

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ONE HUNDRED ELEVENTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

NOVEMBER 11, 1971

10:00 O'CLOCK A.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 John P. Downes - illness;

Representative Oral 'Jake' Jacobs - no reason given.



Doorkeeper: "All who are not entitled to the House chamber, will you please retire to the House gallery. Thank you. All who are not entitled to the House chamber, will you please retire to the House gallery. Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The Clerk will see that those persons not entitled to the floor are removed therefrom and those persons not entitled to be in the hallway are also removed. The invocation will be given by Dr. Johnson."

Dr. John Johnson: "We pray. The night is over and we give you hearty thanks for the rest and protection of this past night. We thank you for the gift of this new day and the opportunity to reflect your will and purposes in what we say and do. And now O Lord I stand quietly for this moment in your presence and ask for your guidance in carrying out these purposes. Let me go through this day with the quiet conscience. Let me go through this day with joy as I derive satisfaction from my work. Let me go through this day with serenity as I commit myself to your keeping. Above all let me go through this day mindful of the truth that I can bear witness to your mercy as I show mercy that I may bear witness to your power as I exercise power carefully that I may bear witness to your concern as I show concern for all who come within the circle of my responsibility and influence, that I may bear witness to your will as I do all that I can to let your kingdom come and your will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Hear us O God, our strength and our redeemer. Amen."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Will, Mr. O'Brien.
Roll call for attendance."

George M. O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House,
some ten days ago through the good offices of our chaplain,
Dr. Johnson, the House remembered my very ill daughter.
She has made a remarkable recovery and I would like to
suggest that there is nothing more likely to disturb the
stars than a two color bi-partisan heartfelt prayer
initiated by a distinguished chaplain. My wife and I are
greatful to you all."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Committee report."

Jack O'Brien: "Mr. Juckett from the Executive Committee to
which House Resolution 437 offered by Mr. Hudson, reported
the same back with the recommendation that the resolution
be adopted."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, there are a few matters
which are we're trying to get worked out and the ah lead-
ership on the Democratic side has asked that we could be
at ease for just about ten or fifteen minutes. Now, we
will when we come when we start up which will be at a
quarter til ten, I expect to immediately be going into
some controversial matters, so I will would like for the
members to all remain in their seats or either be back
when we start up. So, we'll just be at ease now for about
ten or fifteen minutes. There appears a Spring calendar
list of bills and I suggest you look at it carefully. It
will be passed around and if there are any questions,



additions or deletions to that, advise the Clerk so we'll be in shape with regard to that as the time arrives."

Recess at 9:30 O'Clock A.M.

Return at 9:45 O'Clock A.M.

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, we're going to have to get into session now with the members on the Mr. Barry would you notify the Minority Leadership that we're going to have to go into session and. . . All right, with leave of the House, we'll go to Senate Bills second reading. Senate Bill 1286."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1286, an act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of Southern Illinois University. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 1287."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1287, an act making an appropriation, reappropriation to the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 1299."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1299, an act making certain appropriations, reappropriations to the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois. Second reading of the bill."



No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 1281."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1281, a bill for an act to amend 'The Pension Code'. Second reading of the bill. No one committee amendment. Amend Senate Bill 1281 on page 1, lines 1 and 5, by striking 'Section 2-121' each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'Section 2-121 and 2-150'; and on page 1, line 6, by striking 'is' and inserting. . ."

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

Frank C. Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment One to Senate Bill 1281 is a committee amendment and what it does it adds a Section 2-150 to the Retirement System Reciprocal Act. Senate Bill 1281 is the article of the General Assembly article and I ask for the adoption of Amendment One to Senate Bill 1281."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? All those in favor of the adoption of the amendment say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the 'Yeas' have it and the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? Third reading. 1284."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1284, an act making a supplemental appropriation to the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor? Third



reading. 1310."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1310, an act making an appropriation to certain claims against the State of Illinois in conformity with awards made by the Court of Claims. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 1073."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1073, an act to amend Sections 13, 13(a) of an act providing for the Springfield Metropolitan Exposition and Auditorium Authority in Sangamon County. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number One, Jones. Amend Senate Bill 1073 on page 1, lines 1 and 9, by striking '13 and 13(a)' and inserting in lieu thereof '13, 13(a), 15(a) and 15(d)'; and on page 1, line 14, by striking the word 'The Authority shall have' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: and so forth."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones."

J. David Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this amendment to 1073 is an amendment to the Springfield Auditorium Authority and removes the language that is in the present 1073 and substitutes the provision that the Board of the Auditorium Authority will be elected at the general election rather than at the primaries, and I move its adoption."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? All those in favor of the adoption of the amendment say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the 'Yeas' have it and the amendment is adopted. Are there any further amendments? Third reading. 1280. 1280."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1280, an act to add Section 11.1 to an act in relation to State Treasurer. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number One, Choate. Amend Senate Bill 1280 in the House on page 1 by inserting immediately after line 29 the following: 'Section 2. This Act takes effect immediately upon its becoming a law'."

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

Clyde L. Choate: "Ah, very simple amendment Mr. Speaker. It simply says that when the bill becomes law, the State Treasurer will be able to act in pursuant to this bill and I would urge adoption of this amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? All those in favor of the adoption of the amendment say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the 'Yeas' have it and the amendment is adopted. Further amendments? Third reading. All right, with go to Senate Bills third with leave. Senate Bills third reading. Senate Bill 938."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 938, an act to amend Section 70 of and to add Section 66 (a) to 'The Business Corporation Act'. Third reading of the bill."



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

Daniel M. Pierce: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 938 passed the State Senate without a dissenting vote, unanimously, after having been approved in the Senate Judiciary Committee. It was debated extensively in the House Judiciary Committee as a result I put on Amendment Number One yesterday to remove some of the objections and to protect minority stockholders. What the bill does is to provide for a short form merger procedure in Illinois as recommended in the Model Uniform Laws, but Illinois only if the parent corporation owns 99% or more of the subsidiary corporation. The Uniform Model Act provides that if the parent corporation owns 90% or more, we've been much more restrictive, we made it 99% or more. The leading corporate state of our country, including New York, has a short form merger bill if the parent owns 95% or more, Delaware has it, the District of Columbia, which of course, laws are set by Congress, has a short form merger bill. The bill was debated extensively on its merits on second reading yesterday. It provides an alternative method for merging to subsidiary corporations or a subsidiary into a parent corporation. I urge passage of this bill which would put Illinois in line with the other major industrial states of the country and encourage corporations to remain in Illinois by making our law more in line with that of Delaware, New York, Pennsylvania and other leading corporate states."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? The gentleman



from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Harold A. Katz: "Ah, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to Senate Bill 938. The only thing the sponsor hasn't told us is why the bill is needed. He has told us that other states have this kind of provision, he hasn't told us that that makes it right. Other states have other laws that corporations have succeeded in getting in order to take advantage of small stock holders. Now, what is involved here is very simple. We have in governmental units the right of eminent domain. You can take somebody's property without their being willing to do so. That is considered to be a function of the state. You can take somebody's property even if they object to it, you can pay fair value, and what this kind of bill does is to give the power of eminent domain to a corporation. It says that the corporation can take the stock of a minority stock holder against his will, just by paying him the money. Now, we have the right to do that, but we are a governmental entity. But what they're saying is that a private corporation should be given the right of eminent domain. Why should this be so? These bills have been in this legislature for the four sessions that I've been in. They are drafted by corporations lawyers who represent the big corporations who want to get rid of troublesome minority stock holders. Every time this bill has been before us, it has been supported by corporation lawyers acting through bar associations, and every time it has been rejected by this House,



because we are interested in trying to protect individuals who may be minority stock holders. Why should not a man who owns 1% of the stock of a corporation be as entitled to protection as a man who owns 10% or a man who owns 15%? There is no reason given here why there is any fairness in this bill. I have not seen any corporations leave Illinois for New York and other states and I would hope that this House would continue to protect the rights of individuals in political elections, regardless of whether they may be half of 1% and in corporate elections and in corporate procedures regardless of how little stock they may own. I see no reason why the power of eminent domain should be given to the large corporations and so I will oppose Senate Bill 938 and I hope that many of you may join me."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Further discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Burditt."

George M. Burditt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it isn't very often that we have the opportunity of taking sides between the two gentlemen that just spoke, but I'd be happy to jump into the breach on the side of the chief opponent to this bill. There isn't anybody going to lose any property without full compensation by this bill, be it 1% or less than 1% shareholder is going to be paid in full for his interest. It's simply a matter of providing in our statute for a situation where one recalcitrant shareholder who is been holding onto a very tiny minority of the shares is being taken out of the picture so that he can't



tie up the corporate progress. But in doing that he's fully paid for every bit of his stock, so this is a good bill, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, and I'd urge you all to vote for it."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."
Samuel C. Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, with some reluctance, I rise in opposition to this measure. And the reason that I say I rise with some reluctance, I was hoping yesterday if the Katz amendment was adopted that I this bill could have been to a certain degree more palatable to me and I think that many of us here that are not only concerned with the minority stock holders, but also a concern to a great degree of the rate users of public utilities, and that means the consumer at large. Let us review what this bill is trying to do. In essence, it's not trying to do something it can not do under the long form merger proceedings for corporations. You can proceed and still accomplish this fact with the long term merger, except that it becomes more difficult and more costly for the parent company to bring this about, but however more importantly when it does have the long form procedures as many of the steps that have to be given for the minority stockholder, it receiving notices and having proxy statements, and therefore the short form is always more palatable and much easier as we who practice some corporate law are familiar with. Now, the thing that concerned me and I say it in due fairness to the sponsor of the bill and those who



are pushing this bill, they did make it more palatable by the amendment the sponsor of this amendment did bring yesterday. Mr. Pierce, in showing that as long as they are going to take that minority stockholder's shares away from him, they are going to make some extra effort to make sure it's a fair price for what he's be giving up. However, there's nothing in this measure or any other part of the public utilities law which states that when a corporate company and a parent company which deals or merely a corporation outside of the State of Illinois, of which the subsidiary is an Illinois corporation, does come for rate increases in this state before the Illinois Commerce Commission that when they come before them that they'll only show their records and they'll show the profits and losses of that particular company that is being used in Illinois. And if we may use the terminology here of the telephone company, the A.T&T. may come in for raises later on after they usert not usert, but take over the the I.B.T. which has been a well run company these many years and then show that if there's been any losses for I.B.T. it will not necessarily be losses because of customer usage in Illinois, but because of its other subsidiary and other involvements with other states. So, from that angle, from that point alone, I personally object to this bill and I say I do it reluctantly, because I think that the sponsor has made a good effort and I believe an honest effort to make this more palatable to the objections that were raised in the Judic-



ary Committee, however, not enough to take care of the question of the rate uses in our state and the ultimate consumers and who have no voice support and who have no ability to express their opinion, except to pay when these rates are hiked up before the commission, because of proper records or the correct records in my way of thinking would not be produced at these hearings. Now, one other thing that this does, even though many other states do comply have used this as a basis of taking over minority stockholders control and I'm just wondering if we set up a precedent at this time. Yes, we say 99% stockholding control right now, but maybe in a year from now we come with an amendment for 95%, so I ask each of you in due to look at this bill very carefully and make up your opinions, but be assured that whatever your opinion may be that you're not being thought that you didn't do this without proper thought and that you felt that maybe you did get all the information possible, and that's why I had to speak on this bill and I insist and ask that you vote 'No'."

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

J. Theodore Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It seems that yesterday and for the last several weeks we've been discussing ethics House Bill 3700 will eventually provide for an ethical disclosure of stock interests, and one of the in fact the only stock that I own is approximately 200 shares in Illinois Bell Telephone Company. I inherited this stock from my father at his death in 1958. It steadily



increased in terms of approximately every two years the shareholders including the Majority shareholder, who is A.T.&T. has offered the opportunity to purchase stock as they are next month at a significantly lower than market rate. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, what this bill is best classified as is corporate eminent domain. This is a bad bill, it's personally bad for me. This is the third time in my five years of being down here that it has popped up and I hope that this bill will be defeated this year as it has on previous occasions. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Raymond W. Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think you ought to take a careful look at what we're doing. Number One, if you really read the bill and read the emotional aspect out of it, you find out that what you're really talking about is dealing in relationship between a parent and a subsidiary corporation. Now, we're not talking about corporations and when we talk about close knit families in this instance, we're talking about a situation where the parent owns 99% of the stock. Now, we can talk about it anyway you want to, but when you own 99% of the stock, the 1% that's outstanding in terms of the interrelations between the parent and the subsidiary, it's necessary if you're going to deal in business and if you are going to keep some of the corporations of this country healthy and some of the corporations capable of providing employment and economic opportunity, then you're going to



have to sit up and try to do some of the things and help them a little. Now, I think this measure is eminently fair, you're not taking anything away from a the minority shareholders, because they have a perfect right to come into court and get their fair dollar or if they object to it on any they have a chance to get their fair dollar by the courts. Now, when we start engaging again in family relations and that's what I would speak of this as, a bill between a parent and subsidiary, we're again getting into an area where we would have this legislature also look over the relationship between parents and children. I think that this bill on its face is adequate, it's fair, and remember we're only talking about those corporations where they own 99% of the stock. Clearly, this is reasonable. It's not a grab where you start off with 51% of the stock and you attempt to grab a company. I'm suggesting what we do is read the bill. There have been some notions that rates will increase because of Illinois Bell and A.T.&T. I suggest to you that in this economy, we're going to have wage increases, rate increases and the like across the board irrespective. There will be some degree of inflation. That is not the issue. I think we ought to look at the bill, what it says and what it does and give it a fair vote on its face. Thank you."

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

Corneal A. Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not a corporation lawyer and I don't own any



stock in either one of these two. But let me say this to you. I know enough to know that this bill rejects the principles, the essential principles of Illinois corporate law that all shareholders of a corporation are entitled to go in together. They go along together, now why take away the little power that the majority shareholders have? I asked a question here yesterday and it has not been answered. My question was if such a merger of Illinois Bell and A.T.&T. could be accomplished under existing congressional law, why this bill? Now, I get this I get upon this floor and talk for minorities and I'm still talking for minorities. Why do you want to shut their mouths? Why don't you want to give them the chance to come in that the shareholder's meeting, the chance that the Illinois law gives them. If they have this chance under this bill, then why do you want to pass it?"

