

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-SEVENTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

THIRTY-SIXTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

APRIL 5, 1973

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 Richard A. Carter - illness;

Representative Peter C. Granata - illness;

Representative John E. Grotberg - illness;

Representative James G. Krause - illness;

Representative Virginia B. Macdonald - illness;

Representative Fred J. Schraeder - no reason given;

Representative John F. Wall - illness.



Murphy: "The House will be in order. We will have the prayer by Mr. Joseph Carey."

Carey: "Let us pray. And I will give you pastures, which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding, Amen."

Murphy: "Messages from the Senate."

Fredric B. Selcke: "A message from the Senate from Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of House Amendment to the Bill of the following title, Senate Bill 45. Concurred in by the Senate April 4, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm 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, Senate Bill 31. Passed by the Senate April 4, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Conference Committee Report, Senate Joint Resolution 25. Action taken by the Senate ah..... Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles, in the passage of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House, Senate Bill 97, 117, 125, 199, 201, 216, 234, 250, 271, 278, 356, 398, passed by the Senate April 4, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary."

Murphy: "Committee Reports."



Fredric B. Selcke: "Mr. Neff, from the Committee on Transportation, to which House Bills 131, and 132 were referred, returned the same back, and pursuant to Rule 23 (d), the Bills were ordered tabled. Mr. Collins, from Executive, to which House Bill 293, 468, 555 were referred, were reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bill do pass. Mr. Collins, from Executive, to which House Bills 469 and 554 were referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bills do pass and they be re-referred to the Committee on Appropriations. Mr. Collins, from Executive, to which House Bills 532 and 538 were referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bills do pass. Mr. Collins, from Executive, to which House Bill 650 was referred, reported the same back with amendments thereto, with the recommendation that the amendments be adopted, that the Bills amended do pass. Mr. Collins, from Executive, to which House Resolution 82, was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the resolution be adopted."

Murphy: "General Resolutions."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Joint Resolution 27, Juckett. House Resolution 163, Taylor et al. House Resolution 168, Douglas. House Resolution 186, Kempiners."

Murphy: "We're going to change the order of business a minute and move to introduction of Bills."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 920, Berman. Amends the State Employees Retirement System, First Reading of the Bill."



House Bill 921, Arrigo. An Act to authorizing the furnishing of secretarial services to the Members of governing boards, First Reading of the Bill. 922, Ron Hoffman. Amends Retailor Occupations Tax Act, First Reading of the Bill. 923, DiPrima. Amends the Promisory Notes Act, First Reading of the Bill. 924, Huskey et al. Adds section to Mósquito Abatement District Act, First Reading of the Bill. 926, Ron Hoffman. Amends the Illinois Municipal Act, First Reading of the Bill. 927, E.H.Miller, Amends the Illinois Insurance Code, First Reading of the Bill. 928, Leon. Appropriates \$1,004,875 to The Department of Public Health, First Reading of the Bill. 929, Kent et al. Amends an Act creating The Department of Children and Family Services, First Reading of the Bill. 930, R.L. Dunn et al. Amends the Illinois Vehicle Code, First Reading of the Bill. 931, Londrigan et al. Amends the State Employees Group Insurance Act, First Reading of the Bill. 932, Fary et al. Amends Dram Shop Act, First Reading of the Bill. 933, Ebbesen et al. Appropriates \$20,000,000 to the Department of Transportation, First Reading of the Bill. 934, Fary et al. Repeals Dram Shop Section, regarding cash payment for beer, First Reading of the Bill. 935, Berry, et al. Appropriates \$2,000,000 to the Secretary of State, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 936, Polk et al. Amends the Election Code, First Reading of the Bill. 937, McClain et al. Amends the School Code, First Reading of the Bill. 938, Tuerk et al. Appropriates \$15,000 to the University



of Illinois, First Reading of the Bill. 939, Kelly et al. Amends Judges Retirement System Article, First Reading of the Bill. 940, Kelly et al. Amends the Judges Retirement System. House Bill 941, DiPrima. Amends an Act to revise the law in relation to counties, First Reading of the Bill. 942, Von Boeckman, et al. Directs the Division of Water Resources Management to make an engineering examination of several creeks in Tazewell County, First Reading of the Bill. 943, Martin et al. Creates the State Information Center, First Reading of the Bill. 944, Martin et al. Appropriates \$223,100 to the Department of General Services, First Reading of the Bill. 945, Gene Hoffman et al. Amends the School Code, First Reading of the Bill. 946, Jaffe et al. Amends the Insurance Code, First Reading of the Bill. 947, Berry et al. We'll hold on 947 and go to 948. House Bill 948, Berry, Amends the School Code, First Reading of the Bill. 949, Campbell. Amends the Vehicle Code, First Reading of the Bill. 950, Maragos et al. Amends the Insurance Code, First Reading of the Bill. 951, Campbell. "

Murphy: "Excuse me, Fred. Will the Members quit cluttering the middle of the aisle up there, please? Hey, will the Members quit cluttering the middle of the aisle up there, please? Mr. Blair, will you clear that aisle there please?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "951, Campbell. Amends the Vehicle Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 947, Berry. Appropriation to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, First Reading of the Bill."



Murphy: "The gentleman from Will, Representative Blair moves that the House stands in recess until 10:00."

Arthur Telcser: "The House will come to order. The indication by Father John."

Father John: "Centuries ago the people of your covenant suffered and endured hardships before entering the land which you had graciously promised them, O'Lord, so teach us to recognize that periods of difficulty are sent by you to be periods of testing in times of refinement. Grant that we may face all difficulties without falling apart. And grant that we may endure challenge without falling away from trust in your providence. Teach us above all that the real issues are not whether we face obstacles, and not whether we are met by ever new challenges, as we seek to carry out the business of legislation before us, but teach us rather that the real issues involve how we react to them, and how we meet these trials in responsiveness to conscience and in concern to those who have placed us in responsible positions of government. And than teach us in the words to commit our way to you knowing that you will bring things to pass in accordance to you holy will. We ask this in the name of our Savior, Amen."

Arthur Telcser: "The Roll Call for attendance. Representative Washington, for what purpose do you rise?"

Washington: "May the Journal show, Mr. Speaker, that Representative Carter is absent due to illness."

Arthur Telcser: "It will be journalized. Gentleman from



Whiteside, Representative Miller."

Miller: "I request that the Journal please show that Representatives Granata, Wall, and Grotberg, are absent because of illness."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, it will be journalized. Messages from the Senate."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution, adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to-wit Senate Joint Resolution 30, adopted by the Senate April 4, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary."

Arthur Telcser: "Introduction of the First Reading of Bills."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 952, Leon. Amends the Election Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 953, Leon et al. Provides state assistance to reimburse expenses of the Chicago Transit Authority, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 954, Shea et al. Appropriates certain amounts to the Secretary of State for ordinary and contingency expenses, First Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Agreed Resolutions."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Resolution 171, VonBoeckman. House Resolution 172, Diprima et al. House Resolution 173, Tom Miller et al. House Resolution 174, Thomas Miller et al. House Resolution 175, DiPrima et al. House Resolution 177, Calvo et al. House Resolution 178, Calvo et al. House





Resolution 179, Neff et al. House Resolution 180, McClaine et al. House Resolution 181, Rose et al. House Resolution 182, Tipsword et al. House Resolution 183, Lemke, et al. House Resolution 184, Lemke et al. House Resolution 185, Hill et al. House Resolution 187, Maragos."

Murphy: "Excuse me a minute, Mr. Clerk. If you fellows think that I'm going to get rid of this gavel real easy, your wrong, I might keep it a while. But it's a pleasure for me this morning to introduce to this General Assembly, two of the finest young Americans that I've ever met in my life. Certainly an example of what the youth of today could and should be. Mike Dickson and Brent Browning, of the Championship Ridgeway Basketball Team. They really didn't know that I was going to do this and now I'm going to see whether either one of them has any ideas about running against old Clyde one of these days. See what kind of talkers they are. Mike, come up here and say 'Hi' to the General Assembly."

Mike: "Well, I'm happy to be here, and I appreciate your support, thank you."

Murphy: "Mike, I hope you meant that you appreciate that support from a basketball standpoint, now the fact that your going to run one of these days. Brent Browning."

Brent Browning: "I'm happy to be here, I'd like to see how the government runs. It's really an experiance to see how it all works."



Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

W. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, these are the agreed resolutions ah.... House Resolution 171, congratulates the Warriors of Washington Junior High School ah... who had a very successful season, and their coach Harold Franklin. House Resolution 172 by Representative DiPrima, congratulates Joseph R. Sampson on his election of Nation Commander of Amvets. House Resolution 173, by Tom Miller, is a resolution in appreciation to the Honorable Dante L. DeSantis for his service to the Village of Glenwood. 174, also by Miller, commends Village President Robert C. Selvig of Riverdale for his years of service. House Resolution 175, congratulates Mrs. Essley B. Burdine on her election of National President of the Amvets Auxiliary, and I suspect that's DiPrimi,.... right. House Resolution 177, congratulates Mr. and Mrs. Glen Gibson on their 50th Wedding Anniversary. House Resolution 178 congratulates Miss. Kathllene Parmley on being selected as The State Sweetheart for the De Molay's. House Resolution 179, congratulates Dr. Marcy G. Bodine, professor of Political Science at Western Illinois University. House Resoltuion 180 commends Rev. Robert O'Connor on the 25th anniversary of his ordination to the preisthood. And he's the pastor at St. Mary's Church in Lewistown. House Resolution 181 congratulates Mr. Ken Norton, formally of Jacksonville on his victory over former world champion



Muhammad Ali. House Resolution 182 congratulates ah... the Village of Harvel on it's Centennial. House Resolution 183 congratulates the Ladies Parishioners Club of Blessed Agnes Parish, in Chicago. House Resolution 184 commends Dwayne Taylor on his selection of an Eagle Scout. House Resolution 185 congratulates ah.. my seatmate Al and Bea Schoeberlein upon their occasion of their 50th Wedding Anniversary and ah.... this is a very good resolution. Doesn't say anything in here about Al being my seatmate three terms, six years, and I think it should. House Resolution 187 ah.. commends the ah... Michael J. Bakalis Superintendent of Public Instruction on ah... his birthday. And I move the adoption of the agreed resolutions."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of the agreed resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed by saying 'nay', the resolutions are adopted. Committee Reports. Representative Borchers, for what purpose do you rise?"

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise on a point of personal previlage."

Arthur Telcser: "State you point, Sir."

Borchers: "Last week the Amnesty Resolution was ah... up for vote and was carried the voice vote. I want it throughly understood by the Members of the House that I had specifically requested a Roll Call vote and understood that there would be a Roll Call vote. Before I realized it the acting Speaker had gaveled it into a voice vote. I have asked



deliberately for a Roll Call vote because of the prisoners. Because of what I believe and what because we know here, all of us here know who are those who brought in the resolutions for ah... stopping Illinois boys from going into the Army, the Massachusetts, etc. We also know exactly who all of these people are. I'm not going to mention their names, I don't intend to put them on the spot so that they can answer back, but I want you to know that when a Roll Call vote is called for, I feel that have all, and the people of the State of Illinois have a right to know who in hell these people are and put them on the spot so that they can continue to put themselves on the spot in relation to the idiocy of supporting Hanói and all the things that went on there like Jane Fonda. And I'd like them to know that I put themselves in that same classification."

Arthur Telcser: "The Committee Reports."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Mr. Soderstrom from Elementary and Secondary to which House Bill 748 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that Bill do pass. Mr. Soderstrom from Elementary and Secondary to which House Bill 695 was referred, reported the same back with the amendments thereto with the recommendation the amendments be adopted, those amended do pass. Mr. Soderstrom, from Elementary and Secondary to which House Resolution 43 was referred, reported the same back, pursuant to Rule 23(d) the House Resolution was ordered tabled."



April 5, 1973

11.

Arthur Telcser: "House Bills, Third Reading."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 4, Washington. A Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Proceedure, 1963, Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Is Representative Washington on the floor? Take it out of the record."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 24, Sevcik. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: Gentleman from Cook, Representative Sevcik."

Sevcik: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 24 prohibits an insurance company from requiring a physical exam as a condition for a renewal of auto insurance if a policy holder has been a customer 5 years. Unless the company pays the cost of the exam and permits the policyholder to choose his own doctor. I ask for your favorable support."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Question is shall House Bill 24 pass. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 114 'ayes', 1 'nay' and this Bill having recieved a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 29, Jaffe. An Act to amend the Mental Heath Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe."



Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 29 is the confidentiality of Mental Health records Bill. It's purpose is to give a more definite definition of persons entitled ah... to Public Mental Health Records. At the present time the statute is vague and there is a question as to who may look at the records. This Bill would make the definition more explicit and would work to protect the person treated in a public Mental Health Facility. At the present time, it is supported by the Illinois Association for Mental Health and supported by the Department of Mental Health and passed out of committee 14 to 1, I know of no opposition to it. Amendments have been put on the Bill by Representative Kempiners, Polk, GeoKaris and Lundy and I urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "I wonder if the Sponsor would answer a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Borchers: "I recollect about two years or three years ago, we passed a rule that a patient in a Mental Hospital, because of some legal technicalities ah...in relation to his protection could request that his attorney have a copy of his file. I believe that probably the author is on the floor. Ah... thought that that was a very good Bill, because it protected the patient. I wondered, if I recollect correctly, does this effect that ruling of that Bill that was passed?"



Jaffe: "No, it does not. The attorney still has that right."

Borchers: "Fine, thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there..... gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Cunningham: "Representative Jaffe, I had the impression, the effect of this Bill, rather than to deal with the confidentiality was just to seal out the information from the public scrutiny. Isn't that a more accurate summation?"

Jaffe: "Well, Roscoe, what it does is leave in certain individuals who can look at the Bill. The Department of Mental Health, the Director can look at the record, the States Attorney, the County from which the person is admitted, can look at the record ah... and the Secret Service can look at it."

Cunningham: "I'd like to speak just shortly on the Bill, without digging up any political bones and we all like to be thought to be enlightened in view of Mental Health as being an illness and that sort of thing. But if this Bill would have been the law in Missouri last year, we might well have had Thomas Eagleton as Vice President, and worse yet McGovern as President. We should all vote 'no' because it destroys the public's right to know what the background is those who's mental health is a legitimate public concern."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners."



Kimpiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Previously I stood up and spoke against this Bill, and I want to stand at this point to speak in favor of the Bill. There was an amendment put on to ah...amend the Bill to protect the patients privacy while permitting necessary information to be disclosed to people such as the Secret Service. And I think that ah... we have two goals here. One is to protect the patients privacy and another is to make that information.... necessary information available ah... when people who need the information can get a hold of it. I stand in support of this Bill because it is designed to protect the individuals privacy and I urge the support of everybody in this Chamber."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? If not, the gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe to close."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, as I indicated before, this Bill is ah... passed out of committee 14 to 1 and it's supported by the Illinois Association for Mental Health and it's supported by the Department of Mental Health and I would urge and 'aye' vote."

Arthur Telcser: "Question is shall House Bill 29 pass. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and the opposed by voting 'no'. Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I was on the committee that heard the Bill and in support of this Bill, as amended, this Bill does not preclude the State's Attorney or the County from which the person is admitted, from getting this information. There are other





safeguards that we have in the Bill so that the information will be disclosed to the proper party. The purpose of this Bill is to avoid fishing expeditions to malign peoples backgrounds and their ability and so forth. I rise and vote for the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, along with Representative Kempiner and a few others I think I rose in opposition to the Bill previously because I felt that certain things needed clarifying ah.... the amendment that has been added by the Sponsor, satisfies me and I believe satisfies the Mental Health Association of Illinois. I think it is as the lady from Lake has just indicated ah.. a very excellent and important thing in that it protects privacy, which is quite essential, while still making provision for legitimate needs and limited form of medical records. I would very strongly urge the support of this Bill as being a very important addition to something that people in public life should know about, which is the need for legitimate privacy, and would urge the support of this very good Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Hyde."

Hyde: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I think that this is a bad Bill. The motives of the Sponsor are certainly laudible. If you read the Bill, what it does is make the very private records concerning the mental treatment of a patient, and I'm all for that,



except where a governmental agency has a legitimate need to know. We're talking about people who are being appointed to judgeships, being appointed to very sensitive posts in the Federal Government or other governmental agencies. I think that it's very legitimate for the F.B.I. or for some Intelligent Service or Law Enforcement Agency to know whether this person may very well wheel the power of life and death over other people, has been in a mental institution receiving electric shock treatments or something like that. Now I will grant you that this information should not be open to the public, but certainly legitimate agencies of government ought to be able to get this information. Now even the amendment is inadequate, because it's says that the Secret Service, which has the task of guarding the President from assassination attempts, may get the information if the Director of Mental Health deems it appropriate. Now that's nonsense. Certainly the Secret Service ought to know whether there are kooks going to be seating on the ah... Speaker's diocese with the President or the Vice President. And this great distrust of governmental agencies may be well and good, but we oughta clean up the agencies and not deny to the F.B.I. legitimate information concerning the mental fitness of people who are going to be wielding the power and life and death over other people, such as Federal Judges. The Bill is well motivated, but it is certainly misconceived. Thank you."



Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Kane, Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, because of a position on the Data Information Systems Commission, I'd like to be recorded as 'present'."

Arthur Telcser: "Record Representative Waddell as 'present'. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I think that we have just raised all sorts of unjustified bug-a-boos about ah... who may be placed in responsible governmental positions if ah... mental health records or access thereto is denied to certain governmental investigating agencies. These aren't real concerns, let's face it, ah... when background investigations are done on people who are nominated for positions of responsibility in the Federal or the State Government, there are all sorts of ways to obtain information about the mental health background of those persons without going directly to the official records and it seems to me clear that that kind of information would be developed independently without having the F.B.I. and other law enforcement or investigating agencies rummaging through the mental health records of the people of this state. The great danger of allowing free access to mental health records is that we discourage one of the most important goals of even having a Department of Mental Health, and that is to have people seek treatment when they need treatment. Let's face it, many people are



deterred from seeking treatment because they are afraid that their records will be open to public scrutiny or to the scrutiny of investigating agencies that really have no need to see them. Now I urge a favorable vote on this Bill. It's acceptable to the Association of Mental Health, it's acceptable to the Department, I think that this small amount of privacy is the very least that we can guarantee people who receive treatment in the Mental Health Institutions in this state."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to explain my vote on this Bill, which I think is a good one. One of the previous speakers mentioned that ah...in backround investigation that the state and federal agencies have to get into these records. Well, I disagree with that. I don't think that the intimate details of a persons conversations with his psychiatrist are anything that the government should know anything about. And I think that knowing that that person has been in that Mental Institution and doing a backround investigation that facts will be revealed that are pertinent to the government's investigation. Opening this file will not, and I urge your 'yes' vote on this good Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "In reply to some of the arguments that have been ah... proposed against this Bill, let me say this, that the fears are really needless. If you take a look at the Bill, you



would find out that the person himself could give a waiver ah.... so that any institution could look at ah... or any agency could look at it. The State's Attorney of the county from which the person is admitted or in which he resides or which the hospital is located can have access to the record. The attorney for the patient can do it. The Circuit Court in any county can ask for it and that's what usually happens. In addition to that ah... the Secret Service can ask for it certain records. So I really think that we're raising a flag over here that is really needless. I think that this is a much needed Bill to protect the people of this state. There are many poor people that will not go to Public Mental Health Institutions because they are afraid that their records will be opened up to every agency that you have. You have agencies looking at records for no good reasons at all. We want to protect those agencies who have a right to look at those records, but we want to keep out those agencies who do not. I must say that we've had alot of discussion with regards to this Bill. We've talked to the Department of Corrections, we've talked to a number of other people on the Federal level, and this Bill seems to be satisfactory to everybody and it is endorsed by the Illinois Association for Mental Health, and it was passed out of committee 14 to 1 and I know of no opposition to this particular Bill, and I would solicit an 'aye' vote."



Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. B.B.Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I think it's good medical practice and good legal practice to ah... endorse this Bill and to support it because the lawyers are all familiar with the confidentiality privilege extended between a doctor and patient, lawyer and client, ah...religious people and their parishioners and I think that extending this privilege in an area that is really much needed in the mental health area is going to provide for better mental health in this state and assure individual rights with respect thereto and it has these safeguards built in as Representative Jaffe indicated and I would ask that you assist him in the passage of this Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on either a point of personal privilege or inquiry. There is something being handed out here to call for a Constitutional Convention on the U.S. Constitution, which would open up the entire U.S. Constitution to the possibility of change not just for individual specific purposes. There is no name of any legislature on it, reportedly coming through the post office."

Arthur Telcser: "I think Representative McGrew name is on it, isn't it? Is that yours, Sam? I don't know. That's what Fred says. O'kay your point is well taken, Sir. The Clerk is going to have recalled. Now, are there any other Mem-



bers who would like to explain their vote? The gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to explain my vote. I think it's time that we address ourselves to this particular problem. This Bill would simply allow the confidentiality to continue and give the opportunity to the Secret Service to go into the records as they are now deemed as they have the responsibility by statute to do so. I think that this does not open up the Pandora Box. I think intent and content this ah... as rule merit, and I would suggest and ask for your 'green' light. Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to explain my vote in favor of this piece of legislation. And as a co-sponsor I felt that the idea of every busy-body going into mental health records is not a safe one and it precludes the confidentiality of a persons illness. Why is it that we do not bother and ah...go into bother of a persons records in a hospital show that he is suffering of cancer or gall bladder or anything else. Again we feel that it is our public business to go in and see if a man has a mental illness backround. With the amendment's safeguards are there for public purposes and for safety purposes that the Secret Service can go into examine these records. I therefore recommend that everybody get on this wonderful piece of legislation, which will safeguard privacy at the same time not inhibit public safety. Thank you."



Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, I'm casting a 'aye' vote although I did have some previous reservations. I served on the Illinois Legislative Investigating Commission when we had the Peoria State Hospital Investigation. And I was appalled at the lack of concern and the cavalier attitude in handling the personal records of those inmates of that institution. Both their mental records, the records pertaining to their health care. And I certainly feel by those investigations and the information that was presented, that the cavalier attitude in handling individual hospital records and their personal medical records, is something that's a very precious right. And with the attitudes of the handling of these records, I feel that Representative Jaffe is aiming at solving a problem. And I feel that the amendments placed upon the Bill will insure those guarantees which many feel are necessary. For those reasons, I'm casting a 'yes' vote."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I'd like to explain my 'no' vote. I suppose I as a parent of a person or a son or a daughter in a mentally retarded hospital could not go in there and get the information that I would want, nor could I request my physician or doctor to get that information. The exclusion, apparently applies





to parents and or to parents, doctors, and this kind of thing, unless I go into court to get this, or unless I go to an attorney to get this. I think this is wrong. I think that I as a parent of a mentally retarded child should be able to get that information, and it should not be shielded from me."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, I can see that that are adequit votes for this Bill to pass, so I can speak with unfarnished candor in telling you how bad a Bill it is. This doesn't merely restrict the publics right to know, it strangles that right. Now some of you have some confusion in your mind about a busy-bodys on fishing expeditions. That seems to be a code name for a new media people. There's no provision in the Bill that permits new media people to make the investigations that are so vital to the well operation of the system. The suggestion was made here that the F.B.I. could check. How many of you can count on the fingers of one hand where the F.B.I. has turned up this type of information which was clearly disqualifying to those who sought positions of public responsibility. Your shutting out the most effective system that we have for turning up this type of disqualification, which is in the interest of all the citizens to be revealed. A minute ago one Representative talked about the fact that his commission had seen first hand one great wrongs had



been committed by making this information of the patients a matter of public knowledge. It should be pointed out that if this Bill passed, his commission wouldn't be able to make determination whatever as to the status and well being of the records in regard to those very same patients. Those of you who are voting 'green' here are rendering a singular disservice to publics right to know. I ask you to repent, and switch."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Claybaugh."

Claybaugh: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think I heard a Member say a moment ago that this could be taken care of by the House Investigating Committee. I think that if you read this Bill in Section 12-3, you'll find that that committee couldn't even get that information. I think that this is a dangerously bad Bill. We've gotten along a long time without it, so let's not follow 'in thing' and just vote something that going to result in a very bad situation for a great many of us. I don't think that we should certainly include our own House Investigating Committee from the rights of access to these records. I think that it's a bad Bill and you should vote 'no'."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 101 'ayes', 34 'nays' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority



is hereby declared passed. Representative Mann, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I move that the vote by which this Bill was passed be..... (microphone turned off)....."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "I move that that motion lye upon the table."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman has moved that that motion lye upon the table. All those in favor.....does the gentleman seek a Roll Call? Is he joined by four Members? O'kay, the gentleman from Cook, Representative Mann has moved that the vote by which House Bill 29 passed, be reconsidered. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffee moved that motion lye upon the table, the question is on the gentleman's motion to table. All those in favor of the motion signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. People who are for Jaffe's Bill vote 'aye'. The ones who are opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 81 'ayes', 26 'nays' and the gentleman's motion to table prevails. House Bill 43."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 43 held at the request of the Sponsor, ah.... 53. House Bill 74, Ewell. An Act in realltion to medical treatment administered solely for the purpose of prolonging human life, Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell. Representative Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise?"



Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 74 has been assigned to the Inter Sub-Committee of Human Resources."

Arthur Telcser: "Has it been reported out though, Representative Ewell?"

Ewell: "I never knew that it was assigned."

Geo-Karis: "I would ask the Representative to hold until Representative Capuzi....."

Arthur Telcser: All right, the gentleman from Cook, Representative Capuzi."

Capuzi: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 74, and I believe that that's the right to die Bill, is that correct? I don't believe that Bill was sent into Inter Study Committee. No, that ..... this Bill was reported out of committee ah.... and some of the Members who voted for this Bill stated at that time that they were voting for it with reservation, if I recall, and I believe that Representative Duester was one of the ah... objectors to the Bill, but this Bill was actually reported out of committee and it was reported ah.... with a recommendation do pass."

Geo-Karis: "May I direct a question to the Chairman of the committee?"

Arthur Telcser: "Proceed."

Geo-Karis: "If you recall, one of the three assignments to our Inter Sub-Committee was, death with dignity."

Capuzi: "There was another Bill similar to that, Representative Geo-Karis, but this is the Bill... Ewell's Bill, that



was passed out of the committee, I believe Bruce Douglas was present at the time, and ah... there is another Bill, other than this one here."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen, ah... this is a much... this is a Bill that has truly been misinterpreted by many of the opponents of the Bill. I think that the classic illustration is the receipt of a telegram, which I am sure that many of you received, that is telegrams, and the Bill simply says that we oppose Bill #74, concerning youth in Asia. Y O U T H I N A S I A . But clearly, this is not the import, or the impact of the Bill. There has been a great deal of lobbying about this Bill. And it's only that it is a misunderstood Bill. I suggest that the first step for understanding is to take a close look at the Bill itself and determine what it actually does. All that this Bill simply does is make it possible for a person 18 years of age or older, and of sound mind, to sign a written document stating that he does not desire to have administered to him specific medical treatment or treatments solely for the purpose of prolonging his life when the medical prognosis in the opinion of the attending physician or physicians is that such treatment cannot effect a cure or rehabilitation and are administered solely to prolong life. This is not a mercy killing Bill. It is not a Bill that will allow anyone to decide who should



live and who should die. This Bill is a simple attempt to make possible for the individual to make that decision for himself. We're concerned not with your right to decide for somebody else, but simply your right to decide for yourself. I don't ask for the right to decide who should live and who should die for my mother, my parents, my children, my friends, my relatives, or for anyone else in the whole world. The Bill is a simple statement saying that if I am of the opinion that I would like to die peacefully and in the opinion of the doctors, there is no prognosis for rehabilitation or recovery, I don't want to have tubes inserted to me, and I do not desire to have an artificial kidney, a artificial lung machine, a respirator, a ah... intravenous feeding, and all of these other things, solely to prolong life. I believe that the individual has the right to have this decision for himself. I should like to point out that you have a number of cases where people are perhaps completely comatose. They have no recognition, no awareness of anything. They are kept alive simply by machines. I am not asking you to make the decision as to whether the plug should be pulled or not. I am simply saying that if a person wants to think about this problem, and I assure you gentlemen, that everybody under the sound of my voice will one day die. So you may as well start thinking about it. If you think about it and decide that you don't want to live in this comatose state, I believe that that is your prerogative and you ought



to be so entitled to do. We've had a number of ah..... arguments that might be for this particular Bill. The modern view, in fact the in 1957, Pope Pius the XII suggested another criteri, this is of life and death, a brain activity in a address, the prolongation of life. The Pope declared that extra ordinary measures, heart and lung assist, need not be taken to main life when irreparable and overwhelming brain damage has occurred. I'm simply saying to you that ladies and gentlemen, all we're asking if the right to die peaceably for the people who would like so to do. I may suggest that if you are extremely wealthy, and perhaps you can afford the expensive machines and expensive operations, perhaps you may desire to linger on. Perhaps you might not be so wealthy, and these attempts might never be made. But I say that it is the province of the individual to make that decision for himself and that's all that the Bill simply does. I should like to point out to you that you can get caught exceeding \$300,000 for a comatose life, that is life by machine, to have a lung machine, intravenous feeding, and an artificial kidney, performing all the functions of life. Ladies and gentlemen, if you read the Bill, you will find that that is an attempt to do nothing but allow you to make the decision as to whether you want to receive treatment. I would ask for a favorable vote and I would be glad to answer any questions."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Douglas."



Douglas: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I'm very uncomfortable that this enormously complicated and important subject is on the floor for a vote long before it's time. Last year I introduced a Bill which is in principal different, but still related to this. It was a Bill that would define when someone is alive and when someone is dead. This Bill passed this House and passed committee in the Senate, and it was because of the numerous questions that were raised when I introduced the Bill, which incidentally is law in Kansas and Maryland, to define death that I myself became very uncomfortable with the question even of deciding when someone is dead and when someone is not dead. It sounds very simple to say that someone who has been lying in bed for a long period of time, hooked up to all kinds of machinery with literally no chance of returning to consciousness should have some predetermined time have an opportunity to decide that he doesn't want to live beyond a certain point. I'm very sensitive to this. My area in Chicago has the largest proportion of elderly people anywhere in the United States, except in Southern California and Southern Florida. But we're not ready to vote on this Bill right now. I think it would be a mistake and with those thoughts in mind, I introduced a resolution which has already been voted on by the Human Resources Committee. And that resolution is the one to which Representative Geo-Karis referred, which





was put on the Study Calendar, which would give the Human Resources Committee the opportunity that it needs to study the question of death with dignity and also to study the question of when someone is legally dead or not. I would ask Representative Ewell, out of sympathy and concern for the intent of a very important piece of legislation, to consider the advisability of asking for leave of this House to postpone and then if he is willing, to move this back for the kind of study that it deserves in the Human Resources Committee. It would be unfortunate, I believe, if this Bill were allowed the kinds of problems that would develop if we start arguing the ethical, morale, the philosophical, the scientific question when someone is dead and when a doctor or anyone else should have the right to turn off the switch. We're not ready for it. We're not ready for it scientifically if in no other way, and I think that it would be unfortunate even there were a vote on this Bill, and if there were a vote, I would vote against it for that reason."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

I rise in opposition to this Bill. I've read it carefully, as the Sponsor requested, and the more I read it the worse it appears to be. Even leaving out the questionable morality of the Bill, the question you leave a physician in is extremely tuff, to say the least. The way I read the Bill, if a physician prescribed insulin to a diabetic patient, he



might run the risk of committing a class 'A' misdemeanor. This is how loosely the Bill has been drafted. I would say that if.... the way this Bill reads, what we ought to do would probably would be to legalize suicide and legalize assistance and aid in a person committing a suicide. This is terrible Bill, in my opinion, it is so loosely drafted that any noncurable illness, such as diabetes, would prohibit a physician from assisting a patient and administering a type of medication which, although is not aimed at curing a patient, will however prolong his life. I've also talked to physicians about this problem, and I have been told that time and again they have written a patient off as dead, but the will to live is strong enough, that the patient has not only returned to life, returned to active life, but then practically totally cured. I'd like to see as many 'red' lights as possible on this Bill, because I think that this is a dangerous Bill and therefore I intend to vote 'no' and I urge everyone else to do so also."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Capuzi."

Capuzi: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I was on in committee who voted against this Bill. I don't think that this Bill is right at the present time. We do have a study committee in which I appointed Members to that committee who are going to study this problem. But I still contend, who are we, as legislatures, to say



whether an individual should live or die? I believe that this, in my opinion, is one of the worst pieces of legislation that we've had in this House this Session, and I am definitely opposed to this legislation, and I would ask all of my friends on this floor to vote 'red' and vote 'no' on this Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson."

Rayson: "Mr. Speaker, a question to the Sponsor. Representative Ewell, I believe that Representative Douglas might have answered my question. Assuming a case of say terminal cancer where somebody is quite sick and really pleads to terminate life, ah... under your Bill is this ah... a situation where the medical authorities would terminate life?"

Ewell: "Under no circumstances would the medical authorities terminate life. That is not the just of the Bill, it is not the way the Bill is written. All it simply says is that treatments solely for the purpose of prolonging life, would not be administered....."

Rayson: "I appreciate your distinction as you well stated, and I understand that. But than the next question is what if the particular person is really not of sound mind at this moment? Is there any sort of medical judgement that can supervise this sort of unsound position at this point? I think that this is a critical matter of the Bill. Can you respond to that?"

Ewell: "In response to that, we have the same problem when



administering a will. Thoughtfully or hopefully, this type of Bill will not be, or this type agreement or document would not be signed simply ah.. in the last throws of life. It ought to be thought out just like a life insurance policy, just like the state planning, or just like planning for a certainty. And it simply means that your right in making this planning that when in the opinion of the physicians, and there are several criteria that you can not have a cure or a rehabilitation. In other words, it's not possible to even be rehabilitated. Diabetes is a..... diabetes people can live with for years, and it does not constitute a problem, but I'm saying that there are areas, and we're concerned about this problem. The technological advances of man have made it possible to have almost every part of the body, an artificial one. All functions can be maintained artificially, and your talking about everything from the lungs, to the kidney to feeding, and I'm saying that with your..... the understanding is that the persons says, 'I simply don't want to be a vegetable, I'm making this decision for myself. I don't want my friends or relatives to decide whether to pull the plug. I don't want the doctors to decide whether to pull the plug, based on whether or not I have the ability to pay. But I'm simply saying that I for myself would like to make these decisions as part of my inherent rights.'

Rayson: "Thank you for your elaborate response."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hudson."



Hudson: "Would the Speaker yield for a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Hudson: "Representative Ewell, I have a question. What would happen, and this is not a far fetched question, but what would happen if in the event of forgery, and the patient slips into never never land as a result of that forgery ah....how does he sue?"

Ewell: We would have one of the admirable State's Attorney's in one of the 101 counties take care of the forger."

Hudson: "Well Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Proceed, Sir."

Hudson: "Whether the Sponsor agrees or not, I am of the opinion, and so are many of my constituents, that this opens the door to mercy killing, youth in asia, call it what you will. This Bill potentially is one of the most dangerous, one of the most far reaching in it's implications of any Bill that has come before us for a long time. I have received more mail on this particular piece of legislation, opposed to it, than I have on anything else, with the exception of E.R.A. And this mail is coming from across the board, but in many cases from older people, and I think that they fear this Bill, and with good reason. There are no protections in this. I can visualize a patient coming into the hospital in a condition that would leave him less than responsible because of pain. Not because he is not of sound mind. What happens to a man who is in severe pain and decides that perhaps he can't stand the pain and per-



haps he would rather just close his eyes and forget it all, but he is still of sound mind and could be brought back. Under those conditions he could be..... he could possibly see fit to sign a statement, but given a week or two or even just a few days, he would never sign. I can see the possibility of a patient being influenced by outside sources, that might suggest to him that his case his hopeless, that he might as well slip away for whatever purpose these influences might be brought to bear. I think that this is a distinct possibility. I think that it is far better to leave the decision of life and death in the hands of the good Lord and in the hands of those people physicians, and nurses and others that are trained to know the situation better than that patient in his critical condition at that point might be. I think this places a responsibility on a sick man a disabled man. He is absolutely unable to bear, it's unfair to expect him to make a rational and a wise decision. We are taking out of the hands, I say again of the good Lord, and the people trained in this area and responsibilities that we shouldn't take out of their hands and we are, by this Bill, opening the door for mercy killings and youth in asia and God knows what else. And I would hope that this Bill goes down to a resounding and sound defeat, it dangerous. I urge you to vote 'no'."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I descent from those who would indicate that this Bill is



not a proper one for our consideration here today. I think the Sponsor of this measure has brought to our attention a problem in which we must at one time or another address ourselves. I congratulate him for this thought provoking measure, one that goes to not only aiding and helping in the financial fight of many families, but also goes to relieving the psychological burdens of many people. I must state, however, that although in concept I agree with what he intends to do here, I am extremely troubled by much of the looseness in this Bill in a determination of what may constitute sound mind when an individual may or may not sign, whether his signature is irrevocable or can be revoked, exactly what obligations the hospital and the attending physicians are under in the event the individual becomes unconscious, what right the members of the family have, what right the fact that the individual has in the event that he changes his mind. All these things trouble me. In concept, Mr. Sponsor, I agree with what you are trying to do. I think that at some point, as with many measures, this kind of legislation will be passed, it is being studied in many states. I think there is a need for it, however, at this point I think because of the ambiguities in the Bill, and the problems in the implementation of it, I am going to have to cast my vote 'no' and urge all the Members of the Assembly to do likewise. Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Caldwell."



*Abale*

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a couple of questions?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates taht he will."

Caldwell: "Representative Ewell, ah... if your Bill were law, would it have, had it been law at the time that the late President Truman ah... stayed in a comatose state for frankly about three weeks to 30 days, ah.... would this Bill have been of any assistance or benefit to him?"

Ewell: "My response to that is that only the late President would be able to give that answer. For under my Bill, only he would have been able to decide by saying as to what treatments he would prefer administered solely for that purpose. If he gave no statement, I think that there would have been no appreciable result or no change in the death, timing, or any other thing of consequence. And I'm saying that the decision would have been his and not that of the physicians."

Calwell: "Ah..... one other question. How did this Bill get out of committee?"

Ewell: "By Roll Call vote."

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one brief statement. I can conceive of the fact that medical science is attempting to address itself to the ah... problem that the Sponsor is attempting to solve, but I ..... as a nonprofessional have no difficulty in determining that this Bill is bad in every respect. I can see that it..... Representative Geo-Karis thought it had been assigned to a Sub-Committee





for futher study. I would suggest that we defeat it now and let it be introduced again and let it get a hell of alot of studying before we attempt to pass it into law."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Ewell, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, ah... ladies and gentlemen, in deference to the time of the House, I'm of the considered opinion that this Bill, at this time possesses no chance of passage due to the responses of a number of persons who had previously supported the Bill, and I think in deference to the House, the time, I think perhaps it would be better considered if it were put in a Study Commission, and not take further time of the House."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay we'll....."

Ewell: "With leave of the House, I would make that request."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Shea: "I think he's motion has got to be leave to send it back to the reassignment or ah.... the Committee on Assignment."

Arthur Telcser: "That's correct. O'kay, the gentleman has ask leave to have House Bill 74.....Representative Epton, for what purpose do you rise?"

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, I don't know what catagory this would fall in, whether it is a matter of personal previlage or not, but I would think that the principal Sponsor would have at least discussed it with some of the Co-Sponsors. I think that some of us feel very strongly that the questions



raised and the answers given really don't go to the Bill. Whether or not this Bill passes or does not pass, I'm not satisfied, that at least speaking for myself, that I have not an opportunity to explain why my name is on the Bill. I would object to what your proposing."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Capuzi, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Cupuzi: "I don't know whether or not now he withdrew ah... the Bill, or whether or not he wants it to go to a Study Committee, but ah... to clarify it ah...we do have a Innerum Study Committee right now that studying Representative Bruce Douglas's Bill, which is very similar to this, but ah.... I see that there is an objection by Representative Epton, and ah.... they want it to go either up or down here on the floor. There one Bill already in the Committee, the Innerum Study Committee, which is very similar to this, but it's entirely up to the Sponsors of the Bill, what they want to do."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, Representative Epton."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, I would have no objection to whatever the Sponsor decides, if I were given an opportunity to explain why my name is on that Bill as a Co-Sponsor."

Arthur Telcser: "Well, proceed on a point of personal privilege if you wish, Sir."

Epton: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I'm sorry I didn't have an opportunity to speak earlier on this Bill. I certainly to not take offense or



take issue with those of you who see fit to vote against this Bill. I respect your decisions, I respect your motives, but I think that you should respect mine as well. I think that the volume and the oratory on this Bill is not what determines the passage or the failure of this legislation. I do not agree with the Chief Sponsor in his explanation as to how or why this will come into effect. It's amazing how many people can speak on a Bill and expect undivided attention and yet when someone gets up to respond, they are so busy with something else, it reminds me very much, ladies and gentlemen of the House, of a Senate Committee Hearing that I went to this morning where nobody listened to the testimony and they promptly proceeded to vote the Bill out. If it's the wish of the House to vote a Bill up or down, without listening to the arguments, so be it. I submit, however, that you are too responsible to allow this bedlam in the House to continue. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remain mute until this House becomes silent."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Wolf, for what purpose do you rise? B.B. Wolf?"

Wolf: "On a point of order."

Arthur Telcser: "State your point."

Wolf: "Is Representative Epton through with his statement?"

Arthur Telcser: "No, he's risen on a point of personal privilege and he's waiting for a little more order in the House, so he can proceed."

Wolf: "All right, when he has completed his statement, I would



like to be recognized on a point of order."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay."

