognized."

D. A. Henss: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. This Bill is the appropriation for the Board of Regents. The Senate put on two amendments that I will ask for concurrence in eh... these two amendments. The first amendment does not change the total appropriation. It reallocates \$115,000 for more student jobs. The second Amendment is an agreed amendment



with Representative Hanahan. It establishes the increase for wages and salaries at \$262,635 instead of the amount that had been adopted here in the House. I will move for concurrence in both the Senate Amendment 1 and Senate Amendment 2."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? The gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 4211. All in favor of concurrence, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Houlihan 'aye'. Take the record. This question, 106 'ayes', no 'nays'. The House concurs with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 4211. On the order of concurrences, it appears that House Bill 4392, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative B. B. Wolfe, is recognized."

B. B. Wolfe: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment No. 1 corrects a technical defect and puts the Bill in the posture that's required by the Constitution in that the appropriation was eliminated from the Bill itself as it is under eh..... another eh.... appropriation Bill and I would ask that eh.... we adopt eh... or concur with the eh.... in relation to Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 4392."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? The gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 4392. All in favor of con-





currence, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Houlihan 'aye'. This question, 107 'ayes', no 'nays' and House concurs with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 4392. In order of concurrences, it appears that House Bill 4182, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf, is recognized."

J. J. Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. It eh... Senate Amendment to this Bill took the request of \$47,322. The House amended it down to \$46,686 and the Senate cut it further to \$46,489 and I would move that we would concur with the Senate Amendment No. 1 and 2.

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? The gentleman has moved that House concur with Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 4182. All in favor of concurrence, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question, 108 'ayes', no 'nays'. House concurs with Senate Amendment No. 1 and 2 to House Bill 4182. Representative Mann for what purpose do you rise?"

R. E. Mann: "Would you let the record show that Representative Katz is absent due to the serious illness of his father."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The record will so show, Representative Mann. In the order of concurrences, it appears that House Bill 4348, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Moore, is recognized."



D. A. Moore: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Eh..... Mr. Speaker, Senate Amendment 1 is the Home Rule Amendment that was put onto House Bill 4348 in the Senate and I move that the House do concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 4348."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion. The gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 4348. All in favor of concurrence, vote by signifying 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question, 107 'ayes', no 'nays' and the House concurs with Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 4348. On the order of concurrences, it appears that House Bill 4330, for which purpose the gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Craig, is recognized."

Robert Craig: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would like to move to concur in Senate Amendment to House Bill 4330. It makes it only for one year and then next time we come back we will have to worry about it later on the reimbursement for the districts that have lost population. It is just for one year only."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion. The gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 4330. All in favor of concurrence, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question, 115 'ayes', 3 'nays'. The House concurs



with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 4330. On the....  
On the supplemental House concurrence calendar no. 1,  
it appears House Bill 4495, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Glass, is recognized."

B. M. Glass: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is the Bill which changes the name of the Building Fund to the Building Maintenance Operation Fund and eh..... there were amendments added in the Senate which eh.... covered some additional sections that had been left out and I now move that the House concur with the Senate Amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman."

A. I. Berman: "I'm sorry, I couldn't hear the explanation, Brad. Could you repeat it please."

B. M. Glass: "Art, this is the .... as you know the Bill that changes the name of the Building Fund to the Building Maintenance Operations Fund. Now there were several sections eh.... because of this name change, there are quite a number of sections involved. The name eh..... building has to be stricken and then operations building and maintenance inserted, so there was an amendment which picked up a number of sections that had eh.... inadvertently been omitted. There's also an amendment, I want to be sure this is the right Bill, eh..... yea, this is the right Bill that also excludes the City of Chicago. Eh.... at the request



of the School Board."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have you concluded, Representative Berman? Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart."

R. O. Hart: "What is the effective date of this Act, as amended?"

B. M. Glass: "I will have to check that, Representative Hart. I don't..don't know that it would have any different effective date. I'm not aware that the effective date has been changed by the Amendment. Alright, maybe we had better take this out of the record, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Take it out of the record. On the order of concurrences, it appears that House Bill 4551, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea is recognized."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, what Bill number are you talking about?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "4551, Sir."

G. W. Shea: "4550?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "4551 and it is on the Concurrence Calendar."

G. W. Shea: "Why don't you just take it out of the record."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Okay, take it out of the record. On the Concurrence Supplemental Calendar No. 1, appears House Bill 4430, for which purpose the gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham is recognized." Representative Cunningham, do you wish to concur with

House Bill 4430?"

R. D. Cunningham: "Let me...Let me check that and I will be back with you in about a minute, please."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "On the order of concurrences, it appears that House Bill 4681, for which purpose the gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich, is recognized. Is Representative Matijevich on the floor? Take it out of the record. You know, if the members will stay in their seats and stay with this, those of you who have served before know, this is a very hectic day and we want to get finished and we can't do it if the members are not on the floor. Around 7:0'clock tonight everyone is going to be walking up here wanting to know when we can go home. On the order of non-concurrences, it appears that Senate Bill 1369, for which purpose the gentleman from Lee, Representative Shapiro, is recognized."

D. C. Shapiro: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. The Senate refuses to concur in House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1369. I therefore move that the House refuse to recede and move for the formation of a Conference Committee."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

G. W. Shea: "Doc, could you tell me what Senate Amendment did and why you want to refuse?"

D. C. Shapiro: "Representative Shea, this Senate Bill had



\$202,000 taken out of it when it came over to the House. In the House we replaced \$50,000 of it for Grants to local and regional comprehensive health units and the Senate refuses to concur in that amendment. In other words, we are putting back in \$50,000 of the \$202,000 that they took out."

G. W. Shea: "Well, why is this \$50,000 so important. We're going to end up with the two Houses in about 90 Conference Committees and what I'm fearful of is \$50,000 doesn't buy their meat, but someplace along the line, we will end up with \$81,000,000 going in some highway bill or something and everybody will be out here voting at it unless we follow what we are doing."

D. C. Shapiro: "Well, Representative Shea, this money is Grants money to local and regional comprehensive health planning units and a number of these units have in the past year increased from about two in the State to about fourteen, and it is money that would be well spent."

G. W. Shea: "How much money is in the present Bill for this purpose?"

D. C. Shapiro: "You mean for just this particular line item?"

G. W. Shea: "Yes Sir."

D. C. Shapiro: "Let's see, as it came over from the Senate, it was \$150,000 and we were requesting that line item be requested back to \$200,000. The original appropriation was \$250,0000, so we are asking to restore half of



that particular cut and none of the other cuts."

G. W. Shea: "So what you are telling me is that for \$3,500 for each one of these planning units, we are going to put this Bill in jeopardy in a Conference Committee?"

D. C. Shapiro: "For \$50,000."

G. W. Shea: "Yea... but you tell me there are 14 of these planning units, 14 into 50, just real quick in my mind, is about \$3,500 a piece."

D. C. Shapiro: "Well, you could figure it that way, yes."

G. W. Shea: "Well, it is your Bill, Mr. Sponsor, but I just think that if we are going to do this with each and every appropriation bill between the House and the Senate, we will be here sometime Saturday."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede from Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1369. All in favor of the gentleman's move, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed 'no', and the House does not recede from Amendment No. 2. A Conference Committee will be appointed. On the order of non-concurrences it appears that Senate Bill 1439, for which purpose the gentleman from Wayne, Representative Blades is recognized. Representative, Blades, do you wish to put a motion, Sir?"

B. G. Blades: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentleman of the House. Eh.... I now move that we refuse to recede on Senate Bill 1439."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

G. W. Shea: "Ben, how much money are we talking about?"

B. G. Blades: "In the neighborhood of \$63,000."

G. W. Shea: "Alright, is this \$63,000 the Senate took out or put in in addition?"

B. G. Blades: "The Senate took it out. It is the complete operation of the Land Reclamation, but they seem... what the Senate didn't seem to understand was the Land Reclamation Act was transferred from Conservation to the Mines and Minerals and they cut out all the Land Reclamation money."

G. W. Shea: "What is the total appropriation that we... is in... Senate Bill 1439?"

B. G. Blades: "\$1,635,000."

G. W. Shea: "So you a... got a...\$6,635,000 and for \$63,000 you want to put this in jeopardy?"

B. G. Blades: "The total, I am in error on that \$63,000. The total we are trying to put back in is \$127,400, Jerry."

G. W. Shea: "Alright."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede from Amendment No. 1 of Senate Bill 1439. All in favor, signify by voting "aye", opposed 'no' and the House refuses to recede from Amendment No. 1 of Senate Bill 1439. A Conference Committee will be appointed. On the order of non-concurrences, it appears





Senate Bill 1484, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Dan O'Brien, is recognized."

D. J. O'Brien: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I asked that the House not recede and that a Conference Committee be appointed for Senate Bill 1484."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion?" The gentleman has moved that the House not recede from Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1484. All in favor of the gentleman's motion, signify by..Gentleman from Kane, Representative Hill."

J. J. Hill: "Because it is just becoming a little hectic, I would appreciate a short explanation at least of what is happening when we ask to either recede or not to recede."

D. J. O'Brien: "This is the appropriation for the Appellate Court of the First Judicial District. The House Amendment put on appropriations committee reduced the appropriation by \$20,000. It is a \$298,000 appropriation. The Senate refused to concur in that amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion? The gentleman has moved that the House do not recede from Amendment No. 1 of Senate Bill No: 1484. All in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no' and the House refuses to recede from Amendment No. 1 of Senate Bill 1484. Conference Committee will be appointed. On the order of concurrences, it appears that,



is Representative Campbell on the floor? Oh, here he is, o'kay. On the order of concurrences, it appears that Senate 1581, for which purpose the gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Campbell, is recognized."

C. M. Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. Eh..... I want to move that we... the House refuse to recede from Amendment No. 2 on eh... House eh..... House Bill 40, what is the number.... Senate Bill 1581."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

G. W. Shea: "What does Senate Amendment No. 2 do? Er.... the Amendment?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Representative Campbell, do you wish to respond to the gentleman's question, Sir?"

C. M. Campbell: "Senate Amendment No. 2, Jerry, eh..... was an amendment that put in about eh..... 8 or 10 projects that had been agreed to with the Division of Waterways and the Governor's Office and the Bureau of the Budget - All of them are within those eh.... in Representative Fennessey's district."

G. W. Shea: "I just found that out."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion?" The gentleman has moved that the House do not recede from Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1581. All in favor of the gentleman's motion, signify by saying 'aye', the opposed by saying 'no', and the House refuses the recede



from Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1581. Conference Committee will be appointed. On the order of concurrences, it appears that House Bill 4681 for which purpose the gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich, is recognized."

J. S. Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 4681 is the Personal Property Tax Escrow Bill, which passed unanimously in both Houses. This Senate Amendment was prepared in cooperation with the Speaker's staff and all are in agreement with. It has stronger language after this being an automatic protest and that this be an interest bearing account and this is also supported by the Illinois Agricultural Association and I move to agree with the eh... amendments.. Senate Amendments to House Bill 4681 to concur therein."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? The gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate Amendment to House Bill 4681. All in favor of concurrence, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf."

J. J. Wolf: "I know I'm a little late. I wanted to ask a question and I...I... understood the sponsor to say that was a Bill that passed both Houses and I am a little curious to find out why we are getting it back for concurrence if it has passed both Houses."

J. S. Matijevich: "Jake, it was an amendment worked out



with the Speaker's staff and myself to make sure it was stronger language that it pertained to individual's natural persons and that the accounts be interest bearing. It makes it better and we all agreed."

J. J. Wolf: "Record me as voting 'aye' on that, please."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Record Representative J. J. Wolf as voting 'aye', McMaster 'aye', Houde 'aye', Hart 'aye', Tim Simms 'aye'. This question, 129 'ayes', no 'nays', and the House concurs with Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 4681. On the order of concurrences, it appears that House Bill 4495, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Glass is recognized."

B. M. Glass: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen. I think we now have clarified Amendment No. 5 that was put on in the Senate by Representatives Berman and Scariano. Eh.... In that particular amendment, eh.... eh..... eh..... makes it possible when there is a consolidation of elementary and highschool districts for a joint agreement for vocational education programming bids the rights of the highschool districts are transferred over to the unit districts and, of course, this is necessary in areas where units are being formed through consolidation because the joint agreement vocational education programs would otherwise be put out of business. So I now move for eh.... adoption, or eh.. concurrence with the Senate Amendments to House Bill 4495."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer."

R. J. Palmer: "Would the sponsor yield to a question?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He indicates he will."

R. J. Palmer: "Bradley, what .... does this give now the unit district the governing authority of that special district; this is what we are talking about, isn't it?"

B.M. Glass: "It's the transfer from a highschool district, the authority when there is a, a eh.... vocational educational program through a joint agreement, and eh... a highschool district is a member district and a signatory to the agreement, and then there is the consolidation so that the highschool district disappears. All this does is provide that the rights of the highschool district under that joint agreement flow through to the unit district that was created by the consolidation."

R. J. Palmer: "Well, now wouldn't you say the highschool district disappears, do you mean dissolves?"

B. M. Glass: "Yes."

R. J. Palmer: "For some reason."

B. M. Glass: "Right, because of the creation of the unit district, there is no longer a separate highschool district. It is dissolved and the rights that it had eh.... eh.... under that joint agreement, passes through to the unit district."

R. J. Palmer: "Are we talking about special education?"

B. M. Glass: "No, this is vocational ed."



R. J. Palmer: "Alright."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart."

R. O. Hart: "Eh..... Brad, that.... I'm a little confused now. I was looking at a Digest when we brought this bill up before and I understand there are five Senate amendments. What is the thrust of the Bill now? Eh.... it started out as being eh.... a bill to change wording of the Statute from one name of a fund. Is this still in it and what are we doing now?"

B. M. Glass: "Yes, the basic eh.... purpose of the Bill is to change the name of the Building Fund to the Operations Building and Maintenance Fund, and because that name appears in so many different locations in the Statute, some of them were overlooked and Representative Fawell of the Senate Sponsor, I think eh..... had two amendments that added additional Sections. Also, the City of Chicago eh....., at the request of its Bond Council, Chapman and Cutler, was...was taken out of the Bill. Eh.... and then the amendment that I just described is the only one that does something eh.... new and different, so basically the Bill is simply a name-change Bill, except for this vocational education eh.... joint agreement amendment that I just described."

R. O. Hart: "Do you see, eh.... eh..... did this not have any specific effective date in it?"

B. M. Glass: "I don't see any. Eh.... I mean other eh...."



then eh...".

R.O. Hart: "So, it would be effective October the first?"

B. M. Glass: "Right."

R. O. Hart: "Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion? The gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate Amendment No. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 to House Bill 4495. All in favor of concurrence, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no.' Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question, 126 'ayes', no 'nays' and the House concurs with Senate Amendments No. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 to House Bill 4495. On the order of concurrences, appears House Bill 4430, for which purpose the gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham is recognized."

R. D. Cunningham: " Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. I apologize for not being ready when this matter was first called, and I hope it is not unchivalrous of me to say that the reason I wasn't ready was the Queen of the Illinois State Journal was bothering me, and she asked where Lawrenceville was and it completely upset me and I... that's why I wasn't prepared, but I do apologize to the membership and the Speaker. About Lawrenceville, it's near the Ambrose and the Wabash Rivers, and I want to repeat the invitation that I previously issued to all you people to come there on the 13th of July for the 4-H Fair and you will be guests of Cunningham for Board and Room and that includes the



press as well. Now, eh.... about the amendment, we wish to concur in the amendment because the changes made are non-substantive and they are purely of a grammatically nature to the Timber Growers Act, so we respectively urge an affirmative vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 4430. All in favor of concurrence, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question, 124 'ayes', no 'nays' and the House concurs with Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 4430. On the order of Conference Committee Reports appears House Bill 3190, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Sevcik, is recognized."

J. G. Sevcik: "Eh.... Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I move that the House do adopt Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3190."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion?" The gentleman has moved that the House adopt the Conference Committee Report relative to House Bill 3190. All in favor of adoption, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question, 122 'ayes', no 'nays' and the House adopts this Conference Committee Report relative to House Bill 3190. On the order of Conference Committee Reports appears House Bill 4135, for which pur-





pose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Wall is recognized."

J. F. Wall: "Mr. Speaker and Chair.... ladies and gentleman of the House. I move the House do adopt the Conference Committee Report of House Bill 4135."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has moved th.... Gentleman from Kane, Representative Hill."

J. J. Hill: "Mr. Speaker, I want an explanation of what these things do. It's bad enough trying to keep up with them and I think eh.... whoever is sponsoring these motions, should tell what has happened. It's too difficult to keep up with it."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Do you wish to respond, Representative Wall?"

J. F. Wall: "All this Conference Committee Report does is to reinstate money for eight inspectors who were taken out in the Senate and a Conference Committee moved to restore the money back for these eight inspectors who would inspect...eh.... who would be assigned to the Controlled Substance Act eh.... work in the Department of Registration and Education. The Conference Committee Report was signed by eight members who moved to adopt this Conference Committee Report."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

T. J. Hanahan: "I would like to point out to the membership



that Representatives Lechowicz and Hanahan have both dissented on this Committee Report and Mr. Speaker, I might point out, I don't have the Conference Committee Reports here on our desks; on this one we do have, but there are many of them.... members standing up trying to adopt Conference Committee Reports and we don't have them placed on our desks by the pages. I wish the Clerk would instruct the pages to get them on our desks. So Representatives Lechowicz and myself did dissent from this Committee Report."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "O'kay, we will try and see that the Pages get them distributed in a little better fashion, if that is the case. Representative Wall, for what purpose do you rise?"

J. F. Wall: "Mr. Chairman, I've got a Report of the Conference Committee Report on my desk and I noticed on some of the other desks all around me that the Conference Committee Reports are here, so they must have been given out. Talking about \$84,000.

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion? The gentleman has moved the House adopt the Conference Committee Report relative to House Bill 4135. All in favor of adoption, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. McCormick 'aye'. The question, 113 'ayes', 3 'nays' and the House adopts the Conference Committee Report relative to House Bill 4135. On the order of



Conference Committee Reports appears House Bill 4096, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Sevcik, is recognized."

J. G. Sevcik: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I move that we adopt Conference Committee Report to House Bill 4096. This Conference Committee Report reads that we recede from Senate Amendment No. 1 which cut \$235,063 out of the Department's Personnel appropriation, but they have restored this cut. I move for its adoption."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has moved that the House adopt Conference Committee Report relative to House Bill 4096. All in favor of adoption, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question, 126 'ayes', no 'nays' and the House adopts the Conference Committee Report relative to House Bill 4096. On the.... On the order of concurrences, it appears House 3599, for which purpose the gentleman from McLean, Representative Hall, is recognized."

H. H. Hall: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. Eh.... this amendment by the Senate eh.... affects the Lighting Bill and they put an amendment on there that precludes placing these lights within 200 feet of the highway. I move for the adoption of the Senate amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman



has moved that the House concur with Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 3599. All in favor of adoption, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'.

Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

T. S. Lechowicz: "Will the gentleman yield to a question?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He indicates he will."

T. S. Lechowicz: "What kind of lights are we referring to?"

H. H. Hall: "Eh.... Ted, these are high intensity flashing lights that are sometimes on the highway disturbing motorists."

T. S. Lechowicz: "Good enough."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question, 119 'ayes', no 'nays' and the House concurs with Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 3599. Conference Committee appointments. House Bill 1464. Representatives Gene Hoffman, Clabaugh, Soderstrom, Chapman, Schneider. Conference Committee appointments relative to House Bill 4293. Representatives Blades, Springer, McCormick, Stedelin, and Hart. On the order of Conference Committee Reports appears House Bill 1954, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Taylor, is recognized."

J. C. Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I move that the House non-concur with Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1954. Eh.... Senate non-concurred with the Conference Committee Report, I would like the appointment of a second Conference Committee."



- W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman has moved that the House do not adopt Conference Committee Report relative to House Bill 1954. All in favor of the gentleman's motion to not adopt the Conference Committee Report, signify by saying 'aye', the opposed by saying 'no' and the House does not adopt the Conference Committee Report relative to House Bill 1954. A Second Conference Committee will be appointed. Representative Kipley, for what purpose do you rise?"
- L. Kipley: "Just for a matter of point of order, I have a copy of Conference Committee Report 1954. Jim, I noticed you signed that. Has there been a change since eh... the report was sent over to the House?"
- C. Taylor: "Yes, I did, because other problems came up from other Legislators on the floor and I would like the Second Conference Committee so we could straighten these matters out."
- L. Kipley: "Is that in order, Mr. Speaker?"
- W. Robert Blair: "Yes, if the House does not want to adopt the Conference Committee Report, Representative Kipley, that would be in order, Sir." On Supplemental Conference Calendar No. 1, appears House Bill 4676 for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Regner, is recognized."
- J. Regner: "Art, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and gentlemen of the House. This is the appropriation bill for the eh... what we call eh... the Joint Council of Economic Advisors. The titles has been changes to the eh...."

and Fiscal Commission... The Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission and also changes the appropriation making it in line with that of the Budgetary Commission. This Commission will supplant. And I move to amend in Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 4676."

Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman moved that the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 4676. All in favor of concurrence, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question, 124 ayes, no 'nays' and the House concurs with Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 4676. On the order of the House Resolutions, Supplemental Calendar No. 1 appears House Bill 4286, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Regner, is recognized."

Regner: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, this is the substance of the Bill for the grading of the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission in relation to the Budgetary Commission Act and it has some slight wordage changes throughout the Bill and I would like to concur in the Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 4286."

Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman moved that the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 4386. All in favor of concurrence, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This

question, 123 'ayes', no 'nays' and the House concurs with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 4286. On the order of concurrences, Supplemental Calendar No. 1 appears House Bill 1318, for which purpose the gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Pappas is recognized. Take it out of the record. For a correction, the House concurs with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 4286, instead of 4386. On the order of concurrences, Supplemental Calendar No. 1 appears House Bill 3798, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich, is recognized."

R. M. Terzich: Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I wish to concur with Senate eh... Amendment No. 2. All it does is simply bring in the eh... bill eh... in the proper insurance code sections. I suggest your support."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Pappas."

P. Pappas: "What does it bring it into.... eh.... I didn't follow the explanation of the concurrence."

R. M. Terzich: "The eh... when I had the Bill originally, it did not fit in the proper sections of the Insurance Code to cover the Bill, so all this did was bring it in line and in the proper sections of the Insurance Code."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 3798. All in favor of concurrence, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question, 120



'ayes', no 'nays' and the House concurs with Senate Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 3798. On the order of non-concurrences, Supplemental Calendar No. 1 appears Senate Bill 1555, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Frank Wolf is recognized."

B. B. Wolf: Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1555 in its original form, appropriated \$176,000,000. to the Chicago Teachers and the Downstate Teachers for their retirement. The Amendment 2 reduced it which was an agreed amendment between the Budgetary as well as the members of the opposite aisle, and also that of the Offices of Public Instruction and I asked and I move that we do refuse to recede from the Amendment and ask for a Conference Committee."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has moved that the House do not recede from Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1555. All in favor of the gentleman's motion not to recede, signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no', and the House does not recede from Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1555. A Conference Committee will be appointed. On the order of non-concurrences, it appears that Senate Bill 1535, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Regner, is recognized."

D. J. Regner: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, eh.... House Amendment to Senate Bill 1535 reduced the appropriation by \$1,324,000 and House Amendment No. 2 added the correctional units back into this Bill, and I would





move that the House do not recede from the eh...Senate position and that a conference committee to appointed for Senate Bill 1535."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? The gentleman has moved that House do not recede from Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1535. All in favor of the gentleman's motion not to recede, signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no' and the House refuses to recede from Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1535. A conference committee will be appointed. On the order of non-concurrences, appears Senate 1560, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Regner, is recognized."

D. J. Regner: "Eh.... Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I eh.... would move that the House do not recede from Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1560 and that a conference committee be appointed."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? The gentleman has moved that the House do not recede from Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1560. All in favor of the gentleman's motion to refuse to recede, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed 'no' and the House refuses to recede from Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1560. A Conference Committee will be appointed. On the order of non-concurrences, appears Senate Bill 1566, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Regner is recognized."

D. J. Regner: "Eh.... Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of



House, I move that the House do not recede from Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1566 and that a Conference Committee be appointed."

Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? The gentleman has moved that the House do not recede from Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1566. All in favor of the gentleman's motion to not recede, signify by saying 'aye' opposed 'no' and the House refuses to recede from Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1566. A Conference Committee will be appointed. On the order of non-concurrences concurs Senate Bill 1558, for which purpose the gentleman Livingston, Representative Hunsicker, is recognized. Representative Hunsicker, do you wish to put a motion,

Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I move that a Conference Committee be appointed to report that the Senate doesn't concur with the amendment put on this particular Bill for \$100,000 and I move that a Conference Committee be appointed to iron out the difficulties."

Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? The gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede from Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1558. All in favor of the gentleman's motion, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed and the House does not recede from Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1558. Conference Committee will be appointed. On the order of concurrences, Supplemental

Calendar No. 1 appears House Bill 4479, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Hyde, is recognized."

H. J. Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I move that the House concur in Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 4479. The amendment is really eh... restates the language that is in the Bill a little earlier and eh... has no significant affect on the Bill. Eh... and I would move that we concur."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any discussion? The gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 4479. All in favor of concurrence, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question, 117 'ayes', no 'nays' and the House concurs with Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 4479. On the order of a Conference Committee Report appears House Bill 4427, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Hyde, is recognized."

H. J. Hyde: "Eh... Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I move that we adopt eh... Conference Committee Report on House Bill 4427. This eh... Committee Report concerns the Bill that remove the state limits on the loans made to medical students and interns during their eh... eh... attendance at Medical School and the Senate put an Amendment on eh... making this eh... removal of the ceiling effective until eh... for five years. That Amendment is acceptable and that is what eh..."



nonconcurrent and they refused to recede and so we eh.... in accepting this Conference Committee Report, we are accepting that Senate Amendment and I move that we adopt the conference committee report on House Bill 4427."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? Gentle.... Gentleman from Madison, Representative Kennedy."

L. J. Kennedy: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I was on that Conference Committee Report and I was the one democratic dissenter for it; there was one Republican who dissented also. The Republican dissented because he thought there shouldn't be any limitation on rates and I dissented because I thought there should be. Nobody should be exempted from rates. However, there is very meritorious cause and I intend to vote 'no'. This seems odd to make a recommendation that you go along with Henry Hyde because everybody seems to recognize him as being a forceful man, and I probably shouldn't even have the nerve to oppose him, but someday, somewhere along the line, somebody is going to have to do something about rising interest rates in our State and our Nation. As long as I am here in the General Assembly, I intend to oppose such increases. Of course, there has to be some meritorious situations. Don't let anybody kid you that the Continental Bank's not-making money on this. Some of these loans go at a prime rate percent plus two points and one day last week in the Wall Street Journal reported the Continental Bank expected the highest second quarter earnings in there

history. So in spite of all of that, I think you should go along with Henry Hyde. Just let me vote 'no' by myself and next year I intend to introduce a resolution that they change the name of the Federal Reserve Board to Monetary Adolescence."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion. Does the gentleman wish to close.... the gentleman from Cook, Representative Hyde, to close."

H. J. Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I do appreciate and understand the views that Representative Kennedy has. This Bill, however, pertains to loans made by ... there are only about two banks that handle them. Continental is one, and eh... The Riggs Bank in Washington, I'm sorry, and the Bank of America in California. But they are loans to medical students unsecured and eh... they have made over 46,000 of these loans to help these young people get through medical school. They are repaid and goodness, if anybody can repay a loan, it is a Doctor after he gets out of school. This is a program of the American Medical Association and I eh.... despite the remarks of Mr. Kennedy, who as I say with whom I have great respect and agree, I would appreciate your support for this Conference Committee Report.

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman has moved that the House adopt Conference Committee Report relative to House Bill 4427. All in favor of adoption, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish?"



Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brenne."

L. G. Brenne: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen. Every now and then, we have the honor of presenting a very distinguished delegation. This morning I would like to present to you Mr. and Mrs. John Sommoze of Argus, Greece. Mr. Sommoze was formally the Secretary of the Justice of Greece two years ago and he is visiting the United States to observe government at various levels of State, Federal and Local. May I present Mr. and Mrs. Sommoze and their accompanist, Peg Blazer, who is the charming wife of Bill Blazer, and my constituents, Mr. and Mrs. Byron Mallus in the gallery on the right."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? This question, 112 'ayes', 17 'nays', and the House adopts the Conference Committee Report relative to House Bill 4427. On the order of concurrences, appears House Bill 4748 for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea is recognized."

G. W. Shea: "I don't want to call that Bill yet?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "O'kay, take that out of the record. Senate Bills, third readings. Senate Bill 1512. Representative Wolf, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

J. J. Wolfe: "Point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "State your point, sir."

J. J. Wolfe: "Is rule 32 still in effect or did we suspend that rule generally on a previous date?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Eh...."



J. J. Wolfe: "Under that rule there is a closing date of June the 28th, final date for third reading and passage of Senate Bills and the inquiry is concerning that aspect and do we have to suspend the rule in order to now consider Senate bills on third reading. Our amendments did not affect that aspect of the eh.... I don't think of the table of considerations."

Hon. Robert Blair: "O'kay, the parliamentarian informs me that we have adopted rules to indicate that June 2 was the final date, Representative Wolfe."

J. J. Wolfe: "June 2?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yeow, June the second for standing committees to report Senate bills. There is no final date for passage."

J. J. Wolfe: "Well, yes there is, Mr. Speaker, under Rule 32 eh.... under 32b in our regular rules we have a timetable set forth of June 28 the final date for third reading and passage of senate bills, on page 30 of the rules. I am informed we have already suspended the rule 32 generally, so it would take care of it."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "I was just so informed also. We o'kay now."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1512, an Act in relation to Airport Authorities, third reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from McLean, Representative Hall."

H. H. Hall: "Mr. Speaker, I would like the leader of the House



return 1512 to the order of second reading for purpose of amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, Senate Bill 1512 will be put on the order of second reading. Will the Clerk please read the amendment."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment No. 1. Hall. Amendment to amend Senate Bill 1512 on page 1, line 8, by deleting unincorporated and inserting in lieu thereof 'incorporated'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from McLean, Representative Hall."

H. H. Hall: "This amendment, eh..... it was suggested by Representative Bluthardt and eh... I concurred in it, had the amendment drafted and I would move for adoption so that this bill could be returned to third reading and passed today."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

G. W. Shea: "Yeow, will you please explain, you struck 'unincorporated' and put in 'incorporated'."

H. H. Hall: "Yes, in this matter of making a areas that municipalities incorporate into their cities, villages or their towns, eh... areas of less than 60 acres, when they are completely surrounded. This leaves certain territories that should be in airport districts, eh... out of the airport districts and eh..... this bill would take care of it without enabling airport authorities to incorporate farm grounds outside of municipalities, eh..."



even though they might sometimes conceivably surround those unincorporated areas."

G. W. Shea: "Well, I don't think O'Hare is an airport authority, but I would hate to wake up and find out that piece of DuPage or part of the City of Chicago that is in DuPage County could somehow annex DuPage County. I..... poor Philip over there would have a stroke with that."

H. H. Hall: "I would understand his concern, but eh..... the City owns O'Hare Airport and it would not be applicable to this."

G. W. Shea: "But sometimes we forget that there is a part of the City of Chicago in DuPage County."

H. H. Hall: "I've noticed that on many occasions." I move adoption of Amendment 1."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Barry."

T. Barry: "Sponsor yield to question, please?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He indicated he will."

T. Barry: "Wouldn't it be better eh....., Harbor, for all of our purposes to eh..... use both the eh..... words, 'incorporated' and 'unincorporated'? I think for what you propose to do."

