

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

NOVEMBER 12, 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.



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

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The doorkeeper will see that those persons not entitled to the floor are removed therefrom and he shall see that the aisles are cleared and that the hallways on both sides of the chamber are cleared of those persons not entitled to be there. The invocation this morning will be by Dr. Johnson."

Dr. John Johnson: "We pray. Eternal spirit, Lord and giver of life, and of all spiritual blessings, we acknowledge that from your hands flow those resources which are sufficient for our every need. We thank you for all of the gifts which make our daily life possible, our daily food and drink, our clothing and shelter, our house and home, our family and friends. We thank you because you defend and protect us out of your fatherly mercy. And now for our misuse of your blessings, for our thanklessness and the use of your blessings, for our selfishness towards those who enjoy fewer of your blessings, for our failure to be good stewards of your blessings, Good Lord have mercy upon us and forgive us. We call upon you now also on behalf of retired United States Congressman William T. Murphy, upon the death of his wife, Rose. Be to him a comfort and strength and remind him to commit his way to your safe keeping and care. And now, O Lord, for the continuing protection of your presence and the support of your arms, make each of us a more responsible and responsive steward



of that which you have entrusted to us, as individuals, to our nation and to our state. We pray in the name of Christ our Lord. Amen."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Roll call for attendance. Now we would ask the membership to be at lease for approximately twenty-five to thirty minutes, the leaders are meeting in the back room trying to get a problem resolved to see if we can't speed up the process of winding down the session, so we'll be back ready not later than 11:00 A.M. and hopefully before then. So, we'll just be at ease and get back out here as quickly as we can."

Recess at 10:30 O'Clock A.M.

Return at 11:00 O'Clock A.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 concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a bill of the following title, to-wit: House Bill 1573. Together with the following amendment thereto. Passed the Senate, as amended, November 11, 1971. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a bill of the following title, to-wit: House Bill 2916. Together with the follow-



ing amendments, thereto. In the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House. Passed the Senate, as amended, November 11, 1971, by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a bill of the following title: House Bill 1177. Together with the following amendments thereto.

In the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House. Passed the Senate, as amended, November 11, 1971. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representative that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title, in the passage of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House of Representatives: Senate Bill 1283. Passed by the Senate, November 11, 1971. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a bill of the following title: House Bill 837. Together with the following amendment thereto. In the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House. Passed the Senate, as amended, November 11, 1971. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a bill of the following title: House Bill 1787. Together with the fol-



lowing amendments thereto. In the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House. Passed the Senate, as amended, November 11, 1971, by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary of the Senate. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a bill of the following title: House Bill 2379. Together with the following amendment thereto. In the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House. Passed the Senate as amended, November 11, 1971. Kenneth Wright, Secretary of the Senate. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a bill of the following title: House Bill 2899. Together with the following amendment thereto. In the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House. Passed the Senate, as amended, November 11, 1971. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a bill of the following title: House Bill 3552. Together with the following amendment thereto. In the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House. Passed the Senate, as amended, November 11, 1971. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

the House of Representatives in the passage of a bill of the following title: House Bill 3621. Together with the following amendment thereto. In the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House. Passed the Senate, as amended, November 11, 1971, by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a bill of the following title: House Bill 3622. Together with the following amendment thereto. In the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House. Passed the Senate, as amended, November 11, 1971, by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of the bills of the following titles: House Bill 1844, 3543, 3660. Passed the Senate, November 11, 1971. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. No further messages."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, with leave of the House, we'll go to Senate Bills second reading. 1282."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1282. A bill for an act to amend 'The Illinois Pension Code'. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. 1302."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1302. An act to insure accountability and govern to make an appropriation there-



for. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments.

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. Senate Bills third reading. All right, 1286, it's on the tab at the bottom of the right hand page of your calendar, the front page on the right hand side."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1286. A bill for an act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of Southern Illinois University. Third reading of the bill."

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

C. L. McCormick: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the purpose of this bill was amended in the Senate, and what it does is no new general revenue money, it's a transfer from other funds into personal services. I believe to the amount of \$2,900,000.00 and it also gives authority or maybe you call it appropriate \$710,000.00 from the fee for personal services. It does not have anything to do with any judicial increases and it makes a \$2,800,000.00 appropriation or transfer within this particular bill. Now, it was heard in Appropriations' Committee and I know of no maybe one opposition, maybe none, and I would certainly appreciate your vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion? All right, the question is shall Senate Bill 1286 pass with the provision that it will become effective immediately upon its becoming a law. All those in favor will vote 'Yeas', the opposed 'No' and this will require 107 votes. Have all





voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 151 'Yeas' and 2 'Nays' and this bill having received the votes required under the constitution are hereby declared passed. Taylor, okay, Richard Carter, 'Yeas'. 1287."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1287. A bill for an act making appropriations and reappropriations to the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities. Third reading of the bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell."

Charles M. Campbell: "Ah, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1287 does exactly the same thing for the various universities of the Board of Governors that we just did on Senate Bill 1286, and that permits the transfer of funds. There's no new additional general revenue money, there's no increase in tuition and I'd appreciate your favorable support."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? The question is shall Senate Bill 1287 pass with the provision that it shall become effective upon its becoming a law. All those in favor vote 'Yeas', the opposed 'No' and this requires 107 votes. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 152 'Yeas' and 4 'Nays' and this bill having received the votes required under the constitution are hereby declared passed. 1310. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Simmons, for what purpose do you rise?"



Arthur E. Simmons: "Ah, 1310 has not been distributed to our desks and I sent the page after it and he didn't have it."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, take it out of the record. 1299."

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

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

Charles W. Clabaugh: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This bill goes along with the other two that we've just passed and it relates to the University of Illinois for \$2,100,000.00 as being taken or transferred from the equipment fund to the personal services fund which is to be added \$2,100,000.00 like sum from the overhead fund for the pay raise for the members of the staff of the University of Illinois."

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

Philip W. Collins: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if the last two bills were bad, this one is even worse. Ah, the University obviously circumventing the legislative process of appropriating for salaries and shirking their responsibility to raise tuitions as called upon by the Governor even though the Board of Regents did accept this responsibility and in all responsibility did raise



tutions, the others chose not to. Now, they find excess funds in appropriated budgets so they could switch around to accomplish salary increases. The other universities did this. Now, the University of Illinois not only pulls out funds to transfer funds to raise salaries but again are diving into the seemingly bottomless pit of overhead funds and the salary increases that are going to be reflected at Champaign, the \$2,100,000.00 in this bill and another \$2,100,000.00 of our so-called overhead funds, again proving the irresponsible and unchecked approach of our educators in throwing money around over which we apparently have no control in the instance of overhead, actually we have had no knowledge. Actually, I think that this is careless, <sup>1.</sup> carious and I think the time has come to put an end to such wild schemes as reflected in these three bills. I've voted 'No' on the past two and I would urge all of you to join me in voting 'No' on this one. I think it's time that the educators were brought within the control and accountability to the legislature. I think it was long overdue that we insisted they show some responsibility that others would suggest that we should play ourselves. I would urge you to resist this latest attempt to circumvent the legislative process and I urge a 'No' vote."

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

Charles W. Clabaugh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this bill does take two point one million dollars from the overhead fund. Now,



this legislature, whatever you may think, or feel about this overhead fund, it is not an appropriated money, it's money that the university has received from both private and governmental, federal government projects. The money is there. This House just last week or maybe earlier this week refused to abolish that fund. Therefore, if the gentleman who has just spoken dislikes that fund as badly as he says he does, and I'm sure he does, then this is the way to get rid of \$2,100,000.00 and only leave \$680,000.00 in the fund. Now, there has been no raise in the tuition at the University of Illinois and this isn't costing the students anything. The university says they can get along, they'd rather have the other money but they couldn't get it and so this is the way to answer the needs for a salary increase of around 5% for all staff members at the University of Illinois and if we don't pass this bill with at least 107 votes, then that will be they will be the only group of state employees in the State of Illinois that did not get a consideration of even 1%, but it will be 5% roughly, not across the board, but on the average and so I urge you to give support to this bill. There's nothing unusual about it, every university as long as I've known them has had this income or this overhead fund and if you want to abolish the overhead fund, let's spend what's in it and then pass a bill abolishing them, which you turned down last week. I urge your support on this bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question is shall Senate



Bill 1299 pass with the provision that it shall become effective upon its becoming a law. All those in favor will vote 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', and this will require 107 votes. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Roman J. Kosinski: "Would you, Mr. Speaker, would you please record me as voting 'Present'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Record the gentleman as voting 'Present'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 146 'Yeas' and 6 'Nays' and this, 1 'Present' and this bill having received the required vote under the constitution is hereby declared passed. 1297."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1297, a bill for an act to amend 'The Illinois Vehicle Code'. Third reading of the bill."

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

Arthur E. Simmons: "Ah, we do not have 1297 in our books."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "644."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Take it out."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Take that out of the record. 645."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 645. A bill for an act in regard to forcible entry and detainer. Third reading of the bill."

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

Arthur L. Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 645 is an amendment to the forcible entry and detainer act. It



deals with the right of a Board of Managers on condominium apartments to proceed with a forcible entry in the event that one of the condominium owners does not pay his common way expenses. There have been amendments placed to the bill which set forth much more stringent safeguards for the condominium owner than would exist in the usual forcible entry and detainer procedure including a 30 day notice, a 60 day stay, a 60 to 180 day stay of the writ and this is to allow the Board of Managers who actually represents all of the other owners to proceed and safeguard the interest of all of the owners where there is one man who refuses to pay his common way expenses. I would appreciate your favorable vote on Senate Bill 645."

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

Bernard B. Wolfe: "Ah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the gentleman yield for a question, please?"

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

Bernard B. Wolfe: "Art, was we have an amendment on our desks marked Amendment Number Two. Was the first amendment withdrawn and this substituted?"

Arthur L. Berman: "No, sir, Amendment Number One and Two are both in. Amendment Number One extended the period for stay of the writ from just 60 days to 60 to 180 within the discretion of the court. Ah, Amendment Number Two, you and I had discussed and worked out the additional safe guards for the tenant."



Bernard B. Wolfe: "Oh, that was adopted yesterday at a second reading on a recall of the bill?"

Arthur L. Berman: "Yes, sir, yes, sir."

Bernard B. Wolfe: "All right, thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further. . .the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman, care to close?"

Arthur L. Berman: "No, thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question is shall House Bill Senate Bill 8-, 645 pass? 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 141 'Yeas' and 2 'Nays' and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 644."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 644. An act to amend Section 3 of an act to exempt the homestead from forced sale, and to provide for setting off the same, and to exempt certain personal property from attachment and sale on execution, and from distress for rent. Third reading of the bill."

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

Arthur L. Berman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask for leave to have Senate Bill 646 considered with 644. This, with the previous bill, 645 represents a package and they are related."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there leave? All right, hearing no objection, read 646."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 646. A bill for an act to add Sections 9.2 and 18.2 and to amend Sections 10 and 12



of the Condominium Property Act. Third reading of the bill."

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

Arthur L. Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 644 and 646 are companions to the previous bill, 645, dealing with changes in the condominium act to grant the Board of Managers the right to include in their condominium property agreement, provisions concerning forcible entry and detainer and also excluding homestead rights, the enforcement of liens for common way expenses under the condominium under the condominium property act. I would appreciate a favorable vote on 644 and 646."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman, or Mr. B. B. Wolfe."

Bernard B. Wolfe: "Will the gentleman yield for questioning?"

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

Bernard B. Wolfe: "Representative Berman, is the effect of 644 and 646 with respect to the \$5,000.00 homestead exemption, is that what it applies to, the \$5,000.00 homestead exemption act?"

Arthur L. Berman: "It applies, to, yeah, homestead exemption, not any other type of exemption."

Bernard B. Wolfe: "Does, all right, does that destroy the right of the owner of the unit to claim this exemption with respect to a mortgage foreclosure, for example?"

Arthur L. Berman: "Well, Representative Wolfe, you know that when there's a mortgage foreclosure, they've usually waived





that right in the mortgage document. This puts the obligation as to common way expenses into the same category as a mortgage lien, mainly that his homestead exemption would not be waived as to the common way expenses."

Bernard B. Wolfe: "Would it also remove the privilege and right of the unit owner to claim an exemption against a third party creditors?"

Arthur L. Berman: "No."

Bernard B. Wolfe: "It still preserves that right?"

Arthur L. Berman: "Yes."

Bernard B. Wolfe: "Thank you."

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

Arthur L. Berman: "I'd just ask for a favorable vote, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question is shall these two bills pass? All those in favor will vote 'Yeas' and the opposed 'No' and the Clerk will take two roll calls. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Duff, 'Yeas'. Each of these bills having received a vote of 130 'Yeas' and 4 'Nays' is hereby declared passed. Douglas, 'Yeas'. Record B. B. Wolfe as 'Present' on each of those two bills. 1073."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1073. A bill for an act to amend Sections 13 and 13 (a) of an act to provide for a Springfield Metropolitan Exposition and Auditorium Authority in Sangamon County and to define its powers and duties.



Third reading of the bill."

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

J. David Jones: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 1073 is an amendment to the Springfield Auditorium Act. It is not what as indicated in the digest as the amendment passed yesterday is out of the bill. Providing for only two things. One calls for the election of the Board of the authority at the general election instead of the primary, and two prohibits any tax levy during the period covering this extended period. 1073 applies only to Springfield and is sponsored by the entire Springfield legislative delegation. I'd appreciate your affirmative vote."

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

Arthur E. Simmons: "Will the sponsor yield for a question?"

J. David Jones: "Yes, sir."

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

Arthur E. Simmons: "Did not also that amendment provide for becoming law immediately upon passage?"

J. David Jones: "It does sir."

Arthur E. Simmons: "The calendar doesn't so indicate."

J. David Jones: "Yes, . . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes, the calendar should so reflect that that bill requires it has an emergency on it. The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Alsup."

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

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

John W. Alsup: "Now, did I understand you to say that there's



an amendment, that this bill would only apply to the city of Springfield, you took the county out of it?"

J. David Jones: "No, no, ah, no other city. The Springfield Metropolitan Exposition Authority applies only to that."

John W. Alsup: "Then it applies to the whole county then? Sangamon County, right?"

J. David Jones: "Yes, sir, it only has to do with the election of the board thereto."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The. . ."

John W. Alsup: "That's the new bill, this proposed building they turned down several times, is. . ."

J. David Jones: "No, this has nothing to do with the building this is the election of the board, sir."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The. . ."

J. David Jones: "The amendment's on your desk."

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

Richard A. Walsh: "Will the gentleman yield?"

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

Richard A. Walsh: "Ah, Dave, by your explanation then, the bill does not extend any additional taxing power to the authority?"

J. David Jones: "In this it extends the time of the board to be elected in the general election rather than the primary and a prohibition in the amendment that was passed, yes it prohibits any tax levy during that period."

Richard A. Walsh: "So that it's an entirely new bill, this



amendment's an entirely new bill from the one that came from the Senate?"

J. David Jones: "That's entirely what I said, that was my opening remark, sir."

Richard A. Walsh: "Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? The gentleman care to close? The gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones."

J. David Jones: "I'd appreciate 107 votes."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question is shall Senate Bill 1056 pass with the provision that it shall become effective upon its becoming a law? All those in favor will vote 'Yeas' and the opposed 'No' and this requires 107 votes. Stedelin. The gentleman from Marion, Mr. Stedelin."

Harold D. Stedelin: "In explanation of my vote, I'm doing it for the Representatives on the Democratic side of the aisle we want to remember that Senator Horsley was the one that refused to go along with extending the county board election at the same time. It don't seem to me that he practices what he preaches, but I'm going to vote 'Yeas'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 165 'Yeas' and no 'Nays' and this bill having received the vote required under the constitution is hereby declared passed. All right, with leave of the House, we'll go to concurrences on which there appears House Bill 2167 on which the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Arthur A. Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of



the House, House Bill 2167 is a bill which deals with making the Department of Corrections a school district so that the district would qualify for funding for educational purposes. The bill was agreed to by both Dr. Bakalis and the Department of Corrections. Now, Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2167 was worked out with Dr. Bakalis and the Department and restructured the Board of Education for that particular school district. Mr. Speaker I now move that the House concur with Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2167."

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

Arthur L. Berman: "Will the sponsor yield? What is Amendment Number One do?"

Arthur A. Telcser: "Art, Amendment Number One restructured the Board of Education for that school district. It was worked out with Dr. Bakalis' office and Peter Bensinger's Office and that's all that Amendment Number One deals with."

Arthur L. Berman: "Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2167. 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 152 'Yeas' and no 'Nays' and the House concurs in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2167. 1301."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1301. 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. Third reading of the bill."

