

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

NINETY-THIRD LEGISLATIVE DAY

OCTOBER 18, 1971

1:00 O'CLOCK P.M.

THE HONORABLE W. ROBERT BLAIR,

SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

A roll call for attendance was taken and indicated that all were present with the exception of the following:

- Representative Edward E. Bluthardt - no reason given;
- Representative Bruce L. Douglas - illness;
- Representative John P. Downes - illness;
- Representative Benedict Garmisa - no reason given;
- Representative Louis Janczak - family illness;
- Representative C. L. McCormick - no reason given;
- Representative Daniel M. Pierce - no reason given;
- Representative Leland H. Rayson - illness;
- Representative William A. Redmond - illness;
- Representative Anthony Scariano - no reason given;
- Representative James VonBoeckman - illness.



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The House will be in order and the doorkeeper will see that those not entitled to the floor are removed therefrom. The invocation this afternoon will be given by Dr. Johnson, the House Chaplain."

Dr. John Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, our prayer today will be based on Psalm 86. Gracious and merciful Father, incline your ear to me and answer me as I approach your throne of grace for guidance and for strength. I confess that I am needful of your help and I ask that you hear me, because as a Member of this legislative body, I am your servant in government. Be gracious to me, Oh, Lord, as I lift up my soul and spirit, and pray in your name. You, Lord, are good and forgiving. You abound in love on all that call upon you. When we seek you in a day of trouble, you answer us. And now, Oh, Lord, in this session of the House, as vital matters come before us, teach me your ways that I may walk in your truth. Unite my heart to fear your name as I give thanks to you. I ask this because you are merciful and gracious, slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love. Hear me, Oh God of David for your mercy sake. Amen."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Roll call for attendance. The gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Clyde L. Choate: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, would you have the Clerk to show in the Journal that Representative Douglas, Fred, Douglas, Downes, Rayson, Redmond and VonBoeckman are absent because of illness, please."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The Journal will so show. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Capuzi."

Louis F. Capuzi: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I'd like the Journal to show that Representative. . ."

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

Louis F. Capuzi: "Not, not going on."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Now you are."

Louis F. Capuzi: "Oh, now I'm on. Okay. Let the Journal show, Mr. Speaker, that Representative Janczak is absent because of illness in his family, please."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The record will so show. All right, on the calendar on the order of vetoes under Amendatory Vetoes - motions, appears House Bill 687, on which the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell. The Clerk will read the motion."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Motion. I, Representative Caldwell. Motion. Pursuant to Paragraph (e) of Section 9 of Article IV of the Constitution of 1970, I move that the House accept the specific recommendation for changes to House Bill 687 as set forth in the Governor's message of August 24, 1971. That the Clerk inform the Senate thereof, and request that the Senate concur in herein dated October 14, 1971. Representative Caldwell."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Caldwell."

Lewis A. H. Caldwell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ah, Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask that the House go along with the Governor's recommendation. As you may recall, this is the



bill which amends the Probate Probate Act, reduces age requirements of males serving as Executive from 21 to 18 so as to be the same as female age requirements. A the Governor indicated in his veto message that the age should be in uniform for both Executor and Administrator, and I would agree with that recommendation, and at this time would ask the cooperation of the members on the floor to vote 'Yeas' on the recommendation of the Governor."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? All right, the gentleman, the question is shall the House adopt this amendment? All those in favor will vote 'Yeas' and the opposed 'NO'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 108 'Yeas' and 12 'Nays', and the amendment having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared adopted. Any of the members that have bills on third reading that they would like to have the Chair consider calling, if you would advise the Chair why we at the appropriate time will address ourselves to that. There have not been any requests in the last few days for any of the House Bills on third reading. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Harold Washington rise?"

Harold Washington: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, members of the House, due to an inadvertence on my part, last week I filed two bills and left without giving notice to the Clerk that I wanted them posted for this Thursday. Consequently, I have received the consent of the House leaders on both sides



and also the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and I therefore at this time move to suspend the Rule 17 and other appropriate rules in order to hear House Bills 3654 and 3655 before Judiciary II this coming Thursday, October 21, at 2:00 P.M."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, is there objection? All right, ah, hearing no objection, then the Rule will be suspended, so that those two bills may be set by the Chairman of Judiciary II for hearing Thursday. All right. All right, on the calendar under vetoes, under Amendatory Vetoes - Motions, appears House Bill 1753, on which the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman."

Arthur L. Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move that the attached that the amendment as received from the Governor's Office be adopted onto House Bill 1753. The essence of the amendment was to incorporate some additional language to spell out the requirements of security guards in carrying of fire arms as was embodied in another bill which passed out of this House and the Senate and was signed into law by the Governor. The amendment does not change the basic import of the bill which was passed by this House earlier this session, and I move the adoption of the amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? The question is shall the House adopt the amendment to House Bill 1753. All those in favor will vote 'Yeas' and the opposed 'No'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

On this question, there are 133 'Yeas' and 1 'Nay', and the amendment having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared adopted. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Simmons rise?"

Arthur E. Simmons: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, on the last amendment we just adopted, it strikes out lines 1 and 2 on page 4 and inserts a a lot of language. And in doing that, I believe that it leaves the balance of the sentence on line 23 incomplete."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Are you looking at the printed bill or the enrolled bill?"

Arthur E. Simmons: "I'm looking at the enrolled and engrossed bill. And I'm comparing it with the printed amendment that we just adopted. Here's the bill, 1753, isn't it?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, everything was in order with regard to that last motion which was adopted. All right, with leave of the House, we'll go to House Bills third reading, on which there appears House Bill 2346."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 2346, an act to amend Section 27-9.1 of 'The School Code'. Third reading of the bill."

