

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FORTY-FIRST LEGISLATIVE DAY

APRIL 12, 1973

9:30 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 - no reason given;

Representative Bernard E. Epton - no reason given;

Representative Peter C. Granata - illness;

Representative John E. Grotberg - illness;

Representative Fred J. Schraeder - no reason given;

Representative Isaac R. Sims, -no reason given;

Representative Joseph G. Sevcik - no reason given;

Representative John F. Wall - illness.



1:

K. Miller: "The House will be in Order. Prayer by Joe Cary."

Cary: "Let us pray. Lord, by your cross and resurrection,  
you have set us free. Amen."

K. Miller: "Messages from the Senate."



Speaker: "Messages from the Senate."

2.

Fredric B. Selcke: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House

of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House: Senate Bill 2787, 103, 121, 315.

Passed the Senate, April 11, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the following Joint Resolution:

House Joint Resolution \*29. Concurred in by the Senate, April 11, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary."

Speaker: "Introduction and First Reading."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 1134, Tuerk, an Act to designate the Joliet-Marquette Trail. First Reading of the Bill. House

Bill 1135, McClain, amends the 'Vehicle Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 1136, Berman, changes the requirement for filing a certificate showing School Employees be free of tuberculosis. First Reading of the Bill. 1137, Kelly, amends the

'Judges Retirement System'. First Reading of the Bill. 1138, Kelly, amends the 'Judges Retirement System'. First Reading

of the Bill. 1139, Kelly, amends the 'Judges Retirement System'. First Reading of the Bill. 1140, Cunningham, amends

the 'Illinois Vehicle Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 1141, Schlickman, 'Intergovernmental Cooperation Act'. First

Reading of the Bill. 1142, Rayson, appropriates \$35,000 to the Department of Conservation. First Reading of the Bill.

1143, Barry, et.al., amends the 'School Code'. First Reading



of the Bill. 1144, Barry, amends the 'Municipal Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 1145, Barry, amends the 'Local Library Act'. First Reading of the Bill. 1146, Hanahan, amends the 'Workmen's Compensation Act'. First Reading of the Bill. 1147, Craig, amends the 'Vehicle Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 1148, Craig, amends the 'Illinois Swine Disease Control Eradication Act'. First Reading of the Bill. 1149, Schlickman, amends the 'Northeastern Illinois Planning Act'. First Reading of the Bill. 1150, Washington, amends the 'Beauty Culture Act'. First Reading of the Bill. 1151, Washington, amends the 'Beauty Culture Act'. First Reading of the Bill. 1152, Washington, appropriates \$578,800 for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Commission on Human Relations. First Reading of the Bill. 1153, Washington, amends the 'County Police Department Act'. First Reading of the Bill. 1154, Washington, amends the 'Illinois Municipal Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 1155, Washington, amends and Act relating to the Cook County Police Department. First Reading of the Bill. 1156, Washington, creates the Human Rights and Liberty Commission. First Reading of the Bill. 1157, Washington, appropriates \$20,000 to the Human Rights and Liberty Commission. First Reading of the Bill. 1158, Washburn, an Act to authorize the Director of the Department of Transportation to study Water Shed in Livingston and Grundy Counties. First Reading of the Bill. 1159, Barry, requires the head of each Agency of the Executive Branch to submit a report each year to the Illinois



Economic and Fiscal Commission. First Reading of the Bill. 1160, Schlickman, amends the 'Sanitary District Act'. First Reading of the Bill. 1161, Craig, amends the 'Illinois Vehicle Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 1162, Craig, amends the 'County Zoning Act'. First Reading of the Bill. 1163, Murphy, defines the multi purpose of passenger vehicles. First Reading of the Bill. 1164, Redmond, amends an Act in relation to County Zoning. First Reading of the Bill. 1165, Redmond, amends the Downstate Police and the Downstate Firemen's Pension Fund. First Reading of the Bill. 1166, Matijevich, amends the State Employees' Pension Fund. First Reading of the Bill. 1167, Douglas, an Act in relation to the 'Illinois State Medical Disciplinary Board Act'. First Reading of the Bill. 1168, Douglas, amends the 'Medical Practice Act'. First Reading of the Bill. 1169, Totten, amends an Act to the 'Criminal Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 1170, Friedland, amends the 'Illinois Income Tax Act'. First Reading of the Bill. 1171, Clabaugh, amends the 'School Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 1172, Schlickman, amends the 'Municipal Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 1173, Lundy, amends 'The School Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 1174, Grotberg, amends the 'Toll Highway Act'. First Reading of the Bill. 1175, Ron Hoffman, amends the 'Public Aid Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 1176, Ron Hoffman, amends the 'School Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 1177, Hoffman, amends the 'Counties' Act'. 1178, Hoffman, amends the 'Illinois Municipal Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 1179, Jones... David,