H. H. Hall: "Well, the problem was eh..... eh..... noted because airports are normally close to a municipality and the eh..... problem really as it has been noticed and eh..... eh..... eh..... introduced to us eh..... concerns only the incorporated areas. It is conceivable eh....



GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

that an airport authority would get enough support from residents of areas to eh.... provide a district that does surround some unincorporated or farm land and thereby if, if, if we left unincorporated in here, they would be incorporating without approval of those who lived in that unincorporated area. I haven't known anyone that has had that complaint, but the other is a definite problem."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion? Alright, the gentleman has moved that the House adopt the amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1512. All in favor of adoption, signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no', and the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? Third Reading. Senate Bill 1449."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 144.... where is that, on second reading? huh? Senate Bill 1449. Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to water authorities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Keller."

C. F. Keller: "Eh..... Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I would like to have Senate Bill 1449 back to the order of second reading for the purpose of amendment. Just a minute, I think the amendment eh..... he doesn't have drawn up yet. Representative Cunningham has an amendment for this Bill, so could we just take it out of the record."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Take it out of the record. Senate Bill



1604."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1604, "An Act making appropriation to certain departments, boards and commissions by the 77th General Assembly". Third reading of the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Gerald W. Shea: "Ah, with leave of the House, I would like to take that back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, Senate Bill 1604 will be put on the order of Second Reading. Are there presently two Amendments on that Bill?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment No. 3, Shea....."

Gerald W. Shea: "No... Mr. Speaker, what I would like to do is move to table Amendments No. 1 and No. 2 and then add Amendment No. 3, which incorporates Amendments 1 and 2."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from ah.. Cook.....  
The gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Gene L. Hoffman: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor of this Bill yield to a question?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Gene L. Hoffman: "Ah.. Representative Shea, have you ah.. eliminated from this particular Bill ah.. the ah.. quality appropriation which ah.. are ah.. no longer ah.. necessary?"

Gerald W. Shea: " ah.. believe so. Representative Regner and his staff wrote the first part of this Amendment."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representa-

tive Regner."

David J. Regner: "Gene, the Amendment that Gerry is going to offer next will incorporate the first two Amendments which were put on and will eliminate all those items which should be eliminated and add some others on that have just come to our attention. Amendment No. 3, which Representative Shea will offer in a moment will make all the necessary corrections to the Bill."

Gene L. Hoffman: "If it adds some on, will those be explained. what is being added? Ah.. Representative Shea, could you explain the additions?"

Gerald W. Shea: "I ah.. You want to know what?"

Gene L. Hoffman: "Yeah.. What is..."

Gerald W. Shea: "What.. What is being added that wasn't already in here?"

Gene L. Hoffman: "Yes."

Gerald W. Shea: "Ah.. Two things. Ah.. there was an Amendment added for the Illinois Junior College Board and for Kennedy King College in the amount of \$2,400,000 dollars. That Amendment ah.. Bill got lost in the Senate process and there's an additional Amendment of \$125,000 to the Senate Operations Commission to install an electronic voting device. That Bill didn't get moved off of Second Reading yesterday. And, my understanding is that both of these Amendments are agreeable with your side of the aisle."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Regner."



David J. Regner: "There's.. There's one more item also. It's \$88,900 dollars to the Legislative Council for Legislative Computer Services has been added."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Are you concluded, Representative Hoffman?"

Gene L. Hoffman: "So, there were only two additions?"

David J. Regner: "There was a third one, I just got informed, of \$88,000 dollars for the Legislative Reference... or the Legislative Council for Legislative Computer Services. This is what I think that we're going to refer to as kind of a catchall Appropriation Bill to keep up with all of the things that we're forgetting."

Gene L. Hoffman: "Well, I think that that is an accurate description. That you very much."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The gentleman has moved that the Amendment No. 1 and 2, to Senate Bill 1604 be tabled. All in favor of the gentleman's motion to table signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no', and the Amendments are tabled. Are there further Amendments?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment No. 3, Shea, amend Senate Bill 1604, andsoforth."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Gerald W. Shea: "Ah.. I would move for the adoption of Senate Amend.... or Amendment No. 3."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The gentleman has moved that Amendment No. 3, to Senate Bill 1604,



be adopted. All in favor of the adoption, signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment No. 4, Bradley, amend Senate Bill 1604, as amended on Page 6 by inserting after Line 35, andsoforth."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley."

Gerald A. Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah.. Amendment No. 4 ah.. makes an additional appropriation of \$500,000 dollars for financial assistance to School Districts participating in the centralized Government ah.. Government... Government's experiments conducted ah.. by the ah.. Urban Education Department of O.S.P.I. This is what we were discussing last night. If you'll recall, we had an appropriation of some \$7,000,000 that was deleted and cut down to 4.7 and then down to nothing. And, we have talked with the Department of Urban Education and \$500,000 will at least let them to get some initi.... to at least initiate the ah.. experiments throughout the State of Illinois. And, I move for the adoption of ah.. Amendment No. 4, to Senate Bill 1604."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Thomas J. Hanahan: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "State your point."

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Amendment germane to the intent of Senate



Bill 1604, I believe that we're talking about Commissions.. an Omnibus Commission Bill. And, this is a direct appropriation to the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. And, the question is germaneness of the Amendment."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative Simmons, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Arthur E. Simmons: "Well, I've got a question whether or not No. 4 conflicts with No. 3?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "This is just what we're looking at now, Representative Simmons. Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Gerald W. Shea: "Well, if ah.. Representative Bradley would withdraw Amendment No. 4, I'll move this back to Third with leave of the House or if the Speaker would move it to Third Reading, I'll sit down with him and see where the Amendment goes."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Okay. We'll withdraw Amendment No. 4. Now, are there further Amendments beyond that? Third Reading. House Bill 1319.

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 1319. 'An Act to make an appropriation for the expense of Department of Agriculture. Third Reading of the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman -rom Livingston, Representative Hunsicker."

C. T. Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1319 is the annual appropriation for the Department of Agriculture. The amount of \$18,182,796.



This Bill had quite a stormy Session with amendments put on and I think everybody is satisfied or least they should be and I move that the...your favorable vote to pass the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Craig."

R. Craig: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I have before me a release by the United States Department of Agriculture, dated June the 27th, designating the Chicago Grain Inspection Bureau of Chicago, Illinois as the interim official grain inspection agency in Chicago. Now yesterday, we did amend this Bill, putting grain inspection back for downstate and also for the City of Chicago and there wasn't very much opposition to this. I don't want this Bill to be passed out of here and go down to the Governor's desk and him use his line item veto taking out the Grain Inspection in Chiago or maybe all of it and going on with this Bill in the form he wants it and I ask the members here to withhold their votes on this Bill until we get some assurance that this will be done. Furthermore, I don't think the Governor, the Department of Agriculture or anyone else has the right to let contract, if you please, to people when they have not yet received any action from this General Assembly, for I don't believe that we of the General Assembly should be forgotten entirely and let them make contract at their own liking and do away with this and that or what they want to do, so





I urge you to hold this Bill up until we get some word from the Director and the Governor's office that this will not be done. I ask your support in holding this at the present time."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there further discussion? If not the gentleman from Livingston, Representative Hunsicker to close."

C. T. Hunsicker: "We had an amendment to take care of this to-start with. The other side of the aisle, as everyone knows, drafted their own amendment to put these funds back in that the Senate had taken out. I wish somebody would make up their mind just exactly what they want and we will try to get the job done."

Representative Arthur A. Telcser: "The question is, should Senate Bill 1319 pass. All of those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Barry."

T. Barry: "May I be recorded as voting present please?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Record the gentleman as voting 'present'. Have all voted who wish? Cox 'aye'. Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Hunsicker, do you wish to explain your vote, Sir? Is that why you are standing."

C. T. Hunsicker: "Take the Bill out of the Record temporarily, Mr. Speaker."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Does the gentleman have right to take this out of the Record? Take it out of the Record."



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Dietrich, Pastor of Meredith of St. Morris Parrish. Eh... Morris Parrish on its 55th anniversary of service. House Resolution 783 congratulates Phil Corboy upon his election as President of the Chicago Bar Association. House Resolution 785 welcomes back Howard Miller to Chicago's air waves. House Resolution 787 congratulates the Carry Turse Itinerary African Methodist Episcopal Church. House Resolution 788 commends and congratulates the United Christian Methodist Church on the first anniversary of its merger. House Resolution 789 congratulates Patrick Harold upon his election as State Commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. House Resolution 790 eh... congratulates Joseph L. Vicites. He is the retiring commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. House Joint Resolution 149 eh.... mandates the Secretary of State, requests the Secretary of State to provide the credentials committee of the Democratic National Convention with a list of the delegates, alternate delegates, delegates at large and alternate delegates at large duly elected to represent the State of Illinois at that convention. I move adoption of the ...."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative Mann, for what purpose do you rise?"

R. E. Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I did not get the full import of the majority leader's recitation of the last HJR, but if it is what I think it is, because of the extreme controversy surrounding the seating



of the delegates, I would have to object, and I object not on the basis of offense to any of my colleagues in the House here, who are delegates to the convention, but rather on the basis of the fact that we are dealing here with the... a most controversial matter, ah..... which has been the subject of a hearing by eh..... the credentials committee of the Democratic Party who was upheld virtually all of the eh.... allegations of the challengers and Mr. Chairman eh..., Mr. Speaker and members of the committee, I think as a matter of fairness and tradition with the long standing tradition of this House, that controversial matters be referred to committee. I would be respectfully asked that this be referred to that committee."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative from Cook, Mr. Hyde."

H. J. Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, perhaps it might be appropriate that the Clerk read the entire resolution"so everyone knows what we are talking about."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Alright, the Clerk will read the resolution."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Whereas on March 21, 1972, the State of Illinois held a primary election to nominate candidates for the November election of local, county, state and national officers and whereas on the same day, delegates and alternate delegates to the National Convention of the Democrat Party were elected, and whereas on June 16, 1972 the Democratic Party held its State convention in Springfield and elected delegates at large and alternate delegates



at large to its National Convention and selected the Honorable Richard J. Daley, Mayor of Chicago, to serve as the Chairman of the Illinois delegation to the National Convention of the Democratic Party; and whereas the delegates, alternate delegates, delegates at large, and alternate delegates at large, so selected, are listed in the records of the Secretary of State of the State of Illinois and are the only persons selected under the laws of this State to represent the People of Illinois at the Democratic National Convention. Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 77th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, Senate concurring herein that the Honorable John W. Lewis, Secretary of State of the State of Illinois, be requested to provide the credentials committee of the Democratic National Convention with a list of the delegates, alternate delegates, delegates at large and alternate delegates at large, duly elected to represent the State of Illinois at that convention. And be it further resolved that the National Convention of the Democratic Party be informed that the persons so listed by the Secretary of State are to be seated in that convention as representatives of the State of Illinois and that no other persons are to be seated as representatives of this State and be it further resolved that suitable copies of this Resolution be sent to the Honorable John W. Lewis, Secretary of State, State of Illinois and to the National Chairman and the State Chairman of the



Democratic Party and the Chairman of the Credentials Committee of the Democratic National Convention, so that the people of Illinois will be assured of receiving the true representation they deserve."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, eh...."

Mr. Douglas. For what purpose do you rise?"

B. L. Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, I would like, if I may, to have an opportunity to speak on..on the idea of this being an agreed resolution. Eh..... I.. I have become accustomed in the last few days to hear people on both sides of the aisle use the word "resent". I resent what someone said on the other side of the aisle, someone over there resent what we said on this side of the aisle. No one in this House, No one is any more concerned about the nature of this Resolution than I am, and I'm sure I am not the only one. This is an outrageous resolution. It looks awfully simple. It looks very, very simply as a means of asking the Secretary of State to send a list of delegates to the Democratic National Convention and wherever else he wants to find it. Now, Representative Keller is not naive. Representative Keller is entitled. I assume, since I see his name here, he is the sponsor of this Resolution. This is a very controversial resolution to have it pass out of here as an agreed resolution is not proper and is not fair. The papers are filled every day with the nature of the controversy going on. There are those who will say that the matter is one of law. Illinois has made its



decision; therefore lets take these outrageous, ratical, foolish, crazy kids, of whom I admit to being one and tell them that they are violating the principals of democracy. Mr.... Mr.. Mr. Speaker, members of this House I recognize that I am in a very small minority in standing here and saying that I am absolutely outraged that this is being put through as an agreed resolution, even though there may be a large number of people and possibly an overwelming majority who would support it. It must go to committee. There are five pages in today's Chicago newspapers, each of them on this subject, describing the nature of the controversy. There is no simple answer. The courts are involved, the Democratic National Party is involved and also the State of Illinois and the City of Chicago are involved. I welcome an opportunity for this to go to Committee, where I will stay until the end of the Democratic National Convention to be heard on my side of this issue and I know that I am not the only one. This cannot pass this House that simply inferring erroneously that the people of Illinois is behind this resolution and that the people of Illinos support the delegation which there are those of us who will challenge us not being seated as simply as the illustrious Mayor of the City of Chicago would have us believe."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from eh.... McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

T. J. Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of



I hear that somebody's outrage about some sort of resolution, here, that doesn't know what he is talking about. If anyone wants to be outraged, we saw an example of a resolution introduced the other day that said that we were 19th among the professions in being appreciated by our citizenry. Well, let me tell you that these phsyciatrists, whoever they are, and nobody has substantially said who they are, pointed out that we are just ahead of used car salesmen. This is the type of Resolution that this gentleman has now referring to that this is even more outrageous. Let me tell you about some nitwits that I think are phsyciatrists. Their heads are in the clouds and their feet are both on the ground, and the reason why they are both on the ground is because they can't even tie their shoes. That's the kinds of nitwits we've got in this field, going to tell us what to do with Resolutions. Well, let me tell you on this Resolution. I am an alternate delegate, and attended the Convention. And what I saw at the convention was proper. I attended the State Democratic Convention on Friday. What was par for this resolution was in order and it should be adopted by this House and that... by some people who try to tort the Democratic will of the Majority of the People of Illinois by some sort of simple resolutions or condemnation of what is going on and I urge the adoption of this resolution."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The eh... gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."



H. Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and gentlemen of the House. You know, it is a strange thing and a strange cry that are being raised now by those individuals who are in opposition to this Resolution that didn't have the guts enough to put their names on the ballot and face the electorates. Now those people that are doing the complaining today do not have a Certificate of Election from the Secretary of State and these are some of the same people who in the last election for the General Assembly cried because they couldn't get into a meeting place because they were barred. Well, if there is any fair process in this country today, it is not something other than the elective process by which those elected delegates were selected and chosen by the People that we represent their constituency in those congressional districts. Now, those people will want to hold their separate caucuses, in violation I might add, of the McGovern Commission rules whatever they happen to be and say that they are going to select now again people who appeared on that same ballot along with me and failed to get even as many votes and many cases and signatures that were applied to their petitions to enable them to run in the first place. I think they're poor sports, I think they don't know what they are talking about and I think they ought to accept the will of the electorates and sit down and shut up."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Eh.... gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."





D. M. Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I agree with the previous speaker when he talks about the elected delegates. I always elected delegates and the elected delegates should be allowed to be seated at the Democratic National Convention. They were elected by the people and are open primary with access to the ballot and no allegations of vote fraud. The Resolution does go further, however. The Resolution does ask that the at large delegates, the 20 at large delegates with a half of vote be certified. Now, the Statute which created the delegates provided for 10 at large votes. The rules of the Illinois Democratic Party provided for 10 at large delegates. When the Democratic State Convention split that to one-half vote and shows 20 at large delegates, they were violating the law, they were violating the Statute. They.... the previous speaker was correct on the elected delegates. The previous speaker is correct. The elected delegates were elected legally and should be allowed to be seated at the Convention and that includes many people in this hall, and I am an elected delegate and I will back the elected delegates, including the Mayor of Chicago, including Michael Madigan, Thaddeus Lechowicz, Seymour Simon and all of the other challenged elected delegates. Seymour Simon was a regular organization uncommitted, one of the Daley 59, as was the Congressman from the First District. But I do oppose the doubling of the at large delegation, for that reason I think this



resolution should go to the Executive Committee where it will be handled very fairly by the Chairman who will report it back in about 30 or 40 days."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Perry, Representative Cunningham."

W. J. Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could have order in the Chamber, because some of us on this side do not want to miss a word of this."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The eh... for what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, rise?"

R. E. Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on this issue. Eh."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well now wait a minute. You have already spoken on this once."

R. E. Mann: "Point of personal privilege. Point of personal privilege."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "On a point of personal privilege, you are recognized."

R. E. Mann: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and members of the House. Now, the gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, with whom I eh... have served I think in peace and harmony for many, many years, made certain statements, eh.... about gutless wonders, eh.... etc., which I take exception to. I am a member of this House. I have a right to speak, I have a right to speak in terms of the representation of my district. I have a right to point out that I think that this resolution. No, I didn't eh...."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Now wait a minute. For what purpose



does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, rise?"

H. Yourell: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "What's your point?"

H. Yourell: "Now the gentleman is rising on a point of personal privilege. Now I would like him to State that point, because I did not mention that gentleman's name in debate. Now, if he wants to put the onus on himself, so be it. But I did not mention the gentleman's name in debate, who I consider to be a really dear personal friend of mine. I was talking about those individuals who are doing all the screaming. If the shoe fits, so be it."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Now wait a minute. The eh.... just a moment. Gentleman from eh.... Cook, Mr. Phil Collins."

P. W. Collins: "Mr. Speaker...."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Now wait a minute.... wait a minute. Now, the... there has been a question raised, Mr. Mann, concerning whether or not you are actually talking on a matter of personal privilege. In other words, your name was not mentioned in debate and eh.... it seems to be that that point of order is probably well taken. Can you conclude eh.... your remarks eh.... on personal privilege. Can you quickly conclude them? Alright, go ahead."

R. E. Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I..I was one of two speakers that had talked before the gentleman and I think he was referring to me, perhaps, or some of my constituents. All I was saying, Mr. Speaker, here is that this Resolution which is loaded with controversy and which is unnecessary



because the Secretary of State will refer those elected delegates without this resolution. Well, Mr. Speaker, is this the way a member of this House who is elected for five terms is treated because he is trying to speak his voice. Now, what is this typical of?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, let's have order. Let's have order. Now, for what purpose is the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Douglas, rising?"

B. L. Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. Representative Hanahan very clearly spoke of me when he rose and I have been trying to get the microphone on a point of personal privilege."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Now wait a minute, Mr. Yourell is raising a point of order. What's your point, sir?"

H. Yourell: "Will you clarify me, Doctor Douglas, whether you are a dentist or a phsyiciatrist?"

B. L. Douglas: " Mr. Speaker, now I should get double time on my point of personal privilege, since I have two people to answer."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Wait.... now wait a minute. I'm trying to ascertain what Mr. Yourell's point of order is. Mr. Yourell, what is your point?"

H. Yourell: "My point of order is simply this, Mr. Speaker. And the fact is that Doctor Douglas could not possibly been mentioned in the preceding debate because he is not a phsyiciatrist and Representative Hanahan distinctly said phsyiciatrist. He did not say a dentist or any other way



that would identify Doctor Douglas in that debate, so that is my point of order."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Will the gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan..... did you mention him in debate?"

T. J. Hanahan: "I mentioned no member of this House in debate, but if the sho.... if they want to join into these nitwit psychiatrists that supposedly wrote this report, they may join them."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I think the gentleman's point of order eh.... Mr. Yourell's point of order is well taken. Now, do you want to be heard on that, Doctor Douglas?"

B. L. Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Hanahan specifically referred to a Resolution that I introduced. It is no secret to anyone here, he was referring to me. If you choose to take the prerogative of turning off my mike, I suppose there is nothing I can do about it. However, he specifically mentioned the person who put in a particular resolution, which obviously was I and I feel that I have a perfect right to respond on that basis. Now, Representative Hanahan alluded to the fact that anyone that who was concerned about the problem of the image of this House and anyone who was honest enough to say that he was concerned about the image of the politician being listed as 19 out of 20 was someone who had no right to speak out on this question, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that last....

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, one moment please. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, D. J. O'Brien, rise?"



D. J. O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think these members of the House who disagree with the seating of the delegates elected by the people should have an opportunity to say something because their position is indefensible and I think the wash should be hung out here and let's get this straightened out in open debate. Let them say what they are going to say because they have nothing to say."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, will you bring your point of personal privilege to a close, eh...., Mr. Douglas?"

B. L. Douglas: "I will finish, Mr. Speaker, very quickly. When reference was made to the fact that I put in the resolution which is the point I am addressing myself to, I simply say that last week, the actions of the people who stormed the caucuses in Chicago was no credit to the named politicians and all that we are doing here and last week in not discussing this properly and appropriately in the Executive Committee is adding to the negative image of the politician and I am very unhappy about that fact and wish it to be publicly known. Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Phil Collins, for what purpose do you rise?"

P. W. Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I've never been in a Democratic caucus before and I am enjoying it so much, I would like to yield my time to Representative Mann."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I don't think you can yield time on a matter of personal privilege. Oh, gentleman



from Cook, Mr. Ewell."

R. W. Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen. I think about this time, perhaps it would be in order that we have a Democratic caucus and I would suggest that very strongly to the members."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

J. S. Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House. I have a distinct feeling that this isn't an agreed resolution and I thought maybe we could resolve it by getting permission of the House to have the Executive Committee meet for about ten minutes and get it out of there and then we could bring it back to the House if that would be agreeable. I'm just trying to resolve the think, if we could."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, the... this resolution is one of a number that are eh... in the agreed resolution call eh... as you know the rule provides that upon agreement between the Speaker and the Minority Leader, all noncontroversial resolutions may be considered without suspension of the rules and adopted as a group by a single motion to adopt on a given legislative day. I suppose the question that could be raised is whether or not this is a controversial resolution, but I have not heard this question raised. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Granata." I just recognized Mr. Granata. The gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, for what purpose do you rise?"

R. D. Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of



the House. On noncontroversial subjects, we are honored today to have in the rear balcony, Mrs. Elizabeth Hawkins, daughters Leatha, Margie and Mrs. Wilson, and this is the family of our noncontroversial member and colleague, Webber Borchers. Would you please stand up and we will give you a hand, please?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, now, for what purpose are you up now, Mr. Mann?"

R. E. Mann: "Mr. Speaker, merely to indicate that perhaps you were not there at the time, that I did indicate that it was a most controversial resolution and I thought it ought to go to Committee and I objected to it as a consent resolution. That was the thrust of my initial remarks.

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "That under the rule is a eh... eh... it is a controversial resolution. Well, would the Minority Leader come up here, please. Gentleman.... Gentleman eh.. Gentleman from Union, wait a minute. The gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

C. L. Choate: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask for about 30 minutes for purpose of a Democratic conference and I would like to have Room 212 if it is available."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde."

H. J. Hyde: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we are eliminating for the moment House Joint Resolution 149. I wonder if we could adopt the other resolutions. Can we do that."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

C. L. Choate: "I also understand in accordance with the rules





that eh.... upon the request of the leadership that a resolution that has been agreed to by those who do agree to them to.... on the noncontroversial list can be withdrawn on the advice and consent of the leadership and I would first make that request. Pass the other agreed resolutions and then I would like to have a 30 minute recess of this House."

H. J. Hyde: "Alright, I now move, Mr. Speaker, that the resolutions which the Clerk read excepting House Joint Resolution which I withdraw from that list be adopted."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor of the gentleman's motion say 'aye'. Those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the resolutions are adopted. We now will stand in recess for a period of .....

C. L. Choate: "Is Room 212 available?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes, 212 is available."

C. L. Choate: "I would ask the Democratic members to come to Room 212 immediately."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde."

H. J. Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, the Republican members will be quote "at ease" unquote while the democrats confer."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, we will be back on the floor at 15 minutes of 2."

Doorkeeper: "Those who are not entitled to the Chamber, will you please retire to the Gallery? Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the House will be in order and for a minute here, we will just read some messages from the Senate."



Fredric B. Selcke: "Mess....."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Wait a minute. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde, rise?"

H. J. Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, I...I just a point of inquiry that the House Joint Resolution 149, may that be added to the agreed list? Are we off that order of business?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

C. L. Choate: "Let me first.... Let me first say to the distinguished majority leader that I don't need his prompting, as far as the statement I am about to make regarding the action of a Democratic conference concerning the Resolution of which he just mentioned. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of this House, I have been around this Legislature for a considerable number of years and I've seen legislation introduced that I didn't always agree with, didn't always feel it was in the best interest of the majority of the peoples of this State and I've seen resolutions introduced that possibly didn't agree with or I did agree with, but today on the floor of this House, through the means of a resolution, was brought about a situation that in my humble opinion could best be resolved by the members of the party to which it was directed. The Democratic members of this House consequently did meet in conference some, I don't know how long ago incidently, two hours ago, for the purposes I stated on the floor of this House for a 30 minute conference. We're back, but let me say to the people of this State and to this General



Assembly and to whomever might be interested, we're back as a unified strong Democratic Minority in this House of Representatives. And we're going to continue my friends taking the responsible action that we have taken in the past and in the Democratic process, we resolved the disposition of the resolution which was under debate, amongst ourselves without any outside help. We resolved the disposition of that resolution to the extent that it will no longer be needed by this House for any action. And I want to compliment Representative Chuck Keller publicly and I want to pay tribute and compliments to each and every Member on this side of the aisle for the manner in which they conducted themselves in the Conference. I would, therefore, ask you, Mr. Speaker, at this time to recognize a man who has nothing but the interest...the best interest, of the People of his District, especially the peoples of his Party and the majority of the peoples of this State at heart and in his actions. Representative Keller."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Keller."

C. F. Keller: "Thank you Mr. Choate. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House: I introduced this resolution yesterday so that it would provide a vehicle or something for both political parties so that they were represented by the people that elected the delegates to the National Convention. This resolution that I introduced provided that those Democrat delegates to the Convention who were



elected by the People should be seated on the convention floor. Any other results or any other seating would deny to those people who voted for the winning delegates the right to have their vote counted. The Democratic process mandates this. Any other result would have been destructive to this process. I want you to know that we have resolved this issue in caucus overwhelmingly by the Democratic Party and are going to do the same thing that is in this resolution and we are going to be united as minority democratic party on this House floor and we're going to be with the People of the State of Illinois. Therefore, at this time, I would like to have House Joint Resolution tabled."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde."

H. J. Hyde: "Well Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, eh... I would just like to point out that the Republican side of the House was totally uninvolved in the problems that did occur on the other side of the aisle. We were spectators, observing the Democratic process operate and eh.... personally I joint Mr. Keller. We've stood ready to support him in his resolution. If he seeks to table it, so be it, but I just want to add my own approval and congratulations that the Democratic Party now is the united Minority Party."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor of the gentleman's motion to table say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Gentleman from Effingham, Mr: Keller."

C. F. Keller: "Mr. Speaker. The results of what happened in



our Democratic caucus will be announced by our Minority Leader, Representative Choate, and myself to the Press at a later date.... or today sometime, whenever they want to know exactly what happened, and we're willing to do that."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

H. Yourell: "I would like to thank the Majority Leader for his kind remarks and also to remind him of a phrase often used by one of the greatest political leaders of our times and that is, "You are humble in defeat and noble in victory."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Messages from Senate."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Message from Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Joint...Senate Joint Resolution, the adoption I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House. Senate Joint Resolution 78. Adopted by the Senate, June 29, 1972 by 3/5 vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of a Bill of the following title. House Bill 4634. Passed the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of House Amendments 1 and 3 of a Bill of the following title. Senate Bill 1438. Concurred in by



Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of House Amendment No. 2 to a Bill of the following title. Senate Bill 1436. Concurred in by Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of House Amendment No. 1 to a Bill of the following title. Senate Bill 1561. Concurred in by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Conference Committee Report. House Bill 4149. Adopted by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of a Bill of the following title. House Bill 298, together with the following Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of House Amendment No. 1 to a bill of the following title. Senate Bill 1526. Concurred in by Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of House Amend-



ments 1, 2 and 3 to a bill of the following title. Senate Bill 1433. Concurred in by Senate, June 29, 1972.

Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Conference Committee Report. House Bill 4096. Adopted by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of House Amendment No. 1 to a bill of the following title. Senate Bill 1424.

Concurred in by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has conceded to the request of the House of Representatives for a Conference Committee to consider the difference between the two Houses, with regard to House Amendment to Senate Bill 1581. Action taken by the Senate, June 29, 1972.

Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of Amendments 1, 2 and 4 of Senate Bill 1550. Action taken by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendments to a Bill of the following title. House Bill 3031. I further directed to inform the House that the Senate requests a Committee Conference. Action



taken by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment No. 2 to a Bill of the following title. House Bill 4215. I am further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a Committee Conference. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendments to a Bill of the following title. House Bill 4452. I am further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a Committee Conference. Action taken by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has acceded to the request of the House of Representatives for a Conference Committee to consider the differences of the two Houses in regard to the House Amendment to Senate Bill 1329. Action taken by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has acceded to the request for a Conference Committee to Senate Bill 1320. Action taken by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of Amendments to





a Bill of the following title. Senate Bill 1371. Action taken by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of an amendment to a Bill of the following title. Senate Bill 1290. Action taken by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Conference Committee Report. House Bill 1954. Adopted by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of House Amendment No. 1 to a Bill of the following title. Senate Bill 485. Concurred in by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives to pass a Bill of the following title. House Bill 4285, together with the following Amendment. Passed the Senate as amended, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I .... what the heck. There are so many bills, they are coming apart. You asked me when we were going to get out of here - Saturday. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House in the passage of a Bill with the following



title. House Bill 4682, together with the following Amendment. Passed the Senate as amended, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House in the passage of the Bill with the following title. House Bill 4671, together with the following Amendment. Passed the Senate as amended, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House in the passage of the Bill with the following title. House Bill 4528, together with the following Amendment. Passed the Senate as amended, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House in the passage of a Bill with the following title. House Bill 4449, together with the following Amendment. Passed the Senate as amended, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. No further messages."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Eh.... for what purpose does the gentleman from eh.... Mr. Pappas from Rock Island, rise?"

P. Pappas: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to return Senate Bill 1399 from Third Reading to Second Reading for purposes of Amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, does the gentleman have leave. Hearing no objection, bring it back and eh.... read the Amendment."



Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment No. 1. Pappas. Amends Senate Bill 1399 on Page 1 by inserting before the period the following....."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Pappas"  
 P. Pappas: "Eh.... Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. Amendment No. 1 incorporates eh.... House Bill 4251, 4259 and 5281, which have been approved by the appropriations committee, and adds them into Senate Bill 1399. Eh.... this is a appropriation for rehabilitation of the Capitol Building which includes 2.2 million for new appropriations and \$500,000 for an elevator. I would move for its adoption."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there a discussion? All of those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment, say 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Further amendments? Third Reading."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Correct."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Senate Bill 1512. Senate Bill's third reading."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1512. Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the Airport Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."

H. H. Hall: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. This Bill has been adequately discussed yesterday and again today as it was amended. The Bill eh... provides a airport authority in eh.... an annexed property that they totally surround if that property is in an in-



corporated area, such as eh.... a city when the city is... has bought that property. It can also be annexed by the Airport Authority. I believe eh.... I know of no remaining opposition to the Bill since the amendment was put on. I respectfully solicit your support."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Simmons."

A. F. Simmons: "Mr. Speaker, I do not have a copy of that Amendment on my desk."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "It's been distributed. We will have one brought out to your desk."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Get him on will you. I don't know why he persists in that."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, is there further discussion? Alright, gentleman from.... Are there questions concerning the amendment. Do you have any questions."