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

Daniel M. Pierce: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, in answer to my colleague from New Trier Township, Representative Katz, anything that is done under this bill in the way of taking over minority shares can now be done under present Illinois law, if you have two-thirds control of the corporation, by going through the expense of a shareholder's meeting, so we're not creating a new a new form of eminent domain. Any corporation that owns two-thirds of another corporations' stock can merge, dissolve, sell or do anything they want to with that



corporation. I can assure the House and I feel very strongly about this, that this bill has nothing to do with rate regulation. I'm as opposed to some of the rate increases utilities have been receiving Illinois Bell as anyone in this room. Now, maybe the gentleman from Cook is not opposed because he's a stockholder of Illinois Bell, but I'm opposed, I'm opposed to a lot of these rate increases myself and I would not be here today if I felt that this bill had anything to do with the rates. There'll always be an Illinois subsidiary of A.T.&T. to come before the state regulatory body, and the state regulatory body's must separate out the intra-state costs, charges, and expenses from the interstate in order to obtain their rates from the commission. This is done in every state. There's not a state in the country where A.T.&T. doesn't have a operating subsidiary. It never operates local telephones itself, because it's required to separate out the intra-state and interstate. The federal securities laws are still available to every minority stockholder. There's nothing in this bill that in any way, nor do we have the power in the Illinois legislature in any way to amend or detract from the federal security laws and your rights as a shareholder under the federal security laws. You can still go to court and challenge any majority shareholder, any directors or officers that are taking advantage in violating the federal security laws. This bill has been proposed in the legislature before, not by irresponsible or corporate



attorneys but by the Illinois State Bar and Chicago Bar in part of their joint program. It's in the model business corporation act of the American Bar Foundation providing for a subsidiary of 90% or more ownership. In order to restrict the bill, we made it 99% or more. This bill would put Illinois in line with the other major corporate states. Corporations have been leaving Illinois and incorporating in Delaware, in New Jersey and in Nevada and other states regularly throughout the past decade. This has been happening and will continue to happen unless we bring Illinois corporation laws in line with the other advanced states such as New York, Delaware, Pennsylvania, where the business community is able to establish corporate structures with state taxation and regulation. My record in this legislature has not been one to avoid taxing of regular corporations. I favored a double income tax on corporations over that on individuals. I advocated this bill because it modernizes our state corporation laws."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question is shall Senate Bill 938 pass? All those in favor will vote 'Yeas', and the opposed 'No'. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fleck."

Charles J. Fleck: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, I've listened to the debate quite closely on this particular bill and as far as I can see I don't see any corporate eminent domain involved here when you have a parent corporation which owns 99% of its subsidiary, there's going to be a merger and there's



going to be fair and equal payment for the minority share holders interest. Secondly, as I said yesterday, I don't see any rates being affected here and thirdly what's the necessity for this? Well, the necessity is quite clear. The Illinois corporation law dealing with tremendously large corporations is antiquated. It does not provide for expeditious and efficient ways for corporations to merge when they should. I think this bill provides for a speedy merger to due to the fact that the public utilities involved, it's to the benefit of the state and the citizens and I think that we should all give it a favorable vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 114 'Yeas' and 13 'Nays' and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. For what purpose does the gentleman from Johnson, Mr. McCormick rise?"

C. L. McCormick: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I thought that since we have a former Republican colleague on the floor, Eddie Wolbank from Chicago, that we ought to recognize him."

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

Samuel C. Maragos: "I'd like to state since we have a former Democratic colleague up here, Mr. Wolbank I'd like to recognize him."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "With leave of the House, we'll go to Senate Bills second, Senate Bill 1301."



Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1301, a bill for an act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the equal education opportunity department of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 1311."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1311, a bill for an act to make a supplemental appropriation to the Department of Registration and Education. Second reading of the bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "No committee amendments."

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

John C. Hirschfeld: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, while we have a brief lull, I thought that I might introduce the government class of Mahomet - Seymour High School which is from Representative Stone's, Clabaugh's and my district, together with their instructor, Mr. Mike Kilford. They're in the Speaker's balcony. I wonder if they might stand, please."

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

Gerald W. Shea: "I wonder if Representative Hirschfeld would yield for a question?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Will the gentleman yield?"

Gerald W. Shea: "Ah, Representative Hirschfeld, how many new



voters are there in that group up there?"

John C. Hirschfeld: "There are 15 and they're all Republicans."

Gerald W. Shea: "But I want to know did they let them register in Champaign County."

John C. Hirschfeld: "I assure you they have, Representative Shea."

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

Harry Yourell: "A verification."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, for what purpose do you rise?"

Robert E. Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, they all may be Republicans, but they're sitting on the Democratic side."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Clabaugh."

Charles W. Clabaugh: "In reply to the question of Representative Shea, if they are registered, they are registered because they have a right to register, they live there."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ah, with leave of the House we'll go to consideration postponed where there appears Senate Bill 915 and there's been a request to take it back to the order of second reading for the purposes of amendments. If there is no objection, we'll do that and the Clerk will read the amendments."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amend. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Carroll, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"



Howard W. Carroll: "Mr. Speaker, having returned the bill to second reading, I would ask leave to table Amendment Number One which had been adopted last year. Having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote and therefore table the bill, table the amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there objection? All right. Then there's leave then to table the amendment, up, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Richard Walsh."

Richard A. Walsh: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman would just explain the amendment that he's trying to have tabled."

Howard W. Carroll: "The amendment that we're trying to table Representative Walsh was the amendment that would have paid the Magistrates at a rate of \$29,500.00 in Cook County and \$25,000.00 downstate. The original bill as it came over here was \$32,500.00 in Cook County and \$28,000.00 downstate. We had adopted the amendment lowering that by \$3,000.00. We're now trying to table that amendment for the purpose of adding another amendment."

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

Richard A. Walsh: "Ah, now this this bill ah Howard after the amendment is tabled, is it going to be in the form it was in as it passed the Senate or is it still a House amendment on the bill?"

Howard W. Carroll: "Ah, at that stage it will be in the exact form it came over from the Senate. The other amendment



that had been offered did not pass, the other amendment."

Richard A. Walsh: "All right, then do you propose to offer another amendment now that it's going back to second reading?"

Howard W. Carroll: "It's back on second reading, there is amendments that will be proposed. I personally have none, but there are two that I know of."

Richard A. Walsh: "Well, then the amendment that you're tabling is the one that would give the Magistrates salary increases, is that right? Or the former Magistrates?"

Howard W. Carroll: "Yes, the amendment that I'm tabling is would have given the former Magistrates salary increases, now Associate Judges, a pay raise. The bill as it would then read if that is tabled would also have given them a pay raise."

Richard A. Walsh: "Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The amendment, read the amendment, is that?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number, . . . Amendment Number Three, Hyde. Amend Senate Bill 915 in the House on page 1, line 1, by striking 'Section'. . ."

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

Henry J. Hyde: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment Number Three to Senate Bill 915 is provides for increase in the salaries of the judges in the State of Illinois as follows: the Judges of the Supreme Court which now make \$40,000.00 annually under this amendment will get



\$42,200.00. They had sought in the original bill that was here last week had provided for \$42,500.00, but to keep the increases within the 5.5% of the Phase II guidelines, the increase suggested here is \$42,200.00. The Judges of the Appellate Court get \$37,500.00, under this amendment would get \$39,500.00, a \$2,000.00 increase. The Judges of the Circuit Court that now get \$27,500.00 would get \$29,000.00, however in the single district counties, which are Cook and DuPage, there is a county add on of \$7,500.00. Ah, the ah these are the changes except for the judicial circuits other than in other words in the downstate judicial circuits, the salary for lawyer associates is \$18,500.00 and there is no change in that. Also the non-lawyer associates will get \$15,000.00. There are 22 downstate non-lawyer judges. The first judicial circuit, which is Cook County, the associates, there is no change again, \$18,500.00 and \$4,500.00. Now, I might point out that there was great controversy last week when another bill was offered in the providing for these increases. The associate judges or the former magistrates who are now associate judges it was felt they were entitled to an increase and these were not provided in the other bill. As a result the motion to concur in the Governor's suggestions which deleted their increase failed, and as we ah and as a result there are no increases being provided for any judges in the State. This amendment actually restores them back to the Governor's suggestion and in the interim the President of the downstate



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

associate judges, Judge Schonkweiler and the President of the Cook County associate judges, Judge Palmer have visited me, have provided me with a letter stating that they are anxious that this amendment be adopted and this bill be passed, because they do accept as do I a commitment from the Governor that in the next year an increase will be provided the Associates, and I might add that the increase will exceed the 5.5% which is only \$1,000.00 now that is being provided the other judges. So, the Associate Judges are satisfied and are urging the adoption of this amendment and the passage of this bill. They are attempting to wait until next year when they feel and I feel also that their increase will more than offset the delay that they're encountering getting their increase and so at that I would urge the adoption of Amendment Number Three to Senate Bill 915."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Hirschfeld."

John C. Hirschfeld: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I find it very difficult to cross swords with the distinguished Majority Leader and I think this is the first time I have done this in my short tour of duty down here, but I also had an opportunity of speaking with an Associate Circuit Judge, formerly Magistrate John Schonkweiler for an hour and a half in my law office over the week-end via the telephone and Mr. Schonkweiler, I've also spoken to him before on this matter and Mr. Schonkweiler,



Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is a lawyer magistrate and I think that is to be considered, and he told me the contents of the letter that he was addressing to Mr. Hyde and to Mr. Choate and to other members, I believe, of the House. Most of us did not receive that letter. Now, what Mr. Schonkweiler told me was that the Governor stated that he would in no circumstances provide a raise for lawyer or non-lawyer magistrates this year, but that hopefully if the budget permits, next year the lawyer magistrates would be able to receive \$23,500.00. But Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's been no commitment whatsoever for the non-lawyer magistrates and Mr. Schonkweiler informed me that the reason this was not in there was because the Governor was not particularly in favor of non-lawyer magistrates. Well, I stood up here on the floor of this House a week ago and opposed the other bill and I am going to oppose the amendment on this bill. Because it's my personal opinion that the 22 non-lawyer magistrates we have in this state do as good a job if not a better job than many of the lawyers magistrates. We work as I stated before, from early in the morning until 2:00 A.M. in the morning on a judicial pay raise bill last June and this House saw fit to grant a raise, \$21,500.00 across the board for lawyers and non-lawyers magistrates. Now, I am still concerned and I have been concerned about the fact that we may become a one man legislature because of the gubernatorial veto powers that have been installed in the new constitution. It seems to me



that if we can provide a 5% raise for the Supreme Court and the Appellate Court and the Circuit Judges that the Governor should be able to provide a 5% raise to the lawyers and non-lawyer magistrates even if he has a particular ax to grind with the non-lawyer magistrates, and I think this body has got a perfect opportunity to show that we still are the legislative branch of the government and to defeat this particular amendment so that the Governor will either be forced to give the non-lawyer magistrates a raise and the lawyer magistrates a raise if we saw fit last June, or else give none of the judges a raise, and you can bet your bottom dollar that if we stand firm on this that there will be enough pressure put on by the Supreme Court Judges, the Appellate Court Judges and the Circuit Court Judges to see to it that those that are not as lofty in a position can also get what I consider to be a very fair cost of living index raise and I urge you to defeat this amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I join with my colleague, Representative Hirschfeld and some of his allegations to what has happened. Let's be very honest with each other as being a non-member of the bar association and I'm not a member or an officer of the court I have no conflicts on exactly how I feel about pay raises and I think we should be logical in our approach, I think



we should go about this in an orderly fashion, but this amendment is deficient in a couple areas. First of all, we only take care of DuPage County for an add on. I'd like to know what the hell is the matter with Lake County and McHenry County for an add on for our Circuit Magistrates. I would like to know what makes a Judge sitting in Cook or DuPage County different than a Judge sitting in Lake County or McHenry County. I'd like to say I'm tired of sitting here and listening to add ons now that because DuPage County is getting to be a little bigger, that we're going to allow them to do it. Why think a Judge sitting in McHenry County is just as good a judge as anyone sitting in Cook or DuPage County and I certainly think that this amendment is certainly deficient in this area. Number two, who needs a pay raise at this time? Let's let's be honest. Is a person earning \$40,000.00 a year in desperate, dire straights about needing a pay raise? We're talking about welfare crisis, we're talking about needs and public aid and we're going to worry, take up the time of this House and the time of the members of the General Assembly and talk about giving a pay raise to somebody that's making \$40,000.00 a year. Are we insane?"

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

James Pate Philip: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I certainly would agree 100 per cent with the distinguished Representative from McHenry County and if he'll



remember last session that I supported the proposition that all the judges in the State of Illinois receiving the same pay and that still has been my position. I don't think that downstate judges should affect the second class judges. Now, wouldn't it be very interesting to have the state representatives and state senators in Cook County, the State Senators to get \$7,500.00 a year extra and the State Representatives to get \$4,500.00 a year extra? I quite frankly don't think that they're entitled to it, but that happens to be the law and I would suggest that, that this is a step perhaps in the right direction saying that all one county circuits are provided add on out of the local general fund, the county fund. Now, that at this point would only provide add on for one county and that would be DuPage, and I would assume that when we come back here next year that we're going to be reapportioning the circuit. That will also include, perhaps, counties like Lake, Winnebago, Kane, St. Clair, Madison, and so they'll be quite a few counties downstate that will also be provided with the add ons."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all. . .any further discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. McDevitt."

Bernard McDevitt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Majority Leader referred to a letter that he had received from Judge Schonkweiler. This letter was directed to him and to Minority Leader Choate and myself. There's been some misunderstanding about the contents, so if you'll bear



with me, I'd like to read it to you to show you the position that has been taken by these Associate Judges, the former Magistrates, in which they ask that the increase in the bill now presented to you with the amendment be awarded to the Judges. Ah, the letter's dated November 5. Gentlemen: The defeat by the House of Senate Bill 1098 has given rise to the fact that no judges in the State will receive a salary increase during the year 1971. Many reasons have been given explaining the vote of the House, one of them being the Governor's veto of that part of the bill that applied to Associate Judges. The Governor has made his views clear. He will not sign a bill providing for salary increase to Associate Judges this year. As such, any package salary increase including raises for Associate Judges would again be vetoed. We're extremely gratified that members of the House strongly believe that Associate Judges are deserving of increase. However, we do not feel that we wish to jeopardize the salaries of other members of the judiciary who are also deserving of a raise. In conversation with the Governor since the veto, he's indicated to Representatives of the Associates Judges and Representatives of the Judicial Advisory Council that he would again veto any bill that came to his desk providing a raise to Associate Judges. He cited fiscal reasons for this and indicating that it would cost the state almost \$1 million. He further indicated, however, that he would definitely support a raise for Associate Judges in any bill introduced



after January 1, 1972, and see that money was budgeted for that purpose. In line with the above, the governing boards of both the county and the associate state judges have agreed to and in fact have actively supported the amended bill stating the Governor's recommendations. We now submit the following suggestion for your consideration and support. Amend Senate Bill 915 which fortunately is still on the House calendar and presently concerns Associate Judges only to conform to the Governor's recommendations. We urge its passage by the necessary three-fifths vote in both Houses, so that such increase would take effect immediately upon signing this by the Governor. The result, of course, would be that all judges, except Associates, would get the raises approved by both Houses last June. We would hope that the Associate Judges in January, 1972, would receive the same, warm and active support from the members of the House, as displayed this past week, and because of the lack of time in communicating directly with each member of the House, you have our permission to read this letter on the floor of the House or show to any legislative you see fit. If necessary, we'd be willing to come to Springfield and speak to the House as a whole or any individual members. Sincerely yours. Signed, Burton H. Palmer and John P. Schonkweiler."