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

Philip W. Collins: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you'll recall in the 76th General Assembly we passed the bill prohibiting mandatory sex education. If parents objected to children being included in such courses. Unfortunately, the bill used the word comprehensive sex



education and some school districts, I am told, are making courses mandatory and hiding behind the fact that the course is not considered comprehensive. So, House Bill 2346 would merely strike the word 'comprehensive' to clear up confusion which I think has needlessly become an issue in some of our school districts. The some of the western suburbs I know of parents are objecting to courses out there and unless this bill is enacted, their children will not be able to graduate from school this coming Spring.

I'd appreciate the support of the House."

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

Roman J. Kosinski: "Ah, will the gentleman yield to a question?"

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

Roman J. Kosinski: "Ah, P. W., is this an accreditable course?"

Is it a course that gives credit? These sex education courses?"

Philip W. Collins: "No, ah, I don't I don't believe that they are a they give credit, but some of them are making graduation mandatory upon upon completion of such a course. The intention of the original bill was to permit parents to withdraw their children or withhold their children from such courses, if they objected. The that is the law today. However, this word 'comprehensive' is causing the hang-up."

Roman J. Kosinski: "It will still permit this child to graduate?"

Philip W. Collins: "Well, I in some of the western suburbs they've said that these children can not graduate at the



present time because they have not taken these courses, and they say that they don't have to comply with the law, because the courses are not 'comprehensive'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Harold Washington."

Harold Washington: "Will the sponsor yield to a question?"

Ah, Representative Collins, I don't have the bill before me, and I have been trying to follow your response to a previous question, but would you tell me exactly what this bill does? Does it strike the word comprehensive or insert the word comprehensive, and what does comprehensive mean in relationship to the sex education? I didn't get it."

Philip W. Collins: "All right, as to defining the word comprehensive, in respect to sex education, I think I'll bow to your superior knowledge, Representative Washington, but the bill the bill does strike the word, you're looking at the synopsis, which is probably the most confusing synopsis I've ever looked at upon a bill. It merely strikes the word comprehensive from the existing law."

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

Harold Washington: "Yes, now, by striking the word comprehensive, what in practical effect will that mean in terms of sex education in the public schools?"

Philip W. Collins: "It returns the the law to what was intended by at least by the sponsor, myself, when we enacted the the bill in the last session of the General Assembly,



which would permit parents to withhold their children from such courses if they had objection. The, ah, now, by hiding behind this disguise of comprehensive, some of the school districts are telling parents, that unless the children take the course, they may not graduate. So, I by playing with this word, I think they're going, I know they're going contrary to the law that's on the book today.

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

J. Glenn Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Phil, what's going to happen in the area of let's say of health education, or biology, or other areas of science, when there are references that have to do with the human body or so forth. For example, I am sure that the health courses are indicative or try to at least relate to some extent the nature of the physical actions of one's body without making reference to sex. And, I think that seems to me that if we delete comprehensive, that we're going to lose quite a few courses in the area of health care, even I would say in some of the Social Studies, like Psychology and so forth, Sociology, and this seems to me to be detrimental and I don't think, and I think if we lose the latitude here, that we may very well undermine many courses that had not intended to be described as sex education courses, which I think you're going to impute to anything that makes reference to the body. So, I, so I'm worried about health and all that."



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

Philip W. Collins: "Ah, Representative Schneider, I know you don't have the act in front of you, if you would look at the original bill you would see that courses such as biology, psychology, and such traditional courses are excluded from the bill. So, we're not, we're not flirting with danger in the area. Ah, . . ."

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

J. Glenn Schneider: "Ah, did you, does the bill include health, for example, I think when you refer to western suburbs, I you mean may very well be referring to a family in my district, which has expressed this concern to me. And they have a problem with the health course. Now, I'm sympathetic to the fact that they should not have their child held back from graduation because of a health course. I would like to speak, perhaps, to them and to the district but the point is I think a again it says, using the synopsis and you're right, I know the bill, if the course is comprehensive is not comprehensive, then we have to have some way to allow for this kind of leeway. Now, I again referring to a particular family, I would say they are going to have problems if they on their level of opposition. I don't know why they'd oppose a health course, for example. I don't know if the health course includes reference to human reproduction, which I am doubtful of,



as a teacher, personally. But I think maybe they have a level of frustration that they define in terms of exposure to the human anatomy that does not really relate to the question of sex, so I think health has a general descriptive phrase for a course may very well fall into a serious category of not being taught in the high schools when we need to have it done."

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

Philip W. Collins: "Ah, I think we're getting into an area of semantics here, but I will say that I think at least one of the families to which I refer is in your district, Representative Schneider, but there is more than one family. There are many of them sharing this concern. Now we are reaching the point right now where we're debating the whole issue of sex education, and I, my point, of this bill is that I don't care if you're in favor of such courses or not, the original intent of the first bill was to give the parents the option of including their children in sex education courses. Now, I don't know the if they're hiding behind such terms as health, perhaps we need we need further amendatory language to overcome your objections, but I do think that a ludicrous to get around a law that's on the books by hiding behind a a word as nebulous as comprehensive. I think that we can serve the parents who object to such courses and serve them well by removing this this word and allow their children to a to graduate



from school. If further language is needed, such as to clear up the definition of what you call health courses, I'd be very happy to work with you on such amendments. But I do think that the parents are being unfairly treated to use one word to force the intent of the law that's on the books and to prevent their children from graduating because the school district arbitrarily decides that a course is not comprehensive and therefore, must be a mandatory course. The whole intent of this legislation was to insure the the parental right to include their or to exclude their children from courses they that they felt or held objectionable because of their personal views."