amends the Town... Authorized Township, having less than a 100,000 population required by purchase. Otherwise, fire protection, rescue, andsoforth. First Reading of the Bill. 1180, Neff, appropriates \$15,000 to County Providence Commis- sion. First Reading of the Bill. 1181, Blades, creates an Act to vacate highway easement in Wayne County. First Read- ing of the Bill. 1182, Porter, amends the 'School Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 1183, Brinkmeier, amends the 'School Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 1184, Gibbs, amends the General Assembly Pension Fund. First Reading of the Bill. 1185, Kosinski, an Act to authorize the sale of certain real property in Cook County. First Reading of the Bill. 1186, Jaffe, amends the 'Workmen's Occupational Disease Act'. First Reading of the Bill. 1187, Jaffe, amends the Workmen's Compensation Act'. First Reading of the Bill. 1188, Bradley, amends the 'Election Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 1189, Blades, amends the Soil and Conservation District Law. First Reading of the Bill. 1190, Rayson, amends the 'Illinois Horse Racing Act'. First Reading of the Bill. 1191, Schneider, repeals an Act freeing persons from tuberculosis working for schools in School Districts. First Reading of the Bill. 1192, Calvo, amends the 'Illinois Municipal Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 1193, Cunningham, an Act in relation to the authorizing the formation of closed corporations. First Reading of the Bill. 1194, Mahar, amends an Act in relation to State Finance. First Reading of the Bill. 1195, Jaffe, amends an Act in relation to regulation



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

of the University of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. 1196, B. B. Wolfe, creates an Act in relation to the termination of pregnancies. First Reading of the Bill. 1197, B. B. Wolfe, creates the Illinois Educational Services Corporation. First Reading of the Bill. 1198,... Okay.. Okay, Paul. 1198, B. B. Wolfe, appropriates \$18,000,000 to the Illinois Educational Services Corporation. First Reading of the Bill. 1199, Malloy, an Act to amend the 'Credit Union Act'. First Reading of the Bill. 1200, amends the 'Revenue.... Skinner, Amends the 'Revenue Act'. First Reading of the Bill. 1201, Duff, an Act to create the Illinois Council on Criminal and Juvenile Justice. First Reading of the Bill. 1202, McCourt, amends the 'Township Act'. First Reading of the Bill. 1203, Brinkmeier, appropriates \$200,000 to the Superintendent of Public Instruction. First Reading of the Bill. 1204, Stedelin, amends the 'Environmental Protection Act'. First Reading of the Bill. 1205, McAuliffe, amends the 'Retailer's Occupational Tax Act'. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker: "Committee Reports."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Mr. North, from Cities and Villages, to which House Bill 500 was referred, reported the sameback with the recommendation that the Bill do pass. Mr. North, Cities, and Villages, to which House Bill 552 and 766 were referred, reported the sameback with Amendments thereto, with the recommendation that the Amendments be adopted and the Bills amended do not pass. Mr. North, from the Committee on Cities and Villages, to which House Bill 680 was referred, reported





the sameback with the recommendation that the Bill do pass. Mr. North, from Cities and Villages, to which Senate Bill 49 was referred, reported the sameback with the recommendation, do not pass. Mr. Bluthardt, from Election, to which House Bill 430 was referred, reported the sameback with the recommendation that the Amendments be adopted and the Bill, as amended, do pass. Mr. Bluthardt, from Elections, to which House Bill 617 was referred, reported the sameback with the recommendation that the Bill do pass. Mr. Duff, from Judiciary II, to which House Bill 461 was referred, reported the sameback with the recommendation that the Bill do not pass. Mr. Duff, from Judiciary II, to which House Bill 496 was referred, reported the sameback with Amendments thereto, with the recommendation that the Amendments be adopted and that the Bill, as amended, do pass. Mr. Duff, from Judiciary II, to which House Bills 501, 576 were referred, reported the sameback with the recommendation that the Bills do pass. Mr. Walsh, from Revenue, to which House Bills 407 and 410 were referred, reported the sameback with the recommendation that the Bills do not pass. Mr. Walsh, from Revenue, to which House Bills 589 were referred, reported the sameback with the recommendation that the Amendments be adopted and the Bills, as amended, do pass. Mr. Walsh, from Revenue, to which House Bill 666 was referred, reported the sameback with the recommendation that the Bill do pass. Mr. Neff, from Transportation, to which Senate Bill 177 was referred, reported the sameback with Amendments thereto, with the recommendation



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

that the Amendments be adopted and the Bill, as amended, do pass. Mr. Neff, from Transportation, to which Senate Bill 230 was referred, reported the sameback with the recommendation that the Bill do pass. Mr. Walsh, from Revenue, to which House Bill 392 was referred, reported the same. Pursuit to 23 (d), the Bill was ordered tabled. Mr. Capuzi, from Human Resources to which House Bill 794 was referred, reported the sameback with Amendments thereto with the recommendation that the Amendments be adopted and the Bills amended do pass. Ah.."