Epton: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Very simply, ladies and gentlemen, this Bill does not permit anyone to take anyone else's life. To have you suggest that another Bill in committee does this same thing, proves that you are not aware of what this Bill is doing. Very simply this Bill allows the particular individual involved to make that determination. I'm not suggesting that it is right or wrong. The reason that I am on this Bill is because I myself had a situation just recently that my mother suffered a stroke. My mother was taken to the hospital and she was completely paralyzed. As a matter of fact, the doctors had very little hope that she would continue to live. They tried everything possible to sustain her life. They gave her the finest equipment, the finest attention, and the cost was rather astronomical, where it not the fact that her family could afford the cost, I doubt that she would be other than a ward of the state, and even then I question whether she would have been able to maintain the expense necessary. In any event, after much much discussion, when my mother's kidneys started to fail, when her heart became irregular, and all symbols of life were practicly at a standstill, the doctors suggested to our family, that perhaps they should desist with some of their activity. At that time, we took it upon ourselves, and we had no right to, at that time we took it upon ourselves to suggest to the doctor that they should cease with



all heroic measures, and they did. At the same time, the doctors, the hospital advised us, and this is why this Bill comes to pass, and this is why this Bill should be defeated or pass, whatever your personal feeling is; at that the time the doctors, not me, not you, not some testimony, the doctors said that there are certain things that we must do by law. I didn't make that statement, they did. Not withstanding, we told them to stop all these heroic measures. As a matter of fact, we practically called the undertakers to make arrangements for my mother. About six hours later, when the doctors checked in, and were still amazed to find my mother alive, they were shocked suddenly to realize that her kidneys started to function again, that her heart started to beat again, proving again what all of us know, that God makes the decision whether you live or die. It wasn't my decision, it wasn't the doctors decision, it wasn't my mothers. If my mother had remained in that condition, she never would have had a right to determine whether she should die or live. So none of us are trying to play God, we concur that this is not our function. I agree with some of the gentlemen, this is a good case to vote against this Bill, because of my mother's recovery. She is presently in a rest home, I'm not so sure that she is happy, I'm not so sure that she's sad, but the fact remains; that what this Bill is trying to do, is to let my mother, not years in advance, not weeks in advance, but if she is in such great pain, if she wants to die, and she is



of sound mind, it's her right to tell the doctor, please stop helping me. What the elects to do, contrary to the impression given, there is no penalty involved. He can except that decision, if has doubts to her rationality, he can refuse. Let me conclude, I appreciate your attention, and again I say, I have no quarrel with those of you who vote against this Bill, we have no disagreement. And those of you who vote in favor of it, it's simply because we are going to let that individual alone decide..... not the father, or the brother, or the son, not a member of the family make that decision, but it's your and yours alone. Let me conclude by simply telling you this little case of this little girl, this teenage girl in New Haven, Connecticut. Kidney disease forced removal of both of her kidneys in 1970. A donor kidney transplanted from her father failed in 1971, but she was kept alive by twice weekly dialysis and an artificial kidney machine. The girl and her parents asked the hospital to halt treatment and to let nature take it's course. They were convinced to change their minds. After several episodes of complications not unusual for dialysis, the patient again..... the girl again asked that she be refused further treatment, but she could not be persuaded from her wish to be allowed to die. The doctors were stunned, they had a terrible dilemma. What should they do? Should they continue this treatment against this girls wishes? Finally the hospital staff became re-



signed to the fact that the girls decision was her own. It was decided to make her death as comfortable as possible, while continuing daily to counsel her in the hopes that she might change her mind. Shortly prior to her death, the girl thanked the staff for what she knew had been a hard time for them and she told her parents that she hoped they would be happy. I don't think that we are asking anymore than to allow that person to make that decision. Vote your conscience up or down, if you the Sponsor now wants to elect to put this Bill in committee, I can understand his reasoning, but to suggest that this is an irresponsible Bill that was not well thought out, is now true. Thank you for your attention."

Arthur Telcser: "Rperesentative B.B.Wolf, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

B.B. Wolf: "Is a motion to committ this to the Natural Resorces Committee in order at this time?" ah..... Human Resorces?"

Arthur Telcser: "I think that motion would be in order, however, you may want to make it to the committee on referrals, or certainly an motion would be in order to ah.... recommitt the Bill to the Committee of Human Resorces."

B.B. Wolf: "Than I would suggest that the Sponsor make that decision himself, then..."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "I have but one dilemma, and that is asked to the other Sponsor. If he will withdraw his objection, ah.... I will ask that this Bill be assigned, if he will not, than I would



just simply close now and ask that the bill be voted up or down. I'm asking if the other sponsor wants it committed to Committee, I will accept...I will make that request, if not, I think this is my closing remark and I simply ask for a vote."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Duff, for what purpose do you rise sir?"

Duff: Mr. Speaker, I realize that in all of this colloque about whether or not we are going to send it to another Committee and so forth, there have been a number of people who have been seeking recognition of the Chair and it seems to me appropriate that unless the Chair has decided to take no further comment and have closing remarks, it would still be in order for those persons who want to to address themselves to this very important bill, if we're going to vote it up or down."

Arthur Telcser: "Alright, the sponsor has just indicated he wishes to vote it up or down unless a co-sponsor wants it moved to recommit it, if the gentleman persists in that type of motion, then it would be the Chair's intention to go back to debate on the bill, and then have the question on the passage of the bill put. Will the sponsor..I don't see the sponsor, okay he's talking it over with his co-sponsor. Okay Representative Ewell?"

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, members of the House. With leave of the House I would ask that...I would move that this bill be





resubmitted to the Interim Committee on Human Resources."

Arthur Telcser: "Okay, the gentleman has moved that House Bill 74 be re-referred to the Committee on Human Resources. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Capuzi wish to be recognized?"

Capuzi: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, as I stated previously, we do have another bill very similar to this and I think it only right that it should come back to our Committee...a...on assignment of bills and it would be re-referred to Representative Geo-Karis who is the Chairman of this Interim Study Committee and she could handle it from there."

Arthur Telcser: "Okay, are there any objections?. Okay, hearing none, the gentleman's motion will prevail and House Bill 74 be re-referred or recommitted to the Committee on Human Resources."

Fred Selcke: House Bill 124, Griesheimer. An Act authorized to direct the Division of Water Resource Management, Department of Transportation and make examination, surveys, and studies of the shoreline of Lake Michigan, third reading of the bill."

Arthur Telcser: The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House. We have us before us today, a bill which is of importance to every person in the State of Illinois, and particularly to those of us who represent districts along and adjacent to Lake Michigan. My bill, which is the proposed bill for the study of the erosion problem is so serious that the



papers are covered with stories each and every day about the Lake front from the Indiana coastline all the way through the Illinois shoreline, the line in Winthrop Harbor, Lake Forest, Lake Bluff, Evanston, Winnetka as it is falling into the Lake. There is certainly no matter that deserves greater priority today because we need the assistance of every one of you and certainly we want the Departments of State and Federal Government to do something about this very pressing problem. My bill very simply starts out to create a thorough study of this problem of the Lake Michigan shoreline so something can be done about the erosion. Up until the present time, there has been no definitive study by state government on the problem of erosion. We are at a critical high water level now, and as you might have read, just the other day, waves of seven feet in height were striking the Indiana shoreline and the Southern Illinois shoreline eroding houses, eroding patios, garages, streets, roads, etc. The problem we are facing and the reason this bill is so important is the fact that the federal government over the past many years through the corps of engineers has taken upon itself to claim almost absolute jurisdiction of the question of erosion in the United States, and certainly in the State of Illinois. But as a very practical problem, very little has been done to cure the erosion problem as it has progressed. The last complete and comprehensive study of the Michigan shoreline, including our State shoreline in the State of Illinois,



was done ten years ago by the corps of engineers. While they are claiming this absolute authority over our shoreline they are offering such things as sandbags in the Village of Winthrop Harbor in my district to cure the erosion problem. The gentleman whose home is falling into Lake Michigan, giving him empty sandbags, some ten thousand of them, and telling him this is the way to cure it is giving him a bandaid for a severed arm. My hope is that this bill will receive unanimous support from the House now as this is a substitutive bill not creating a new Commission, but giving to the Department of Water Resource Management the authority to make a comprehensive study of what needs to be done on our Lake front to permanently stop so much as is possible and as nature will allow the question of erosion. I feel that the companion bill, which is still in Committee for the funds for this particular thing will becoming up shortly. For those of you who have any questions as to the cost involved and the financial note on this, I would call to your attention on this that the companion bill, House Bill 124, or excuse me, House Bill 123 calls for a \$40,000 appropriation which will be used by the Department of Water Resource Management to not only conduce this study, but to enter into contracts with other agencies, with individuals private and corporate, to study this problem and to take some definitive action. I would further call to your attention that on second reading, we have amended this bill to provide an immediate report



as soon as a report is available. The original bill provided for a report the 1st of January, 1974, and do to the rather good idea suggested by one of my colleagues, we have speeded up the report plan on this so hopefully, we can get a report back in the hands of the people of the Department of Water Resources Management and the Department of Waterways within a matter of months after this bill is passed. I have been advised that even though the funds for this were not in the Governor's budget, that he has given us priority, at least he's given us assurance to the people of Lake County, who are finding their homes and their bluffs falling into Lake Michigan, that we will be given the money to handle this problem not only for the study but for the ultimate construction of the growing and the other objects necessary to stop erosion. I certainly hope that all of you will consider this matter and will give it your greatest attention and urge your support for this bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Could you tell me where the appropriation for this is?"

Grieschimer: "Yes, at the present time, I have been advised that the appropriation is in the Appropriations Committee, I've been waiting for a hearing on this for approximately four and one half weeks and I'm advised that it will go into some form of omnibus bill whenever it is repaired. Insofar as where the omnibus bill is, I can't tell you, Representative Shea."

Shea: "My concern is, and I have a study commission that I just



sent to Appropriations, is that this is extremely good legislation, but if we send it to the Department of..you know, we pass the bill and we told these people, let's make the study, and then for some reason or another, the appropriation doesn't come along, we are sitting there with the obligation on a State department to perform a taske and not having supplied the money, I think we find ourselves in a very strange position."

Griesheimer: "Representative Shea, all I can say is that I concur with you exactly and if there was any way within my power to speed up the appropriation bill, I would certainly solicit your support and the leadership's support on your side of the aisle, I would do anything available for this support."

Shea: "Well, what I'm..what I'm thinking is that on bills like this where we haven't got the appropriation, I took my bill off the calendar and sent it to Appropriations yesterday just for that very purpose and I'm wondering if we might not be better off so we keep these bills together."

Griesheimer: "Well, my thought on this is just a personal reflection, is that my bill might end up dying completely. The thought being that if the bill is passed through the House, even without appropriation, and it gets over into the Senate, I will be working on the Senators over there to convince them of the need and necessity for this bill. Hopefully, when the appropriation- comes through within the next three or four weeks, when the omnibus bill is prepared,



we will be able to speedily expedite it, not only through the House on third reading, but through the Senate as well. This problem is so crucial to our area that quite frankly, I...I wish that there had been no omnibus bill created, but I must admit as a freshman, I am advised that that is the way things are done in the House and therefore I am ...I have bowed to senior authority you might say."

Shea: "Well, I'm of the opinion you ought to push your appropriation bill. "

Griesheimer: "I concur. Again, I bowed to the leadership."

Arthur Telcser: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House.

I live in the same area involved and I'm a mile west of the Lake. I went to visit and see all the devastation that is happening to Lake Michigan and it would really horrify you. It's coming closer and closer. This study is very important. I'm one of the co-sponsors with my colleagues, Mr. Griesheimer and the other colleagues here from my district and I urge you to support this bill, it's a necessary thing. Believe me, you'd have to see it to believe it and I do have the pictures of it in my office."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, much to my dismay, did I understand the gentleman from Lake to talk about the people from Lake their houses and their bluffs, is that what you said?"



Griesheimer: "To answer the question directly, Representative Ewell, I was talking about the people in Lake but I'm also talking about the people in Cook. I believe that you'll find that the bill is co-sponsored by many Representatives from Cook County as well as Lake County."

Ewell: "I understand that, but what I'm to get at is that a little while ago, I had a bill which talked about the Lake in terms of the Lake being the property of all the people of the State of Illinois, and I'd like to point out to you that in times of trouble, as the waters rise and take away their houses and their bluffs, it becomes our problem. I should like to ask where were you gentlemen when the people who lived a little inland asked the right to use your beaches during the hot summer months? And the answer always seemed to be, allow increased fees for non-residents. Might I ask this question. Do you think an increase in non-user...non-resident fees might solve your problem?"

Griesheimer: "A Representative Ewell, to answer your question. No, I don't think it does. If I may just elucidate a little bit on your question, you are failing to distinguish between maintenance of a beach and the maintaining of the beach for posterity purposes. When you live along the Lake shore, whether it be in Lake County or Cook County, with having life guards and people to clean the beachers, the maintenance problem which the people living in the adjacent municipalities must pay for with their taxes,



therefore, when someone comes from an area outside that municipality to use our beaches, the only way we can help defer the cost of maintaining the beaches from the standpoint of cleanliness and safety is by giving them or by assessing them a small charge. What we're talking about today has nothing to do with cleaning the beaches or keeping life guards on them, its keeping the beaches there which are falling off day by day and falling into the Lake, and this is truly not only a State of Illinois problem, it's really a national problem, but on the other hand, as number of Representatives have indicated, the national government has failed to take appropriate action on this issue."

Ewell: "A, to the sponsor, I am very sensitive to the needs, I am sensitive to the crumbling houses of the citizens of the Lake, I am very sensitive to the crumbling beach line, I would like to join you in your measure, but I wonder if you might not like to also join me in my measure to open up these beaches once we have saved them so that all of the people of the State of Illinois might enjoy the fruits of their hard earned dollars."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House. I just want answer my good friend, Ray, over there and the fact that I know that what he is referring to is ...was the bill on the City of Highland Park. I want to remind him





that we have many many miles of public beaches on Lake Michigan up in Lake County that are used almost exclusively by people from Chicago, who come there by the tens of thousands and are treated with hospitality and properly in Lake County. We are talking about the beach and Illinois Beach State Park and right on up that is owned by the State of Illinois for use of the people of all of the State and in particular, of course, the people the Chicago because they are close by, and so this is a problem that belongs to all the people and it is not a problem peculiar to Lake County, and I urge your support of the bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matejevich."

Matejevich: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I too urge in support of my colleague of the Representative from Lake and I might say that the Representative from Cook, his point is really mood, because the State of Illinois, and the Department of Conservation has gone ahead really without looking into the interests of the home owners in that area and has gone about the task of acquiring all of the properties north of the Illinois Beach, all the way to the Wisconsin State line, so Ray, there is going to be a lot of lake property that is going to be open to all of the people of the State of Illinois, but I think that this is very important because if we don't get to the subject of erosion I don't know what beaches there are going to be for anybody."



Also, I want to say on the issue both of my colleagues from Lake and the Representative from Cook, Representative Shea are right. Because the issue is important but I think we also have to realize for the sake of trying to determine where these bills are that both these bills...that both of the substitutive bills and the appropriation bill ought to be going along together in this legislative process. It's a new issue because of our State Constitution and Mr. Speaker and members of the House, some weeks ago we were told that the Rules Committee was looking into this and that we were finally going to resolve this now here we're come again where we've got a substitutive bill and the appropriation bill somewhere else. Now, for the sake of us members, I would hope the Rules Committee would finally resolve this. Let's do it properly, let's get both bills...companion bills in the Committee at the same time, in the substitutive committee, both bills in the appropriation bill..committee at the same time, and both bills in this committee at the same time. Let's get that resolved once and for all."

Arthur Telcser: "Okay, ladies and gentleman, I'm going to interrupt the debate right now. We have with us today a very special guest and I'm going to ask that all of you be in your seats, remain quiet and have Senator Davidson introduce to you the special person we have with us today.

Davidson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the



House. I'd like this opportunity to present to you and being escorted down the center aisle by three members from this district, Representatives Londrigan, Gibbs, and Dave Jones, Chief Warrant Officer Roy Ziegler, prisoner of war from Springfield, Illinois. Roy."

Roy Ziegler: "Thank you very much. Thank you, thank you very much. This is the first time that I've had the opportunity to be in this room, and I of course just came from the Senate, it was the first time I was in there. I'll say probably the same thing here that I said in the Senate. Thank you all so much for everything that you have done for us. I want to thank you for putting legislation on the floor in our behalf. Illinois has always been one of the first States in the country to pass legislation for their veterans. It's a great State, I'm proud to be a citizen of Illinois, proud to be a citizen of the United States of America. I really don't know what to say, it's...my home coming has been beyond my expectations. American people, citizens of Illinois, citizens of Springfield have just been wonderful. And all I can say is thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate. Well, Mr.

Choate: Well, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House. One of the proudest days that I have had in especially recent years, and yes in my life time, I guess, is when I had the pleasure and the privilege of attending



the ceremony at the Statue of Abraham Lincoln on the Capitol lawn with the citizenry of Springfield and the surrounding areas welcoming home this distinguished American. I only wish, Mr. Ziegler, I only wish that in these days of time and trial, and sometimes bad happenings, in the world in which we live today, that there were more people, not only of America, but of all of the world, that had the belief in the freedoms which you gave up so much of your life to help protect and make possible for all people of freedom-loving nature. I feel that I speak for not only the members of the General Assembly, but for all of the people of the State of Illinois and all of the people of our great fifty states, when I say that, I too, am at a loss for words, today to really express our debt of gratitude to you and the others who served with you. And I only hope, my friends, that there will be no more times when the young people of America must have to endure the things that Chief Warrant Officer Ziegler, and others have endured. I only hope that eventually the world will face up to the reality that a majority of all peoples are of a peace loving nature, and that we don't need to enter in to armed conflict to protect those freedoms, to protect the wishes of a great majority and a vast majority of all people. I only hope also, that after the newness of these returning people have more or less worn off to a degree, we don't find ourselves in a position of forgetting,



forgetting the things that they have endured and the things that they attempted to do, and in a large measure, did do. I only say this to you, sir. I'm proud of you, we're proud of you as all right thinking Americans are extremely proud of you."

Roy Ziegler" "Thank you very much, sir, for your kind words, and I'm sure that the State of Illinois will not forget her veterans. Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Okay, back on House Bill 124. I think the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Duff, was seeking recognition."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I would only like to give my support to this bill and add to the comments that have been made that this bill does not only refer to beaches this bill refers to a very serious erosion problem of major proportions effecting highways, buildings, and man-y many miles of access and a not merely with recreational problems. This is a kind of bill that might pertain, for example by analogy, the building of dikes along the Mississippi River or to the building of dams within certain parts of Illinois to protect the natural resources, the Lake is in fact, of course, one of our great natural resources. The property adjacent thereto are heavily used economically by transportation methods and many other ways. I would urge the support of this good bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman



Cook, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and gentlemen of the House there is a obvious solution to this dilema, and that simply is to give the beaches in the land to U. S. Steel and in twenty or thirty years, a they'll fill it in and develop it and build break waters and all of the problems will be answered and so I would suggest to the sponsor that he do that."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Now, the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer, to close."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I believe we've covered everything on this bill, but I would merely urge the members of the General Assembly to cast their affirmative vote for it."

Arthur Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 124 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye, the opposed, no. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this questions, 147 ayes, no nays. Farry, aye. Londrigan, aye. and Blades, aye. This bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."

Arthur Telcser: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise?"

Geo-Karis: Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, this was my collegue's first bill, I believe."

Fred Selcke: "Yeh, it was. House Bill 128, Hart. An Act in relation to municipal county retailers occupation taxes, third reading of the bill."



Fredric B. Selcke: "Ah.. House Bill 128, Hart, an Act in relation to the Municipal County Retailer's Occupation Taxes. Third Reading of the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart."

R. O. Hart: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 128 is a very important Bill throughout the State of Illinois to Areas where there are minerals produced such as coal, oil, gravel or sand or other type of minerals. This Bill would amend the Retailer's Occupational Tax Act to provide that the one cent local tax on the sale of such minerals would be paid at the point where the minerals were extracted. Under the present regulations of the Department of Revenue, they take the position that the occupation is where the Sales Office is and not where the mine is. I feel that this is very unfair and it has deprived local Counties, where minerals are a factor in their economy, from large sums of money from over several years since the one cent local sales tax was enacted. Ah.. this.. This Bill would not create any new tax nor any burden on anyone except that it would change the place where the local one cent tax is paid. It does not apply on sales for resale. It does not apply on sales outside of the State of Illinois. It only applies to minerals sold, mined and sold in Illinois. It has the support of the ah.. people in the Areas where minerals are produced. I'm told that the Suburban Council of eleven ah.. Suburban Counties support the concept of this Bill. I feel that the present



situation creates an extreme inequity. It's very unfair. And, by this Legislation, we would attempt to put some equity into the matter. I would urge the support of my Colleagues on the passage of this very important piece of Legislation."

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

W. D. Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose this Bill. I don't see any reason why minerals should be put in any different classification from any other ah.. items that are sold at retail. Ah. minerals are pretty much the same as bread or ah.. food products, manufactured products, anything else. The Municipal Sales Tax really is to benefit the Communities where the people are, where the sale takes place. Excuse me. That's where the expenses of Government are and these are the people who should benefit from the ah.. ah.. sale, whether it be minerals or manufactured products or foods. So, I ah.. I oppose this. And ah.., suggest to you that you ah.. vote 'no' on it. It ah.. The effect of it would be that the.. the populous Counties and Cities would suffer greatly by this Bill. We would receive no sales tax, for example, on coal sold in the ah.. ah.. in the County of Cook or on oil. Ah.. this is really a bad Bill. And ah.., should be defeated."

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

J. P. McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, it would appear to me that a City ah.. such as Evanston or any Cook County Community, that has





traffic day in and day out with coal trucks and other vehicles delivery fuel, they must maintain their streets for this ah.. heavy usage, would be penalized for having the coal companies and would not get any of the benefits that they presently do. I hope that this Bill will be solemnly defeated."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Wayne, Representative Blades."

B. C. Blades: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I.. I respect and have a high regard for the Majority Floor Leader, but this happens to be one of the places where he's mistaken. This Bill should be passed. I rise in support of this Bill. What we're trying to do, is to collect the one cent tax where the coal or other minerals might be mined in the State of Illinois, not where the billing is done. Often times, the billing might be done in Indianapolis, Indiana or St. Louis, Missouri or, yes, even in Chicago and the sales, if it's Chicago, why then, the sales tax goes there but there's not too much coal billed from the City of Chicago because they have... they don't want to use Southern Illinois Coal. We've discussed that here on the floor on numerous occasions. But, much of this coal, that is sold, is billed by the larger companies and the larger corporations either in the City of St. Louis or in Indianapolis, Indiana, in which case, they pay the four percent State Sales Tax but they do not pay any local tax. And, all we're trying to do here is to get that local tax in the County where this product is mined. And, ..