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

Lewis A. H. Caldwell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1301 is an appropriation for the Equal Education Opportunity Department of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction office. It appropriates approximately \$95,000.00 which the federal government will match that with \$107,000.00. This bill which was within the Appropriations' Committee came out 16 to nothing and I would appreciate your support. I need 107 votes."

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

Robert S. Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield for a couple of questions?"

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

Robert S. Juckett: "How many employees are there in your department?"

Lewis A. H. Caldwell: "Ah, would you repeat the question, Mr. Juckett."

Robert S. Juckett: "How many employees are there in your department?"

Lewis A. H. Caldwell: "I understand that there are seven."

Robert S. Juckett: "Seven? Seven employees and you're going to be spending about \$201,000.00. What is the purpose for yeah what's the purpose of this department?"

Lewis A. H. Caldwell: "Mr. Mr. Juckett, let me get this infor-



mation, I have it somewhere on my desk, but I don't want to hold up the proceedings at this point, so if the Speaker will pull it out of the record for a minute, I'll be prepared to answer all the questions."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, pull it out of the record. With leave of the . . . all right with leave of the House, we'll go to concurrences, House Bill 2674. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAvoy, with regard to Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2674."

Walter McAvoy: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move that the House concur in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2674. It amends House Bill 2674 on page 2, line 27 by striking the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'and the public'. And in line 32 by inserting after the period the following: 'in addition that the bank shall post notice of temporary closing and authorization to the closing on the main entrance of the door in case of disasters.' I'd appreciate your favorable consideration in concurrence."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Further discussion? The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2674? 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, Choate 'Yeas', on this question, there are 144 'Yeas' and no 'Nays' and this bill and the House concurs in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2674. Senate Amendment Number Two. The



gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAvoy."

Walter McAvoy: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, Senate Amendment Number Two to House Bill 2674 in the Senate on page 1, line 30 by inserting immediately after the word 'vote' the following: 'and one or more or all of the officers of a bank'. On page 2, by striking line 33 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'following natural disasters, civil rights, powers failures, interruption in communication facilities, robberies or interruptions or attempted robbery and they shall post a sign to protect the public.' I'd appreciate favorable consideration and concurrence of this bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number Two to House Bill 2674? 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 141 'Yeas' and no 'Nays' and the House concurs with Senate Amendment Number Two. Ah, Senate Bill 157."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 157. An act to amend Section 1 of an act to designate certain areas of State Parks, Memorials and Conservation areas and to vest jurisdiction over the same in the Department of Conservation. Third reading of the bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Washburn."

James R. Washburn: "Ah, Mr. . . ."





Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Washburn, do you want to proceed with that Senate Bill 157?"

James R. Washburn: "Ah, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 157 is a routine bill that simply designates Goose Lake Prairie as in the public interest and names it Goose Lake Prairie Park. I'd appreciate your vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? The question is shall the House pass Senate Bill 157? All those in favor vote 'Yeas' and the opposed 'No'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 135 'Yeas' and no 'Nays' and the Senate Bill 157 is declared passed. All right, 1223."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1223, a bill for an act to amend Sections 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the Safety Inspections and Education in Industrial and Commercial Establishments Act. Third reading of the bill."

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

Leland J. Kennedy: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1223 is the Labor Laws Commission bill. It provides for the inspection of places of employment by the Department of Labor for the purpose of enforcing all pertinent occupational health and safety laws. It provides for inspection at reasonable times and notice of hearing for violations of the law. This bill has an emergency clause on it and I'd appreciate your vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion? The gen-



tleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this bill is a very important bill for the Department of Labor and the Industrial Commission and it does have an emergency clause on it in that in discussing with the Industrial Commission and the Department of Labor and other interested parties that this is a compromise position by the amendment that was attached hereon. We are very much in favor of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. and is very much in favor of this bill in the U.A.W., so I urge that this bill be passed."

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

Fred J. Tuerk: "Would the sponsor yield?"

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

Fred J. Tuerk: "Lee, I notice by this Amendment Number Three in the enforcement of the provisions of the Health and Safety Act. Now, with the Federal Health and Safety Act being passed and enacted into law, and it's being implemented now, how does this affect, for example the state inspectors versus the federal inspectors. Who takes precedent?"

Leland J. Kennedy: "Well, Representative, Amendments Number One and Two were tabled. You're correct. . . ."

Fred J. Tuerk: "I can't hear you, I'm sorry."

Leland J. Kennedy: ". . . Amendment Number Three was introduced by Representative Hanahan and I would like to yield to him for an answer to that question."



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

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Right, in the Amendment on Senate Bill 1223, the amendment clarifies what the Health and Safety Act is looked to in Illinois, not in the United States. But the bill also incorporates any health and safety laws applicable in Illinois. In Senate Bill 1223 made federal regulations enforceable as part of Illinois law. These rules are covered by Senate Bill 1223. In other words, what's happening here is we do not have presently any law in this area enforced the health and safety inspection. We need this bill to do that. There is no conflict between the federal no more than there is in any other federal minimum wage law or if we had a collective bargaining law. There is no real overlap of duties, because generally similar to the Liquor Control Inspections the state inspection is geared for a certain type of infractions against state law, the federal law more than likely supersede to make sure that the state is doing its job. This is how it really works."

Fred J. Tuerk: "Well, according to the federal law, the federal inspectors come in and investigate conditions, do they not?"

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Right."

Fred J. Tuerk: "Well, how do the state inspectors tie into that, I'm not sure."

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Well, first of all, I might point out



there aren't enough federal inspectors in the State of Illinois to cover one-tenth of the jobs they should be doing. Number one. Number two, there is no state inspection in this area right today, because we have no law in this area, we're void of law right now. Nobody's doing the inspecting right now."

Fred J. Tuerk: "Well, what you're saying then this bill addresses itself to help implement the federal law in a sense?"

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Yes, yes, the state inspectors will help implement the federal. Because you see under this amendment the director of labor, if it's imminently dangerous the job to continue under this bill we will allow the director of labor to go into circuit court and try to stop the dangerous position of the law. A federal inspector at the same time could have uncovered this, but our state director would have the empowering right to step into court."

Fred J. Tuerk: "All right, you would say then that this bill does not give that state inspector a lot of undue powers, ah. . ."

Thomas J. Hanahan: "No, definitely not."

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

Robert J. Walters: "Would the sponsor yield to a question?"

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

Robert J. Walters: "Representative Kennedy, the statement was made that this bill has been endorsed by labor, I wonder if



the industry has approved this bill?"

Leland J. Kennedy: "They have, Representative, yes."

Robert J. Walters: "Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Kane, Mr. Schoeberlein."

Allen L. Schoeberlein: "Ah, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this bill was given a good full hearing in Industry and Labor Committee. We held it over for four and a half months in order to get communications to see how much opposition there may be. We did not get them and I would suggest and ask that you vote the bill out."

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

Roman J. Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield to a question?"

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

Roman J. Kosinski: "Mr. Kennedy, does this raise any fees or oppose any new fees on the commercial establishments inspectors?"

Leland J. Kennedy: "Well, Representative, I'm of the opinion that Amendment Number Three as it was written and introduced by Representative Hanahan, and if you would permit me, I would like to have him answer that question. He's not in his seat now, but he gave the same answer to, he gave the same answer to Representative Tuerk from Peoria and I'm sure that. . ."

Roman J. Kosinski: "I'll repeat my question, Representative Kennedy. Representative Hanahan, does this act this bill



increase any fees or oppose any new or additional fees on commercial establishments for such inspections?"

Leland J. Kennedy: "No."

Roman J. Kosinski: "Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, is there any further discussion? The gentleman from Madison, Mr. Kennedy, to close."

Leland J. Kennedy: "Mr. Speaker, I won't belabor the point anymore, I would appreciate your vote and needs 107 votes."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question is shall House Bill 1223 pass? All those in favor. . .Senate Bill. . . 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 152 'Yeas' and no 'Nays' and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Granata, for what purpose do you rise?"

Peter C. Granata: "Mr. Speaker, I move to make a motion."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Okay."

Peter C. Granata: "Mr. Speaker, I now move that House Bills 1142, . . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ah, Mr. Granata, let me interrupt for just a moment. What the gentleman is doing now, is he's going to be reading the House Bills for which there has not been a request that they be put on the Speaker's table and on the Spring calendar and when he finishes, he's going to move to table all of those bills, so I would suggest that you get your calendars before you and if there are any sec-



ond thoughts, you'd better let us know now, as we move along. I'll recognize anybody that has any question about that as when we get to the end of the gentleman's motion. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Granata."

Peter C. Granata: "I move to table House Bills on second reading, House Bill 1142, 1543 and 3562 and House Bills on the order of third reading, 1486, 1487, 1785, 1909, 2306, 2307, 2340, 2414, 2529, 2557, 2840, 2859, 2905, 3040, 3727, 3740. And on the order of consideration postponed, third reading House Bill 524, 1554, 1710, 1836, 29-, 2195 and 2898. I move that those bills be tabled."

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

Arthur E. Simmons: "Did he read 2197?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Did you read which number, Mr. Simmons?"

Arthur E. Simmons: "2197."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He read 2195."

Peter C. Granata: "2995, I did not read no 2997, or 21-."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

Monroe L. Flinn: "Under consideration postponed was 1554 one of those bills?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Did he read 1554 on consideration postponed? Yes, he did. All right, delete 3740 from that list on House Bills on third reading, 3740, that will be taken off the tabling motion. All right, also take back off the tabling motion 3720 through 3725. They're on House Bills second reading. All right, is there any further



question on the motion to table made by the gentleman from Cook? All right, all those in favor to table the bills will say . . . all those in favor say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No' and on tomorrows calendar those bills that have been tabled will not be shown on the calendar. The gentleman from Coles, Mr. Cox, for what purpose do you rise?"

William D. Cox: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, I also would like to, me and the Chief Sponsor of House Bill 2820 to table that bill "

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

William D. Cox: "On third reading."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, I'm advised by my colleagues over there that that was on the motion to table. So, it's been tabled already, it was on the motion. All right, there is now being distributed the supplemental calendar on concurrences which you will be referring to throughout the day. House Bill on the supplemental calendar, 1573. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, desire to be heard on that matter?"

Gerald W. Shea: "Ah, I was getting a map for Mr. Madigan, he's got a little confused. Senate. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Madigan's never confused about maps."

Gerald W. Shea: "Well, we're discussing some concepts, let's put it that way. How big a district you could run in in this state, you know, like statewide or something. House Bill 1573 is the four installment plan for Cook County and I would move for concurrence in Senate Amendment Number Two."





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

Arthur E. Simmons: "What did the amendment do?"

Gerald W. Shea: "Ah, the amendment instead of being on the changes the payments from the first day of the month to the tenth day of the month so that the people could have their interest in savings and loans and banks and that so they wouldn't have to break the interest cycle."

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

Bradley M. Glass: "Will the sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes?"

Bradley M. Glass: "Representative Shea, ah, under this bill as amended in the Senate I know there were concern by those who would like to retain the two installment payment procedure, and this I know provides for four payments, but under the amendment and under the bill will it still be possible for a tax payer to prepay his first three installments at the due date of the first installment."

Gerald W. Shea: "Line 23 of Amendment Number Two puts in this language, 'the tax payer may prepay any installment.'"

Bradley M. Glass: "Ah, thank you and ah I think that covers any objections that I had and I think this is a good amendment."

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

George M. Burditt: "Will the gentleman yield?"

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



George M. Burditt: "Ah, Jerry, what is the effect going to be in the suburban area of the amendment?"

Gerald W. Shea: "Well, I I don't quite understand what you mean. What's the effect going to be in the suburban area. If this bill passes, it's anticipated from the figures that I've seen that there will be a savings in all taxing bodies in Cook County of up to \$55 million a year and the sale of tax anticipation warrants."

George M. Burditt: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, I haven't had an opportunity to consider the amendment, I wonder if the gentleman would take it out of the record for a minute so I could come over and talk to him about it?"

Gerald W. Shea: "I'd be very happy to, George."

George M. Burditt: "Thank you."

Gerald W. Shea: "Will you just give me an assurance that I can get the bill called again during this brief session?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Lee, Mr. Shapiro."

David C. Shapiro: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I also think that we ought to wait on 1573 until the Senate passes out a personal property tax deduction bill in the minimum amount of at least \$10,000.00."

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

Henry J. Hyde: "Well, Mr. Speaker, an important announcement for anybody who has not yet gotten the word. We are moving into tomorrow certainly and so the members should retain their hotel rooms for tonight. I regret inability to tell them about Sunday, we don't know, we are making progress



and not making progress and it's difficult to tell, so ah certainly we will be here tomorrow. Number two, I now move that this House stand in recess until the hour of 3:00 P.M. this afternoon."

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

Holloway, for what purpose do you rise?"

James D. Holloway: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to say a few words about that last announcement. It looks to me like we're going to sit around here again until 3:00 P.M. this afternoon and twiddle our thumbs and then we're going to adjourn and come back here tomorrow. Now, maybe you don't have any control over it, maybe too, you do. But let's not fool around here and spend Saturday and may get into Sunday. Now, if we're going to be here, let's stay here as long as we need to today and come back the first of next week and stay all next week, if you want, but this is a lot of bologna."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The motion was not debatable, so your remarks are out of order. All those in favor of the motion say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', that we're in recess until 3:00 P.M."

Recess at 12:45 O'Clock P.M.

Return at 3:00 O'Clock P.M.

Voice: "I move we adjourn, Mr. Speaker."

Doorkeeper: "All who are not entitled to the House chamber,



will you please retire to the gallery. Thank you."

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

Fredric B. Selçke: "Messages from the Senate by Mr. Wright.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a bill of the following title: House Bill 2673. Together with the following amendment, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House. Passed the Senate, as amended, November 12, 1971. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a bill of the following title: House Bill 3560. Together with the following amendment, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House. Passed the Senate, as amended, November 12, 1971, by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title, in the passage of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House of Representatives: Senate Bill 890. Passed by the Senate, November 12, 1971. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurred with the House in the adoption of House Amendment Number Three to a bill of the following title: Senate Bill 597. Concurred in by the Senate, November 11,



1971, by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurred with the House in the adoption of House Amendment Number Two to a bill of the following title: Senate Bill 670. Concurred in by the Senate, November 11, 1971, by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. No further messages."

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

Henry J. Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House stand in recess for purposes of a Republican conference in Room 212 for one half hour. Republicans, please report immediately to Room 212."

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

Clyde L. Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Democratic members to please come to Room M-5 and we'll get back on the floor probably. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Before at 4:00 P.M., as close as we can to 4:00 P.M."

Clyde L. Choate: "All right, M-5."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, we'll stand in recess until 4:00 P.M. Republicans in 212, Democrats in M-5."

Recess at 3:27 O'Clock P.M.

Return at 4:00 O'Clock P.M.

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Message from the Senate."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright."



Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title, in the passage of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House of Representatives: Senate Bill 1130. Passed by the Senate, November 12, 1971. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, with leave of the House, we'll go to all right on on is it on now? Okay. All right on there are two supplemental calendars on conferences on your desk and we're now referring to Supplemental Calendar Number One, on which there appears House Bill 837. The gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Clabaugh."

Charles W. Clabaugh: "Mr. . . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Champaign."

Charles W. Clabaugh: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 837 was passed by the House with no considerable opposition as I recall. It went to the Senate. The amendment in the Senate did not change the sentiment in the bill at all. It simply combined two sections of the bill in the one and frankly, Mr. Hoffman and I think it's in better form than it was. This deals with school transportation in which an Appellate Court decision upset the long established position of transportation in this state. The Superintendent of Public Instruction Office under Dr. Bakalis worked with the School Problems Commission for the passage of 837 and I now move sir that we concur with the senate amendment to this bill."

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



is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 837. 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 107 'Yeas' and 3 'Nays' and Houlihan 'Yeas' and the House concurs in Senate Amendment Number One to H.B. 837. Giorgi, 'Yeas' on that last bill. On the second page of the Supplemental Calendar appears House Bill 2673. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton."

Bernard E. Epton: "Mr. . . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "On Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2673."

Bernard E. Epton: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move concurrence in Senate's amendment."

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

Bernard E. Epton: "Senate Amendment Number One."

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

Samuel C. Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it greatly if the House sponsors of the Senate amendments or would ask for concurrence would explain what these Senate amendments do."

Bernard E. Epton: "The amendment simply changes the date Sam to make it effective. It changes the business date to December 31, 1971 and it simply says that the amendatory act shall take affect on December 31, 1971. In effect they're purely technical changes and in no way affects the



substance of the bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, is there any further. . . the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

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

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

Bernard E. Epton: "I would prefer not to."

Gerald W. Shea: "Ah, I see that the Senate Amendment gives it an earlier effective date and then do you know if this bill has been passed by a majority of the 60% majority as required in the Senate and the records so show it?"