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

Howard W. Carroll: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The amendment to Senate Bill 915



offered by the distinguished Majority Leader, Mr. Hyde, does more than what has been bandied around this floor. It also takes the Sections of the Judicial Article which have always been confusing that have always been improperly interwoven and improper legislative conduct rewrites these in a reasonable, parallel and understanding manner. In doing that, it includes the raises that he has reiterated. These raises are within the federal 5.5% guidelines. These raises are within what has been asked of us by both the Judges Association, the former Magistrates, the Governor's Office, and this body which last June sent out a bill which includes these raises, in fact we're reduced them even slightly in one area. What we are attempting to do to this amendment is follow the will of this body. We have not gotten it to the area of the new Associate Judges and I know many of us have different feelings about lawyer and non-lawyer former magistrates, about add ons and non-add ons. The whole purpose of this amendment is not to get into that at this time. If they are willing to wait, I don't see why we shouldn't be willing to wait as to them and I might remind you that the constitution of 1970, in the Judiciary Article in Section 11, says that the eligibility for office of either Judge or Associate Judge, that he must be an attorney at law. When you're talking about non-lawyer Associate Judges, there's a question about whether there they will be in the future be eligible. We know they can't be replaced by another non-lawyer, because



the constitution prohibits it. And the question will be whether when they come up for renewal of office if they will even be able to take the oath a second time. They took the oath this time before the constitution went into effect or they wouldn't have been eligible under this constitution. We're talking about a body of 22 lawyers, of 22 non-lawyers who are doing the work of lawyers, but who after this, when it comes time to be renewed, will not be eligible for office. I don't think that this should be a prime concern at this time. I think we should pass this amendment, put the whole Judicial Article in proper shape, in proper language with parallel language and then move on. Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Roscoe D. Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. How tragic it would be if we passed this particular bill. How difficult it would be to face the people from Chicago when they come down here and tell us that they need Public aid, to continue to live. How difficult it would be when we come back home and meet our voters and try to explain to them why we raised the salary of people who already made many times the average salary of those same voters. The time has come for this House to quit paying lip service to the cause of economy. How many times do we have to beat this judicial pay raise? Last week in Senate Bill 1098 we went firmly on record as opposed to any pay raise at any



type for this time for these judges. We need to stand by this resolution. I want to publicly commend my friend, Representative Hanahan, as a new recruit to the cause of economy and government and lower salaries for public officials. How much better it would be in this instance to take the \$1 million which you propose to fritter away on the judges per year and give it to the crisis in Chicago for public aid. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We could transfer that \$1 million. We realize it'd only be a drop in the bucket, but it'd be a drop in the right direction, and I hope that the newspapers, and particularly the world's greatest newspaper have a more accurate count nose count on the number of lawyers who dare to defy the judiciary into opposing this bill. We'll all feel better for having done our duty if we'll vote 'No'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Pappas."

Pete Pappas: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I urge the support of the House to defeat this amendment. The letter that was just read by Bernie McDevitt, to me is nothing but legalized black mail. What can an Associate Judge do when the Supreme Court Judge, the Appellate Judge and the Circuit Judges say this is what it's going to be. How can an employee argue with his boss? I think we should stand up on our own two feet, do what we've tried to do all this year and defeat this amendment and show them that if one should get their raise, everybody should get a



raise. Let's defeat this amendment."

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

Henry J. Hyde: "Ah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I won't ah attempt to reply to every representative's remark that was made about this amendment, some of which I must sign as manifestations of pique at some local judge, no doubt, but I it was highly ironical to hear the distinguished gentleman from McHenry do a 180 degrees turn on pay raises. He, who has proposed pay increases for the Governor to \$60,000.00 a year and substantial mind boggling increases on every state official, he has been in the vanguard of that including legislative pay raises and he has set new standards of increases for salary, so to hear him suddenly turn on the judges and say that they shouldn't get a 5.5% increase was astounding to say the least. Now, as far as the distinguished gentleman from Champaign, I think we should encounter the real world and know that a 5.5% increase on \$18,500.00 is about \$1,000.00. That isn't much of an increase and I am willing as our Associate Judges to accept the commitment of the Governor and others that they will get an increase next year and I am confident that it will exceed the pittance of the \$925.00 or \$1,000.00 that they would be entitled to under this bill. I hate to be more Russian than Joe Stalin, but the fact is the Associate Judges have asked for this in the expectation and the very reasonable expectation that they will get this a substantial



increase next year and I'm willing to accept that, so I would ask adoption of the amendment, which, by the way is not final passage of the bill, we're just seeking to adopt an amendment, so I ask for its adoption."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question is shall the amendment be adopted? All those in favor of the amendment number three. All those in favor of the amendment will vote 'Yeas', the opposed 'No'. The gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Barry."

Tobias Barry: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, without wasting the time of the House, you've heard my arguments on this subject many times before, I would like to be recorded as voting 'Present'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Barry, 'Present'. On this question, the gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipword, 'Present'? Yeah, there are, take the record. On this question, there are Sevcik, 'Yeas'. Take the record. Alsup, 'Present', 'Present', yeah. On this question, there are 95 'Yeas' and 36 'Nays' and the amendment is adopted. Further amendments?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number Four, Philip. Amend House Bill 915, Amend Senate Bill 915 in the House as amended, amend Amendment Number Three to Senate Bill 915 in the House on page 3 by striking lines 3 and 4 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(a) In judicial circuits other than any judicial circuit which consists of no more than one county, each'; and on page 3 by striking lines 10 and



ll and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(b) In any judicial circuit which consists of no more than one county, each associate judge shall be paid, '."

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

James Pate Philip: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 915 in its present form just provides for a one county circuit for circuit judges. What my amendment provides is that also would include the Cook County add on for all one county circuits for Associate Circuit Judges. I move the adoption of Amendment Number Four."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any discussion? All those in favor say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the 'Yeas' have it and the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number Five, Williams. Amend Amendment Number Three to Senate Bill 915 in the House on page 3 by inserting after line 23 the following: 'Section 4. This amendatory Act of 1971 shall be repealed upon the occurrence of the event that the sum appropriated in Public Act 77-271, page 2, line 22, 'For General Assistance and Local Aid to the Medically Indigent under Articles VI and VII' is exhausted and depleted, provided that such event occurs prior to July 1, 1972'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Williams."

Gale Williams: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I offer Amendment Number Five to Senate Bill 915 and I can't help this morning but be somewhat disturbed



when we spent the last three or four weeks, Mr. Speaker, talking about ethics in the General Assembly. And where do we find ourselves on the morning of November 11? We find the lawyers in the General Assembly sponsoring a bill to give the judges of Illinois a pay raise. And all at the same time, we've got people in Illinois that's hungry, Mr. Speaker, and all this amendment would do, this appropriation is not in the budget, and the sponsor knows this better than I do. This appropriation is not in the budget. We all know it's not in there. All this amendment would do would say that judges could get a pay raise, Mr. Speaker, if the money's available, but if the money's exhausted for general assistance, in the Public Aid Department, it would mean they could not get their pay raise. I think it's utterly ridiculous to talk about giving judges a pay raise and people going to bed hungry in Illinois. I come from a district where if there's any fat cats in Illinois, it's certainly the judges. I would hope that the members of this General Assembly, as Representative Hanahan just told you, and Representative Cunningham, I think it's long overdue that we do something about the pay raises for judges. You and I know the damn judges are ridiculous in coming in here asking for a pay raise. When a man's paid \$40,000.00 a year to sit over here in a building and class himself as one of the untouchables, and that's what they think they are, they put on a little robe and go in and sit down in a chamber with two or three secretaries floating around them.



and they sit there and how many cases do they hear? They are being paid at the rate of \$400.00 an hour. If you would figure it on an hourly basis. I think that it's ridiculous and I would think the lawyers in this General Assembly in order to keep your ethics half way clean, just half way clean, that you would lay off this bill and clean up your own ethics. I think that it's time that we start looking and looking hard at who's handling these bills. Now, they said who endorsed this bill? It was endorsed by the judges, isn't that just ducky? That the judges would endorse themselves a pay raise and they expect you and I to vote for it and then the papers will write the editorials talking about you and I giving them a pay raise and still we're talking about economy; we're telling people who're hungry that there's no money, we're telling people that wants roads, there's no money, we're telling higher education, that we've got to raise tuition, that young people can't go to school, because tuition's already beyond their means, but we can give the judges \$40,000.00 a year salary. We've got the money for that, we're saying. So, I urge the adoption of this amendment, Mr. Speaker, I think it's a good one."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those. . .the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Simmons."

Arthur E. Simmons: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the wording of that amendment states that this is to amend another amendment, and I question that procedure."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I think frankly it's the only way that it can be clear just what we are dealing here, the amendment here that Mr. Hyde put on stripped the bill, so in order to correctly refer to the page numbers, etc. that these subsequent amendments are addressing themselves to, it had to be the page numbers in the in that amendment, so it's very clear from reading it what is intended and the last amendment we adopted offered by Mr. Philip was in the same language. All those in favor of the adoption of the amendment say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the 'Yeas' have it and the amendment is adopted. Further amendments?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number Six, Williams. . . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "You want a roll call? All right, okay. Further amendments?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment, . . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "How many, well, do we have the number five, six, is that what you're saying? Ah, further amendments?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number Six, Williams. Amend Amendment Number Three to Senate Bill 915 in the House on page 3 by inserting after line 23 the following: 'Section 4. This amendatory Act of 1971 shall be subject to Executive Order 11615, dated August 15, 1971, as issued by the President of the United States to stabilize prices, rents, wages and salaries, together with any modification or extension thereof by or pursuant to Federal Law, including but not limited to any rule, order, regulation or



guideline of the Cost of Living Council or the Pay Board'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Williams."

Gale Williams: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment Number Six is a very simple amendment and I think the bill would come under whether this amendment was adopted but I would like to speak about it. It simply says that the pay raise will be subject to the Federal Wage and Price freeze and I don't think that's asking too much to ask the judges to comply with the Federal Court order, so I would move the adoption of Amendment Number Six."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, all those in favor say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the 'Yeas' have it and the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? Third reading. All right, with leave of the House, we'll go to the Speaker's table on which there appears House Bill 3700. Now, that inadvertently was left off the ah on the concurrences on the on the calendar and ah I would like to indicate to the membership that it is the intention after we concur in the 3700 that we will take a lunch break, for about an hour and a half or so. All right, the gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Lindberg, in connection with the Senate action regarding House Bill 3700."

George W. Lindberg: "Ah, first, Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry. Ah, yesterday I believe that we simply took the bill out of the record, so that if I were to desire to withdraw that motion, I take it it's not necessary



if I wanted to make a new motion at this time."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes, it has been the ruling of the Chair that when leave is given to take a matter out of the record, that anything in connection with that is taken out of the record with it."

George W. Lindberg: "All right, then, Mr. Speaker, ah ah I would like to move that we do not concur in the Senate amendments to 3700 and by way of explanation, let me simply say that many of the comments that were made on the floor of the House yesterday, I took note of and spent the total night up until 4:00 A.M. this morning reviewing all of those criticisms, and it is my conclusion in weighing all of the considerations that were brought out on the floor and also incidentally because I have some question as to the viability of the double dipper amendment, which is number two, for that reason, I have concluded that we should move to not concur in those Senate amendments, and I so move."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Richard O. Hart: "Would the sponsor yield to a question?"

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

Richard O. Hart: "Ah, George, what percent of these are good and what percent of these are bad?"

George W. Lindberg: "It got down to this, Dick, I suddenly realize that we had gone over the 51% bad mark, so we have 51% bad and 49% good and for that reason, I think we ought not concur."

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



Raymond W. Ewell: "Would the sponsor yield to a question?"

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

Raymond W. Ewell: "Mr. Lindberg, is there any reason why we couldn't just leave this to the discretion of the Governor and his amendatory veto and get it out of the way now?"

George W. Lindberg: "Yeah, the big problem among many of the others raised is the fact that when the Senate amended 3700 they also struck the emergency clause, so we would leave here without having any possibility, we would leave here with the possibility of not having passed the bill that would be effective in time for our filing in December, thanks to Representative Pierce on that point."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, what's your point?"

Roscoe D. Cunningham: "What's the status of Senate Bill 1302, is there any possibility that it'll come before this group before we adjourn? The reason that I think it's relevant, . . . let me finish my question. . . is that it it offers the best chance that we have to pass a meaningful ethics legislation without obligating to the Governor the responsibility of drawing the bill. Would the Chair answer?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the House will be at ease while we have the Clerk check on the status of House Bill 1302 for the gentleman from Lawrence. Oh, Senate Bill, I see. All right. All right, the Chair is pleased to inform the gentleman that Senate Bill 1302 sponsored by Senator Partee is on the order of Senate Bills first reading and it



has not been indicated to the Chair who is the intended House sponsor of that bill, when that occurs, why we will go that order of business and have it read a first time."

Roscoe D. Cunningham: "If the sponsor were found, would it be possible to move it along and waive the rules if the people would agree on it, would the Chair be amenable to moving it along within the two days that remain?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I think it might be longer than two days that we're going to be here, but the Chair is always amenable to thoughtful suggestions."

Roscoe D. Cunningham: "Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question. . .the gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Clyde L. Choate: "Are we going to have a vote on the gentleman's motion to non-concur?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yeah, I was just going to do that. All those in favor of, all those in favor of the gentleman's motion to non-concur say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', . . .the gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Clyde L. Choate: "Mr. Speaker, I don't care whether you have an oral vote or a roll call vote, but I do desire the privilege of explaining my vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "You may explain your oral vote."