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

James Y. Carter: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to correct my distinguished colleague in one respect. That the original intent of the bill is exactly what it was - that it was my bill, I was a member of the Sex Offenders' Commission and it was recommended out of that commission, so therefore it had to be the intent of what the commission saw fit to walk."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Eugene M. Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, would the sponsor yield to a question?"

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

Eugene M. Barnes: "Ah, Representative Collins, I'm kind of



confused now. I just had experience with that particular educational clause and elementary school system with my own young daughter. And as I understand from what was told to a group of parents, and as I was told, we had the at our discretion whether or not the child would be permitted into the courses. Now does this bill change that?"

Philip W. Collins: "No, you are absolutely right. You do have the discretion in Chicago to include your child or to exclude your child. That was the bill, that I introduced - House Bill 2323 in the last session of the General Assembly. And Chicago is following that intent. However, in some school districts they are hiding behind this word 'comprehensive' and making the course mandatory rather than allowing the parent any discretion at all."

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

George Ray Hudson: "Would the sponsor yield for a question?"

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

George Ray Hudson: "Phil, this is a subject of great interest to the people in my constituency. I've had letters on it, and my question to you is this - you mentioned the fact that some of these students might not be able to graduate or at least that is a foreseeable danger. Now, we're entering into the fall term here. To your knowledge, now is this affecting, it would not be affecting students certainly that graduated last June, we're entering into the fall a season. Is this apt to affect their graduating say in mid-term, or say at semester time here?"



Philip W. Collins: "I can only tell you what I was told by parents from your district, that their children are in danger of not being allowed to graduate because they have not allowed their children to take this course, which the school district insists is mandatory. I can only hope that if we pass this bill the school board would take a different view in light of the will of the legislature, but, the parents are from your district and they did tell me that they'll their children will not be allowed to graduate."

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

George Ray Hudson: "One one further question. If you strike the word mandatory, then that will simply leave the language referring. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Collins."

Philip W. Collins: "We aren't striking the word mandatory, we're striking the word comprehensive."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Hudson."

George Ray Hudson: "I I beg your pardon, I meant to say comprehensive and that would leave the language of the bill and simply referring to such sex education courses, is that correct?"

Philip W. Collins: "That's absolutely correct."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any further discussion? The gentleman care to close?"

Philip W. Collins: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, briefly in closing I just would like to reiterate that the your feelings upon



the subject of sex education, I, I pro or con, I don't think should enter our considerations here. I think that by the use of semantics, a a law that is on the books has been circumvented. I think that we can simply strike this word and then everyone will have a clear cut definition as to what is sex education and what are the rights of parents in this area to include or withhold their children from such courses and I would appreciate the support of the House."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question is shall House Bill 2346 pass? All those in favor vote 'Yeas', the opposed 'No'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? On this question, take the record: Cox, 'Yeas'. On this question, there are 101 'Yeas' and 5 'No' and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared adopted. 2347?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 2347. An act to amend Section 117-1 of the 'Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963'. Third reading of the bill."

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

Philip W. Collins: "I think maybe I'm pressing my luck, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2347 was a bill introduced by me in the 76th General Assembly and passed. Ah, it passed by this House at that time. I reintroduced it in the last session and it passed out of Judiciary Committee, a but got caught up in the rush of the last day. It was a bill in this era of so-called law and order in



gun control and suggested legislation in this area, this bill is a bill simple though it may be, I think is a very strong bill that would deny probation to anyone convicted of a felony in which a gun is used. Ah, as I say this bill has been considered by this House before and by the Judiciary Committee twice. I would ask for your favorable consideration. I would attempt to answer any questions that members may post to the bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Roman J. Kosinski: "Will the gentleman yield to a question?"

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

Roman J. Kosinski: "Representative Collins, I don't know whether you're aware, but recently the Governor vetoed my bill 1212 which was essentially this, in favor of a package situation from the Senate which affected this end. Now does this bill contain something that that package did not or that 1212 did not, are you aware?"

Philip W. Collins: "You'd have to refresh my memory as to House Bill 1212. I know I voted for your bill, I, this bill probably does not go as far as yours did, it does merely say, but it's a strong merely, upon conviction of a felony in which a gun is used, probation is denied."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Kosinski."

Roman J. Kosinski: "I suspect, Representative, there's much duplication in this bill and my 1212 which was vetoed by the Governor in favor of that Senate Bill. However, I would



not be averse to voting for this bill, and then consider it in terms of amendments or in committee."

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

Harold Washington: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in light of the inability of the sponsor of this bill to answer what I considered to be an extremely pertinent question, that is, if the bill passes it may be redundant, or at worse, if it passes, it may conflict with what the Governor has signed into law. In light of that, I think that many members of the House would have to say that they have a state of unreadiness. I would suggest to the sponsor of the bill that he hold this bill until such time as we can read the Governor's message in terms of the bills he passed and the veto message of House Bill 1212, Mr. Kosinski's bill, so that we can all vote intelligently on this bill."

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

Philip W. Collins: "Ah, in all deference to my friend and colleague, Representative Washington, he and I have discussed this legislation and similar legislation upon many occasions. House Bill 1212 has been vetoed. I I do not believe that we have duplication here, but if we do, of course, the Governor's discretion would see no need to sign this bill. I don't think that we're getting into any area of danger that we might have overlapping laws."



If House Bill 2347 contains provisions already enacted into law, well, then obviously the Governor would find no need for it and would veto it. I do not think that this is the case and I would appreciate the support of the House on House Bill 2347."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The question is shall House Bill 2347 pass? All those in favor will vote 'Yeas', the opposed 'No'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Kennedy 'Yeas'. On this question there are 90 'Yeas' and 7 'Nays' and this bill having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde rise?"