A. F. Simmons: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't have a copy of it."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Oh, I'm sorry. I thought it was out to you."

A. F. Simmons: "I do now. Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Hall, to close."

H. H. Hall: "I solicit support for this Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Question is shall Senate Bill 1512 pass? All in favor will vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."



T. S. Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker.. I know Representative Shea asked the question of the Sponsor yesterday and in his opening remarks today said everything had been rectified. I was wondering if this Bill affects O'Hare Field in any way? Or anyother airport in Chicago?"

H. H. Hall: "Well, it doesn't affect O'Hare Airport. I can't speak for any of the other airports because I am not familiar with eh.... how they are formed. This eh..... This would apply to any eh.... airport authority organized under the Airport Authority Act. Eh.... where the conditions were met here, but it.... it doesn't apply to O'Hare Airport because the City owns the airport and it is not an Airport Authority in itself."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the Record. On the question, there are 111 'ayes', 4 'nays'. This Bill having received a Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 1372."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1372. An Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the School Building Commission. Third Reading of the Bill. Hasn't come back down. It was amended earlier."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

R. K. Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1372 is the appropriation for the ordinary and contingency expenses of the School Building Commission. We had some discussion of this on Second Reading. Eh.... this includes eh.... \$300 and some odd thousand dollars for



operations and \$1,700,000 for IBA rentals and \$20,000,000 for Voc Ed or Voc Tec centers and \$36,000,000 for elementary and secondary schools grants-in-aid and I would appreciate your support."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? Question is should Senate Bill 1372 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. D. J. O'Brien 'aye'. On this question...: Pierce 'aye'. Jaffe 'aye'. Rayson 'aye'. Maragos 'aye'. Klosak 'aye'. McMaster 'aye'. Chapman 'aye'. On this question, there are 123 'ayes', no 'nays' and this Bill having received a Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 1402."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1402. An Act making an appropriation for the Secretary of State for a cafeteria in the Capitol Building. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Regner."

D. J. Regner: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1402 is the Bill which provides the eh... monies to build the cafeteria in the basement and I would urge a favorable eh... vote on Senate Bill 1402, at this time."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

W. Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, fellow members of the House. Of course we are going to vote for this Bill because we need the cafeteria. But I think I know with a little bit of



experience of four years that all of us have enough trouble eating right here on this floor, besides now having to go down to that basement. I think ordinary horse sense would have said we should have put it up on this floor, where we'll have time to go over and get something to eat and come back without having to go down on the crowded elevators, back and forth, and the annoyance we are going to have to suffer as a result of us putting it in the basement, as I understand that is where it is to go. We should put it up where it is convenience to us."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Juckett."

R. S. Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield to a question?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He indicates he will."

R. S. Juckett: "What's the amount of the appropriation?"

D. J. Regner: "\$500,000, Bob."

R. S. Juckett: "\$500,000?"

D. J. Regner: "Yes."

R. S. Juckett: "Has any construction on the cafeteria begun?"

D. J. Regner: "Yes, there has. About \$300,000 worth."

R. S. Juckett: "How could they begin any construction if there hadn't been any authorization for it?"

D. J. Regner: "This was in the last session, about \$300,000 was appropriated at that time and that is about the amount of work that has been done at this time."



R. S. Juckett: "O'Kay, it was estimated last time that \$300,000 would do it?"

D. J. Regner: "No, I think that's all they thought they could get done during the last fiscal year."

R. S. Juckett: "Has this renovation of the Capitol been approved by the Space Needs Commission?"

D. J. Regner: "Yes it has."

R. S. Juckett: "It was my understanding that it had not been approved."

D. J. Regner: "Yes it has. I'm informed that it has been fully approved."

R. S. Juckett: "What.... Now this \$500,000. This is to complete the restaurant?"

D. J. Regner: "\$300....\$300,000 of the \$500,000 is a reappropriation from the last session, to pay the bills for the work that has begun already."

R. S. Juckett: "In other words, none of the \$300,000 that was appropriated during.... for this current session has been spent?"

D. J. Regner: "\$500,000 has been appropriated. \$300,000 has been reappropriated and I understand that \$200,000 of it is for equipment."

R. S. Juckett: "And so the total cost of this restaurant will be \$500,000?"

D. J. Regner: "\$700,000 including the equipment."

R. S. Juckett: "So now we had an appropriation for this budget of \$300,000 and this bill is \$500,000. Where does





the other \$200,000 come in?"

D. J. Regner: "They have \$500,000 last session, Bob. They spent \$200,000, so in this Bill for \$500,000, \$300,000 of it is the reappropriation from the Public Aid 77-1583."

R. S. Juckett: "And so we appropriated \$500,000 during this current biennium for this current budget, we are reappropriating \$500,000, we spent \$200,000 out of the first \$500,000, \$300,000 is lapsing and now we're reappropriating \$300,000, for a total of \$700,000."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Now wait a minute. Mr. Lechowicz says he can shed some light here. Let's get the benefit of his comment."

T. S. Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and gentleman of the House, Senate Bill 1402 concerns the cafeteria presently being built in the basement of the Capitol Building. In Fiscal Year 1972, the Secretary of State's Office was appropriated \$375,000 to construct a cafeteria. At the present time they are under contract and work is progressing. However, work will not be finished by the end of this fiscal year. Therefore, they are asking for a reappropriation of \$300,000 of the unexpended balance thereof. In addition, they are asking for a new appropriation of \$200,000 for equipment to be installed in this cafeteria. This Bill is exactly as House Bill 4258, which passed this House."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peter Miller."



P. J. Miller: "Well, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, there was a remark made that the Space Needs Commission o'kayed the cafeteria. I want to say to my recollection and the records we are looking, it was officially never voted on. All I'm going to say is, I as a Member of the Space Needs Commission, was opposed to having the restaurant in the basement because I said the roaches down there got...you could put saddles on them. The rats in that basement descended from Lincoln's time. It's the most ..... It is the least, in my opinion, conducive place to have a restaurant because if you would go down there and look at it, the pillars down there, you won't have two or three cables that can be set next to each other. You will be fighting with the posts down there, and I'm sorry to say that the Space Needs Commission was dormant, but it was not to any members fault of the Space Needs Commission and Representative Choate knows it, as well as Brandt, and McAvoy and Wall. We were waiting for a meeting to be called and according to the Statutes, we have to approve the contracts. However, it is done. We are not going to cry over spilt milk and I am not going to be saying well, it's his fault or her fault. We've got to make the best of a bad situation. I think that there are many things that we could criticize but in the waiting hours of this session, we must try to get along, do the best under some trying circumstances and make all of these contracts and the work come out so that for the best



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

interest of the members. But it is going to be difficult for us to be running up and down to the restaurant. I was hoping we could have it up on third floor, but the Secretary of State was involved, leadership was involved. We were ignored, but we are not going to cry over spilt milk, but I do hope we could get together and before we make other changes, that the Space Needs Commission and the leadership, yes and the Speaker and the Pro Tem will get together on some of the changes so that we don't have this occurrence again, and I'm happy that we are going to get the appropriation, even though I am going to have to battle down there with cockroaches and rats, because that basements needs cleaning up, it needs fumigating and I hope that these..... those that follow after I leave here will recognize some of these things and make some changes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All of those in favor vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."

E. J. Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I have a respectful suggestion and maybe the Republicans could have a caucus over this like we had one about an hour ago."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The Clerk will take the record. The question, 91 'ayes' and 29 'nays' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Eh..... 1130."



Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1130. An Act to amend Section 12-10 of the Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Moore."

D. A. Moore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1130 amends the Public Aid Code that makes the Cook County Department of Public Aid an instrumentality of the State and an Agency of the Illinois Department of Public Aid. It provides for the transfer of personnel, operations and funds. Provides that State and Municipal funds for general assistance purposes are to be paid into and disbursed from a special purpose trust fund. The Cook County Department of Public Aid delivers a wide spectrum of services to some 666,856 public aid recipients. Over \$70,000,000 a month are budgeted for these purposes. In other words, over 2/3's of the welfare case load in the entire state and over 2/3's of the welfare expenditures are spent in the County of Cook. The intent of Senate Bill 1130 is to make the Cook County Department of Public Aid a State Agency. The State funds, the Cook County Department, with all but a small fraction of its total appropriation. Furthermore, over 90%, in fact 92% of the general assistance money expended in Cook County is to come from the State Treasury. We have already protected the employees pension rights, their civil service status, etc., when we passed the series of Bills starting with House Bill 4331 which is presently pending in the Senate. The Cook County personnel will become State employees



when Senate Bill 1180 becomes law. President George Dunn, President of the Cook County Board, on October 25, 1971, at a meeting before our Legislative Advisory Commission on Public Aid, advocated the taking over of the Cook County Department by the State of Illinois. So there would be no political ramifications, Mr. Speaker. We have amended, .... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have amended this Bill to an effective date of January 1, 1973. I might add that the Bill passed the Senate by a 47 to nothing vote and I would be happy to answer any questions and to ask for a favorable rollcall, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson."

L. H. Rayson: "Mr. Speaker, will the gentle.... he said he would answer some questions. Don, I...I understand that this is eh.... recommended by the Public Aid Commission and other groups. Is that right?"

D. A. Moore: "Yes, the eh.... this particular type of Bill has been introduced, Representative Rayson, for I believe the last 6 or 8 years, and it has finally come to the realization that in the best interest of economy, for better administration, for eh.... better service to recipients in the Cook County area, for a great potential savings in funds, that it would be better that Cook County would be made the same as every other County in the State of Illinois."

L. H. Rayson: "Well, I'm... I'm impressed by that point of view but eh.... eh.... eh.... you as being known as a great



advocate of local government and local government can always best serve the needs. Is it unusual to suggest that we transfer a County service to a State service?"

D. A. Moore: "Not when you get into over \$70,000,000 a month that is expended in the County of Cook. The great vast majority of that comes from the State Treasury. The State of Illinois has very little control. All we do is furnish the money. We do not operate this, like we do in the other counties. I think from an efficiency point of view, because of the great magnitude of not only the millions of dollars that are involved but the over 666,000 people that are receiving this Public Aid, that this should probably be a State function."

L. H. Rayson: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I will support this Bill and I appreciate the irrational and persuasion of the gentleman and I think he will admit that local government can always best serve the interests of the people."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

G. W. Shea: "No."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis."

C. A. Davis: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I am a member of the Advisory Committee on Public Aid, but I.... I have never agreed that Cook County's problems were the same as downstate problems, the problems of any other municipalities in this State. The problems in Chicago are all together different. For instance, we have a ceiling



imposed on us in Chicago, and you know that it is almost impossible for us to operate under these ceilings. It may be that the rest of downstate can eh... operate under ceiling, but the rents are much higher in Chicago. That's one of the problems. The other problem is staffing in Chicago. Eh.... we have all kinds of trained staff up there who know how to deal with these problems. I don't know what the policy will be when the State takes it over, insofar as staff is concerned. A lot of things that we must deal with in Cook County are all together different from the problems we have downstate. I now I heard one of the County Commissioner's when he said here that he didn't particularly care that the State could take it over. But I think, I think that it is a problem of the County of Cook and the problem of the County Commissioners. I don't think it should be shafted off and that eh... this is a responsibility of Public Aid. It is the responsibility of the County of Public Aid and the County Commissioners. And I think.... I don't think it should be eliminated. I think the County Board should handle it because they.... they.... the Cook County Board is elected by the people in Cook County and the Chicago part of the Board is elected by the people in Chicago and they know the problems. Our problems are altogether different from the problems downstate. And I'm afraid we're going to run into a lot of difficulty. I know how it is now when we meet in the Advisory Committee. I know how the people come down. Of



course, we can advise. Of course, the Director of the... of the State of Illinois is still the head and he can sit and advise with the Director of the Cook County Public Aid. In fact, we take his direction. I don't know what more we need to do. I don't know how we can improve upon the system. When the Director of the State already issues his orders and the Cook County Director certainly takes... obeys those orders and must go by them. But I still think that the complex problems, especially of Chicago, is altogether different from anyother City and I think we ought to leave this thing with the Cook County Commission, the Commission that is elected in Chicago and the staff that live in Chicago. Certainly if we leave it there.... Now I'm going to be frank with you. I'm going to be brutally frank with you now. I don't know how it will shape up in the field of employment. Up in Cook County, Daniel's is the Director up there. He has a staff of black people who are familiar with these problems. I don't know what is going to happen staff wise when you take this thing over. I know that there has been a long line now since the Governor downstairs appointed Bill Robinson as Director. There's been a long line of black people heading this thing. I don't know what the policy will be now. If the policy will be that we're going to change it and we're going to have someone downstate to handle those problems and tell them what to do up there - not one black person be any kind of capacity to say what ought to be done up





I want you to know that I am against it. Absolutely and positively against it. And I'm going to tell you something else. You're going to have a lot more trouble than you are having when you try to take this over and run it from downstate. Mr. Speaker, irrespective of what anybody else things, I'm against it and I think Chicago is doing about as well as they can do under the circumstances with its Director up there who is eh.... Daniels and is doing a good job. I think when we transfer the responsibility downstate, I think we going to have a lot more problems. For that reason, I'm going to vote against it."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde."

H. J. Hyde: "Well, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I strongly support this Bill. Eh.... Eh.... the last gentleman who spoke seems to have some misgivings about what will happen to the staff in Cook County. I submit nothing will happen to the staff in Cook County except for the first time in the administration of what is laughingly known as the "welfare mess", there will be unified responsibility and unified control. Everybody knows what a chaotic situation we have in welfare. It is rather stupid for the State to provide the funds, and to have no supervision over how those funds are expended by Cook County. Now unified control will permit the staff that is doing the best possible job up there to continue doing that job. But they won't look to two masters for



their instructions. There won't be two places for them to take their problems and to seek solutions. There will be one, and when you can affix responsibility instead of passing the buck, instead of the State blaming the Cook County for maladministration and instead of Cook County blaming the State, there will only be one person to blame and that will be the State. Now welfare is bigger than staff problems. It's bigger than personnel. It is an enormous problem. In the County of Cook, out of every 1,000 persons, 121 are getting some sort of Public Aid. That's over 12% getting Public Aid in the County of Cook, not just Chicago. It is very important that we get the most for the dollars that are spent, avoid duplication, avoid non...eh... non-assignment of responsibility and this can be done if we can only unify Public Aid in Illinois. This is a progressive Bill. Director Weaver is ready to assume this responsibility. He'll be in Chicago a lot more than he will be in Springfield, I can assure you and I hope that this will get the whole-hearted support of those of us who wish to do something constructive to solve the welfare mess in Illinois."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

G. W. Shea: "It's hard to follow such an eloquent speaker as the Majority Leader, and tell another side of the story. It could be true that we in Cook have 12% of our population on welfare and that's not a very good record for any of us. And in some areas in Cook, certain sections



we have a very high percentage of our people on welfare, general assistance, old age assistance, some kind of assistance program, and some of that, my friends, has to do with the National economy of this country. But let's talk, not so much about that, but about when we talked about the transfer of this to the State and some of the intervening things that have happened. Working with Director Weaver and Corneal Davis and the Advisory Council we were able to hammer out a program that greatly reduced the general assistance categories of people in this State and used the Federal programs, and that was done by a bi-partisan effort of this House. Just recently, with the help of my colleagues across the aisle, I passed a Bill for direct Vendor payments from the State of Illinois, which was causing much of the confusion and much of that duplication and waste that Henry so eloquently spoke about. I think we now have a cooperation between the two departments. I think we have a workable program the way the present law is and I don't think at this juncture, at this time, we need to transfer one department to another. Let us solve some of our problems in Cook County, in Cook County with our staff, with our people. Let us do the job. Give us your help and we will try to do a better job. Therefore, I respectfully ask my colleagues not to support this legislation."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: The gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

G. L. Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor, say 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. The previous question has been moved. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Moore, to close."

D. A. Moore: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. Mr. Speaker, I think that if we look back into the year, 1969, when we passed the law down here that transferred the duties of the Cook County Department when they.... sofar as they dealt with children to the Department of Children and Family Services. We saw a great improvement and efficiency. We saw no violations of any employee's rights. We saw civil service maintained with those employees. We saw a much better working, efficient operation. I think that if we look back to what we did in '69, we can look forward in '73 and see the same type of accomplishments if this Bill passes, and the State Department of Public Aid assumes the responsibility, there can no longer one blaming the other. When you consider that all the State Department can do today, is to investigate and recommend to the Cook County Department, that's all. If they see fit not to do anything, then there is nothing that the State can do, outside of keep dumping them the money. Now I see and I look again at the Senate passing this Bill 47 - nothing. I look at President George Dunn's statement on October 25, 1971, I think that there is a need. Particularly President Dunn, the County Board in Cook County, who are the elected representatives from the County of Cook, realize there is



a problem that they just can't quite cope with and they think that the County of Cook should be on the same basis of all the other counties in the State of Illinois. I think this is a good piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a progressive step in the right direction, not only for the potential savings of money but for a more efficient, eh.... benefit to the many welfare recipients in the County of Cook, and I would respectfully request 89 votes or more so that this bill may become passed. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Question is, should this Bill pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Craig."

R. Craig: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House. I do not profess to be any professional in the Department of Public Aid. But it always seems funny that the years that I served here, that there is always Bills in of this similar nature criticizing the County of Cook and Chicago for all their problems in Public Aid. And I would like to report to you that in the County of Vermilion, our Public Aid office which has moved from.... they have a new office... which they were paying between \$900 and a \$1,000 a month, the office that they have moved from and they are moved to a office that is costing them between \$3,035, a month. They have also increased their employees from 25 to 40 or 45. So I don't think that we have to criticize the increase in Public Aid in the County of Cook. I think that is



taking place all over the State of Illinois, so.... but this is what happened in my County, which I know, because I have talked to the people that have worked there and they.... I urge you to take time and not put enough green lights up there, because this isn't just confined to Cook County only."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde."

H. J. Hyde: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm very disappointed that we don't have enough votes up there to pass this Bill. I can tell you that the eh.... the Department... the State Department of Public Aid was very concerned about assuming eh.... the responsibility for running the Cook County Department of Public Aid. But in my judgment, the right thing was done, the decision was made to try and do it. Now welfare is too important to play politics with. We have to have a single responsible source to make the decisions. What we have now is like the Chicago Board of Education. The State money goes up there but there is no responsibility as to how it is spent. Economies can be affected, responsibility can be determined for making decisions that can be effectuated, quickly and swiftly and the only sensible thing to do if you are interested in solving the welfare mess, is to remove any excuses for passing the buck for the County to blame the State and the State to blame the County and let the State take this over. The State pays for it, eh.... the State ought to have the responsibility for running it. Now if the other



side of the aisle chooses to maintain the status quo, then it is their responsibility, but let it not be said that the Republican Party in this Administration wasn't willing to assume the responsibility for trying to come to grips with the welfare problem and I would hope that we could get 89 votes, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Harold Washington"

H. Washington: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House. The majority speaker asked the question why aren't there more green votes up there. The answer is simple. A lot of us are not in accord with this obvious power grab on the part of the State. We have... we feel that no sound, logical case has been made for centralization which I always assumed the Republican Party was opposed to. It is a mighty strange thing, Corneal, you put your finger on it. One of the central questions here is what is going to happen to that fine staff in Chicago and Cook County, led by that excellent black Director. Corneal, would you agree with me that everytime we get close to the holy rail, they change the rules, don't they? They try to slip in the back door. They even take some of the fine phrases of the Democratic Party, like centralization and use them for their own. They know that they don't believe in centralization unless it hurts somebody. They never talk about centralization, unless they are talking about poor people. The Illinois Department of Public Aid is no monument to



efficiency; on the contrary. It seems to me that part of the welfare crisis we went through the last session, grew out of the ineptitude of the leadership that was supposed to be directing the welfare of futures of all those people that you say are on welfare. There is no sound, logical reason for Cook County being lumped into that mores that you call the Illinois Department of Public Aid. We have problems peculiar to our own County. We are addressing ourselves to those problems as best we can and I would make this note, that no one said here that the Chairman of the Public Welfare Department of the Cook County Board endorsed this idea. He is a black man incidentally. In a matter of fact, I think he is opposed to it. This is an obvious power grab. The State can't handle it. I think the Cook County, it should be best left in their hands. In conclusion and in response and to reiterate my remarks to the Majority Leader, I simply say this, it is a power grab."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Douglas."

B. L. Douglas: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House. I am at this moment a confused member of the Democratic side of this House. I have gone through two political campaigns where I have heard reiterated over and over again, complaint after complaint from people in Cook County claiming and asking as clearly as I have ever heard anything expressed that they wished to have the Cook County Department of Public Aid accepted as part of the Illinois





Public Aid program. Now, I have been one of the strongest critics of many aspects of the Illinois Department of Public Aid operation, but I am confused at a time when politics seem to be rearing its ugly head once again. This last day of this session will go down in my diary as one of the most confusing days of my life. I cannot understand the hypocrisy on my side of the aisle when the Cook County Democrats have said over and over again, George Dunn includes, that they want this to happen, please my leaders let me know why I should vote otherwise."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Duff."

B. B. Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I think in answer to some of the comments that were made from some of the gentlemen from Cook County on this subject, it might be appropriate to read back to them some of the figures from which they spoke themselves a very few weeks ago. There's been a question raised here by two of the representatives from Chicago as to whether or not there would be an adequate amount of black persons employed in this Department if it were a State-wide level. I would like to point out to them from their very own figures which they raised to us two weeks ago that in the Governor's office one out of four people who are employed are black. In all of the other constitutional offices of the State, it's one out of 15. In the administra....constitutional agencies of the Auditor of Public Accounts, it's one out of twenty. In the constitutional offices of the State Treasurer, it's one out of



twenty. In the constitutional offices of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, it's one out of twenty. Now, gentlemen, you raised these figures to us just two weeks ago. I asked you to stand by to strengthen your own convictions and don't talk about power; talk about people. You are with your own words saying to us know that your very words were not meant to apply to all occasions. This is the first opportunity that you have had to put in a decent administration for tax dollar savings for your very people an opportunity to stand up now and put a red light on there."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Mann."

R. E. Mann: "Mr. Speaker.... Mr. Speaker, could I just have a little order, Mr. Speaker?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Duff said he meant green."

R. E. Mann: "Mr. Speaker, eh.... and members of the House, as my colleagues know, I think, especially Deacon Davis, with whom I have worked very closely on the legislative advisory committee on Public Assistance, that Public Aid has been a principal interest of mine, and every since I have been down here, I have opposed taking away the sovereignty of the Cook County Department of Public Aid on the grounds that it was closer to the people and gave them an opportunity to exercise whatever complaints and grievances they had with the local department. Now that has not worked in Cook County and has not worked, I might say, it's not the fault of Dave Daniel for whom I have the highest



respect. Now I would like to relate to you a conversation that I just had with the Director of the Department of Public Aid because I put this question to him very squarely. I asked him, "Would any of the personnel now working for the Cook County Department of Public Aid be jeopardized by this consolidation" because as you will recall, Deacon, this has been one of our concerns. He indicated to me that no one would be jeopardized in terms of job position or tenure. I then asked him "Would Dave Daniel be jeopardized in any way?" He informed me that Dave Daniel would not be jeopardized. Now I think on the basis of those comments, I will support this Bill, but as I do it, I want to issue a warning to the Illinois Department of Public Aid. You are now solely responsible for Public Aid in Illinois. You're solely responsible for giving us a humane program, for giving us a cost-of-living increase, for treating people with decency and respect; and we are going to look to you to formulate that kind of a program which will make first class citizens out of Public Aid recipients."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Madison, Mr. Walters."

R. J. Walters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I wonder if someone on the other side of the House could explain to me, I have a copy of the roll call on this Bill in the Senate, November 12, 1971. The vote was 47 'yea' and no 'nay', and here we are a few



months later and all of a sudden, it is a little different story. I wonder if they could explain why it was o'kay in November, but come June it is a different issue?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

E. M. Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, members of the House. In all due respect to the previous speaker, one of the reasons that eh.... I'm sure you find the roll call in the manner in which you have stated is because I am not in the Senate. Otherwise, I knew it would have been changed by one. Not that clears that up. Now in terms of one of the previous speakers that was referring to a survey. I concur with some of the things that he said and with most of them, but I would like to point out one thing about that survey that the Department of Personnel is in the hands, I believe, of the Republican administration and from what I can understand from many of the department heads that we have been trying to deal with, to improve any of those figures that you have mentioned, that one of the major stumbling blocks has been the Director of the Department of Personnel. Now that is, I believe, a Republican person. Now, my colleagues from Chicago. I would like to stress some facts to you. The simple reason that it seems to me, not only withstanding the people on the other side of this aisle, everytime we as the people, began to be in the majority of anything that concerns us, some of our own very so-called friends stand up and decide that we have moved a little too far a little too fast. I think it's time to put that to rest.



Now this Department is up in Chicago. It's handled by Chicago. It's handled by an able Director. I believe it was pointed out that the head of the Cook County Public Aid on the County Board was not even consulted on this matter and he happens to be a black man. Now it seems to me that there is a problem here and the problem is plain and simple as my colleague said that this is a power play, a grab for jobs, plain and simple, and the jobs now are in a place where blacks can more readily get to them in Chicago, controlled by blacks and that's where it should stay, ir- regardless of what anyone else says down here. Now that's the facts of life whether you like it or not. That's the way it is."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis."

C. A. Davis: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I want to answer the distinguished majority leader. He talked about uniformity and I agree with him. We ought to have uniformity. If we had uniformity, the Supreme Court would not have to outlaw the residency requirement. If we had uniformity, the Federal government would take this thing over. That's who should take it over; not the State of Illinois because the Federal government..... let me explain the matching fund to you. For the..... twenty-two dollars, the Federal government puts in the first twenty-two dollars for ten dollars from the State, and then it is matched dollar for dollar after the first thirty-two dollars is



there, then it matched. The reason we don't have uniformity is because the responsibility is the Federal responsibility and we are still denying... trying to deny rather, people the right to ask for a piece of bread who come from one State to another. It's the Federal government, my friends, who will solve this and give us uniformity, not the State of Illinois. Yes, I'm fighting for jobs, for black jobs; that's what I'm fighting for. And I think you will agree with me that one of the reasons we have this problem is because black people have been the first people fired and the last people hired. I agree with the figures over there. But you walk over there in the Department of Public Aid now and see how it looks. Walk over there and see how many black directors you have. Walk over there and see how many people are over there now. I'd like you to walk over there. And I ask you to defeat this Bill. The people in Cook County elected there elected representatives and the Board of Directors and they have a right to speak through their representative. This is what they're doing on Public Aid - they're speaking to the Board up there and this is there right to speak to their Board."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "On this question, there are 93 'ayes', 94 'ayes', 37 'nays', 1 present. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

G. D. Shea: "I would like a verification of the roll call, please."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "You'll certainly have that. Eh....



Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Moore."

D. A. Moore: "Eh... Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with the verification, I would appreciate it if we could poll the absentees."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, that is our normal procedure, to the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea. What numbers are we starting with? We are starting with 94 'ayes', 38 'nays' and 1 present. O'kay, now we'll poll the absentees."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Alsup."

J. W. Alsup: "Aye."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Alsup, 'aye'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alsup, 'aye'."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Arrigo. Boyle. Brandt. Capparelli. Carrigan. Choate. Conolly. Corbett. Fennessey. Hart. Jacobs. Janczak. Keller. Klosak. Kosinski. Krause. Krause 'no'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Krause 'no'."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Lechowicz. Lenard. Londrigan. Ed Madigan. Markert. McDermott. McGah. McGah 'no'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "McGah 'no'."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Merlo. Murphy. George O'Brien. O'Hallaran. Pierce. Redmond. Ropa. Schisler. Schoeberlein. Stedelin. Stone. Stone 'no'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Stone 'no'."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Terzich. VonBoeckman. Washburn. Williams. Frank Wolfe. B. B. Wolfe."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, now we will proceed to verify



starting with the affirmatives. What purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, rise?"

G. W. Shea: "If I might ask that the gentlemen be in their seats Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, let's be in our seats, so those people speaking to verify will be able to see what they are doing. Proceed with the verification."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Alsup. Anderson. Barry. Bartulis. Blades. Bluthardt. Borchers. Bradley. Brenne. Brinkmeier. Burditt. Campbell. Capuzi. Chapman. Clabaugh. Phil Collins. Cox. L. Cunningham. R. Cunningham. W. Cunningham. Day. Douglas. Duff. Dyer. Epton. Fleck. Friedland. Gibbs. Glass. Graham. Granata. Hall. Harpstrite. Henss. Hill. Hirschfeld. Gene Hoffman. Ron Hoffman. Holloway. Houde. Hudson. Hunsicker. Hyde. Jones. Juckett. Kahoun. Karmazyn. Katz. Kipléy. Kleine. Lauterbach. Lehman. Lindberg. Mann. Matijevid. McAvoy. McCormick. McDevitt. McMaster. Meyer. Kenney Miller. Peter Miller. Moore. Neff. North. Nowlan. Palmer. Pappas. Philip. Randolph. Rayson. Regner. Rose. Scariano. Schlickman. Schneider. Sevcik. Shapiro. Simmons. Timothy Simms. Soderstrom. Springer. Telcser. Jack Thompson. Tipword. Tuerk. Waddell. Wall R. Walsh. W. Walsh. Walters. Genoa Washington. J. J. Wolf. Zlatnik. Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright. Questions of the affirmative Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."





G. W. Shea: "Blades."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's here."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Burditt."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's here."

G. W. Shea: "Mrs. Chapman."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Who was that last person?"

G. W. Shea: "Mrs. Chapman."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "She's eh... she's back there."

G. W. Shea: "Phil Collins."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Here he is over here."

G. W. Shea: "Lester Cunningham."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's back there."

G. W. Shea: "W. Cunningham."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "William Cunningham. Here he is."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Fleck."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Fleck. Fleck's here in the aisle."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Gibbs."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Gibbs. Right in the aisle."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Graham."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Who?"

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Elwood Graham."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Elwood Graham is here in his seat."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Harpstrite."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's back there."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Katz. Mr. Katz."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Katz. How is the gentleman eh..."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "O'kay. O'Kay. Alright, take him off the record."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Mann."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's back there."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Friedland."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's there."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Phillip."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's back there in the back."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Randolph."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's eh.... How's he recorded?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "The gentleman's reported as voting 'aye'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Thank you. Take him off the record."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Soderstrom."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "How's he recorded?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "The gentleman is reported as voting 'aye'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Take him off the record."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. J. W. Thompson."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "How's the gentleman recorded?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "The gentleman's reported as voting 'aye'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Wait a....take eh.... I don't see Mr. Thompson on the floor. Take him off the record."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Genoa Washington."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "How's he reported?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "The gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Take him off the record."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Shapiro."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Shapiro. He's back there."



G. W. Shea: "Mr. Sevcik."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "I see him out there in the aisle."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. McMasters."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "McMasters is here."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Hudson."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ray Hudson. He's there."

G. W. Shea: "Is Mr. Juckett on the floor?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Juckett's back there."

G. W. Shea: "I don't see him in his seat."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Nah... he's back there eh.... beside  
Mr. Kahoun and back of Mr. Waddell and in front of Mr.  
Epton."

G. W. Shea: "Is Mr. Edward Madigan recorded?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "No."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Recorded as not voting."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Timothy Simms."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's right here."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Got ninety now."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "O'kay, Fred, what's you got?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Ninety 'aye'."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Zlatnik. I don't see him there."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is Zlatnik recorded?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, take him off the record."

Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Carrigan, for what purpose do  
you rise? Carrigan.