Clyde L. Choate: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, only one who stands on the floor of this House is truthfully the only one that knows in his heart and his conscience how he feels when he casts a vote and I know that



on many occasions the news media as well as peoples as well as members of this legislature, often do and frightfully so I suggest, speculate as to the sincerity of the vote that maybe a member cast. I'm not one that usually browses into heresay, but I was told last evening and yesterday afternoon and this morning something by three different members of the Senate, and I will not go into their names, that brings about the explanation of my vote. It was told to me that in a Democratic caucus of the Democratic side in the Senate yesterday, when they were talking about Senate Bill 3700, that a statement was made by one of those members that they didn't really have to worry about Senate Bill 3700, because when it came back to the House, that Clyde Choate would see that it was not concurred in and that it would be led down to defeat. Well, I want to tell the Democratic members in the State Senate and I want to tell the Democratic members in this House, and I want to tell the Republican Members as well in both bodies and the entire State of Illinois, that I'm sincere about a code of ethics, and if they think that they're going to pass it over here and Clyde Choate is going to be a part or party to leading it to defeat, they are out of their cotton picking minds. I'm going to continue doing what I set out to do last week. I'm going to be for the strongest code of ethics that can possibly come out of this General Assembly. And that's the reason that I'm happy to see Representative Lindberg move to non-concur is only to print on more strengthening language if at all



possible. I resent members of my party and on the other side of the rotunda taking that attitude, and I'm going to publicly tell them so, not individually. If they want to hear it individually, they can come and talk to me."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The 'Yeas' have it and the House non-concurs in the Senate amendments and the message will be sent over there now. The gentleman from Randolph, Mr. Holloway."

James D. Holloway: "If we could have your attention, Mr. Speaker, we'd like to have a roll call vote on that motion."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "I've already announced the result. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde."

Henry J. Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I now move this House stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 P.M."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', we'll be in recess now for two hours til 2:15 P.M."

Recess at 12:19 O'Clock P.M.

Return at 2:15 O'Clock P.M.

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "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 adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House of Repres-



entatives, to-wit: Senate Joint Resolution Number 58. Adopted by the Senate, November 11, 1971. Kenneth Wright, Secretary of the Senate. Message from the Senate by Mr. 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, to-wit: House Bill 3700. I am further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a Committee on Conference to consist of five members from each house to consider the differences of the two Houses in regard to the amendments to the bill, and that the Committee on Committees of the Senate has appointed as such Committee on the part of the Senate the following: Senators Partee, Cherry, Lyons, Harris and Coulson. Action taken by the Senate, November 11, 1971. Kenneth Wright, Secretary of the Senate. No further messages."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde, moves that we accede to the Senate's request for a Conference Committee regarding House Bill 3700. All those in favor say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', and the 'Yeas' have it and the House accedes to the Senate request. The appointments from the House will be Speaker, Hyde, Lindberg, Tip-sword and Shea. All right, with leave we'll go to the Senate Bills first reading, Senate Bill 1302."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1302. An act to insure accountability in government and make an appropriation there-fore. First reading of the bill."



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

Raymond W. Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, 1302 is the Senate version of an act to insure accountability in government. I think that sounds a little better and appropriate, and what we're going to do is in order to have another vehicle, I'm going to make a motion that we suspend the appropriate rules and advance Senate Bill 1302 from first reading without reference to committee, to be placed on the second legislative day, so that we can make any necessary amendments that might be necessary. I'd like to ask leave of the House."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Harold A. Katz: "Ah, it seems to me that the bill should have hearing as far as vehicle is concerned, don't we have a couple of vehicles already to legislate the field. I really don't see why we need the bill for that purpose. I don't know why it shouldn't have the same kind of hearing that the constitution requires that is notice of hearing on bills."

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

Raymond W. Ewell: "Well, in response from the gentleman from Lake, ah I'd like to say that first of all if we talk about hearing, we've had enough hearings on this last bill to last us all year. Everyone has basically made up their minds that they have some opinions and some thoughts on this and this is an expression by the entire Senate, their



bill, they passed it and I feel that they're entitled to have their say in court. Now, we can't hide behind little minor technicalities and say we haven't had a hearing, because all we've been talking about around here is accountability and I suggest that we've had enough hearing and if there's an objection, I'd like to make a motion."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All. . ."

Raymond W. Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave, I'd like to make a motion. I make a motion. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes, I. . .there is objection to your request for unanimous consent to advance 1302. Now, you're recognized to make a motion?"

Raymond W. Ewell: "Yes, I'd like to make a motion that we suspend the provisions of 32b which is the timetable and we also suspend the appropriate provision for the rules sending it to a committee and what we're asking, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, is this is ethics, it's the Senate version and I feel that they're entitled to have a hearing and we know that there will be no hearing if we try to send this to committee again. So I'm asking that we suspend the rules and advance this bill at the same time to second legislative day, second reading, at which time this House can have its say on any amendments that they might want to put to the Senate Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, is, the gentleman is moving to suspend the rules to advance Senate Bill 1302 to the order of second reading without reference to committee."



The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Harold A. Katz: "Well I was just going to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the merit of his motion would be involved and I simply was going to explain my vote, and I didn't know if we'd reached the point of explanation of votes."

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

Henry J. Hyde: "Well, Mr. Speaker, speaking for myself and our leadership, we have no objection to advancing this to second reading. We have a conference committee set up that will be grappling with this problem and I think it might be well to have this on second reading as a vehicle in the event we are unsuccessful. I don't predict that, but I think it is a good idea, so I don't object to it being advanced."

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

Harold A. Katz: "In view of the Majority Leader's statement, I will withdraw my objection, there's no use in doing that which isn't going to work, wasting the time, I will argue about it when we get on second reading or third reading."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, then, is there objection then to consent then to advancing to second, second ah day? Hearing none, then the bill will be all right, advanced to the order of second reading. All right, on the concurrence calendar appears House Bill 1311. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell."

Raymond W. Ewell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of



the House, House Bill 1311 is a bill which related to ambulance chasers, which this House passed by an excessively large majority. The Senate had put in a simple amendment to provide for written notice, and that's all that the amendment does and I would urge concurrence of the House in the amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Further discussion? All right, the question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 1311? All those in favor will vote 'Yeas' and the opposed 'No', and this is final action. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 120 'Yeas' and no 'Nays' and this bill having received, the House concurs in Senate Amendment Number One. 1314. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell."

Raymond W. Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 1314 is a companion bill which deals with claims against fire insurance companies or representatives of insurance companies for fire insurance damages. Ah, it is the same as 1311, the same amendment was added by the Senate, which simply provides for written agreement and I would urge agreement of the House."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 1314? 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 117 'Yeas' and 1 'Nay' and the House concurs in Senate Amend-



ment Number One to House Bill 1314. 2209. The gentleman, the lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman."

Mrs. Eugenia S. Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 2209 is the bill that removes the discrimination which presently exists against women in the unemployment compensation act who are 13 weeks before or 4 weeks after child birth in order to secure approval in the Senate, I accepted the very reasonable amendment proposed by a gentleman on the other side of the aisle, and therefore I move concurrence with Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2209."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor of the bill and amendment explain what does the amendment do?"

Mrs. Eugenia S. Chapman: "Ah, you asked, I'm sorry, . . ."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "I asked what does the amendment do?"

Mrs. Eugenia S. Chapman: "Okay. Ah, what the amendment says is this. Ah, if oh, my glasses, if a woman is discharged from her employment within eight weeks of her anticipated birth of child, she shall be anticipated to be able to work unless the employer presents direct or competent proof of her inability or unwillingness to work and the Senate sponsor of this amendment felt that this would give the employer an option to answer to enter into the decision."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "That was eight weeks?"



Mrs. Eugenia S. Chapman: "Ah, yes, sir."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Thank you."

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

Romie J. Palmer: "Will the sponsor yield?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "She indicates she will."

Romie J. Palmer: "Mrs. Chapman, was this considered, if you know, by the group Economic Security Employment Advisory Board in their deliberations whereby they came out with a an agreed bill. Do you know whether or not this was considered?"

Mrs. Eugenia S. Chapman: "Ah, I trust I talked with a gentleman on the phone yesterday who told me no, they really hadn't considered it, but of course, this bill was introduced in the middle of the session in the Spring and I'm quite disappointed that they didn't give it careful consideration."

Romie J. Palmer: "Mr. Speaker?"

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

Romie J. Palmer: "Just a short statement."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Proceed."

Romie J. Palmer: "Normally these things, everything that is to be considered, is considered by the group that's supposed to do the study. I don't have any real great objection about this type of a situation, I don't think that there's any type any great problem with the intent, but I think it must be that the that that group, the advisory group did consider this and did not make it a part of the great pro-



cess and by not having it as a part of the agreed bill that is presented here, passed out of this House and now by the Senate, that perhaps that they did consider it and felt that at perhaps this time they shouldn't go with it. Ah, that reason, I feel that perhaps we should hold this perhaps until Spring to find out if these facts are so and then we can go with it at that point."

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

Daniel M. Pierce: "Ah, Mrs. Chapman, you remember when this bill came up, and I know that this is unemployment compensation, for women who are pregnant, I did discuss with you the possibility of broadening the bill to include workmens' compensation payments for women who became pregnant on the job. I wonder if you did anything about that in the Senate?"

Mrs. Eugenia S. Chapman: "No, sir, I hope that this House will pass affirmatively on this bill this afternoon, however."

Daniel M. Pierce: "Well, I think you should consider these industrial accidents where things do happen along this line but the bill as far as it goes under unemployment compensation bill seems all right and I will support it, but I wish you had included workmens' comp for these industrial accidents."

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

Brian B. Duff: "Ah, will the sponsor answer a question, please?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "She indicates she will."

Brian B. Duff: "Ah, Representative Chapman, I don't find the amendment on my desk, I did listen to your explanation and



I'd like to ask you to clarify what what I think was the import of it. Is it my understanding that this amendment says in effect that the employer must prove that the woman should not be still employed even after the period eight weeks before the expected termination of the pregnancy, is that correct?"

Mrs. Eugenia S. Chapman: "Yes, this is what the Senate sponsor of this amendment desired to give the employer and an opportunity to have his say in the decision."

Brian B. Duff: "And yet he, under what circumstances is he allowed to provide that proof? Must he, for example, ask the employee to take a physical? Or how else would he have that information?"

Mrs. Eugenia S. Chapman: "Mr. Duff, I'm not an expert on the unemployment compensation. They'll probably is someone on the floor better able to answer that than I can. My understanding is that this should be covered by rules and regulations, and that in any case where there is a question of whether the person is able to work, that there can be a requirement, a doctor's statement be available."

Brian B. Duff: "Representative Chapman, in the event that the unborn child, who was only eight weeks away from expectant life, were injured in an an occupational accident, in other words, under the workmans' compensation act, ah, do you know if the workmans' compensation act would apply to that child also?"

Mrs. Eugenia S. Chapman: "Ah, I can't see that this enters



into this matter of unemployment compensation, Mr. Duff."

Brian B. Duff: "How about the employers liability, common law liability, then, to the unborn child who is present on a working scene?"

Mrs. Eugenia S. Chapman: "I presume that there would be no difference whether it is eight months before, eight weeks before or eight months before, I can not see that this relates to the question at hand."

Brian B. Duff: "Well, doesn't it say then in effect and this is what I'm really getting at, that the mother, in an economic need, or else in a self-interpreted economic need could bring a viable child, so to speak, unventure simere into the working circumstances where that child might be injured."

Mrs. Eugenia S. Chapman: "Mr. Duff, if you're concerned about such things as miscarriage, there's a lot more opportunity for miscarriage during the first three months of pregnancy than in the last two months."

Brian B. Duff: "I didn't say anything about miscarriage, I said I'm talking about industrial accidents."

Mrs. Eugenia S. Chapman: "Again, they could this is something which could occur anytime during the course of pregnancy, I would presume, and I do not see how this relates to unemployment compensation."

Brian B. Duff: "Well, I'm talking about the fact that the mother, under these circumstances, as a detriment to the employer's option without proof and the circumstances of



proof you have not yet related to would be involved and the rights of that child. It seems to me that unless you have heard some testimony before some committee or some commission on this subject, that I've got to agree with Representative Palmer that without further illumination, this amendment shouldn't be passed through at this time."

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

Robert E. Mann: "Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes."

Robert E. Mann: "Is there a gynecologist in the House?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Apparently not. The gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."

George Ray Hudson: "No."

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

Bradley M. Glass: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ah, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as a member of the sub-committee that conducted hearings on this bill, heard at some length, I think it's a good bill. However, I share the feeling of Representative Palmer that the timing perhaps is not right for the passage of this bill and I refer the membership to Chamber of Commerce newsletter of November 8, in which they point out that this bill along with another bill really is in violation of the agreed bill process in the House and that to maintain the good faith of the both the management and organized labor, worked out the provisions of a rather complex agreed bill, it would perhaps be better to hold this bill off. Now, I it's the first contact I've



had of course with the agreed bill process in this session, but it seems to me if we are going to support that process then we shouldn't make exceptions and if this bill was not part of the agreed process, I would urge that it be held off until Spring."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, any further discussion? The lady care to close?"

Mrs. Eugenia S. Chapman: "I would appreciate a green light on this motion, please."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2209. All those in favor will vote 'Yeas' and the opposed 'No'. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer."

Romie J. Palmer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to explain my vote, ah, I think that the passage of this amendment, possibly passage of the bill, certainly does violation to the agreed bill process and does set a precedent where we can not perhaps rely on the group composed of members of labor, public members and members of management, whereby they've gotten together before and ironed out these very thorny problems on unemployment compensation. If we set a precedent here, then perhaps we're going to set a precedent again at some other place. And for that reason and the further reason that unemployment compensation benefits comes about as a result of determination of employment by reason of economic circumstances and not biological circumstances and the concept to me seems a



little far fetched at this present time, but perhaps has hope conceptually and I suspect that's what we're talking about and for that reason I'm going to vote 'No', and to ask others to vote 'No' also."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. I'm sorry, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Scariano."

Anthony Scariano: "Mr. Speaker, may I be recorded as 'Present'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Record the gentleman as 'Present'. McClain, 'Present'. Yes, take the record. Boyle, 'Present'. On this question, there are 89 'Yeas', 24 'Nays' and the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer, has requested a verification, so the Clerk will proceed to verify the affirmative votes."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Alsup, Arrigo, Barnes, Barry, Berman, Borchers, Bradley, Brandt, Brummet, Burditt, Caldwell, Calvo, Capparelli, Carrigan, Carroll, Jimmy Carter, Richard Carter, Chapman, Choate, Colitz, Otis Collins, Corbett, Craig, R. Cunningham, Davis, DiPrima, Douglas, Dyer, Ewell, Fary, Fennessey, Flinn, Garmisa, Gibbs, Giorgi, Hamilton, Hanahan, Hill, Holloway, Houlihan, Jacobs, Jaffe, Jones, Kennedy, Kosinski, Krause, Laurino, Lauterbach, Lechowicz, Lenard, Leon, Londrigan, M. Madigan, Mann, Maragos, Markert, Matijevich, McCormick, McDermott, McDevitt, McGah, McLendon, McPartlin, Merlo, D. O'Brien, O'Hallaren, Pierce, Randolph, Rayson, Redmond, Rose, Schneider, Shaw, Shea, Timothy Simms, Ike Sims, Smith,



Soderstrom, Stone, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, R. Thompson, Tipsword, Harold Washington, Welsh, Williams, B. B. Wolfe, Yourell."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "DiPrima, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. DiPrima. The gentleman, Stedelin, 'Yeas', Ropa, 'Yeas', Frank Wolf, 'Yeas', Borchers, 'Present', all right, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer. Would the members please be in their seats now. Madigan, 'Yeas'. He's already voted once."