Speaker: "Constitutional Amendments Resolutions."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House ah.. Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment \*22, Hart, et.al. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 78th General Assembly, State of Illinois, Senate concurring therein, that there shall be submitted to the Electors of the State, for adoption or rejection, as the General Election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Section 9 of Article VII of the Constitution to read as follows: Article VII, Section 9, Salaries and Fees. A. Compensation of officers and employees of the Office Expense unit of local government. Shall not be paid from fees collected. Fees may be collected as provided by law and order and shall shall be deposited upon receipt to the Treasurer of the Unit. Fees shall not be paid upon funds dispursed or collected nor upon the levy or extension of taxes. However, when a county



officer collects taxes for other units of local government, the county may charge the other units of local government actual cost of collecting such taxes, which cost may be distributed among the several units involved proportionately on the basis of the amount of taxes collected for the respective units. B. An increase or decrease in salary of an elected officer or any unit of local government shall not take effect during the term on which the officer elected is scheduled. This amendment shall take effect upon the first day of January in the year following its adoption. First Reading of the Constitutional Amendment. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 23. Fleck, et al. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 78th General Assembly, State of Illinois, Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the Electors of the state at the General Election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Sections 1, 3, 7 and 15 of Article V, the Constitution to read as follows: Article V, Section 1. Officers of the Executive Branch and to include the Governor, Lt. Governor, Attorney General, Solicitor General, Secretary of State, Comptroller and Treasurer, elected by the electors of the State. They shall keep the Public Records and maintain a residence of seat of government during their terms of office. Section 3. Eligibility. To be eligible to hold office, the Governor, Lt. Governor, Attorney



General, Solicitor General, Secretary of State, Comptroller, and Treasurer, a person must be a United State Senator, at least 25 years old and a resident of the State for three years preceding his election. 7. Vacancies and Other Elective Offices. If the Attorney, Solicitor General, Secretary of State, Comptroller or Treasurer fail to qualify, or if his office becomes vacant, the Governor shall fill the office by appointment. The appointee shall hold office until the elected officer qualifies or until a successor is elected and qualified as provided by law, and shall not be subject to removal by the Governor. If the Lt. Governor fails to qualify or if his office becomes vacant, it shall remain vacant until the end of the term. Section 15. Attorney General, Solicitor General Duties. A. The Attorney General, shall be the legal officer of the State, except with respect to those matters invested in the Solicitor General by Paragraph B of this Section. B. The Solicitor General shall defend the State and its officers and agencies and all proceedings in which any of them is a defendant. Schedule. The First Solicitor General shall be elected at the General Election in 1976, for a term of two years, commencing on the Second Monday of January, 1977. Thereafter, the Election in term of the Solicitor General shall be as provided in Section 2 of Article V of the Constitution. First Reading of the Constitutional Amendment."



K. Miller: "Gentleman from Johnson, Mr. McCormick, moves the House adjourn.... recess until 9:30 AM. So ordered."

Honorable W. Robert Blair: "The House will be in Order. The invocation will be by Doctor Johnson."

Doctor Johnson: "We pray. Almighty God, when life becomes difficult and the strain of responsibility weighs heavily upon us, then rid us of the arrogant delusion that in our age, it's harder to live and that the problems of this day are more difficult to cope with. Remind us, Oh, God, that it's taxing to live decently and according to your will, at any time, and when we think we have more excuses for our muddling and eroded standards because we live in these particular days, remind each one of us that we help make the days what they are. Above all, remind us that you are the same yesterday, today, and forevermore. Teach us by your sane word, therefore, that we commit our lives to you daily. You will neither leave us or forsake us, but withhold us with fresh assurances of your care and concern. Bestow your spirit upon us this day and this Session, and be with us then as we



return to our homes and bring us back in safety to this Assembly of Government. We ask this in the name of our Redeemer. Amen."

Honorable W. Robert Blair: "Roll Call for attendance." Committee Report."

Selcke: "Mr Tuerk, from Industrial Affairs, to which House Bill 448 was referred, reported sending back with a recommendation the Bill do pass."

Honorable W. Robert Blair: "Introductions."

Selcke: "House Bill 1206. Choate et al. Amends Workmen's Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1207. Choate et al. Amends the Occupational Disease Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1208. Schneider et al. Creates an Act relating to Public Employees Personnel Files. First Reading of the Bill."

Honorable W. Robert Blair: "Agreed Resolutions."

Selcke: "House Resolution 200. Lemke et al. House Resolution 202. Terzich et al. House Resolution 204. Lemke et al. House Resolution 206. Deavers."

Honorable W. Robert Blair: Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, these are the agreed resolutions. House Resolution 200 commends Monsignor Theodore Kesaroski. House Resolution 202 congratulates the St. Gaul Junior and Senior Division bands. House Resolution 204 commends the ah.... Mothers Club of the Good Shepard Catholic



Church. And House Resolution 206 ah.... congratulates the highly skilled computer operators of the Legislative Reference Bureau, and House Joint Resolution 32 is the Adjournment Resolution....."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Wait a minute. 32 the Clerk advises is not agreed, yet."