J. D. Carrigan: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"



- Hon. W. Robert Blair: "How's the gentleman recorded?"
- Fredric B. Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as not voting."
- J. D. Carrigan: "Vote me 'aye'."
- Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Carrigan 'aye'."
- Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, we are now at 90 'ayes', 40 'nays', 1 present. And on this question, the... the Bill is hereby declared passed with a Constitutional Majority. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Moore."
- D. A. Moore: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, of Senate Bill 1130, I now move that we reconsider the vote by which that Bill is passed."
- Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Clabaugh."
- C. W. Clabaugh: "I second it."
- Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor of the motion, say 'aye', the opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it and the motion to table prevails. 1296."
- Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1296. An Act to amend Sections 1.3 and 4 of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Phil Collins."
- P. W. Collins: "Eh.... Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. It's my pleasure to present Senate Bill 1296 for passage at this point. As we all know, Senate Bill 1296 is the Bill creating the State Board of Elections. We eh.... debated quite thoroughly to that Bill yesterday and now as amended, the Bill would carry out the Constitutional



mandate to create the State Board of Elections. The Board would be comprised of 5 members, 4 appointed from a panel of 8 nominees submitted by the Legislative leadership, eh... 4 of those to be selected by the Governor, 2 from each party, or I should say, no party should have more than 2 of those members. The fifth member, by amendment yesterday, of course, as we all know, is the independent tie-breaker. The eh... Board's powers are spelled out in the Bill and I would be more than happy to answer any questions with regard to these... to these eh... powers. The Board, by law, would meet once a month or more often by the decision of the membership of the Board. Eh... the eh... chairman of the Board would be elected by its members and the vice-chairman would be selected from the... cannot be selected from the same political party as the chairman. The eh... chief clerk and the employees of the Board would be employed under the Personnel Code of the State and no State employee of the Board may take part in any partisan political activity and would have to resign if they did or stood for any office. Eh... Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, eh... the Constitution calls for the creation of this Board to have general supervision over the administration of the registration and election laws throughout the State. This Bill complies with this mandate and I would solicit your favorable support."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, eh... Mr. Palmer."

R. J. Palmer: "Eh... will the sponsor yield for a question



or two."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He indicates he will."

R. J. Palmer: "Phil, does this delete Home Rule eh... counties or more specifically, does the County Clerk of Cook County come under this Board? Does the Chicago Board of Elections Commissioners come under the Board?"

P. W. Collins: "I don't know quite what you mean by come under the Board. The Board...the State Board is the final authority and supervision, general supervision of elections. However, the Boards of Election Commissioners and the County Clerks would still administer the elections in eh... there own domain."

R. J. Palmer: "What about the mechanics of selection of those people who are members of the Board, how are they selected?"

P. W. Collins: "The Board is selected in the following manner. The policial appointees.... each... there will be eight members; two nominees submitted by each Legislative leader. From that panel of eight, the Governor shall select four. Then by amendment yesterday, eh... each Legislative leader will then submit the name of one independent and from that panel of four, the Governor shall select one. Eh... he will be the so-called tie-breaker on the Board."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

R. J. Kosinski: "Will the sponsor yield to a question?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He indicates he will."

R. J. Kosinski: "P. W., I missed something. For which party will the tie-breaker, the independent tie-breaker be



appointed?"

P. W. Collins: "You didn't miss anything, R. J. The tie-breaker will come from neither party."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion?" Question is should Senate Bill 129.... Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

G. W. Shea: "Now, Mr. Collins, there were a couple of amendments put on here yesterday that we discussed at length. Eh...., these were amendments that took the local control away from the County Clerks and the Boards of Election. Eh.... I've been informed by the County Clerks' Association that they oppose this legislation in that form, and what I.... It's hard for me to understand, I'll speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. It's hard for me to understand that we spend a \$100,000 on an Election Commission that yesterday on the floor of this House, we vote for deficiency appropriation of some \$30,000 and then with three or four simple amendments we gut the work of that Commission to death in very short order. I think that the amendment tried to cripple this Bill, because I think people were afraid of election reform, so I would humbly ask that this Bill not receive enough votes and then possibly the sponsor would postpone consideration, take it back to Second Reading, put it in the form the Election Laws Commission had it in, bring it back to Third, and let's pass it and get some election reform in Illinois, instead of being opposed to it all the time."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."



C. L. Choate: "I would like to ask the sponsor a question, Mr. Speaker. Phil, you told us yesterday when you put the tie-breaker on, that it was to be a completely independent person as near as possible and I told you I didn't think there was any complete independents. Would you tell me what is the effective date of this particular bill that you've got introduced just now?"

P. W. Collins: "The effective date is faulty and eh... that is something that would ....

C. L. Choate: "It's when?"

P. W. Collins: "The effective... the effective date by Senate Amendment, I believe, is January of this year and that would have to be something that would have to be ironed out in Conference Committee."

C. L. Choate: "I don't believe you are right if I read the Bill...."

P. W. Collins: "Oh no, wait, here it is. Shall take effect upon it becoming law."

C. L. Choate: "That's what I kind of thought. It was kind of immediate like. Now you said by putting the independent tie-breaker on there, it was to keep the Bill completely and above partisan politics. Inasmuch as you have the effective date immediately, then I would ask you if you would want to keep it completely above partisan politics, why don't you put the effective date next January, like you evidently thought it was and take it and remove it from the forthcoming election."





- W. Collins: "Well, actually the Bill will become law when the Governor signs it, so that the effective date, do..."
- L. Choate: "No, you didn't answer my question."
- W. Collins: "I'm attempting to phrase my answer. I'm not sure I understand your question. Eh.... I really have no argument with your premise, as.... eh.... this is something that has been brought up now. And if we get into a Conference Committee, I certainly think we could hammer an effective date out. That is I don't think the primary objection or argument for the Bill and eh...."
- C. L. Choate: "I'm not talking about the primary objection or the argument for or against it, I'm simply saying that you said on the floor yesterday, you wanted to keep it above partisan politics and yet you've got the effective date immediately, with an election just a few months away. It appears that you want the present Chief Executive to put the tie-breaker on prior to the election. I'm telling you if you want to keep it completely above partisan politics, make the effective date next January."
- P. W. Collins: "Well, Clyde, remember that this amendment that made the effective date immediate was adopted almost a year ago, so there was no thought of making it partisan at the time. This is a Senate amendment, so eh... eh... it was nothing I was doing by design to make it eh... eh...."
- C. L. Choate: "The Bill wasn't at em.... pushed hard to be passed a year ago, though. It's being pushed hard to be

passed now, just on the eve of an important election."

P. W. Collins: "It's a question what you mean by pushed hard. Eh... many of us, eh... yourself included and many of us on both sides of this aisle have been working hard on getting this Bill in shape."

C. L. Choate: "No, Phil. Let's set the record straight. I can recall the very last night of the last session that we begged you to call this Bill and have it come up for a vote."

P. W. Collins: "And we were unable to agree on amendments at that time and so it was not called by me because we were still trying to effect amendments."

C. L. Choate: "No, well, that's your version of it, it isn't mine."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

R. E. Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, eh... Phil, I've got to remind you of a conversation which we had. I believe that you told me that this was effective January 1, and that the whole idea of it was that we didn't know what Governor would be elected on January 1 and I think, Phil, you put a different perspective on the Bill and I don't think I'm misrepresenting our conversation because I remembered it very distinctively in terms of the fact that we wouldn't know which Governor would be appointing the tie-breaker, and that's why I felt it wasn't a partisan measure."

P. W. Collins: "Well, if I was mistaken and I don't remember saying January first to you, Bob, but I'm sure I must have,



I will eh.... promise right now in Conference Committee to change that effective date to January 1. That's absolutely no problem."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

R. E. Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and members of the House.

Phil, eh.... I .... I think on a measure of this importance I think the matter ought to be taken care of now and I think frankly eh.... I have or at least I have some right to ask of it. Eh.... having eh.... been one of those who voted for the amendment on this side of the aisle and I think it ought to be January 9, so that we take it out of any suspicion that it's a Bill designed to give anybody an edge. Now, if ...."

P. W. Collins: "Would you draw that amendment, we'll adopt it today?"

R. E. Mann: "Well, I think we can draw it together."

P. W. Collins: "Alright, I'll have it amended."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Ogle, Mr. Brinkmeier."

R. E. Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, would the speaker yield to a question?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He indicates he will."

R. E. Brinkmeier: "Phil, I'm sorry if I missed this, but what would the length of term of office be of the Members of this State Election Board?"

P. W. Collins: "The eh.... the, the... the first Board will eh.... will be elected for a, wait a min.... a two year..... no, they are four year terms. The first chairman will be



elected for a two year term."

R. E. Brinkmeier: "O'kay, thank you."

P. W. Collins: "Pardon me. The first Board will be a two year term and then four after that."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

J. S. Matijevich: "Would the gentleman yield to one question? Representative Collins, would the tie breaker amendment, would you say that a political party could actually have the majority of this Board? Is this possible that a political party?"

P. W. Collins: "Well, no I don't see how they can. Eh... if you have an independent on there, he is by definition not a political party. The eh... the Bill specifically says that no party may have a majority of members, so if it was evident that one party did have three nominees, it would be in conflict with the law and so it would, eh... one member... the tie breaker, if he was misrepresented as an independent, would be ineligible to serve."

J. S. Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker...."

P. W. Collins: "That would be under the constitution, also."

J. S. Matijevich: "Well, I would just like to respond to that by saying that we've got to make sure that we not only follow the Constitution to the letter, but also the spirit, and that's why I think it is all the more important that we... that we follow through with Representative Mann's suggestion as to the effective date, because my guess is, Phil, that if you don't get the right Governor come this



election, you'll be the first one to come back here to say let's change this, because I think I served with you in the Elections Committee and I know how you feel politically, so that's why I think to make sure you follow the spirit and the letter of the constitution that we up the effective date to make sure it doesn't relate to this election."

P. W. Collins: "I've just accepted that amendment and I'm waiting for it. As soon as it comes up, I'll make the motion to take it back to Second."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

D. M. Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, as a co-house sponsor as I see I still carry, I might make another suggestion for an amendment to Representative Collins. That we call this tie breaker, this fifth man, that belongs to no political party, that we give him a name. We might call him the official State Unit or the Official State Neuter and then try to find him. I would say, in addition to Mr. Shea, who is against the tie breaker and believes there should be two of each party, I think it is such a good idea that maybe we should amend the Board of Election Commissioners Act and have two Republicans and two Democrats on all of the Board of Election Commissioners around the State, including the Chicago Board of Election Commissioners. I have become very sold on this two and two idea, Jerry. I'll take it you will consider that for next year's session. Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."



R. F. Tipsword: "Would the gentleman yield to a question, please?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He indicates he will."

R. F. Tipsword: "Representative Collins, I understand on this independent tie breaker that has been put in by the amendment, eh.... he can.... is it correct he can't have voted in a primary for six years, or something...."

P. W. Collins: "Four years."

R. F. Tipsword: "For four years. Well now, what if in this time he hasn't voted in this primary, but he has been candidate for office and signed a verification that he's a member of one party or the other?"

P. W. Collins: "Well, I think by verification self-signed, that he is a member of a party, would disqualify him as an independent."

R. F. Tipsword: "Is that what's in the Bill or does it just say that he hasn't voted in the primary?"

P. W. Collins: "An independent is defined by one who has not voted in a primary."

R. F. Tipsword: "So would the gentleman, I understand, who ran for Mayor of Chicago, Mr. Friedman, would qualify?"

P. W. Collins: "Mr. Friedman signed an affidavit that he was a member of the Republican Party."

R. F. Tipsword: "Did he vote in the primary?"

P. W. Collins: "Eh.... I'm certain he did. He was a candidate himself."

R. F. Tipsword: "Now how about someone that has signed a



petition for office for someone say for the House of Representatives, which you verify that you are a member of one or the other of the political party and you sign the petition, and you still don't vote in the primary. Is that person eligible to serve as this independent tie breaker?"

P. W. Collins: "I would say that anybody who has certified that they are a member of one party or another, is on record as a member of that party and this would be further defining him as a member of the party and he would obviously be ineligible."

R. F. Tipword: "Well, is this what your language says or does it just say you haven't voted in a primary?"

P. W. Collins: "It says "has not voted in a primary, but obviously if he has designated himself as a Republican or Democrat, I think by self-admission he would be declaring himself ineligible to serve on this Board."

R. F. Tipword: "It appears to me that it is more than obvious that he hasn't, so I would like to speak to this Bill that he hasn't declared himself so ineligible. I think he would be qualified under the terms of this Bill to be the independent tie breaker, even though he may have been a partisan candidate for office or signed a partisan petition during that time, so I submit that this is really some tie breaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins, to close."

P. W. Collins: "Eh.... I'll close, Mr. Speaker, but we are



waiting for an amendment. I.... I have just agreed with Representative Mann that I would accept an amendment to this Bill, and it's on its way up. I... I would like to only.... I think I have answered all the questions that were brought up, except Representative Shea did make reference to the \$30,000 we appropriated for the work of the Election Laws Commission Council. This has nothing to do with this Bill. The money that we appropriated eh.... was money that we were paying Council for the drafting of the proposed new State Election Code eh.... which is before us eh.... also. This work we are being paid for has nothing to do with the Bill that is before you today, so I would have to dismiss that argument. The Constitution as I said earlier does mandate us to create this Board which will have supervision over Elections throughout the State. The eh!... the eh.... objection of the County Clerk, although they have not come to me since yesterday, eh.... I have only heard from Walter Oblinger, the representative of the County Clerk sometime in the past, where he indicated disagreement with certain portions of the Bill and it was not necessarily the tie breaker as I remember it. But regardless of who may have opposed this Bill or who may favor it, the point is, is that the Constitution does state that we shall create a State Board of Elections. That Bill is before us today. Its in form that will insure honest and clean elections throughout the State of Illinois administered impartially by a Board under regulations and rules





pomegranated by that Board so that throughout the State elections will be administered and conducted in the same manner for every citizen of this State for the protection of every citizen, for the protection of every candidate and for the general good of the State of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I commend to you this good Bill. I eh.... offer it for consideration, I solicit your support, and at this point I would have to ask that you hold it on Second Reading until the amendment comes up, which I am told is now being drawn, so in a matter of minutes, Mr. Speaker, we should be able to entertain..... I will make the motion to return it to Second Reading for purpose of Amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, we'll put it back on Second. Now, wait a minute. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, rise?"

G. W. Shea: "Now that this Bill is on its Second Reading, I would make a motion to table amendment No. 1 and 2, put on by the gentleman yesterday. 2 and 4.

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Now Jerry, I didn't say we would take it back there now. I said we would take it back there when we get the Amendment."

G. W. Shea: "Oh, I thought you said it was back there and I was just going to make a couple of little motions."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Look, it says third reading. In the meantime, here's some Conference Committee appointments.

Senate Bill 1555. Phil Collins, Hall, Shapiro, Wolf, Frank,



and Hill. House Bill 4215. Regner, Phil Collins, Clabaugh, Hanahan, Lechowicz. House Bill 3031. Henss, Glass, Burditt, Hart, Barry. House Bill 4452. Neff, Pappas, Blades, Carroll, Giorgi. Senate Bill 1558. Hunsicker, Waddell, Kipley, Fennessey, D. J. O'Brien. Senate 1560. McCormick, Collins, Wall, Lechowicz, Hanahan. Senate 1666. McCormick, Collins, Wall, Lechnowicz, Hanahan. Messages from the Senate."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of the Bill with the following title. House Bill 4220, together with the following amendment. Passed the Senate as amended, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has exceeded to a request of the House of Representatives for a Second Conference Committee to consider the differences between the two Houses in regard to Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1954. Action taken by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has exceeded to a request of the House of Representatives for a Conference Committee to consider the differences between the two Houses in regard to House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1439. Action taken by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed



to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has acceded to a request of the House of Representatives for a Conference Committee to consider the differences between the two Houses in regard to House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1484. Action taken by the Senate, June 29, 1972.

Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has acceded to a request of the House of Representatives for a Conference Committee to consider the differences between the two Houses in regard to House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1369. Action taken by the Senate, June 29, 1972. No further messages."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Senate Bill 1395."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1395. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the construction of Motor Vehicle Services Building. Third Reading of the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Jones."

J. D. Jones: "Senate Bill 1395 is a reappropriation of \$4,300,000 for the Motor Vehicle facility now being constructed on South Thirty-first Street in Springfield out by the Highway Department and I move the passage of this Bill at this time. Appreciate your green lights."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion?" Question is should Senate Bill 1395 pass. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish. Take the record. This question, 10... Choate



'aye', Berry 'aye', Krause 'aye', Jaffe 'aye', Colitz 'aye', Kosinski 'aye', Thompson 'aye', Harold Washington 'aye', McLendon 'aye', Glass 'aye', Houlihan 'aye', Stedelin 'aye', R. Carter 'aye', Barnes 'aye'. Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

G. W. Shea: "Maybe if you took a new roll call it would save a little time."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Question is, should Senate Bill 1395 pass? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish. Take the record. This question, 150 'ayes', 1 'nay', and this Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared pass. Senate....A conference committee appointment relative to Senate 1535. Representatives Regner, Day, Pappas, Garmisa and Lechowicz. Senate Bill 1399."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1399. An act to make an appropriation for refunds of fees and taxes. Third Reading of the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Pappas."

P. Pappas: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. Eh.... this Bill eh.... appropriates \$500,000 to the Secretary of State for the refunds, \$485,000 from the Road Fund, \$15,000 from the General Fund. Also includes House Bill 4251, 59 and 81 in this Bill. I would urge your adoption."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Question is shall Senate Bill



1399 pass? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question, 138 'ayes', no 'nays' and this Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1404."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1404. An Act to make an appropriation to the Secretary of State. Third Reading of the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Jones."

J. D. Jones: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. 1404 is for the Secretary of State appropriation for repairs and rehabilitation of buildings in Chicago and Springfield, reduced in the Senate by \$150,000 and now carries an appropriation of \$725,000."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Question is, should Senate Bill 1404 pass. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question, 139 'ayes', 2 'nays' and this Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Tipsword, for what purpose do you rise, Sir."

R. F. Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I just been called off the floor and couldn't get back to my switch in time and I wonder if I might have the privilege of the floor of casting an aye vote on Senate Bill 1399 that was just passed. It will not change the results."



Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Does the gentleman have leave?

Hearing no objection, would the Clerk record Representative  
Tipsword as voting 'aye' to Senate Bill 1399. Senate Bill  
1471."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1471. A Bill for an Act  
conveying land in DuPage County. Third Reading of the  
Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from DuPage, Representative  
Schneider."

J. G. Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 1471 is a routine  
Bill, which transfers the property that is presently held  
and being used as a State Boys School in DuPage County.  
Standard Oil bought that property. They purchased it with  
the intent of donating 30 acres and a facility that will be  
constructed at not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the Boys  
School in DuPage County. It is in agreement with all  
DuPage County legislators. It passed out Committee  
unanimously without a discenting vote. I solicit your  
support."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Question  
is should Senate Bill 1471 pass? All those in favor, signify  
by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all  
voted who wish? Take the record: On the question 134  
'ayes, 1 'nay' and this Bill having received the Constitu-  
tional majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill  
161."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 161. A bill for an act to

amend the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Carroll."

H. W. Carroll: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. Eh... the Digest version of 161 is nothing of what the Bill is. Now, this Bill is a vehicle to amend the Vehicle Code. This is the Bill by which we are going to extend the effective date of the implied consent law for the State of Illinois. As you know, we passed the implied consent. We passed the visionary to clarify it. There were some studies made by the task force. They finally approved the types of machines to be used. Eh... these are the automatic machines. Apparently, the Department of Public Health has not eh... accepted all the machines, and they need a few months in which to get delivery of all the machines. We understand from the Governor's Office that the U.S. Department of Transportation will not take the funds away from us. That they will allow us the extra little bit of time. Eh... what we hope to do by this Bill is to extend the deadline for three months so that will .... it will be effective September 30th. There will be another Bill coming over in a little while that will add another three months, just in case there is no delivery. So that... this will be a definite three months."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there discussion? The question is 'shall Senate Bill 161 pass?' All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have



all voted who wish? Tim Simms, 'aye'. Take the record. Duff, 'aye'. On this question there are 127 'ayes', 3 'nays', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Gibbs, 'aye'. Senate Bill 1283. Is Representative Springer on the floor? Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1283."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1283. An Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Representative Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Springer."

N. G. Springer: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1283 amends an Article of the Pension Code in relating to General Assembly Retirement System Public Employee Pension Fund Division of the Department of Insurance. Revises provisions relating to services and officer of the General Assembly to include the entire period for which a member was elected to serve as an officer. Requires the Director of Insurance to report the non-compliance of any public body or officer with any application provision of the pension code to the Attorney General or the appropriate State's Attorney. I asked that everyone vote for this Bill."

Representative Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Question is 'shall Senate Bill 1283 pass'. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Juckett, to explain his vote."





R. S. Juckett: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was not at my desk at the time it was called, eh.... in the Digest it indicates that the full period of time for an Officer of the Assembly and I'm wondering if the Sponsor could explain how long a period of time the Officer must serve as an officer to qualify for pension?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Springer, will explain his vote and answer your question."

N. G. Springer: "Representative Juckett, this formalizes an opinion from the Attorney General to the effect that one elected as an officer of the General Assembly is to receive credit for the full period of his services as an officer by making the required contributions on his additional salary if he withdraws from the General Assembly prior to the end of such period."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question, 125 'ayes', 3 'nays' and this Bill, having received the Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1461."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1461. A Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Springer."

N. G. Springer: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1461 clarifies the appointments to



the eh.... State Investment Board. In case of..., I think there's going to be a vacancy in the near future, and therefore this has been approved by the Pension Laws Commission and I solicit your vote."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Question is 'shall Senate 1461 pass'. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish. Take the record. This question, 129 'ayes', no 'nays', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. 1361, on which the gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff, in accordance with the understanding that he had with Mr. Bradley, yesterday asked leave to return that Bill to the order of second reading, so Mr. Bradley can submit an amendment for consideration. Is the amendment here? Yeow, let me have a copy of it. The gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

G. A. Bradley: "Eh.... Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I certainly would like to thank Representative Neff for holding this for ten or fifteen minutes. It turned out to be twenty-four hours, but I think the other amendments were resolved eh.... to some peoples satisfaction, but this is Amendment No. 6, Mr. Speaker that we have discussed yesterday afternoon in some detail and I would simply move for the adoption of Amendment No. 6 to Senate Bill 1361."

Honorable W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. eh.... Palmer."



R. J. Palmer: "Well, eh... yes, eh.... the eh.... will he explain the Amendment."

Honorable W. Robert Blair: "Let's have the Clerk read it and then we will have it explained."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment No. 6. Bradley. Amends Senate Bill 1361 on Page 12 by striking line 7 and inserting in lieu thereof the following. "Expenditures pursuant to the amount appropriated in Sections 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 12, 13, 16, 18 and 20, previously designated in this Section shall be made only as adjusted in the same amount and on Page 12, line 13 by striking the period and inserting in lieu thereof providing, however, that no jurisdiction under the Personnel Code shall be extended to positions under this Act where more than one-half the number of positions to which jurisdiction is to be extended or filled by persons affiliated with the same political party at the time such jurisdiction is extended. For the purpose of this Section, affiliation with political party may be evidenced by registration to vote in primary elections of that party."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley. One moment. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Simmons."

A. F. Simmons: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. I believe that it was yesterday it was offered to the House Amendment No. 6. It was subsequently held not germane. My question is in such a case do you forget about that number or should this be Number 7?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the Clerk's records indicate



that we actually stopped at 5. The Chair had indicated that an Amendment up here which would have been Amendment 6 would be ruled not to be germane, so eh.... Mr. Bradley withdrew what would have been Amendment No. 6, so eh.... the record stands with just Amendment No. 5. Now he is submitting what will be an Amendment No. 6. Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Philip."

J. Philip: "Yeow, Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I'm assuming this is the same Amendment he had yesterday or the day before which, if I remember correctly, provided that 50% of the employees would be Republican and 50% Democrat, and if I remember correctly, this Bill deals with an appropriation for the Department of Transportation. It would seem to me once again that this Amendment is not germane. And I would like a ruling on that. Because quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, this will probably go down in the annuals as the poorest Amendment offered this Session."

Hon. W. Robert W. Blair: "Well, does the gentleman from eh... McLean, desire to be heard on the gentleman's point?"

G. A. Bradley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Before you make that ruling, I think now the Amendment as it is drawn referring to the Sections 1, 2, 3, etc., as to the expenditure of funds in this appropriation bill, I think that now my point, Mr. Speaker, is that we are germane and we are addressing ourselves to the appropriation. Therefore, this eh.... amendment, I am hoping you will see fit to rule it germane. Mr. Speaker, such as our OSPI Bill, when we



specifically designate in there the eh... percentages, how it shall be spent, that appropriation money, how it shall be spent in certain areas, such as waited pupil attendance, etc. in that Bill. We are doing the same thing with this Amendment to this appropriation bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, eh.... I don't see where the language of that has been added into this eh... proposed Amendment No. 6, eh.... it is different eh.... than the Amendment that was tendered yesterday. Eh.... now let me explain. The first part of this amendment is different because that language was not in the Amendment yesterday, but unless I misread the language that is here, it appears to me that it is redundant and eh.... in no way affects the Bill. In other words, there is no substance at all in this change that you have here. It does not in any way affect the Bill."

G. A. Bradley: "On line 4 of the Amendment, eh.... expenditures pursuant to the amounts, then the second part of the Amendment, eh.... addresses itself to that line, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Right, but the line 7 on page 12, eh... says 'the Act mentions salary rates shall be adjusted in the same amount; and what I'm suggesting to you, you've stricken that line, but the language you've put back in there is the same.... as to the same affect as line 7 would be now, in the Bill. Where is it really different?"

G. A. Bradley: "Expenditures pursuant to the amounts appro-



appropriated in Sections name.... previously designated in this Section, shall be made only as adjusted in this same amount. The language in the line now says that the afore-mentioned salary rate shall be adjusted in the same amount."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "I don't see where you've done....."

G. A. Bradley: "The point, Mr. Speaker, we are designating that money in those amounts on those various lines to not be expended except as from line 11 through 19. Pardon. And that was not in the Bill before, but now we are saying that the expenditures of this appropriation on those various lines and on those various Sections cannot be expended except as eh... this amendment reads through line 11 through line 19. Otherwise, eh... one part without the other is eh... means nothing, but I think with the two of them together and we are addressing ourselves to the sections as designated on lines four through eight that those monies can only be expended as provided on lines 11 through 19 in this appropriation bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Philip."

J. Philip: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that in the new State Constitution, Page 26, Article IV, Section 8, Paragraph D. "Appropriation Bills shall be limited to the subject of appropriation." Now that couldn't be any clearer. Secondly, this is.... this amendment is a job qualification. Haven't got a darn.... a thing to do with appropriation, and I think it is a point well taken and it is not germane."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

G. A. Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this is limiting language in this Amendment and I will repeat myself again, and I go back to the eh.... our educational appropriation for eh.... the school system. Eh.... we provided in that appropriation Bill eh.... language that designates certain amounts of money provided on the average daily attendance and weighted experience in the different school systems. We provide for a differential between unit districts and eh.... other districts and other types of districts in this State and that's the language we are trying to eh.... a similar language, a similar meaningful language, in this appropriation Bill and I think it's very germane to the appropriation. I would like to see it ruled germane and let the amendment go up or down on the merits of the amendment and then let's get on with the debate on the amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, the Chair simply cannot understand and eh... what is intended by the new language that is in this amendment. To see wherein it would be directing itself to the matter of appropriation which is in the Bill. Eh.... if you could explain how this language that reads "Expenditures pursuant to the amounts appropriated in Sections 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 12, 13, 16, 18 and 20", then goes on to say "Previously designated in this section", which is Section 25, "shall be made only as adjusted in the same amount, and". Now, can....."



G. A. Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, without pressing, I just would make the additional or repeat myself that we are just limiting language that we are trying to apply into the appropriation Bill Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, as I say, I can't frankly from reading that language that I just read, eh... see where the Amendment goes into the area of appropriation. Now, if you can explain to me how it does, then I will consider your position in connection with my ruling. I just can't frankly..... what does that language mean?"

G. A. Bradley: "Alright, I would simply explain it this way, Mr. Speaker. There is eh... personal service funds in the appropriation bill that will be used to pay the salaries of certain individuals working in the Highway Department that we eh..... are addressing this amendment to. Eh.... and that's eh... the best way I know to explain the amendment that the personal service sections of this appropriation are going to be used to pay the salaries of certain individuals, and that's where we are addressing ourselves to that part of the appropriation and I think the intent of the ..... and the money is being restricted by the language in the Amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the Chair is prepared to rule that the gentleman's point from DuPage is well taken that the language that I read eh... in the first part of this Amendment, proposed amendment, "Expenditures pursuant to





the amounts appropriated in the sections named, previously designated in this section shall be made only as adjusted in the same amount that a reading of Section 25, which starts out with the amounts appropriated in those particular sections that you are referring to shall be available only for compensation for positions classified and coming back then to Line 7 on Page 12, the aforementioned salary rates shall be adjusted in the same amount..." That it is really a nullity. That language does nothing. If it were to stand along, it adds nothing to this Bill. You follow what I mean? Lines 4 through 8 in your proposed amendment neither adds to nor detract from the Bill. Now that is the only way that this amendment that you offered yesterday is going to pull itself up by its boot straps and I don't think it does that and so for that reason I am going to rule that the gentleman from DuPage's point is well taken that the Amendment does not address itself to the question of appropriation. Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Philip."

J. D. Philip: "Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. Does the ruling of the Chair, does that end up being journalized?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, everything that eh.... journalized.... eh...."

J. D. Philip: "If not, Mr. Speaker. If I'm in order, I would like to have that ruling journalized."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ordinarily what would be in the journal would be simply the entry that the Speaker ruled that the Amendment was not germane. Eh... now, eh.... you want



to have the journal reflect that eh..... my eh.... remarks concerning the eh.... background for that ruling?"

J. D. Philip: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that would be most appropriate."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, well it's on the tape and eh. that eh.... can be eh.... of course placed in the Journal. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I am thinking back to the amendatory vetoes that were brought back from the Governor's office in the line item reduction vetoes, and on one with regard to the Junior Colleges you held that not only were the dollar amounts important, but the words and phrases were extremely important in an appropriation bill. That's the one where the Governor reduced the amount of dollars per hour, dollars per hour for the Junior Colleges and you held that that was really not an amendatory veto but a line item veto and you specifically stated as I remembered that although it didn't deal with dollars, it dealt with the appropriation process and can't you find that this also deals with the appropriation process in the same manner?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I don't recall the specifics as well as you do concerning my rulings in that situation and I eh.... can only really look at this situation and if the language in the Constitution eh.... means anything, I think it means that this type of language being put into a matter that is purely appropriation eh.... would not be in order. I see nothing in this proposed amendment that affects the



appropriation bill as an appropriation bill. Now, if someone can tell me where it does insofar as appropriations are concerned, eh.... I would....."

G. W. Shea: "It deals dramatically with the way that those appropriations may be expended dramatically, my friend."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I'm still where I am, my friend. The gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Barry."