Romie J. Palmer: "Tobie Barry?"

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

Romie J. Palmer: "Did I see Mr. Brandt, is he over there?"

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

Romie J. Palmer: "Brummet?"

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

Romie J. Palmer: "Calvo?"

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

Romie J. Palmer: "DiPrima?"

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

Romie J. Palmer: "Fennessey?"

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

Romie J. Palmer: "Gibbs?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, how is the gentleman recorded?"

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

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's not in his seat, take him off



the record."

Romie J. Palmer: "Corbett?"

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

Romie J. Palmer: "Krause?"

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

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

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

Romie J. Palmer: "Mr. Hill?"

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

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

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Take Hill off the record and put
Krause back on."

Romie J. Palmer: "Mr. Craig?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Craig? How is Craig recorded?"

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

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

Romie J. Palmer: "Markert?"

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

Romie J. Palmer: "O'Hallaren?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "O'Hallaren? How is, there he is."

Romie J. Palmer: "Brinkmeier?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman is not recorded. Gibbs
is back on the floor, put him back on the record."

Romie J. Palmer: "Mr. Garmisa?"



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

Romie J. Palmer: "Mr. Holloway?"

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

Romie J. Palmer: "Mike Madigan?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mike's over in the corner. He's. . ."

Romie J. Palmer: "Londrigan?"

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

Romie J. Palmer: "Timothy Simms?"

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

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

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Now, he's not in his seat, take him
off the record."

Romie J. Palmer: "Mr. Terzich?"

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

Romie J. Palmer: "Mr. Welsh?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's back there. For what purpose
does the gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart, rise?"

Richard O. Hart: "Mr. Speaker, am I recorded on this roll
call?"

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

Fredric B. Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as, . . . the
gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Richard O. Hart: "I'd like to be recorded as voting 'Yeas'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Record the gentleman as voting 'Yeas'.
The gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. VonBoeckman."

James VonBoeckman: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"



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

Fredric B. Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as not voting."

James VonBoeckman: "Record me as voting 'Yeas'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Record the gentleman as voting 'Yeas'. There are 89 'Yeas', 24 'Nays' and 3 'Present', so the what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell, rise?"

Lewis A. H. Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I now move that the vote by which House Bill 2209 was recorded be reconsidered."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, Karmazyn, 'Yeas', your order will be in motion as soon as I have announced that the House has concurred in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2209. The gentleman has moved to reconsider and the gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Daniel M. Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I move that that motion lie upon the table."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor of the motion to table say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the 'Yeas' have it and the motion. . .all those in favor say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No'. . .all those in favor vote 'Yeas', and those opposed vote 'No'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 88 'Yeas' and 45 'Nays' and this motion to table prevails. 2662. The gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Lauterbach."

Wilbur H. Lauterbach: "No."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Take it out of the record. All right,



27-, 2732. The gentlemen from Jackson, Mr. Williams."

Gale Williams: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to move to concur in Senate Amendment Number One, which is an amendment that was agreed to by the department. It simply strikes on page 1, line 25 and 26 and inserts in place of that 'forest fire warden' means any district local emergency forest fire warden and on page 3 by striking line 26 and inserting in lieu thereof the following 'outside the limits of any city, village or incorporated town'. I would like to move the adoption of Senate Amendment Number One."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2732. All those in favor will vote 'Yeas' and the opposed 'No'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Garmisa, 'Yeas', Carroll, 'Yeas', Maragos, 'Yeas', Simmons, what purpose does the gentleman rise?"

Arthur E. Simmons: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I have two amendments for this bill and Amendment Number One does not underline the new language as Amendment Number Two does."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the Clerk is correcting the file copy, underlined, rolling and engrossing, and it is taking a while. O'Brien, 'Yeas'. On this question, there are 130 'Yeas' and no 'Nays' and the House concurs in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2732. Now, with respect to Amendment Number Two to House Bill 2732, the



gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Williams."

Gale Williams: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Amendment Number Two is another amendment that's been agreed to by the department. On page 2, line 1 inserting after the period the following: 'No such district may include any part of any territory of any forest preserve, district or park district, or successor thereof, except for any land which was leased from the department'. And I would move the adoption of Amendment Number Two."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any discussion? The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2732? 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 120 'Yeas' and no 'Nays' and the House concurs in Senate Amendment Number One, Number Two to House Bill 2732. 2662. 2662. The gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Lauterbach."

Wilbur H. Lauterbach: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 2662 amends 'The Fish Code' changing from a negative to a positive legislation to make it easier for the public to read and understand. These Senate Amendments simply correct the spelling of many words that were misspelled and these amendments are also clean up measures, all of which are requested by the Department of Conservation. I would appreciate your support in concurring with the Senate amendments."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? Can we have a little order in the chamber, please, we're on final action on these matters. All right, we'll just wait a little bit. All right, the question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2662. The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Alsup."

John W. Alsup: "May I ask the sponsor a question?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He indicates he'll yield."

John W. Alsup: "Now, we have passed and I understand it the Governor has signed into law a rate for those of over 65 of \$.50 for a fishing license, which was the law, and this session a rate of \$1.00 for hunting license, only for those over 65 and which does not include a deer permit. Now, exactly what does this bill do in regard to the cost of license for hunting and fishing for those over 65?"

William H. Lauterbach: "These amendments this amendment has nothing to do with that part of the bill. These are simply corrective matters in which the words have been considerably misspelled, and this corrects the spelling in this bill. It does not change any of the bill itself."

John W. Alsup: "And there is no increase or decrease either?"

William H. Lauterbach: "None whatsoever. If you check with the amendment on your desk, it's quite clearly written there, it's just a few words that are misspelled."

John W. Alsup: "Well, as you know nobody checked the amendments on your desk anymore. We've got to do something about that first thing process, so we have to depend upon the



word of the people and I think you're an honorable man, I don't question what you're saying, I just wanted to know, a point of information."

William H. Lauterbach: "As an example, it says on page 14, line 15, by striking 'roccus' r-o-c-c-u-s and inserting in lieu thereof the correct spelling 'm-o-r-e-n-e', now just what that means, I am not sure either, but this is correcting the spelling as it is desired by the Department of Conservation."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion? The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2662? 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 140 'Yeas' and no 'Nays' and the House concurs in the amendment. Senate Amendment Number Two to House Bill 2662. The gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Lauterbach."

William H. Lauterbach: "Senate Amendment Number Two does the same thing, only on page 18, line 14, it strikes certain numbers such as '2.19' and inserting in lieu thereof '3.19'. In other words, this is again corrective legislation that that there were errors made in the preparation of this bill. I again ask concurrence in Senate Amendment Number Two to House Bill 2662."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number Two to House Bill 2662? 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 140 'Yeas' and no 'Nays' and the House concurs in Senate Amendment Number Two. House Bill 2663, the gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Lauterbach, with regard to Senate Amendment Number One."

William H. Lauterbach: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 2663 amends 'The Game Code' in the same manner as I explained 'The Fish Code', and again we have Senate Amendment Number One with an entire page here correcting spelling of words, such as otherwives, which was supposed to be otherwise, and striking foe and inserting of, in other words, to complete the bill with words that have been misspelled and this is the reason for Senate Amendment Number One. I would appreciate your support in the concurrence of the Senate Amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Further discussion? The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2663? 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 137 'Yeas' and no 'Nays' and the House concurs in Senate Amendment Number One. Senate Amendment Number Two. The gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Lauterbach."

William H. Lauterbach: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, again Senate Amendment Number Two amends House Bill 2663 in which the words again are corrected in any, down, game animals and inserting in lieu thereof mammals and inserting



in lieu of animals mammals and in other words it is again corrective legislation to bring us in line with the requirements of the Department of Conservation. Again, I would request your concurrence with this Senate Amendment Number Two to 2663."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The question is shall the the House concur in Senate Amendment Number Two to House Bill 2663? 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 130 'Yeas' and 1 'Nay' and the House concurs in Senate Amendment Number Two. 1508. The gentleman from Johnson, Mr. McCormick."

C. L. McCormick: "Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Johnson, Mr. McCormick, you're reading that editorial. . ."

C. L. McCormick: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on House Bill 1508, the bill didn't pass the House on the consent counter on the county clerks' bill makes Senate Amendment Number One makes a change on page 2 by striking lines 23 and 24 and inserting in lieu thereof 'of the county treasurer monthly, by the 10th of the month, all fees and incomes of the county' has to be turned in by that time. I know of no objection to this bill and I would therefore move for concurrence."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 1508. All those in favor will vote 'Yeas' and the opposed



'No'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Berman 'Yeas'. On this question, there are 138 'Yeas' and 1 'Nay' and the House concurs in the Senate Amendment Number One. Senate Amendment Number Two. The gentleman from Johnson, Mr. McCormick."

C. L. McCormick: "Amendment Number Two, Mr. Speaker, simply replaces the date for the act to become effective to December 1, 1971, and I move its adoption or concurrence."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number Two to House Bill 1508. 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 140 'Yeas', no 'Nays', Shaw, 'Yeas', and the House concurs in Senate Amendment Number Two. Senate Amendment Number Three, the gentleman from Johnson, Mr. McCormick."

C. L. McCormick: "Ah, Senate Amendment Number Three, is that number Two now, Mr. Speaker?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Three."

C. L. McCormick: "Three, well, . . . I've slipped a card somewhere, because I don't have it."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, we can go on to 1509 and work our way back to Three if you'd like?"

C. L. McCormick: "I'd appreciate it if you could take 1510 and 12, I'll have to run that amendment down, I thought I had all of them."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, all right, all right, all



right. We'll go to, the Clerk has it up here, he can read it."

C. L. McCormick: "Well, I think, read it and see if they won't accept that. Here it is right here."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ah, . . ."

C. L. McCormick: "Thank you, Art. On 1509, on page 1, line 14 by striking the word 'elective' and on page 1, line 15 by striking the word 'the first and'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, . . ."

C. L. McCormick: "Is there any objection?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, wait a minute. The Clerk advises that you were discussion Amendment to 1509 and we're on three to 1508."

C. L. McCormick: "Well, I'm I'm still wrong, then."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, right now the Clerk's going to read three to 1508."

C. L. McCormick: "Yes, that's what I want."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number Three. Amend House Bill 1508 on page 1, line 16 by striking the word 'elected' and on page 1, line 17 by striking 'the first and'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Johnson, Mr. McCormick."

C. L. McCormick: "I'd move, is there any objection to it?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Richard O. Hart: "I don't have the Senate Bill, I have the House Bill, it's the way I understand this, it just, instead of saying successors elected and qualified, it just



says the successors are elected, is that your understanding, C. L.?"

C. L. McCormick: "That's right."

Richard O. Hart: "It wouldn't in any way permit the appointment of the clerk?"

C. L. McCormick: "No, I wouldn't be for that at all, you know that."

Richard O. Hart: "Un-huh. Right, all right."

C. L. McCormick: "I move for its concurrence, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, any further discussion?"

The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number Three to House Bill 1508? All those in favor will vote 'Yeas' and the opposed 'No'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this, the gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Richard O. Hart: "On a point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, now that this bill has an earlier effective date, what would be the required number of of votes to pass this or any other amendment?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "It would take. . .all right, inasmuch as Amendment Number Two added the language that the act would become effective on December 1, 1971, it will be the Chair's ruling that to pass this Amendment Number Three will require 107 votes. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 149 'Yeas' and no 'Nays' and the amendment is passed with the required number of votes. Choate, 'Yeas'. 1509."



C. L. McCormick: "Ah, no, Mr. Speaker. . I would like to. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, 1510. Okay?"

C. L. McCormick: "Now, ah, . . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Johnson, Mr. McCormick."

C. L. McCormick: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment Number One makes a very small change on page 1 by striking lines 19 and 20 inserting in lieu thereof, the recorder of deeds shall enter upon the duties of his office on the first working day of the month in December following his election. He shall be commissioned by the Governor. That's Amendment Number One and I move its adoption."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? The gentleman from . . . Simmons, Cook, Mr. Simmons."

Arthur E. Simmons: "Are we dealing with Senate Amendment Number One to 1510?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes."

Arthur E. Simmons: "Well, the description doesn't fit the amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "You mean the explanation doesn't fit the amendment?"

Arthur E. Simmons: "Yeah."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The Amendment Number One that's up here . . ."

Arthur E. Simmons: "It's on page 2."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yeah, line 16."



Arthur E. Simmons: "And that isn't what he said."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Johnson, Mr. McCormick."

C. L. McCormick: "Except that these hidden facts and I didn't look them over close enough to see, apparently they've given me House Amendment. Just take this series out until I get it straightened out, will you?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right."

C. L. McCormick: "May I ask the Clerk, how many Senate Amendments do you have?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "To 1510? Three."

C. L. McCormick: "Then the Senate Amendment Number One is the same as it was on the county clerk where they turn their fees over by the 10th day of the month following, all the fee income, that's from the recording, so I would move its adoption. I think there's no controversy over it."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 1510. 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 142 'Yeas' and no 'Nays' and this bill having received the required number of votes is hereby declared passed. Senate Amendment Number Two."

C. L. McCormick: "Number Two, Mr. Speaker, is the the same thing, the mandatory act becomes effective December 1, 1971 the date of the effect of the act. I move its adoption."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, all those in favor of the adoption of the amendment say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 144 'Yeas' and no 'Nays' and Senate Amendment Number Two is adopted. Now, Senate Amendment Number Three."

C. L. McCormick: "Now, Senate Amendment Number Three. . ."

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

C. L. McCormick: "Mr. Speaker, is simply sets the program up like it is now, where the County Clerk is an ex officio in county under 60,000 and of course you have the separate recorder in counties over 60,000. I move the concurrence in Amendment Number Three."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Gerald W. Shea: "Will the sponsor yield for a question?"

C. L. McCormick: "Yes, sir."

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

Gerald W. Shea: "C. L., my digest indicates that these this series of bills regarding counties not applicable on home rule units, is that the way they now read?"

C. L. McCormick: "Well, that's that's true. Ah, that is true."

Gerald W. Shea: "All right, thank you."

C. L. McCormick: "You're welcome."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number Three



to House Bill 1510? All those in favor will vote 'Yeas' and the opposed 'No'. This is final action and a provision has been put on that the bill will become effective on December 1, 1971 and will require 107 votes. 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 145 'Yeas' and no 'Nays' and the House concurs in Senate Amendment Number Three. House Bill 1512.