Bernard E. Epton: "Yes. Ah, my esteemed colleague on the other side of the aisle, both the House and the Senate have passed it by sufficient majority to make it effective on that date. I believe the vote was well, like. . ."

Gerald W. Shea: "Well, you're going to need 107 votes as I read the bill now, to pass it. My comment is that the this is final action and unless the Senate record reflect that it was passed by a three-fifths majority, . . ."

Bernard E. Epton: "Yes, I understand that, Mr. Shea. In both instances it passed this House, I believe by 142 votes and in the Senate by 47 votes."

Gerald W. Shea: "Thank you."

Bernard E. Epton: "You're welcome."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the . . . all right, the question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2673 with the provision that the act shall take effect on December 31, 1971 which requires





a three-fifths or 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 133 'Yeas' and 1 'Nay' and this amendment having received the vote required under the constitution is hereby declared adopted. Back to page one of the Supplemental Calendar, House Bill 1177. The gentleman from Perry, Mr. Cunningham."

William J. Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in regard to House Bill 1177, Amendment Number One was hurriedly passed in the Senate, was later found to be defective on several counts. Amendment Number Two was prepared to make the bill in a form agreeable to all the parties concerned. Now, the Senate passed Amendment Number Two without removing Amendment Number One and I'm going to move now that the House non-concur in Amendment Number One and concur in Amendment Number Two. I'm told that the Senate will recede from Amendment Number One if we now do this, so I now move that the House non-concur in Amendment Number One to House Bill 1177."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor of the motion to non-concur say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', and the House non-concurs in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 1177. Now, Senate Amendment Number Two."

William J. Cunningham: "By the same token, I now move that the House concurs in Amendment Number Two to House Bill 1177."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? The question is . . .the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman."

Arthur L. Berman: "Ah, would the sponsor yield?"

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

Arthur L. Berman: "Ah, Bill, from the synopsis it says that from my impression it indicates that there would not be any personal liability involved in the dram shop policy enforced. Is that the gist of the bill?"

William J. Cunningham: "The gist of the bill was to remove the liability of dram shop on the landlord as long as there was coverage by the insurance policy. That is what the ultimate effect of keeping Amendment Number One will do."

Arthur L. Berman: "What does Amendment Number Two do?"

William J. Cunningham: "Ah, ah, keeping Amendment Number Two, Amendment Number One we've taken off by the action just a few minutes ago. And Number Two is the one that we all agree with that there should be coverage, for the agreed parties."

Arthur L. Berman: "Now, if there is, does the policy have to insure the landlord also or just the tavern owner?"

William J. Cunningham: "There's two provisions in this Amendment Number Two. If the landlord is one and the same as the licensee, then he can't get out of the kettle of fish, but then if the landlord is separate from the licensee and there is an exemption, a violate insurance policy, then the landlord is free and the licensee is in the kettle of fish."

Arthur L. Berman: "Now, what happens if there is either a



denial of coverage with the existence of a policy, but the denial of coverage by the company? What would happen if this bill passed?"

William J. Cunningham: "If there is existence of coverage you say. . ."

Arthur L. Berman: "Well, no, you say many times a dram shop policy excludes coverage if the bartender is the assailant and would the landlord be in or out if in that situation where the bartender was the alleged intoxicated person, but there was an exclusion in the policy where the company wouldn't pay if the it was the bartender?"

William J. Cunningham: "This bill, after being worked over, a little bit by our friend, your friends, our friends over in the Senate, makes a bona fide landowner free, a non-bona fide landlord not free, but a bona fide landlord just because he owns a building with a dram shop happens to be in existence is not to be charged if there existing in charge."

Arthur L. Berman: "Just one more question. If the tavern owner has a policy and all the leases I'm aware of that the tavern holder has to take out a policy that also covers the landlord. What's the need for this bill?"

William J. Cunningham: "The need for the bill is the revision of the 104 years ago by Carrie Nation that we haven't gotten around to changing yet. This is the need. I think we discussed this bill a long time ago, Art. Ah, the the fact is we just don't want to leave everybody off the hook."



We want to the general public covered for their dram shop cases, but we want to leave a bona fide landlord who has nothing to do with the dram shop case whatsoever off the hook if he has ascertained that there is sufficient insurance under his lease. And you're the one drawing the lease of course, so you can do make this a provision of your lease."

Arthur L. Berman: "My fee isn't big enough to cover the injury, that's the trouble."

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

Samuel C. Maragos: "Will the sponsor yield to a question?"

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

Samuel C. Maragos: "Bill, it's confusing to us because from practice in comparing and representing landlords and also tavern owners and preparing leases, assuming that the time that the lease is drawn up there is a policy and you ascertain that there is coverage, therefore the landlord is not on the hook as you put it. However, during the interim, assuming that the policy is cancelled, and inadvertently no notice is sent to the landlord, what happens then?"

William J. Cunningham: "I'm glad you asked that question, because this will be of benefit to the lawyers, it will protect the lawyers, and I'm in an odd situation trying to do anything for the lawyers. . ."

Samuel C. Maragos: "I'm interested in protecting the public, not the lawyers."

William J. Cunningham: "Yes. . ."



Samuel C. Maragos: "But in order to be protected, they have to have lawyers, Bill."

William J. Cunningham: "The burden of proof is on the bona fide landlord to ascertain at all times that there is an existing insurance to cover the limits as described by the policy. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right. . . wait wait just a moment, we've got to get a little order in here, or we're not going to get anything accomplished for the rest of the day, and the night. All right, now you want to proceed."

William J. Cunningham: "And I would like to move the House concurs in Amendment Number Two."

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

Samuel C. Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, in due deference to the distinguished (jes) on the other side of the aisle, member on the other side of the aisle, he still hasn't answered my question. Bill, what I'm trying to ascertain what if that policy is cancelled, does the amendment affect that at all?"

William J. Cunningham: "Ah, I want to say. . ."

Samuel C. Maragos: ". . . does this amendment affect that at all? Know what the original bill says, but this amendment affect that point at all, that's what I'm asking?"

William J. Cunningham: "This amendment does not affect that point and I want to say it once again, in the event that the landlord does not keep in effect a valid policy of insurance, then he becomes liable again, in the event that



there is existing insurance and he is off the hook."

Samuel C. Maragos: "In other words, whether it's his fault or not, if there is no coverage he's liable and if there is coverage, he's not liable."

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

Romie J. Palmer: "If the sponsor would yield?"

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

Romie J. Palmer: "What organization, Bill, requested this amendment be placed on in the Senate?"

William J. Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there is no organization, there is no Bar Association, there is no Chicago Bar, Illinois Bar, State Bar, there is no Liquor Tax Association, Insurance Association, Carrie Nation, W.C.T.U. or anyone else that is interested in this amendment other than the people that think that the ownership of a building should not necessarily be a residual for bad cases of the dram shop law. I do resent any kind of implication that may make the last speaker think that I have any ulterior motive whatsoever. I have nothing to gain and nothing to lose, and once again I move that the House concur in Amendment Number Two."

Romie J. Palmer: "I I let me just say this, I didn't intend to enfeather the House sponsor here, I just wanted to know if there was any organization, you mentioned people, the people who wanted the amendment put on, I thought that perhaps you might want to, if it was an organization, you might like to identify them, that's all."



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

Richard O. Hart: "I'd like to ask the sponsor a question."

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

Richard O. Hart: "Now, Representative Cunningham, I'd like to think that you stated and I don't think you meant to say that this requires that the landlord have insurance and if he has insurance, then he's not virtually liable. The amendment would require or would provide that if the non-landlord bartender or licensee has insurance then the landlord is not liable, isn't that right?"

William J. Cunningham: "You read it the way I do, yes, sir, Dick."

Richard O. Hart: "All right, ah, the problem you know one of the problems that we've had in this field is insurance companies going broke and what if there is in fact in effect at the time of the claim of an action, a policy but later on before there's any recovery, the company goes broke, where's the landlord there and then where's the person that's injured?"

William J. Cunningham: "Well, you and I both are aware of the fact that we didn't pass the impaired insurance act this year and we are relying on the Department of Insurance and the successors to the present Department of Insurance to be sure that the dram shop carriers in this state will not be impaired. They have the authority over here to do that and we charged them with that responsibility."



Richard O. Hart: "That was an excellent piece of legislation, I might say. Would that would that cover these people, in other words if the dram shop company went broke after they had issued policy, then the claims that were reduced to judgment collectible would then be paid in full from this fund, is that right?"

William J. Cunningham: "From the fund."

Richard O. Hart: "In full, 100%?"

William J. Cunningham: "It's supposed to be, yes, sir, up to the amount of the limits as established by Number Two."

Richard O. Hart: "Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

John S. Matijevich: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support Representative Cunningham's motion for concurrence for this amendment. But one of the speaker's asked why do we need this bill? The reason we need this bill is that the insurance companies have made a bonanza by collecting insurance twice, both by the landlord and the licensee. Now, I resent also the Representative who did asked, who asked you who introduced this legislation, because as you all know, I introduced and passed House Bill 63 and to my amazement I read an article in one of the Church Council's newsletter that someone asked me to introduce this bill or prepared it in fact, they said they prepared the bill. I walked to the Reference Bureau and had the bill prepared. Then they further went on to say that





the bill was defeated in committee 10 to 1 and mysteriously it was brought back alive. You all know how it happened, it happened because we as a legislature heard the arguments on the floor of the House and we thought we had an inequitable situation. And I say here and now that this too has been inequitable, that the landowners, the building owners, have been paying insurance unduly and I think it's been improper and I think that we as a legislature ought to help these aggrieved people and I therefore ask for your support in the House concurrence to Senate Amendment Number Two to House Bill 1177."

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

William J. Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this particular amendment is what was the result of many many hours over in the Senate and here in the House of trying to arrive at something that was equitable for the landlord in the State of Illinois, the one that has no way whatsoever of determining intoxication of a client in a dram shop. We've explained it, we've gone through it, this is a good bill. I have every reason to believe that it is a first break through in dram shop in 104 years. I ask your support of this amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate Amendment Number Two to House Bill 1177. All those in favor of concurrence will signify by voting



'Yeas', the opposed by voting 'No'. The gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer, to explain his vote."

Romie J. Palmer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it would appear that this amendment may very well be unconstitutional because of an unreasonable classification. If you ah if you have insurance then those no judgments shall be rendered against the person. If you don't have insurance, then apparently you can get a judgment. I'd like to suggest that if this is correct, then there is certainly a situation here and a very unreasonable classification which is violative of the constitutional provisions of the federal and also the state constitution. The ownership of an insurance policy being a deciding factor of whether or not the liability shall be incurred or not I think is completely wrong, constitutionally and morally."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The. . ."

Romie J. Palmer: "I urge your 'No' vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. Representative Maragos, 'Present'. On this question, the 'Yeas' are 94, the 'Nays' are 24 and the House concurs with Senate Amendment Number Two to House Bill 1177 Record Representative Hill as voting 'Yeas'. On the order of. . .on the order of concurrences appears House Bill 3-, Representative Cunningham, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

William J. Cunningham: "Having voted on the prevailing side, on the motion for adoption of Amendment Number Two to House



Bill 1177, I now move that the vote by which it passed be reconsidered."

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

Pete Pappas: "Mr. Speaker, I move that motion lie on the table."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman has moved that motion lie upon the table. All those in favor signify by saying 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the gentleman's motion prevails. Representative Berman, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Arthur L. Berman: "A point of parliamentary inquiry."

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

Arthur L. Berman: "Inasmuch as Amendment Number One was not concurred in, does this now go back to the Senate to see if they will recede?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes, sir. The sponsor informs me that they have agreed to recede. On the order of concurrence committee reports appears House Bill 2867, for which purpose the gentleman from Whiteside, Representative K. Miller is recognized."

Kenneth W. Miller: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, 2867 is the one we discussed last evening for some time here and at the request of some members we held up on adopting the conference committee report. I'd like to just very quickly review this just for a moment for the information of the members. By the way, the Senate, I'm informed, is already adopted the conference committee report by



an overwhelming majority. Now, the this bill, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the purpose of it essentially in a sentence or two is that this will create the programs involved in order to raise the standard of living for the average welfare recipient. The recipient will not be short changed by taking any job under this bill. The some of the facts, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, are that this is tied in with the Federal Emergency Employment Act and it will provide the State of Illinois approximately \$42 million for the purpose of of up to the employment of up to 10,000 welfare recipients. This puts these people, if they are able to work, this puts these people in the position of holding up their head and receiving a pay check, a pay check and I still have and I know all of us knew the feeling that most of these people are proud people and hopefully they will be in a much better position to continue life the way with this type of a program. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move that the House adopt the conference committee report."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is. . ."

Kenneth W. Miller: "And I might say, Mr. Speaker, this is going to require 60% vote, 107 votes."

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

Eugene M. Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, with will the sponsor yield to a question or two?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He indicates he'd be pleased to."

Eugene M. Barnes: "Ah, one thing in the committee report on



this particular bill, you mentioned the concerning jobs that are involved here. And it also mentioned training programs thereof. But aren't we really talking about in the main, service jobs, not any other meaningful training program?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "That is right, they are service jobs in fact, actually, but in some instances, these people do need need to gain the necessary knowledge in order to do the service jobs according to my understanding. I think I'm right on that regard. We want to give them all the help we can give them."

Eugene M. Barnes: "Okay, okay, all right, I have no problems with that, but I just wanted it understood, because contrary to what I didn't think you wanted to mislead the House and contrary what was said, we're talking about here are remaining service jobs and not jobs that will give these people any particular training and any particular schooling skill as such, is that correct?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "No, it's my understanding that the that this is more or less a temporary program and it's my understanding that no welfare recipients would necessarily be trained in some of the most skilled of our employment sector, but it's only to help these people better themselves and thus hopefully sometime in the future they can get a job when jobs are available in the public or private sector."

Eugene M. Barnes: "One more question. This and I put this in a form of a hypothetical possibility, but would this and



in any way since it is a mandatory act, would this in any way say a guy who has had ill health or what do you have that had previously had some skill that he had pursued, that he had gotten on the welfare rolls through various for various reasons, yet if offered a bonafide job on this particular under this program, he would have to take that job without getting back to the skill that he necessarily had before, or pursuing a skill that he may have attained earlier in life, is that not so?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "I think, Mr. Barnes, that as a temporary measure, that he would be it would be necessary that he take a temporary job until such time as is as there was a skilled opening and he was then able to actually carry on with his skill that he was trained for, but in the interim period, this would give him some kind of employment, rather than be on a welfare program."

Eugene M. Barnes: "May I address myself to this for just a moment?"

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

Eugene M. Barnes: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think this is an extremely important measure that each and every member of the House should give his attention to. For this magic touch every county and every local governmental unit in the State of Illinois. They are referred to directly in this measure and it will have some type of effect on your particular locale. I'm not trying to discredit the theory or the purpose of this legislation. I



think that it's going in the right direction. I've said many times before that part of the problem that I've seen down here was knowing when I was coming up with any suggestions of getting any jobs for people that were on welfare and people who had the greatest need. I think that in this measure that we must consider that it's not a perfect measure, and far be it from that. I think that it has some glaring deficiencies, I think that many of these perhaps if we had additional time should be corrected, but considering what is involved here, considering the job, considering the money that's involved on the emergency program, I will not fight the concurrence, but I think that in the future, that some method should be set up whereas certain people that are involved as an advisory group, if you will, should have some type of input into this type of legislation, so that these various programs will not continue to keep a man below the poverty level in one of these low paying jobs for ever and ever. I think this should be taken under consideration and watched very very closely. Thank you very much."

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

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want to commend publicly Representative Barnes for his insight in a very troublesome area, for public aid jobs recipient type program. I want to thank publicly Representative Miller and Collins, Representative Course, Repres-



entative Krause, Representative Moore, for holding up this bill, because without many members knowledge, this floor of the House, this conference committee report that we're now voting on, is a lot different from the conference committee report that was presented last Thursday. If that conference committee report had been passed last Thursday, I could say to you Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that we would have created a monster in the area of strike breaking, in the area of involving themselves in private sector of public aid workers working, taking jobs of people at lesser wages that aren't on public aid, that it was with the insight of Representative Barnes, Davis, Krause and the rest that we uncovered some of the things that may or may not have been intentionally put in there. I want to point out that on page 6 on line 34 so that the record may show that the word 'not' has a line in it so that it is not so clearly transcribed, but in case there's any question, the recording of this debate that the word 'not' has a line through it and will be omitted and to give you an example, so that the Illinois Department shall not be bound to termination which reflects a going or economic rate for work is completely changed by the word 'not' being removed. I'd like to say to you Ladies and Gentlemen this is just a start, it's the start of a program, a change from projects to programs, but as as sure as I'm standing here and as sure as there's members in this House that will concern themselves with what we're going to do with public aid recipients and what





we're going to do with work programs, yet, I could say to the Governor's Office that I could join with them in doing any constructive work that is necessary. This is the first step. However, I want to place them on notice that at no time will I ever support their reference in this area, where I believe it's anti-union, or will it subject union people from loss of jobs or just taxpayers in being hood-winked into thinking that we're doing something we're not. I think we've caught something that is going to serve notice that you don't move something through the House of Representatives without committee hearings in either the House or the Senate, changing a barrier bill into a major item of business, that there are intelligent members of both sides of the aisle in this House and we will be watching your program, we're serving you notice, do something with it. Don't come back to us with lame duck excuses that we didn't give you the laws that are necessary, because I think we've bent over backwards giving you everything you wanted in the area of a program. But I can say to you very honestly we intend if you do not do the job that we think that we have been told you will do, that in March or April or May we will be back and we'll change the laws how it should be changed, too. So, I do support the gentleman from Sterling, Representative Miller, in concurring with this report. I think there are some deficiencies, but I think we'll let the program go right now until the March session and see what results you come back with and go from there."