T. Barry: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. I was respectfully request that you might consider though it was not the Speaker on the rostrum yesterday with regard to a similar matter and eh.... in Senate Bill 1319, there was a simple amendment limiting the use of the appropriation in question; namely the gross appropriation for the Department of Agriculture in Senate Bill 1319 and the Amendment was to cause monies of that appropriation to be indicated in signed form at various county fairs that some of that money comes from gambling. Now the Chair then ruled and I fully respect the fact that you were not then on the rostrum, the chair rules that that amendment was germane and I think in fairness to this sponsor of this amendment, eh... that the limiting language is no less limiting than in that one."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Eh, here..... the key part of the proposed amendment eh... does not get into that matter of how the appropriation is to be spent. It simply says "provided, however, that no jurisdiction under the Personnel Code shall be extended to positions under this Act, where



more than one-half the number of positions to its jurisdiction is to be extended or filled by person affiliated with the same political party at the same time at the time of this jurisdiction is extended. Through the purpose of this section affiliation of a political party may be evidenced by registration to vote in primary elections of that party." I don't see how that affects the matter of appropriation. Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

G. A. Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, eh... I refer to House Bill 4449, Amendment No. 5 to 4449, if I could read it. Eh... "flat rate grants", now this is an appropriation bill, and it states "flat rate grants shall be provided only for courses that are normally part of that oriented program, occupational programs and general studies, instructional programs, approved by the Illinois Junior College Board that apply to an associate degree or certificate." Now the language in that approp... that amendment, eh... does not deal specifically with the appropriation or tries to change the figures of the appropriation amount in any way at all."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Eh... was the point raised at the time that that amendment was placed on the bill?"

G. A. Bradley: "I can't say, Mr. Speaker, whether it was or not. I'm just that the bill has...."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "But the point of it is is that unless the points are raised on the floor as to the amendment, the Chair does not address itself to those parliamentary in-



quiries."

G. A. Bradley: "I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if eh.... I could asked Mr. Neff again to hold it for 10 minutes. I promise it will be no longer than ten minutes. We will resolve the issue and we will live by your ruling at that time."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Philip."

J. D. Philip: "Mr. Speaker, I know we always try to be fair and I certainly believe in being fair, but it seems to me that we discussed this today for a good amount of time but we discussed it yesterday. I really don't think he could put the amendment on in the second place and I just guess it is a kind of wasted time and I think we ought to go on and conduct our business."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "I think we have spent a considerable amount of time on this matter. The Bill has been taken out of.... Not only was the Bill put on Third, but after it was there, the sponsor agreed if the gentleman came up with an amendment it was acceptable to have it back on Second. We've brought it back on second. I've addressed myself to the merits to the gentleman's amendment. I have stated that I see really in no way in which the amendment is changed from the amendment that was offered yesterday, because I think the language in Lines 4 through 8 are redundant and offer nothing. It neithers adds to or detracts from the bill itself and you know, it appears to me that its been put in there for the purposes of making it appear that it was trying to affect the appropriation and I'm saying that



it simply does not. Now gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

G. A. Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, just to thank you and the House for the time we've spent on the bill. I appreciate it very much and I want to again thank Mr. Neff for allowing us to bring it back to Second Reading."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, Third Reading. Senate Bills Third Reading. Senate Bill 1361.

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1361. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Transportation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

C. E. Neff: "Eh... Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. This is the annual appropriation for the Department of Transportation, as the grand total now stands it's \$1,688,515,100 as it, pardon me, as it came out of the Senate. Now we have added onto this bill eh... \$441,000, otherwise the bill is the same as when it came out of the Senate. The Senate did eh... reduce the eh... total appropriation \$4,213,300, but as the bill now stands we have added on two amendments \$441,000. At this time I would be glad to answer any questions on this eh... appropriation. I would appreciate a favorable vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Barry."

T. Barry: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to recorded as present."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan."



J. T. Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. We have apparently failed with our fair play amendment, for at least for the moment. However, one of the devastating problems in the present administration is the complete deterioration of the morale of our State workers. The personnel code is in a shamble. It started primarily when we brought in 35,000 dollars a year hot shots from out of state to run our departments. It further deteriorated when the Personnel Code and Administration played complete, and I say complete, politics with our personnel and civil service commission. Now we are all not naive enough to know that there is not politics and has not been in the democratic administration, but never, and I say never, have our State employees, our professional, technical and everyone under the code, been at lower morale than presently and it is because they are not secure in their jobs, they can be fired at will, they are replaced by Republicans, you cannot get a fair civil service job and what is happening now, with these new jobs going under the Code, is that you are getting twenty minute snap personnel placements. Now only the Republicans in the jobs can even take the tests. What kind of a civil service test is that when you call in your present employees only and give them a snap course to put them in in June, so they will be in in January. Now we are striving here to make this fair to all. To stop the playing of politics with



these jobs and it is the only way we are going to get the Personnel Code and the Civil Service as we would all want it to be. If you continue to force through this personnel code as you are presently doing when the Democrats take over and I believe they will, we will be right back where we are again with more politics to try to get rid of them. Now let's play fair and put through this amendment like we have in the past, and we just put in on the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Now let's play fair and get it on this Transportation's one like we should and we can give all these State employees the break they are entitled to."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Philip."

J. D. Philip: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentleman of the House. I can't speak about the highway workers in Sangamon County. Quite frankly, I don't know what the situation is, but I think I can speak with some authority into what has happened in DuPage County. Now we have two barns in DuPage County and we have in round figures about 100 - 110 maintenance men in those two barns. To my knowledge, at this point, there are about 14 carry over democrats. They were all given the opportunity to take the test. They all took the test and I assure you that probably all 14 of them will be coded. So I don't know what is going on down here, but I will tell you this, in DuPage County, the repertoire in that Department is the best it's ever been."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."





E. J. Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, could I asked Mr. Neff a couple of questions? Mr. Neff, I'm from 51 area, Highway 51 area and I'm wondering eh.... Governor Ogilvie's promised us in Northern Illinois for the last four years that there is going to be money in the Department of Transportation for the building of 51. Now I would like to ask you is it true that 51 is going to be started next year or is it true that they are going to build a Toll Road for 51?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Eh, further discussion? Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff, to close."

C. E. Neff: "In answer to the gentleman's question. No, I can't answer that. I do now that this budget has been cut as I mentioned before by about four million dollars and this is going to hurt roads in some place, but I'm sure the Governor, if he told them that, he is going to do everything he can to get you that road. Now eh.... on this eh... eh.... this appropriation, I still want to add that the appropriation has been cut almost to the bone. I think it has been gone through thoroughly in the Senate when they cut over four million dollars off. We gave it a thorough hearing, a long hearing, in the appropriation committee and as I recall it came out of the appropriation committee without any descending votes. So I would appreciate a favorable vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, rise?"

E. J. Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I asked your permission for a



couple of questions and I only asked one. I would like to ask another."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, the gentleman has already closed."

E. J. Giorgi: "No he hasn't, Sir, he was answering my question. You're a little busy today, Speaker, but my question is you are telling me the building of Highway 51 in Corridor A, B, C, D or skyway is not in the bill and you are telling me maybe a tollroad will be built because you can't say that a tollroad won't be built. Is that what you are telling me Neff? Are we going to get a tollroad or both, Highway 51 divided?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "O'kay, Mr. Neff. You got the answer there?"

C. E. Neff: "There will be no tollroad built by eh...."

E. J. Giorgi: "You speak for the Tollroad Authority, Mr. Neff? Are you authorized to speak for the Tollroad Authority?"

C. E. Neff: "You asked me the question and I was trying to get it for you eh.... from the highway department and that's what I've been told and also he's eh.... the Governor's planning on proceeding with the promises he has made."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright the.... for what purpose does the gentleman from Lake, Mr. eh.... Matijevich rise?"

J. S. Matijevich: "I'm sorry he closed."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yea.... he did close actually. Question is, should Senate Bill 1361 pass. All those in favor vote



'aye', the opposed 'no'. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

G. W. Shea: "This went from Second to Third Reading without any intervening action didn't it? It was brought back to Second, then it went back to Third."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yea.... nothing happended on Second."

G. W. Shea: "Well, I thought there had to be some intervening action from going from Second to Third Reading."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "What rule?"

G. W. Shea: "Well, eh.... your parliamentarian's off the rostrom now, but if I could borrow him for a few minutes I will find one."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "No, B.B. Wolfe's over there. I don't think there is a rule like that, Jerry. Have all voted who wish? The gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. North."

F. P. North: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain my vote. I'm going to have a hard time voting for this. There's several hundreds of millions of dollars in series 'A' bonds that we are giving a blank check to the DOT to put roads in as they please and unfortunately I voted for that bond issue and I'm not very happy about doing so, because we in Northern Illinois do not, and I want to emphasize, do not have any highways whatsoever except a tollway that we can get in any direction of Rockford, Illinois. And I have been assured that they were going to start on Highway 51 in the year 1973. Now I'm informed that it is nothing but a high priority and that's the same gas they have been giving us for the last five years. And I'm going to have



to vote 'no' on this, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 70 'ayes' and 2 'nays' and this Bill having failed to receive a Constitutional majority, is hereby declared..... gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

C. E. Neff: "I would like to postpone consideration at this time permission."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, is there leave eh.... to place this on the order of postponed consideration? Alright. 1296. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sevcik."

J. G. Sevcik: "Mr. Speaker, point of order. If I have a bill on Third Reading, which I don't want to have called today or tomorrow or whenever we get out of here, will that automatically appear on the November calendar."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "No, I don't think so. At least the plan right now, the leaders is that eh.... there will be a tabling motion."

J. G. Sevcik: "To table all bills?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes."

J. G. Sevcik: "Alright, thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: The gen.... Now I called 127... 1296, and that's the order of business we are on and eh.... the gentleman have leave to eh.... have it brought back to the order of Second Reading for the sole purpose of his eh.... considering the amendment that is to be offered by Mr. Mann. Is there objection? O'okay, hearing none, the amend-



ment will be read."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment No. 5. Mann. Amend Senate Bill 1496."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

R. E. Mann: "Well, eh...., Mr. Speaker, members of the House.

This is the amendment that I made reference to that Representative Collins agreed to, making the Bill effective January 15, 1973 and I urge its adoption."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The eh... alright, all those in favor of the adoption, say 'aye', the opposed 'no'. 'Ayes' have it. Amendment's adopted. Third Reading. 1409."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1409. Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1409 is a bill to provide a special primary election for the election of judges so that those vacancies may be filled on the November election. To set all of your minds at ease very quickly about the cost of another election, there is in Senate Bill 1604 the sum of three million dollars to pay for that special election so there will be no additional cost on units of local government. Eh.... I've had requests from several members to get this Bill called and get it passed and I have a feeling that some of them may have something to say so I will be very brief. It is a special election for filling vacancies in the November primary as you know, the law with regard to



judicial elections was not changed until after the date for the primary filing had passed and this is an attempt to get us back on an even keel. This is a one time shot and I would appreciate the support of the House."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

R. O. Hart: "Well, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. The eh... Senate has already passed a Bill over there which would do this - have an election or build the ballot in November by managing committee and that bill is on its way to the Governor and that bill doesn't cost anything. And I'm not comforted by the fact that we've got that amendment floating around here on some Bill that is eh.... going to provide that the State pay for this election instead of the local government, because after all three million dollars is our three million dollars regardless of whether or not we pay for it in Springfield or we pay for it in the County seat of 102 counties. And I've just found out today that as of the present time, we have over appropriated eh... by one hundred and twenty-nine million dollars. That was the last available figure that I had, over expenses, I mean estimated income. And I think that we have an adequate means of holding this ... of filling these places on the ballot this year. If we have a primary in my area, it's going to be very expensive for everybody who's interested in it and I would suggest that this Bill ought to be defeated."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

T. J. Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, of all the things that we do in the General Assembly and one of our greatest privileges of serving in the General Assembly is setting down some priorities of spending. Well you know this is really the oddest way of wasting money that I could probably hear of in this Session. Three million dollars is to spent for nominations of judges. I would sooner give it to them in salaries and hope we get some better judicial decisions. I would like to get the workers in the Mental Hospitals three million dollars more so that they could earn a decent living. I would like to give the highway workers a little more money so that they could do a better job for the citizens, but to spend three million dollars foolishly like we are doing here is really asanine. What in the hell do we need to spend this for on an election for nomination of judges? If we didn't have these judges and let the ones that are sitting on the bench do a little more work instead of going to the golf courses all the time, maybe we wouldn't have to tax the people so much money. I vote no on this bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

R. F. Tipsword: "Ladies and gentleman, Mr. Speaker. I don't know what the climate of the thoughts of the people are in the counties from which each of you come throughout this State of Illinois. I happen to know I think in the area



where I live. I have received more complaints from people over the number of elections that we had this spring and the excess cost of those elections and questions as to why we did not consolidate those primary elections last fall and have had quoted to me time after time after time the amount of money that we spend on multiple primaries this spring. That came out of our taxpayers pockets and that was out of the real estate taxes because our local governments had nowhere else to go for that cost. Now I don't know if there is an appropriation in for this particular primary election. If there's not, its going to come from the same source unless the State comes up with the money for the payment of this primary. But whether it comes up with the money for paying for this primary or whether the local government pays for it, it is still money out of our taxpayers pocket and money that they need to keep. They need that money at home to pay for raising their families, for educating their childre and they don't need it for multiple primary elections that we require of them. I would certainly suggest that we defeat this bill and certainly in the wisdom of all of you members of this Body and of the Senate, we can devise a much better and much less expensive means of providing for candidates for judges or for filling the offices of judges throughout the State of Illinois."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Pappas."





P. Pappas: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House.

We talk about the previous bill that had been passed which covers this same subject. However, that bill, if I remember correctly will appoint or nominate the judges in the vacancies by weighted vote of the county chairman, which is a very strictly political approach to appointing judges. With the primary, at least the people who are paying the bills will have an opportunity to vote and nominate the people that they feel are qualified for judges rather than having a set of county chairmen in a certain district appointing a judge. I think this is a good bill and it should pass."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Glass."

B. M. Glass: "Thank you, Mr. speaker. Will the sponsor yield to a question?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He indicates he will."

B. M. Glass: "Jerry, eh... is this an alternative method to the Bill that eh... you sponsored previously which would call for the eh... committees of each party selecting the nominees?"

G. W. Shea: "That's right. That's the absolute reason I'm calling the bill. Eh... you've got one of two methods. eh... the Governor could look at both or either and do what eh... gives you both method."

B. M. Glass: "And the alternative, if neither bill passes would be to have the supreme court continue filling the vacancies?"

G. W. Shea: "That's correct. If neither bill passed, there



would be no judicial election from what I understand and the Supreme Court would fill the vacancies."

B. M. Glass: "Well if I may speak to this bill, Mr. Speaker ladies and gentlemen. I have no doubt, whatsoever, that the previous bill we passed is constitutional. It is clearly unconstitutional eh... method of selecting judges which would leave us only this possibility eh... and in the expense of three million dollars of the taxpayers for the continuation of partisan politics in eh... this election or selection of judges. It's something we don't need and I would strongly urge your 'no' vote on this bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Douglas."

B. L. Douglas: "Eh... Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, there are in addition to a number of valid reasons already expressed, there is at least one other reason that I feel is appropriate to defeat this bill. It's too expensive and secondly, as I have said many times, I have my reservations about primary elections in Cook County, at least. Primary systems sounds like a highly democratic approach to the election of public officials but I do not think that that necessarily in this time in history provides any distinct advantage in this Bill over the previous one passed and I also think it is not inappropriate to mention that the timing of the potential passage of this bill provides an opportunity for at least one person who has not hesitated to make his desires known, name at this time is not relevant, has already been appointed



to Public Office and who would prefer to have been a judge to use this as a stepping stone to be a judge and then to simply to select his selector somewhere else in this General Assembly. Vote 'no'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fleck."

C. J. Fleck: "Mr. Speaker, in the interest of getting home sometime this year, I move the previous question."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor, signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no' and the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, to close."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. This is a bill that will provide for a primary so that we may implement the law passed by Representative Hart earlier this year. I would appreciate your support of the House."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: Question is, should Senate Bill 1409 pass. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."

H. Yourell: "I would like to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker. For the reasons expressed by Representative Douglas, I vote 'aye'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Miller:

K. W. Miller: "Mr. Speaker, members of the House. I'm going to vote 'aye', but I want to tell you the reason why I'm



going to vote 'aye'. I don't want the present Supreme Court of this State or any future Supreme Court of this State to select our appellate court judges. Therefore I vote 'aye'.

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea?"

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I would like to put this bill on postponed consideration."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Does the gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, Senate Bill 1409 will be put on the order of postponed consideration. Conference Committee appointment relative to House Bill 4102. Representatives Shapiro, Glass, Phil Collins, Hart. Senate Bill 1296."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1296. Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

P. W. Collins: "Eh.... Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1296 I think has been thoroughly aired and debated over the past two days. I don't have to tell you this is the bill appropriating the State board of elections. I would like to compliment Representative Mann for offering an amendment to set back the effective date. I think that this truly removes some objections from the bill in that it divorces it from the present election. It will place the appointment powers to the Board in the hands of the new legislative leaders next



year and in the new Governor whoever he may be and eh....

I now would ask the House to eh.... favorably consider Senate Bill 1296. This is our Bill, Clyde. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I solicit your support."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Representative from Cook, Mr. Leon."

J. F. Leon: "Eh... Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the sponsor one question, please."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He indicates he will."

J. F. Leon: Mr. Collins, will the amendment that you added on take away powers from the local county election boards that presently constitute it?"

P. W. Collins: "It wouldn't take any power away. I think it would establish the State Board of Election as the final authority and the overall power as I believe was mandated by the Constitutional Convention, to which you were a delegate I might add."

J. F. Leon: "Yes and that is the reason I am asking that particular question. The State Constitutional Convention specifically stated that the powers of the State Board should be in the area of conduct of legislations and application of uniform election laws. It did not give them the power in the constitution which you are attempting to give the State Board of the conduct of elections. On that point, I would like to poise a parliamentary question to the Chair please. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary question. How many votes will it take to pass this Bill? I will as soon.... The reason I asked that question, Mr. Speaker, that under



the Home Rule provision, it takes 2/3 vote of both Houses to take away any power that is now in the hands of units of local government under Home Rule. I believe this amendment takes away the power of the County Board of Elections Commissioners in Cook County as well as the Chicago Board of Election Commissioners to have complete control of the conduct of their elections. Therefore, I ask you how many votes will it take to adopt this measure."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The Chairman's rule, Sir, that Senate Bill 1296 is enacted into law would indeed take no power from Home Rule units; therefore would not be a pre-emption of Home Rule powers and as a result, 89 votes would be all that would be required for Senate Bill 1296 to be declared passed."

J. F. Leon: "I disagree severely. I believe that the conduct of elections in this amendment by Mr. Collins would take away powers from the regularly constituted Board of Elections in Home Rule units. I don't see how you can interpret his amendment which says that the conduct of elections shall be in the hands of a State Board of Elections. If that is so, they are taking powers away from the constituted Boards of Election now."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Representative Collins, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

P. W. Collins: "I... I might suggest to the gentleman that the language in Senate Bill 1296 is taken directly from the Constitution and there is no power being removed from any



homerule unit. The Bill establishes as the wording in the Constitution reads that the State Board shall have general supervision over the administration of the registration and election laws throughout this State."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative Leon, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

J. F. Leon: "I arise to the proposition that he has stated the constitution exactly right. There is nowhere in the Constitution, in this section, that gives or authorizes the State Board of Election as we will constitute it to have power of the conduct of elections throughout the State. That is my point I am raising. He is adding a power to that State Board which the Constitution specifically does not give us."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Well, the chair...."

P. W. Collins: "I ask the gentleman to show me specifically in our amendments where we do what he indicates we do."

J. F. Leon: "If I'm reading correctly your amendment, you state 'the State Board shall have power for the conduct of elections State-wide.' That is my point."

P. W. Collins: "Where is that?"

J. F. Leon: "Read your amendment in which you define the powers of the State Board and the conduct of elections."

P. W. Collins: "The amendment says it shall supervise, just as the constitution directs."

J. F. Leon: "Supervise what?"

P. W. Collins: "Supervise the eh..... the administration of



the registration and election laws throughout the State.

It goes further than that if I'm not mistaken."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Well, Representative Leon, are you persisting in your ....."

J. F. Leon: "I'm not going to persist any longer....."

P. W. Collins: "Mr. Leon, you are mistaken. After the State is period."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Does the gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins, wish to close?"

P. W. Collins: "Eh.... very briefly, Mr. Speaker. This Bill certainly has been debated at length. The last gentleman raised a point, which I think he was just reading more into the amendment than is there. The Amendment merely said that the Board would have the power that is prescribed in the Constitution, that the Board shall have general supervision over the administration of the registration and election laws throughout the State. There is nothing beyond that. Local authorities would continue to administer their elections, the Constitution mandated that there would be a State Board and this Bill, Senate Bill 1296 is carrying out that mandate and I eh... would urge every member to join me in voting for Senate Bill 1296."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Question is, shall Senate Bill 1296 pass? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Phil Collins."





P. W. Collins: "Would you poll the absentees, please?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "O'kay, let's first take the Record now. Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ray Welsh to explain his vote."

R. J. Welsh: "Mr. Speaker, the questions raised by Representative Leon, would you please record me as voting 'present'?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Record Representative Welsh as voting 'present'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record.

Representative Redmond, did you seek recognition, Sir?

Record Representative Redmond as voting 'present'. Representative

Choate as voting 'present'. Pierce 'present'.

Hill 'present'. Bradley 'no'. Caldwell 'present'.

Fennessey 'present'. Barry 'present'. Berman 'present'.

Von Boeckman 'present'. Corbett 'present'. Schisler

'present'. Holloway 'present'. Alsup 'present'. Londrigan

'present'. Otis Collins 'present'. Representative

Washington, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

H. Washington: "I know I'm recorded as voting 'no'. Would you change that to 'present'?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Record Representative Harold Washington as voting 'present'. Representative Collins, for what purpose do you rise?"

P. W. Collins: "Eh.... Mr. Speaker, by eh.... way of explaining my vote, I just like to quote a very famous citizen of that city who said that "Chicago ain't ready for reform yet. Thank you."



Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: On this question, there are ...

Representative Choate, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

C. L. Choate: "In the country boy's venacular, an answer to Representative Collins "I ain't from Chicago."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Record Representative Glass as voting 'aye'. On this question, there are 73 'ayes', 37 'nays' and 18 answering 'present', and this Bill having failed to receive a Constitutional majority is hereby declared lost. Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

G. W. Shea: "I talked to the Speaker and I was going to handle 868 for Representative McPartlin. He's home. Will you bring that back to Second Reading for the purposes of an amendment?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: Are there objections? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

T. S. Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, eh.... ladies and gentlemen of the House. In difference to the previous comments by Representative Collins, just want to make it perfectly clear that when those amendments were adopted on that Bill yesterday, I stated the effects of what that Bill would do. And in turn we were going to support that Bill as it came in from the Senate, but unfortunately the amendments were adopted by the Republican Party and that's the outcome of the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Are there objections? Hearing none, Senate Bill 868."



Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment No. 1. Shea. Amend Senate Bill 868 henceforth."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, this is another one of the Bills from the Election Commission. Eh.... this amendment will put Senate Bill 868 in the same position that Senate Bill 1296 was before it was riddled with bad amendments and hopefully we'll move this back to third and I'll find some support from my friend, Mr. Collins, who talks about election reform and maybe we can move this one over to the Senate for concurrence or to a Conference Committee or someplace. So I would move for the adoption of amendment no. 1."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative from Cook, Mr. Collins."

P. W. Collins: "I ask the gentleman to hold the Bill on Second while I prepare some amendments, Mr. Speaker. This is the first indication that I had that the Bill was going to be moved along in this fashion."

G. W. Shea: "Why don't we just move it back to Third, Phil and when you bring over your amendments, we will see about bringing it back to Second."

P. W. Collins: "I would rather you held it on second now, Representative Shea, so we could get it in form acceptable to everybody."

G. W. Shea: "Well you know Phil, this is so funny. You had a vote on the Bill the way you wanted it and it didn't get



enough votes. Now let me get this one to Third Reading in the form it was last year when the Election Laws Commission finished it up and let me have a vote on it in that fashion and then let's see if who's ready for reform in elections in this State."

P. W. Collins: "Well, I have to correct you. In wasn't the form of the elections law commission, it was the form the Senate sent it over in. There were changes made in the Senate, so you are not entirely accurate in that. Eh.... however..."

G. W. Shea: "It came out of the Election Commission. It was sponsored by Representatives Graham and Dougherty in the Senate and Phil, let's quit kidding the people, huh?"

P. W. Collins: "I would suggest that to you, Representative Shea, quit trying to fool the people. The majority of members of this... the voting members of this House eh.... voted yesterday to amend the Bill and to the form that eh.. we considered it. Majority of those voting today voted in favor of the Bill. Unfortunately, we didn't have a constitutional majority. I don't think we are trying to fool anybody. I think those present votes and those absentions were an attempt to fool somebody, so let's put the shoe on the foot that it fits."

G. W. Shea: "Well, that's what I'm trying to do, Phil. Let me get this thing to Third Reading and let's take a roll call vote on it. You know, I have heard so much about who's for what, but when it comes to voter reregistration on a



Statewide basis, we can't get it. We fought for four years down here to require voting machines in all the counties of the State over 40,000 and for once, you know, like Representative Choate said "We practically begged you the last night of the session to call 1296." Practically begged you, but then here we are in the closing day, but Phil maybe this time we were waiting for what you did because here's an amendment that will put it back in the shape of 1296 and then let us vote it up or down."

P. W. Collins: "What shape are you putting it in? The shape that it started in the Senate in or the shape it came out of the Senate? There were five Senate amendments. What shape is it in?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Hyde."

H. J. Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, eh.... ladies and gentlemen of the House. I find this dialogue very interesting and instructive, but I would suggest to eh... the chief sponsor of the Bill that Mr. Collins be given an opportunity to prepare and submit some amendments. You can't foreclose and deny, or you ought not, a member of this House, any member, offering amendments and he is asking for the courtesy of holding the Bill until he can prepare and offer an amendment. Now if he cannot succeed in imposing those amendments on the Bill, so be it, but if he can succeed then it is the will of the House, the Bill be amended, so I submit that eh.... common courtesy would dictate the



gentleman hold the Bill for a reasonable length of time to permit Mr. Collins to prepare and submit his amendments."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, if you'll move this Bill to Third Reading. I'll wait for Representative Collins to bring me over the amendments, I'll be happy to stand up here and make a motion to bring it back to Second and if he wants to try and put on some meaningful amendments, I'll be very happy to work with him, but I think in this the closing day of the session, I think I would like to have the Bill on third reading. I have never broken my word with anybody here and I'll give my word that I will bring this Bill back if he's got some amendments."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, R. Walsh."

R. A. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the crust of this thing is, you know, what amendments are going to be adopted on Second Reading. And we may have substitute amendments rather than additional amendments if eh.... Representative Collins amendment is not consistent with any amendment that Representative Shea has adopted, then it would have to be ruled out of order. The only way to approach this thing, is to keep the Bill on second reading and then consider amendments as they are proposed."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative Shea, then, eh.... it's the Chair's understanding that you do not wish to eh.... grant that privilege to Representative Collins, is



that correct sir?"

G. W. Shea: "The Bill is now on what Second Reading?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "On Second Reading, Sir."

G. W. Shea: "Has amendment No. 1 been adopted?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Not yet, Sir."

G. W. Shea: "I would like at this juncture to move for the adoption of Amendment No. 1."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman, o'kay, now. On the amendment. The gentleman from Cook, Representative Richard Walsh."

R. A. Walsh: "Eh... Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman is insisting on debating this thing at this time, I think the only fair thing to do, is just consider a motion to postpone consideration for 30 minutes or whatever length of time it would take Representative Collins to prepare an amendment. It's just ridiculous to keep pushing these things from Third to Second. He's granted the courtesy to take it back to Second to consider an amendment, which is extraordinary, and I think we have been doing it too much, but if it's going to go back, we ought to consider all amendments at this time."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

G. W. Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, could we get Amendment No. 1 on the Bill on Second Reading and if Senator Collins is insistent upon staying on second reading and I have the assurance of the chair that Amendments will be offered



and I'll have an opportunity to get this to third reading and get a vote on it, I'll leave it on Second Reading after I get my amendment on it and I will be happy to furnish the Senator Collins and have the staff assistant that worked on the Bill sit down and work with him and explain everything in the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative from Cook, Mr. Phil Collins."

P. W. Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker eh.... the assistant minority leader's word is certainly good and eh.... with his assurance that we will have the opportunity to consider amendments that deflates any argument I might have, so whether you decide to hold it on Second or move it to Third with the assurance that it will come back, eh.... I defer to any decision made and eh.... I know that Jerry Shea will honor and give me the opportunity to offer any amendments that I wish to, so I don't think we have to prolong this debate any longer."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bil..... Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer."

R. J. Palmer: "Mr. Speaker, what does the amendment do? Will the Clerk read it and then maybe we can have an explanation."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Well, the Clerk informs me it is quite long. Perhaps Representative Shea could explain it, would that be suffice? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."





G. W. Shea: "This will put this Bill in the same shape that Senate Bill 1296 was in yesterday before it was amended. That's the Bill that's been on the calendar for about a year."

R. J. Palmer: "Speaker, does that mean that there will be eight members of the.... or that the minority leader and the eh..."

G. W. Shea: "It's a two and two member board, four member board. Two from each of the political parties."

R. J. Palmer: "And the rest of it remains the same as it was yesterday?"

G. W. Shea: "Yes Sir."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 868. All in favor of adoption, signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Do you wish a roll call? Amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? Now what is the gentleman's wish, to have it moved to Third? Representative Shea?"

G. W. Shea: "As long as the speaker will give me an assurance that it will get to Third and I'll get a chance of a roll call vote, I don't care if you want to put it on Third or or leave it on second."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative Simmons, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

A. F. Simmons: "I would like to remind the Speaker that this is a long amendment and we cannot vote for it on third



reading and we cannot vote for it on third reading until it is duplicated and placed on each member's desk."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The Chair's aware of this, Representative Simmons, and would also take a suspension of Rule 47A at some point."

A. F. Simmons: "That's a Constitutional requirement and can't be circumvented."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "We'll leave this on the order of Second Reading, o'kay, Representative Shea?"

G. W. Shea: "Well to facilitate things if you are going to keep it on Second Reading, could you ask that the amendment that was just adopted be duplicated and put on the members desks?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The Clerk informs me they are going to work on it right now, Sir."

G. W. Shea: "Alright, thank you."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "You're welcome. On the order of concurrences appears House Bill 4465, for which purpose the gentleman from DuPage, Representative Gene Hoffman, is recognized."

G. L. Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. House Bill 4465 and House Bill 4430, which we concurred in earlier today, to allow for the 1971-1972 school year for school districts to use either the 71-72 weight average daily attendance, whichever is the District's best advantage. Eh.... comprised the basic elements of the eh.... school aid proposal eh.... for the ensuing school



year. House Bill 4465 was amended in the Senate eh .... pursuant to a compromise reached with the House and Senate and the office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Governor. It was amended in the Senate to change the density allowance for Districts with a weight average daily attendance of over 200,000 from 14 to 16 percent and return the reduction of qualifying rates to the level proposed by the School Problems Commission, i.e., 84 cents for highschool districts over 500 and 84 cents for elementary districts over 1,000. The Superintendent's appropriation Bill was amended to reduce or eliminate the urban education eh.... grant which helped make possible this particular compromise. The appropriation for both of these Bills, 4330, which Representative Craig passed earlier and 4465 are contained in House Bill 4663, which was amended up in the Senate to 802 million dollars and I move that we concur in Senate Amendment to House Bill 4465 and after that I will move on House Bill 4463."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Now before we call discussion, I think you are all aware you ought to be sending out for something to eat. We will be here for a while. God knows how long, but eh.... the gentleman from Cook, Representative Bill Walsh."