C. L. McCormick: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Amendment Number One sets a date to become effective December 1, 1971 and I'd move concurrence."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? All those in favor of the House concurring in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 1512 will vote 'Yeas', the opposed 'No'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are. . .the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry, if I might. These bills originally passed the House had no need to have more than 89 votes. They were amended over in the Senate with an earlier effective date and I raised the question does the amendment from the Senate, or does the message from the Senate say that they passed the Senate with a three-fifths vote? I'm just curious how we do this because this will be final action, and unless the message from the Senate states that and we certify from the House that they passed with that majority, I don't know how they can be effective earlier."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, there's no, there's nothing on the message from the Senate that would indicate that they passed the bills out with a three-fifths vote and that's beyond the control of the Chair, but the our taking action on the bill in the form that it is from the Senate will require 107 votes since it is final action and passage on the bill and that provision is on there."

Gerald W. Shea: "Well, this is, I think, the point of my inquiry that we are passing amendments and our records will indicate that they passed by a three-fifths vote or 107."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "As far as the House action is concerned, that is correct."

Gerald W. Shea: "Now, do we have any indication of what the Senate did on these bills or I'm I'm fearful and I know how important these are to Representative McCormick and some of our downstate counties and I just wonder if there is some way that we can get these straightened out, because I'd hate to see these bills come back on a constitutional ground."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I would suggest that that would be an appropriate question to put to the President of the Senate by somebody over in that chamber, and I suggest you convey your request to him or to the Secretary of the Senate and if they need to do something, I am sure that we can undo something that we have done here by reconsidering, sending them back for the action, but that ought to be



checked on. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Gerald W. Shea: "Might I suggest that we hold them in this chamber while we do check rather than get them back to the Senate."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, we'll take them out of the record now while that matter is being cleared. For what purpose does the gentleman from Logan, Mr. Madigan, rise?"

Edward R. Madigan: "Ah, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the interest of conserving some time of the House, and particularly the time of the members of the House Revenue Committee and I understand with the agreement of both the Democrat and Republican membership, I'd like to move to suspend the provisions of Rule 72 for the purpose of discharging from the House Revenue Committee, Senate Bills 1244 through 1251 for the purpose of placing them on the calendar on the order of second reading."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the gentleman has moved to suspend the provisions of Rule 79, ah, in order that he may discharge the committee of the bills to which he referred. Is there any objection? Question. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Samuel C. Maragos: "Mr. Madigan, do any of these bills, what do the Senate Amendments do to these bills, if you know off hand?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Logan, Mr. Madigan."

Edward R. Madigan: "The amendments adopted to the bills in the Senate were amendments requested by Mr. Ives, the



Superintendent of the Rules and Regulations Division of the Department of Revenue. One amendment would make the bills more capable of being administered, the other amendments would provide that the revenue from the bills would be generated a year quicker than otherwise would have been as the bills were originally drafted."

Samuel C. Maragos: "Okay."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, is there any other objection? Is the leave given then? All right, the bills will be discharged and placed on the order of second reading, second day. Well, we'll come back to those bills when they are brought down so that they can be read a second time. 10-, now with leave of the House, back to concurrences, House Bill 1088. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Arthur A. Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you may recall that House Bill 1088 was one of a series of bills offered to the legislature by the Spanish Speaking Peoples Study Commission. The bill provided that the Secretary of State may give driver's license examinations in Spanish. The Senate offered and adopted an amendment which clarified the language on two points. One, it provided that the signs in English would still have the English words on those signs in the examination and also provided that the Secretary of State at his discretion could give the examination in languages other than Spanish. Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House do concur in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 1088."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 1088. 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 133 'Yeas' and no 'Nays' and the House concurs in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 1088. House Bill 783. The gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Philip."

James Pate Philip: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the original House Bill 783 amends 'The Illinois Highway Code' and abolishes township road commissioners under five miles of roads, and what it provided was that the county superintendent of roads would take over the supervision of those miles in each respective township. What the Senate Amendment does is provide that the township board of auditors will contract with a city or municipality or the county road commissioner, and I move that the House do concur on Senate Amendment Number One."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? The gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Krause."

James G. Krause: "Would the gentleman yield?"

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

James Pate Philip: "Representative, yes, I will."

James G. Krause: "Representative Philip, what do you mean by contract, that the Board of Auditors will contract with the municipalities?"

James Pate Philip: "All right, hypothetically, if a township



road commissioner had less than five miles of road, he would be abolished. All right, there may be two miles left, three miles left. It would leave it up to the town Board of Auditors who would be responsible for the upkeep of those two or three miles. Possibly they could contract with the large municipalities to take care of those, they could do it with private contractors, they could do it with the County Road Commissioner. It would leave it up to their prerogative, that's what it does."

James G. Krause: "Yeah, but if the township road commissioner is abolished and part of the roads are within the town, how is the county road going to contract? They're either going to give those roads to the town to the city or they're going to give them to the county, whichever portion they decide to do. How are they going to contract for this, how are they going to pay, how are they going to levy even if there's not a road commissioner?"

James Pate Philip: "Well, I that's a good question. I would assume that it would come out of the township fund."

James G. Krause: "Will you hold this and let's talk about this?"

James Pate Philip: "Sure. Sure. Sure."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? Oh, take it out of the record. All right, with leave of the House, we'll go back that so that we can read a second time those bills that were placed on the calendar on the order of second reading. Yes, read the bills."



Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1244. An act in relation to tax upon the privilege of using rented or leased tangible personal property. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor? Third reading."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1245. An act in relation to tax upon persons engaged in the business of renting or leasing tangible personal property. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor? Third reading."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1246. An act to amend Section 6 of the 'Retailers' Occupation Tax Act'. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor? Third reading."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1247. An act to amend 'The Use Tax Act'. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor? Third reading."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1248. An act to amend Section 20 of 'The Service Use Tax Act'. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor? Third reading."



Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1249. An act to amend Section 20 of 'The Service Occupation Tax Act'. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor? Third reading."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1250. An act to amend 'The Illinois Municipal Code'. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor? Third reading."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1251. An act to amend an act to revise the law in relation to counties. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. With leave of the House, we'll go to Senate Bills second. Senate Bill 1271."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1271. An act to amend 'The Municipal Code'. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

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

William A. Redmond: "I believe, I believe there's an amendment on 1271 on the desk."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, read the amendment."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number One, Redmond. Amend Senate Bill 1271 on page 1, by striking line 13 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: and so forth."



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

William A. Redmond: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1271 amends 'The Municipal Code' by removing the third member of a water commission, that previously was a judicial appointment, but there was no provision made for any other way to appoint them. This amendment provides that he will be appointed by the Chairman of the County Board with the consent of the board, consistent with the previous action taken in the legislature in these matters, and I move the adoption of the amendment."

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

Harry Yourell: "Would the gentleman yield to a question, please?"

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

Harry Yourell: "Bill, in the in home rule counties, would the chief executive of that county now still have the appointive power now for those vacancies?"

William A. Redmond: "I believe so. This follows the same method of appointment that we have for other local governments, whatever, see, it provided for judicial appointment and we removed that and it left a two member water commission, and this is the same as the other appointments and I believe that. . ."

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



Arthur E. Simmons: "Is this a House amendment a floor amendment or a committee amendment?"

William A. Redmond: "Floor."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Floor. All right, all those in favor of the adoption of the amendment say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the 'Yeas' have it and the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? Third reading. 1285."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1285. A bill for an act to amend 'The Election Code'. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number One, Collins. Amend Senate Bill 1285 on page 1, lines 1 and 9 by inserting immediately after the word 'Sections' the following: '2-4'; and on page 1 by inserting immediately after line 13 the following: 'Section 2-4. The Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, and so forth.'"

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

Philip W. Collins: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Constitution of 1970 establishes the order of gubernatorial succession as the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Secretary of State and Comptroller. Amendment Number One would bring Senate Bill 1285 into compliance with that stipulation or provision. I ask for support and adoption of the amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, any further discussion?"



All those in favor of the adoption of the amendment say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the 'Yeas' have it and the amendment is adopted. Further amendments? All right, there is an amendment, a second amendment, but it is in conflict with the one we just adopted, so, we'll just hold the we'll take it to, while it's being worked out, we'll leave it on second reading. 1297."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1297. A bill for an act to amend 'The Illinois Vehicle Code'. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number One, Day. Amend Senate Bill 1297 in the title and in the first sentence of Section 1 by striking 'Section 3-808' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Section 3-808 and 8-102'; and so forth."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Day."

Robert G. Day: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this amendment is the same amendment that we put on the corresponding House Bill which is now over to the Senate. The bills are now identical. What the bill does is to correct an error in the bill that was previously passed. It does change the section number so that the section number of the statute is correct. I move the adoption of the amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any discussion? All those in favor of the adoption of the amendment say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the 'Yeas' have it and the amendment is adopted. Are



there further amendments? Third reading. All right, with leave of the House, we'll go to Senate Bills third reading. 1054."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1054. A bill for an act to amend 'The School Code'. Third reading of the bill."

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

Robert E. Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 1054 would extend the deadline for a vote to be taken for a referendum in the Harlem School District that's a suburb of Rockford. Recently, they did hold an election and probably due to misunderstanding on the part of the voters, it failed by 74 votes. Now, this bill has come over from the Senate with a 46 and 0 vote and all it really does is extend the deadline limitation as far as a referendum should be held from December 3, ah, from October 1 to December 31 and I'd certainly appreciate your support."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? All right, the question is shall Senate Bill 1054 pass? All those in favor will vote 'Yeas' and the opposed 'No'. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Simmons, rise?"

Arthur E. Simmons: "I'd like to ask the sponsor a question."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, since we were close there on the call, go ahead."

Arthur E. Simmons: "Ah, Senate Bill 1054 changes the effective date to December 31, 1971 and if it's going to be effective as of that date, shouldn't the bill have an



emergency clause to be effective when passed?"

Robert E. Brinkmeier: "Representative, I'm sorry that I didn't mention that, it does have that clause on there. That's amendment three. It will need 107 votes."

Arthur E. Simmons: "Well, I don't have that particular amendment, though . . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, Amendment Number One provided that the act take effect upon becoming a law, so that will require 107 votes. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 124 'Yeas' and no 'Nays' and the bill having received the constitutional three-fifths is hereby declared passed. Berman, 'Yeas'. All right, with leave of the House, we'll be back to concurrence. All right, 783. The gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Philip."

James Pate Philip: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, evidentially there was some misunderstanding exactly if the town Board of Auditors had the authority in regard to levying a tax and providing some type of service for roads under five miles. We met out in the rotunda and I think we met with an agreement and I ask that the House do concur with Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 783."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, discussion? All right, the question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 783? All those in favor will vote 'Yeas' and the opposed 'No'. Have all voted who wish?"



The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 123 'Yeas' and 1 'Nay' and the House concurs in the Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 783. On the order of Conference Committee Reports appears House Bill 2867 on which the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Miller."

Kenneth W. Miller: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is with respect to the Conference Committee Report on 2867. For the information of the members, we've had considerable negotiations with the members on various members of this House and with the Senate with respect to this problem. Now, this bill, this Conference Committee Report now recommends the adoption of the amendment that was adopted by the Senate with some slight modifications. I might say this in the way of explanation, the purpose of this bill now is to provide for a welfare recipient who is over age 16 and is physically able to provide that he can have employment in the public sector, essentially, and it sets up rules and regulations concerning that employment. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to make a long explanation for this, the Conference Committee Report, this has been agreed to by both sides of the aisle, according to my understand, and so Mr. Speaker, I now move that this House accept the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2867."

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

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I've looked on my desk, I don't seem to find a copy of the Conference Committee Report."



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

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. On a Conference Committee Report such as this which has never gone through Committee action in neither House nor Senate because of a new act, and I know that the conference committee report as completed has not been placed on the desk, wouldn't it be better for the sponsor to participate in giving the intent and all the language in the bill or to conference committee report out so that the recordings of legislative intent would be recorded for posterity in case there's any question, but not having any copies on the desk and having the sponsor or the spokesman for the Conference Committee not explain all this, there may be some loss of legislative intent."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Shea, ah, Mr. Miller."

Kenneth W. Miller: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can make some remarks that will enlighten the membership. A week ago there was a conference committee report placed on every members' desk. Now, that report was not adopted because there were members who desired changes in it. And I'll be glad now if you take those committee reports that were placed on your desk last week and I can tell you exactly what the changes are if that is what Mr. Shea would like or Mr. Hanahan. They're very simple if you have that. On page 4, line 19, the following words are deleted, 'the



non-profit community agencies and institutions performing health and welfare functions'. On page 5, lines 11 and part of 12 are deleted, and the words that are deleted are on page 5, 'civic and non-profit community agencies and institutions performing health or welfare functions', and also on page 5, line 31, the following words are deleted, 'with institutions performing' and on the top of page 6, 'health or welfare functions'. On the bottom of page 6 in line 35, the word 'not' is deleted. In all other respects, the report that was placed on your desk last week is correct. Now, the essential parts of this, Mr. Speaker, are that this does authorize the employment in those cases where a welfare recipient is able bodied and safeguards are built into this, it does permit those public recipients who are able bodied to be put on a training program and to work in certain specified restricted areas in the public sector. The effect of the amendment is that these changes that I just talked about, the effect of it is that they will not be permitted to work in non-profit organizations. In other words, that has been deleted. I hope that that is a satisfactory explanation. Now, I'd like to renew my motion, Mr. Speaker."

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

Robert E. Mann: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I just want to refresh the membership. This bill in its original form was presented to us on the morning of June 30, having been completed and changed on the Senate side



and it came back to us for concurrence. At that time, I asked that no action be taken and the House agreed so that we might have an opportunity to look at the bill. I don't know what I will oppose the bill or if that's a bad bill, but Kenny, I just got shold of the amendment for the first time. It deals with a matter that this House has been wrestling with all session, that is some kind of a viable program for the poor and I would appreciate it very much if you would give me the opportunity to take a look at the thing in some detail. I know that we're going to be here at least tomorrow, and I'd appreciate that opportunity, rather than have you force it through here on an issue of this importance."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan. Was there a question of the sponsor?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "Ah, yes, sir. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the gentleman indicates he'll answer."

Kenneth W. Miller: "Ah, Representative Mann, this matter has been kicked around for some time as you know. We've discussed this several times as you know and this is the question of adopting a Conference Committee Report and I'd like to proceed with it now, with your indulgence, please. I think maybe Representative Hanahan might also offer some comments in this regard."