Henry J. Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, a several of our members have made inquiry of me as to whether it would be permissible for them to tear Tommy Hanahan's picture out of their Blue Book and I I wish you'd instruct them that I think that'd be a gross impropriety."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "What was your point? For what purpose does the gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster rise?"

A. Thomas McMaster: "A, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to request permission to suspend Rule 32C regarding the introduction of bills. I would like to briefly explain the problem that is involved. Last week I attempted to get a bill drawn by the Reference Bureau in sufficient time to introduce it Thursday within the deadline. However, they were not able to get the bill



drawn in time. This bill is in regards to the drawing of precinct boundaries by county boards. As many of us know, it is required that county boards change precinct boundaries in June and pass the new precinct by the July meeting. We also know that we did not have districts drawn as far as legislative districts in the state are concerned and also congressional districts and county board districts. This bill would allow county boards to draw precinct boundaries, by January 8th. I would like permission of the House to suspend the Rule to introduce this bill."

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

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this I think this is an extremely important bill and I also think that we ought to give to the local municipalities some money to do this job with, and I would hope that the sponsor would either amend it on second reading, to include an appropriation, or that would accept that type of an amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, hearing no objection, then the rule will be suspended and the bill will be posted for hearing oh, we're going to advance it to second reading without reference. All right, the Clerk will read the bill."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 3727, McMaster, et.al. Bill for an act to amend 'The Election Code'. First reading of the bill."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, hearing no objection, unanimous consent will be given to advance the bill to the order of second reading without reference to a committee. For what purpose does the gentleman from Clinton, Mr. Harpstrite rise?"

Ben C. Harpstrite: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to have unanimous consent to move House Bill 3690 and 3691 to second reading without reference to committee. These bills were passed 125 to nothing out of the House. I have cleared both sides of the House on these bills and I would appreciate your support."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right. Both of these bills, being on the Speaker's table, the gentleman has made a motion to a waive to suspend the rule so that they can be read a first time and advanced to the order oh, they've been read a first time, to suspend the Rule so that they can be advanced to the order of second reading without reference to committee. Is there objection? All right, leave been granted for for advancing them, those bills will be advanced to second reading. We're just holding here for a minute or so while the amendments for about three or four of those Amendatory Vetoes are being placed on your desk. These are vetoes in which there are perhaps more than one amendment to be offered. Now on the calendar under the order of vetoes, appears Amendatory Vetoes - Motions. House Bill 1842. For what purpose does



the gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich rise?"

John S. Matijevich: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, ah Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to rise on a point of personal privilege which I don't think I'd ever done before. But I didn't I want to rise on a point of privilege which I doubt if I've ever done before in my five years here, but I've been waiting for Brian Duff to appear on the floor of the House and now that he's here, I'd like to make my point. The point is that Tuesday morning of last week, we did have a House Ethics and Government Commission meeting. Before the meeting started, I told the Chairman, George Lindberg, that we had a caucus at the . . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill rise?"

John Jerome Hill: "Apparently, Mr. Speaker, there is something wrong with the system and I'd appreciate if Mr. Matijevich would go to another mike."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Apparently there is a problem with your mike, try the one next door."

John S. Matijevich: "I said I rise on a point of personal privilege which I don't believe I've ever done before, but I was waiting for Representative Brian Duff to appear on the floor of the House. He's late, I'm usually here on time, but now that he's here and I make this point. Tuesday morning we had a meeting of the House Ethics and Government Commission. Before the meeting, I had told the Chairman George Lindberg that we had a Democratic caucus



at 11:00 A.M. About twenty minutes after eleven, Representative Tipsword made what I thought was a very polite request, that he be allowed to attend the Democratic caucus. It just so happened that this came at sort of a heated portion of the meeting wherein the Democratic members had been trying, and I personally believe in a campaign spending limitation for all candidates, but we had a motion with regard to campaign spending limitation for the legislature, which the Republicans voted against, 4 to 3. In his request for leaving the meeting, Rolland Tipsword did say that this was degenerating into part part of an issue. Well, Representative Berman and I both wanted to be excused too, and we were. A well, this Friday on Channel 44 in the Chicago area, I was amazed, maybe not amazed, because I heard a rumor Tuesday of that day, that the someone had run to the news media accusing the Democrats of walking out on an Ethics Committee meeting. So I wasn't as amazed as I could have been, but I was amazed at this particular TV broadcast on Channel 44, that Representative Brian Duff did misrepresent the fact and said to the viewing public that the three Democratic members all walked out on the Ethics Commission meeting. So I make this point of the personal privilege, we didn't walk out, in fact, we did return in the afternoon of that meeting, and the Republican membership took a reversal in that position, and we didn't walk out. I'm here right now to say that I wish the commission would meet further on this matter of



campaign spending limitations and other matters. I don't walk out on the Ethics Commission meeting. Brian, I thought about this, I was going to walk up to and talk to you personally about it. I talked to the other two members and they thought, 'No', that this ought to be cleared up right on the floor of the House, and I think that we were all excused, we were excused properly, and we did come back after the session. If we did walk out we would never have returned and you know it, so I wanted to make that point, as I've heard someone say before, perfectly crystal clear."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, with regard to House Bill 1842, the amendment that he has, . . . For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff rise?"