Walsh: "Also, excluding, House Joint Resolution 32, then, I move the adoption of the ah.... Agreed Resolutions."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, ah.... all those in favor.... Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Did you take 32 cut so that there's just those congratulatory resolutions?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Introductions."

Selcke: "House Bill 1209. Schlickman. Amends the Metropolitan Authority Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1210. North et al. Amends an act to provide a law in relation to counties. First Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "House Bills, Third Reading."

Selcke: "House Bill 3. Hanahan. An Act in relation to settlement of differences between public employers and public employees and providing for collective bargaining. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 3 is the State Labor Relations Board Act, that is created by this Bill, that would fill the void in the Statute Books



concerning the area of collective bargaining in the public sector. There is no greater need in this State than some statutory provided law that would once and for all end the confusion on whether or not Public employees have a right to be bargained in behalf of by organizations set up to represent public employees with their public employer. House Bill 3 would create a State labor relations board, which would supervise the recognition of public employee representatives. In all the years I've served in the General Assembly, everybody pays lip service to the fact that we need a collective bargaining law. Some people feel it should be more strict. Some people feel it should make other provisions in it, but I think everybody agrees that we need in this day and age in Illinois a law called collective bargaining in the public sector. If we want to continue along with the area of judicial decisions, such as the Hartigan decision, that allow public employees to be represented, by public employers, and we want to go along with the various other decisions allowing public employee representatives to be representing public employees, then we just keep on going without a bill such as House Bill 3. But if you are sincere, in the area that we want to sit down into law, a way of prohibiting, a way of providing relief from, strikes in the public sector, especially in the area of recognition, this Bill would provide such a relief. Ninety percent of all strikes in the public sector





have been caused because of the refusal of recognition. Not over the old scares of wages, powers, or working conditions, but just over the fact that Public employers and public employees are not provided with the law, providing some statutory provisions of how to recognize and how to deal with and how to work with collective bargaining in the public sector. This bill provides that all public employees would be under the arm of the State Labor Relations Board. The only exemptions would be the non-academic employees at the University systems that now have some form of collective bargaining. The other public body that would not be under the umbrella of House Bill 3 would be the Chicago Transit Authority, which by statute now allows collective bargaining. I would like to point out that the provisions of the Act have been amended with many amendments. One for conscientious objectors. One to bring in the anti-injunction act. Another one to provide clarification on the academic employees being brought in under the Bill. Representative Hyde put in the mutual consent amendment, which took out mutual consent, or any aspersions to the fact that it could be a sweetheart agreements between employees and employer organizations. Other amendments concerning unfair labor practices, discrimination on race, creed or sex, have been amended into the Bill. This Bill has been around a long time. The members of the General Assembly have been offered and have been allowed the right with no



speed up of moving the bill without the chances of ah... provisions that members should have the right to offer amendments to the Bill. The debate on the Bill has been heard by the old timers, members who have been serving on here in the General Assembly before. This is a labor bill. This is a number one priority bill of labor and I suggest to the Members of the General Assembly there are no segments of labor. There are no union organizations. There are no organizations within the umbrella of the AFL-CIO or those without the umbrella of the AFL-CIO that are in opposition to this Bill. The Teamsters, the autoworkers and the all Members of the AFL-CIO are in favor of this Bill. In fact, if anything, they would like a stronger bill, but I suggest to the Members, to the Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, that if you want to fill the void, if you want to do something for working people in Illinois in the Public sector, then vote for House Bill 3. If you want to nitpick or find excuses not to vote for working people, that's your privilege, but then when working people request of you some relief, some help in the way of legislation, this is the Bill that is provided for you to vote on in order to give this relief. Now, I know there will be questions on the right to strike and I suggest to those Members that consider it a right to strike is an important issue on why they support to oppose House Bill 3, that they've had plenty of opportunity to introduce bills prohibiting the right to strike. They've



had plenty of opportunities to clarify the right to strike. To use the bill that is set up to create a State Labor Relations Act is not, in my judgment, the vehicle to use to attack other issues or other ills in our society such as policemen, firemen or prison guards striking. If this prohibition is necessary, if this prohibition is need, I suggest to those members of the General Assembly that feel that strongly about it that they introduce legislation to that affect and let it stand or be defeated on its own merits. But when you want a collective bargaining recognition law, a State Labor Relations Act, House Bill 3 proports to do nothing else it does not proport to do anything in any other area except grant statutes that would provide for an orderly recognition of public employees choosing their collective bargaining representative in mandating the public employer to sit down, negotiate any question on recognition or any question on the hours, working conditions and wages of the public employee. With that I would leave open to question any of the aspects of the bill or answer any criticism of the bill in closing.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise not only to oppose this bill but ask for a ruling from the Chair."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. State your point."