W. D. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. This Bill is a part of the famed deal that was made a few days ago without the knowledge of most of us and what this does to us, those of us who represent the dual school



districts and that's most of the people in the State of Illinois outside of the City of Chicago. Any of you who represent people outside Chicago, probably represent the people in dual districts. What it does is provide for a greater discrimination than existed before. In Fiscal 1972, the people in the dual school districts paid about 100 million dollars more for education than they would have if they had been formed into a unit district. This, then, by dropping the qualifying rates from 87 to 84 cents, the sponsors of this deal tell us, we'll give the dual school district 6 million dollars, but by increasing the rate from 12, the add on rate from 12 to 19 percent, it in effect takes back 7 percent of the discrimination of 100 million dollars and takes away from us then 7 million dollars. So the deal for us is a sham. We get nothing. The dual school district people are paying more and more and more. We are going in the wrong direction. I submit to you that this is wrong. That this should be defeated. This should be referred to another Conference Committee or even let go on the basis it is. Let me tell you that you are not voting against the appropriation for the school children, you are voting against the formula that is a sham. I submit it is bad and you should vote no."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative from Lake, Representative Pierce."

D. M. Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor of the motion yield to a question?"



Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "He indicates he will."

D. M. Pierce: "Mr. Hoffman, A year ago when we reduced the foundation level to reduce the discrimination against dual districts from 90 cents to 87 cents, didn't we have a minimum daily attendance of 100 students required by the school districts and don't we in this Bill raise that to a 1,000 students?"

G. L. Hoffman: "DE, the amendment, the change that was made last year remains in the Bill. The amendment eh.... for the change this year provides that eh.... for the 84 cent level, we will have 500 in the thousand for the 87 cent level. We will still have the same figure of a 100."

D. M. Pierce: "For the 84 cent level, you will have a 1000 minimum ADA for elementary schools, is that correct?"

G. L. Hoffman: "Correct."

D. M. Pierce: "Now Mr. Speaker, I'm going to oppose this concurrence for this reason. I have long opposed the discrimination against our dual school districts. We were finally able a year ago in this House to get a minimum, a minimum reduction in the foundation level of 3 cents for elementary and 3 cents for highschools, the first step towards eliminating discrimination. This year, the School Problems Committee Commission recommended another 3 cent reduction, but they took it away by putting on a 1,000 student minimum. There are 21 school districts in Lake County, 21 elementary districts that are below 1,000 average



ADA and would not receive the benefit of the further reduction in the foundation level. They are being discriminated against, and I want to say this House followed its responsibilities. This House passed the Bill introduced by Representative Walsh and Representative Burditt to further eliminate the discrimination against school districts. But the State Senate refused to pass those Bills and the fall lies equally with the democrats and the republicans in the State Senate and the fault lies with Senator Saperstein, Chairman of the Senate Education Committee, with Senator Tom Hinds and with Senator Gilbert who introduced this amendment. I voted for Chicago, I voted to help Chicago in every way I can in school districts. The supplemental budget, the borrowing of the Rehabilitation Fund, but what do the Chicago Senators do when they get our dual district equality bills in the Senate? They bottle them up in Committee. They defeat them and then they pass out a school formula that denies 21 school districts in Lake County the increased State Aid that they should get by reduction of a foundation level. Who's speaking for those children. The only one who is speaking is the suburban legislators here and we have no political machine behind us. Chicago gets taken care of because they have a political organization. Downstate, East St. Louis gets taken care of, but the small dual districts do not get taken care of. For that reason, for that reason, I'm going to vote against concurrence and hope that we can get a con-



ference committee that will lower it to 500 or 100 students the minimum ADA for elementary school districts, so that all of our small districts, all of our small districts can benefit. I might point out that there are no requirements on unit districts if they have a 1000 students. Well over half the unit districts in the State have less than 1000 students. They are not being penalized. We are penalizing the unit districts. Now my school district filed the Roth Child case and that case is going to go ahead and completely upset the school aid formula of this State which is a rotten formula and we are going to go ahead with that suit because we can see here in the General Assembly we're not going to get any sympathy toward eliminating discrimination against dual districts. I'm going to oppose, I'm going to oppose this concurrence and I want to tell my brother from Chicago that I'm very disappointed at what our Senators did in defeating the dual district equality and I'll think twice in the future before I support further aid for the Chicago Board of Education until we get parity. All we asked for, not complete equality, but a lessening in the discrimination between dual and unit districts. I urge you all not to concur and have a conference committee."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Is there further discussion. Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart."

R. O. Hart: "Well very briefly, Mr. Speaker, to concur in the remarks of Representative Pierce, Walsh and the others who represent small schools who it will dual district. I can't



imagine Senator Gilbert even being a part of this, but I guess he was. But there's not a dual district with an average daily attendance in my area or even in the southern part of the State, that has a 1000 daily average attendance that I know of. And eh.... this just discriminates and gives the dual districts with a better assessed valuation in the bigger cities more money and takes more away from the small town schools, in the little towns. And the trouble with the equalization formula, it doesn't equalize. It doesn't even attempt to equalize, and here through the efforts of the school problems commission and I think the only problems they've ever solved are the ones in their own districts, are going to further discriminate between the dual districts and the poor areas and those in the rich areas. And I think this amendment ought to be soundly defeated."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Is there further discussion. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman."

A. L. Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've been involved in this argument since the session began in April. We've talked about the need for schools for more money. I think at this point in time that we have a situation that it's a question of how the amount of money that has been voted upon in the appropriation bill is going to be divided up. I don't think anybody impartial is happy or over-joyed with this arrangement, but I think like many settlements, if everybody's is a little unhappy, it means that it's





about the best thing that can be obtained at this hour.

So with those reservations, I add my voice to Representative Gene Hoffman's in urging a support for the motion of concurrence."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Glass."

B. M. Glass: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen. Eh... very briefly, I know the sponsor of this Bill, Representative Hoffman, eh... has had and has the best intentions, eh... as far as this formula is concerned and there is a limited amount of money to go around and the three cent reduction in the qualifying rate for dual districts will help finally some of the dual districts in excess of a thousand. It's already been discussed at great length the number of districts that will not benefit that have less than a thousand but I think we should bear in mind that this is an example of tokenism anyway. This is only a slight benefit to dual districts. We put an amendment on here last week that would have been more significant that was taken off in the Senate and I think that eh... we can go year after year hoping that there will someday be enough to eliminate or to reduce this discrimination but I don't think it's really going to happen unless those of us who represent dual districts take a stand. And I think, therefore, we should nonconcur in these amendments and force this Bill into a conference committee."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative



Krause."

J. G. Krause: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, we who represent dual districts have been fighting this thing for this whole session now trying to get something done for the dual school districts. Everytime the Bill gets to the Senate, we get knocked out. Now we've got a chance to get this Bill in a conference committee and try to get something for the school districts. Maybe we won't get everything we had in Representative Glass' amendment, but maybe we can get something out of this thing. I urge everybody to nonconcur and help us get this in a conference committee."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Duff."

B. B. Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to Representatives Pierce, Glass, Hart and Krause, and I would also like to mention to the gentleman from Chicago who spoke that I'm sorry to say that the 60,000 people in Evanston that I have represented which will be in his District next year will not concur with the feeling that is probably better if everybody be a little unhappy, because those people, as many of the others in the dual school districts have had to suffer this discrimination for these many years. It's time for us, as said by Representative Krause, to do something about it."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Clabaugh."



C. W. Clabaugh: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, and members of the House. Some of the speakers might lead you to believe that Chicago is the only unit district in the State of Illinois. I would suggest to you that there's Rockford and Peoria, eh... Rock Island, Quincy, Decatur, Springfield, Champaign-Urbana, Danville and practically all of the Corn Belt. I talked with Representative Walsh a few minutes ago and I must say that I can't follow his mathematics in that this is more than a discrimination against the dual districts. I just have this one thing to say, we have a formula now ladies and gentlemen, that the schools are living under and it's my opinion that if we don't stay pretty close to just what's in this suggestion of Mr. Hoffman's than we will have no change in the formula. The appropriation bill has already been passed and we'll go along with the formula and we'll be getting for all of our districts, about 45 or 50 million dollars less than we will if we go ahead and concur in this report as suggested and I appreciate it if you will support it."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative Walsh, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

R. A. Walsh: "My name was mentioned, Mr. Speaker, and in order to clear up the question of mathematics. It was simply this: The qualifying rate has been reduced in this formula for dual districts by three cents. Now this results in six million dollars approximately, as I understand it, more for dual districts. But at the same time, the add-on was



increased for both unit and dual districts from twelve to nineteen percent. That's an increase of seven percent. Now the discrimination in Fiscal 1972 was a hundred million dollars. Thus, seven percent of a hundred million dollars is seven million dollars; therefore, the dual districts are losing a net of one million dollars more than they lost in Fiscal 1972."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Gentleman from Moultrie, Representative Stone."

P. Stone: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, I believe that that this amendment should be accepted by the House. I know that the discrepancy between the dual and the unit districts would be reduced by adopting this formula. Now as was pointed out by Representative Clabaugh, the appropriation bill for this has already been passed and if we do not accept this formula or some other formula we would necessarily go back to last year's formula and it doesn't matter if you are a dual district or unit district or what you are, you're going to get more money for your school district if you adopt a formula other than the one we are working under now. And for these reasons, I believe, that we should adopt this amendment put on by the Senate."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Juckett."

R. S. Juckett: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. As you can see from the debate today, some of us are divided on this particular issue. However, when this



amendment was put on by Representative Glass, the House overwhelmingly adopted the amendment and I think the only way to solve the issue is let's not debate and degrade each other here, but let's refuse to concur in the amendment, let's get it into a conference committee and let's work out the differences. Now if we do vote to concur, we're not resolving any difference at all and I think all of these of you who work for this amendment are just going down the tube. The only way that we can resolve it, is to vote to nonconcur. Let's get it into a conference committee, let's work out the differences and let's try to bring equality, let's try and eliminate discrimination because this is what this Bill does is it does discriminate and the original amendment of Representative Glass helped to remove much of the discrimination, so if you'll vote 'no', you'll get a conference committee and we can resolve it by that method."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscher: "Is there further discussion. If not, the gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman, to close the debate."

G. L. Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. The debate that we've heard today is a continuation of a discussion which someone has pointed out has been going on since we came in session. This is healthy and this is what this process is about. But we're at the point now where we have to fish or cut bait, as someone has said. I think it ought to be pointed out as Representative Walsh has stated that there is a seven percent add-on increase



for all districts, unit and dual. I think it also might be pointed out in defense of the actions of this General Assembly that in two sessions, in two sessions, ladies and gentlemen, this General Assembly has reduced for the taxpayers of dual districts twelve cents reduction in their qualifying rate if you take the six cents with a high school district and the six cents for the elementary district. Show me any other two sessions of this General Assembly when this has happened and while this was happening, there was no reduction in the qualifying rate for unit districts, so in fact the discrepancy which does exist is less than it was at that time. Now, with the amount of money that is available, this is a reasonable and equitable compromise. It has been pointed out by another speaker that no one is overjoyed by this particular arrangement, but this is the arrangement, gentlemen. This is a reasonable arrangement and I incur, and I encourage you to support eh... and to concur in the amendment or the amendment to House Bill 4465."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 4465. All in favor of concurrence, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman, to explain his vote."

A. L. Berman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, to respond to the candidate for re-election from the first district, I think it's rather ludicrous to talk about the needs of the dual districts



when you're talking about a formula only, when the appropriate bill that really is the bill that means more money for the school districts that need it, if you're talking about getting money for the dual districts and not hurting the unit districts, you should... we should nonconcur in the money bill. March down to the second floor and get more money. That way, everybody will be taken care of. But to talk about the needs of the dual districts or the needs of the unit districts without intending to get more money for the total formula is just plain politics and being ludicrous with the facts in the situation. That's the reason, in view of the position of the administration that there won't be any more money that this motion to concur will provide. That's why I say it's not the ideal thing, it's not what we wanted, it's not what we argued for. But it's the only way that you're going to be able to get a reasonable compromise without critically hurting one segment of the total school community. That's why I'm voting 'aye'."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman, to explain his vote."

G. L. Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. The arrangement which we are dealing with here is an amendment by the eh... Senate to House Bill 4465, which puts the bill back to the level of the School Problems Commission proposal, which included a three cents reduction in the dual district rate and a seven percent add-on for all dis-



tract. The only change is that there has been a change in the density from fourteen to sixteen percent for those school districts with over 200 weighted average daily attendance. The funds for this eh.... we found these in the urban education proposal. I encourage your support of this concurrence so that we might move on with other business. This eh.... amount of money that's available here is the amount of money which we have been able to work out. There isn't any more money available. It's a question of taking this particular arrangement or quite possibly not increasing the school aid at all. Therefore I would encourage your support of this concurrence."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Gentleman from Moultrie, Representative Stone."

P. Stone: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen. It's very, very encouraging to me to see that Representative Hyde is following the lead of Representative Berman in this matter as he said he usually did on the floor a few days ago."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Clabaugh."

C. W. Clabaugh: "One other thing, Mr. Speaker, about this Bill. One facet of it that hasn't been mentioned here this evening. When the allotment was set out in the budget for the common school fund, the members of the school problems commission decided that we should pay a little attention to the cry and justified it was indeed for increased funds in the pension fund, the teachers retirement, and thirty-two





million dollars was taken from what could have gone into the distributed fund and put into the sagging teacher retirement. Seven million in Chicago and twenty-five million in the downstate fund. Now a great deal more money could have been distributed, but you know and I know that the school districts of this State are far more concerned about the condition of the retirement fund right now than they are about the additional distributive fund and I just simply say that I think we are limited in the amount of money that we are going to get and I don't see any other way than to vote for this and to represent a progress. We are making progress. Any of you that have had any experience at all with distributive funds know that you don't cut down one type of district in order to give to another. But you get enough money together to gradually bring them up, but you just don't cut them back because you would wreck school systems if you did that. And so I, just for the sake of avoiding going back or staying with the same formula we had this year, I urge you, there's enough people here, from the unit districts and the one's that are thoughtful enough to know a good eh... arrangement when it's made in progress to give support to this motion."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscher: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question, there are 77 'ayes', 57 'nays'. Representative Hoffman, for what purpose do you rise?"

G. L. Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to request a poll of the absentees."



Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. Will the Clerk please read the names of the absentees."

Jack O'Brien: "Blades, Boyle, Caldwell, Capuzi, Conolly, W. Cunningham, Douglas, Fleck, Garmisa, Giorgi, Granata, Hanahan, Janczak, Karmazyn, Katz, Kipley, Kleine, Klosak, Lehman, Lindberg, E. R. Madigan, Mann, McDermott, Murphy, Nowlan, D. J. O'Brien, G. M. O'Brien, Randolph, Rayson, Schoeberlein, W. T. Simms,"

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Record Representative W. T. Simms as voting 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "Simms, W. T. Simms. Got 88 now. Soderstrom, J. W. Thompson, Tipsword, Washburn, G. Washington, R. A. Walsh, Williams, J. J. Wolf, Zlatnik."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "This question, there are 78 'ayes', 50.... Representative Collins, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

P. W. Collins: "How am I recorded?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'. Record Representative Collins as voting 'aye'. Representative Philip, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

J. Philip: "Mr Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "How is Representative Philip recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

J. Philip: "Record me as 'aye'"

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Record the gentleman as voting 'aye'."



Representative Caldwell, for what purpose do you rise?"

How is Representative Caldwell recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as 'not voting'."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Record the gentleman as voting 'aye'."

Representative Garmisa wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative J. J. Wolf wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Are there further inquiries as to this roll call? Record Representative Bill Cunningham as voting 'aye'. Representative Anderson, for what purpose do you rise?"

M.K. Anderson: "How am I recorded?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "How is Representative Anderson recorded as voting?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

M. K. Anderson: "Aye".

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Record the gentleman as voting 'aye'. Representative Mann, for what purpose do you rise?"

R. E. Mann: "How am I recorded?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "How's the gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

R. E. Mann: "Vote me 'aye'."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Record the gentleman as voting 'aye'. Representative Douglas, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"  
How's Representative Douglas recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Record the gentleman as voting 'aye'."



Representative Cunningham, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

W. J. Cunningham: "Somebody switched my switch 'yes' and it should have been 'no' instead."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Record Representative Bill Cunningham as voting 'no'. Representative Anderson, for what purpose do you rise?"

M. K. Anderson: "Somebody switched my switch. I want to vote 'no'."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Representative Anderson wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'."

Jack O'Brien: "Well we just lost two, we had ten, we added eight."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Representative Fleck, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

C. J. Fleck: "How am I recorded?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "How is Representative Fleck recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

C. J. Fleck: "Vote me 'aye'."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Vote the gentleman as voting 'aye'. Representative Merle Anderson wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. When the Clerk gives me the roll call, I will be happy to announce it, Sir. On this... Representative Bill Walsh, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

W. D. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I would request that you have the Sergeant at Arms clear the floor of everyone who is not



a member of this Body."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "I think that is a very fine point, Sir. Will everyone who is on the floor who is not authorized to be on the floor, please leave...."

W. D. Walsh: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker I would go further and request that representatives of the Governor and other lobbying groups be asked to leave also."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: " I believe that they have permission to be on the floor, Sir. Representative Walsh, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

W. D. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I've observed Blakeman lobbying on the Floor. Now it's not right and I don't care if it's the Governor's people or anyone else. They do not belong on this floor lobbying. And I request that you asked them to leave."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Representative Redmond, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

W. A. Redmond: "How am I recorded?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "How's the gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'.

W. A. Redmond: "May I be recorded as voting 'yes'?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Record the gentleman as voting 'aye'.

On this question, there are 88 'ayes', 58 'nays' and the House does not concur with Amendment No.... with Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 4465. Senate Bills. Third Reading. Senate Bill 1449."



Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1449. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the establishment of water authorities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Keller."

C. F. Keller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. I would like to move this Bill back to the order of Second Reading for the purpose of Representative Cunningham putting on an amendment."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, Senate Bill 1449 is put on the order of Second Reading for the purpose of amendment. Will the clerk please read the amendment."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment to Senate Bill 1449. Amendment. 1. Amend Senate Bill 1449 on Page 1, Line 1, by deleting Section 3 of and inserting in lieu thereof the following, etc."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Gentleman from Perry, Representative Cunningham."

W. J. Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. This amendment is simply giving the water authorities the right of election of their Board of Trustees. They have peculiar problem in one district in the State and it can all be settled if they have the right of the people to elected their own trustees and we've done this on many, many other districts. There's nothing wrong with this. We've taken about a week to work it out. We have it in proper



form. I move the adoption of this agreed amendment, agreed on both sides of the aisle by everyone we've talked to. Thank you."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has offered the move of the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1449. All those in favor of adoption, signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no', and the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? Third Reading. Senate Bill 1319."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1319. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Agriculture. Third Reading of the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Hunsicker."

C. T. Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House. This is the annual appropriation for the Department of Agriculture. We had this Bill up earlier this morning. Didn't get enough votes to get it passed. Somebody wanted to make some changes. No one has come to see me and we are calling it up again on third reading."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Craig,"

R. Craig: "Mr. Speaker, members of this House. I've talked with Mr. Swanson and also with the Director of Agriculture and they have made no assurance to me that they would accept these amendment or keep those amendments that we put on yesterday, and until they do so, I urge the members on

this side of the aisle to remain off of this Bill until they give us some assurance that they will accept our amendments on grain inspection to be replaced as we put the amendment on yesterday. And I urge the staying off of this Bill until we get that assurance."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Is there further discussion? Does the gentleman from Cook, Representative Scariano, seek recognition? Question is, shall Senate Bill 1319 pass? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye'. Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Lauterbach."

W. H. Lauterbach: "Well Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, we passed HJR 34, which asked the Department of Agriculture to take a new look at the possibility of establishing a system of diagnostic labs across the State of Illinois to more adequately serve the poultry, dairy and livestock industry of this State. This Resolution asked that the expenditure at Kewanee be reduced and we asked that they maintain the one at Peoria Illinois and look at the possibility of establishing small field labs in Brown or Pike County and in the Rockford area. Using the University of Illinois as a backup for these series of centers. This would more adequately serve, I believe, the farmers in the agricultural State of Illinois. This Bill still provides one million five hundred thousand to go to one place only and no assurance we can keep the Peoria facility any longer than a year or two while we finish the Kewanee site. I'm sorry but I must oppose this legislation as long as it remains





in that form."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Is there further discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill No.... gentleman from Livingston, Representative Hunsicker to close the debate."

C. T. Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I'd just like to make this statement. The Department of Agriculture appropriation has been made the whipping boy for the past several sessions, suffering a cut in funds. Each year, while other Departments have been increased, many of them by millions. As you know, Agriculture is the backbone of the economy of Illinois. Being No. 1 in exporting State and agricultural products. Farm land paid for an enormous share of the tax burden in last year's appropriation was cut a hundred thousand dollars and this year it is cut seven-hundred and sixty four thousand. Even with what was restored in the amendment yesterday. Now the amendment was proposed. It is the other side's amendment. They put it on. They asked for it. And this House voted that it be on. This amendment is your amendment, gentlemen. You were not satisfied with the one adopted in the Committee restoring part of the funds, which were eliminated by the Senate. You wanted more added." Now your amendment increasing the appropriation was adopted yesterday. Today it is up to you to approve what you asked for in your amendment. I solicit your favorable vote to pass the appropriation so that the State government can continue to operate."



Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Question is, shall Senate Bill 1319 pass. All, Representative Craig, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

R. Craig: "Mr. Speaker, members of this House. I don't think there's anyone on this floor that stood up for Agriculture more than I have over the years. And I've probably done as much for the agriculture department even last year for getting them an appropriation increase and the appropriation when it was failing as anyone did. And I want it plainly understood that I'm not opposed. But due to the new Constitution of the line item veto by the Governor, I don't want this Bill to go out of here, excepting it understanding it that what we are doing and go down on the Second Floor and line item veto the amendment we put in there out, and then we are stuck with what he wants. That is the reason that this side of the aisle is not voting on this measure. We want some assurance from the second floor that they will accept the amendment as we have it."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Question is, shall Senate Bill 1319 pass? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Gentleman from Bureau Representative Barry."

T. Barry: "Perhaps I have more guts than brains, but there's a million and a half dollars in here for my district and I want to be voted as being 'present'."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Record the gentleman as voting present. Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."



E. J. Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, in all the confusion here last night, we didn't fully get the impact that in Hunsicker's district, there are three county fairs in one county. That's the only county in Illinois. And he never did fully explain that, and I'm wondering if you will say publicly that those three fairs in his county, are subsidized from the gambling revenues of the State of Illinois. I wonder if he would admit that to the General Assembly here tonight?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Lehman."

E. Lehman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Due to the fact that I was not invited to stay off of this Bill, because the only invitations were given to those on the other side of the aisle, I vote 'aye'."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster."

A. T. McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. It seems like the income from the race track and its impact upon county fairs has become an issue around this floor. I would like to ask if all the revenue from the race track goes to county fairs? Is it not true that probably the larger amount of that money does go into the general revenue fund of this State and I certainly feel that every part of the state, schools, whatever part you are talking about, any part of our State government is in a part subsidized by the races. I see no problem with this. I think if you are talking about hanging a sign on a county



and say this is subsidized by the race tracks, certainly we in county fair business feel that we are the proving grounds for the horses that go to the race tracks. Certainly, if it were not for county fairs and running horses at that level, we would not have anywhere near the horses that we have to run at the mutual tracks. Also, I think if we're going to hang signs on eh.... one part of the State, then let's hang them out here in our front door and say we are subsidized by the race tracks. Thanks."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Anderson."

M. K. Anderson: "Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the House. I haven't been on the floor to talk about anything for quite a while, but being a real dirt farmer and a man who is interested in agriculture and a man who lives in the middle of agriculture, I'm very much interested in this bill. And I think we should all get down there and give it a green light. Let's do something for agriculture so we can be proud of it. It's the biggest business in the State of Illinois. We are the biggest exporter of crops in the United States. I think we need support, and if this Bill doesn't pass, we don't get it, I'm going to make hay out of it - I'm going to make political hay. And we'll see what happens when we get a going on this - if we don't get some help from you fellows on the other side of the aisle who are farmers and good dirt farmers. Vote along with me."



Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Gentleman from Fayette, Representative Brummet."

D. E. Brummet: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. So there will be no errors in your thinking, I would like for you to know that we on this side of the aisle are also for the farmers. I in particular am. And what we have done is not to subtract from the agriculture budget but we have actually added in over 900 thousand dollars to take care of the Grain Inspectors in the State of Illinois. I would like to add that we have inspectors now for meat, milk, dairy products, whiskey. We have inspector scales to be insured that you are getting the right weight, to inspect your gasoline pump to see that you get the right amount of gallons and I have heard no one argue that we should turn this inspection job over to some private inspectors. And that is what is in the program to do what the Grain Inspection of the State of Illinois. I do not like it. I think we are selling our farmers down the river when we do it. Because this is one job that they need done and they need done well. I think when you turn this over to private inspectors, you are turning it over to someone who can be the tools of your big grain industry. We do not want this. Last year, shipped out of the State of Illinois, in international commerce, was 326 million, 143 thousand, 200 bushels of grain. We need an inspection on this if we are going to sell on the world market. And as you have already been told, we've got no assurance from the Governor that he will



GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

keep this part in there. This is what we object to as the fact that we have no assurance that this will be kept in. Thank you."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Hunsicker."

C. T. Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I'd just like to explain my vote up there. Occassionally some of the economy comments that come from the other side of the aisle when it comes to economy bills affecting someone elses districts, certain members are tight as bark on a tree. When their own toe gets pinched by eliminating some of their own patronage, which is considered unnecessary, so economies can be instituted, it becomes liberal as a goose on green grass. I solicit your 'aye' vote."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Have all voted who wish? This question, there are 70 'ayes', 3 'nays', 1 answering 'present' and this Bill having failed to receive a Constitutional majority, is hereby declared lost. Conference Committee relative to Senate Bill 1329. Representatives Bluthardt, Campbell, Phil Collins, Tipsword and Keller. Senate Bill 1389."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1389. An Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Craig."



R. Craig: "Mr. Speaker, will you take this out of the record for the time being, please."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "O'kay, take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1511."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1511. Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Commission on Labor Laws. Third Reading of the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Gentleman from Madison, Representative Kennedy."

L. J. Kennedy: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. I wonder if I could leave to have 1511, 1606 heard at the same time. They are companion bills?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, will the clerk please read Senate Bill 1606 a third time?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1606. An act to make an appropriation for Illinois Commission on Labor Laws. Third Reading of the Bill."

L. J. Kennedy: "Ladies and gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1511 creates the Labor Laws Commission for one more year. Consists of eight legislative members and six public members and one ex-officio members which is the Director of Labor. It has no appropriation. Senate Bill 1606 is the appropriation of twenty thousand dollars, the same as it was last year. And this year we returned fourteen hundred and eighty dollars back to the General Fund. I would appreciate a favorable vote on both these bills. Thank you."



Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster."

A. T. McMaster: "Will the sponsor yield to a question?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "He indicates he will."

A. T. McMaster: "Mr. Kennedy, what is the impact of these bills and the cost of them please?"

L. J. Kennedy: "I didn't hear what you said, Sir."

A. T. McMaster: "What is the impact of these bills and also the cost of them?"

L. J. Kennedy: "Well the Labor Laws Commission has held a number of hearings around the State to try..."

A. T. McMaster: "I can't hear you, Mr. Kennedy."

L. J. Kennedy: "The Labor Laws Commission has held a number of hearings around the State with an effort to enact legislation for guidelines from Federal Health and Safety Laws and the cost of them up to now, Sir, we have a twenty thousand dollar appropriation for last year and we are asking for the same appropriation this year. That's the only way I can answer it, Sir."

A. T. McMaster: "What did you say the cost was, I'm sorry?"

L. J. Kennedy: "Well, I said last year's appropriation was twenty thousand dollars and we returned fourteen hundred and eighty dollars and this year we are asking for the same amount of appropriation. That's the only way I can it, Sir."

A. T. McMaster: "Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the Bill sir, please."





Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Proceed, Sir."

A. T. McMaster: "Mr. Kennedy, I happen to be a farmer and quite interested in the appropriation for Agriculture, and I certainly feel that we have just as much necessity as farmers to conduct our business and to conduct the Department of Agriculture. I think that the Labor Commission is probably unnecessary. I think that you can come up with Bills without the Labor Commission, and I would certainly urge a 'no' vote on this or a blank vote, one of the two."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Is there further discussion?  
Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

E. Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield to a couple of questions."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "He indicates he will."

E. Schlickman: "I'm sorry, Representative. I was hoping that you would explain what the Labor Laws Commission had accomplished this year and what the unfinished business of the Commission is."

L. J. Kennedy: "Well, Representative Schlickman, the unfinished business of the Commission, I would assume is Senate Bill 1112, where the bulk of the money has been spent. It's the public employees bargaining bill that we have never been able to reach a conclusion because of the no strike clause. That's the only way I can answer that."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Is there further discussion? Does the gentleman wish to close the debate?"

L. J. Kennedy: "Well, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of

the House, this was obviously a bad time to call these Bills, but eh.... I'm not against farmers. I don't believe the enactment of 1511 and 1606 in any way has anything to do with Representative Hunsicker's bill, and I would appreciate a favorable vote on both of these Bills."

Rep. Arthur A. Telser: "Question is, should Senate Bill 1511 and Senate Bill 1606 pass. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. The Clerk will take two roll calls. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

E. Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen. In explaining my vote, I believe I heard the Sponsor of this Bill say that the purpose for it was to advance by further efforts on the part of this Commission a particular Bill. Well, it would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, that we should all be engaged in priorities and if we don't have enough money or enough support for Agriculture, I don't think there should be support given to this Bill, which is related to a particular Bill that hasn't passed the Legislature."

Rep. Arthur A. Telser: "Have all.... Gentleman from Madison, Representative Kennedy."

L. J. Kennedy: "Can I take them out of the record for the present, Mr. Speaker."

Rep. Arthur A. Telser: "You don't have enough, Representative Gentleman from Henderson, Representative Neff."

C. E. Neff: "Representative Kennedy, I'm giving you the same



vote you gave me on the highway."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Representative Kennedy, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

L. J. Kennedy: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have permission to remove these bills from the record for the present time, because my political hide is about as tough as anybody elses."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Does the gentleman have leave? Hearing none, these two bills are to be taken out of the record. Now who wants a Bill called? Representative Choate, for what purpose do you rise?"

C. L. Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in as much as it seems to be the mood of the membership that you didn't vote for my bill because...now I'm not going to vote for your's. It seems like we might as well go home, get a little rest and come back tomorrow, kind of bright eyed and bushy tailed and get on along with the work."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Messages from the Senate."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secret...."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Repre... Representative Cunningham, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

L. Cunningham: "I have a Bill here, it will probably be my last one. I haven't passed too many, but eh... I think it's foolish. We have a lot of work to do for the State of Illinois and I think that this thing is just absolutely foolish. I'll take a change on passing a Bill to get



together and finish our work."

A. Telscer: "O'kay, messages from the Senate.  
and them, let's conclude that. Messages from the

Becke: "Eh... Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform

of Representatives the Senate has adopted the  
Conference Committee Report. House Bill 3639.  
by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright,

Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the  
Representatives the Senate has refused to concur  
House in the adoption of amendments to House of  
Representatives Bill with the following title. Senate  
Action taken by the Senate, June 29, 1972.

Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to  
the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted  
Following Conference Committee Report. Senate Bill  
Adopted by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth  
Secretary. Mr. Speaker - Here it is, Jerry. 1130.

Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Repre-  
that the Senate has refused to concur with the

the adoption of amendments of the House of Repre-  
to the Bill with the following title. Senate  
Action taken by the Senate, June 29, 1972.

Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to  
House of Representatives the Senate has concurred  
House of Representatives in the passage of the  
the following title. House Bill 4329, together

with the following amendment. Passed Senate as amended, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. This is a new one that you don't have yet, Jack. 4329. It's not on the calendar, though. O'kay. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Amendment no. 1 to Senate Bill No. 1529. Said first conference committee on the part of the Senate has been discharged and the Senate requests a second conference. Action taken by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. No further messages."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "On the order of nonconcurrency calendar appears Senate Bill 1130, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Moore is recognized."

D. A. Moore: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Eh.... I move that the House do not recede from eh.... concurrence with the Senate's action that a committee be appointed for Senate Bill 1130."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "The gentleman has moved that the House do not recede from the House Amendment to Senate Bill 1130. All in favor of the gentleman's motion to not recede, signify by voting 'aye.... Representative Otis Collins, do you seek recognition, Sir? All those in favor of the gentleman's motion not to recede, signify by saying 'aye'; and the opposed by saying 'no', and the House does not recede from Amendment to Senate Bill 1130. Representative Moore, did you refuse to recede from Senate Amendments



1, 2 and 3?"

D. A. Moore: "Both Senate Amendments 1 and 2, Mr. Speaker."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscher: "And that is what the Clerk declared, Mr. Clerk. On that question, the House refuses to recede from House Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1130. Members of the Conference Committee relative to Senate Bill 1130 are Representatives Moore, Campbell, Roscoe Cunningham, Davis and Flinn. Senate Bill.... On that last Conference Committee, will Representative Flinn will not be on that Conference Committee. Representative Krause will. Senate Bill 208. On Third Reading. Senate Bill 208 on third reading. You don't want that called? Take it out of the record. Do you wish Senate Bill 606 called? Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 889."

Fredric B. Selcke: Senate Bill 889. An Act creating the Office of Appellate, State Appellate Defender, defining powers and duties to make an appropriation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscher: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Gibbs."

W. J. Gibbs: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 889 was originally handled by Representative O'Brien who was called out of town and it's the appellate defender bill for the State of Illinois. It passed the Senate 36 to 4 and before that it passed out of the Senate Committee 9 to 1. It's wholeheartedly supported by the appellate courts in the State of Illinois and I have



correspondence from the judges to the effect that they are one hundred percent in favor of this program. Now basically what this Bill does. Eh... over the last bill since 1969, the Illinois Defender Project under the ILEC has handled appeals from criminal indugents and what this does starting in 1973, it sets up what we call an appellate defender system whereby the Supreme Court for the State of Illinois appoints an appellate defender who is an attorney. And that appellate defender in turn will appoint deputy defenders throughout the five appellate districts, subject to the approval of the judges in each one of the appellate districts. It... what it actually does, it stream lines the system that we now have, because of the court's decision which I'm sure you are all familiar with, that just came out yesterday, concerning the eh.... appeals that these criminal indugents are entitled to and also the fact that anyone eh.... would be subject to a possibility of a jail sentence, is required to have defense counsel appointed. What this does, is the indugents criminal appeals for more or less in my opinion, stream line the system and save the State and the Counties money involved in criminal appeals. At the present time, the way the system was set up prior to this study, eh.... a criminal was entitled to be appointed, eh.... to have a counsel appointed and it would cost the County 750 dollars per case. Well as the attorneys know, you cannot handle a appeal for 750 dollars. Eh.... the Bill is subject to two amendments which have been approved

and I ask for your favorable vote."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Is there discussion? Gen.... Is there discussion. Alright, the question is, shall Senate Bill 889 pass? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye' the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 132 'ayes', no nays and this Bill having received a Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Frank Wolf, want 1281 called or... Do you want 1281 taken out to? 1385."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1385. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hunsicker."

C. T. Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. I would first ask if I might have leave of the House to consider Senate Bill 1385, 1386, and 1387 as a package, as they are related."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, read those Bills."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1386. An Act to designate Veterans Day as a holiday. Third Reading of the Bill. 1387. An Act to revise the law in relation to promissory notes and support thereof. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hunsicker."

C. T. Hunsicker: "Ladies and gentlemen. These bills do exactly what the Digest indicates that they do. They amend the Veterans Day Act to put the holiday back on November 11, of each year instead of the fourth Monday of October as





they currently are. These are supported by American Legion, VFW, many, many of our citizens and I would asked your support, favorable action on the three Bills."

Mr. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, is there further discussion? The question is, shall these three bills pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', the opposed 'no' and the Clerk will take three records. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On each of these questions, there are 140 'ayes', Otis Collins 'aye', 141 'ayes', 1 'nays' and each of these Bills having received a Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. 1392."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1392. Bill for an Act to amend the Highway Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Mr. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Pappas."

Mr. Pappas: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1392 corrects the language of the Illinois Highway Code to make it conform with the provisions of the Federal Interstate and Defense Highway System. This is in relation to relocating utilities if needed for highway purposes. In the initial language of the transportation bond act, this was inadvertently omitted and this Bill will correct this oversight. I urge your support."

Mr. W. Robert Blair: "Is there a discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill 1392 pass. All those in favor vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 122 'ayes',

no 'nays' and this Bill having received a Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Eh.... Hill 'aye' and Duff 'aye'. 1370."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1370. A Bill for an Act to amend the Purchasing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."  
Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones."

J. D. Jones: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I'm sure all of you are aware of the situation relative to the ex... expansion of the State building construction by the practice known as 'add-ons'. It was spotlighted by a series of articles in the Illinois State Journal by State House Reporter, Bob Estill. To correct the many documented abuses in this regard, we have Senate Bill 1370 for your approval. 1370 requires that no funds for contract for repairs, maintenance, renovation or construction can be obligated for changes or additions to any contract unless it is (1) germane to the original contract, and (2) must be in accordance with the rules and regulations established by the Capital Development Board. This much needed legislation and I solicit your support."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

T. J. Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, maybe.... I know he's not the author of the Bill, but maybe the sponsor in the House would answer some questions about this. Does this mean that if the carpenter contractor is remodeling some State office building or some State-owned facility that if he runs into problems on the way while he's actually performing

this service, that he can't continue to remodel a portion of the work that may be necessary even though it wasn't in the contract and do the add-on? Is this the intent of this legislation?"

J. D. Jones: "If there's additional....."

T. J. Hanahan: "I can't hear you, Sir."

J. D. Jones: "If there's additional costs involved in it, it would have to be cleared by the Capital Development Board. Right, Sir."

T. J. Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, members of the House. I don't know how many members of this General Assembly have ever done any maintenance or remodeling or construction work, but I am a carpenter by trade and I'm proud to be a member of the Carpenters Union for 21 years and served my apprenticeship in exactly this kind of work, for Sears & Roebuck, a private concern. And if Sears-Roebuck wanted a large corporation to this State had to live up to going back to the supervising architect for permission to continue a maintenance contract or remodeling contract for everytime there is a little expenditure, I think they'd be in bad shape. I don't see the real benefit even though I have heard of a few abuses. I don't say you throw the baby out with the water because of a few abuses in this area. Many times in construction and in remodeling you come across things that are germane, that are not necessarily heard of at the time of the award of the contract and to stop work just for a supervising architect's permission I



think would be improper."

D. J. Jones: "Mr. Hanahan, reply to that, the amendment says that no obligation may be made or incurred unless in accordance with the rules and regulations established by the Capital Development Board. We are going to have the new Capital Bonding Act and they will work out the procedures for this and whatever those procedures are worked out as, will be what they will do and not necessarily what... if their procedures would say to proceed in a certain matter, well that would be the case."

T. J. Hanahan: "Then we are just going to authorize this Board to set up rules."

D. J. Jones: "That's right."

T. J. Hanahan: "Why do we need the statute, then. That's the question I've got. It's the Board that's going...."

D. J. Jones: "So that add-ons would be reviewed by... under the proper procedure and it be spotlighted so they are aware of the change and that eh.... everybody is aware of what's going on is the main case. I'd say the Contractor's association approves of this amendment."

T. J. Hanahan: "I haven't been convinced that it is necessary. We've got a Statute Book, four books, right now filled with rules and laws that nobody pays attention half the time anyway and this just seems to me another silly way of adding into the Statute Book another portion of the Statutes saying that, you know, that we have to hamper it somehow with rules from some organization saying how to remodel and maintain."



I think if somebody's guilty of some wrong doing in the past, they should be prosecuted. I think if someone does something wrong in the future, they should be prosecuted, but to hamper the whole construction, maintenance and remodeling industry with this type of legislation, I just haven't been convinced it's necessary."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones, to close."

D. J. Jones: "Eh... this is simply to have the rules for the game established so that as they do proceed in such projects they will be properly cleared by the agency that will have the most to do with the new construction because this is under the Capital Bonding Act will be expertise as to the construction of buildings and their regulations then would be eh.... in proper form so that eh.... that have contracts will be in compliance with them. I would appreciate your favorable support."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor, vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Have all gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

R. O. Hart: "Eh... Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I would like to ask Representative Jones if this Bill has an effective date other than the uniform effective date, and if it doesn't, I believe it should have one, effective upon becoming law and although there is a lot of votes on that Board there, I think it might be a worthwhile thought."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones."

D. J. Jones: "Well, I assume the Bill would be effective when signed by the Governor and eh... how would you suggest we correct it?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

R. O. Hart: "Well, Representative Jones, we have eh... a uniform effective date act, which we passed in the last session, which provides that unless a Bill carries a different date, the Bill will become effective on October 1, following the session of the legislature and eh... I don't believe there is any effective date on this Bill and I believe that it will be worthwhile to bring it back to second reading and make it effective before becoming a law."

D. J. Jones: "Yes, we will need a concurrence from the Senate. I suppose we can do this on the concurrence."

R. O. Hart: "Well, that would be fine if we do have another shot at it."

D. J. Jones: "I think it's a good idea."

R. O. Hart: "Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 124 'ayes', no 'nays' and this Bill having received a Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. 1389."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1389. A Bill for an Act to Amend the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Craig."

R. R. Craig: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House. House Bill 1389, the House Amendment which made it a new Bill was a bill to the .... that the Secretary of State wanted in order to give the Salvation Army and YMCA and the YWCA and all charitable people a five dollar license plate and also the second amendment was the present law provides that the Secretary of State shall license motor vehicle dealers. They're striking the word 'motor' out and just making it 'vehicle dealers' because some of these dealers sell trailers only. And this more or less makes it legal what they feel like they should do and that is the substance of House Bill 1389 and I urge your favorable support."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any discussion? Gentleman from eh.... Whiteside, Mr. eh.... Kenny Miller."

K. W. Miller: "Will the gentleman yield to a question?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He indicates he will."

K. W. Miller: "Representative Craig, I just want to be sure on one point. When we take out the word 'motor vehicle' that has a definition and eh.... in our Code or Statutes. Are we saying though that now you might have the possibility that tractors might have to be licensed?"

R. R. Craig: "No, No. Like trailers or something like that, vehicle dealers..."

K. W. Miller: "Well, a tractor is a vehicle."

R. R. Craig: "Tractors are not licensed in our present law now and....."



K. W. Miller: "This does not change that?"

R. R. Craig: "No, no. I'll assure you of that."

K. W. Miller: "On your assurance, I will vote 'aye'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? Question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor, vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 120 'ayes' and 6 'nays' and this Bill, having received a Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. 1338."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1338. An act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Legislative Audit Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Phil Collins."

P. W. Collins: "Eh.... Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1338 is the annual appropriation for the Legislative Audit Commission in the amount of \$67,300. I would solicit your favorable vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion. All those in favor, oh... The question is, shall Senate Bill 1338 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. Houlihan 'aye'. Gene Hoffman 'aye'. D. J. O'Brien 'aye'. Mann 'aye'. B. B. Wolfe 'aye'. Scariano 'aye'. Campbell 'aye'. On this question, there are 132 'ayes', no 'nays', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional majority, is hereby declared





passed. 1380."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1380. An Act to amend Section 1 of an Act to declare certain building projects and facilities in the public interest and support. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. eh.... Hoffman."

G. L. Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. Eh.... Senate Bill 1380 eh.... is a Bill which eh.... declares that certain acts as necessary under the IBA. And the only thing this Bill does, it doesn't refer to changing anything, but it changes the location of the Voc. Tec. center in DuPage County from a location of Wheaton to eh... DuPage County. Eh.... when the Bill originally went through last time, it designated Wheaton as the place. There has been a request to designate it as DuPage County and I appreciate your support."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? Question is, shall Senate Bill 1380 pass? All those in favor, vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 126 'ayes', no 'nays' and this Bill having received a Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. 1420."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1420. An Act authorizing the Director of Conservation to convey by Quit Claim Deed



certain State-owned land located in Sangamon County. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Sangamon, eh... Mr. Jones."

J. D. Jones: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. 1420 transfers the Lincoln Home property in Springfield to the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, United States Government. You may recall that President Nixon came to Springfield to personally sign the legislation whereby the Home will be taken over in the four block area in that vicinity developed and preserved and operated by the National Park Service. We need to make this transfer to Federal Government. I would appreciate your affirmative vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

S. C. Maragos: "Mr. Jones, eh... I remember reading a lot about this Home site that has become a National landmark, and who owns this site now, the State of Illinois?"

J. D. Jones: "The State of Illinois, Department of Conservation."

S. C. Maragos: "Are we going to get any compensation for it or just transfer it..."

J. D. Jones: "No, settle it by grant."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor, vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this



question, there are 125 'ayes' and this Bill, having received a Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed.

1473."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill.... or Senate Bill 1473. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the expenses for the Commission on Children. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The eh.... lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer."

Mrs. R. C. Dyer: "Eh.... Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. This is very simply the 1973 appropriation for the Commission on Children. It passed overwhelmingly out of the Senate. Has been approved by both sides of the House in the Appropriation Committee and I urge your favorable vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? Question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor, vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 128 'ayes', no 'nays' and this Bill, having received a Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. You want 1485? O'okay.... 1485."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1485. A Bill for an Act to amend the 'Purchasing Act'. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from eh.... Whiteside, Mr. Miller."



Kenneth W. Miller: "Eh.... Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1485 amends the 'Purchasing Act'. Inasmuch as the Digest is not entirely correct in the second sentence, I'd like to take the liberty of reading the thrust of the Bill. 'When a public contract is to be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder, a residence bidder must be allowed a preference as against a nonresident bidder from any State which gives or requires a preference to bidders from that State. This preference is to be equal to the preference given or required by the State of a nonresident bidder'. Simply, Ladies and Gentlemen, what this Bill does is to not put preferences as far as the Illinois Contractors are concerned, but to say, in effect, that if another State does have preference for its Contractors, which would be a detriment to the Illinois Contractors going in that State, that all we're saying is that we should be equal in that regard. This has nothing whatsoever to do with States which do not have preference for their own Contractors. Now, this Bill eh.... does not apply to any contract in which Federal Funds are used. This Bill is supported by the Office of the Secretary of State, by Organized Labor and by the Associated Employers. It passed the Senate 39 to 1. And, I'd appreciate your favorable Roll."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? The gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Barry."

Tobias Barry: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He indicates he will."

Tobias: "Kenney, do you think that it would be Constitutional to discriminate upon these bidders based upon the Laws of their home State? Isn't that the thrust of this?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "Ah.. I don't understand the last part of what you're saying. Let's give the example that we're all familiar with, I think, on auto license plates. You remember several years ago, the successful bidder was from Arkansas. Now, I have the Arkansas Statute here now and the Arkansas Statute now provides that any bidder in the State of Arkansas, bidding on an Arkansas contract, in effect, has five points. So, an Illinois bidder going into Arkansas is at an extreme disadvantage. Now, please understand and let me repeat again. This has nothing to do with any State that does not have these type of preferences ah.. Legislation. I might also add, right at the moment, that this is patterned almost directly after the Minnesota Statute which has been enforced for some time."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Richard O. Hart: "Ah.. Kenney, I don't believe that this Bill has an effective date either. And, I would just suggest to you that it might be a valuable addition to the Bill if it's ah.. worthwhile to get it started July the 1st rather than



October the 1st. And ah.., ah.. maybe you ought to give that some thought."

Kenneth W. Miller: "Ah.. I have thought about it, Dick. And ah.., as far as I'm concerned October 1st is adequate on it..."

Richard O. Hart: "Alright.. I.. I.."

Kenneth W. Miller: "From.. From all of my information. I.. I.. I'm perfectly willing to go either direction."

Richard O. Hart: "Well, it's no matter to me. It's your Bill. And ah....."

Kenneth W. Miller: "This Bill does not have to go back to the Senate, by the way."

Richard O. Hart: "Yes.. I know that."

Kenneth W. Miller: "And, I hesitated at this late stage to.. to insert that, if you'll go along with me on it."

Richard O. Hart: "What ya do, suits me."

Kenneth W. Miller: "Thank you, Dick."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The ah.. gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Roman J. Kosinski: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question? Ah.. Ken, from the synopsis, something is unclear to me. I go along with the philosophy of a local bidder having certain preferences. But, does this infer preferences over dollar competition?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "Over what?"

Roman J. Kosinski: "Ah.. competition dollar-wise?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "It affects the dollar. The Digest is wrong in the second sentence where it starts out, 'provides that



When a public contract is to be awarded and so on'. That sentence is incomplete and it is wrong. Now, I think I understand your question. What we're saying is, and let's just give you an example, Indiana does not have a preference for Contractors who reside in Indiana, who bid on Indiana contracts. Therefore, a.. a Contractor from Illinois, a business from Illinois, can bid on an Illinois... on an Indiana contract. And, they would be equal. They would be equal as far as dollars are concerned. The only that this proposal would go into effect would be in a case, like my example that I gave for the State of Arkansas. Arkansas says, in effect, that that.. that the Arkansas Contractor, who resides in Arkansas, has a.. a gain of five points. He has a bonus of five points which he can use to bid. That prohibits us from going there. Now, all we're saying here is that, therefore, a Contractor from the State of Arkansas, coming into Illinois to bid on our public contracts, is also going to be, in effect, ah.. Wait a minute.. The Illinois Con.. The Illinois Contractor would get the same five points against the Arkansas Contractor but not against an Indiana Contractor. It may sound complicated but it actually isn't, Romie."

Mr. J. Kosinski: "Thank you.. Thank you, Kenney. I concur."

Mr. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijeovich."

Mr. S. Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, you've heard a lot about Arkansas in the debate of this Bill. And,

the thrust of this Bill started with the matter of the manufacturer of Illinois License Plates. Now, everybody remembers Paul Powell, I'm sure. And, everybody remembers the criticism that he received ah.., especially after he died of having the automobile license plates manufactured in Arkansas. Now, they've been manufactured there and we haven't heard too much criticism about that. And, the only reason they're manufactured there is because the bids from the manu... from the Arkansas manufacturer is lower and in the best interest of the taxpayers as far as I'm concerned. Now, this sounds appealing and.. and.. in a matter of fair play to Illinois manufacturers. I believe that Illinois manufacturers ought to be able to compete with other manufacturers. And, I believe that this Bill is unconstitutional as a violation of.. of free trade. And, if Illinois manufacturers find that other States do have such Legislative enactments, I think, they ought to go to Court and they'd find that they are unconstitutional. But, we are going to give a free Bill to the Illinois manufacturers a.. a place in the future to come with whatever bid they want to come with because that's the one bid we're going to have to except. And, we will except it, I'm sure, and there won't be any criticisms because we'll say, 'It's an Illinois Manufacturer. Give it to them'. But, I think, in the best interest of the taxpayers, this Bill ought to be defeated. I'm sure that many of you will say that it's good for Illinois and you're going to vote for it. But, I think it's bad for the taxpayers."





Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ah.. the gentleman from ah.. White-side, Mr. Miller, to close. Did you want, Mr. Anderson?... Did you want.. Did you have a question? The gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Anderson."

Merle K. Anderson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to ask this last Speaker a question, please. Would he answer?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, it's a little unusual. Ah.. Mr. Matijevich, Mr. Anderson is asking if he could ask you a question."

Merle K. Anderson: "Who has the contract for the plates now, Illinois or Indiana or.. or Arkansas?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich. The question was, 'Who has the contract?'"

John S. Matijevich: "I.. I understand that.. My understanding is that Arkansas has the contract right now. Or, they had it last year, I should say."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff, says he can shed some light."

Brian B. Duff: "Mr. Speaker, some four years ago in a campaign, I suggested that the State of Illinois could save a million dollars by adding competitive bids on its license plates which it had not had for thirty years. In fact, when the Secretary of State went in and let this bid out to the State of Arkansas, he did save the first time, \$400,000 and the next time, \$300,000. And, when the present Secretary of State let it out, another \$200,000. This year they had



saved yet more and the contract is back in the State of Illinois. It is back in the State of Illinois, in fact, having saved by competitive bidding more than \$400,000. Now, with the penalty that would be put on this Bill, you can see that Arkansas or any other place would not truly be burdened.

And, this would, in fact, give equity to the Illinois Employees and to the Illinois Manufacturers and to the Illinois Bidders."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

John S. Matijevich: "Since ah.. Merle Anderson posed that question, the real point here is that Illinois came in with the low bid because there were other bidders, even though they were from other States. If that were the only bid and they knew that there weren't going to be other bids from other States, you wouldn't get that low bid. So, Brian, you ought to protect your own Legislation to make sure that everybody is going to bid. And then, we'll continue to save money. I.. Sure, I hope that Illinois gets the bid in the best interests of the Illinois Manufacturers. But, take away that right for other States to bid and we won't save that \$300, \$400 and \$200,000. Let's continue to have those savings and defeat this Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. McAvoy."

Walter McAvoy: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it and the previous question has been



moved. The gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Miller, to close.

Kenneth W. Miller: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to be distinctly understood. I'm all for having contracts ah.. lent to Illinois Citizens and Contractors of business in Illinois. In other words, I want to keep business in Illinois. I do not believe, however, in putting up any wall around any State in order to seek to do this. I'm opposed to the theory of the Arkansas Statute. But, let me say this, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm all for open bidding. Lent it to the lowest bidder and the proof has been that it has been the lowest bidder. The facts are that in one year that the State, on a manufactured license plate, saved in excess of a half a million dollars in.. involving this route. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a good Bill. And, as I said before, it is not only ah.. recommended or approved by the Secretary of State's Office. I have the assurance of Organized Labor that they approve of this because they want to have the Employees in the State of Illinois get the benefit of business generated in the State of Illinois. And, I urgently request a favorable Roll Call."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The question is, 'shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted... The gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. Carroll."

Howard W. Carroll: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ah.. Kenney, during the explanation of vote, I know it's a little bit unusual, I have two questions that maybe you could answer in explaining



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

your vote. First of all, is there anything in here when you have a bidder from Illinois, a bidder from a State that gives a preference, a bidder from another State that maybe gives a different preference, a couple bidders from States that don't preferences at all, and, you know, how do you equate all of these things? My other question is, is this Law progressive in that, let's say, Indiana next year gives a preference, would they also... would the bidders from Indiana then be included under the Illinois Law under their preference?"

Mr. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Mr. C. Maragos: "In explaining my vote, I also have an inquiry. What happens if there's only one Illinois manufacturer manufacturing this particular item that is being purchased? Is there any provision that then there has to be strictly competitive bidding?"

Mr. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Miller."

Mr. W. Miller: "In explaining my vote, ah.. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to try to answer these three questions, if you don't forget one of them. In the first instance, ah.. there's nothing in this Legislation that prevents any bidders from coming in. We want bidders. This Legislation does not bar bidders at all. So, therefore, we welcome bidders. But, we only have one bidder, of course, it's up to the State to approve it. This does not bar anyone coming in from any of the fifty States in bidding at all. In trying... In

trying to answer ah.. Mr. Carroll's question, if a State has a five percent ah.. premium or add-on, another State has three, the State of Illinois will consider the three as to the bidder from one State and consider the five in connection with the bidder from the other State, if that answers your question."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Gibbs."

W. Joseph Gibbs: "Mr. Speaker, I realize that I'm a little late, but I wonder if I could have leave to ask.. to ask the Sponsor a question?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Yes."

W. Joseph Gibbs: "Do any of the other surrounding States around Illinois, Missouri, Indiana or Wisconsin or any of them have a Statute similar to this?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "The State of... The only record I have ah.., if I may, Mr. Speaker, is the State of Minnesota has one like this. There are some seventeen States in the United States which do have a preference for Instate bidders, Instate bidders. It is my believe that those... that type of Legislation is in error and this type of Legislation may teach those States to repeal their Instate Bidder Laws."

W. Joseph Gibbs: "Well, Mr. Speaker, very briefly in explaining my vote that I'm certainly in favor of this Bill when one-third of the States has it. But, I was afraid that we might start a reaction whereby the other States would put this in ah.. in answer to our Statute. But, I think, it's good



Legislation."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question, there are 95 'Ayes', 10 'Nays' and this Bill, having received the Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1504."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1504. A Bill for an Act to Amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer."

R. J. Palmer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1504 amends the School Code as it relates to the suspension of students. Presently, if a student is suspended, a review is required of the Board or by hearing officer appointed by the Board. The current practice is and has been that the School District would appoint a hearing officer and it would go to the Board for review. House Bill 1504 simplifies and modifies that requirement by requiring that the Board or the hearing officer, not the hearing officer, but that the Board or the Superintendent, Principal or others send a notice to the parents immediately, notifying them of the causes of suspension and notifying them of their right to a review. Now this will save the taxpayers a lot of money in many of the districts. It also enlarges the class of persons who may be authorized to suspend. Presently, the Superintendent and the principal may be regulation be given the right to suspend a student. House Bill, eh.... Senate



Bill 1504 enlarges that to provide for the Dean of Students or other official responsible for student discipline. And this amendment was put on at the request of eh... Representative Berman and others who have reviewed this problem. We feel that minimum due process requirements have been met in this particular case and also that it will save a lot of time insofar as the Board or the School Officials are concerned. I ask for your favorable consideration."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1504 pass? All those in favor, signify by voting 'Aye', the opposed by voting 'No'. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Otis Collins to explain his vote."

O. G. Collins: "Eh... would the sponsor yield to a question?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "We're in the explanation of votes, Sir. Unless you want to ask a rhetorical question."

O. G. Collins: "Eh.... does this apply State-wide or...?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Palmer."

R. J. Palmer: "It does not apply to the City of Chicago."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, 123 'Ayes', Scariano 'Aye', Jaffe 'Aye', Jack Hill 'Aye', this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1530."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1530. A Bill for an Act to amend the Medical Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Boone, Representative Cunningham."

L. Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much. I don't know whether I can get through this. I'm kind of worn out. Thank you for calling it. This Bill eh... Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, amends the Medical Practice Act. Provides that State Hospitals permits may be renewed only twice and for a period of one year. Provides that all State Hospital permit holders must pass an examination given by the Department of Registration and Education to obtain renewal of a permit. This Bill intended to improve the quality of care in State institutions which have a large portion of the physican personnel practicing under what is called a 'hospital permit'. It does so by requiring all hospital permit holders to pass the educational council for foreign medical school graduate exam. Eliminating indefinite renewals of State Hospital permits and thus requiring passage of the Illinois Medical Exam within two years of receipt of a hospital permit. The State Hospital permit allows the person to practice medicine at an approved State facility under the supervision of an Illinois licensed physician. Typically, foreign medical graduates practice on a hospital permit while preparing to take the Illinois examination. I would ask for an affirmative vote."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Barry."





T. Barry: "Unless I have some difficulty understanding the purpose of this Bill, would you explain that firstly, please?"

L. Cunningham: "Eh.... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The reason for the Bill is to bring better service to the patients in the Illinois institutions. The Department is quite aware of eh... Representative Barry, that it is going to cause some hardships. I believe that eh... there are 368 eh... foreign doctors eh... that this will affect. And we are quite well aware that it will be a hardship on the Department, but in order to provide better care to the patients, they feel that this is a good start, in the right direction."

T. Barry: "I read some language, Les, that eh.... that is eh.... about the middle of the second page, indicating that all permits in effect on the date of this amendatory act shall expire on July 1, 1973. It just disturbed me because I thought perhaps that it might be doing an injustice to the legitimate practioners in Illinois, but you assure me that it is not, then I'll vote with you."

L. Cunningham: "No, eh.... I can say without qualification that there is no injustice in it."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Douglas."

B. L. Douglas: "Eh.... Representative Cunningham, let me premise my question to you by making a statement. The Department of Registration and Education has in the eyes



of many people, been grossly negligent in allowing a large number of doctors to practice medicine in our State institutions the last couple of years. The incident that took place at Elgin State Hospital about four months ago, where one doctor allegedly was practicing without ever having even graduated from medical school, is just one such example. The quality of medical care in our State institutions is so grossly inadequate, that I wouldn't permit my pet rat to go to any of those places on the basis of the kinds of medical care that's available there. Now, I would like to know from you, Representative Cunningham, what's the difference between the kind of examination that will be given by the Department of Registration and Education and the routine examinations that are given to doctors in order to qualify for medical practice in the State? I get the opinion that this is something less than that and that the people of these hospitals are entitled to a lesser kind of care."

L. Cunningham: "Well, Doctor Douglas, eh.... I guess that's what they call you, your title's back to Dr. Douglas?"

B. L. Douglas: "Psychiatrist Douglas."

L. Cunningham: "All holders of the State hospital permit have had a one year training in the U.S. prior to avocation for the permit and must have already passed the ECFMD. However, about 1/3 to 1/2 the current State hospital permit holders have not passed this because they have received permits prior to 1960 when they did not have this... they did not



give this exam."

B. L. Douglas: "Alright, then, Mr. Speaker, if I may address myself to the Bill, eh.... I would appreciate if we could have a little order. It's very hard to hear. Eh.... Thank you, Representative Hanahan, I think the same thing of you. Mr. Speaker, this Bill innocently looks like we are supporting and protecting the quality of medical care in our State hospitals. I would submit that we are so negligent in this area and that we have been so negligent and I have so much concern about the inadequate job that the Department of Registration and Education has done not only under this administration incidentally, that I'm going to vote against this Bill. Now there will be those who will say that voting against this Bill, if that Vote should prevail, Mr. Speaker, may we have some order? There are those who would say that a vote against this Bill or defeating this Bill would deprive large numbers of people of medical care. In actuality, the medical care is so bad now and the standards of selection of doctors and the testing for the determination of quality of doctors is so bad that in many instances I sincerely believe we would be better off with no doctors than the kinds of doctors that we have at these institutions based on the standards that are presently used to determine whether they are qualified. For example, in the psychiatric or mental hospitals, we have large numbers of doctors. This is also true in our own Cook County Hospital, who can't even speak English



adequately to communicate with their patients, and while this is not meant disparagingly because they were born in other countries, it's beyond my comprehension how a doctor can practice medicine adequately if he can't even communicate with his patients to find out what's bothering him. I would submit that this is a bad bill, that we ought to beat it, and we ought to find some other way of dealing with this serious situation between now and the next time we come back in the fall."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart."

O. Hart: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very important Bill and I'm very confused by eh.... Representative Douglas' eh.... I wonder if it would be proper for me to ask Representative Douglas a question?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Well, if the gentleman wants to yield. Representative Douglas, do you wish to respond to a question from Representative Hart. It's irregular but since you're an expert in the field."

L. Douglas: "Oh, sure."

O. Hart: "Eh.... I had the impression upon reading the synopsis and even after reading the Bill that this Bill was going to do something to improve the situation. Now eh.... from what I gathered of what you said, you feel that it will go the other way?"