Brian B. Duff: "Mr. Speaker, only because I feel such a comment should not go unnoticed. I do apologize to the Speaker and to the House for being late today. I'm late because today I have one hundred per cent attendance record in this House and I went to great efforts to be here. I would like to say that there were indeed some very a heated political comments made by the Demos as they left the room last week. They did, in fact, all leave. We did, in fact, sit there wondering what to do and adjourned, rather than go along in a bi-partisan way. I hope that Mr. Matijevich understands that if he can't stand the heat, don't go near the kitchen."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Shall we recess for a meeting of the commission? The gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Rolland F. Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise on a point of personal privilege, too. The privilege, I think, has already been explained by Representative Matijevich. I did not see the program, but it has been reported to me. I would merely like to say that I was the first of the Democrats who arose. This was twenty minutes after our caucus was supposed to have begun. It was as Mr. Matijevich said, after we'd had some heated debate on whether or not campaign limitations should be included in the bill or not, and after it had been defeated in the early morning session, and I indicated at that time that I would like to be excused, that I felt the matter had been degenerating, unfortunately, in the committee at that time, and at that time our very good Chairman asked me if I would be returning, and I told him I would be as soon as we had completed the Democratic caucus if I could be excused. He was very kind to excuse me and to let me go. I then left, and went to the Democratic caucus and shortly thereafter my my two colleagues from the Democratic side of the House, Representative Matijevich and Representative Berman joined me, and I would publicly thank the Chairman for adjourning until we could return, but I would certainly like to support what Representative Matijevich has said to you, a specific request was asked that we be excused from that meeting at that time because



of the caucus. I thank the Chairman for letting us go, and I do resent any indication that the Democrats walked out of that meeting. Thank you."

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

Arthur L. Berman: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, on the same point, I merely want to refresh my colleagues memory, that before I left the room with my two Democratic colleagues, on that commission, there was a motion made that they recess until after adjournment. You did not sit there not without knowing what to do, the the motion was moved and it was my suggestion that they recess until after the session. That's what you did, there was certainly not any kind of a thing that we walked out with the impression that we're trying to scuttle any of this legislation. I thought, up to that point, that that committee had worked very well with the avowed purpose of getting in some ethics legislation. I think we ought to find practice a little about what we preach about far as our ethical conduct between ourselves."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce rise?"

Daniel M. Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, as a colleague of Representative Matijevich. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "No, what's your point?"

Daniel M. Pierce: "A point of personal privilege I would like to tell. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Concerning what? Just tell and with-



out debating it. What's the point? Is it concerned with the same subject?"

Daniel M. Pierce: "Yes, it's not about congressional reapportionment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Are you a member of that House Committee on Ethics?"

Daniel M. Pierce: "It's about the point made of Mr. Matijevich not being about to stand the heat."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I'm you're that's out of order and I'm going to set a rule. Gentleman cut him off. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Brian B. Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I have the highest regard for the three Democratic members of the Ethics and Government Commission. I don't think that any of them would say that there were not heated words prior to their unanimous departure from that meeting. I don't think that any of them heard the program or they would know that while I said that those words characterized their departure, that it was also with the comment that they were going to a caucus. I wish that I had waited a few moments ago until all three gentlemen had been heard. If they are offended in any way by my actions, I apologize. I would also add that the guilty conscience needs no accusing. Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, now we're on the order of Amendatory Vetoes - Motions, on which there appears House Bill 1842. What purpose does the gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce rise?"



Daniel M. Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I was going to. . ."

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

Daniel M. Pierce: "Well, if you'd let me say it. I'll say it."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, say it. What's your point that you're standing on? A personal privilege or what?"

Daniel M. Pierce: "The point is personal privilege. As a . . . Lake County Democrat. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, there right there, just wait a minute, right there on the question of being a Lake County Democratic, that's not a point of privilege that I'm going to allow and it's not important enough to interrupt the pending business before this House. Now the pending business before this House is Mr. Terzich's motion on Amendatory Motions. We'll proceed with that."

Fredric B. Selcke: "I move that the attached amendment be adopted as changed to engrossed House Bill 1842 in acceptance of the Governor's specific recommendation for change, dated October 13, 1971, Robert M. Terzich."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "What purpose does the gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate rise?"

Clyde L. Choate: "Mr. Speaker, only for one brief statement, and that is inasmuch as Mr. Duff spoke twice that I want to tell him that as my long association and acquaintance with the distinguished gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevec, that I've never seen him hesitate to take a side on any issue and I'm sure that he can stand the heat just



about as well as anyone in this legislature when the time arises."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right! Applause is one sided. All right, now we're at a different procedure here. We've, Mr. Terzich has filed an amendment with regard to his bill. There has also been filed a another amendment. And out of deference to the sponsor of the bill, the Chair is going to recognize Mr. Terzich first with regard to his motion on his amendment. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Robert M. Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1842 bans the spraying of a asbestos so that may it may escape into the atmosphere. The veto specifies that the pollution control board may adopt additional regulations in this area. I do agree with the Governor's message, however, the initial amendment to this bill was technically incorrect, therefore, members of our staff met with Mr. Schneiderman from the E.P.A. which redrafted the amendment which would make it technically correct. And I move that the House adopt this amendment."

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

Henry J. Hyde: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate that Mr. Schneiderman redrafted it rather than the Governor, because as I read the Constitution, it is the Governor's prerogative to make specific recommendations to the General Assembly on Amendatory Vetoes and what has happened here, unfortunately, is a rewriting of the bill by some-



body else, and I would urge that this is beyond the power of this House at this stage in the legislative process. As I read the Constitution and as I read the Attorney General's opinion concerning amendatory vetoes. The specific recommendations of the Governor must be followed except for matters of form only, which would include typographical errors. Now what has happened here by Mr. Terzich's own comment is that somebody else has rewritten the Governor's specific recommendation, and so I think it imposes too severe a burden on the Speaker, to determine whether or not the changes made in the amendment are formal or substantive and I would urge them in view of the fact that this is a change from the Governor's specific recommendation that the motion is out of order and not be entertained."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, while I'm studying that and before I rule, I'll recognize the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have the utmost respect for the Majority Leader and his reading of the Constitution, but I watched last week the erosion of the legislative power of this State, time and time again, and if I read Section 90 of the Constitution it says that we will take an Amendatory Veto that the Governor suggest to this body and amend a bill that's been passed by overwhelming majorities of this body and make specific changes and send it back to the Governor. If the Governor then determines that the language we've