And, I rise in support and urge you to support this Bill."

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

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose this measure. This would have, I think, a very bad effect on some of the major Cities in our State where these sales are made. And, I know from, at least, the analysis that I've got, if this sales tax money is not there, there's only one other place you can go for it and that would be on the Real Estate. And, we're doing everything we can to keep down Real Estate Taxes. And, this would have ah.. just, I think, force your real estate taxes up in the Metropolitan Areas that you're taking ah.. this money away from. I think, another thing you have to look at, is people are anxious to do this, would it be fair then, in your major Metropolitan Areas where your manufacturing goods that are sold throughout the State, would we then come in with a Bill to say that the Sales Tax shall go to the place of manufacturing instead of the place of sale? So, I think, that ah.. the whole basic thing of the sales tax is to place the money where the burden is. And, I think, this is bad Legislation."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman ah.. from Kane, Representative Waddell."

R. B. Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Bill. And, for the farm advisor from Cook County, let me tell him that his County has not been raped and left with huge holes and great big



gapping holes in the pocket book to support the schools and other things. I suggest to you that this is a fair and an equitable Bill. And, I urge your support."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Marion, Representative Stedelin."

H. D. Stedelin: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we, in Southern Illinois, go through a whole lot for these particular mines that furnish the fuel and the power for everybody throughout the entire State. This is one of the finest Bills that I've ever seen. And, I don't know why there should be any opposition to it at all. Where it's mined and where they tear up things to have it mined, it's not only in Southern Illinois, we have strip mines and mines in other parts too. This is a good Bill and should absolutely come out with ah.. an affirmative vote. Thank you."

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

J. D. Jones: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Bill because it is important to every Downstate County. Many of you, who have been delayed in Springfield by the mile long unit trains that go down, the GM&O, ah.. the unit trains owned by Kom-Head as they travel through Springfield hauling the tons and tons of coal from Central and Southern Illinois on the way to Chicago. The coal is mined in Central and Southern Illinois. And, the local sales tax should be paid at the source of where the coal is produced and sold and not where it's billed from."



I think, it would behoove every Downstate Legislator to support this particular Legislation."

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

R. S. Juckett: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my neighboring Legislators have told me what a great Bill this is and what it will do to help their Communities. The only thing is, I think, they're using the wrong method because our Occupational Tax is based on the person who makes the final sale to the consumer. And, they are introducing a new concept into this field of endeavor. What they are really seeking is a tax on the removal of the minerals from the ground. They say that the people come in and rape the land. They say that the people, who own the land, should not be able to utilize the land in the way that the owner wants to. Because after the owner gets through with it, they are left with a hole. Now, of course, many of these holes are now being developed into beautiful lake regions. The homes that are being built there are far more expensive than farming land. And, the taxes, that they are realizing from the finished hole, if it is redeveloped, is far more productive in taxes. But, a question, that could be asked of the Sponsors, is if this is mining land, and they know that it is mining land, why don't their local assessors assess the land at a far higher rate than farm land? But, I've asked the question and they tell me, well, they don't do it. Well, the question is, 'why don't they do it?' Why don't their



local assessors do their job as they should do it? Or, are their pressures brought to bear and are these assessors too weak to stand up to the job? But, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the answer is not to change the Retailer's Occupation Tax to be something different than what it is. Because, as the Assistant Minority Leader said, 'if you do it for the miners, then let's do it for the manufacturers and let's place the tax on the manufacturer'. And so, all of the items that are sold Downstate in the Coal Mining Communities will not be paid because it's paid at the source of the manufacturing. And then, we will have a manufacturing tax. We'll have a mining tax and it's all wrong. If these people are desirous of gaining other revenue, then I say to them, kill this Bill and come in with a Mineral Extraction Bill and put the tax on where it is extracted. That's what they're after. This is a poor Bill. It's a poor excuse. And, I urge a 'no' vote."

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

C. L. Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I rise as a Representative of the County in Illinois that produces forty percent. That's right, forty percent of the gravel in the State of Illinois. The.. Nevertheless, this Bill will not have a major impact on the revenue of McHenry County. And, the reason it won't is that a lot of gravel is not taxed. It does to public projects. It goes to build roads. It will only be the gravel that.. the gravel and coal that is used in private projects that will



end up being taxed. Illinois has no Mineral Extraction Tax. Some States do. Minnesota does. It has had it since the Massabé Range started being mined and they have a very hefty principle amount from which the interest is used to finance State Aid to Education. The question has been raised about real estate tax. Let me tell you how gravel pits are assessed in McHenry County. They are assessed like farms. They are assessed at a maximum of \$250 per acre that brings in \$7.50 per acre in tax. I would like to suggest that the profit on gravel is approximately seventy-five percent of the.. of the sale price. And, this does not... I do not wish to reveal my source, but it does come from the inside of a Gravel Company, a rather large Gravel Company. Now, the suggestion has been made that it's the local assessor's fault. It would like to suggest that, at least, in McHenry County's case, it is not the local assessor's tax.. ah.. fault, at least, not in Algonquin Township where the assessor did tax the gravel pit lands and future... and lands, being held in reserve, up to \$5,000 per acre. At that point, when the.. when the review was being made by the County Board of Review, the Board of Assessment Review, the taxes... the assessments were slashed and cut back to \$250 an acre. What the Bill tries to do is to give some minimal compensation to Areas such as Algonquin Township which looks like the armpit of the World right now as a result of the gravel mining. I would suggest that, if this Bill does not pass, that, perhaps, we ought to move to a true sales tax where we can.. we can



ah.. make some changes that would make some sense."

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

S. C. Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I also rise in opposition to this measure, not because I haven't the compassion or the understanding of the problems of the Areas where the mining is taking place, and not because I do not feel that they have a problem that should be solved and that they need more income for their properties in the Area. However, I feel that this method, as was stated by Representative Juckett, is the wrong method to approach this problem. There's a question of Constitutionality involved because you are not using the sales tax or the retailer's occupational tax in the proper light. And, I would bet any man here a good hat or any woman here a good hat, ah.. ah.. a woman's hat within reason, that this Bill will be declared unconstitutional, if it is at all signed or it becomes Law. I, again, offered in Revenue Committee, when I studied this thing and I said to the Sponsor and I say to others who are in favor of this Legislation, at this time, I'll support any measure and work with them to bring them more income in the extraction of these minerals. However, this is not the method by which to do it. I think, you're going to run into more problems than you are going to solve. And, I think, that you should think this very seriously and defeat this measure. And, I would, again, before the Session is through, if you want, help you out in any way I can, and I know that many



others would who are from the Areas that are not directly involved. I should say that Cook County also has mining, doesn't have coal mining and much mineral and gravel mining. But, they.. they will not... they would benefit indirectly, now to the extent that the Downstate Areas would from this measure. However, it is illegal and unconstitutional ah.. approach to this problem. And, I think, we should give it second thought and vote it down and come back at a later time with a bet... with more appropriate Legislation for this purpose."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster."

A. T. McMaster: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Legislation. I think, it is good Legislation and it seems that we have touched upon a sore subject. Perhaps, we ah.. find that ah.. some Areas in the State of Illinois have been collecting this tax. We're not talking about a finished product. We're talking about a raw material that's being produced in the Downstate Areas. I certainly feel that it is only just that the sales tax on this should go, the one percent, to the local Areas. I certainly would hope that you would find it possible to support this Legislation."

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

R. W. Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Bill. Somebody talked about rape of the land. This is more like





others would who are from the Areas that are not directly involved. I should say that Cook County also has mining, doesn't have coal mining and much mineral and gravel mining. But, they.. they will not... they would benefit indirectly, now to the extent that the Downstate Areas would from this measure. However, it is illegal and unconstitutional ah.. approach to this problem. And, I think, we should give it second thought and vote it down and come back at a later time with a bet... with more appropriate Legislation for this purpose."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster."

A. T. McMaster: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Legislation. I think, it is good Legislation and it seems that we have touched upon a sore subject. Perhaps, we ah.. find that ah.. some Areas in the State of Illinois have been collecting this tax. We're not talking about a finished product. We're talking about a raw material that's being produced in the Downstate Areas. I certainly feel that it is only just that the sales tax on this should go, the one percent, to the local Areas. I certainly would hope that you would find it possible to support this Legislation."

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

R. W. Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Bill. Somebody talked about rape of the land. This is more like



prostitution. I think, there's consent and there's the passage of money. What actually happens is, you're trying to make panders out of the rest of the State. What you're doing is simply shifting the burden of taxation back to the people of Cook County who are using the product because you're going to ask them to pay for taxes that the County is unwilling to ask for themselves. What you're going to do is create a gaping hole in the tax budget of Cook County for the benefit of some Counties that.. where the product is mined. And, I agree with Representative Juckett, if you want to impose a tax and collect the mon... and collect the money, let them impose a tax by their own people. But, sit up and make the people in Cook County pay the tax and send the money back Downstate. That's an unrealistic approach to taxation. Taxation has to be or taxation ought to begin at home. And, I don't think that you can make procurers out of the rest of the State in order to benefit your own Community. If you want the tax revenue, you've got to levy the taxes on yourself. There's no such thing as all getting and no paying in. And, I think, you've got to keep the burdens equitable."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Randolph, Representative Holloway."

J. D. Holloway: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support this Bill. And, I'd like to to say in the offset that I don't blame anybody in the City of Chicago not necessarily voting for this Bill because this is where the one cent tax, that we're talking about, is going.



Well, let me give you the typical example that's taking place down in the Southern part of the State. We have a Coal Mine in Randolph County producing all of the coal that is burned in a power plant right across the County Line in the County of St. Clair. None of this coal is going to Chicago. None of it is leaving the Area. But, the sale on that coal, the contract on the sale of that coal, was signed, evidently, in the City of Chicago. So, this is where the sale took place. Randolph County is losing on the production of that coal produced in Randolph County burned within a hundred feet of the coal facility is losing approximately four hundred thousand dollars a year on the sales tax. Folks, all we're asking is what is rightfully ours, what should stay in the Area where the coal is being produced and the coal is being burned and not just because of some technicality in the Law ah.. based on where the contract was signed. I'd appreciate your support and I'm sure all Downstaters would."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Fulton, Representative Schisler."

G. Schisler: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Legislation. It's good Legislation. I commend Representative Hart for his foresight in introducing this Legislation. We, in Fulton County, have approximately fifty thousand acres of land that has been strip mined and it is still in the disrupted state that they left it. If this land is not reclaimed by the coal company, if they steal away in the night, if you will, then the County is left with



that destruction and no way to level it. This one cent local sales tax would be beneficial to Fulton County. Fulton County is the third or fourth largest coal producing County in the State of Illinois. And, we desperately need this Legislation. It would amount to three or four hundred thousand dollars for my County and I urge your support. Thank you."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Further discussion? If not, the gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart, to close."

R. O. Hart: "Thank you ah.., Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to clear up a few inaccuracies that have been said on the floor of this House about this Legislation. In the first place, this does not apply in the cases of sale for resale. It doesn't apply in the cases where the coal is shipped up to ah.. to a coal yard in Chicago and sold up there. It has no application on a sale for a resale. It only applies to retail sales. There's no similarity between this and talking about ah.. putting a tax where goods are manufactured. Goods are shipped from the manufacturing plant to a place where they're sold. There's no tax at that level. So, that is completely incorrect, wrong, illusory or whatever you want to call it. I want to talk about this Legislation and not some other ah.. claims of similarity. There's no similarity between that kind of a Bill and this Bill. This Bill applies only to retail sales. Now, why would it... why would there be any interpretation that a retail sale takes place in the City of Chicago, for



instance, when ah.. Representative Holloway said, 'the coal is mined in Randolph County and sold in Saline County'?" And this, we're talking about an Amendment to the Occupation Tax Act. Where is the occupation? The occupation is where the mine is, where the minerals are mined. And, that's where the one cent sales tax should be paid. Now, just briefly, in answer to Representative ah.. William Walsh, I've got a letter here from the Village of Hodgkins, which I presume is in his District, from ah.. Leon Cook, the Village President. And, he tells me that he's in support of this Bill. He's says that our Village is not one that's receiving its fair share for a mineral plant in our Village. And, he mentions Representative Walsh and Mrs. Dyer and ah.. and it's important to their District. So maybe ah.., better give some thought to that. But ah.., in answer to ah.. the Representative from Chicago... in answer to the Representative from Chicago about the real estate taxes in Cook County, this Bill hasn't got anything to do with real estate taxes in Cook County. The.. The tax, that is now being paid, is paid to the City of Chicago, not to the County of Cook. And so, any difference in the tax page of the City would not affect the tax bills for the County. And, that has no implication, as I can see. The amount of money that we're talking here is a flyspeck in the budget of the City of Chicago, but it's a major thing in the budget of the Counties where the minerals are produced. And what is the equity? What is the equity of the situation? The City of Chicago, for instance, has



completely divorced itself from the Coal Industry. You can't even burn coal up there. If there was any justification at all ever for the fact that they burned it up there and they polluted their air, that's completely gone because you can't even burn it up there. You can't burn it up there. They don't mine it up there. They don't sell it there. All they do is send out the Bill and that's the reason ah.. the Revenue Department says they get their money. It's not fair and it should be changed. And, this is the Bill to do it. This is the way to do it. And, I would like to have this House support this Legislation."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The question is, 'shall House Bill 128 pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. The gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

C. L. Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to just, very briefly, explain my vote in support of this measure. If you want to get right to the nitty-gritty of this thing, it's really a fact that the sale in the City of Chicago or any other Municipality, Kankakee or wherever it might be, is nothing more than a paper sale in somebody's sales office. The coal is not mined there. The coal probably, never even sees that City. It is shipped to some other destination. And yet, that Municipality is the one that receives the tax that we're talking about. If we want to be fair, if we want to be fair, let's put the tax where it rightfully belongs. Let's put it where this mineral comes



out of the ground, where the workers are involved, where this revenue is desperately needed, desperately needed to bring about industrial expansion and more gainfully employ other people in Downstate Illinois that are, at the present, not employed. This is what we're asking for. This is what we want. And, this is what this Bill is all about. I vote 'aye'."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Johnson, Representative McCormick."

C. L. McCormick: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to remind my friend from Cook over there awhile ago that said this was kindly of a Prostitution Bill ah.. ah.. against his Community, that I wholly disagree with him because, I think, that we have been talking in Illinois for the last several years to quit this old feeling of what Cook County or Chicago gets or what Downstate and Southern Illinois gets. You people holler that kind of ah.. of.. of a message every time you have a Bill to pass that takes something away from us. But, you, in turn, when we are trying to get something, that rightfully is ours, why, you start hollering that we're trying to take something from Cook. What do you say about the billion and a half four hundred million dollars worth of relief that we appropriate in Illinois? It don't all go down to Vienna or Cairo. The biggest majority of it goes to your County and it's paid from the taxes that people Downstate pay. It isn't asking too much, that in the mining Areas, where our County Boards have to take



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

care of the roads where the mined coal is taken out, to have money to pay for that. You got your new Constitution in Nineteen Hundred and Seventy and it was a total Urban Constitution that eliminated us from having the money to even keep our people on the payroll or pay our County Officers in Southern Illinois. Just think what this little amount of money would do for the force of our Area, of Hardin and Polk County, two of the poorest Counties in the State of Illinois. And, you people in Cook County wouldn't even know it if you didn't actually have the money in your pocket. You wouldn't even miss it if you didn't get it. I don't see how in the World that any man can sit in this House and be so selfish that you are the giant of the State of Illinois, to live and breath and have all the money that they want to spend on any kind of a job they want. And then, look at your brothers and sisters in the South, literally starving to death to another Sheriff or for a Deputy Sheriff that we can't pay. Polk County has a Sheriff. He hasn't been paid in six months. We don't even have the money to hire a Deputy or pay his gas bills. We've got people all over our Area that want better Law Enforcement. We want roads that we can't even have gravel on. And, all we need is a little help like this. There's no excuse for you.. for you, in Cook County, for you, up in that part of the State, to be so selfish. Did you know, that on this great big Highway Safety Program that we spent billions, millions of dollars a year on, did you know that ninty percent of it goes into your five or six County Area?





We can't even get enough for a fire truck or an ambulance Downstate. Did you know that it would be only fair for you to take us as brothers instead of step-children? Mr. Speaker, there's no excuse to treat us the way that you people, in the City, want to treat us. We give you almost everything that you want. I voted yesterday, for instance, against my own political welfare and gave you black boys a vote on Martin Luther King and that won't do me any good in Metropolis. I turned right around and I gave you women of vote on E.R.A. And, I don't know of a soul in my District that's for it. And, here I come back and we ask you for just a little help for my Sheriff, for my County Clerk in this District, for my Assessor. And you, my friend, from McHenry talk about our assessments. But, you don't want to give us the money to hire the people to do the job with. Give us some help, I ask you. Thank you."

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

H. Washington: "In explaining my vote, Mr. Speaker. C. L., you almost went too far and said too much. But, I got the main thrust and I'm voting 'aye'."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania."

S. Catania: "I think, the client should give a little bit as well as the prostitute. I vote 'aye'."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Dyer."



R. C. Dyer (Mrs.): "On.. On a point of personal privilege as well as explaining my vote, I just want to call ah.. Representative McCormick's attention to the fact that I am supporting his Bill about that call. I don't forget the people who deal fairly with me. Thank you."

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

R. A. Mugalian: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my vote, very briefly. I studied this Bill in the Revenue Committee and I've given it a great deal of thought. I believe that this Bill makes a shift only in the distribution of the local one cent tax. We're not talking about a great deal of money. And, it's a question of technical interpretation as to where the sale takes place. As Representative Hart pointed out, it only involved retail sales. It does not involve sales ah.. for re.. for resale. Now, I think, the important question is, 'where is the burden?', 'where is the burden on the.. on the sale at retail?'. I think, to say that there's a burden on a City which merely prepares a bill and sends it out, is.. is not realistic. The real and only burden in the sale of coal is where the coal is mined and shipped for sale to the ultimate consumer. I, therefore, vote 'aye' on this Bill."

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

W. D. Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't expect my remarks to ah.. to really have



much effect. But, I would like to point out to Representative Hart, who mentioned a Mayor in my District as supporting this Bill, I'd like to point out to him that the Mayor, Mayor Cook, also supports a Bill that Representative Dyer and I have so the Mayor can't be altogether with it. Now, in addition to that, I'd like to point out to Representative McCormick that there are trains that are probably five miles long running from.. from Southern Illinois to Cook County and delivering coal to the Commonwealth Edison Company. Now, that coal is polluting our environment in Cook County and the surrounding Counties. I'd like to point this out to you, Representative Catania who traded your vote, apparently, for this, for something that went on yesterday and Representative Dyer and others and others on the other side who have traded their votes, on many occasions, the C.T.A. for the E.R.A., this is absolutely abominable, this vote trading business and.. and actually getting up and talking about it. Ah.. we're told not to take ah.. any consideration for our vote, no money for our vote. I think, I would respect a person, who took \$5,000 in consideration of a vote, rather than a vote in consideration of a vote. Ah.. this is a terrible thing and it has come up on this subject and ah.. it ah.. is a disgrace to this House, to the Members of this House, to this Legislature. And, I would certainly hope it would stop. This is a bad Bill. The Commonwealth Edison example, I think, is a good one. We're charged in Cook County with clear.. with cleaning up our air for the coal that's burned



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

by Commonwealth Edison that comes from Southern Illinois. Certainly, the burden is on us, up there, who are using it. The benefit of the Municipal Sales Tax should come to us."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania, for what purpose do you rise?"

S. Catania: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege...."

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

S. Catania: "Since my name was just mentioned by the Majority Leader."

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

S. Catania: "I'm told that the profession of prostitution is the oldest in the World. It's been practiced by women, not by men. Uum.. I guess they know more about it than men do. I was speaking, though, only about that. I wasn't alluding to any sort of vote trading. I've really haven't learned yet about vote trading. But, perhaps, I could take lessons from the Majority Leader."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? The gentleman from Lake, Representative Murphy."

W. J. Murphy: "Mr. Speaker,....."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Ah.. one moment, please. Representative Walsh, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

W. D. Walsh: "Well, the Lady brought up two subjects. And, I don't know which one she's looking for lessons in. But, I was, indeed, in earnest and very serious when I brought up the point on vote trading. I suggest to her, and it looks



to me, as though she is not representing her District when she votes 'yes' on this Bill. And, it looks to me like there was a trade made. Now, in a recent edition of the Chicago Daily News, I read that Representative Chapman and Representative Lechowicz made a trade on E.R.A. for C.T.A. This appeared in the Newspaper. Now,...."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Now, let.. let the gentleman finish. Now, I suspect that there'll be a number of points of order and personal privilege, whi... which we're going to have to deal with. Now, the gentleman from Cook, is on a point of that nature now. Let him finish and then we'll pick up the rest of you."