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

Robert E. Mann: "Ah, would the sponsor yield for a few questions?"

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

Robert E. Mann: "Ken, am I correct that this does not refer to general assistance persons?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "Well, . . ."

Robert E. Mann: "Well, I didn't hear you."

Kenneth W. Miller: "Well, it's my understanding that being informed here that this is federal funds and it affects A.F.D.C. and is not presently affect general assistance."

Robert E. Mann: "All right. We're talking about employment primarily, are we not, for 16, 17 and 18 year olds and for A.F.D.C. mothers?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "That would be true."

Robert E. Mann: "And am I further correct in inquiring that if these persons do not accept designated employment, they will be removed from the rolls."

Kenneth W. Miller: "If they are able to be employed."

Robert E. Mann: "If they're able to be employed. Now, one other question. Can you tell me what the effective date of this bill, in other words, when would the federal funds be available?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "To my knowledge, we do not know as yet the exact date that the federal funds will be available. Under this emergency act of the federal government."



Robert E. Mann: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, may I ask this of you sir? I know there are going to be other questions, I'd like to listen to the other questions and answers and perhaps be recognized later to address myself to it."

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

John Jerome Hill: "I wonder if the sponsor would yield to a question? Where it mentions in the bill a 16 or 17 or 18 year old being qualified for work, would this in any way interfere with his schooling?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "No, not in the least, because if he's in school, that's where he should be."

John Jerome Hill: "Does it state so in the bill?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "It's my understanding that that's right."

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

Gerald W. Shea: "Ah, will the sponsor yield for a question?"

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

Gerald W. Shea: "Representative Miller, I just read this through several times, but there is a provision on page 3, section 6-1.3 which says utilization avaid available under provisions of the code. Then it talks about a person must have been determined ineligible for aid under Articles III, IV and V, but why is this particular language thereafter struck, 'but general assistance under this article may be provided for persons apparently eligible under Articles III, IV and V until such times as they receive aid under



these articles?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "Ah, just a second, but I think we have the answer. I think this is a requirement to get massive federal funds, if I'm not mistaken, Jerry."

Gerald W. Shea: "No, it is not and this is the problem that I want to bring out, because I think that unless somebody can explain this provision, I'm going to ask to non-concur in this report, because what's happened up in Cook County and I explained this to Representative Hyde earlier today, we haven't had enough people to get the people into the categorical programs. We now find ourselves where we've had to put them on general assistance to feed them. As I now read this program, or as I read this, anybody that is not eligible or is eligible under Titles III, IV and V can not be put on general assistance while they're waiting."

Kenneth W. Miller: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm I'm informed that that there's no intention whatsoever in this bill to be involved with general assistance in any way."

Gerald W. Shea: "Well, that's why I'm asking and I'd like somebody to get to the director or the department or something, because you're striking the lines after line 4, but general assistance under this article may be provided for persons apparently eligible under Articles III, IV, and V until such times as they receive aid under these articles. Now, this is going to put us in a position throughout the State, particularly in Cook County, that a vast number of people are going to be unable to receive any aid from gen-



eral assistance or in any other form until they're put into the categorical program. And it's going to mean in some instances, we're going to have people that aren't going to be able to be fed for 60 days if I read this correctly and I know I know you don't want to do this, at least I think you don't want to, Representative Miller, so might I ask you to take this out of the record for a minute until we get this straightened out?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, I will agree with Mr. Shea for just a moment. We want to make sure this is done today, but in fairness to you, sir, we would like to give you the answers."

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

Kenneth W. Miller: "May I take it out for just a minute?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes, you surely may, sir. Take it out of the record. On the order of concurrences appears House Bill 3552 for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf, is recognized."

Jacob John Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Senate amendment to House Bill 3552 merely struck off the lines that provide that the bill would take effect upon signature. The reason that this was done, as you know this was changing the age for a circulator of a nominating petition from 21 to 18. It's been pointed out that in some of the municipal elections that many have their petitions already being circulated and so as to not cause any confusion or court challenge, we are striking that and I move



concurrence with Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 3552."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? The gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 3552. All those in favor of concurrence signify by voting 'Yeas', the opposed by voting 'No'. Does this have an emergency clause, Representative Wolf? Okay. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. Maragos, 'Yeas'. Duff, 'Yeas'. On this question, the 'Yeas' are 143, the 'Nays' are 0, Waddell, 'Yeas', and this bill having received, and the House concurs with Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 3552. On the order of conference committee, on the order of concurrences, on Supplemental Calendar Number Two on the order of concurrences appears House Bill 3560, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf, is recognized."

Jacob John Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Senate has placed an amendment on this bill. We found that there are some problems with this and I would move to non-concur and that a conference committee be set up."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman has moved that the House do not concur with Senate Amendments to House Bill 3560. All those in favor of non-concurrence signify by saying 'Yeas', the opposed by saying 'No', and the House refuses to concur with Senate Amendments to House Bill 3560. On the order of concurrences appears House Bill 3621 for which purpose the gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Lehman



is recognized."

Ed Lehman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment Number One to House Bill 3621 provides the 'Illinois Building Authority' with the authorization to construct two facilities to be used by the Illinois Department of Corrections. The first authorization is to construct a juvenile reception and diagnostic center at the cost of \$8 million. The second authorization is for the construction of adult classification facility at a cost of \$6 million. It is important and necessary that the state authorization be provided for these facilities in order to capitalize on federal funds presently available. The federal commitment is already available allocated one half the cost of the adult facility and this project can begin as soon as the authorization comes from the State. I recommend concurrence or I suggest concurrence of Amendment Number One to House Bill 3621. "

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

James G. Krause: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to concur in the Senate Amendment but I don't think it's a good a very ethical thing that happened. As you know, the bill as it passed the House was to build a building in the city of East St. Louis and now there are two more buildings attached to it. I'm going to vote for the concurrence, but I don't think it's very good."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion? If not, the gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate



Amendment Number One to House Bill 3621. All those in favor of concurrence signify by voting 'Yeas', the opposed by voting 'No': Have all voted who wished? The, record Representatives Maragos and Jaffe as voting 'Present'.

Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, the 'Yeas' are 126, the 'Nays' are 2, 2 answering 'Present', and the House concurs with Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 3621. On the order of concurrences, appears House Bill 3622, for which purpose the gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Lehman, is recognized."

Ed Lehman: "You call my name, Mr. Speaker, or Mr. Flinn?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Your name."

Ed Lehman: "All right, thank you. I was a little disturbed back here by a couple of my colleagues."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Nothing could shake you, sir."

Ed Lehman: "This amendment provides for the appropriation to pay rentals to the Illinois Building Authority for the construction of the two facilities to be used by the Illinois Department of Corrections. The rental cost for the construction of the Juvenile Reception Diagnostic Center is \$772,880.00. The rental for the construction of the Adult Classifications is \$542,160.00. I would move that we concur in the Senate Amendments to House Bill 3622."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? The gentleman has moved that we concur with Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 3622. All those in favor of concurrence will signify by voting 'Yeas', the opposed by voting 'No'.





Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question, the 'Yeas' are 123, the 'Nays' are 0 and the House concurs in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 3622. With leave of the House, we'll then go to Senate Bills third reading. Senate Bill 1311."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1311. An act making a supplemental appropriation to the Department of Registration and Education. Third reading of the bill."

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

Henry J. Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1311 appropriates \$214,000.00 to the Department of Registration and Education to provide the means for administering the Illinois Controlled Substances Act which we passed during this session of the legislature. I know of no objection to this supplemental appropriation and I would respectfully urge your support."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall Senate Bill 1311 pass with the emergency clause? All those in favor will signify by voting 'Yeas', the opposed by voting 'No'. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question, the 'Yeas' are 151, the 'Nays' are 0 and this bill having received the constitutional 60% majority is hereby declared passed with the emergency clause. Senate Bill 1301."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1301. An act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Equal Education



Opportunity Department of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Third reading of the bill."

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

Lewis A. H. Caldwell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1301 is an appropriation for the Equal Education Opportunity Department of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Ah, this bill was heard previously and I had to withdraw it from the record because there was some question from some members of the other side. As I indicated to you before, it has been heard in the Appropriations' Committee at which time some two or three members requested some definitive information which has been supplied to them by the Superintendent of Public Instruction's Office. I might say by way of background, Mr. Speaker, that this bill was passed originally and ended up on the Governor's desk and because of a misunderstanding, he vetoed it. The Superintendent then called on the Governor and they discussed it and found that it wasn't an out and out grant, that there were matching funds from the federal government. The matter was satisfactory to the Governor. It's my hope now that the questions that were previously raised have been satisfactorily answered and I would ask you to give us 107 votes on this bill."

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

Robert S. Juckett: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the



House. As you know and as the sponsor so ably presented the fact that it was in the record, was pulled out, and Representative Collins and I discussed the matter with one of the employees of the E.E.O., unfortunately we did not get our questions answered, because this particular individual did not have the answers. The Director of the Department has been trying to reach us and I got the message. I've been unable to call him back. The employee that we did talk to does not believe that these are matching funds and that if this appropriation is not passed, that the federal appropriation would be ended. There are some \$107,000.00 of federal money which is appropriated because of a contract with the State of Illinois to provide these services. Some of the state monies are used in relation to employees of this department to do to do other than what is concerned with E. E. O. and I would think that at this time until we can get ahold of the Director and find out specific answers to our questions, that we either hold this bill, because they have been getting along without the appropriation for the time being. They've gone for three months with some of the carry over appropriation. I understand this will last for another half month or month. We could then get ahold of the director, Mr. Lyons, and find out specific answers. I understand we're going to be in session tomorrow, we could contact Mr. Lyons and get our answers to the questions, and then if they're properly answered, we would be happy to withdraw any objections we



have to the bill. I don't think that it's necessary that we pass the bill today, we could do it tomorrow and be well assured of the answers. I don't think its necessary to appropriate in essence \$202,000.00 for seven people to go around the State of Illinois and it's an item that was set up by the federal government, not initially by the state government. And I think we've got enough time to wait until tomorrow, and so if the sponsor does urge a vote now, I would urge not to support it. You don't necessarily have to vote 'Yeas', but let's not support it and get some answers before we vote \$95,000.00 of our monies when so many people on relief need money such as this."

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

Charles W. Clabaugh: "Mr. Speaker, not in opposition to anything that was said by the last speaker, but there is a department in the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction which was put there by this General Assembly. There is no appropriation for it to operate on and I'm not aware of the details of this proposition. I think that it is our responsibility to finance the department that we created. I think that the creation of that department came out of a recommendation of a commission which I'm a member. I would have no objection of waiting tomorrow, but, the way I think that a good many of the members feel that it would be very unlikely that there would be members enough here tomorrow to do this job. I think we could take a chance on



\$97,000.00. I'm going to support this bill and I trust that you others will, too."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion? The gentleman. . .the gentleman from care to close? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell."

Lewis A. H. Caldwell: "Just to say, Mr. Speaker, that this is precisely the situation as described by Representative Clabaugh. It's difficult for me to understand exactly what's going on and I would suggest and urge that you give us 107 votes to pass this bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The question is shall House Bill Senate Bill 1301 pass with the provision that it shall become effective immediately upon its becoming a law? All those in favor will vote 'Yeas' and the opposed 'No' and this requires 107 votes. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Juckett."

Robert S. Juckett: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's just strange that we're voting out \$95,000.00 and an employee of this section couldn't tell me how much money is regularly appropriated, how long the agency has been set up, exactly what it is supposed to do, other than they go in and help the local school districts change their boundaries. And he indicated to me that they have never recommended bussing. He just said that they might recommend that the fifth grade go over to the school across the town, the sixth grade might go to another school across the town,



etc. And he's off on doing business which does not have anything to do with the Department which he is assigned. And I think if we're spending \$95,000.00 here, \$95,000.00 there or everywhere else, that we'd just better take a second look at what we're doing. We were castigated earlier by members of some of the parties as to spending money here there and everything else, while the poor people were starving in Illinois. I think you ought to look at your conscience and look at what we're doing here where no one can tell you what they're doing. No one can tell you what this particular department is doing. Take a look at it before you vote the \$95,000.00."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted whowished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 125 'Yeas' and 15 'Nays' and this bill having received the votes required under the constitution is hereby declared passed. 1293."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1293. An act to require the reporting of the Governor's actions on bills to the members of the General Assembly. Third reading of the bill."

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

Henry J. Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this bill requires the Governor to report his action on bills with copies of messages to the Clerk and of the House of Representatives and to the Secretary of the Senate within two days after the action is taken. Whereupon the Clerk and the Secretary will promptly distribute copies to



members of the House and the Senate. And what this does, it will permit us to be promptly advised, especially when we're out of session as to action the Governor has taken. I know of no opposition. The Clerk tells me that this is easily implemented, so I would urge your 107 votes plus. Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? The question is shall Senate Bill 1293 pass? 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 154 'Yeas' and no 'Nays' and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 589."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 589. An act to amend Section 5.1 of the Social Workers Registration Act. Third reading of the bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."  
Richard O. Hart: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this bill amends the Social Workers Act and it will allow certain social workers who were eliminated from the prior act to take the exam waiving the educational requirement and allowing them to take the exam. The amendment has been worked out and it is now the bill, with the Department of Registration and Education. And in fact it was drafted by Mr. Alexander of their legal department. I know of no opposition to it and I would appreciate the support of the membership. It does have an effective date on it and would require 107 votes."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? The question is shall Senate Bill 589 pass with the provision that it shall become a law immediately upon its becoming effective or it shall become effective immediately upon its becoming a law? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 141 'Yeas' and 7 'Nays' and this bill having received the required votes under the constitution is hereby declared passed. 1310."

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

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

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1310. An act to make appropriations for certain claims against the State of Illinois in conformity with awards made by the Court of Claims. Third reading of the bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, regarding Senate Bill 1310."

Eugene F. Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on Senate Bill 1310 appropriates the sum of \$164,000.00 to the Court of Claims to pay claims in conformity with the words and recommendations made by the Court. This bill was passed by the Senate without a dissenting vote, it has an early effective date and I would appreciate your support."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? The question is shall Senate Bill 1310 pass? All those in favor, with the provision that it shall become effective upon its becoming a





law? All those in favor will vote 'Yeas' and the opposed 'No'. This requires 107 votes. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 145 'Yeas' and 1 'Nay' and this bill having received a vote required under the constitution is hereby declared passed. 1297."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1297. An act to amend 'The Illinois Vehicle Code'. Third reading of the bill."

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

Robert G. Day: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the same bill that the House passed out earlier, Senate Bill and provides for a \$20.00 fee for a ceremonial vehicle every two years, registration fee. This would cover the American Legion Locomotive and those vehicles that are very seldom used on the public highway, except on ceremonial occasions: That's all the bill does."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any discussion? The question is shall Senate Bill 1297 pass with the provision that it shall become effective upon its becoming a law? All those in favor will vote 'Yeas', the opposed 'No'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, the 'Yeas' are 148 and 1 'Nay' and this bill having received the vote required under the constitution is hereby declared passed. 1244. And 1245, I understand the gentleman desires to have those bills brought back to the order of second reading for the purposes of offering an amendment. If there is leave, we'll do that. The Clerk will read the amendment."



Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number One, Madigan. Amend printed Senate Bill 1244 in the House on page 1 and so forth."