amended it to conform, he has the right to sign it, or veto it or he may veto the bill because he doesn't like what we've done, but I don't think any member of this body wants to put himself in a position under any Governor, and gentlemen, Governors change. I don't think anybody wants to put themselves in a position where a Governor and only a Governor is going to tell us how to amend bills, because then the next thing we'll know we might as well let the Chief Executive Officer rewrite all the bills and then we can go home. I think that we have the power to amend the bills in the form and the fashion, we think can conform to his suggestions, and if he doesn't like it, then he can veto the bills. Thank you."

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

Henry J. Hyde: "Ah, because this is a matter of great importance, I would beg the indulgence of the Speaker to reply briefly to what the distinguished Assistant Minority Leader stated. I, too, join him in regretting the erosion of legislative power, ah, but I think the erosion occurred during the Constitutional Convention, when the delegates passed a document that permits the Governor to return a bill with specific recommendations or, an Amendatory Veto. Now, this is not our fault, but it is a constitutional fact that we must come to grips with. So that being so, we must read the constitution and we must follow it. And the specific recommendations of the Governor are have been contained in an amendment that was provided with the message, but the



sponsor has chosen to amend it further in his own manner and form, and that's fine. I'd like to see that that would be permissible, but I don't interpret the constitution thusly, nor does the Attorney General, and I think the only question before this House is the Governor's specific recommendations, nor their modification either by the chief sponsor or Mr. Schneiderman. And that being my position, Mr. Speaker, I would urge that this amendment that is being offered by the chief sponsor is not merely a formal change or a typographical change, but it is a rewriting of the bill and the remedy for that is to draft and file a new bill or to accept the Governor's specific amendments and recommendations. So this is my position and I regret the erosion. I regret that the Governor can amend bills but I think what the Governor is saying to this legislature is 'look, I'm going to veto this bill, but if you want another chance at it, if you still like the concept, but if you'll correct this language and correct it as I have specifically stated, I will sign the bill'. Ah, this is a more flexible arrangement, I think, this is what the delegates wanted to do and I think that's what they've done and I think that's what they've done and I think that's what we must do."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, now, so we stay on the track, on procedure, this is not a debatable matter that's been raised by the Majority Leader. He's asked for a point of order and that's not debatable. But inasmuch as I have



allowed the Assistant Minority Leader to be heard and the Majority Leader to be heard twice, and I see that the Minority Leader would like to be heard and considering the import, I will allow the Minority Leader to speak, but then I intend to rule on the matter, because as I said, it's it's not a debatable point. The gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Clyde L. Choate: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if you have a copy of the Constitution of the State of Illinois for 1970 before you, I ask you to turn to Page 10 under he under Section 9 which is the veto Procedure if you will look at item (e) the last paragraph and I quote it says, 'such bills shall be presented again to the Governor and if he certifies that such acceptance conforms to his specific recommendations the bill shall become law. If he does not so certify he shall return the bill as a vetoed bill, and etc.'. Not, it appears to me that at least in my interpretation of that sentence, that if we were not able to offer an amendment up here, there would be no need for the Governor to be placed in the position to either have to so certify or to disagree with the actions of the House of Representatives, because if we were not able to amend, then the bill would not have anything in it for him to either certify or to not certify. And this is the reason that I think, Mr. Speaker, that the members of this General Assembly, although I have said on past occasions that the legislative prerogative has been



eroded to a degree under some of the interpretations of the new constitution, this is one item that I feel that we do have the prerogative of exercising legislative authority, however, the Governor has the final say so as in most cases as far as legislation is concerned, but by this action he can either certify or not certify which is the prerogative of either vetoing or not vetoing. And I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to look at that one sentence in item in the item which I just mentioned under Section 9, Item (e), and I do believe that it would that it would give us that prerogative."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, I'm prepared to rule with regard to the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde's motion. Now he has raised a point of order concerning whether or not the amendments submitted by the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, is in compliance with Section 9 (e) of the 1970 Constitution of the State of Illinois. I have read the Section (e) and I see that it says among other things that the General Assembly may accept the specific recommendations made by the Governor by a record vote of a majority of the members elected to each House. I've also read the Attorney General's opinion that was sought by the Minority Leader of the Senate and it is my conclusion that only those amendments that vary from the specific recommendations amendments of the Governor, the that would change it by typographical errors or in form would be in order. Now, this particular amendment if you address yourself to it, makes



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

the point. The correction that the gentleman attempts to make in the Governor's amendment is to change the word chapter to title in two instances, and if that were all that were involved in this situation, I would rule that that amendment would be in compliance with the specific recommendations because it is a change in form that we could address ourselves to. But thereafter, he goes into questions concerning the provisions of this sub-section (e) which is beyond that which the Governor has recommended and I don't intend to have this General Assembly in a question of determining whether or not these situations are in compliance or not in compliance. He sends them back to us for typographical errors or form errors. We will address ourselves to those and have them submitted for consideration. But, I'm going to sustain the point of order raised by the Majority Leader. The gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Clyde L. Choate: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I understand, seriously, your explanation of sustaining the Majority Leader. Are you saying to me that in one instance a member of this General Assembly can introduce an amendment to his legislation that the Governor has sent back up here if it only changes a word. However, if it changes a a the nature of the legislation he will not have the prerogative of introducing the amendment?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, he can certainly attempt to submit his proposal as he sees it for consideration by this House. If there is a similar objection raised to that



which has been raised by the Majority Leader, I would rule in the same fashion that I am ruling here. If his amendment only varies from the Governor's specific recommendations in the nature of a typographical error or in the nature of a form change, and here it's a form change, for example, the word chapter, deleting that from the Governor's specific recommendations and putting in the word title. That's a form change. And I, in reading the Attorney General's opinion feel that those are within the bounds of propriety as far as General Assembly is concerned, but beyond that when they get into the question of the language that's submitted in Line 7 and 8, I think that's beyond the realm of typographical and beyond the realm of form and that I'm ruling in the nature of a an objection that the amendment itself would not, for example, be germane. And that's the basis for my ruling."