Robert E. Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to Representative Miller, the distinguished colleague and



another distinguished colleague, Representative Hanahan, ah the issue may have been kicked around, but I don't think many of us have had the opportunity to look at it in any depth and we're dealing now with an employment program for all the poor in the State of Illinois, and I would think that all of us before we vote on this measures, we're voting for a bill, it may be a conference report, but this is final action. All I'm asking is that we have an opportunity to look at it. We're not going to be concluding at the end of the day and I think that that's a reasonable request, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly would think that the other members would want to look at that, too."

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

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely extremely important piece of legislation. We've been contacted by people from the Governor's office, we've looked at this proposal and I certainly think that Representative Miller wouldn't have any objection to holding this until tomorrow as we told him we'd give him our support when we worked out all the problems with it and I'd appreciate it if he would."

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

Kenneth W. Miller: "Ah, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't have any wish to proceed with this matter in case there's some questions on it. I was of the understanding that every member was informed on this. This proposal now is practically no different than what it was a week ago, but



I'll defer to the wishes of the members at their request here, if they would like, I'll hold it until tomorrow morning."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, we'll take, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis."

Corneal A. Davis: "Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't wish to deny anyone the right to look at this bill, because it is a very important bill, but I would also like to remind them that \$22 million is involved here in some 10,000 jobs. Labor had some objections, folks like Representative Hanahan, and we went back today and ironed out all of those objections, the protection of the minimum wage. There's a clause in here that would prevent them from putting public aid recipients in these private institutions as strike breakers, and we've worked very hard on this and but we're still going to hold it and let them look it, Mr. Barnes, Mr. Hanahan and myself, and the gentleman on the other side of the aisle will work very hard, but remember that there are about \$22 million involved and 10,000 jobs, for public aid recipients, and it will not be strike breakers."

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

Robert E. Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the willingness of Representative Miller to hold it over night and I want to assure my colleague, Corneal Davis, that all I want to do is have the opportunity to look at the measure. Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, we'll take it out of the



record. 1512. 1512. The gentleman from Johnson, Mr. McCormick."

C. L. McCormick: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're back on 1512 that was mixed up a while ago on the amendment. Amendment Number One is making the effective date a mandatory date in 1971, December 1, 1971, and I would move for concurrence in that amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 1512? 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 124 'Yeas' and 1 'Nay' and the House concurs in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 1512. I'm sorry, Amendment Number Two. All right, Senate Amendment Number Three to House Bill 1512."

C. L. McCormick: "Mr. . . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Johnson, Mr. McCormick."

C. L. McCormick: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on page 2, line 21 after the word 'Clerk', you add the following, 'and Chairman of the County Board'. I know of no controversy and I would move to concur with Amendment Number Three, Mr. . . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? If not, the gentleman has moved to concur with the Senate Amendment Number Three to House Bill 1512. All those in favor will



signify by voting 'Yeas', the opposed by voting 'No', and this will take 107 votes. This is Amendment Number Three. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, the 'Yeas' are 126, Campbell, 'Yeas', the 'Nays' are 6 and the House concurs with Senate Amendment Number Three to House Bill 1512 with a 60% majority."

C. L. McCormick: "I believe that's all the amendments, isn't it, Mr. Clerk?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes, it is, Mr. McCormick. Record Representative Thompson as voting 'Yeas'. Do you wish to proceed with 1509, Representative McCormick?"

C. L. McCormick: "Yes, sir."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "On the order of concurrence, appears House Bill 1509 on which the gentleman from Johnson, Representative McCormick is recognized with regard to Amendment Number One."

C. L. McCormick: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Amendment Number One to House Bill 1509, on page 2, line 22, by striking 22 and -3 and inserting in lieu thereof, 'the county treasurer monthly by the tenth of the month following all fees and then period the coroner.' In other words, all fees to be turned into the county treasurer. I would move concurrence in that."

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

Tobias Barry: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've been waiting for this bill, as the sponsor knows,



to suggest non-concurrence for the reason for several reasons, one of which is the most important, I'd like to see it in a conference committee to be amended to a considerable degree and I would ask the sponsor at the outset if he would be agreeable to that and if he does not so agree, I would acknowledge that he has a good reason. Would you agree to going to a conference committee on this, because I think you might know my purpose?"

C. L. McCormick: "I know your purpose, Representative, and I understand it, but I agreed for the Coroner's Association to ask for concurrence like it is and I would have to do that."

Tobias Barry: "Then if I may be heard, Mr. Speaker?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Proceed, sir."

Tobias Barry: "All right. This bill Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, very simply mandates to our county boards to all of our downstate counties that they proceed to elect coroners from now on as indicated as an alternative in our new constitution and in fact suggests a minimum pay of \$8,500.00 per year. House Bill 1509, I might tell you, was never sent to the Constitutional Implementation Committee, and yet the Constitutional Convention was so closely divided on the issue that they specifically provided for a means of either the legislature or the county boards to abolish the office. I remind you again, this bill mandates that a coroner shall be elected from now on at a minimum pay rate and under the new constitution, no officer can be paid from



fees and thus we must revert to the present law on county officer's salaries and the range I should insist that you listen to is in counties under 14,000 population, the minimum salary of \$8,500.00 a year and in counties of 300,000 to 1,000,000, a minimum salary of \$16,000.00 a year. Most counties downstate, small counties can ill afford this kind of pay and to pay a man who is usually the local undertaker working a very few hours per year in the case of the small county at \$8,500.00 a year minimum. This bill if passed is obviously in my opinion premature, because it ties the hands of the county boards in many of the counties that I've known who would prefer to abandon the office of coroner. I suggest a conference committee where we might propose a permissive bill to allow the counties to either mandate or to allow them to join with other counties and pay them something reasonable, perhaps a per diem, as was suggested by Ben Blades here in a bill a few weeks ago. Passage of the bill at this time if not amended, would lock in the coroner's throughout the State. It should be sent to a conference committee and in the alternative I would respectfully suggest we'd be better off passing no law and allow the coroners that are now elected to continue in office until we get back here and do something decent about it. I would move for non-concurrence."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion? Does the gentleman from Johnson wish to close the debate?"

C. L. McCormick: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of



the House, these this bill is just one of a series of bills on county officers. I think everybody here knows what they want to do about it and I would think that the vote would tell the tale."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 1509. All those in favor of concurrence signify by voting 'Yeas', the opposed by voting 'No'. The gentleman from Lake, Representative Murphy, to explain his vote."

W. J. Murphy: "No, I understood Representative Barry to non-concur, so I wanted to be. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, Representative McCormick made a prior motion, Representative Murphy."

W. J. Murphy: "Oh, his motion doesn't supercede?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "No, sir. The question is to concur. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question, the 'Yeas' are 29, the 'Nays' are 76 and the House refuses to concur to Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 1509. On the order of concurrence appears House Bill 1509 on which the House recognizes on which purpose the gentleman from Johnson, Representative McCormick is recognized relative to Senate Amendment Number Two."

C. L. McCormick: "Mr. Speaker, Senate Amendment Number Two sets the mandatory date, I mean, December 1, 1971, and I would move concurrence."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any objection? Discussion? The gentleman has moved the House concur with Senate Amend-



ment Number Two to House Bill 1509. All those in favor of concurrence signify by voting 'Yeas', the opposed by voting 'No'. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question, the 'Yeas' are . . ."

W. J. Murphy: "The green hornet strikes again."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "On this question, the 'Yeas' are 58, the 'Nays' are 1 and the House refuses to concur with Senate Amendment Number Two to House Bill 1509. On the order of concurrence appears House Bill 1509 for which purpose the gentleman from Johnson, Representative McCormick is recognized relative to Senate Bill Number Three, Senate Amendment Number Three."

C. L. McCormick: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would think that the way the amendments are going right now, that it might be best for us to ask for a conference committee or do we have to wait until they're notified?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "We would have to refuse to concur with Senate Amendment Number Three, Representative McCormick, so we should take a roll call."

C. L. McCormick: "All right, will you refused to concur in two of them, you might as well do it on the third one. Same roll call."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman has moved the House do not concur with Senate Amendment Number Three to House Bill 1509. All those in favor of non-concurrence signify by saying 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the House refuses to concur with Senate Amendment Number Three to House Bill 1509.



On the order of concurrences, appears House Bill 2874, for which purpose the gentleman from Kane, Representative Schoeberlein is recognized."

Allen L. Schoeberlein: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm losing my voice today. This particular bill is a bill that came out of the Labor Commission and has been amended in the Senate. Now, two amendments have been adopted by the Senate and I concur in the second, but not in the first. The amendment number one Amendment Number One on 2874 in the Senate on page 4 by adding after line 6 the following: 'Section 7. This act does not apply within the jurisdiction of any home rule unit'. Now, this is a statewide legislation on the commission heard that many witnesses we found that many of the violations were right in the home rule city or county and I for one do not concur in this particular amendment. I'm quite sure Representative Hanahan also has something to say on the subject."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion? The gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Thomas J. Hanahan: "A parliamentary inquiry. Did the gentleman make a motion to non-concur?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Representative Schoeberlein, did you put a motion to non-concur?"

Allen L. Schoeberlein: "I do make that motion."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman has made a motion that the House do non-concur with Senate Amendment Number One to



House Bill 2874."

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I agree with the gentleman in his non-concurrence motion, that when we're talking about contract labor agencies, we're talking about specifically problems in large cities that could be home rule units. The biggest problem that we've had is that the contract labor agencies have prevailed generally in areas that need this kind of legislation, so I join with the gentleman from Kane, in opposing Amendment Number One to House Bill 2874, and hope that in a conference committee that we could agree to delete Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2874."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion? If not, the gentleman has moved that the House do not concur with Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2874. All those in favor of non-concurrence signify by saying 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the House refuses to concur with Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2874. On the order of concurrences, appears House Bill 2874, for which the gentleman from Kane, Representative Schoeberlein is recognized, relative to Senate Amendment Number Two."

Allen L. Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Amendment Number Two deletes several lines that do not impair the act and I would move in concurrence on Senate Bill Number Two in the House."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? The gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate Amendment



Number Two to House Bill 2874. All those in favor of concurrence signify by voting 'Yeas', the opposed by voting 'No'. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question, the 'Yeas' are 122, the 'Nays' are 1, Cox, 'Yeas', and the House concurs with Senate Amendment Number Two to House Bill 2874. On the order of consideration postponed appears Senate Bill 773 for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Fleck is recognized."

Charles J. Fleck: "I wish to move Senate Bill 773 to third reading."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "It's been read a third time, Representative Fleck."

Charles J. Fleck: "Please. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "It's on third reading right now."

Charles J. Fleck: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 773 was a group of administration bills that dealt with the licensing of professions in the State of Illinois. As you recall, I stated that there were two bills that were placed on consideration postponed consideration. This bill, Senate Bill 773, which deals with the licensing of teachers, and in essence, the bill provides that determining good character before the license is given, any person convicted of a felony that this would not be a bar but would just be merely taken into consideration before the licensing would be given. I ask the support of the House in passing this bill."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

William D. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, when this bill was heard the last time, the point was brought out that in the other licensing arrangements under the Department of Registration and Regulation and under the Insurance Department, the act of a felony, the conviction of a felony was by statute a bar from licensing. Unlike these licensing requirements, under the School Code, a commission of a felony is not a bar to certification at all so this bill in effect does nothing except clutter up the statutes and I suggest to you that you vote 'No' again on this bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion? Does the gentleman wish to close the debate?"

Charles J. Fleck: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't see the great hang up that should be involved with this bill. It does not say that anyone convicted of a felony must be licensed to teach school in the State, it merely says that a person convicted of a felony who applies, this may be taken into consideration of considering good character and morals. Now, to determine what a felony is, let me point out a few provisions of the Criminal Code which are felonies and see a little ludicrous. For example, dueling in the State of Illinois happens to be a felony, punishable in a penitentiary from one to five years; eavesdropping is also considered a felony, so is



deception and pandering and another. And I think a person who might be convicted of one of these rather ludicrous crimes should have a right to teach if he shows otherwise good, moral character. Now, it seems to me in view of some of the teachers that are teaching school in this state, that the mere fact that a person has been convicted of a felony and shows good moral character otherwise, that he should not be barred. Other teachers, I think, who are in the radical extreme, and I don't particularly consider radicals a bad feature in the teaching institution, because it's merely the conservatism of tomorrow injected in today's affairs, but in view of the fact how some teachers react and what they teach and what they espouse and what they philosophize, I do not see where a person who might be in a penitentiary wouldn't have an opportunity to teach and might be a much better professor. I ask that for the support of the House."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The question is shall Senate Bill 773 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'Yeas' the opposed by voting 'No'. Have all voted who wished? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. J. J. Wolf, to explain his vote."

Jacob John Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'm at loss to explain why there aren't more green lights up there on that board. We followed the premise that a man who pays his debt to society is a free citizen once more, his voting rights are restored, he should be able to



get employment and as Representative Fleck so ably pointed out, that this doesn't say that they must hire that individual, but because a man or a woman has made a mistake in their live at one time should not be barred from employment and I think that we should have more green lights on this measure."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

William D. Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I I agree completely with what the sponsor of this bill and what Representative Wolf said. The point is that a the commission of a felony is not now a bar from certification and never has been a bar as I know to certification. The most this bill does is to clutter up the statute, is entirely unnecessary and there's just no need to mention it in the statute, especially since it's been removed from the other registration requirements. Now, again solicit your 'No' vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider, to explain his vote."

J. Glenn Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote which at this time is an 'Yeas' vote, which I also believe is a change from my previous vote on a tally that was taken this Spring, I guess my apprehension is that the ah act of a felony could be interpreted and could be construed under the School Code to be a violation of the School Code as it is presently written. So, in order in



my mind to be certain that those people that are in the position of hiring teachers do not misinterpret the School Code, I think it would be very helpful to have it clearly stated that a felony should not be a bar to the possibility of being an educator, so I would like to solicit further support and more green lights on the board for this bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Fleck, to explain his vote."

Charles J. Fleck: "Well, I'm a little confused at what the main opponents to this bill says is true, that it isn't a bar now, what's the difference if this bill passes? I don't see that this clutters up the statute, I think it sets out clearly what the prevailing situation might be, and if that is the case, why not clearly set it out in black and white letters, it is not necessarily a bar but something that should be considered and only considered. And I do not see any great problem that the present situation with the School Board today."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, the 'Yeas' are . . . Representative Fleck, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Charles J. Fleck: "It's so close, I'd like to poll the absentees."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I don't know if my vote got recorded, I got on late. Am I recorded as voting



'Yeas' on that bill?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes, sir, you are, Representative Shea. The gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. Will the members please be in their seats and the Clerk will proceed to read the names of the absentees."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Arrigo, Barry. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Record Representative Arrigo as voting 'Yeas'."