W. D. Walsh: "Now, those two people, it would seem to me, should have taken the floor on a point of personal privilege when that appeared in the Newspaper. I thought that was, indeed, scandalous and there should have been much much made of it. Now, if this is true, if a Member of this House could trade his vote on a serious of a matter as a Federal Constitutional Amendment, I would suggest that he kind of parallels Benedict Arnold. And, I would suggest, too, that the Lady, if she felt very strongly, that the C.T.A. Bill should not have passed, then her actions, it seems to me, are pretty much the same as those Tokyo Rose."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Have you completed your point, Sir? Okay.. Now, Representative Boyle, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

K. Boyle: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, ah.. I rise on a point of order."



I wonder if, before we have any more public confessions, ah.. we could get a Roll Call on the ah.. on this Bill. And then, we can go through with the ah.. with the confessions."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Okay.. Have... Representative Lechowicz, for what purpose do you rise, Sir."

T. S. Lechowicz: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

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

T. S. Lechowicz: "I'd like to recommend to the Majority Leader, if he is a Leader, that he will conduct himself in that fame. To reply to your ah.. comments on this floor, I will, and I will also correct the Newspaper Article, which was brought to my attention after it was printed. Just want to point out one thing, Majority Leader, the Chicago Daily News checked my vote last year, both in Committee, I'm sorry, I wasn't... I was not on Executive Committee last year. But ah.., as far as the Well Clause, that we had on that Bill or that Constitutional Amendment last year, I voted 'aye' everytime it was on the floor. Number two, the Committee... the Bill came out of Committee by one vote, Ladies and Gentlemen, by one vote. And, I spoke in its behalf as I spoke on the House Floor last year in its behalf. I resent the comments of the Majority Leader and I resented the implication that was in the Chicago Paper. And, I would hope that you would conduct yourself as a Leader."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question, there are 104 'Ayes', 46 'Nays' and this Bill having received the Constitutional majority is



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

hereby declared passed. Ah.. Representative Beaupre, for what purpose do you rise, Sir."

J. R. Beaupre: "On a point of order,..."

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

J. R. Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker."

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

J. R. Beaupre: "We.. We ah.. allow the matter of personal privilege to come before the House as a matter of courtesy. And, I might suggest that we neither do courtesy to ourselves nor to the people of the State of Illinois by continuing on with this sort of diatribe. I would suggest that it is, indeed, out of order. I think, there is, indeed, ah.. a crisis of confidence in our public officials. And, I think, that we ought to take note of that and behave like responsible people when we're on the floor. Now, I would hope, as a matter of order, that we would discontinue this sort of practice."

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

K. Boyle: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, having voted on the prevailing side, I now move that the vote by which House Bill 128 passed be reconsidered."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."

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

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman has moved that the mo-



tion lie upon the table. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no', the gentleman's motion prevails."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Ah.. House Bill 129, Hart, a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Governmental and the Governmental Employee Tort Immunity Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

R. D. Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, I was trying very hard to get your attention. I needed to explain my vote. I realize that it's after the vote has been announced. But, I'd appreciate just a minute of your indulgence to do so. While the Roll Call was going, I was getting a mental telepathy message from the splendid Sponsor of this Bill, not to say anything lest it be lost. But, I would be remiss in my duty to the Fifty-Fourth District, which is the second largest coal producing District in the State, if I were not to thank Representative Hart for his splendid effort and for all of the enlightened citizens of Cook County and the City of Chicago who didn't let gold dust get in the way of the coal dust that we have to put up with to get the money to which we're entitled. And, we thank you for your kindness and graciousness in giving us this simple justice. And, I would add, at this time, Mr. Speaker, that we seem to have an obsession in all of the discussion, that we had today and in prior days, with the subject of sex. Everything has sex in it. Now, since we've had E.R.A., since we had E.R.A. laid away to rest yesterday, may we hope that sex will no longer





be an obsession in all of our disquisitions on this floor in the days that lie ahead."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Now, Representative Chapman, did you seek recognition?"

E. S. Chapman (Mrs.): "Ah.. I did, Mr. Speaker. This is the first time that I.. I have ever ah.. risen on a matter of personal privilege. My name was mentioned in debate. Ah.. I'm surprised that the Majority Leader would believe everything that he read in the Newspapers. Ah.. I only wish to substantiate the statement made by Representative Lechowicz. What he says is, indeed, true and the record supports this. Ah.. Mr. Lechowicz's record on the Equal Rights Amendment is clear and was in ah.. no way based on the ah.. accusation that was made in ah.. ah.. a Newspaper. I only wish to set the record straight."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart, in reference to House Bill 129."

R. O. Hart: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 129 would amend the Governmental Tort Immunity Act to extend the time when ah.. notice has to be given after ah.. an injury ah.. in which the Governmental Immunity is ah.. claimed to be liable from six months to one year. And, it would ah.. change a little bit of the wording about the kind of notice that has to be given and makes it ah.. say that ah.., 'the notice has to be given in substantially the following form'. It also ex... It extends the Statute of Limitations on Tort Claims against Municipali-



ties, Government Units, from one year to two years. Under the present law, if a person is injured and has a claim against a ah... city, for instance, you have to give a notice to that city within six months or your ah... claim is barred. This is a ah... it works alot of hardships on people because they don't know about it ah...and ah... they lose their right, so we would extend that time that that notice has to be given from six months to one year. Also in all other cases that I know about where you have an injury, a Tort Claim, you have two years to file your suit. Under this Act, you only have one year, so we are changing that to extend it to two years. Also ah... I .... as far as I know, with the amendments that have been put on this Bill, there's no opposition to it. I think it is a very good Bill, it's ah... it makes it a little bit more fair in conformity to the rest of the statutes, as far as Tort Claims are concerned, and I would appreciate the support of the House."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Question is shall House Bill 129 pass. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Brandt, 'aye'. Take the record. Representative Hart, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Hart: "I just want to thank Representative Leinenweber for his ah... help in getting this Bill straightened out for me. He did a very good job."

Arthur Telcser: "Collins and McGrew, 'aye'. Ralph Dunn, 'aye'."



On this question there are 124 'ayes' and 3 'nays' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Now let the record show that Representative Alsup, on House Bill 128 was reported as not voting because he..... and Tipsword, voting 'present' on 128. Representative Alsup had sought recognition but the Chair did not see him and he would like that journalized. Lundy 'aye' on 129."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 171, Kempiners. A Bill for an Act to commend an Act relating to Local Governmental Agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners."

Kimpiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would seek leave of the House to consider House Bill 171 and 172 together."

Arthur Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, will the Clerk please read House Bill 172."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 172, Kempiners. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners."

Kimpiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, these two Bills pertain to local units of government when the unit of government purchases a life and health insurance policy for it's elected official. This legislation will limit the amount the governmental unit will have to pay to 10% of a part time official's salary, and a part time official is designated as one who works



19 hours a week or less. Both Bills came out of committee with a 15 to 0 and a 15 to 1 vote, and I would solicit your support."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Question is shall House Bills 171 and 172 pass. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and the opposed by voting 'no'. The Clerk will take two Roll Calls. Have all voted who wish? Leon 'aye'. Capuzi, 'aye'. McAuliffe, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Telcser, 'aye'. On these questions there are 123 'ayes', 5 'nays' and these Bills having received a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. McMaster 'aye'. Totten 'no'."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 188, Katz. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."

Katz: "House Bill 188, which was approved by the committee to which it was referred, I think unanimously as I recall, provides that in the construction of new curbs in business areas here in Illinois, that they will be constructed in such a way to permit, at each cross walk, a ramp built into the curb so that someone in a wheelchair will be able to move from one curb to the other curb at the intersection without having to go through the inconvenience of having someone lift the wheelchair off a one curb and put it down in the street. This is part of a National trend, a movement that we in Illinois played a leading role in, to



try and make our facilities available to the physically handicapped, and I would urge the approval of House Bill 188 that is applicable to new construction or substantially remodeled construction so it will not require in City or Village or unit of government to tear the existing walkway or sidewalk or curb."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question."

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates that he'll yield."

Borchers: "Ah... I was not aware of this particular until right now, but in our city, this week they are now tearing out, in our streets and putting in ramps, such as your talking about here. I read the story in the paper and it said that it was because they discovered there was law that passed, I believe in 1965. Now if that is so, this Bill is not necessary, now I don't know, it's not that I'm opposed to the Bill, but I'm curious if we may have two Bill covering the same subject, if you looked into that, because we're doing that right now."

Katz: "Representative Borchers, the Bill that was passed in ah... 1965, I believe is the Bill that I was the Chief Sponsor of, I think it was House Bill 2516, as I recall. It does not apply to sidewalks, it does apply to public buildings, or private building that are used for public purposes. It will be the subject of the next Bill, House Bill 189, which as far as I know, there was no Bill passed in 1965 or since then that relates to curbs, which is the subject of this



of this particular Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Your on Representative Borchers, is your microphone working? Go to the next one then, Web,"

Borchers: "Representative Katz, well if the next Bill covers that, what is the need of the Bill because ah... on reviewing what I saw with my own eyes, it was in front of some public building that this was being done? So what is the difference between the next Bill and this one, that would save me asking that question when it comes up next?"

Katz: "The Bill that we are now considering does not relate to public buildings. It only relates to public streets. And it only relates to those streets in predominately business areas. It has no connection to the ramp that may be required to be built into buildings. They are entirely separate subjects. Both are designed to help the handicapped, but they relate to entirely separate subjects. One relating to buildings, ah... that's not before us here today. In this Bill, this relates only to curbs on sidewalks, to that particular problem that people in wheelchairs have when they come to an intersection and there is no place for them to be able to wheel their chair down from the sidewalk to the street, without facing the risk of their wheelchair toppling over or having someone who takes and lifts them down. This is a very simply change in the architecture or the structure of a sidewalk that is a tremendous accommodation at no difficulty to the city or village, but a tremendous accommodation to people who are



not able to get along without being in wheelchairs."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fleck."

Fleck: "Representative Katz, would this cost any additional money for the cities to lay special forms to ah... have this slope in the crosswalks?"

Katz: "And the answer to that is, no. It would just be in the original form, that's why we excluded all existing curbs and sidewalks. It does not require any reconstruction and when they are constructing it, it's just as easy to construct it so that it has built into it a little ah.... a small little incline. So that in new construction it isn't an additional cost factor, I am told."

Fleck: "Now is this in all cross walks, or in just the commercial areas of the city? I'm in Chicago and I'd hate to think that every crosswalk gonna have to have a slope down it."

Katz: "Well, this relates only to the business area and the predominately business area and all it does is provide that there will be built in a slight ramp which will be available for the use of people in wheelchairs. Actually if you go in downtown Chicago, and you look, they are already doing that now. You don't notice it because fortunately we are able to get along without wheelchairs, but if you will look in downtown Chicago you will already see the appearance of this. They don't mean anything to us, but to those people who have no other way of getting from the sidewalk to the curb, it is a difference of being able to



travel about in the city area and not being able to travel about without extra assistance."

Fleck: "Well, how do you determine what the commercial or business area is? There is maybe 50 or 60 of those areas in Chicago. Are you just going to say downtown, or any area where there are stores or zone commercial or what?"

Katz: "Under House Bill ah.... Amendment #3, it says within any block, which is contiguous to any highway and in which more than 50% of the territory is devoted to or zoned for business, commercial, or industrial use. The amendment was suggested to me by, I believe, from someone from the Municipal League, and I took someone who has experience in it and had the Legislative Reference Bureau draft the amendment ah... I believe that it would not be difficult for the ah... local government to administer and put it in so that it would not be necessary to do this is predominately residential areas where there are driveways, where a person in a wheelchair can come up and down a driveway. In a business area, you don't have driveways. I believe that the definition I read to you, which is now inbided in the Bill will be quite understandable to the people who are putting up the sidewalks in our various cities and villages in Illinois."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Day."

Day: "Would the Sponsor yield for a quesiton?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Day: "Representative Katz, does this Bill ah... prescribe the





ah...the ah... specifications for curbs in the case of the City of Chicago and other home rule municipalities?"

Katz: "This is a general Bill that would be applicable to curbs anywhere in the State of Illinois. People in wheel-chairs who travel about the state, don't have any different problem in a one kind of city or another. It is the general rule that would applicable throughtout the state that would enable handicapped citizens wherever they travel to be able to ah... get on and off a curb without any difficulty. There has been, incidently, no opposition of any kind expressed to this Bill and it is widely supported by handicapped groups, physiotherapy groups, Vetrens groups, it is a very important matter to the people it effects, actually it doesn't effect most of us, but it would cause no problems at all in cities and villages or whatever unit it is, and a number of people in the city or village doesn't really effect the need of a handicapped person to be able to get from the sidewalk down to the street without being lifted by four strong people."

Day: "Well Representative Katz, my only question is, does the Bill...the specifications provided for in this Bill, provide..... apply in the case of the construction of curbs in the City of Chicago and other home ruled cities?"

Katz: "And the answer I gave was 'yes'. It is a general Bill applicable throughout the State of Illinois."

Day: "Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer."



Palmer: "If the Sponsor will yield for a question."

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Palmer: "Harold, what about a state maintained road within a municipality, is this covered? Either state or county maintained road within a municipality?"

Katz: "Well, it doesn't deal with roads, but if the road had a curb and a sidewalk, I would assume that it would be covered."

Palmer: "Well, certainly roads normally include curbs and it may include sidewalks in certain instances. I'm in favor of the concept, but ah... the question is to the governmental body that is to pay the cost."

Katz: "Well, it isn't..... because it does not cover existing construction, there is no cost really, it is just a question that the form that is to be used in to which the concrete is to be poured will have a little ramp in it, so that when the concrete dries, it'll have it a place where somebody in a wheelchair can go up and down from the curb. It is not a cost factor and I have not included any requirement that any existing curbs be rebuilt or changed. It's only when the governmental unit is going to put in a new curb or substantially remodel an old one, in that event they would have to use a form anyway, and it might as well be a form that accommodates the general public who are physically able and the physically disabled as well."

Palmer: "Well, I understand what the purpose of the Bill is, my question to you is; does the Bill provide that any



state highway that goes through a municipality or a county highway that goes through a municipality, highway or street, a...does it provide that the state or the county shall pay the cost, whatever the cost might be?"

Katz: "Well, whoever would bear the cost of putting in the curb would simply have in the form something that provide a little ramp, it doesn't change the allocation of cost or who does it. Whoever does it normally will just use a slightly modified form. once that form is modified, I'm sure it will be used over and over again and there is not really a cost factor involved. There is no reconstruction required and it does not involve anything except construction that the particular governmental unit has already decided to do, so there is no cost involved."

Palmer: "I understand that, but you have the language of for or by, it says for or by any municipality, and I just wanted to call that to your attention."

Arthur Telcser: The Gentleman from Moultrie, Representative Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying aye, the opposed no, the gentleman's motion prevails, and Representative Katz to close."

Katz: "House Bill 188 provides a way in which when our local authorities put in new curbing they will use the form that



state highway that goes through a municipality or a county highway that goes through a municipality, highway or street, a...does it provide that the state or the county shall pay the cost, whatever the cost might be?"

Katz: "Well, whoever would bear the cost of putting in the curb would simply have in the form something that provide a little ramp, it doesn't change the allocation of cost or who does it. Whoever does it normally will just use a slightly modified form, once that form is modified, I'm sure it will be used over and over again and there is not really a cost factor involved. There is no reconstruction required and it does not involve anything except construction that the particular governmental unit has already decided to do, so there is no cost involved."

Palmer: "I understand that, but you have the language of for or by, it says for or by any municipality, and I just wanted to call that to your attention."

Arthur Telcser: The Gentleman from Moultrie, Representative Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying aye, the opposed no, the gentleman's motion prevails, and Representative Katz to close."

Katz: "House Bill 188 provides a way in which when our local authorities put in new curbing they will use the form that



has in it a slight ramp so that someone in a wheel chair, who is a citizen, who is disabled and who in the future, will try to move from that sidewalk across the intersection will be able to do it by using that ramp. It involves no cost to anyone, no additional cost in the construction, but is a tremendous aid to the physically handicapped. No opposition was expressed in the committee by any group at any time to this bill and I would very strongly urge its support."

Arthur Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 188 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye, the opposed no, Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers to explain his vote."

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish I could ask...a...I wanted to ask another question because I might ask it in a way that I can vote to make it an intelligent vote anyway. But as far as the cost is concerned there is going to be more cost. Because you have to work the cement and there will be more cement, there isn't going to be much, but there will be more cost. A...but, what I was curious about if there is a need, and I would wish that he would just raise his hand, have you looked into how many, or do we have that many people in wheel chairs? Do you honestly believe that we should do this?"

Katz: Well, the answer is that we have a number of people who are disabled either due to disease or to war or to old age.



Now those people who are entitled to not only be recognized here when we applaude them but when they come back from war showing a leg or disabled however many they are they are to be able to go into our municipal downtown areas and move about freely, and this is an easy way to do. Incidentally, on the question that was raised a minute ago. The State has nothing to do with, I am told now by someone who knows with the construction, the curbing anywhere in the State."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record.

Oh, excuse me, Representative Day."

Day: "Gentlemen, to explain my vote, a...Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. I certainly am in agreement with the concept of this bill, I think that every municipal-ity should have a ordinance providing for this, but I do not think that this legislature should embark on a program now of setting forth the specification and the design of curbs for municipalities. Curbs or sidewalks, these are financed, paid for by the people in each municipality, and I don't think that under the home rule concept that we should start breaking the precedent now and enacting legislation which controls matters such as this, which are really a function of local government and certainly under the home rule provisions of our new Constitution, should rightfully be determined at the local level, so forthat reason I am voting no."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Representative



Schlickman, to explain his vote."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry."

Arthur Telcser: "State your point, sir."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, would you give an opinion as to whether or not House Bill 188 constitutes a regulation of a function of a home rule unit thereby requiring 107 votes?"

Arthur Telcser: "I would rule on this bill, Representative Schlickman, that this bill in effect, would not be a pre-emption of home rule and therefore, could pass with a constitutional majority. Is that your question?" While we're getting that ruling, Representative Schlickman, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure if I was recorded as aye, but the thought occurred to me that it might cause some problems for pedestrians in icy weather and I am recorded as voting aye, I'd like to change it to as voting present, please."

Arthur Telcser: "Record Representative J. J. Wolf as voting present. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, while there's a lull for a minute, I'd like to direct the Chair's attention to the journal of March 13, 1973, on page 17, the journal shows on House Bill 39 as recording me as voting aye, and then on page 18, shows me as voting no. I find it hard to vote both yes and no and I wish the journal would show that I just voted yes and take my name away from the nay column."



Arthur Telcser: "Okay, the Clerk indicates that a...that there is probably an error in the journal and they will straighten it out. You want to be recorded as voting aye?"

Shea: "I would prefer just to be recorded as voting once and then as aye unless the Chair wants to give me two votes."

Arthur Telcser: "I don't want to say what I'm thinking, but..."

Okay, Representative Schlickman, the ruling of the Chair, based upon the fact that the State already has rules and regulations in reference to the handicapped citizens, Representative Katz' bill, originally from 1965,...a the Chair would therefore rule that it would not be a pre-emption of any rule and therefore could become law with a constitutional majority. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding, under Article 7, that when you don't have pre-emption, 107 votes are required. When you do have pre-emption, then only 89. I don't see the consistency between your statement of fact and your conclusion."

Arthur Telcser: "Are you say, Representative Schlickman, that if we pre-empt home rule power, we need 89 votes? Which sub-section are you referring to, Representative Schlickman (g), (h) or (i)?"

Schlickman: "Let's you and your parliamentarian take this...me and your parliamentarian take this under advisement. I don't have a copy of the constitution here."

Arthur Telcser: "Ah, great..Ask you a question, what..





Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think you are talking about a pre-emption under (g). Because what you are saying, in effect, is that presently a municipality that is a home rule unit can build its sidewalks anyway it wants. What you are now saying is that you are pre-empting them from building them the way you want, but you must build them in conformity with this act. Therefore, you are limiting or restricting power they have under sub-section (g) or you are limiting or restricting the power of a home rule unit and sub-section (g) says that if you limit that power, you are pre-empting them, and therefore require a 3/5's vote."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would concur with the distinguished minority, Assistant Minority Leader, if this is under (h) it's not a pre-emption, if it's under (g) I would also agree that it appears that it would be under (g), then it is a pre-emption/powers and would require the higher vote."

Arthur Telcser: "Well, the Chair would rule as it did earlier that the State already has involved themselves with setting standards for the handicapped, and that the State in doing so already has involved itself in this area and it is not really pre-empting something which a local government already has. Representative Shea?"

Shea: "Well, again, Mr. Speaker, ...this bill had, as I remember, 119 votes, and the question is whether you are going to say it passed or passed with the 3/5's majority? And I



think that since you are pre-empting, and in my opinion, you are pre-empting units of local government from acting or not acting, that in order to be safe, I would say that you ought to hold that it is a pre-emption and pass it as a pre-emption bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Peoria, Representative Day."

Day: "Point of parliamentary inquiry."

Arthur Telcser: State your point, sir."

Day: "I'm looking at Article 7, sub-paragraph (1) which states that the General Assembly may not deny or limit the power of home rule units to make local improvements by special assessment and to exercise this power with other counties and so forth. Now curbs and sidewalks are usually built by special assessments and that is exactly what we are doing here. We are limiting that power to specifications set forth by this bill and we are providing that if they are going to install curbs by special assessment, they should do it in a certain way."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Duff, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Duff: "Well, a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker. This bill amends the municipal code and as such is, I would agree with the Speaker, if the essence of the bill was in relationship to the State's powers in relation to the health and welfare of the handicapped, but the essence of this bill is in respect to the municipal code and the powers



of the municipalities under the code are existing. I would want to clarify, I think, the point that the distinguished Assistant Minority Leader made as to whether you are taking away, or telling them they can or cannot, I would distinguish it and say that under (h), if there is no existing power under the municipal code, then the State may exercise the exclusive jurisdiction and if they have already the powers and I believe they do under the municipal code, then the State is pre-empting a power, not in health and welfare, but in the municipal powers, and consequently, a pre-emption."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Lechowicz, for what purpose do you rise?"