Clyde L. Choate: "Mr. Speaker, if you have a copy of the Attorney General's opinion, I would like to turn your attention to page 7, page 7 about the middle of the first paragraph, where it says 'my opinion for the reasons set out immediately below is that there should be some corrective ability', ability to correct, in other words. Then it goes on in the next Paragraph, and it says 'that it would seem that the General Assembly would not be limited to acceptance of a specific recommendation as precisely formulated or restricted but would have some latitude since the Governor might feel that the acceptance even



though somewhat modified, came within the spirit, if not the letter of his recommendation. Now, I I would feel that other language in the interpretation, says 'that such worthwhile objectives should not be thwarted by an interpretation that puts both the Governor and the General Assembly in a straight jacket of word definitions'. Now, I know that I'm picking out certain portions of the Attorney General's interpretation, but it seems to me that the meatiest of all is probably where he says it would seem that the General Assembly should not be limited to acceptance of a specific recommendation. In other words, it would leave a wee bit of power in the hands of the General Assembly to not accept specific recommendations and send back to the Governor the thinking of the Majority of the members of the General Assembly. And I would think, Mr. Speaker, that and you know that I'm attempting to be constructive about this, because I do feel strong about the General Assembly as I well know the Speaker does, I would think that Mr. Speaker before we really got into this iron-clad interpretation, as to what we can and can not do that we would deliberate on this subject matter to the extent that we will not be penalizing the members of this General Assembly if we can at all help otherwise."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, certainly, and without getting into a debate between the Minority Leader and the Speaker, the sentence right after the first sentence that you read on page 7 says 'however, the debates in the Constitutional



Convention as referred to hereafter indicates the delegates intended no flexibility and that no modification could be made'. Now, my ruling goes on over to page 14 and where they get into answering question one and the Attorney General says 'on a basis of a strict construction that if typographical errors only were corrected it is unlikely that anyone would raise an objection, if one would be raised, it would be unlikely that it would be entertained by any court'. And b, 'if the change had no substantive effect on the Governor's recommendation but was mechanical only and conformed to proper legislative procedure, it is unlikely that a question would be raised, however,' and this is interesting, 'even if a question were raised the court under the theory of no flexibility whatever would probably rule against the change', and then they go into the other three points. So, the Attorney General, it seems to me, and his opinion is not binding upon this General Assembly, and the separation of powers doctrine of the operation of government in the State of Illinois, but even giving it the fullest consideration with regard to point one, the Attorney General takes both sides of the issue as I see it, he says on the one hand there can be a flexibility on the part of interpretation, on the other hand, and he cites precedence, and on the other hand, he says that there can be strict construction, and it's the intention of the Chair to rule strictly with regard to this matter. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."



Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, are you then saying that with regards to this specific amendment, that if Mr. Terzich changes the word title to chapter it would be an acceptable amendment?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "I've indicated that the change from chapter to title would be ruled by me to be a formal change a change of form and that that would be one that could be submitted, because we would be abiding by the specific recommendation of the Governor. Turn the gentleman on."

Gerald W. Shea: "What I'm asking the Chair is if Mr. Terzich would redraft his amendment striking the word title and inserting the word chapter, it would then be an acceptable amendment?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes, provided that it in every other respect, the only changes that were made from ah at the specific recommendations of the Governor, were, it was exactly alike with what the Governor sent back, but the only change from what the Governor said would be a proposal from chapter to title, that is a matter of form. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde."

Henry J. Hyde: "If I may clarify what was just said, I think the Assistant Minority Leader is a little confused. Ah, what the Speaker said is that an exchange of the word chapter and title is a merely formal change and therefore that is acceptable, but any other changes beyond become form. Now, what Mr. Terzich has done here is change title and chapter and that's acceptable. That's merely a change



in form, there's no problem with that. So whether he has chapter or title is not essential to the viability of this amendment, but he changes more than that and therefore he goes beyond the specific recommendations of the Governor and this is what is objectable and that is what my motion relates to."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich rise?"

Robert M. Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, since this bill I feel is a very important bill and I think we all agree in content, that I want to comply with the Governor's recommendations and since it is a point of controversy, I'd like to pull it out of the record."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, if there's not objection, then leave will be granted to take it out of the record. We'll leave it on Amendatory Veto - Motions. For what purpose does the gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich rise?"

John S. Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, members of the House, because it relates so closely to this and so many of us, I think, are voting on these amendatory vetoes depending on the substance and importance of the bill, for example, last week. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "For what purpose do you rise?"

John S. Matijevich: "I'm sorry, a parliamentary inquiry."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Okay, state your point."