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

Edward R. Madigan: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, there are three different amendments up there and I don't know which one it was that was read."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number One. Amend printed Senate Bill 1244 in the House on page 1, Section 2, line 14, immediately after the word 'paid' by inserting the following: 'on or after the effective date of this Act', and again on page 19, Section 21, line 8, immediately after the word 'lessor', by inserting the following: 'where such lessor purchases such property on or after the effective date of this Act', and again on page 20, Section 21, line 1 immediately after the word 'property', by inserting the following: 'on or after the effective date of this Act'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the gentleman from Logan, Mr. Madigan:"

Edward R. Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment that has been sent over to me this afternoon by Willard Ice in the Department of Revenue that is in response to a complaint that he has had from representatives of the car and truck rental industry. They feel that a bill without this amendment would create an administrative hardship upon them and so it is a corrective amendment as a concession to that industry and I would move for the adoption of Amendment Num-



ber One."

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

Samuel C. Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, would the sponsor yield for a question? Ah, Representative Madigan, what does this particular bill do that Willard Ice said it should do or should not do or what is so bad about this? Since we have a committee here, that's why I'm asking the question?"

Edward R. Madigan: "Well, the bill provide a an expansion of the leasing tactics to apply to vehicles used in the car and truck rental industry and the industry indicates that the cars that were purchased or are purchased after December 31, of this year for short term rental periods would be subject to the provisions of the bill but that is their income would be but they would not have, as the bill is drafted, they would not have the direction or the authority to collect the tax, they would be responsible for paying the tax to the state, but would not have the authority to collect, and that is the matter on which the bill was drafted. So the amendment is to correct that situation."

Samuel C. Maragos: "One, another question. You mean is that for the leases that have taken effect before December 31? Of this year or is it because they is this giving them retroactive powers, or what, why can't they collect the taxes? On the present bill as it is placed now, why couldn't they collect it now? Because they've got the authority as I read the bill, to do that, unless there's a reason why you



say unless it's the present lease they can't go retroactive and they can't get excused from that. That's what's bothering me, I just wanted to get an explanation why they are not doing it."

Edward R. Madigan: "Well, I'm having trouble following you, I think maybe because you're talking too fast. I don't understand."

Samuel C. Maragos: "No, I in your explanation I thought you said that the bill, that this amendment is needed because the vehicle lessors are not able to collect the tax. I thought that was in the bill already. Is it a fact, I'm asking, because some of the leases are now coming into effect before the effective date of this act that it may become a retroactive portion or an excuse from that portion, of the lease?"

Edward R. Madigan: "Well, I'll just read you the first portion of this letter, because I can't understand what it is that you're trying to cause me to understand. 'This morning we sent you an amendment striking a paragraph of Section 5 of Senate Bill 1245. Without further amendment, the representatives of the car and truck industry feel that they would be put to an administrative hardship and having to collect and remit rental tax on some cars and trucks after January 1, 1972. Those purchased after December 31, 1971, for short term rental purposes. While not being able to collect and remit tax on rental on cars purchased prior to that date. We can see that point about this, feel that that



remedy, that the remedy then should be for them to collect and remit tax to the state on all rental on and after January 1, 1972 except on long term leases when they exercise the option given to them by Senate Bill 1244, 1245, to pay the tax on their purchases of the vehicle."

Samuel C. Maragos: "Well, that's what I thought it that I thought might be the reason, now you've answered me, thank you very much."

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 further amendments? 1245. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Simmons, for what purpose do you rise?"

Arthur E. Simmons: "Well on that amendment we just adopted, it says on page 19, line 8, I'm mistaken."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "1245."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1245. Amendment Number One, Madigan. Amend printed Senate Bill 1245 in the House, on page 3, Section 3, line 7, by striking 'August 1, 1971', and by inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1972' and again on page 13, at the end of the bill, by adding Section 11 reading as follows: 'Section 11. This Act takes effect January 1, 1972.'"

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

Edward R. Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, we have that that amendment to this entire series of bills originally they called for an effective date of August 1, 1971, which is an impossible



situation now because it's November, so that amendment changes the effective date on each of these bills from August 1 of 1971 to January 1 of 1972 and I would move for the adoption of the amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any, is there any discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering if the sponsor would yield to one question?"

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

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Ed, did the department make any kind of a projection as far as the amount of money that they anticipate they could collect on a monthly basis. How much of a loss if we adopt these amendments as we have been doing, will there be a loss to the general fund and the revenue fund in the State of Illinois?"

Edward R. Madigan: "Well, no they don't expect to lose any money. They expect that this series of bills would yield approximately an additional \$5 million a year in income."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Well, we're going to be losing it because according to the bill the way it's written, it's August 1, 1971. If we adopt the amendment it's January of 1972."

Edward R. Madigan: "But the bill hasn't been enacted."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Well, . . ."

Edward R. Madigan: "And the bill is still pending in the legislature, but it was introduced in the Spring prior to August 1 and it has an effective date of January 1. . ."



Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "And it has an effective date of January, 1972, is that correct?"

Edward R. Madigan: "That's correct."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "All right, thank you."

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

Romie J. Palmer: "If the sponsor will yield for a question.

Ah, is this in addition to a sales tax for that a person might pay or this is this the sole tax, the lease occupation tax. My question is is there any other tax on the business of leasing tangible personal property that you know of now?"

Edward R. Madigan: "Well, this, this is a motion to adopt an amendment to a bill that would then change the effective date of the bill from August 1, 1971 to January 1 of next year. That's what we're discussing here."

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

Clarence E. Neff: "Ah, Ed, did I understand you right that the amendment which was adopted to on the other bill was agreed to by the automobile dealers?"

Edward R. Madigan: "Ah, . . ."

Clarence E. Neff: "I thought I heard you make that statement, that Willard Ice that worked this out with the Automotive Dealers Association?"

Edward R. Madigan: "The third paragraph of the letter says we are enclosing an amendment to Senate Bill 1244 and an amendment to Senate Bill 1245 which would remedy this situation and which are agreeable to the representatives of



car and truck industry as well as to this department."

Clarence E. Neff: "Well, I might say that I've had several calls today, I know several others here on the floor have had these calls from the association in Chicago, Seymour Lewis, the automotive dealers in St. Louis. I've had some calls from downstate and they have never they have nothing concerning these amendments, know nothing about them and have heard nothing of them or seen them. I think this is real bad when we're putting on amendments here and we make the statement that we think the associations have agreed, because to my knowledge they don't even know what these amendments are."

Edward R. Madigan: "Representative Neff, as I indicated to Mr. Palmer, what we're discussing at this point is a motion to adopt an amendment to change the effective date of the bill, that's all we're discussing now."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Lehman."

Ed Lehman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move to the previous question."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the 'Yeas' have it and the previous question has been moved. The any all those in favor of the amendment say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the 'Yeas' have it and the amendment is adopted. Any further amendments?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number Two, Madigan. Amend printed Senate Bill 1245 in the House on page 1, Section 2,





line 13, immediately after the word 'paid', by inserting the following: 'on or after the effective date of this Act' and again on page 5, section 5, by striking lines 24 through 33, and again on page 6, section 5, by striking lines 1 and 2, and again on page 10, section 10, line 3, immediately following the word 'property', by inserting the following: 'on or after the effective date of this Act'."

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

Edward R. Madigan: "Now, that's an amendment, a technical amendment requested by the Department of Revenue for the purpose of improving in their judgment the administration of the bill and I would move for the adoption of the amendment."

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

Ray J. Kahoun: "A question of the sponsor, Mr. Speaker. Ah, Representative Madigan, is this a new tax, this bill does it represent a new tax to the tax payers in the State of Illinois?"

Edward R. Madigan: "Well what they represent is the option on I really don't think that's a proper question.. ."

Ray J. Kahoun: "I do."

Edward R. Madigan: "Because we're talking about the adoption of a technical amendment. I'm going to answer the question. What the bills in total represent is the option on the lease of equipment, presently the person who buys equipment for the purpose of leasing equipment to someone else



pays the tax and then includes the tax in the cost of the lease to the person using the equipment. What these series of bills provide is an option for the purchaser of the equipment to either elect to pay the tax and put the cost of the tax into the cost of the lease or to not pay the tax and add the tax to the amount of each monthly payment or each annual payment remitting it to the Department of Revenue in that manner."

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's adopted. Further amendments? Third reading. 1246."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1246. Amendment Number One, Madigan. Amend printed Senate Bill. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, he ask for leave to bring that back to the order of second reading for the purposes of amendment. Hearing no objection, read the . . . 124-."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number One, Madigan. Amend printed Senate Bill 1246 in the House, on page 3, section 2 of the bill by striking line 20, and by inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1972'."

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

Edward R. Madigan: "That Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that is the effective date amendment that we adopted to the two prior bills, changing the effective date to January 1 next from August 1 past, and I would move for 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. 1247, he's ask leave to bring this back. Hearing no objection, the Clerk will read the amendment."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number One. Amend printed Senate Bill 1247 in the House on page 2, at the end of the bill, by adding the following: 'Section 2. This amendatory Act of 1971 takes effect January 1, 1972'."

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

Edward R. Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that again is the same amendment and I would move for the adoption of Amendment Number One to Senate Bill 1247."

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. Further amendments? Third reading. 1248, ask leave to bring that back. Hearing no objections, read the amendment."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number One. Amend printed Senate Bill 1248 in the House, on page 2, Section 2, of the bill, by striking line 9, and by inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1972'."

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

Edward R. Madigan: "I move the adoption of Amendment Number



One to Senate Bill 1248."

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. 1249, ask leave to return that for the purposes of amendment. All those, read the amendment."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number One. Amend printed Senate Bill 1249 in the House, on page 2, Section 2 of the bill, by striking line 9, and by inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1972.'"

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

Edward R. Madigan: "General Joshua Logan. I move the adoption of Amendment Number One to Senate Bill 1249."

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. 1250, leave of the House to return that for the purposes of amendment. Read the amendment."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number One. Amend printed Senate Bill 1250 in the House, on page 5, in Section 2 of the bill, by striking line 14, and by inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1972.'"

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

Edward R. Madigan: "I move the adoption of Amendment Number One to Senate Bill 1250."



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. 1251, the gentleman ask leave to have that returned to the order of second reading for the purpose of amendment. Objection? Read the amendment."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number One. Amend printed Senate Bill 1251 in the House, on page 3, in Section 2 of the bill, by striking line 34, and by inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1972'."

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

Edward R. Madigan: "I move the adoption of Amendment Number One to House Bill 1251."

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. With leave of the House, we'll go to messages from the Senate."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary: Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a bill of the following title: House Bill 2422. Together with the following amendment in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House. Passed the Senate, as amended, November 12, 1971, by a three-fifths vote. Ken-



neth Wright, Secretary. No further messages."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "No further messages. We want the messages from the Senate. Message from the Senate."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary: Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the following preamble and joint resolution, to-wit: House Joint Resolution 103. Concurred in by the Senate, November 12, 1971. Kenneth Wright, Secretary of the Senate. No further messages."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, ah, we'll go back to Senate Bills third reading, Senate Bill 1244."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1244. A bill for an act to amend 'The Leasing Use Tax Act'. Third reading of the bill."

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

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Do you desire to have this series considered as a group with leave or you do you want it individually?"

Edward R. Madigan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it is all the same subject matter and they are amendments to different acts to accomplish one purpose, so they could be considered in a series unless there is some opposition."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, is there objection? All right, hearing none, the Clerk will read the balance of the bills through 1251."



Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1245. A bill for an act to amend 'The Leasing Occupation Tax Act'. Third reading of the bill. Senate Bill 1246. A bill for an act to amend 'The Retailers' Occupation Tax Act'. Third reading of the bill. Senate Bill 1247. A bill for an act to amend 'The Use Tax Act'. Third reading of the bill. Senate Bill 1248. A bill for an act to amend 'The Service Use Tax Act'. Third reading of the bill. Senate Bill 1249. A bill for an act to amend 'The Service Occupation Tax Act'. Third reading of the bill. Senate Bill 1250. A bill for an act to amend 'The Municipal Code'. Third reading of the bill. Senate Bill 1251. A bill for an act to amend an act to revise the law in relation to counties. Third reading of the bill."

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

Edward R. Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. . ."

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

Rolland F. Tipsword: "Ah, for the purpose of a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

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

Rolland F. Tipsword: "I'm just asking for a clarification, I'm not stating an objection or anything: A clarification under the rules, if we are proceeding under third reading upon these bills that have just been read, does that mean that during the remainder of this session if we amend a bill we can vote on it on third reading on the same day?"



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, the gentleman was just preparing to ask for leave to suspend the provisions of Rule 47a which requires that the amendments be on the desk over night and ah the gentleman puts that motion to suspend the provisions of Rule 47a?"

Edward R. Madigan: "Yes, please, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, is there objection? Hearing none, the . . . the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kipley."

Edward L. Kipley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think you ought to be quiet for a minute and pay particular attention to what's happening here right now. These bills have been slipped in here off of third reading without reference to committee and now they're asking us to vote on them with right after they've been amended. Now, I think the amendments are great. I think the bills are lousy and I think we ought to pay particular attention to what we're doing here tonight and pay attention to what's going on and I want to talk on the bill, but I'm talking against the suspension of the rules right at the moment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, objection's been heard with regard to suspension of the rules. The gentleman from Logan, Mr. Madigan."

Edward R. Madigan: "All right, Mr. Speaker, I would move to suspend the provisions of Rule 47a for the purpose of considering these bills on third reading at the moment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the gentleman has moved to





suspend the provisions of the rules so all those in favor will vote 'Yeas' and the opposed will vote 'No'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 27 'Yeas' and 47 'Nays' and the motion fails. All right, with leave of the House, we'll go to Senate Bills second reading. Senate Bill 1285."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1285. A bill for an act to amend 'The Election Code'. Second reading of the bill. Amendment Amendment Number One adopted. . ."

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

Philip W. Collins: "Mr. . . ."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number One was adopted. . . previously. . ."

Philip W. Collins: "Mr. Speaker, . . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes?"

Philip W. Collins: "I was just going to make that point that Amendment Number One has been adopted."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number Two, Shea. Amend Senate Bill 1285 in the House, as amended, on page 1, lines 1 and 9, immediately before the number '3-1', by inserting '2-26.01', and so forth."

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

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this is probably one of the most important amendments that we'll have an opportunity to vote on during this brief session we're in Springfield."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Proceed."

Gerald W. Shea: "This amendment provides that the supervisors in counties outside of Cook will run at an election in November and be elected or be nominated at a March primary. Now, this bill was designed, or the amendment will aid the downstate counties to a tune of about \$6 million. This will allow either reductions in local property taxes or it will allow your counties to provide other services. I think it is an extremely good amendment and I would ask for the support of the House."

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

Philip W. Collins: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose this amendment to Senate Bill 1285. First of all, it hardly seems proper that a bill dealing with the 18 year old vote and conforming our statutes to the United States constitution should be a proper vehicle for such an amendment. Not only that but today every authority has urged the shortening of the ballot rather than the lengthening of the ballots in elections and when we are faced with a national, state and county election coming in November and now to add the further burden of lengthening the ballot by adding the county commissioners in downstate Illinois, I think that these offices would just get lost. I think it's proper that these offices that are so close to the people should be considered separately and individually and on their own merits and would



not be following the trend of a national ticket or a state ticket. I think it's unfair to the electorate, to ask them to consider such a lengthy ballot at the same time and for these reasons I would urge the defeat of this amendment."

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

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as one of the members of my county will be directly affected by this amendment, not coming from the city of Chicago, I might mention to Representative Collins that in my county it's going to cost the real estate tax payers a couple of hundred thousand dollars to not have a consolidated election. Now, you know I've heard all sorts of reasons why we shouldn't have heard we shouldn't have the consolidation of elections with the supervisors on our regular ballot, but I really can't figure out the real reason to me it seems if I was running in a tightly contested election, I'd want the candidates for supervisor on the same ballot that I'm on to make sure that they're not sitting at home not doing anything. And I think that this cuts both ways for the Republicans and Democrats, but I think overall I haven't heard any logical explanation for this from anyone either on this side of the rotunda or on the otherside why we should treat some county officers better than others, and this is what we're talking about. These supervisors are county officers and should be elected along with the coroner and the state's attorney and any other county officers on the



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

same ballot and if they don't think they should be good Republicans or good Democrats, they shouldn't serve. I think it's coming to a time of history that comes when county officers should stand for something besides hiding behind special elections when very very few people come out costing the real estate tax payers an awful lot of money just to conduct a special election just for them. I think it's a good amendment and should be adopted."

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

James Pate Philip: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I oppose this amendment on two bases. The first basis is to make this amendment correct, you'd have to amend two sections of the statute. Not only the section on elections, but also the section on counties which this amendment does not do. So if we did put this amendment on, mechanically, it would be incorrect and it would not become the law or become effective. Secondly, we've always had the theory and heard the theory of shortening of the ballots. Do you realize in my county if we included these board members that run, we would have a total of 23 candidates running at the same time? Also I think it would be very confusing, we've got the national issues, we've got the state issues and then we're going to worry about the township and county issues. When that voter gets down to voting for 20 people or 22 people down at the end of the ballot, what are they going to do? They're not simply going to vote for them and I'd certainly think this is a step in



the wrong direction. Now, my suggestion to my friends on the other side of the aisle was to combine the primary, let the board members run with us March 21, take half of the election cost and then have them in a May election for the county board, but that wasn't satisfactory to the people on the other side of the aisle. On these two bases, I would suggest that we defeat this amendment."