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I ask that the question yesterday, maybe in a different vein to the sponsor of the bill and he in turn, responded that the various municipalities could establish their own criteria of uniformity in the placement of these ramps for the handicapped. And based on that interpretation of my question of yesterday, I voted for this bill, and I'd like to have the sponsor reply whether it does restrict the municipalities or whether the municipalities have the right of placement of the ramps at their traffic engineering studies that they recommend."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Katz, do you wish to respond, sir?"

Katz: "There would be a considerable discretion left in their



engineers as to where the intersections would be located in the business districts, but they would have to be in the intersections, but where they locate them, the matter that would be left to the local authorities under this bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further inquiry? This question, there are 118 ayes, 6 nays, one answering present. Totten, no. 7 answering present. This bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 189."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 189. Katz. A bill for an Act to amend the facilities for the handicapped act, third reading of the bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz." Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I would like the journal to show that I respectfully dissent in the ruling of the Chair that it was my opinion that House Bill 188 was a restriction on home rule powers that it was depriving them of certain powers and that, therefore, that bill required 3/5's vote, and by only passing with a constitutional majority is not law."

Arthur Telcser: "Okay, the journal will show the Gentleman's dissent, he is joined by Representative Duff and Schlickman. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: Mr. Speaker, if the sponsor of that motion would



say regulation rather than denial, I would like to join with him in his objection."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, I'll go along with regulation and denial, how's that, Gene? Because it is denying to them the power to do it as they see..as they think they should do it."

Schlickman: "Would you make it regulation or denial?"

Shea: "Regulation or denial."

Schlickman: "I join with you, thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Okay, Representatives Schlickman, Duff, Porter, Day, Let's go a little slower so the Clerk can get it. Lechowicz, and McGah, also join in the dissent which will be placed upon the journal."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Please record me as present on that roll call."

Arthur Telcser: "Record Representative Lechowicz as voting present. Representative Borchers joins in dissent. Representative Leon?"

Leon: "I also want to be recorded as present."

Arthur Telcser: "Record Representative Leon as voting present."

Brandt present; Lenke, present; To abide by the rules, those of you who wish to change your votes now from aye to present are going to have to get leave of the House really.

You can only do that on legislative day. Okay House Bill 189, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz." The



Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leon."

Leon: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that the vote by which..oh, wait a minute, I'm present, I didn't vote on the prevailing side. I'm sorry."

Arthur Telcser: "House Bill 189, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I'm going to try to avoid giving any curbstone opinions here on this bill. House Bill 189 amends a bill that this General Bill passed in 1965, in 1965 an enactment known as Facilities for the Handicapped Act, provided that in construction of new public buildings or new private buildings used for public places of gathering that the buildings would have to be construction incorporating certain designed features that made the buildings usable for the physically handicapped. We have now had 7 or 8 years experience in dealing with the law and House Bill 189 makes two changes in the law. It adds to the public buildings that must comply, buildings privately constructed but for public use, it covers theatres, restaurants, hotels, and it adds two other categories, which are factories and office buildings. Now bear in mind that in no instance does the change in the law effect any existing building, it simply covers the construction in the future of new factories and new office buildings. And certainly, the physically handicapped, we want to be self-sustaining and support themselves need to be able to have access to



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

factories and office buildings. The second change that is made in the law is to provide as in the series of bills that was passed last year sponsored by Representative Juckett and others that the Attorney General shall investigate any complaints if there is a violation of the law and that he can go into court to bring an action to provide appropriate relief. The Attorney General has already been closed with this power with reference to other aspects of the handicapped problem, this simply provides and enforcement mechanism in the event that a building is constructed that doesn't meet the standards. But that very briefly is the bill. There was no opposition to the bill in committee and it has been very broadly supported by all groups involving physically handicapped, veterans, a ...citizens of all kinds who want are public facilities to be available to all of us citizens, including the citizens who are physically handicapped."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion?" The question is shall House Bill 189 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye, the opposed, no. Have all voted who wish? Juckett, aye; Telcser, aye; J. J. Wolf, aye. Have all voted who wish? Your switches are still open. Skinner, aye. Let's go Cal, take the record. To the question, 117 ayes, 3 nays, and this bill having received a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bills second reading. House Bill 1."



Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1. A Bill for an Act to promote fair practices in the election campaigns for political offices in the State of Illinois, second reading of the bill. Five committeemen: Committee amendment No. 1. Amend House bill on pages 1, 3, and 4 by striking section 203 and so forth."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "A...Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House. All Committee Amendment No. 1 does four things. First of all, it takes the various penalty sections that are in the bill as originally introduced, and combines it into one penalty section at the end of the bill. The second thing that Amendment No. 1 does is conform the penalties to classification of offenses under the unified code of corrections. The third thing that the Amendment does is change the language in Section 805 of the bill to make clear that upon discovery of a violation, the State Board of Elections, shall request the Attorney General or the appropriate State's Attorney to initiate prosecution proceedings. The bill is as introduced improperly allowed the board to initiate these proceedings. And the fourth thing that the Amendment does it it extends the limitation on prosecution from 18 months as originally introduced to five years. Mr. Speaker, I would offer and move the adoption of the Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."  
Shea; "Phil, I gotta question on the penalty section. You





know, we limit what can be spent like with the media, alright?

Collins: Yes.

Shea: "Okay, and its by Representatives for and against. Now let me ask you this. If somebody wants to go out and beat you or me and say the limitation is \$1000, now if your opposition goes out and spends \$1000 in newspaper adds to beat you, it would seem to me that if you went and spent one penney, you would be going over the limit set by this legislation?"

Collins: "I don't think I understand your question. The money that is spent by others that is in opposition to you is not only in the aggregate as to what you can spend."

Shea: "Well, it doesn't say that in the bill."

Collins: "I believe it does. There was a question raised on people who would go out and campaign against a candidate and we did clean that up in one of our amendments. We're going to get to that."

Shea: "But you have cleaned that part of it up?"

Collins: "Pardon me?"

Shea: "You have..you have taken care of that situation?"

Collins: "Yes, yes we have cleaned that up. That was raised in committee, and we did address ourselves to that problem."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Win-nebago, Representative Georgi."

Georgi: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask Mr. Collins a question."

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."



Georgi: Phil, in this bill, you are talking about what it costs to campaign, right? Campaign limitations."

Collins: "Well, there is a limitation on spending in the communications media, yes."

Georgi: "Is that the present media also?"

Collins: "Yes."

Georgi: "Well, my question to you is, do you have a board to determine what an editorial endorsement is worth in campaign expenditures?"

Collins: "Well, I think the question is rhetorical. We are..."

Georgi: "The question is rhetorical, but..."

Collins: "I don't mind answering the questions, but I really think these questions would be more properly put on third reading, I don't think your question goes to the heart of Amendment No. 1."

Georgi: "For instance, if I spend \$200 in a newspaper ad and they put it near the obituary and the newspaper editorial is on the front page, now what is that worth to the opponent? That is my question, it's a very important question. I could spend \$5000 on the inside pages and get collobored on the front page."

Collins: "Well, I think that's a problem that we all expose ourselves to in running for public office, but I hardly think that it isn't anything that can't be dealt with in this bill." Again, I would like to suggest to you that we are debating the bill now and I'm offering a series of amendments so none of which really have to do with the



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

question that you are asking."

Georgi: "My only suggestion to you is that there ought to be something in your bill to provide for value placing on those type of endorsements or editorials because I received a few in my life time to and I think they are worth more than the money I spent."

Collins: "That well may be, but I don't think that we could take care of such a problem in legislation. If you want to offer an amendment that you think could cover that, I'd sure be happy to look at it and consider it and maybe even support it."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The gentleman's offer to move the amendment to House Bill 1. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Collins, what are the penalties involved here? First of all explain if there have been any changes in by this amendment or any of the amendments that you are going to introduce today?"

Collins: "Well, the penalties and the amendment would fall under the uniform code of corrections and violation of the act would classify a misdemeanor which does allow for imprisonment in other than a penitentiary for one year and a fine not to exceed \$1000. A violator on a second offense would be guilty of a class 4 felony, of which he is punishable by one to three year's imprisonment in the penitentiary and a fine not to exceed \$10,000."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative



Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Ya, I was wondering if there was any provision in that amendment. did you say 'Class 4' felony?"

Collins: "On second offense."

Lechowicz: "And what is first offense?"

Collins: "First offense is a 'Class A' misdemeanor."

Lechowicz: "Which is \$500 and six months in jail?"

Collins: "No, as I understand it's up to a year in other than a penitentiary, and a fine not to exceed \$1000."

Lechowicz: "Well, the only thing that I was wondering..... who in the world are you going to get to take care of your books?"

Collins: "Well, as you know the Bill requires a Campaign Committee to be formed ah.... there will be a Chairman and a Treasurer of each Campaign Committee."

Lechowicz: "Now, ah..... what was that?"

Collins: "Are you talking to me or Mr. Epstein?"

Lechowicz: "Well, he said something and then I'm sorry, I didn't hear your reply."

Collins: "Ah.... as to bookkeeping, you asked the question ah... who would take care of the books. The Bill contemplates the organization of Committees ah... that would handle the ah.... accounting of the Campaign Contributions and expenditures and would require that each Committee have a Chairman and ah... a Treasurer."

Lechowicz: "And who would..... say for example, that they made a mistake. Who would go to jail, both of those people or who?"



Collins: "Ah... if it's willful violation, and nobody goes to jail for mistakes."

Lechowicz: "That's a ah.... matter of interpretation."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Phil, can I ask you a couple of questions about what you've done in the penalty section here?"

Collins: "Surely."

Shea: "All right, now as I read the penalty section before, it said that violations of Articles 5,6,7,8, ah... are violations that you could be fined not more than \$1000 or imprisoned in a penal institution other than a penalty,.... penitentiary for one year, that was the original language, is that correct?"

Collins: "That's correct."

Shea: "O'kay, then when we get into your new Section 9, I think you've gone alot farther than that and Number 1, ah... you've separated it and you've made some a misdemeanor and some a felony, is that correct?"

Collins: "No ah... we haven't. We said that ah... first offenses under the Bill, under any Section of the Bill is a misdemeanor, second offense is a felony."

Shea: "All right, but you've now got it to where things are a felony, is that correct?"

Collins: "Ah.. that's correct."

Shea: "All right, now what is a 'Class 4' felony? Would you explain that?"

Collins: "A Class 4 felony is one that is punishable by one to



three years in the penitentiary and a fine not to exceed \$10,000."

Shea: "All right, now for the.... in other words for the second offense you could go to jail for up to three years, is that correct?"

Collins: "Ah... that's correct."

Shea: "All right, ah... that's in 901. In 902 you said that prosecution for any offense designated by this Act must be commenced within five years after the commission of the offense, is that correct?"

Collins: "That's correct."

Shea: "Do you know what the present statute for a misdemeanor or a felony is?"

Collins: "Ah.... I believe that it's 18 months."

Shea: "So in other words, your extending the statute of limitations for violations of this Act from 18 months to 5 years?"

Collins: "That's correct."

Shea: "Why?"

Collins: "Well, we feel that 18 months may be too short of a period that ah... often violations may be brought to life ah... at some period ah... further along in time. Ah... we thought that 5 years allowed a more realistic time for the prosecutions under the Bill ah... we do have a tuff Bill here and I think that ah... this just strengthens it further."

Shea: "Well,.... when you say that you think that it strengthens it further, you know, and we all run for public office, Phil, my question to you is, ah... you know your going to resign



one of these days and I'm going to resign. Do you want to put in the position for the next five years, you don't know when somebody is going to file a charge against you?"

Collins: "Well, I'm not going to resign, I'm sorry to hear that you are, ah.... but ah..."

Shea: "I didn't say that it was going to happen today, Phil, but I think one of these days, your going to quit and I'm going to quit, or the voters maybe will take care of it for us, that's not the point."

Collins: "Well, personally if I willfully violate this code, I don't care if it's five years or ten years, if I'm responsible for something, I should be ah... subject to penalty. I'm confident that neither you nor I would be in that position."

Shea: "All right, then the next one is Seciton 903. You say that this should be brought speedily on a courts docket so that five years after this offense has been committed, it would be the next case tried, is that correct?"

Collins: "O'kay, so you feel that that's that important. Then when you get down to 904 ah... I see that you've further strengthened it or changed it where not only are we talking about the State's Attorney of the counties involved, but now your giving the Attorney General the power or the right to bring the actions in the name of the people, is that correct?"

Collins: "Yes, that's correct."

Shea: "All right, now why have you all of a sudden given the Attorney General the power of a State's Attorney in 102



counties in the states for this Bill?"

Collins: "Well, I think you ah...quite properly expressed this; ah... that we are trying to make the Bill as strong as possible. Naturally the State's Attorney will be involved and Attorney General as the attorney for the people of the State of Illinois. I think he is vitally involved in ah... between ah.... or in the election reform in the State of Illinois. I don't see any argument ah....against ah.... including the Attorney General in law enforcement officers charged under this Bill."

Shea: "Well ya but Phil, when you take all four things that you've done in this amendment and put them together, what your doing is saying that things that you started out to be misdemeanors are now misdemeanors or felonies, that your extending the statute of limitations for the average misdemeanor or felony to five years so your ah.... you've extended almost crippled the statute of limitations. Ah... then your moving into the field where State's Attorneys normally and conceptually operate under the criminal law, and your making the Attorney General of the state a super State's Attorney in 102 counties. You know Phil, your in effect taking all the criminal law in Chapter 38 and throwing it right out the window, you realize that, with this amendment."

Collins: "No, I don't think so. As a matter a fact ah... I don't think that the amendment has changed any of the offenses or has really put more astringent penalties upon violations



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



of this Act in the original Act."

Shea: "Phil, Phil....."

Collins: "Actually we brought in into conformity with the Code of Corrections."

Shea: "No, I think you missed the point, Phil. In the Criminal Code of Procedure we set out certain limitations. We set in the laws of the state certain duties and obligations for our State's Attorneys and certain duties and obligations for our Attorney General. We've very clearly set our Statute of Limitations and what your doing by an amendment to the Election Code is attempting to amend very broadly and very widely the Criminal Code of this state."

Collins: "Well, I don't agree with you, but that's your point of view."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Representative Collins, our philosophies are generally congruent, I think you'll agree. The philosophies of this Bill, of course, is good, but as Mr. Shea put it, your amendment is providing problems. I have a personal recommendation. Hold the amendment, keep it on Second Reading, let's work this out."

Collins: "No, I can't do that. Tomorrow is the last day for this Bill and further more this Bill has been on Second Reading for a considerable amount of time during which time, I have been waiting for any amendments to be offered or suggested. Some were presented to me by Representative Lundy, which he may present today, I don't know, but I



have been awaiting amendments and ah... at the last moment, ah... I don't see how I can hold it at this point, Roman."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. B.B. Wolf."

Wolf: "Will the gentleman yield for a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Wolf: "Ah.... Representative Collins, ah.. are the amendments that you have just suggested to the House all contained in one amendment or are they five separate amendments?"

Collins: "They are five separate amendments. The amendment I just explained does.... it's in four parts. It does four things. It's only Amendment #1, I have four more to go."

Wolf: "Oh."

Collins: "They are all Committee Amendments."

Wolf: "Then what you have just explained is in one amendment. For example the Statute of Limitations change of 18 months to 5 years is in this amendment, is that right?"

Collins: "That's right, that's in Amendment #1."

Wolf: "Well, I don't buy your analysis of what your doing to the Criminal Code and I suggest that you better heed to what Jerry Shea said because that's exactly what your doing when you take a 18 month Statute of Limitations and ..... this is not related to law and order and it's not related to a tuff Bill. This is related to the process of law which says that misdemeanors in the Criminal Code have to be brought within a certain time and now your saying that you want to take the Statute set forth for felonies



in relation to a misdemeanor. So I think that in that context you better think about it a little bit before you make a change which is going to effect the existing Criminal Code Rules in connection with misdemeanors."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1. All in favor of the adoption signify by saying 'aye', the opposed by saying 'no'. Do you wish a Roll Call, Sir. Is someone requesting a Roll Call? O'kay, a Roll Call has been suggested. The gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are..... Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I request a Poll of the Absentees."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, the gentleman has requested a Poll of the Absentees. Members please be in their seats, and will the Clerk please read the names of the absentees."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Brinkmeyer, Calvo, Campbell, Cupuzi, Carter, Chapman, Choate, ....."

Arthur Telcser: "Record Representative Choate as voting 'no'."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Clabaugh, Craig, Deuster, Douglas, Ralph Dunn, R.L. Dunne, Farley, Fennessey, Fleck, Giglio, Granata, Grotberg, Hart, Hill, R.K. Hoffman, R.H. Holloway, Hudson, Hyde....."

Arthur Telcser: "Record Representative Hudson as voting 'aye'."



Fredric B. Selcke: "Juckett, Katz,....."

Arthur Telcser: "Record Representative Katz as voting 'no'."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Kent....."

Arthur Telcser: "Record Representative Brinkmeyer as voting 'aye'. Representative Clabaugh as voting 'aye'. Ralph Dunn, 'aye'. LaFleur, 'no'. Peters, 'aye'. Merle Anderson, 'aye'. Kucharski, 'aye'. Tuerk, 'aye'. Record Representative Jack Hill as voting 'no'. The Clerk tells me that there's a little bit of confusion, let's get a new Roll Call. Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise?"

Shea: "When you take the new Roll Call, I want to explain my vote."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay. The gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1. All in favor of the gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea, to explain his vote."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, the reason that I want to vote 'no' on this amendment is because I feel that the Sponsor has taken and just changed all of the criminal law in the state in one Bill. He's attempting to extend the Statute of Limitations ah... to a period of 5 years, he's attempting to change what was a misdemeanor when he originall put it in, now to a misdemeanor and a felony in extending the statute. And instead of the State's Attorney, who is a traditionally prosecuting agency in any county, he's now attempting to give that



power to the Attorney General to go to 102 counties in this state. I think that it's a bad amendment."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well Mr. Speaker, I think that the last statement was somewhat misleading. We have not changed ah... the original thrust of this Bill all that much at all. We had stiff penalties in the first Bill, in the Bill that was originally introduced, however, we have now combined into one penalty section and have put it in to conform to our unified Code of Corrections. As far as extending the Statute of Limitations, I can't see anything wrong with that. Here we are trying to give ample time for authorities to bring prosecution under this Act ah.... against anyone who would willfully violate the provisions of the Act. I..... as I said earlier, I don't think anyone here has anything to fear whether it's 18 months, or 5 years or 10 years. The point is that if evidence of wrong doing comes to life, you should be answerable to it whether it's 18 months, ah... in the future, or longer. I don't see why anyone in a relatively short period of time should be given the option of escaping the ramifications of this Bill and its penalties on a mere time period. So I think that this is a good amendment. I think it's one that's worthy of your consideration and I would urge all Members to join in support of Amendment #1."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my 'no' vote, of course I bleed for my colleague across the floor, who has the



the finest intentions, but I take exception to this being congruent to the unified Code of Corrections. I think that he has been misled in that area, and must necessarily vote 'no'."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, on the first Roll Call I voted 'no' because I thought that perhaps the amendments were so severe that the Bill itself, which I favor, would ah... may go down. However, there are technical amendments in this amendment ah... and if there are not made, the Bill will be very confusing. And although I'm not terribly happy about the flight alterations in the Code of Corrections, ah... I am concerned that if we vote this amendment down that the Bill will be technically poor. And therefore I change my vote from 'no' to 'aye'."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I would have voted for the amendment, as I said earlier, when I asked my colleague from my own district about who's the Sponsor of this amendment, ah... that if he had left the thing to be uniformed with all the other misdemeanor in that class, he's giving us something in addition and I think therefore he is jeopardizing, from the technical viewpoint, on the criminal penalties section, whether than for the purpose of what the Bill is trying to do. And therefore, I have to vote 'no', and that's why I asked at that time what he was doing with the amendment and ah... I ah... in explaining my 'no' vote, ah... that's



the reason I'm voting 'no'."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I ah... I look at that board and I have to say to the Members of the Democratic side, that what is obvious is happening and ah... the Republicans don't want this amendment anymore than we do on the Democratic side, but the strategy is quite clear. They want the Democrats gut the amendment, beat the amendment, and gut the Bill. So ah... I just called that to your attention ladies and gentlemen, that the Republicans are voting 'aye' and the Democrats are voting 'no'. We're going to beat this amendment, I think, but you know what's going to happen? The Democrats are going to get the credit for gutting this Bill. So you better be aware of that little strategy."

Arthur Telcser: "Did you want to thank ah..... Representative Collins, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Collins: "I just wanted to thank Representative Yourell."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record.