Tuerk: "My point is, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if you look at Section 16 of this Bill and I shall read it. It is very short. This Act supercedes all previous statutes concerning this subject matter and shall preempt all contrary local ordinances, executive orders or legislation. My point is, how many votes will this require to pass?"

W. Robert Blair: "All right. The Chair's prepared to rule on that question. Does anybody care to ah.. ah.. take a ah.. Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan, do you desire to be heard on it?"

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I don't understand the question of the ruling if this Act is a new Act and it's going to be.. provides a new statute. I don't see where there's any rules or any constitutional question on whether or not an Act needs more than a simple majority of ah.. a constitutional majority of 89 to pass."

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

Choate: "Ah.. yes, Mr. Speaker, would you have the Gentleman to state his question again? I'm not sure that I understood it or heard it right. If I heard it right I don't understand it."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. Gentleman from Peoria or the Gentleman from McHenry. Gentleman from Peoria."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, my point of inquiry was based on Article VII, Section 6(g) of the Constitution. And the wording of this bill would,



in my opinion, preempt home rule units of government from adopting ordinances. For example, prohibiting strikes, etc. And it's my feeling, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that this bill will require a 3/5 majority to become law."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, while we're looking these things up, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to you Chuck Campbell's wife and mother-in-law, Marge Campbell and Grace Barton sitting over in the gallery to my right."

W. Robert Blair: "Well, it would appear to the Chair that the Gentleman's point of order would be well-taken that Section 16 does direct itself to the question of preemption ah.. ah.. concerning the subject matter of ah.. this bill so that ah.. local home rule units would not be able to ah.. ah.. function in this area. We would be, ah.. in other words, denying or limiting the power of home rule units to ah.. act in this area and under the provisions of Section 6(g) that would require a 3/5 vote. Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the question I've got then, are there any local ordinances? Are there any Executive Orders? Or is there any legislation that this is preempting? That fact they may is the question. And I



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

suggest that there are no local ordinances, there are no executive orders, nor is there any legislation this is preempting. Whether in home rule or non-home rule counties or cities."

W. Robert Blair: "Well, the fact is that it is a power or a function which is now vested in a home rule unit."

Hanahan: "Well, that's the question. Is it a.."

W. Robert Blair: "Yes, it is."

Hanahan: "Do they have the right to do this?"

W. Robert Blair: "It would be.. it is a power or a function which home rule units could now exercise. And under the provisions of Section 16 you would be denying those home rule units the power that they have. And that requires a 3/5 vote in the opinion of the Chair."

Hanahan: "The question is on the ruling before it's completely finalized, I would suggest how a home rule county could or how a home rule unit can set up a State Labor Relations Board in a county or a city. It can't. I suggest that the bill does not create local.. or preempt local labor relation boards. This is for a State Labor Relations Act. It says so in the preamble. It says in the synopsis and it says throughout the bill we are creating a State Labor Relations Act. We are not providing a city, a county, a municipal organization, a local government unit with any provision of preemption. It is.. I just suggest that you cannot set up a State Labor Relations Act by a county ordinance



or a city ordinance."

W. Robert Blair: "Well, what you're addressing yourself to in part on this bill affects the power of a home or function of the home rule unit to deal with its public employees. And ah.. that is a power which they have now as home rule units. And where you would be attempting to limit ah.. that power of a local home rule unit to deal with its employees. And if you'll note in Section 2.. If you'll note in Section 2, public employer means not only the State of Illinois but any political subdivision of the State including without limitation any town, city, county, bureau, district, township, etc."

Hanahan: "Well, you know, I understand your ruling, Sir. But I really disagree with the interpretation that somehow a State Labor Relations Act would preclude some local unit of government from dealing with its employees. We're just setting up an umbrella organization to make sure that it is done in a local level and public employee represented. But, your ruling will stand I hope to receive 107 votes. I hope to receive 177 votes. But I'll accept your ruling but I don't believe that in trying to set up a State Labor Relations Act we're preempting any rights of a home rule county or a home rule city in this state."

W. Robert Blair: "Well, I'm advised that under the present time under existing law that a city for example could



prohibit a strike by its ah.... employees, and it could prohibit a strike right now.... "

Hanahan: "But I don't authorize it in this Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Wait a minute. It could prohibit a strike right now. It could prohibit a union shop right now, and that would be denied to the ah.... home rule units under the provisions of this legislation."