L. Douglas: "As I understand this Bill, and I stand to be corrected if I'm wrong. The.... the bill would allow

the Department of Registration and Education to provide a special examination to those doctors who according to Representative Cunningham have already passed the so-called ECFMG. Why cannot those doctors take the regular examination that all doctors who are qualified to practice medicine in this State have to take. What we are saying, in allowing this Bill to pass, is that we are legislatively providing that some people.... some people are entitled to a lesser quality of care given by doctors who passed a lesser examination. Now if I'm wrong, I will be certainly willing to retreat on that point, but that's my understanding of what that Bill does."

R. O. Hart: "Well, this does.... this Bill doesn't permit anyone to practice medicine without a license does it?"

B. L. Douglas: "You know permit holders, unless there are amendments that I just don't have, Permit holders are not like license holders. Permit holders is a system that's been established because we don't have adequate numbers of real doctors. And that's a strong statement to make, but I consider a doctor whose granted a license under the State according to the standards of medical care that you and I would insist on receiving or our children receiving to be real doctors. The minute we give them permits, it should be for one reason only and that's to allow them a year of training, which is necessary for them to be properly qualified later on under the supervision of a licensed physician. Let us not kid ourselves. These doctors who



practice in these hospitals, are not practicing under the supervision of licensed doctors. In every hospital in this State where these doctors are wandering around aimlessly they are not licensed doctors for them to account to, they are practicing so called medicine as if they were practicing in private offices and we should not hold... or put our heads in the sand and think that we are giving our people in these hospitals good medical care through permit issuance. Permit issuance is not license issuance. It's a stepping stone that I think has been abused to the disadvantage of I don't know how many thousands of poor souls who don't know what bad medical care they are getting."

R. O. Hart: "Well, eh.... how would you suggest we....

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative Hart, could you kind of contain your questions to Representative Douglas, simply because it is an extraordinary procedure and we are trying to move along?"

R. O. Hart: "Well, I certainly will abide by the request of the Chair, except I... I .... at least one member on the floor does not quite understand the pros and cons of this what to me is one of the most important bills of the session."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Juckett."

R. S. Juckett: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. It's unfortunate that some of the members who have not been through all of these institutions are answering



all of the questions. I think what you have to do is look at the current situation and you have to look at the current law. The permit holders are those doctors who do practice in the institutions and are licensed physicians. They are licensed to practice in the State institutions. Unfortunately they are not licensed to practice in all of its branches. Now, under the current law, these doctors and many of them were included in the Grandfather Clause when we started that system. Now that system was much better than when it was before. But we have come to the conclusion and rightfully so, that the patients in the State institutions do demand and should have better care. Now what this Bill will do is it will require every physician that is practicing in a State institution to take a test and if he does not pass that test, having been trained in a foreign school, if he does not pass that test, he can no longer practice in the State institution. And if he does pass the test, he can then be licensed for a year and that license can only be renewed for a maximum of two years and so it is conceived by the Mental Health Department that within a three year period, we will have reduced many of those foreign doctors or any other kind of doctors that is not licensed to practice in all of its branches. And then after the three year period, there would be very few, if any, doctors who are not licensed completely. Now I put in a Bill which would have eliminated all doctors who were not licensed to practice in all of



its branches. But the Department came to me and said we're sorry Mr. Juckett, but we can't support your Bill because it would severely cripple all of the medical services in our hospitals. Now you might say that the patient is not getting complete medical care. However, I've heard many of you on the floor say that your areas do not have doctors there and your people are not getting service.

-And if we were to go along with the Representative from Chicago, this would be exactly what we would have in our State institutions. We would not have any doctors practicing there, because I've seen many of you vote against the Department of Mental Health's appropriation, and if you want a licensed doctor, one such as your regular doctor, you would have to pay them 25, 30 or 40 thousand dollars a year, and I haven't seen any of you willing to do that. So the next best thing, is a gradual reduction over a three year period where we will then be able to raise the salaries and be able to have the men who are qualified to practice, and I would urge all of your support for Senate Bill 1530 and then in the meantime, I would urge all of you to take trips not through the local mental institution in your area, but go through all of the State institutions. See them all and see how they are producing as far as medical facilities."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Meyer."





J. T. Meyer: "I move the previous question."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor, signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no' and the gentleman from Boone, Representative Cunningham to close."

L. Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm not going to take up too much more of your time on this Bill. Eh.... the Department realizes it is going to have some hardships on this Bill, but what they are trying to do Ladies and Gentlemen, is to give better service to those poor people who need it who are in the State institutions and if we can upgrade that by passing this bill, and now if it doesn't work, Doctor Glass, Director Glass, is certainly going to say that now this is not working and come back next year and correct it. But for heaven sakes, if the people are talking like that, like Representative Douglas said, if they would spend just one hour and travel around the institutions in their district, and talk to some of the patients, what we've got to do is give them the best and this way Ladies and Gentlemen, it is my feeling and I know it's the feeling of the Director that if we start in this way, we can at least give the patients.... we know they are going to get the best doctors and therefore I ask for an affirmative vote of this Bill. Thank you."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Question is shall Senate Bill 1530 pass. All those in favor, signify by voting 'Aye', the



opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. Duff 'Aye' and this question, 133 'Ayes'-Hirschfeld 'Aye', 1 'nay' and this Bill, having received the Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Bradley 'Aye'. Taylor 'Aye'. Representative Waddell, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

R. B. Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I rise to appoint a personal privilege. Having been Les' running mate in the 33rd district, it's going to be our loss and the loss of the people of the State of Illinois for a whale of a legislator that I know that we cannot replace and Les, I think, we owe him a deep vote of gratitude and a standing, rousing, bunch of applause."

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Representative Ewell, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

R. W. Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, a point of semi-personal, well semi-personal privilege. I look around and see that the leaders are gone and the troops are still in the trenches and I asked the question, and I asked the question, how long will we proceed so that we may go?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telscer: "Well, Representative Ewell, if anyone can predict how long members should debate any Bill, it would be an easy job for the leadership to determine when we are going to leave. We're still working awhile, eh.... I just can't give you an answer as to when we will be adjourning for the evening. Representative Choate and Speaker Blair are meeting right now in his office. Pierce



is on the floor working with his troops. So is Cox. Senate Bill 1534."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1534. An Act to Create the Joliet-Marquette Tri-Centennial Commission. Defines Powers and duties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Meyer."

J. T. Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, if I could have House. Senate Bill 1575 read also. It is a companion bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Does the gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, the Clerk, please read Senate Bill 1575."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1575. An Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses to Joliet-Marquette Tri-Centennial Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Meyer."

J. T. Meyer: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, this Bill creates a Commission which would commemorate the 300th anniversary of Father Marquette and eh... Louis Joliet discovering this area. They camped at Joliet and Starved Rock. This is part of a Federal program. There is a \$2,000 appropriation."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kosinski."

R. J. Kosinski: "Will the sponsor yield to a question?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "He indicates he will."



R. J. Kosinski: "Ted, eh.... when this was in an earlier reading, I think one of the questions that I brought up was whether this should go under special events commission, an existing commission, and whether we would lose Federal funding in terms of it. I don't think we ever got an answer to that, and eh.... can you give me one now?"

J. T. Meyer: "Eh.... I believe that Representative Lechowicz was directed a letter from the... Mr. Robert Sullivan, Division of...."

R. J. Kosinski: "Excuse me, I can't hear you Ted."

J. T. Meyer: "Yes, they would lose money from the Discover America Travel Fund, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the United States Travel Service."

R. J. Kosinski: "We would lose money? There's no transfer under our Special Events Committee, is that correct?"

J. T. Meyer: "I am told by Mr. Sullivan of the Department that they would lose money from the United States Travel Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Discover America Travel Organization."

R. J. Kosinski: "Thank you, Ted."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Arrigo."

V. A. Arrigo: "Will the sponsor yield to a question?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "He indicates he will."

V. A. Arrigo: "As you know, Representative Meyer, the forgotten man in Illinois history bears the name of an Arico Tonte. He was here with Joliet-Marquette and I



was wondering whether or not any provision is made for the proper commemoration of the contribution of Arico Tonte to the history of the midwest?"

J. T. Meyer: "I'm certain.... did he carry the canoe?"

V. A. Arrigo: "No, as a matter of fact, you might be interested to know that he is buried at Starved Rock, he did most of the exploration of the Mississippi River, he was the father of Arkansas. Indeed Tonte Town in Arkansas is named in his memory and the next time you are on the Michigan Avenue bridge in Chicago, please pause and read the plaque that was there in his honor. They call him the 'Great Path Finder.' And I trust that this Commission will not continue in the common historical error that is made in giving proper credit to people bearing italian names in their roll in early American history."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from..."

J. T. Meyer: "Mr. Arrigo, Representative Arrigo, it's... the Bill provides for two members to be provided, appointed by the Senate and two by the House. I'm sure that with your charm, you can persuade the leadership to appoint a distinguished Italian American to represent your interests."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative Arrigo, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

V. A. Arrigo: "As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, I will accept gladly that appointment, but may I also answer on a matter of personal privilege a statement made a few moments ago by Representative Glass, Repre-



Representative Douglas with reference to foreign born doctors. May I remind him that in 1942, the atomic bomb was finally brought to a successful conclusion at the University of Chicago and most of the men that played an important role were foreign scientists who could not speak one word of English when they came to this country, and of course, I need not mention that the most prominent role was by Doctor Enrico Berme."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative from Cook, Mr. Simmons."

A. F. Simmons: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman moves the previous question."

All those in favor, signify by saying 'Aye', the opposed 'No' and the gentleman from Cook, Representative Meyer to close."

J. T. Meyer: "I urge your approval of these bills, Mr. Speaker."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Question is, shall Senate Bill 1534 and 1575 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'Aye' the opposed by voting 'No', and the Clerk will take two roll calls. Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers."

W. Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I hate to do this to my good friend, Representative Arrigo, but unfortunately Joliet is buried and the rest of... and others of French and Italian are buried about five miles upstream in what is Old Fort St. Louise and he is not buried at Starved Rock proper. I just hate to do this."



Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? On these questions, there are 128 'Ayes', 4 'Nays' and these Bills having received a Constitutional majority, are hereby declared passed. 16... Senate Bills. Second Reading. 1608."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1608. A Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Any amendments from the floor? Third Reading. 1467."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1467. An Act to amend an Act in relation to State Finance. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Any amendments from the floor?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment No. 1. J. J. Wolf. Amend Senate Bill 1467 on Page 4 by adding below Line 31 the following. 'Section 2. This amendatory act takes effect February 1, 1973. Where is Mr. Wolf? Harbor are you going to move it?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Hall."

H. H. Hall: "Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment discussed earlier. I move for adoption."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "All those in favor, say 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments. Third Reading. 1468."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1468. An Act to amend the



Civil Administrative Code. Second Reading of the Bill.  
No Committee Amendments."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Any amendments from the floor?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment No. 1: J. J. Wolf."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Hall."

H. H. Hall: "Mr. Speaker, this amendment eh.... improves the  
Bill and I move for its adoption."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "All those in favor, signify by saying  
'aye', the opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the amend-  
ment is adopted. Further amendments. Third Reading.  
1337."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1337. An Act making an  
appropriation for the installation of electronic voting  
devices in the Senate Chamber. Second Reading of the  
Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor? Third  
Reading. 1364."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1364. An Act to amend the  
Illinois Aeronautics Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments? Third Reading.  
Messages from the Senate."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Message from the Senate by Kenneth  
Wright, Secretary. Mr. speaker - I am directed to inform  
the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused  
to adopt the Conference Committee Report to Senate Amend-  
ments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2416. The said first Conference  
Committee on the part of the Senate has been discharged and





the Senate requests second Conference, consisting of five members of each House. Action taken by the Senate, June 29, 1972, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1369. Senate requests a second Conference. Action taken by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has acceded to the request of the House of Representatives for a conference committee to consider the differences between the two Houses in regard to House Amendment to Senate Bill 1535. Action taken by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am eh.... directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has acceded in the request of the House of Representatives for a Conference Committee to consider the differences between the two Houses in regard to House Amendment to Senate Bill 1566. Action taken by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House that the Senate has acceded to the request of the House for a Conference Committee on House Amendment to Senate Bill 1560. Action taken by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House that the Senate has acceded in the request of the House for a Conference Committee to consider the differences



between the two Houses in regard to House Amendment to Senate Bill 1555. Action taken by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to the Bill with the following title. Senate Bill 161. Adopted by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to the Bill with the following title. Senate Bill 1404. Concurred in by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of House Amendment No. 1 to a Bill with the following title. Senate Bill 1461. Concurred in by the Senate, June 29, 1972. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Rep. Arthur-Telscer : "On the order of consideration postponed, appears House Bill 4478, on which the Chair recognizes the no, no, wait a minute...motion with regard on the order of motions is Senate Bill 1462, on which the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham.:

R. D. Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker; Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This splendid Senate Bill had rather a spotty track record to date. You remember the explanation a couple of days ago that it's an Insurance Department Bill to make



it more feasible to defend shaky insurance companies. I was indebted to the incomparable Charles Fleck for his explanation that the House had already passed an identical bill. In view of that fact, it is almost as though we were in a contest with the Senate to see if we could be as efficient in helping pass good legislation. We would be indebted to each of you if you would vote 'aye' on this motion to take from Committee, which is with the consent of the Chairman of the Committee, that it might be put on the calendar for the Second Legislative Day."

Rep. Arthur Telscer: "Alright, is there discussion? Question is, on the gentleman's motion, to take from Committee? Is there consent? Alright. Hearing no objection, the rules will be suspended and will be placed on the order of second reading, second day. Alright. Senate Bill Second Reading. Senate Bill 1462."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Eh.... Senate Bill 1462. Give me the Digest. Senate Bill 1462. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Rep. Arthur Telscer: "Third Reading. Senate Bills - Third and we are just about ready to wind it up. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea. 1604. Senate Bill 1604 on the Third."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1604. Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for commissions created by the 77th General Assembly. Third Reading of the Bill."

Representative Arthur A. Telscer: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."



G. W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1604 has 13 sections in it. It's kind of a catch all Bill for ominous appropriations and I would appreciate the support of the House."

Representative Arthur A. Telscer: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

G. W. Shea: "Roll Call."

Representative Arthur A. Telscer: "Okay. Question is, should Senate Bill 1604 pass? All those in favor, vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 118 'ayes' and 3 'nays' and this Bill, having received a Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, rise?"

G. W. Shea: "Earlier today, I brought House Bill 868 back to Second Reading for an amendment. It was amended. I have been waiting for some further amendments from Representative Collins. He told me they would not be forthcoming this evening and he said he would have no objections to moving that Bill to Third, so might I ask the Speaker to move it to Third Reading? I told him I would tomorrow if he had amendments bring it back certainly at his request."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Phil Collins."

P. W. Collins: "Just to confirm what Representative Shea said, Mr. Speaker. Amendments weren't ready on time. He has indicated a willingness to bring the Bill back tomorrow and if it's your desire to advance the Bill to the Third,



I have no objections."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Simmons, rise?"

A. F. Simmons: "Well, due to that explanation, I would like to change my 'no' vote to 'yes' on the last roll call."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the gentleman have leave. Add him on the call. Eh... we can move 868 to Third Reading although it has been read a second time, it doesn't make any difference the fact that it will be on Second Reading tomorrow, because I can advance it to Third and read it a Third time tomorrow, but I will put it on Third tonight if you want me to. Third Reading, yes."

G. W. Shea: "Thank you very kindly."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "On the Speaker's table appears eh... House Resolution 786. Eh... on which the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

H. Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to move for the suspension of House 538 for the immediate consideration and adoption of House Resolution 786. Eh... House Resolution 786 very simply eh..., I think if I read it, it is the simplest. 'Whereas Lake Michigan is a resource which belongs to the people of Illinois and the State as Trustee, of the Public interest, and whereas all of the municipalities bordering Lake Michigan only the City of Chicago and the City of Waukegan afford the people of Illinois free access to its beaches and lakefront areas for recreational uses; and whereas municipalities of Evanston, Wilmette,



Kenilworth, Glenco, Highland Park, Lake Forest, Lake Bluff and North Chicago, maintain lake front property for recreational purposes, but do not provide for access to such property on a non-discriminatory basis, that's economic discrimination, eh....' What we are dissolving is that we ask these people to cease and desist these practices and to make Lake Michigan accessible to all of the people of the State of Illinois."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there leave? Objection? Alright, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff, and others have registered objection. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

H. Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, I now move for the immediate suspension of Rule 53A for the immediate consideration and adoption of this resolution. Eh... I would like to point out that in this resolution, all we are simply doing is making Lake Michigan free to all of the People of the State of Illinois and where the City of Chicago maintains 20 miles of free beaches, free to all the citizens from every County. I mean, you can come from Saline, Johnson, Jackson and enjoy these resources. All we are saying to these municipalities, and I have a list of the discriminatory fees that they maintain, eh... for anyone who cares to see them."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, gentleman from Cook, Mr. Meyer, for what purpose do you rise?"

J. T. Meyer: "Point of order. I believe this motion is not debatable."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright. All those in favor of the gentleman's motion, vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'. This



requires 89 votes or 2/3rds of those voting. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the Record. Alright. Rules suspended. The Clerk will read the resolution."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Resolution 786. Yourell. Whereas Lake Michigan is a resource which belong to the People of Illinois and the State as Trustee, of the Public interest; and whereas all of the municipalities bordering Lake Michigan only the City of Chicago and the City of Waukegan afford the people of the State of Illinois free access to its beaches and lake front areas for recreational uses; and whereas the municipalities of Evanston, Wilmette, Kenilworth, Glenco, Highland Park, Lake Forest, Lake Bluff and North Chicago maintain lake front property for recreational purposes, but do not provide for access to such property on a non-discriminatory basis; therefore be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 77th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that the municipal authorities of Wilmette, Kenilworth, Winetka, Glenco, Highland Park, Lake Forest, Lake Bluff and North Chicago be directed to cease and desist from the practice of discriminating against the People of Illinois who are not residents of those communities who seek access to Lake Michigan. That a suitable copy of this preamble and Resolution be presented to the Executive Official of each of those named communities."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

H. Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, very briefly, what we are talking about is a discrimination of \$3.00 fee for Evanstonians and



\$6.00 for non-residents. Eh.... Wilmette's got a seasonal pass of \$8.00 for husband and wife and \$16.00 for non-residents. And two to four dollars for non-resident children. A dollar and fifty cents for adults, seventy-five cents for children, or two-fifty for adults and a dollar-fifty for non-residents. Kenilworth's season passes are not issued to non-residents. That means that all of you nice time gentlemen who are so good to us and southern Illinois and let us come down and enjoy your recreational facilities, cannot reciprocate. But what we want to do is make it so that everybody can enjoy the beaches and we have others with stickers and non-residents in Lake Forest must pay \$20.00 for a season sticker. And eh.... in Lake Bluff, no beach privileges are offered to non-residents. Mr. Speaker, this is a very amirable resolution. I think this is the essence of freedom of the lake. The lake belongs to everyone and we want to make it so be."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

B. B. Duff: "Ladies and gentleman of the House, I object to this Resolution for several reasons. First of all the resolution itself is discriminatory. Although it uses the word 'discriminatory' in relationship to the communities to which it refers. In the first place, this resolution, if it would apply only to the communities who park districts have Lake front land, Mr. Speaker, could I have a little order? If it would apply at all, would apply to every park district in the State of Illinois. Now as you all know, the people who live in park districts are taxed for the upkeep of those park





districts. Many of the communities to which this resolution refers have gone out of their ways to spend large amounts of money at the local taxpayers expense to maintain facilities that they do indeed make available to people from outside those park districts. As an example I give you the Village of Wilmette Park District recently passed a referendum only two weeks ago, by which the average taxpayer in that town was willing to raise his personal taxes more than fifty dollars a year to purchase the last remaining open land in that part of Cook County. Open land being bought for the benefit of all the people who can avail themselves of that privilege. It is not discriminatory when taxpayers are willing to go that far to then ask for a legitimate related fee. Now these fees have never been challenged on the basis of cost. The local taxpayer does in deed get a fee for a local amount, because he is paying the taxes. The non-local user is also allowed to freely use the facilities for a reasonable additional fee. Now as far as the beaches are concerned, it is a fact that, for example, in Wilmette or in Evanston, they have spent thousands and thousands of dollars in recent years dredging that land, maintaining those beaches, keeping them clean and free of glass, broken glass and litter, providing lifeguards, providing services in terms of refreshments available to everybody that uses them. I would suggest that this resolution itself, by pointing out those communities, is not only discriminatory but totally unfair and uncalled for. To suggest that a

## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

legitimate basis of use is discriminatory towards anyone is out of order."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."

E. R. Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. I just like very much getting up and speaking after the last speaker, because his track record has been a little weak lately. Nevertheless, I think he is on the right vane and I think the proposer of this resolution has lost sight of a very important thing here. And that is, that the taxpayer of that level community has paid the taxes for the maintenance and the operation of that park and of the recreation district that runs the park area. It's not unusual, we find that all through the State, where eh... recreational facilities are provided by a municipality and eh... paid through either a general revenue bond issue or by general taxes that non-residents are charged a little extra than the residents. And I think we want to question as to whether or not the additional amount charged is reasonable and I don't think there is any showing that there is not a reasonable amount or reasonable difference here by the mere fact that you are not a taxpaying resident. I think the resolution ought to be defeated."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Simmons."

A. F. Simmons: "Will the sponsor yield to a question?"

I understood your remarks and I tried to listen to the reading of the resolution and it seemed to me that perhaps it's in error. I believe the City of Zion, Illinois has at least in



part, within its corporate limits, a State park, Illinois State park, which is a beautiful place for everybody in the State to get access and I just wondered if your.... "

H. Yourell: "Oh no, I said nothing about Zion, you see, because Illinois Beach State Park has no fees to anyone and its free to everyone."

A. F. Simmons: "I know, but you said that two cities in the State gave...."

H. Yourell: "Well, Zion does not have lake front property. That's the problem. They are adjacent to the beach park, but they don't own the lake front."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Downes."

J. P. Downes: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House I move the previous question."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor, say 'aye'; the opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Previous question has been moved. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, to close."

H. Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, very briefly. If these districts... I would like to point out that the Districts we are talking about are the districts that feast upon the value of their land and could far better afford to have free beaches in the City of Chicago or the City of Waukegan. Now what we're talking about is places like Lake Bluff, where residents only, in other words if you come from any other section of the State, you can't even enjoy the beach up there. You can't go there. You can't park there. You're talking about eh... Kenilworth that has a fee and only residents can do



it. You are talking about other districts like Wilmette that has \$8.00 resident, \$16.00 non-resident. You are talking about Winetka with \$10.00 for residents, \$20.00 for non-residents. Mr. Speaker, what we're talking about here is who owns the lake. Is not the lake a part of the property and a part of the heritage it belong to all the people? Certainly, when it comes time to vote money for eh... sewage and the other things that go into the Lake, we find out that the people from northern Illinois and these Districts want the eh... to help with their problems. Now I'm suggesting what we really are talking about here is the essence of democracy. And I think that these snobbish, districts cannot afford to go along on their affluent ways and ignore the plight of all the people of the State of Illinois. Sometimes it gets hot in land and such places, Rockford, and the people would like to come to the lake, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the City of Chicago and the City of Waukegan which has set the example, they provide totally free access to the lake and Mr. Speaker, this is the essence of a freedom of the lake or a Lake Michigan Bill of Rights. You're talking about a Bill of Rights for the people and this eh... Bill is clearly documented. I have over here at my desk an entire article about the lake front, the amount of land that's available and all the charges, and I would welcome the ability to give it to anyone."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: Alright, the question is, shall we adopt the gentleman's motion to adopt the resolution. All those



in favor say 'aye', the opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it. Alright, roll call has been requested. All those in favor, vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

D. M. Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, being from one of the affected communities and representing three of them, I should get a word here in explaining my vote. I think Mr. Yourell's talking about the affluence of these suburbs. I think rather than affluent, if he came down to our beaches he would see that we are famous for effluent, because everyone of these beaches have been closed by the Lake County Health Department for sewage imminating from the North Shore Sanitary District. And because I think you should have the right to use our effluent filled beaches for the same cost as the residents I will support this resolution and vote 'aye'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

R. E. Mann: "Well Mr. Speaker and members of the House. It is a fact that outside of Chicago only eight percent of the shoreline adjacent to the beach is open and available to the public, and I think that since the people of the State of Illinois eh.... do own the lakes and since the State holds it in trust for the People of the State, I think that the lake and the lake front ought to be available and ought to have access to it, completely whether it be in Chicago or in the suburbs. I just like to say that the absence of access in the suburban areas causes increased pressure on the beaches in Chicago and those other areas where the



beaches are open which in turn causes increased pressure on the Lake, so I think this is a reasonable resolution and I hope you would support it."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Glass."

B. M. Glass: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise partially on a point of personal privilege and inasmuch as one of the previous speaker's mentioned my name in the debate, referring to the fact that it did cost money to remove a lot of glass from the beaches. Eh... which illustrates of course the point that eh... it does cost these communities something to maintain them, the beaches. As Representative Mann indicates, that the eh... there ought to be free access to everybody in the State of Illinois to the beaches and he is certainly correct, and eh... all we are doing is assessing in many of these communities a reasonable charge for the maintenance and the providing of lifeguards and other beach facilities. I think it's entirely reasonable and I would think that eh... if the State wanted to provide free access to all the beaches, that the State should condemn all the beaches and maintain them, but since that is not the case, a reasonable charge by the local governments that do maintain them is proper. It doesn't deny anyone access and therefore I think this resolution ought to be defeated."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

W. Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, fellow members of the House. Now, eh... we have a lake in Decatur, which is called Lake Decatur. I'm glad that you appreciate that profound state-



ment. May I continue, I'm being bothered here. What I wanted to say here was that eh... there is numerous individual who own land right down to the lake front. Now it belongs to those people. The City owns the lake. Now I don't see much difference in the rights of an individual and the rights of a community. Those communities own the beaches they certainly own the beaches and I think they should have a right to control their beaches. The freedom of the lake, of course, is eh... belongs to the people, but the beach themselves is a matter of title of property and should be protected, otherwise we certainly are going in the direction of eh... tax on property rights, so I think we should vote no on this and protect the rights of the people or the cities and communities that own these beaches."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

B. B. Duff: "Ladies and gentlemen of the House. For two years now we, I have heard many of the people in this General Assembly ask for consideration on the merits for the districts for which they represent. I am suggesting to you, to the taxpayers in the communities to which we refer, I would like.... Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak at the moment on personal privilege."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright."

B. B. Duff: "Now, I am trying to explain a position on a resolution that is important. There is a certain amount of disturbance to my left relative to my position and I would appreciate it, as a member of this General Assembly, if I



might be allowed without interference to express this point of view."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Proceed."

B. B. Duff: "Mr. Speaker, as I have said, I have heard many people on the merits ask support of the positions of their districts. The taxpayers in the communities to which I referred, many of them are paying as much as two hundred to three hundred dollars a year to maintain these beaches so the people from all over the State of Illinois may use them. There is no showing of all that there is any discriminatory use at all. If I want to use a library in another community, I have to pay for the privilege, if I want to use a facility in another community, let's say over in Park Ridge, I'll have to go over there and pay a fee, if I want to use a skating rink in a Village like North Brook, I'll have to go there and pay a fee. We make facilities in our communities available to the entire State of Illinois. We're proud of them and we feel that this resolution which uses words like 'discriminatory', is totally offensive. And I would very much appreciate your consideration of my plea for the residents of my district as I have so many times for so many of you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The Clerk will take the record. This question, there are 80 'ayes', 35 'nays', and the resolution is adopted. Now there are just two bills left on Senate Third that we want to get rid of. Senate Bill 1532."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1532. An Act concerning conveyances. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. DiPrima."

L. DiPrima: "Eh.... Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1532 is a Bill to protect the interests of Veterans overseas who have been reported lost or missing. Questions have been raised by title companies on the use of Power of Attorneys executed by overseas veterans in the transfer of real estate. In order to complete any future transactions, the given power of attorneys still has the authority to execute transfer of real estate. I would appreciate your support."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, question is, shall this bill pass? All those in favor, vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 132 'ayes', no 'nays' and this Bill, having received a Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Yourell 'aye'. 1478."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1478. An Act to convey land in Cook County. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Moore."

D. A. Moore: "Thank you very, very, very kindly, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I have been plagued with a small problem with this bill that is often known as a good bill, but a bad Senate sponsor. And eh.... I want to personally thank the Speaker, I'm glad he's a friend of mine. Eh.... otherwise I probably would not have an opportunity to present this



very worthwhile piece of legislation before this Body. Eh.... I am also very glad that any minor irritations that the Speaker of this House might have against a member of the other side of the rotunda has not been taken out on a member of the General Assembly. Mr. Speaker, what Senate Bill 1478 does, it authorizes the Illinois School Commission to transfer a piece of land in lieu of another piece of land in School District 140 which is in the Tinley Park-Orland Park area of my township. The reason for this is that there has been load made by the School Building Commission to District 140 and they have title to this land. The Bill specifically states that the value and the desirability of any land exchanged for it shall be determined by the School Building Commission. Eh.... what they want to do is trade a or eh.... gain a larger piece of land adjacent to the school for another tract of land that they have no use for. I know of no objection to this Bill, eh.... it was advanced without reference in the Senate and passed there. The Committee was discharged here and I would appreciate 89 votes Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Krause."

J. G. Krause: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the other day I had asked Don several questions on this Bill and I had some doubt about it, but since that time Don and I have sat down and gone over the Bill and I think all the difficulties have been straightened out and I urge your support."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright. The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor, vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 130 'ayes' and 4 'nays' and this Bill, having received a eh.... Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. One agreed resolution. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde."

H. J. Hyde: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, while we have many resolutions... agreed resolutions eh...., because of the lateness of the hour, we will only do one eh... one such resolution and eh.... I've been asked to read it so I shall do so. House Resolution 896. 'Whereas there is a tide in the affairs of men and whereas Charles N. Wheeler III, the loyal scribner of a famous vendor of facts and fiction, who is widely reknown for his equanimous constitution, even in the severest squash of circumstance, today rides the crest of this tide in fear and trembling, with downcast and nitted brow in deepest contemplation of what awaits him on July 8 of this year of his still young life. In short, the shackles of holy matrimony. And whereas this perplexed mortal has been seen convorting with someone unfavry fellows who reportedly have ties with the Illinois General Assembly, the most scrulous of all being one David Epstein, and has reportedly cohabited with said fellow and others including Republicans in various locations in the City of Springfield which have been the sight of notorious celebrations attended even by legislators. And whereas



Charles N. Wheeler is not withstanding about to engage in a great mortal struggle testing whether his will or Paula's so conceived and so dedicated can long endure. And whereas it is all together fitting and proper that the world will little note or long remember what we say here, nevertheless let it be dissolved by the House of Representatives of the 77th General Assembly of the State of Illinois that we comfort and console Charlie Wheeler in the twilight of his bachelor days and we pledge to gather together in spirit at his bedside, although in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow that alter. That among other things herein unmentionable is for Charlie to do, but we can nonetheless offer the Charlie and his fiance, Miss Paula Roach, our sincere congratulations, and be it further resolved that Charles N. Wheeler is directed in the words of the immortal Bogart to make his move, and be it even further resolved that a suitable copy of this resolution be delivered to Charles N. Wheeler III, Legislative Correspondent of the Chicago Sun Times.' I now move adoption of House Resolution 806."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those eh... yeow, we better have a roll call, in favor vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde."

H. J. Hyde: "I would just like to say in behalf of the rest of us here who are already married to Charlie, welcome to the ranks of the living dead."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 142 'ayes' and 3 'nays' and the Resolution is adopted. Alright the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde."

H. J. Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, again it gives me great pleasure to move that this House stand adjourned until the hour of 9:30 A.M. tomorrow morning."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor, say 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House stands adjourned."