On this question there are 74 'ayes', 68 'nays' and the gentleman's motion prevails. Are there further amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Collins. Amends House Bill 1 on page 3 by striking line 4 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth..."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 ah.... Committee Amendment #2 again does a



number of things. The first thing is a re-definition of a Political Committee. Now, this deals with the matter ah... that Representative Shea raised previously concerning ah... people that ah... operate in opposition to candidate or candidates. It also ah... committees that operate on more than.... on behalf of more than one candidate. Furthermore it clarifies the formula for limitation of expenditures to read \$.10 per registered voter at the time of the most recent General Election. Ah... third, it strikes the minimum amount of contributions that the Treasurer has to keep a record of ah... the ah... the \$10.00 threshold in the Bill is introduced ah... it was thought that this would allow an unrecorded purchase of a string of ah... \$10.00 ah.. or less contributions. So it strikes all reference to that. It also strikes the similar threshold of \$100.00 for expenditures that must be kept a record of. Ah... then it also ah... it strikes the penalty section that was overlooked in Amendment #1. And so this would put the penalties all in the section as explained in Amendment #1. And ah... Mr. Speaker, I would move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor of the amendment yield for a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Lundy: "My copy of the amendment reads ah... in the last line,





ah... line 16, and on page 16 by striking lines 20 through 32. As a look at the Bill, that doesn't seem to make much sense, and I wonder if they might be a typographical error in that line of the amendment?"

Collins: "Could you repeat that please, Joe, I missed it?"

Lundy: "Yes, ah... on the last line of Amendment #2 reads, and on page 16 by striking lines 20 through 32. If you look at the Bill on page 16, it doesn't make any sense to strike those particular lines. I thought perhaps that last line should read striking lines 29 through 32."

Collins: "Yes, your right. There is a typographical error there."

Arthur Telcser: "The Clerk will correct it if ah...."

Collins: "Yes, I was going to ask that that be done."

Arthur Telcser: "Yes, the Clerk will correct it." The gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman."

Berman: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Berman: "Phil, under this amendment ah... am I correct that any contribution even under \$10 has to be reported, whereas before it was \$10 or over?"

Collins: "Not reported, just recorded."

Berman: "Ah... the reporting stipulation is still the same.

This now requires that all contributions be recorded. Ah... the Bill is introduced with only the .... to say that the committee would have to keep a record of all contributions received in the excess of \$10.00. Now it would say that



they've got to keep a record of all contributions. See....  
the reporting is still the same."

Berman: "And what's the reporting requirement?"

Collins: "The reporting requirement is still the same, it's  
\$100.00."

Berman: "Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The gentleman  
has offered to move the adoption of Amendment #2 to  
House Bill 1. All in favor of the adoption signify by  
saying 'aye', the opposed 'no', the amendment is adopted.  
Are there further amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Collins. Amends House Bill 1 on  
page 3 by adding after line 6 following and so forth."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the  
House, ah... Amendment #3 regards changes that were made  
in accordance with suggestions made before the Elections  
Committee ah... by a Representative of the organization  
known as 'Common Cause'. Ah... it does a number of things.  
First off it includes a candidate who handles over \$1000  
on his own behalf in the definition of a Political Committee.  
This insures that such a candidate is included under the  
Disclosure Provisions, which are stated in terms of Polit-  
ical Committees. Secondly, it inserts cumulative in re-  
ference to the expenditure limit on personal and family  
funds that a candidate may use in his campaign. Ah... this  
clarifies the intent of the section is that the limit be



a total one rather than a limit on the size of individual contributions. Ah... third, it provides that a candidate who wishes to administer his own campaign finances may designate himself both as Chairman and Treasurer. Ah... this is necessary because a candidate who runs his own campaign and handles over \$1000 in the process, falls under the definition of a Political Committee and so ah... without this amendment he would have to designate a Chairman and a Treasurer. Fourth, it provides that copies of Political Committee Reports ah... that the Board is required to make available to the public shall be available at reasonable cost. Ah... it further reduces from \$5000 to \$1000 the minimum for last minute contributions that must be reported within 48 hours after election. And finally, it provides that duplicate copies of reports filed under this Act shall be available at cost. And Mr. Speaker I would move for the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 1."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Macon, Representative Alsup."

Alsup: "Mr. Collins, it's always been my experience in a campaign, unfortunately probably, that I have to finance most of my own and usually have to borrow money. And naturally you have to spend your own money. You have to pay for your advertizing, your literature, and all that when you order it. And as a result, even if somebody contributes to your campaign..... later.... ah... have you made any type of provision for this type of thing?" In other words, Collif: you've already spent your won money and then are you



allowed to be reimbursed of any contributions someone may give you? If you are going to set up this type of a system?

Collins: "Well, I don't think the bill does contemplate a situation...such a situation you raise. I think that this probably would fall within the administrative purvue of the Board of Elections in administering this Act. I think that you have touched upon a gray area that has not been considered previously, and I really don't think I can answer your question. I will remind you though, that the limitation, remember, is on communications media and not on total amount spent and our 10 cent per registered voter of the restriction is on expenditures on communications media which is of course, radio, television, newspaper, etc. , which would figure out to be about \$9000 to \$10,000 per election per district. Of course, that includes the primary and general elections, so we're talking about in the neighborhood of about \$18,000 to \$20,000 per election."

Alsup: "But you're talking about a party such as yours that has more money than they know how to spend effectively."

Collins: "I wish that were true."

Alsup: "What about the guys that get very few contributions? \$5, \$10, \$20 from a friend and this is it. Now, have you given any great thought to the guy who finances mostly his own campaign?"

Collins: "Well, I think we're talking about two different



amendments, this ...the fellow that finances his own campaign, I think might be harmed under Amendment No. 5. Actually, there is no limitation in Amendment No. 3 on what you are spending of your own money. Amendment No. 5 I admit to you does reduce that amount and I personally, have no great feeling about Amendment No. 5, and I'm going to offer it but it would not be all that displeased if it were defeated."

Alsop: "Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion?"

Collins: "This one I would like to see adopted, No. 3."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman has moved for the adoption of No. 3 to House Bill No. 1. All in favor signify by saying aye, all opposed no, the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: Amendment No. 4, Collins, Amends House Bill 1, page 1, line 24, inserting..."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. Amendment No. 4 is a amendment meant for clarification purposes. It adds in the definition of communications the word "rented" before outdoor advertising facilities. In committee, some of the members brought up the fact that perhaps we were applying the strictures of this bill to include bumper stickers and cartop signs and it would include them in



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

the communications media, and in attempt to exclude such tools that we all use, we put the word "rented" in there to mean that we didn't mean bumper stickers, cartop signs. Furthermore, we had to add at the beginning of Section 307 a reference to the federal law required by that law in order to enable states to apply the provisions of our act to station licensees, and that's all that amendment No. 4 does and I would move for its adoption."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The gentleman has moved to offer for adoption of Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 1. All in favor signifying by saying aye. the opposed no, the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: Amendment No. 5, Collins, Amendment to House Bill 1 on page 6..."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House.

Amendment No. 5 addresses itself to the problem of what was brought up by Representative Alsup. It reduces from \$10,000 to \$3000 the limit on personal and family funds that a candidate for the General Assembly may use for his campaign. This was offered in committee as a suggestion of, again, by the organization known as Common Cause. And I think their reasoning, which is valid, is that since the practical limit on a candidate's spending on communications media in the bill is \$10,000 that it was somewhat unrealistic to allow the candidate himself to spend \$10,000 of his personal fortune, and so they



the reduction from \$10,000 to \$3000. As I said to Representative Alsup, I have no great feeling about this amendment, I offer it in good faith, I think its a good amendment, but I can't see the problems that it may raise such as he suggests, and so I will, at this point, move for the adoption of the amendment No. 5 to House Bill 1."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "I believe that this amendment may be counter-productive. I think it has one good purpose, but I think it is outweighed by the fact that in some State Senate and State Representative district races, candidates may reasonably spend \$10,000 or \$15,000 and I guess in some races, the total has been more than that. This bill might mean that a person who decides to file as a candidate would estimate that his campaign would cost \$15,000. Put because he had no wealthy friends, and was relatively unknown in the district, or was in a district where they could not raise something like \$12,000, he could not in good conscience, file, because he would know that he would have to raise \$15,000 and that he could not receive campaign contributions of \$12,000. IN fact, this bill might require a candidate to obligate himself to various interests in order to comply with the bill, and I think this amendment should be defeated."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The gentleman



has offered to move for the adoption of amendment No. 5 to House Bill 1. All in favor of the adoption signify by saying aye, all opposed, no, Okay, the gentleman has offered for the adoption of Amendment No. 5 to House Bill 1, all in favor signifying by voting aye, all opposed by voting no. I wouldn't guess on that one. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. Brandt, aye. To this question, there are 63 ayes, Lemke, aye; Brinkmeier, aye; 34 nays, McGrew, aye; Randolph, aye; Oh, boy! Why don't you come up to the Clerk's office.....er Clerk's desk. Geo-Karis and Dyer, aye. 34 nays. The gentleman's motion to adopt the amendment prevails. Now the Clerk will put you on the roll call if you wish. Are there further amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment No. 6, Mugalian, amends House Bill 1 on page 7 by inserting after line 20, the following, and so forth."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Would it be in order to ask the Clerk to read the amendment, or ...."

Arthur Telcser: "The Clerk...Representative Collins, for what purpose do you rise sir?"

Collins: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Arthur Telcser: "State your point."

Collins: "I believe that this amendment may not be germane to the bill. The bill addresses itself to State executive





offices and elections for members of the General Assembly. Now, this amendment would extend provisions of it in one section to party offices. State central committeemen, ward committeemen, township committeemen, precinct committeemen, and I question whether it is germane to the bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Epton, for what purpose do you rise, sir? "

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, I'm having extreme difficulty following, and I understand there is some unauthorized personnel on the floor of the House. Now that comes as a surprise to me because in all my years, I've never known that to happen, and I wouldn't want to even mention Phil Crone's name. But if you would take care of that, Mr. Speaker, I would be most appreciative."

Arthur Telcser: "Well, I don't know who the gentleman is, but if he is on the floor, I hope he'll remove himself forthwith. After, conferring with our parliamentary Representative Mugalian, a...I am informed that the bill does indeed deal with the legislative and executive branch of government, now with party offices and that therefore, amendment No. 6 would not be germane." Representative Mann, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, how would you describe a party office? It's an elective office, how would you describe it? I mean you are excluding it, and Mr. Speaker, I urge you to take a long hard look at this particular amendment."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Collins, for what purpose do



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

you rise, sir?"

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I am in order in answer to Representative Mann, we have excluded all other offices from this bill except state offices and election to the members of the General Assembly. We've excluded county offices, municipal offices, and the bill doesn't deal with any of these and I suggest that if there is a bill pertaining to party offices, this should be more properly introduced in a separate bill, and that was the basis for my reason for a point of order."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Mann, do you wish to respond?"

Mann: Well, Mr. Speaker, committeemen run in the city, they run in the county, a...you can't exclude them. They are certainly not judicial officers, they run on a public ballot, their elections are subsidized by the public. I don't see how the gentleman can distinguish them with any other elected official. They are representative committeemen and their roll is selecting the number and the identity of the persons to run within a district. According to some of our law, they nominate judges to fill vacancies...a...Mr. Speaker, I don't see how you can possibly exclude them, Mr. Speaker. Really."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea, did you seek recognition, sir?"

Shea: "I got a copy of the amendment, I didn't have one."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Berman, did you seek recognition?"  
The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman."



Berman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I call your attention on this question that was posed as to the germanance of the amendment. I think that it is certainly germain because it lies within the scope of the subject matter generally the scope of the subject matter of the bill. This is a new bill, it creates a new act, so I don't think that you can throw it out because it is outside of the specific subject matter. It deals with elections. And I think to coin a phrase of a previous speaker of this House, it certainly is within the four corners of the subject matter of the act. Now as to whether the sponsor of the bill thinks that it ought to be excluded, I think that relates to the merits and he can argue it up or down on the merits but I certainly think that the proposed amendment is germain to the subject matter of the bill, and I would suggest that you take a closer look at the proposed amendment."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if it will serve to move things along, I'll withdraw my objection."

Arthur Telcser: "Okay, the gentleman has withdrawn his inquiry. Now, does Representative Mugalian, did you want the Clerk to read the amendment?"

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, I think that perhaps this bill, although it may technically be germain, I would like to withdraw the amendment and perhaps offer it as a separate bill."



I do withdraw the amendment."

Arthur Telcser: "Okay, the gentleman has withdrawn the amendment.

Are there further amendments? No further amendments.

Third reading. Okay, under the rules there are three bills

on second reading which must be handled today. I believe

I am in order to go out of numerical sequence in the order

of second reading and call House Bill 125."

Jack O'Brien: House Bill 125. A bill for an Act to amend  
Section 1 of and add Sections to an Act concerning dis-  
closure of information = second reading of the bill.

One committee amendment. Amends House Bill 125..."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative  
Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen  
of the House. The amendment in question is a committee  
amendment. It was put on the bill in committee in order  
to put the bill in proper format for the House floor.  
The first part of the amendment makes this newspaper  
shield bill apply not only to newspapers that require  
funding for publication, but would also apply to newspapers  
that issue publication without charge. In my district,  
for example, we have a newspaper called The Rantoul Free  
Press, but does not charge for publication which would not  
have come under the bill without that amendment. The  
second part of the amendment adds other agencies besides  
just the judicial, so that any agency that has the right



to issue a subpoena will come under the newspaper shield bill, and I move the adoption of these two committee amendments."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion?" The gentleman has offered to move the adoption of amendment No. 1 to House bill 125....the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Georgi."

Georgi: "Mr. Speaker, could I ask Mr. Hirschfeld a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates a yield."

Georgi: "When you first introduced the bill, John, on a March the 2nd, the Rockford newspaper editorialized about government of the people and that's when we had that demonstration in the gallery where the from Will County were down here complaining about taxes and the reporter wrote up in Rockford. Such behavior is not tolerated in the visitor's gallery. It tends to interfere with the numbling and snoring on the House floor below. Now my question is..."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Leinenweber, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Leinenweber: "Point of personal privilege."

Arthur Telcser: "State your point."

Leinenweber: "Representative Georgi is not talking about Will County citizens, but citizens from other citizens in the State that were raising the ruckusin the gallery."

Georgi: "Very well put, I agree with you." But my question is



is the shield to protect the reporters who wrote the editorial, or to protect the legislators that were snoring? That's my question, John." I have the editorial in my hand if you want to see it."

Hirschfeld: "I really don't want to see it, Representative Georgi, although as with all of your questions, I'm having a very difficult time answering, because I'm having a very difficult time understanding them. But...a"

Georgi: "Let me repeat them, John."

Hirschfeld: "I don't think...this bill as far as I'm concerned, is to avoid the incidents such as occurred in California and elsewhere, where newspapers reports and others in the media are jailed for contempt for refusing to disclose their sources. Now if you want to argue against the bill and its purposes, I would suggest to you that the more proper time to do that is on third reading tomorrow."

Georgi: "John, my question is, if there was an attempt to subpoena the reporter, you wouldn't know who to subpoena because the editorial board doesn't sign this editorial, but who are you protecting, the editorial board or the snoring legislators is my question? Who gets the protection?"

Hirschfeld: "I've never found the legislators to need any protection. But I presume I am, therefore, protecting the editorial board."

Georgi: "I didn't hear that, would you repeat that?" Okay, thanks. Yourell tells me he has a bill to identify



45-73

editorial writers, and I think in that bill, we will probably put a value on editorials. Thank you Mr. Speaker."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman has moved to offer the adoption of Amendment No.1 to House Bill 125. All in favor of the doption signify by saying aye, opposed no, the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? Third reading. Also, on second reading appears House Bill 373, which will be the last day tomorrow to be heard. That bill has been called a second time. Are there any further amendments to House Bill 373."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment No. 2, Shea. Amends House Bill 373 on page..."

Arthur Telcser: The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House. This is another amendment that was prepared by the Reference Bureau as you know, this is the Reference Bureau's bill to clean up the statutes where there were one or more acts passed in the last session to get them down to one act and I respectfully ask the adoption of Amendment No. 2."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Duff." "Okay, is there any discussion? The gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 373. All in favor of the adoption signifying by saying aye, opposed no, the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? Third reading. House Bill 374."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 374, A bill for an Act to repeal acts



and parts of acts herein named, second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Arthur Telcser: "Are there amendments from the floor? Third reading. Also House Bill 185 on the order of second reading."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 185, A bill for an Act to amend sections of the Election Code, second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Arthur Telcser: "Are there amendments from the floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment No. 1, Berman. Amends House Bill..."

Arthur Telcser: The gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman.

Berman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, a...House Bill 185 is a bill that deletes the requirement for notaries on absentee ballots. The bill was voted out of the Election Committee 16 to 0, and after it was passed out, I received some correspondence from the State's Attorney of Cook County who raised some technical questions regarding some of the language. The amendment that I'm offering today is in conforming with the request of the State's Attorney and as also been recommended by the County Clerk of Cook County. It does not change the substance of the law, it merely deals with some of the technical language regarding the wording of the ballot once we do away with the notary. I move the adoption of committee amendment...of a floor amendment No. 1, to House Bill 185."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman has offered to move the adoption





of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 185. All in favor signify by saying aye, opposed no, the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? Third reading. Okay, I think we've got all the bills on the second reading that would ...Representative Berman, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Berman: "Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry."

Arthur Telcser: "State your point sir."

Berman: "There are two bills that relate to the same subject matter and are quite similar as to House Bill 125 that we have just moved from second to third reading. Those are bills 380 sponsored by Representative LaFleur and House Bill 475 sponsored by myself. I would like to inquire or ask for leave of the House to waive the appropriate rules so that we can consider House Bill 475 and if Representative LaFleur wishes, he indicates that House Bill 380 on second reading out of order so that they can all be moved together so that we could debate these three bills dealing with the reporters shield laws on third reading at the same time. I would move leave for the House."

Arthur Telcser: Okay, the gentleman has moved that the House now consider on the order of second reading, House Bills 380 and 475. It will take 107 affirmative votes. All in favor of the gentleman's motion, signify by voting aye, the opposed, no. Have all voted who wished? Take the



record. To this question; there are lll ayes and no nays, the gentleman's motion prevails. On the order of second reading House bill 380.."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 380, A bill for an Act to amend Section of a Act concerning disclosure of sources of information, second reading of the- bill. No committee amendments."

Arthur Telcser: "Are there amendments from the floor? Third reading, House Bill 475."

Jack O'Brien: House Bill 475. A bill for an Act to amend Section of an Act concerning disclosures of sources of information, second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Arthur Telcser: "Are there amendments from the floor? Third reading. 475 is on the third reading now. The order of motions. Are there motions on the floor? The gentleman from Cook, Representative Douglas."

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, and members of the House. Yesterday afternoon because of the problem with the length of the session, the committee hearings were crowded into a very short space of time. The rules and Regulations Committee had been announced to meet at 6:15, a bill, two bills of nine which this week reached the 45 day period were scheduled to be heard in the Rules and Regulations Committee and I have another bill in the Judiciary 2 Committee. When I attempted to get to the Rules and Regulations Committee which had met, according to the Chairman, somewhat earlier than had been announced, the



committee was completely it's deliberations and it was impossible for these two Bills to be heard. Representative Klosak, the Chairman of the committee, explained this to me and has agreed to cooperate if I can get leave of the House on House Bills 366, and 367 to be heard next Tuesday. This would require suspension of Rules 18 and 23 to allow for these two Bills to be heard, which were not heard yesterday afternoon because of the crush of time and because of the length of time we were in Session yesterday. I'd like to ask the leave of the House to get the appropriate number of votes with the concurrence of the Chairman of the Committee to do so."

Arthur Telcser: "All right, the gentleman has moved that the Rules 18 and 23 be suspended for the purpose of hearing ah... House Bills ah... 366 and 367 of registration and regulation ah... next week. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I talked to Representative Klosak about this and all we are trying to do is to get this extended long enough rather than putting in two new Bills and then assigning them to committee just with regards to these two Bills, we'd like to extend the 45 day deadline until after they get a hearing next week in committee and I'd appreciate some help if we could do that."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record."



Representative Douglas, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Douglas: "For a ruling from the Chair, Mr. Speaker. How many votes will I need to do this?"

Arthur Telcser: "My recollection is 89, if I'm not mistaken.

The ..... On this question there 99 'ayes' 1 'nay' and the gentleman's motion to suspend the Rules 18..... the Parliamentarian informs me that it takes 107 votes, I have not announced it yet. B.B.Wolf 'aye'. Youréll, 'aye'.

Representative Pappas, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Pappas: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I happened to serve on that committee and we sat in that committee and waited for Sponsors to come in with their Bills. Now if we're going to have to sit all night long, I think we better take a look at this thing because I think we are going to open a can of worms and if somebody doesn't get around to calling their Bill within the 45 days, we're going to be getting motions and motions and more Bills.

I think should be stopped right now."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Kane, Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Well, I believe that fair is fair, and we left that Committee last night at a quarter to seven, not six six fifteen."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay the Clerk tells me that we oughta get a new Roll Call. The gentleman has moved that the suspension of Rules 18 and 23 so that House Bills 366 and 377 can be heard in the Registration and Regulation Committee next week. This will take 107 affirmative votes. All



those in favor of the gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye' and the opposed by voting 'no'. Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, ah... Mr. Speaker, as the Chief Sponsor of House Bill 746, I'd like move of the House to table that Bill. House Bill 746."

Arthur Telcser: "Well, we're in the middle of a Roll Call."

Ebbesen: "All right, I'll hold it."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Douglas."

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, I'm the first one to ask that the Rules be observed and I agree with Representative Pappas and Representative Waddell that it would be a very unfortunate precedence to move in this direction, but as long as the times were mentioned, I think it's only appropriate and I hope Representative Klosak, since you and I have spoken that you will assist me in making the facts clear. Yesterday we left the House and on the rostrum the Speaker said the the Registration and Regulation Committee will start it's meeting at 6:15, that was the request from the Chair. When I left here I had a Bill that was being heard in the Judiciary II Committee and that was scheduled in R & R. I went to the Chairman of the R & R Committee and I told him that Representative Duff had been willing to call my Bill early and that I would get over as quickly as I could. Now I had a Page standing at the door, and I only mention these details because I think these are the kinds of problems other people may have under similar circumstances."