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

John S. Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I support Amendment Number Two to Senate Bill 1285. I think that all of us have to admit that one issue which many voters have talked to us about. I think the voters are sick and tired of going to so many elections. I think that if a poll were taken of the voters, the vast vast majority would say consolidate the elections, first because they are voting in so many election. And let's face it the voters are intelligent enough to separate the issues and the candidates. Secondly and let's face it again, Representative Juckett talked about \$99,000.00 some figure or that amount. Now, we're talking about saving \$6 million. \$6 million. Where do you stand on that issue? Do you want to save the taxpayers in the State of Illinois \$6 million by consolidating elections? And another point, what good is it to talk about registration of voters if you have these elections, you are disenfranchising voters and it will be impossible for them to register. Do you



want to disenfranchise the voters and not allow them to vote in elections, the right that they have to vote? I think this is a good amendment and if you want to save the taxpayers money to the tune of \$6 million, if you want to consolidate elections like all of the voters, so many of them want, you will vote for this amendment. Otherwise, you are going to be on the spot and are going to be a political issue otherwise and if you want to face that as a political issue, then vote 'No' against this amendment, but if you want to be with the people and to save money, then vote for this amendment, Amendment Number Two to Senate Bill 1285."

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

John C. Hirschfeld: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I do not want to question the intent behind the amendment introduced by the worthy Assistant Minority Leader for the Democratic side of the aisle, but my suspicious nature can't help but make me wonder if the amendment would have been introduced if the recent Sun Times poll had reversed its percentages?"

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

James T. Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support this legislation. I think it is obvious the intent is to save money. If the people can vote whether or not to save this \$6 million, the people in



my district could vote whether or not to save approximately \$190,000.00, you know what their vote would be. You also know if we have one election we will get far far more people out to vote and that's what we constantly say democracy and our elections are all about, so for those two reasons, we should do it. And while you're bringing in the Sun Times poll making this a political issue, I don't know. My county, Sangamon, is Republican, but I understand that the Republican supervisors who run this county are for this consolidation. They want to save the money. Now why make this a political issue? The issue is money, then get off the boat."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Fennessey."

Joseph Fennessey: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in support of this amendment. In our county, we're going to have some five elections this year. Each of those elections will cost the neighborhood of \$50,000.00. Also we have a county clerk, a Republican county clerk by the way, who has served the people for the last 25 or 30 years. I talked to him over the week-end and he said this is completely out of reason to have that many elections and he supports this amendment wholeheartedly. He'd like to see these elections combined. Counties are forced with the scarcity of funds and this is certainly one way we could pick up some additional dollars for our counties. Also, the fact that any downstate county that may have voting



machines will not be able to use these voting machines only in one election as you know they are locked for 30 days, and it is going to force these counties to go out and buy other voting machines, rent other voting machines or provide paper ballots. I support this amendment wholeheartedly and urge its adoption."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill."

John Jerome Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I had no intentions of rising on this particular bill, but because of the outburst in regards to the young, intelligent Representative from Champaign, I'd like to say this. That House Bill 285 was over here approximately two months ago, rather passed here and I'd like to tell him that that particular piece of legislation went over into the Senate. This amendment is the same as House Bill 285. I wonder where the gentleman was on this. Certainly it was before the Sun Times poll. And I would like to say to him that if he doesn't have any more faith in the Governor of the State of Illinois, Mr. Ogilvie, then he had better change parties. Now, in regards to the piece of legislation in front of us, in my new district, I'm going to represent four different counties and if this particular piece of legislation does not pass, it's going to cost those counties \$610,000.00 extra from the property tax payers in that area who conduct the elections as you people want. Certainly the piece of legislation that we're confronted here with today will be a savings to the taxpayer and it's something





that you had better take under consideration, because the last two week-ends, I've had the opportunity of discussing this and the people our fed up not by a long ballot, but they're fed up by the elections that are going to confront them in 1972, the amount of elections. In our area, we're going to have three primary and three run offs if we don't adopt this piece of legislation and it seems to me that it is tantamount that for once we think of the taxpayer, the property taxpayers, because I'm sure that you hear from them like I do and vote for this amendment. Thank you."

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

Robert S. Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor of the amendment answer a question or two?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes."

Robert S. Juckett: "Could you tell me the primary is the Mayor of the city of Chicago nominated at a regular city primary?"

Gerald W. Shea: "No, he is not."

Robert S. Juckett: "Is that a special primary?"

Gerald W. Shea: "No, the mayor of the city of Chicago is nominated at a special primary. . .he is. . ."

Robert S. Juckett: "Is he elected at a special election?"

Gerald W. Shea: "Can I finish my answers, or do you want to just get get what you want?"

Robert S. Juckett: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Mayor of the City of Chicago is nominated at a special primary and he's elected at a special election held in the



City of Chicago and there are some almost 4,000 precincts that are involved, almost half of the precincts in the state and it's too bad that they killed the bill that would have required the mayor to be nominated at a regular primary and a regular general election."

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

John H. Conolly: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the 'Yeas' have it and the previous question is moved. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, to close."

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think of some words I used to hear from a great Majority Leader across the aisle. A lot of saw dust went up in the air. And I used to listen to that man and wonder what he meant and now I found out. All we're asking is to save the taxpayers of this state \$6 million next year and \$6 million every two years thereafter. All we're asking you to do is reduce some property taxes in your home counties. Now, if you're sincere, if you're honest for what you've been telling me down here, you'll vote for this legislation. And I answer my friend from Champaign, that I was leading a for battle on this one Saturday long before any Sun Times poll came out. I'm interested in some economy, some help for the property tax payer in this state and I just would love to have some help from my colleagues from across the aisle."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The question is shall Amendment Number



Two to Senate Bill 1285 be adopted. 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 103 'Yeas' and 51 'Nays' and Amendment Number Two is adopted. Are there further amendments?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number Three, Shea. Amend Senate Bill 1285 in the House, as amended, on page 1, lines 1 and 9, by striking '4-8 and 4-23.01' where they appear on page. . ."

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

Gerald W. Shea: "This is just a corrective amendment. It takes out some sections that were already adopted last summer. I've supplied Representative Collins with a copy of it, I don't know if he's had an opportunity to look it over yet or not."

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

Philip W. Collins: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, I did just get a copy of this amendment this evening and I'd had some conversation on it, but I haven't had a chance to check it out and really from looking at it, it's, I can't support it or oppose it, so I would suggest perhaps we could hold the bill until I have had a chance to check it out."

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

Gerald W. Shea: "I'll withdraw the amendment."

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



Collins."

Philip W. Collins: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, there may be need for this amendment or other amendments, so would you hold this bill on second reading, please?"

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

Gerald W. Shea: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, . . ."

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

Gerald W. Shea: "Like to rise on a point of personal privilege if I might."

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

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, this particular piece of legislation is extremely critical. Now, I know. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "What's the point of personal privilege?"

Gerald W. Shea: "I want to get this bill in the position to pass this week if possible. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "This piece of legislation is sponsored by this gentleman over here and he's asked me to hold it on second reading and I said that I would, it's not your bill. All right, 12-, . . . all right, on the order of concurrences, 2422, the Clerk will indicate that that is just come over and it hasn't gotten on our latest concurrence calendar yet."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 2422 is on a supplemental calendar on concurrences, it's not on yours on the desks, because we haven't printed it yet. We can't take time to



print one for each bill that comes over."

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

Gene L. Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we concur in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2422. This is an amendment that has just recently been distributed on your desks which provides that an amendment to this bill limiting the application of the legislation to the Area Vocational Centers and are approved by the State Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation prior to December 31, 1971. I worked this amendment out with Representative Craig and members of the Democratic staff in the Senate and consultation with Chapman and Cutler to make sure that the original legislation would apply and therefore I would move for concurrence in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2422 and this is a emergency bill and therefore needs 107 votes."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any discussion? The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Alsup."

John W. Alsup: "Could I ask the gentleman a question?"

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

John W. Alsup: "I notice that this synopsis says that the bond shall be 7% bonds. It doesn't say 7% or less, it says it shall be 7%. Is this amendment in any way change that language?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from, indicates he'll yield."



Gene L. Hoffman: "No, it has no effect on that at all."

John W. Alsup: "In other words, they must pay 7% even though they could sell them for less?"

Gene L. Hoffman: "They're not to exceed, let me just check."

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

Arthur E. Simmons: "Mr. . . ."

Gene L. Hoffman: "Shall not exceed 7%, that's in the amendment that we adopted in the House."

John W. Alsup: "Well, that's what I'm asking, thank you."

Gene L. Hoffman: "I'm sorry, thank you for asking."

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

Arthur E. Simmons: "Amendment Number Two covers that point."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Craig."

Robert Craig: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, what Representative Hoffman said, we worked this afternoon several a couple three hours this afternoon on this amendment and it was agreed by all parties and I would urge the concurrence in the Senate Amendment to House Bill 2422."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, is there any further discussion? The gentleman care to close? The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 2422? All those in favor will signify by voting 'Yeas', the opposed 'No'. With the provision that it shall become effective upon its becoming a law. This will require 107 votes. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 139 'Yeas' and 7



'Nays' and this bill having received the votes required under the constitution is hereby declared passed. On for what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Simmons, rise?"

Arthur E. Simmons: "The bill we just passed, Amendment House Bill 2422 I have two amendments here, Amendment Number One and Amendment Number Two."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, we we we we concurred in Senate Amendment Number One to the House Bill. One. Okay? On for what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, rise?"

Gerald W. Shea: "A point of parliamentary inquiry."

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

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill or Senate Bill 1285 was called, read a second time, and amended. I call your attention to the rules of this House, Rule 49."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "I'm familiar with that rule, you don't have to read it."

Gerald W. Shea: "All right, it says that the Speaker shall advance."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "That's right, except it doesn't say what happens if the sponsor who has control of the bill asks the Speaker not to do it. It's never been the case where this Chair has called the bill where the chief sponsor has not asked for something to be done. If that would be the case, the bill would be on third reading, too."

Gerald W. Shea: "Well, I understand that, I wish it were on



third reading."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Now, House on the supplemental calendar page 1 appears House Bill 1787 on which the Chair recognizes the gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Senate amended the Illinois Plumbing Code Law with Amendment Number One, Three, Four and Five and it makes an emergency, adds the emergency clause to the amendment, to the bill. As some of you may know, the Supreme Court has ruled on the certification of the plumbing contractors as being illegal. So this is the only law that protects the public health and safety of the people and the Department of Public Health requested the amendments that were put on in the Senate and I move to concur with Amendment Number One, Three, Four and Five in House Bill 1787."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion? All right, the question is all right, the question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 1787? 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, Fleck 'Yeas', on this question, there are 135, . . .the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Simmons."

Arthur E. Simmons: "On the concurrence motion of Senate of House Bill 1787, Amendment Number Five strikes line 14 and Amendment Number Three page 6, line 14 and I believe they are in conflict. Amendment Number Three. . ."





Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, we've only done one."

Arthur E. Simmons: "He said all of them."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Oh, no. Yeah, we take them one at a time when we're voting on them. Except when they're indivisible, yeah, so that and what the vote that I called for was House concurrence in Senate Amendment Number One. So, now we are on Senate Amendment Number Two, the gentleman, oh, all right, Three, and the gentleman now from Cook, Mr. Simmons, has raised a question with regard to Three being in conflict with One, so let's take it. . ."

Arthur E. Simmons: "No, with Five."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Oh, with Five. Ah, we could have an explanation of Three, we're not in conflict of anything on it now right now until we get to Five. The gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, I read his objection but it's on page 6, line 14 by striking 'Department' and inserting there if we amend Amendment Number Three and then we go to Number Five, ah, by striking lines through 14 and 18 they just wanted to take that out, I don't know why they did it that way, I see no technical reason why you could object to it, because all they're doing is they're taking out and putting in the emergency clause on it. They are not doing anything else with Amendment Number Five, they're striking something that they did put in in Amendment Number Three but I don't see any constitutional limitations, I don't see any reason why it can't be done. So,



I'd move the adoption of Amendment Number Three in the meantime, and I'd hope to work out Five by the time we get there."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there Four? Well, you've got one more to go. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Simmons."

Arthur E. Simmons: "Well, anyway, I think that all of these amendments after the first should be as amended. They don't so show that now."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The Clerk advises me that our enrolling and engrossing will handle the Senate Amendments so that it will read Amendment to the bill, as amended. All right, is there further discussion on Amendment Number Three? The question is then shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number Three to House Bill 1787? 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 126 'Yeas' and no 'Nays' and this bill having received the required three-fifths majority vote is hereby declared passed. This amendment is hereby declared adopted. Now, Amendment Number Four. Fary 'Yeas'. The gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Amendment Number Four it lets the Advisory Committee be compensated sum of \$50.00 each day or part thereof that he serves and I move its adoption."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? Is there, all right, the question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number Four to House Bill 1787? 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 114 'Yeas' and 7 'Nays' and this bill having received the required three-fifths vote is hereby declared adopted. Senate Amendment Five. The gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Amendment Number Five puts that the amendatory act shall take effect immediately upon becoming law and it does do what Representative Simmons pointed out, it did strike some section of another part of the amendment on page 6, but this in line with making the act more constitutional, according to the constitutional advice that I've gotten from one of the staff assistants. I move its adoption."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, is there discussion? The question is shall the House concur in the Senate Amendment Number Five to House Bill 1787? It has the provision that it shall become effective upon its becoming a law. All those in favor will vote 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', it requires 107 votes. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 121 'Yeas' and 7 'Nays' and the House concurs in Senate Amendment Number Five, to House Bill 1787. All right, with leave of the House, Senate Bills third reading, Senate Bill 837, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Hallaren, requests leave to have it returned to the order of second for the purposes of an amendment. Is there any objection? Hearing none, the Clerk will read the amendment."



Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 837. Amendment Number Two.

Amend Senate Bill 837 by striking. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Hallaren."

Bernard J. O'Hallaren: "Ah, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this amendment, actually what it does is for counties under 20,000 population. It fixes the salary of the State's Attorney now with this amendment a minimum of \$8,000.00 and a maximum of \$15,000.00 with counties between 20,000 and 80,000 the minimum salary will be \$10,000.00 and a maximum of \$15,000.00. Counties with 80,000 and over it will be a flat \$20,000.00 with the proviso that the State's Attorney will not be able to practice privately. And I ask for your vote favorable."

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's adopted. Further amendments? Third reading. The gentleman has a similar request with regard to returning House Bill or Senate Bill 838 back to the order of second reading for the purpose of amendment. Is there leave? All right, for what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Simmons, rise?"

Arthur E. Simmons: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I I tried to get your attention but Amendment Number Two on the last bill that we just passed, changes Amendment Number One and therefore I believe that Amendment Number Two should say as amended."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, it does now."



Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment. House, Senate Bill 838.

Amendment Number One. Amends Senate Bill 838 on page 1, by striking all of lines 13 through 15 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'as will make his salary amount to \$42,200.00'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Hallaren."

Bernard J. O'Hallaren: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, actually this is a reduction. This bill here is the State's Attorney of Cook County and in conformance, I've talked to both sides of the aisle. The House sponsor on these bills, Representative Palmer, and it's the thinking of the administration that they keep it in tune with the Supreme Court Justices making it \$42,200.00 and I ask for your favorable vote."

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

Arthur E. Simmons: "Ah, I would like to ask the sponsor a question if he'll yield."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, he'll yield."

Arthur E. Simmons: "Ah, increase in salary for the State's Attorney far exceeds the 5.5% guideline restrictions made by the federal administration."

Bernard J. O'Hallaren: "Ah, Representative Simmons, I was down talking with Pete Bobbitt this afternoon and with this particular question and he said it does not have any bearing, because this salary does not take effect until after



the next election for this particular office. And he this is exactly his own words."

Arthur E. Simmons: "Well, can you tell. . ."

Bernard J. O'Hallaren: "And that's why, that's why there was no amendment to include this federal guideline."

Arthur E. Simmons: "Can you tell me what he is making now?"

Bernard J. O'Hallaren: "Approximately \$35,000.00."

Arthur E. Simmons: "And this would bring him up to \$42,200.00?"