John S. Matijevich: "So many of us are voting on the substance and importance of a bill, for example, last week I



think there were some bills that we believe in principle, but we didn't believe in the amendatory recommendations of the Governor. Now, I was lead to believe by your interpretation of (e) that the bill if we do not approve the specific recommendations goes back to the Governor and I've been reading the constitution and I just can't understand how anybody can come to that conclusion and I wanted to re-iterate whether that is your conclusion, because it is so important to our particular vote, because as I read the constitution, it says 'such bills shall be presented to the Governor and if he certifies that such acceptance conforms to the specific recommendations, the bill shall become law, if he does not certify he shall return it as a vetoed bill to the House in which it originated'. My point is that particular sentence refers to whether we made some changes according to his specific recommendations but my point is if we do nothing by Wednesday at midnight, how can the bill go back to the Governor in my interpretation of this bill, the bill is dead."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "My interpretation last week was based upon a very clear delineation of that very point in Rule 100 which the Rules Committee has already submitted and was adopted very clearly says under Rule 100 that if the amendment fails to be adopted within 15 days after entry of the objection of the Governor upon the House Journal, the Clerk shall return the bill to the Governor. Now, that's what the rules say and the Rules Committee can take



that up at a at a session either tomorrow or the next day if there is some question about wanting to change it. Now what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos rise?"

Samuel C. Maragos: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

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

Samuel C. Maragos: "Ah, Mr. Terzich, Representative Terzich withdrew his bill at this time for consideration. Do I also interpret that your ruling on this is still in abeyance, it is not final? That's my question."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, once the matter was taken out of the record, there was the, we did not have to proceed, but my my ruling is not going to change, if and when that question is raised again."

Samuel C. Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I am asking therefore that you have you have not ruled on this question at this time as far as that still in abeyance. I want that for the record, because if I do then I have to take other actions as as a member of the House, if I. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, if you want, if you want to file a motion to over-rule the Chair, I'll make that ruling and say that that is the ruling right now."

Samuel C. Maragos: "I want to ask, sir, what it is, if it was withdrawn, sir, that's the that's my question? In other words, if everything's in abeyance with the withdrawal of the a motion at the present time, for postponed consideration?"



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ordinarily when a matter is taken out of the record, all actions with regard thereto are taken out of the record with it."

Samuel C. Maragos: "That's that's all I wanted to know, thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Harold Washington: "Just a parliamentary inquiry of the Speaker, if I may. My question, Mr. Speaker, is has the Senate interpreted Subsection (e) of the Veto Section of the Legislative Article in the same manner that you have? The reason I ask the question is because if they have not and they take a contrary interpretation, then there may be some confusion between the two houses."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, it won't be different than the past. No, I'm saying that what the Senate determines to do with regard to its rules is an internal matter, I would not interfere with them and I, in turn, would not expect the Senate to interfere with what our rules are here. We do have a joint rule proposal concerning some of these things which we are going to consider in the Rules Committee."

Harold Washington: "That has not been determined as yet."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "No, it hasn't been."

Harold Washington: "Then is it a possibility, Mr. Speaker, and I don't want to leave out the point, is there a possibility that you may recede from your tentative ruling?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "I would doubt it very much. All right,



on the a order of Amendatory Vetoes - Motions, appears a motion with regard to House Bill 2063 on which the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Randolph, Mr. Holloway."

James D. Holloway: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House as chief sponsor of House Bill 2063, I would like to move at this time that the amendment as prepared to that bill be adopted by the House."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? The question is shall the House adopt the amendment? All those in favor vote 'Yeas', and the opposed 'No'. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe."

Bernard B. Wolfe: "Ah, I can't find the particular amendment and I would appreciate if the sponsor would just briefly say what the amendment does."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the gentleman from Randolph, Mr. Holloway."

James D. Holloway: "I checked, the amendment is on the members' desks. All it does is delete the word 'truckster', page 2, line 8. Deletes the word 'truckster'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? Okay, all those in, ah, the Clerk will take the record. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Simmons."

Arthur E. Simmons: "If you delete the word 'truckster', then you would have 'a semi-trailer or trailer', is that correct? I believe that you would have to eliminate the comma also."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The comma's in the amendment that I have. 'Truckster' comma. It is in the amendment. So,



that with the amendment it would be 'a semi-trailer or trailer' having a gross weight. Truckster and the comma are deleted. On this question there's 121 'Yeas' and no 'Nays' and the amendment having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared adopted. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman rise? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, have a motion? Do you have a motion? You don't? House Bill. Second reading. Yeah, House Bills Second reading. All right, with leave of the House, we'll go back to House Bills second reading. House Bill 3638."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 3638. Bill for an act to amend Section 28-4 of the 'Election Code'. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, do we have copies of House Bill 3638 on our desks?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the amendment, the bill is not back from the printer so we will leave it on second reading until it is back. Resolutions."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Resolution 412, Roscoe Cunningham. House Resolution 413, Borchers. House Resolution 414, Schlickman, et.al."

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

Henry J. Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, these are the agreed Resolutions and House Resolution



412 extends to Allen Crane of Radio Station WBBM in Chicago our appreciation, respect and admiration for his work while he was down in Springfield broadcasting news of the State Government. House Resolution 413 is a death resolution memorializing the death of James L. Atkins of Decatur. House Resolution 414 heartily congratulates the John Hersey High School Marching Band and its able director, Mr. Don Caneva. I move adoption of the agreed Resolutions.

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor of the adoption of the agreed Resolutions list say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the 'Yeas' have it and the agreed Resolutions are adopted. Further Resolutions?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Joint Resolution - Constitution Amendment #10, Matijevich, et.al."

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

Henry J. Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there will be a meeting tomorrow morning at 10:00 A.M. of the Republican leadership and committee chairmen in the Speaker's Office at 10:00 A.M. All committee chairmen and Republican leadership in the Speaker's Office. I now move this House do stand adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 12:00 noon."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the 'Yeas' have it. The House will be in adjournment until 12:00 noon tomorrow."

Adjourn at 3:05 O'Clock P.M.



10/18/71
skn.