This Bill has been amended and has been changed. It's among many Bills that I've introduced. It was at the last dying breath, and I expect the responsibility for having to get it out, but the Committee met a half hour earlier and I had the Page standing there when the Committee started meeting. And Representative Waddell, according to the Page who was helping me out, you did not leave at a quarter to seven, I was reading to come over and ready to have the Bill heard, and the misunderstanding I think, and Representative Klosak, I hope you will explain this because I think it is only fair and appropriate that I have your support here that the Committee did leave earlier than would have been the case. There were three other Bills that were heard before mine and I got there nine minutes after the Committee was supposed to start meeting and the Committee was on it's way out. In my asking for the leave of House, so I'm not pushed into a more untenable parliamentary position of reintroducing these Bill, which is what I'll have to do if this is what the House chooses to have me do. I ask for the understanding of this House for a difficult situation of having these Bills heard next week when the R. & R Committee has only one other Bill to be heard."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take.... Gentleman from Cook, Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "I voted in favor of the motion because I too feel that we should not play lightly with the Committee System,



however, if we force the Sponsor of this Bill to reintroduce it, we only putting a bigger load on the Reference Bureau, which is really loaded between now and April 14th to get all the new legislation out and I think we should give the additional votes because he explained it. It was not really his fault that it did not go, fully his fault, to go before the Committee yesterday. So let's have a little heart for the Legislative Reference Bureau as well on this point."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take.... gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, as I understand the situation, the Sponsor appeared at a Committee at a time that had been announced as the Committee time. The Committee had already adjourned certainly in that situation the Sponsor could not fairly had his Bill dismissed for noncompliance with the time limit. He appeared at the proper time and the Committee had already adjourned, so I do not see how in fairness the Sponsor can be denied the opportunity to be heard anymore than a member of the general public would have ah.... could be denied the opportunity to be heard. So I'm voting 'yes'."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from McLean, Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker, as a Member of that Committee, I'll have you know that we were in Session until ten minutes to seven yesterday. Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record."



The gentleman from Cook, Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, I'm a Member of that Committee ah... I think that ah.. generally speaking ah... what has been said from both view points is correct. On the other hand, we did meet early and we heard Bills and when we got down to Representative Douglas's two Bills, ah.... we recessed briefly hoping that he would show up. I would suggest that we give him the 107 votes and let him let us hear these Bills perhaps next week and have it over with. I think the Sponsor ah... has a ah.... has a case, but I am not sure about the ah... time. The last Speaker indicated the time we left. What I think happend; Representative Douglas anticipated the number of Bills to be heard ah.... we would be there perhaps longer than 7:00. It so happened that we had some Bills where we voting by the last unanimous Roll Call, in other words, we didn't have too many controversial Bills. I would suggest to my colleagues on the R & R Committee and the rest of us that in this instance we ought to give the Sponsor the benefit of the doubt. It's obvious that a person can't be in two places at the same time and it's a technicality here but I do not believe that we would be abusing the Committee System, since Representative Douglas has a good reason for not being there at the time the Committee adjourned. I would hope that we would give him the 107 votes and ah.. get on with the business of the day."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record."





Representative Fary, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Fary: "I to am a Member of that Committee, and if we're going to kill the Bills, let's do it with dignity and not leave any bad taste in anybody's mouth. Now ah... the doctor was in earlier but he left and said he'd be back. He was mentioning to me that he was going to be there. I know we can't wait too long. The guys are tired and beat, but ah.... I think he deserves this break and I'm going to ask my friends here to please ah... vote in favor of hearing them next week and if we're going to kill them, let's do it real nice in a real fancy manner and nobody will be angry. Witnesses or opponents or anybody else."

Arthur Telcser: "On this question there are 95 'ayes' .....

how's Representative Kosinski recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Arthur Telcser: "Record him as voting 'aye'. On this question there are 96 'ayes', 3 'nays'.... Huskey 'aye'...97 'ayes', and the gentleman's motion to suspend Rules 18 and 23 fail. Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, as the Chief Sponsor of House Bill 746, I would like leave of the House to table House Bill 746."

Arthur Telcser: "Does the gentleman have leave? House Bill will be tabled. Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, as Chief Sponsor of House Bill 414, I'd ask leave of the



House to have Representative J. David Jones shown as a Joint Sponsor of that Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Does the gentleman have leave? It will be so recorded. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. For the purpose of an announcement, the House Appropriations Committee will meet a half hour after adjournment and I would have the Members note that the meeting room has been changed to C1 in the State Office Building."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Capuzi."

Capuzi: "Ah... Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I rise to announce that the Committee on Human Resources will be immediately after adjournment and it will be in Room MC here in the State Capital Building. Our room has been changed."

Arthur Telcser: "You mean in Room M3, Lou, right?"

Capuzi: "Right."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay. The gentleman from Morgan, Representative Rose."

Rose: "Mr. Speaker the Judiciary I Committee will meet fifteen minutes after adjournment at the usual meeting place, D1, State Office Building."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, in terms of House Bill 7, which is on



Second Reading, may I address it?"

Arthur Telcser: "What do you want to do with it?"

Kosinski: "Well Mr. Speaker, if I could just ah...have a moment I would direct this not only to the House, but to the Members of the Judiciary II. This is a well amended Bill in Judiciary II. It's a good Bill unfortunately that we couldn't amend properly and it was my hope on Second Reading to offer the proper amendments to make it palatable to the General Assembly. I was not capable of achieving this. So in deference to my Committee, I wish to table this Bill. May I?"

Arthur Telcser: "Gentlem.....Are there objections to the gentleman's motion? Gentleman has moved to table House Bill 7. Are there any objections? Hearing none, House Bill 7 will be tabled?"

Kosinski: "Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Tuerk, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Tuerk: "Purpose of announcement. The Industrial Affairs Committee will meet immediately adjournment in Room M4."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Washburn, for what purpose do you rise?" Representative J.J.Wolf."

J:J.Wolf: "The House Committee on Veteran Affairs, Personnel and Pension will meet in Room M5, five minutes after adjournment."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative W.D. Walsh."



W.D. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, because we're meeting a day later this week ah... than usual, ah.. we will run afoul of the ah... 6 1/2 day posting rule unless we suspend it. So I move the to suspend the provision of Rule 18 B so that Bills may be posted 5 1/2 instead of 6 1/2 days this week and this week only."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, the gentleman has moved that the provisions of Rule 18 B be postponed. All those in favor signify..... suspend it I mean. Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise?"

Shea: "I don't think that's the way the motion was put, Mr. Speaker."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman put a motion to suspend the provisions of Rule 18 B ah....., dealing with posting of Bills. Isn't that what he said?"

Shea: "Well, now is he wants to suspend it and put it that form, I think he's gotta do it by individual Bills. Because you know... ah... I ... I'm just not sure what the motion says."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, it's been pointed out to me that we better make it 5 instead of 5 1/2 days to begin with and ah... the motion says simply that Bills may be posted today for hearings next Tuesday, and tomorrow for hearings next Wednesday. Five days notice instead of 6 1/2 as the ah... as the rule states and the ah... motion is limited to this



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

week and this week only."

Arthur Telcser: "Well, ah... Representative Shea."

Shea: "You don't want to suspend the rule then Bill, you kinda want to amend it don't you? Saying it's 5 days for this week and this week only?"

Walsh: "Well, ya, o'kay if you prefer that, the rule says 6 1/2 days but ah...."

Shea: "I just want to get the record straight so that nobody says that we got rid of that rule two weeks ago."

Walsh: "All right then, ah.... maybe a way to put it is to suspend it for the Bills that are posted 5 days prior to the Committee Meeting this week."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay. All those in favor of the gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye' the opposed by voting 'no'. 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 125 'ayes' and no 'nays' and the gentleman's motion to suspend the provision of Rule 18 prevail. Representative B.B.Wolf, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

B.B.Wolf: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Arthur Telcser: "State your point, Sir."

B.B.Wolf: "I assume that we're going to have a motion to cover the vacation period and those Bills which will either expire in committee or in the floor of the House because of our absence, am I correct in that assumption?"

Arthur Telcser: "Yes, it may not be put today but ah..."



B.B.Wolf: "Before we adjourn?"

Arthur Telcser: "Yes Sir."

B.B.Wolf: "Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Are there further motions or announcements?"

The lady from DuPage, Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "I would like to remind the Members of the Higher Education Committee that tomorrows meeting will be at 8:00 AM instead of 2:00 PM. 8:00 AM in Room M3 tomorrow morning."

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

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I want to call to your attention ah.. House Bill 998, which was filed today. It calls for a cost of living increase of 5% to state employees under the jurisdiction of the Governor. There is nothing in the Governor's Budget to provide for such a consideration and ah... we on this side of the asile particularly believe ah....that something should be done so we have filed House Bill 998 to accomplish that objective and we invite all those in the House to join in the Sponsorship is they so desire."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay ah... House Bills ah... First Reading."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 955, Murphy. Amends the Counties Act, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 956, Day et al. Amends the Income Tax Act, First Reading of the Bill. 957, Kelly et al. Amends the Judges Retirement System, First Reading of the Bill. 958, Kelly. Amends the Judges Retirement System, First Reading of the Bill. 959, Craig.



Creates the Illinois Dairy Practice Act, First Reading of the Bill. 960, Craig. Amends Civil Administrative Code, First Reading of the Bill. 961, Craig. Appropriates \$60,000 to the Department of Public Health, First Reading of the Bill. 962, Craig. Amends the Finance Act, First Reading of the Bill. 963, Matijevich. Amends an Act codifying the powers and duties of the Department of Mental Health, First Reading of the Bill. 964, Matejevich. Amends the Illinois Toll Highway Act, First Reading of the Bill. 965, Sharp. Amends the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund, First Reading of the Bill. 966, Telcser. Open Space Lands Acquisition Act, First Reading of the Bill. 967, Telcser. Appropriates \$25,000,000 to the Department of Conservation, First Reading of the Bill. 968, Skinner, Amends the Revenue Act, First Reading of the Bill. 969, Juckett. Amends School Code, First Reading of the Bill. 960, Skinner. Amends Municipal Code, First Reading of the Bill. 971, Stiehl. Amends Counties Act, First Reading of the Bill. 972, Day, Amends Municipal Code, First Reading of the Bill. 973 Berman, Amends School Code, First Reading of the Bill. 974, North, Amends Municipal Code, First Reading of the Bill. 975, Stone, Amends .....Pention Code, First Reading of the Bill. 976 Stone, Amends Pention Code, First Reading of the Bill. 977, Berman, et al. Amends School Code, First Reading of the Bill. 978, Matejevich, Prohibits fee splitting and other



financial arrangements between drugists and physicians, First Reading of the Bill. 979, Matejevich, Prohibits fee splitting between pharmacies and hospitals, doctors, and other health care facilities, First Reading of the Bill. 980, Schneider, Amends General Assembly, State Employees University Downstate Pension Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill. 981, Berman. Amends an Act Codifying the powers and duties of the Department of Mental Health, First Reading of the Bill. 982, Telcser. Amends the Illinois Controlled Substance Act. First Reading of the Bill. 983, G. Hoffman, et al. Amends Public Defenders Act, First Reading of the Bill. 984, Timothy Simms, et al. Requires public utilities to bill on a monthly basis, First Reading of the Bill. 985, Katz. Amends an Act relating to the operation of the General Assembly, First Reading of the Bill. 986, Katz. Creates a Commission on the organization of the General Assembly, First Reading of the Bill. 987, Katz. Amends the Illinois Banking Act, First Reading of the Bill. 988, Katz. Amends the Illinois Savings Loan Act, First Reading of the Bill. 989, Katz. Amends the Civil Administrative Code, First Reading of the Bill. 990, Katz. Amends an Act relating to notices, First Reading of the Bill. 991, Katz. Amends an Act relating to governmental service fees, First Reading of the Bill. 992, Tuerk, et al. Amends Public Utilities Act, First Reading of the Bill. 993, DiPrima et al. Appropriates \$3,000,000 to the Department of Children and





Services, First Reading of the Bill. 994, B. B. Wolfe, et al. Amends Retailers Occupation Tax, First READING of the Bill. 995, Choate, et al. Appropriates \$280,000 to the Department of General Services, First Reading of the Bill. 996, McCormick, Amends Shawnee District Port Act, First Reading of the Bill. 997, Collins, et al. Amends the Code of Criminal Procedure, first Reading of the Bill. 998, Jones, et al. An Act to make an appropriate for a cost of living increase. First Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Wills, Speaker Blair."

Blair: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I could just take one minute and if we could have a little reduction in the noise level. I think it...I just want to point out that the Governor has recommended no cost of living increases in his budget for fiscal year 1974. Rather he has said that he will assess employee productivity at mid year and make a decision at that time. Now on this side, the Republican leadership disagrees with the Governor on several points. First, to deny State employees a cost of living increase in today's inflation is, in effect, asking them to work for less money. This is wrong. Second, as usual, the Governor's employee productivity plan consists than nothing more than words. We have seen no productivity factors made available. And we challenge the Governor to make public this productivity plan now so that it may be aired by the legislature and the employees. It is only fair and equitable. Productivity should be awarded by merit increases



currently allowed under statutory pay plan. Cost of living increases are designed to protect the employees purchasing power, not to generate some vague, undefined concept of productivity. For this reason, Houses Bills 9 and then 98 is a proposal that would provide a 5 percent cost of living increase for State employees within the executive branch, and under the jurisdiction of the Governor, and we certainly invite all members on both sides of the aisle to co-sponsor this Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I'm pretty happy to hear the Speaker take the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee, when I asked the Director of the Bureau of the Budget's position as far as the cost of living increase for State employees, and he, in turn, told me and every member of that committee that the Governor is looking into this question, and in turn, is checking the cost of living as far as how it effects the State employees and the dollar amounts involved. I personally would also like to recommend the Speaker in last year's gubernatorial budget, it also did not reflect a cost of living increase, and, in turn, we almost had to amend every single bill. So I brought this to the attention of the new Director of the Budget, and they, in turn, are well aware of the situation and I am sure that



cost of living factor will be forthcoming without necessity of the bill and the publicity."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Blair, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Blair: "Well, there is just one comment I want to make on that. While it might not have been itemized in the last budget. The Administration's bill said they were submitted, every-one of them did include a cost of living increase."

Arthur Telcser: "House Bill's first reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 999, Skinner, et al. An Act to add a Section to the REvenue Act of 1939, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1000, Epton, et al. Amends an Article 25 to the Insurance Code, First REading of the Bill. House Bill 1001, Fleck. Amends Civil Administration Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1002, Porter, et al. Amends the Game Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill, 1003, Georgi. Amends the School Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1004, Maragos, et al. Real Estate Appraisers Licensing Act, First REading of the Bill.

Arthur Telcser: "House Bill Resolutions"

Fred Selcke: "House Resolution 188, Kosinski. House Bill 190, Merlo. House Resolution 191, Katz, et al."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, I think this might be important to this Assembly. I'm entering a Resolution and I had the



option this morning of putting it as an Agreed Resolution and I rejected that option, because I wanted to focus attention to the Resolution by the need of a 107 vote over-ride of the rules. May I read the Resolution, Mr. Speaker?"

Arthur Telcser: "Proceed, sir." or the Clerk will read it for you.

Kosinski: "I would rather read it if I may? Whereas in the great legal tradition of these United States of America, all people are assumed innocent until proven guilty; and whereas when charges are brought against citizens and they are taken into custody, their rights should be fully recognized under this great constitutional tradition; and whereas abusive treatment of the accused is an affront to all people of our country; and whereas the nature of the elected crime and the past conduct of the accused should be taken into account when they are arrested and taken into custody; and whereas unnecessary use of handcuffs on a person whose past conduct who in no way indicates he or she would try to escape, constitutes abusive treatment and is an affront not only to the dignity of the accused but also to the dignity of all citizens of our nation. Be it therefore resolved by the House of Representatives of the 78th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that members of this House condemn, I repeat, all unnecessary use of handcuffs on any of our fellow citizens by any law enforcement agency, whether it be local, State and federal



and I enter this resolution not for a specific person, but for us, the citizens of the State of Illinois and I want 107 votes to over-ride House Rule 41."

Arthur Telcser: "Okay, the gentleman has moved that House Rule 41 be suspended for immediate consideration and adoption of House Resolution 188. All those in favor of the gentleman's a..well, we better get an affirmative vote. All those in favor signifying by voting aye, the opposed, no. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. To this question there are 137 ayes, no nays, and Rule 41 will be suspended. The Gentleman now moves for the adoption.."

Kosinski: "House Bill 188, Mr. Speaker."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman has now moved for the adoption of House Resolution 188, all those in favor to the adoption signify by sayin-g aye, the opposed no, and the Resolution is adopted. On the order of Resolutions the Chairman Resolution." Representative Collins, for what purpose do you rise?"

Collins: Mr. Speaker, we just adopted House Resolution 188, and I'd like leave of the sponsor to be added as a co-sponsor and I think that the content of this Resolution being what it is I would urge every member of the House to join the co-sponsors to the Resoltuion. I think that everyone of us should proudly affix our names to that Resolution and I would urge every member to join Representative Kosinski in-sponsoring House Bill 188."



Arthur Telcser: "Okay, is there leave to have every member added as a co-sponsor? Hearing no objections, the Clerk will add every members name to the Resolution."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Joint Resolution No. 30. Walsh. Resolved by the Senate of the 78th General Assembly, State of Illinois and the House of Representatives concurring herein. When the Senate adjourns on Thursday, April 5, 1973, it stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 10, 1973, to meet at 11:30 o'clock A.M. and when the House of Representatives adjourns on Friday, April 6, 1973, it stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 10, 1973, at 9:30 o'clock A.M. We have Amendment No. 1 to Senate Joint Resolution 30, reasons follows. Amend Senate Joint Resolution 30 by deleting everything after House of Representatives and inserting in lieu thereof the following, adjourns on Friday, April 6, 1973, it stand adjourned until Monday, April 9, 1973, at 12:00 o'clock noon."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from....I think its regular session at noon...The Gentleman from Cook, Representative W. D. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, and members of the House. I unwillingly move the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to the adjournment Resolution. And that is the amendment that brings us back at 12 o'clock noon on Monday."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman...."

Walsh: "12 noon Monday, we return after adjournment tomorrow."



Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman has offered to move the adoption, all in favor of Amendment No. 1 to the adjournment resolution, all in favor ....The Gentleman from Cook, Representative B. B. Wolfe."

Wolfe: "Could we amend that resolution still further? Were there no committee meetings on Monday? We've had a long week this week. Could we come in at 4 o'clock in the afternoon and some of us. Why not?"

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. Let me inform the membership that they have been contemplating an Easter break, and if we're going to have an Easter break and keep an orderly process for us moving the House calendar, committee meetings and what have you, then we better get to taking some of these bills off the calendar. And that was the prime reason for being here at noon Monday, so that we can start moving some legislation and go ahead and have an Easter break. Now if you don't want an Easter break, it's alright with me."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to the Adjournment Resolution of Senate Resolution No. 3. All in favor signifying by saying aye, the opposed, no. The Amendment is adopted. Now the Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution No. 30. All those in favor of its adoption



signifying by saying aye, the opposed no. The Resolution is adopted. Death Resolutions."

Fred Selcke: "Death Resolutions.. House Resolution 149, Jones, et al. In respect to the memory of James E. Londrigan. House Bill Resolution 156, Tuerk, et al. In respect to the memory of Robert M. Schneider. House Resolution 157, Tuerk, et all. In respect to the memory..."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Tuerk, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, and member of the House. That death resolution about Mr. Schneider. There was a personal interest in my behalf since I was a classmate of his and I know that there are many many members of this House, who new Bob Schneider as the Director of Agriculture under Governor Kerner's administration, and I would invite anyone who would like to become a co-sponsor on this death resolution to do so."

Fred Selcke: House Resolution 159, Boyle, et al. In respect to the memory of Eugene A. Batty. House Resolution 164, Jaffe et al. In respect to the memory of Paul Peter Black. House Resolution 166, Arrigo, et al. In respect to the memory of Maurice Aschello. House Resolution, 170, Skinner, in respect to the memory of Mrs. Vera R. Frantz. House Resolution, Day, et al. In respect of Milo Nelson."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the





death resolutions."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman has offer to move the adoption of the death resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying aye, all opposed no. The resolutions are adopted. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I would like to move for the adoption of the resolution dedicated to the memory of a highly respected member of our Springfield community, the late James E. Londrigan, father of my colleague from Springfield, Representative James D. Londrigan. Representative Gibbs and I would ask leave to have all members of the House join in the sponsorship of this particular resolution."

Arthur Telcser: "Hearing no objections, leave will be granted. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative W. D. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn until 9:30 tomorrow morning, perfunctory session, 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning regular session."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, as a democratic spokesman on the County and Township Affairs Committee, I would like a little direction from the Chair as to when we are going to meet today?"

Arthur Telcser: "Representative McMasters' do you wish to respond, sir?"

McMasters: "I assume that we are still to meet at the appointed hour of 4:00 P.M. in Room M-5."



Arthur Telcser: "Okay, the Gentleman has moved that the House stand adjourned until 9:30 A.M. tomorrow morning, perfunct, 10:00 o'clock, regular. All in favor signify by saying aye, the opposed, no. The House stands adjourned.