Bernard J. O'Hallaren: "That's right."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? Is there discussion? All right, all those in favor of the adoption of the amendment say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the 'Yeas', all those in favor of the adoption of the amendment will vote 'Yeas' and the opposed will vote 'No'. The Clerk will take the record. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 87 'Yeas' and 15 'Nays' and the amendment is adopted. Further amendments? Third reading. All right, with leave of the House, we'll go to Conference Committees, House Bill 2867. The gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Miller."

Kenneth W. Miller: "Ah, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is the same Conference Committee Report that we discussed here earlier today and also yesterday. We've had many conferences on this with the interest in parties and my understanding, Mr. Speaker, everything is now resolved and agreed upon and therefore Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move that this House concur adopt, I'm sorry,



adopt the Conference Committee report on House Bill 2867, and as I said before it requires 107 votes."

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

Otis G. Collins: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the sponsor ah ah would he yield for ah ah question?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes, he indicates he will."

Otis G. Collins: "Yes, thank you. Ah, Representative Miller, under the Section 11-10, it's referred to again on Page 7, line 30, Public Service Employees, and I might mention here that I was out of the chambers when this was being discussed previously, I came in on the last part of it and I just am not repetitious. But I am I am I am I I'd wish to ask with reference to public service employees, ah, what ah what position of ah for considering the fact that we have problems in high schools now and hopefully they will be solved in the future and our program would be an on-going thing here, what would be the position of the Department with reference to having ah public aid workers going into hospitals which might be having difficulty with labor unions?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, I think I can answer that, but I think I'd like to refer to Representative Hanahan because I think that's an area which he was interested in and perhaps he can answer the gentleman's question."

Otis G. Collins: "Ah, the question was what ah considering the facts we do have problems in hospitals now, and hopefully they will be corrected in the immediate future. Consider-



ing the fact that the program has to do with jobs for welfare recipients, that is those on general assistance, 10,000 particularly, my question is Mr. Hanahan, what would the position of the Department be considering a a situation wherein that the hospital had difficulty with its striking employees?"

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Well, in answer to that question on it, I'd say that the areas, we struck out the areas of community, non-profit community agencies and institutions performing health and welfare functions, because in that given area this area of unionization activities right now especially in view of the Supreme Court ruling allowing hospital employees to strike. The fear that we have is the fact that there may be an attempt if this is allowed to be happening to sending in welfare recipients to replace an unskilled personnel in the house care field and if they refuse to cross the picket lines say at Martha Washington Hospital which is on strike right now on Ashland Avenue in Chicago that if a welfare recipient had refused to go in, that he would be ineligible to receive any more public aid, so it seems to me that illogical that we should that we should use a bill that is to help people to hurt another segment of our society and that would be the employees not right now working in the health and welfare field in hospitals. This would only add fuel to a fire that's growing right now at dissatisfaction of the low pay and the bad working conditions in hospitals. We don't want to clutter that up





with another federal program going into this area. There's enough improvement in the governmental buildings that I think the welfare recipients could do in areas of cleaning up parks and ah being an assistant janitor or an elevator operator or window washer, any building which the bill allows, working in forest preserve parks, play grounds, streets and highway and governmental maintenance, constructions directed towards environmental improvement, I think to include hospitals right now would be ill advised."

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

James A. McLendon: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that I support the concept of the bill, but I'd like to direct one question to the sponsor. On page 10, Section 11-220, Paragraph 3, you will note that this paragraph substantially provides that any person who is in this program and who refuses to commute to certain distances may be or relief or aid may be put off altogether unless he travels these distances. I'd like to have the record have the sponsor's statement, approximately what distances does he have in mind."

Kenneth W. Miller: "I think I can give you an answer on that, sir. This question came up in Conference Committee. Senator Fred Smith was there and this question was raised and ah he was agreeable to the word 'reasonable' and here's my reasoning, or here's my understanding of it, sir. As you well know better than I do, in the City of Chicago particularly, there are areas for example, where the people might



be away from public transportation, maybe a mile, and it may be very difficult for them to walk to work on that type of a thing, whereas other people might be ten miles away and can jump on a C.T.A. and get there easily, so it's very very difficult to set up standards in the area of saying a mile away or five miles or ten miles or a half a mile or any other thing. It would be very difficult in each circumstance, cause each individual welfare recipient who was involved in this training or work program would have to be treated differently, because of where they happen to be located, so I don't see how we can put any criteria in it at all other than the word 'reasonable' in this area. Now, that's my understanding of the answer to your question, sir."

James A. McLendon: "Thank you, that answers my question, sir."

Kenneth W. Miller: "You're welcome."

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

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

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

Harold Washington: "Ah, Representative Miller, I gather that this ah amendment to House Bill 2867, Mr. Speaker, could I have some order, please. I gather, Representative Miller, that this amended House Bill 2867 was drafted with an eye toward the Federal Emergency Employment Act, is that correct?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "Well, . . ."



Harold Washington: "And you have attempted to bring this act into compliance with the federal law?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "That is right, because it's my understanding if we don't make this in compliance with the federal law, we can't are not eligible to receive the federal program."

Harold Washington: "Now, does the federal emergency act address itself to the question of voluntary or mandatory employment?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "Well, I'm informed that the rules and regulations of the federal employment act emergency act have not been published yet, Representative Washington. So I don't know how I could answer your question specifically."

Harold Washington: "Well, I assumed that there are some federal guidelines in the federal emergency act, are there not?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "There are, but I'm not informed of the details, Representative Washington."

Harold Washington: "Well, let me rephrase it. Does the act the federal act in any way address itself to the question of mandatory labor or voluntary labor or is it silent on the subject?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "I'm not sure I can answer you specifically but I can say this to you, which may be an answer, Representative Washington, that in the State of Illinois has to have a program in this area so before we can get federal



funds. Now, it's my understanding that this this bill does set up the necessary program, the necessary machinery, necessary machinery so we can qualify under the federal act, but please understand that we have to do this first. According to my understanding."

Harold Washington: "Well, it has been, Mr. Speaker, may we have some order please? This bill was never in committee and I I'd like to know about it. Now, it's my understanding and I got it indirectly and I gather that it's Director Weaver's position. If I'm wrong, he'll of course correct me, that his interpretation of the federal act is that it calls for voluntary employment. And if that interpretation is true, then this whole act is ineligible because it's based on the concept of mandatory action."

Kenneth W. Miller: "I'm I'm not sure but I have to take it for granted that it is mandatory because otherwise this program would not dovetail into the federal program."

Harold Washington: "Well, I would like a precise answer to that question, I know that this bill has been in and out of the record so many times, it looks like a ping pong ball but it seems to me that that question must be answered precisely and specifically or else we'll be passing a bill that won't mean nothing."

Kenneth W. Miller: "Will you hold it just a second. Director Weaver is available and I'll try to get an answer from him for you. Ah, Representative Washington, I've just been informed that the federal act does not deal in the concept of



whether it's voluntary or mandatory."

Harold Washington: "Well, let me ask you this. Has the federal government ever ever dealt in a program of this sort in which it called for mandatory action or permitted mandatory labor action?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "Will you state that again, I didn't understand your question."

Harold Washington: "Well, have do you know of any federal programs in which the federal government has permitted mandatory labor act in so far as its funding of state or municipal programs are concerned?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "I understand that the work incentive program requires mandatory registration."

Harold Washington: "There is a precedent, then?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "That's my understanding, sir."

Harold Washington: "Well, now, I'm not in objection to the main thrust of this bill, Representative Miller, but I think you can appreciate my concern when we talk about mandatory labors, particularly when we realize that we have a federal thirteenth amendment and in light of that may I draw your attention to Section 11-20, Sub-paragraph 4 and it states there. . ."

Kenneth W. Miller: "What page, what page, Harold?"

Harold Washington: "Page 10, line starting with line 14. Now in that section, that sub-section it reports to set out guidelines, I quote: 'without limiting other criteria which the Illinois Department may establish, it shall be good cost



or refusal if, (a) the wage does not meet applicable minimum wage requirements' and there's two others, (b) and (c). My question is this. As you read this section, Representative Miller, is it not possible for the Director by issuing other rules or criteria as you called it to completely negate (a), (b) and (c) which call for minimum wages. In other words, the question put in a more legal framework would be has not the State legislature by drafting it as it has done set up standards and then permitted the Director at his discretion to negate those families, is that true?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "Well, it's my understanding, if this answers your question, Representative Washington, this is a state law and the Director is bound by what is said here. Now as I understand it, he can at any time implement this type of thing, but he can not change what the law says here specifically."

Harold Washington: "Well, how do you how do you read this language here on line 14? Without limiting other criteria which the Illinois Department may establish? And then it sets out."

Kenneth W. Miller: "Well, the. . ."

Harold Washington: ". . .these other qualifications."

Kenneth W. Miller: "Without limiting other criteria, but the Director would be bound by (a), (b) and (c)."

Harold Washington: "May I address myself to the bill very briefly, please?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, yes, you've already been on it



13 minutes."

Harold Washington: "I have?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes, you have."

Harold Washington: "Well, I won't exceed my prerogative."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "You have by three minutes. I'll let you continue for just a little bit."

Harold Washington: "Ah, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

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

Harold Washington: "I am not opposed to this concept of a work program, particularly if it will bring into the state \$20 some odd million dollars. But it seems to me that we have to look beyond the simple question of whether or not money will come into the State. We have to look at the rights of individuals under this work program, and we have to be certain, beyond any reasonable doubt that no machinery that comes out of this legislature will infringe upon those rights under anybody's directorship, and I'm certain that the Director knows that I'm not directing my remarks toward him. After all, laws are not made for man, they're made for men. The thing that bothers me about this entire bill, House Bill 2867 is its vagueness and its apparent conflict from section to section. It's very vague as to exactly what standards are going to bind the director in mandatory work programs, but it's very clear in giving to the Director almost absolute discretion to override the legislative standards. I think what it does is get very very close to an unconstitutional delegation of legislative



power to an administrative agency. That's the first problem. And that wouldn't bother me so much, because that's just a legal concept. What does bother me is that what we are delegating to the Director is almost absolute discretion to the to determine whether or not one shall go off the work relief rolls if by some rules which have not been delineated heretofore by the Director, said person violates those rules. This is a tremendous danger. I think this is the kind of legislation which should come out of the chamber, but it appears to me in light of these conflicts and in light of these ambiguities and in light of the inconsistency and in light of what I consider to be a clear, unconstitutional delegation of legislative power, I would follow in the footsteps of Representative Barnes, Mann, Hanahan, and those fine people who have been addressing themselves to this question for several days and send this bill ah back to the Conference Committee for additional study. It is the rights of human beings we are talking about. It is the thirteenth amendment to the constitution that we are talking about. And we can't take that lightly, so even though this particular piece of legislation may seem like a ping pong ball jumping in and out of the record, I think we owe it to ourselves in light of the the fact that there were no committee hearings in either House and only close reading of this bill was in the last day or two, I think it should go back to the conference committee."

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





Don A. Moore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'll be very brief, Mr. Speaker, on this matter. I feel that this is one of the most important bills concerning welfare that has come out of this session of the General Assembly. In reply to the prior speaker, I would like to recall or refresh his recollection that the Director of the Department of Public Aid, under the present director and under the prior Director, has always had that discretionary powers and perhaps by necessity you can look back when we created the Legislative Advisory Commission on Public Assistance, created of six House and six Senate members. All we can do is advise the Director what to do. There are certain things that he has to bring before us for our advice. We can't bind him, we can say no and he can go ahead and do that which he sees fit. Now, I think we have to have faith in the Director of Public Aid, we surely had faith in Director Swank for many, many years while he served as Director of the Department and I for one have the utmost faith and confidence in the fairness of the new Director of Public Aid, Ed Weaver. I think we're concerned with one thing in this bill, we're concerned with some \$20 million worth of federal money that can be available to the State of Illinois. We're concerned with putting some 10,000 people to work who are on or going on public aid, it can help out the financial crisis, it can help out 10,000 needy people in the State and I join the distinguished Assistant Majority Leader in concurring with this Conference



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Committee Report. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton."  
Bernard E. Epton: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I certainly agree with some of the points raised by Representative Washington. I think that many of us were somewhat apprehensive about the possibility that might be something mandatory or some possibility that the welfare recipient might be abused in the interpretation of this act. I do however think that the point that Harold raised is outweighed by the fact that the Director feels that he is bound by the law, we all know that he is bound by the law, as it is written in the bill. As I read the act, I feel that those further implementation, those further directions, that further leeway that the Director is given do not go to the substance of the act, but simply allow him to assist the instruction of the case worker in providing for those additional jobs. I agree with Representative Washington to accept \$20 million or \$50 million or \$100 million that the at the sake of sacrificing the rights of the welfare recipient or any citizen of our state would be in error. Mostly in error, despite how fundamental our need is. I also know as all of you do that there are many many people on welfare who have been wrongfully accused time and again of their inability, of their lack of desire to work. If we pass this bill, if we concur in this, it will once and for all show all of the people of the State that welfare recipients who are eligible to work are anxious to



work if the job is provided. Under Director Weaver we will have an opportunity to see this act in action. And even though I have some misgivings as Representative Washington has, I do think that they are outweighed by the merits of this bill. I think we should give it a chance and I would hope that we would vote to concur."

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

James C. Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?"

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

James C. Taylor: "Representative Miller, if a man has a felony conviction under this program would he be eligible for employment, because we do have quite a few people who are on public aid simply because they can not get employment because of this conviction?"

Kenneth W. Miller: "Ah, it's my understanding that he would under this program, there's nothing in this legislation, to my knowledge, sir, that would prevent a person who is now a welfare recipient and has a record of some kind from from taking advantage or being put on this work program to get a little dignity that he might deserve."

James C. Taylor: "Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion? If not, the gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Miller, to close the debate."

Kenneth W. Miller: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen



of the House, this issue has been this bill has been debated on and on and on, I've enjoyed the discussion and I'll make no closing remarks other than to request 107 votes on the adoption of the Conference Committee Report."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman has moved that the House adopt the Conference Committee Report relevant to House Bill 2867. All those in favor of adoption signify by voting 'Yeas', the opposed by voting 'No' and it will take 107 votes. The gentleman from Cook, Representative Washington, to explain his vote."

Harold Washington: "Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I'm not about to join issue with my esteemed colleague, Representative Epton, but I simply want to say that it is not a question of passing or deceiving this legislation. The only issue I am raising this is that this bill should be sent back to Conference Committee to wipe out the ambiguities and remove the conflict to which I alluded. I supported the concept but knowing knowing that there are ambiguities and conflicts here, I simply can not support this legislation. Furthermore, it's obviously going to pass. I assume we're going to be back here in January, I hope none of us have to take the floor and say I told you so, and in conclusion nothing that I have said has been directed toward Mr. Weaver. But we donot pass legislation because of a man, we pass legislation to embrace people and concepts, so I wish to be recorded, Mr. Speaker, as voting 'Present'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all. . .the gentleman from Cook,



Representative Mann, to explain his vote."

Robert E. Mann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain my vote. As I understand this bill, it applies to 16, 17 and 18 year old young people and A.D.C. mothers and it does not apply to general assistance persons. And it requires that those persons I just enumerated enroll in work programs or avail themselves to work opportunities not necessarily within their communities at the peril of being removed from the public assistance rolls. Now, I, too would like to disqualify anything I say from pertaining to our esteemed new Director, Mr. Weaver, whom I respect highly, but there's nothing about the history of public assistance in this state or any other state that would lead me to believe that a mandatory work program is going successful. However, I don't believe that it would be responsible on my part to oppose a program which will bring into the state \$22 million worth of federal funds. I do hope that no one is going to believe or think that this is going to solve our crisis. We're still going to be saddled with the same rotten public assistance program that we had before this bill was offered. But if it is an opportunity to provide some dignified and I want to underline the word dignified meaningful employment, it does deserve a chance, and for Mr. Speaker, for the reasons cited by Mr. Washington, there are all kinds of ambiguities, contradictions, vagueness in this legislation, I'm going to have to vote 'Present'."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, have all voted who wished? McLendon, 'Present'. Rayson, 'Present'. B. B. Wolfe, 'Present'. Caldwell, 'Present'. Douglas, 'Present'. Jaffe, 'Present'. Davis, 'Present'. Otis Collins, 'Present'. Barnes, 'Present'. Schneider, 'Present'. Scariano, 'Present'. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Otis Collins."

Otis G. Collins: "I wish to explain my vote very briefly if I may."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Proceed."

Otis G. Collins: "Ah, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd only wish to state that I certainly support work concept for welfare recipients, but I do feel that under the circumstances, this bill having been stricken after the enacting clause and an eleven page amendment ah added and due to the fact that this bill did not have the privilege of being examined by and heard by examined or heard by the welfare committee, I am and in addition to that, ah ah some of the observations cited by my distinguished colleague, Representative Washington, and in lieu of this I'm going to vote 'Present'. I vote 'Present'. Thank you."