Victor A. Arrigo: "Am I recorded as an 'Yeas' vote?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Victor A. Arrigo: "Well, then I am voting 'Yeas'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Record the gentleman as voting 'Yeas'."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Barry, Bartulis, Bluthardt, Boyle, Bradley, Capparelli, Capuzi, Choate, Phil Collins, Conolly, Corbett, Cox, Craig, W. Cunningham. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Representative Craig, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Robert Craig: "'Yeas'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Record the gentleman as voting 'Yeas'."

Fredric B. Selcke: ". . .Downes, Duff, Epton, Fary, Fennessey, Friedland, Garmisa, Granata, Hall, . . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Representative Hall, record Representative Hall as voting 'Yeas'."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Hall, . . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Record Representative Granata as voting 'Yeas'."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Harpstrite, Henss, Ron Hoffman, Holloway, . . ."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Representative McPartlin, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Robert F. McPartlin: "How am I recorded?"

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

Fredric B. Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Robert F. McPartlin: "I vote 'Yeas'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Record the gentleman as voting 'Yeas'. Representative Boyle, okay, Representative Boyle, 'Yeas', Choate, 'Yeas', Barry, 'Yeas', Lechowicz, 'Yeas', Dan O'Brien, 'Yeas', okay, Markert, all right, the Clerk informs me that he would like to proceed with the polling of the absentees am then we'll come back and put the members on the roll call that wish to be."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Holloway, Houde, Hudson, Hyde, Jančzak, Kahoun, Karmazyn, Katz, . . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Record Representative Katz as voting 'Yeas'. You want a new roll call, Fred? All right, we'll take a new roll call, Ladies and Gentlemen. The question is shall Senate Bill 773 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'Yeas' and the opposed by voting 'No'. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question, the 'Yeas' are 103, the 'Nays' are 29 and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Record Representative Louie Caldwell as voting 'Yeas'. Representative Caldwell, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Lewis A. H. Caldwell: "I rise, Mr. Speaker, since that bill



just passed, would it be in order for me to ask that you table, I'm going to table House Bill 695, I think it's 695, yeah, that's the same bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "And you are the principal sponsor, right, sir?"

Lewis A. H. Caldwell: "Yes, sir."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Where is it, Representative Caldwell, on. . ."

Lewis A. H. Caldwell: "On Consideration Postponed."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Does the gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, House Bill 695 will be tabled. On the order of Senate Bills third reading appears Senate Bill 645."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 645. An act to amend Sections 2 and 3 and to add Section 30.1 to an act in regard to forceable entry and detainer. Third reading of the bill."

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

Arthur L. Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd ask for leave to return Senate Bill 645 to the order of second reading for the purposes of an amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, Senate Bill 645 will be put on the order of second reading for the purpose of amendment. Read the amendment."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number Two, Berman. Amend Senate Bill 645 on page 2, line 13, by inserting and so forth."



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

Arthur L. Berman: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment Number Two to this bill puts in additional safeguard to the owners of condominium property concerning the eviction procedure involved when they fail to take their common element assessments. It would require that both that not only an eviction suit be brought, but that also a money suit when we call a joint action for both money and evictions be brought. I would move the adoption of Amendment Number Two to Senate Bill 645."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Dan O'Brien."

Daniel J. O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask for a little order. I think this is very important bill, we should be attentive."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion? If not, the gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment Number Two to Senate Bill 645. All those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', and the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? Third reading. With leave of the House, we'll go to the order of House Bills third reading. House Bill 3060."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 3060. An act to provide for a privilege tax on certain mobile homes, and to repeal part of an act herein named. Third reading of the bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Lake, Representa-



tive Murphy."

W. J. Murphy: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, do I need leave of the House to hear this bill?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes, you have to suspend the appropriate rule."

W. J. Murphy: All right, I would ask leave then to void Rule 32c for the purpose of hearing this bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, the provisions of Rule 32c will be suspended for the purposes of hearing House Bill 3060."

W. J. Murphy: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, last Spring we passed a bill for mobile homes putting a tax rate on them of 10¢ a minimum of 10¢ and a maximum of 15¢ to be set by the county board. Since that time, the personal property tax came back on and so to prevent double taxation, it is necessary that we pass this bill at this time, so I'd ask your favorable support on 3060."

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

Romie J. Palmer: "Does this apply only to non-home rule counties?"

W. J. Murphy: "NO, this is permissive legislation and it applies to all counties."

Romie J. Palmer: "It says non-home rule county in the digest."

W. J. Murphy: "I'm of the opinion, maybe Harber Hall can answer that, I'm of the opinion that was taken out."

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



Romie J. Palmer: "Does it apply to municipalities?"

W. J. Murphy: "Yes."

Romie J. Palmer: "Does it apply to non-home rule municipalities?"

W. J. Murphy: "It applies to all mobile home parks in the State of Illinois, it exempts only mobile homes around solid and permanent foundations, it takes them out of the category of real estate and puts a service tax on them per square foot, that's the bill that is the law now. Now, this bill is only extending the time for this. That bill is the law now, this is not making it, that bill is the law now."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion? Does the gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Henss."

Donald A. Henss: "Will the sponsor yield for a question?"

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

Donald A. Henss: "The bill that we passed previously in which became law, made these mobile homes part of the real estate so that they would be taxed upon the real estate law, did it not?"

W. J. Murphy: "No, the bill we passed last Spring, Senate Bill 198 made them non-real estate and made it possible for the county board to levy a tax on them, a monthly tax, based on square foot basis rather than personal property tax or real estate."

Donald A. Henss: "So that there would be a double taxation if, under the Supreme Court decision, now if we . . ."



W. J. Murphy: "That's right. . ."

Donald A. Henss: ". . .take care of that personal property situation, ah, in this session, . . ."

W. J. Murphy: "I beg your pardon?"

Donald A. Henss: "Now, if we do take care of that personal property tax situation by having a large exemption or something of that nature, what happens to your bill?"

W. J. Murphy: "Well, 1971 of course, the taxes already apply and then this would take effect April 1, 1972."

Donald A. Henss: "Under your bill would the mobile home escape taxation completely then?"

W. J. Murphy: "No, it would not, because it's already been assessed for 1971."

Donald A. Henss: "But for the future would. . ."

W. J. Murphy: "For the future it would it could not be taxed doubly, I mean it would have the service tax and it would not have the personal property tax."

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

Samuel C. Maragos: "Representative Murphy, just to refresh my memory, did the amendments in committee which were adopted on second reading provide a better definition for what we consider mobile home, is that the. . ."

W. J. Murphy: "One amendment provided that the other amendment provided that it takes a 60% vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion? If not, the gentleman from Lake, Representative Murphy, to close



the debate."

W. J. Murphy: "I just solicit your vote, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The question is shall House Bill 3060 pass with the emergency clause? All those in favor signify by voting 'Yeas', the opposed by voting 'No'. It will take 107 votes. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. Tuerk, 'Yeas'. On this question, the 'Yeas' are 134, Barnes, 'Yeas', the 'Nays' are 1 and this bill having received the constitutional 60% majority is hereby declared passed with the emergency clause. I got R. Barnes, oh, R. Carter, 'Yeas'. Introduction and first readings of bills."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 3763. A bill for 'An Act making an appropriation to the Department of Public Works and Buildings for constructing drainage and flood control improvements in and between the Illinois-Michigan Canal and the Des Plaines River near Rockdale in Will County. First reading of the bill. House Bill 3764. A bill for an act to amend Section 3-606 of 'The Illinois Vehicle Code' approved September 29, 1969, as amended. First reading of the bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Representative Hart, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Richard O. Hart: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, there was a motion filed to discharge the committee on Senate Bill 589. I'd like to suspend the appropriate rule, I believe 79, for the purpose



of having that motion heard at the present time. Ah, the bill is going to be amended in the Registration and Regulation Committee. We've worked out an amendment with the Department and I think it's satisfactory to everybody and due to the short time we have left, I'd like to proceed to have the motion heard at this time and have the bill placed on second reading for the purpose of offering the amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Does the gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave will be granted. Read the bill."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 589. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Okay, Senate Bill 589 will appear on the order of second reading, second legislative day. Representative Hart?"

Richard O. Hart: "Ah, yes, I have I have an amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, read the bill a second time, please."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 589, second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Are there any amendments from the floor?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number One, Hart. Amend Senate Bill 589 on page 1, line 1, by striking 'amend' and inserting in lieu thereof 'add Section. . .'"

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

Richard O. Hart: "Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to the 'Social Workers' Act' and when the amendment the act was



passed cutting off a deadline for persons who didn't have a college degree, it provided certain persons who had worked for the Department, in at least two of the last five years could still qualify. There were certain persons who were working at the time that didn't have two years in and we worked out an agreement with the department, whereby these people can take the social workers' exam, so I would move the adoption of the amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? If not, the gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment Number One to Senate Bill 589. All those in favor of the adoption will signify by saying 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? Third reading. On the Speaker's table appears Senate Bill 1224 for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Leon is recognized."

John F. Leon: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to have the proper rules suspended in order to have Senate Bill 1224 advanced to the order of second reading, second legislative day, without reference to committee."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Does the gentleman have consent? Hearing none, Senate Bill 1224 will be put on the order of second reading, second legislative day. Do you have amendments, Representative Leon? Will the Clerk please read the bill a second time?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1224. Second reading of the



bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Are there any amendments from the floor?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number One, Leon. Amend Senate Bill 1224 on page 14, by inserting after line 30 the following: 'Section 2. This Act takes effect immediately upon becoming a law.'"

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

John F. Leon: "Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of this amendment: This will make this bill an emergency, having it take effect when signed by the Governor. I move its adoption."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? The gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment Number One to Senate Bill 1224. All those in favor of adoption signify by saying 'Yeas', the opposed 'No' and the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? Third reading. Representative Hall, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Harber H. Hall: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to advance Senate Bill 1290 to the order of second reading, second legislative day, because of the short time we have remaining, I would like to discharge the committee for that purpose."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Does the gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, Senate Bill 1290 will be put on. . . Representative Barry, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"



Tobias Barry: "I respectfully suggest that we vote on that motion."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Objections have been heard. Do you wish to move?"

Harber H. Hall: "Yes, I would move the question."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from McLean, Representative Hall, has moved that the Senate Bill 1290 be taken from the committee and be put on the calendar on the order of second reading, second legislative day. All those in favor of the gentleman's motion will signify by voting 'Yeas', the opposed by voting 'No'. O'Hallaren, 'No'. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question, the 'Yeas' are 15, the 'Nays' are 69 and the gentleman's motion to put Senate Bill 1290 on the order of second reading, second legislative day, fails. All right, now, the Clerk will inform me that the Senate bill has not been read a first time. I'll have the Clerk read the bill a first time now and it'll be sent to the proper committee."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1290. A bill for an act to amend 'The Revenue Act of 1939.' First reading of the bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "With leave of the House, we'll go to resolutions."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Agreed resolutions."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Resolutions. House Resolution 475, Schneider, et.al. House Resolution 476, Fary, et.al. House Resolution 477, Juckett, et.al. House Resolution 478,



Timothy Simms, et.al. House Resolution 480, Palmer, et.al. House Resolution 481, Zlatnik, et.al. House Resolution 482, Hudson, et.al. House Resolution 483, Juckett, et.al. House Joint Resolution 108, Rose, et.al. Senate Joint Resolution 58, Barnes."

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

Henry J. Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the agreed resolutions 475 congratulates Mrs. Mae Watts on her untiring dedication of the Science of Ecology. House Resolution 476 congratulates 'Moose' Krause of Notre Dame for his service to the cause of athletics. House Resolution 477 . . . memorializes Veterans' Day, which is today. House Resolution 478 commends political reporter Gary Watson for his fine coverage of the of this session of the General Assembly and congratulates him on his appointment as City Editor for the Rockford Morning Star. House Resolution 480 commends and congratulates the First National Bank of Blue Island on its diamond jubilee. House Resolution 481 wishes a very happy birthday to the Attorney General of the State of Illinois, William J. Scott. House Resolution 482 commends Mrs. Beverly Gordon and Mrs. Betty Arnspiger for their courageous and untiring leadership to in the fight against illicit drugs. House Resolution 483 is a death resolution memorializing Robert J. Barzditis of Park Ridge. House Joint Resolution 108 commends and congratulates John H. Conolly for the honor bestowed upon him upon his election as President of the National Legislative Conference.



House Resolution 58 memorializes the Illinois National Guard in concert with the National Guard Bureau to review and adjust appropriate rules and regulations to permit the Illinois National Guards to accept veterans with general discharges provided that they are deemed worthy by the Illinois National Guard. I now move adoption of the agreed resolutions."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, on the order of Senate Bills with leave of the House, Senate Bills second reading appears all right, all those back to resolutions. All those in favor of the adoption of the agreed resolutions say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the 'Yeas' have it and the agreed resolutions are adopted. Further resolutions?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Further resolutions. House Resolution 479, Kosinski, et.al. House Joint Resolution 107, Madigan, et.al."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, all right, the there's one announcement before we close up. The leadership on both sides of the aisle will be getting together tomorrow morning to discuss some new proposals concerning the welfare problem and for that reason Representatives Washington has agreed to go along with referring consideration of his considerable motions to suspend that this etc. concerning his bills that are on the Speaker's table, until we go into the session tomorrow after the leaders' meeting to see if we can address ourselves to that problem. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Laurino, rise?"



William J. Laurino: "Just an announcement, Mr. Speaker. There was to be a football game this evening between the press and the legislature, and due to the long work day and the late hour, it has been postponed until further notice."

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

Henry J. Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I now move that this House stand adjourned until the Hour of 10:00 O'Clock A.M. tomorrow morning."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, there's one, there's one motion that the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Carroll, wanted to make."

Henry J. Hyde: "I'll withdraw my motion."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, while he makes his motion."

Howard W. Carroll: "Mr. Speaker, under the heading of motions, we have filed with the Clerk a motion to discharge the Committee on Appropriations as to Senate Bill 1269 which deals with the constitutional mandate that we transcribe debates. I've cleared this with the leadership on both sides of the aisle, and with the Chairman of the Appropriations' Committee and I would move that the bill be discharged, taken from committee and be placed on the order of second reading, second legislative day, and that the appropriate rules be suspended."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, is there objection? Hearing none, the bill will be brought of committee and placed on the order of second reading, second legislative day tomorrow. Now, the gentleman from ah, there will be a meet-



ing of the Conference Committee on 3700 at 6:00 P.M. in the Speaker's Office. Ah, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde, now renews his motion."

Henry J. Hyde: "I now renew my motion, Mr. Speaker, that we adjourn until 10:00 A.M. tomorrow morning."

Hon.W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No'."

Adjournment at 5:28 O'Clock P.M.

11/11/71
skn