Hanahan: "I would suggest there's a lot of legislation that this question is going to have to be addressed to, then, and.... I mean, the ruling.... if the ruling wants to stick, I don't mind it. I would just suggest, then, on every Bill that we pass, we're going to have to have these rulings and we're going to have some uniformity on it, because if we're going to say that State Labor Relations Act is going to preempt some home rule jurisdiction under the Constitution, I could name 50 Bills, whether it's monitoring ah.... easedropping by employees of the Bell Telephone Company, this question could be addressed to. Every Bill that we present ourselves now, in some way, a City of Chicago could pass an ordinance on. So then, therefore, the 89 votes no longer will be meaningful in this Legislature. A 107 votes will be needed for every bill in this Legislature if this question is asked."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I don't..... that would have to look at each question as it comes up, but it would be the Chair's decision that ah.... you would be invading the present power or function of a home rule unit ah.... to





pass ordinances concerning ah.... this Labor Relation with its employees, and it seems the Chair thinks that is the very thing to which Section 6G of the Constitution addresses itself, and that since we are denying or limiting that presently existing power, that it would require a three-fifths vote. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Yeow, I'm wondering if the ..... now that I've read Section 16 and it's been called to my attention, there's two questions here. This Act supersedes are previous statutes, and shall preempt all other legislation, would be what I think were in effect is by implication repealing statutes, and I would ask if we could do that?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I ah.... is your question concerning the validity of that Section ah... or its implications or what is your parliamentary inquiry?"

Shea: "Ah.... I would direct it to the sponsor and ask him what the attempt is, if I could."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right." Gentleman from McHenry."

Hanahan: "Yes, the reason for Section 16 was in case there were any intervening statutes placed when the Bill was introduced and any statute in this area, that this would supersede. There are no statutes that I have any knowledge of in this area as setting up a State Labor Relations Act. There are no local ordinances in this area and there are no executive orders to the contrary concerning a State Labor Relations Board or even a Local Labor Relations Board or even a County Labor Relations Board. It's just



preclusion that in case there were some, but we can't find them in the statute book, and we're trying to create a new act."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, is there any further.... Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield to a question?"

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

Schlickman: "Representative, do I understand that with regard to the....."

Hanahan: "I can't hear you."

Schlickman: "Do I understand that with regard to the specific Section, I believe it was Section 16, that the ah.... object, purpose and intention of that Section, is that the State would be exercising an exclusive jurisdiction with regard to the subject of the Bill?"

Hanahan: "Yes, I... I would venture to say that the interpretation of Section 16 would make it a... a.... State function to operate and provide the personnel and all to create a State Labor Relations Act."

Schlickman: "Now, I don't have a copy of the Bill here, but does that Section specifically declare, specifically declare that the State exercise would be exclusive?"

Hanahan: "I don't believe that that would be true; that if a State Labor Relations Act were adopted by the State of Illinois that it would prevent a county, a city, a park district, from setting up ordinances concerning a Labor Relations Act."



Schlickman: "It would not?"

Hanahan: "I don't believe it would. I think this would be the umbrella making sure they'd come within the provisions of this Act, but I think a park district in some community that wanted to set up a Labor Relations Act and provide its own benefits, as long as it was within this Act, they would provide it."

Schlickman: "Then are we talking about concurrent jurisdiction between the State and....."

Hanahan: "Right now, my interpretation of all the municipal ordinances and to the best of my knowledge, I know of no local ordinance, no executive order, or no statute creating a Labor Relations Act in Illinois today, by any municipal or political subdivision of the State."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ah.... is there any other discussion? Now, on the ah.... subject matter of the Bill, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, am I in order to ah.... question the Sponsor?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Oh, sure."

Kosinski: "Will he yield, Sir?"

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

Kosinski: "Representative Hanahan, my district and I are violently opposed to the privilege of people connected with Public Safety, having the right to strike. Does this Bill give them this right?"



Hanahan: "Emphatically, no. This Bill does nothing whatsoever in the area of giving anyone the privilege or the right to strike anymore than it prohibits it. I believe the collective bargaining state labor relations act which is before us, sets up a recognition procedure. It has nothing whatsoever to do with granting any rights to any citizens that they don't presently have right now or prohibit any rights that any citizen wants to take right now."

Kosinski: "Thank you, Mr. Sponsor."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Ah. .... Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of this Assembly. Would the Sponsor yield to three questions?"

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

Geo-Karis: "Ah.... Mr. Hanahan, your paragraph 3, Section 3 in your Bill specifically says, the last three lines of it, quote, "and to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection, free from interference, restrain or coercion." Does that not mean that they would have the right to strike?"

Hanahan: "The answer to the question is that we are not granting to any public employee any right that he now does not presently have under this Bill. Section 3 to the contrary."



Geo-Karis: "And under your Section 16 of your Bill, the last Section, when you say 'this Act supersedes all previous Statutes concerning this subject matter and shall preempt all contrary local ordinances, executive orders or legislation.' Aren't you saying, in effect, that the Legislature can't do a thing about it once this Bill passes?"

Hanahan: "Oh, no, ah.... the Legislature with a vote of this House and Senate could amend this Bill at any time or amend any Statute at any time concerning this subject of a State Labor Relations Act."

Geo-Karis: "My third question. Mr. Hanahan, isn't it true that when a Public employee, is in the employ of the Public....."