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

Corneal A. Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, certainly I'm concerned about the observation as made by my distinguished and learned colleague, Representative Washington. I rely on him very heavily and I was very very much concerned. But let me give you a little his-



torical background. When these questions came up, Senator Smith who has served on the legislative advisory committee with me and myself and Senator Dougherty, Bud Krause who served on there with us. We had the Cook County Director of Public Aid, Mr. Daniels come in. We rehearsed with him thoroughly these questions. We got an assurance from him that this bill would produce the amount of money that it said it would produce and now we understand that it will produce some \$32 or \$33 million in money and that it would not be abused. That's why we signed this conference report. We had the assurance that it would not be abused. It would bring 10,000 jobs and some \$33 million and I want my distinguished friends to know that that is the only reason that we signed this conference report. The five Democrats that signed it on there and there was very much concern about the problems and questions that had been raised here, but when we waited against the fact that 10,000 people would be employed and \$33 million would come into the State and it is my understanding that we don't have to wait for this money. All we have to do is pick up the money. This is my understanding. All we have to do is pick it up. Are we coming back in January and if we find that we've been deceived in any way, we'll have an opportunity to do something about it. Thank you very much, that's why I signed the report."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Take the record. On this question, there are , William Walsh, 'No', William Walsh, 'Yeas'. On



this question, there are 133 'Yeas' and 5 'Nays' and the House, and 11 'Present' and the Conference Committee Report with respect to House Bill 2867 is adopted. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Moore."

Don A. Moore: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, ah, by the by which the conference committee report on House Bill 2867 was adopted, I move to reconsider the vote."

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

William J. Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, I move 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 to table prevails. With leave of the House, we will go to Senate Bills second reading, Senate Bill 81."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 81. An act to amend Sections 1-103 and so forth of an act in relation to ethical standards and state government. Second reading of the bill. Okay, thank you. One Committee Amendment. Amend Senate Bill 81 on page 1, by striking lines 1 through 11 and so forth."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, oh, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Burditt."

George M. Burditt: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as you all know, this is the Senate version of the Ethics Bill. Hopefully tomorrow is the last day of the





present session and since we need reading, two more readings on this bill after discussions with the leadership on both sides of the aisle, we have agreed to adopt the Committee Amendment without discussion and with of course the approval of the membership, move the bill to third reading today, and you have my assurance and the assurance of the leadership on both sides of the aisle that the next action which will be taken on Senate Bill 81 will be to call it back for second reading if we need it as a vehicle to call it back to second reading tomorrow, at which time the Committee Amendment and all of the other amendments which any member may have will be fully debated. In other words, the sole purpose of calling the bill tonight and if my motion to adopt the Committee Amendment is so that we can have today take effect as one of the three day which the bill is to be read. But again I assure you that no action, whatsoever will be taken on this bill until tomorrow, if necessary, we will call it back to second reading and no action will be taken except to call it back to second reading and then only if we need it for a vehicle to give further consideration to ethics legislation, so with that understanding which I have discussed directly with Representative Choate and the leadership on this side, I move Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that Committee Amendment Number One to Senate Bill 81 be adopted."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, all those in favor of the adoption of the amendment say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the



amendment is adopted."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment Number Two, Katz. Amend House Bill Number One. Amend House Amendment Number One to Senate Bill 81 on page 17, by striking lines 1 through 10 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'Section 6-101'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, no, the understanding is that we'll hold these floor amendments until tomorrow."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Oh, all right."

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

Harold A. Katz: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, I left that up there some days ago before this agreement was reached. I'm perfectly agreeable to withholding it and proceeding ahead to third reading on this bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right. With the understanding that we'll bring it back tomorrow if we need to have it as a vehicle. All right, third reading. On the concurrences appears Senate Bill 1573, House Bill 1573. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Gerald W. Shea: "With respect to Senate Amendment Number Two. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move that this House now concur in Senate Amendment Number Two to House Bill 1573. House Bill 1573 is an amendment to the 'Revenue Article' of this State, wherein the Cook County will be allowed to collect its real estate taxes in four installments instead of the present two. It will insure that all taxes are collected at an earlier date and it is my understanding that this will save the taxing bodies in



Cook County approximately \$55 million a year in money that is presently being spent on tax anticipation warrants. I would appreciate the support of the House."

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

Bradley M. Glass: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this amendment and briefly for the background of the membership, ah the objective of this bill is thus extremely praiseworthy, namely to save the tax payers of Cook County substantial sums of money that would otherwise be through tax anticipation warrants. Right now the taxing bodies throughout Cook County and the schools in particular run out of money early in the calendar year and because the taxes don't come in until May or June, there's a period there where they have to borrow money from the public and pay interest on it to tax anticipation warrants, so there is no doubt that we should have a bill to correct this situation. Now, the only thing at issue, Ladies and Gentlemen, is whether the bill should have four installments or two installments? I have sponsored a bill in this House which has called for two installments a payment of taxes just as we have now with a delinquency date moved up to February 1 and July 1. Senator Terrel Clarke in the Senate sponsored a similar bill over there and so the issue has really broken down to whether or not we should have two installments to get the money in sooner, or whether we should go to four installments? Ah, I'm surely urging at this time that the House do not concur in this amendment so that we



can go into a conference committee and work out what is the best answer. Now, the answers to the four installment bill are simply these and very briefly these: the simplicity and ease of operation would be maintained with the two installments. There would, Ladies and Gentlemen, be an increased expense to the Treasurer of Cook County in making four mailings and even though he might not have to make additional mailings of the tax bills since they could be contained in two envelopes, nevertheless when he sends out receipts for payment of the bill to the tax payer, this would involve additional mailing costs, it has been estimated possibly as much as \$400,000.00. There would be additional costs in the preparation of the additional bills as well. Now, a number of tax payers in Cook County do not pay their bills by mail, they go in and pay them by person and I think all of us from Cook County are familiar with the long lines of tax payers waiting outside the Treasurer's Office to pay their bills and the delinquency dates. This would mean that they would have to go down there four times a year instead of two and I think that perhaps one of the most serious objections to the four installments, or the bill as it now stands is that it contains no provision for payment to the schools and other taxing bodies promptly. In other words, the money will come in sooner, hopefully, but how do we know that it's going to get out to those school districts that want it? I think there ought to be a provision in the bill that would require



prompt payment of those funds out to the taxing districts. We've also been advised that the present Treasurer of Cook County, Bernard Cortz, opposes this procedure. He points out the additional increased load on his office for processing the additional tax bills and I submit that we ought not to burden him, so I'm submitting at this time that this is an important piece of legislation. I think that all of us want to save tax payers money, that is not the question. The real question is should we have a four installment bill or a two installment bill? This bill will not become effective until 1973 in any event. We have time to work out the bill in the best form that we have and I think there's a legitimate honest difference of opinion over whether there should be two or four installments, so let's make the bill workable and do the best job for the taxpayers and let it go to a conference committee and let's defeat this amendment. Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tip-sword."

Rolland F. Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, if we would refuse to concur with this amendment, I could see this bill going back to the Senate, the amendment being taken off and the bill being declared passed, so it is with reluctance, therefore, that I move that this motion to concur 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 right, the question is on the gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword's motion, to table the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea's motion that the House concur, in Senate Amendment Number Two to House Bill 1573. All those in favor of the motion to table will vote 'Yeas' and the opposed 'No'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 89 'Yeas' and 59 'Nays' and this motion to table prevails. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Burditt."

George M. Burditt: "Ah, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House non-concur in Senate Amendment One <sup>e</sup>Two to House Bill 1573."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, all those in favor of the motion say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No' and the House non-concurs to Senate Amendment Number One to House Bill 1573. Resolutions. Agreed resolutions."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Resolution 484, Hoffman, et.al. House Resolution 485, Arrigo, et.al. House Resolution 496, Genoa Washington, et.al. House Resolution 487, R. L. Thompson, et.al. House Resolution 488, Choate, et.al. House Resolution 489, Keller, et.al. House Resolution 490, M. Madigan, et.al. House Resolution 491, Richard Carter, et.al. House Resolution 492, Jones, et.al. House Resolution 493, Campbell, et.al. House Resolution 494, Boyle, et.al. House Resolution 496, Juckett, et.al."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde, on the agreed resolutions."



Henry J. Hyde: "Somehow, Mr. Speaker, over here I feel light headed. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the agreed resolutions 484 congratulates Martin Romme for his effort as the Bensenville Board of Education. House Resolution 485 is a death resolution honoring the late Paul D'Arco. House Resolution 486, 'Whereas, Our highly respected and most esteemed colleague from the 26th District in the Great City of Chicago, the Honorable J. Horace Gardner celebrates his 39th birthday on November 12, 1971; and Whereas, Since his freshman appearance in this body seven terms ago he has shown a high devotion to duty, and his hard, steady work on behalf of his assigned committees, Welfare, Personnel and Veterans Affairs, and Public Utilities has won him the lasting respect of his colleagues and the admiration of the people of the 26th District, who he so diligently and ably represents in this body; and Whereas, During his 7 terms in this legislative body he has always found time to demonstrate his sincere concern for the feeling and opinions of all the members of this august body; and Whereas, since his freshman induction to this assembly has continually been known as a 'man of peace'; therefore be it Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Seventy-seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we are pleased to join with his family, many friends and professional associates in congratulating him on the celebration of his 39th birthday; that we extend our sincere and best wishes for many happy returns of the day



and that a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution be forwarded to the Honorable J. Horace Gardner."

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

J. Horace Gardner: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I do appreciate this gesture on your part. I just want to say that I am just like Jack Benny, I play a violin, too. Thank you very much."

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

Raymond W. Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, a point of clarification.

Did the distinguished Majority Leader say light headed or light pocketed? I missed that."

Henry J. Hyde: "Light headed, heavy pocketed. Ah, House Resolution 487 congratulates the 42nd Ward intermediate and junior basketball champions. House Resolution 488 is a death memorial resolution to Louis Markert, the father of State Representative Markert. House Resolution 489 congratulates the Rt. Rev. Monsignor John McGrath upon his receipt of padre of the year award, from the National Catholic Youth Organization. House Resolution 490 is a memorial to the wise of former congressman, William Murphy who passed away November 11, 1971. House Resolution 491 salutes the London House in the City of Chicago on the occasion of its 20th anniversary. House Resolution 492 congratulates the Illinois State Journal, official newspaper for the State of Illinois and its publisher and editor, John P. Clarke. House Resolution 493 congratulates the Danville Vikings for their football team. And House Resol-





ution 494 congratulates football coach, William Schuetze of Carlinville High School and moving right along on these resolutions, 496 wishes the best to Gary Jonland in his attempt to make the United States Olympic Speed Skating Team. I move adoption of the agreed resolutions."

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

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Resolution House Resolution 495, Schlickman. House Joint Resolution 109, Mike Madigan, et al."

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

Michael J. Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move to suspend the provisions of Rule 53 (a) in order to consider House Joint Resolution 109 immediately. Would the Clerk read the resolution?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the gentleman has asked for the provisions of Rule 53 (a) to be suspended so this could be considered. Is there objection? All right, the gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell. There's objection to unanimous consent. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Michael J. Madigan: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have a roll call on that issue if we could. Could the Clerk read the resolution?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "A roll call on unanimous consent?"

Michael J. Madigan: "On my motion to suspend."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He now moves to suspend the provisions of Rule 53 (a). All those in favor will vote 'Yeas' and the opposed 'No'. Well, . . . all right, that's the motion, yeah, well, he's asked for the resolution to be read for the motion to suspend."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Joint Resolution 109. 'Whereas, Americans of every faith and political persuasion are distressed by the bloodshed and suffering of the people of Northern Ireland; and Whereas, The causes of the present conflict in Northern Ireland may be traced to discrimination in housing, employment, and political representation against a minority of the people; and Whereas, The governments of the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland have failed to end the bloodshed and suffering; therefore, be it Resolved, By the House of Representatives of the Seventy-seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that we urge the Secretary of State for the United States of America to express to the government of the United Kingdom and of Northern Ireland the concern of the American people for the bloodshed and suffering of all of the people of Northern Ireland and to urge the government of the United Kingdom and of Northern Ireland to take immediate steps to end discrimination against the minority in Ireland; and that copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the Office of the Secretary of State to the Honorable William P. Rogers, Secretary of State for the United States, and to President Richard M.



Nixon.'" "

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, now the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, has moved to suspend the rules for the immediate consideration and adoption of House Joint Resolution 109. All those in favor of the motion to suspend will vote 'Yeas' and the opposed 'No'. The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Webber Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and Fellow Members of the House, I'm very happy to have walked in at this particular moment. Feeling as I do at the moment on implied consent, I think I'll take it out on this. Feeling at the moment as I do, at what's been happening. Now, this summer I was in England and Scotland and when I was in Edinburg Castle, the Irish Republican Army, you didn't read about it, while there were thousands of people, thousands of people at Edinburg Castle in Scotland they planted a bomb and blew part of it out. My grandson and I were there. I never expect to get bombed again but I got bombed. I don't want to be charged with a crime that's being taken up on this applause. So, let's have a little order, Mr. Speaker. But I want to tell you about a few facts of life about us sticking our noses into other people's business. All right, I for one am for complete I for one am in complete agreement and I believe that we should allow the English Army to take out women and children out of that place and let those idiots butcher themselves. It's incredible to me that people at this time and age after 300 years, well, I've read this alleged accusa-



tions in the resolution earlier in the day would believe all of that stuff, behind the basic is one of the most silliest things you've ever heard about - a fight over religion. People that fight over religion in the 20th Century haven't got a lick of sense. And anyone in this country and this state that is frightfully idiotic enough to have us as a State stick our nose in another nation's affairs, we really ought to have our heads examined."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, bring your remarks to a close."

Webber Borchers: "Very well. All I can say is that's having the bomb in a land other than Ireland by these people and endangering tens of thousands, I think it's ridiculous and to stick our nose and to try to enter affairs in a concerned sort of <sup>of</sup> affairs and we ought to stay out of there."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. The gentleman from . . . on this question, there are 98 'Yeas' and 21 'Nays' and the motion to suspend prevails. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Michael J. Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I would now like to move for consideration of this resolution and adoption of it and if I might, I'd like to speak to the resolution briefly."

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

Michael J. Madigan: "Ah, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, I'm sure that all of us are aware of the conditions that exist in Northern Ireland today. We have all read the daily newspaper accounts and television



accounts of the atrocities which have been committed in Ireland, I don't wish through the vehicle of this resolution to ascribe faults to any individuals or groups. I simply wish to express to the governments of Northern Ireland and the United Kingdom, the concern which I as a American with Irish ancestry feel that the situation in Northern Ireland and the concern which I feel that many Illinoisians share with me. I would ask for your favorable consideration."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question is, . . . all those in favor of the adoption of the resolution say 'Yeas', the opposed 'NO', the 'Yeas' have it. All those in favor of the adoption of the resolution will vote 'Yeas' and the opposed 'No'. The gentleman from . . . have all voted who wished? The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Webber Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know what the vote is, it's probably in favor of this idiotic resolution, but let me tell you about atrocity. Three Scottish boys when I was over there, three of them, 17 and 18 year old brothers, without a bit of arms or ammunition on them, walked into a pub over there and to get a drink. They were picked up by armed men, taken out and executed, and to me that was a horrible thing to do. To think that three young lives were snubbed out without any cause whatsoever. Now, that's the atrocity of the Irish army. I suppose I'll get bombed for talking like this clear over here if I can get bombed in Scotland, I can



get bombed in Illinois, but again I appeal to you, we have no business entering the affairs of Ireland. The English army are doing their best to keep these people apart and they're the ones that should have the resolution and the support, not the Irish of either side, but the British army who is suffering the casualties and trying to keep from firing on women and children, although they are the ones that are being fired on by women and children, including men of the Irish army and Irish patriots so-called."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Take the record. On this question, there are 92 'Yeas' and 29 'Nays' and the resolution is adopted. Further resolutions? That's it. All right, the gentleman from Randolph, Mr. Springer, ah desires to ah be recognized concerning Senate Bill 1283."

Norbert G. Springer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, may I have unanimous consent to suspend the appropriate rule that Senate Bill 1283 be taken from the Speaker's table, by-pass the committee and be placed on second reading on the second legislative day. I've cleared this with leadership on both sides of the aisle. This bill has been approved by the Pension Laws Committee."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, hearing no objection then the bill will be advanced to the order of second reading, second day. All right, the message was read on that one last, so you'd better read the bill a first time and then it goes to second."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1283. First reading of the



bill."

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

Henry J. Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, I now move this House do stand adjourned until the hour of 10:00 A.M. tomorrow morning."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', and we're adjourned until 10:00 A.M."

Adjournment at 8:03 O'Clock P.M.

11/12/71  
skn.