Hanahan: "I can't hear you now. I'm sorry I'm getting a lot of over-ride here now."

Geo-Karis: "When a person works for the public or any agency of the public. Can you hear me now, Mr. Hanahan? Isn't it true....."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "I wonder if those persons that are there in the aisle by Mr. Hanahan, would ah... move ah... hold down their conversation level so he can hear the questions. It's going to be a long day and ah.... I think it would be helpful to expedite the legislation, if we'd be in our seats and ah.... if we would keep our conversations as low as possible."



Geo-Karis: "Isn't it true, Mr. Hanahan, that when a person works for any Public unit of government, state local, et cetera, they're working for a public agency which is not ordinarily a money making organization, that can't share the wealth of their profits?"

Hanahan: "I'm very sincere in this. I cannot understand the question. If I'm getting you right, are you saying that these are public employees not working for a profit and ....."

Geo-Karis: "Isn't the State government, the county government, the school government, the township government, the municipal government, aren't they all agencies working not for profit?"

Hanahan: "I.... Representative, please, I don't want to be embarrassed. I am death in one ear, and I'm having one hell of a time trying to hear you, and it isn't.... the question is, who is a public employee?"

Geo-Karis: "No, my question is, I'll repeat and slower, and I'm sorry if you can't hear me too well."

Hanahan: "Would they turn up the volume, please, so I could hear it?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "They say they've got it up as high as they can get it. If we would hold down our conversations I'm sure it would expedite the process."

Geo-Karis: "Isn't it true, Mr. Hanahan, that your units of school districts, your units of city or village districts, your unit of township, your unit of county, your unit of



state government, are not money making organizations? They are public, not money making organizations, and they cannot share the wealth or profits that we could have done in a private organization?"

Hanahan: "Very true. This Bill deals only with public employees and nobody else."

Geo-Karis: "My next question. And then should any governmental agency, which is in the business of giving services to the public and not for purposes of profit, be shut down at any time which your Section 3 would permit this to happen under your concerted activities section, giving the right to engage in concerted activities and to strike. In other words, when your house is burning and the firemen are on strike, they're not suppose to go and look after your house. Isn't that right, Mr. Hanahan?"

Hanahan: "Well, being a lawyer, Representative, I'm sure you know the kind of question you're asking is like when did I last quit beating my wife. The question, I think, put in the proper context, to me as sponsor of the Bill, would say, do I give a public employee the right to strike. And I suggest you know. I give no rights to any public employee that he does not presently have."

Geo-Karis: "And I suggest, Representative Hanahan, that you are giving the public employees that are engaged in health and welfare, occupations like police and fire, the right to strike when you say in your Section 3 that



they can engage in concerted activities. I would like to speak against this Bill. I think it is a horrible Bill. I believe in compulsory arbitration. I'm committed to it and I would like to call to the attention of this Assembly if I may, three cases. The Illinois Appellate Court in the case of Fletcher vs. the Civil Service Commission of Waukegan, said that a strike of governmental employees for any purposes are illegal. The Universal rule is that there is no inhering constitutional rights given to public employees to strike against their employers, be it municipal, state or federal employees. In the case that brought that out, was the Brown case. The U.S. Supreme Court, United Federation of Postal Clerks, 325 federal supplement 879, which is a 1971 case."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, ah.... let me make a ah... announcement. Those of you who are ah... first termers. Ah.... all the parking lot spaces have now been assigned by seniority, down through the second termers, and ah.... it is being done by lot within seniority groups. Ah.... we have the ah.... first termers names and if they'll just come down and draw out of a box down here, ah.... the numbers, that's the way we can get your parking lot assigned to you. Just by drawing it out of the thing, while we are processing through here, and so when you come back, everybody will hopefully a painted identified parking space. Ah.... all right, now, Mr.





Hudson."

Hudson: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill, but I want it perfectly clear in so doing. I want it perfectly clear that in rising in opposition to this Bill, I detract .... this is meant to detract nothing whatsoever from my respect for and ah... admiration of ah.... the Sponsor of the Bill and his dedication and ah.... to the purpose and the cause that he believes he serves. So having said that, I would like to say this, that in my opinion, if there is a reason, for this Bill, which permits collective bargaining in the public sector, it should be to assure a continuity of services to the public. I feel that this Bill fails this specific bill fails to do that. It does allow the right to strike in the public sector, because it introduces collective bargaining into the public sector, and therefore I think it would lead to work stoppages, even by policemen and firemen. It does not meet the minimum requirements to protect the right of the individual not to join, and I give Tom Hanahan credit the other day, I think he was very understanding about an Amendment that was added to the Bill that did permit members of certain religious sects, not to contribute their money directly to the union, and I respect him for his attitude concerning that. But I would draw it further. I feel that every man and every woman should have a right not to join a union if they so choose, particularly in



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

the public sector. Thereby, I feel that this Bill is introducing an element of compulsion that is bad in the public sector. This Bill would put public and private employees on the same footing in this regard, and I think this is wrong, because public employees are employed by the taxpayers of the people of the State of Illinois. The people as a whole, if you will, and private employees are not - in private industry, in business, the strike, for example, is the last resort that labor has and the last resort that they choose to use to get larger share of corporate revenues. The expenses involved are passed on to the consumer in higher prices, perhaps lower dividends to the stockholders, but not so in the public sector. The expenses are passed on in the form of higher taxes. The other day we were treated to ah... quote from a famous writer, Jack London, and I would like to read to you, I feel I'm entitled to another quote from a gentleman that some of you remember, Franklin D. Roosevelt, of some years back, and I would like to read to you something that I think is important to hear. He said in 1937, 'All government employees should realize that the process of collective bargaining as usually understood cannot be transplanted into the public service. Militant tactics have no place in the functions of any organization of government employees. A strike of public employees manifest nothing less than an intent on their part to prevent or obstruct the operations of

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

government until their demands are satisfied.' He went on to say, 'Public employees are employed by the whole people, whose interest in welfare require orderliness and continuity in the conduct of government activities. Government cannot go out of business. School pupils are not customers who can decline to buy if a price is too high. If they stay away, government pursues them with truancy laws. Nor are taxpayers able to quit in disgust, bankruptcy or retirement. If public employees are encouraged by statute to prevent or obstruct the operations of government, until their demands are satisfied, law becomes absurd and government paralyzed.' I think that's not a bad statement of what I'm trying to .... a summary of what I'm trying to say.' I feel if this Bill passes, we have surrendered to a wrong idea. We have turned the decision of what government services will cost over to forces beyond our control. Our appropriations committee here in the legislature might as well stay home. Perhaps the legislature itself in this regard. Costs will escalate. We have undermined the right of the people through their elected representatives to make decisions which are properly ours. We are undermining to this extent representative government and I respectfully urge a no vote on this Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I apologize for interrupting the proceedings, but



I would just like to take two or three seconds to introduce ah... a group of young students from the Rock Falls Junior High School down here to visit the House today and acknowledge the fact they're here under their director, Mr. Don Loftus, right up here behind us."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Peoria. Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, there's been quite a bit of discussion this morning relative to strikes by public employees. And the Sponsor of this Bill, says that this Bill does not allow public employees to strike. During the early part of this debate, I would suggest to every Member of this House, to take a look at Section 3 line 1, on Page 3, which defines the fact that the public employee, this bill gives public employees the right to engage in other concerted activities, and my knowledge of NLRB rulings is that this includes strikes. Whether you want to agree with this or not, the facts remain that this Bill would allow public employees to strike. Now the other day when I tried to tack that amendment on to this Bill, I did not prevail, but I thought very assuredly, that we came up with some good arguments, relative to the prohibition of strikes, relative to this Bill. Now let me delineate for you, just for a moment, the difference in my estimation between public employees being allowed to strike and the private sector employees allowed to strike. I think you have a difference here in that the ones that are going to lose in the long run are the



taxpayers of the State of Illinois, because the taxpayers have no input in attempting to settle a strike as opposed to the management labor negotiation ah.... system in a private sector. Now that takes care of this one point of whether employees in the public sector are allowed to strike and I submit to you they are by the provisions of this Bill. I oppose House Bill 3 for a number of other reasons and if there is a reason for this Bill or any Bill dealing with collective bargaining rights of public employees, it definitely should assure the continuation of governmental services which House Bill 3 fails to do. If this Bill passes, it is predictable and certain that the cost of State government and local government will substantially increase. House Bill 3 fails to meet the minimum requirements I feel should be included in any legislation providing the mechanism for collective bargaining of public employees. It should, as I mentioned a moment ago, prohibit all strike and work stoppages by public employees and it should be voluntary in membership requirements which House Bill 3 fails to address itself to. It also should prohibit mandatory binding arbitration, and these are some of the main points that I make in opposition. In summary, I feel that House Bill 3 is fraught with peril. It is weighted in favor of the public employee unions, to the detriment of public employees, the public employers and the taxpayer and I submit to the Membership of the House that



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

you take a real hard look at this, before you cast your vote, and I would suggest a negative vote on this Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Does the gentleman from Champaign wish recognition? Mr. Clabaugh? No. Is there any other discussion? Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Kriegsman, you're on."

Kriegsman: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen. My reasons for being against House Bill Number 3 are very simple. If you want to have a whole group of unhappy state employees, vote for House Bill 3. If you want to raise taxes, vote for House Bill 3. If you want to see more regulations thrust on State employees, vote for House Bill 3. If you want to see another disregard for the right of...."

K. Miller: "Just a moment. For what reason does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, arise?"

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, could you get some order in this Chamber, please?"

K. Miller: "I certainly will try, Mr. Shea. The House will be in order, please. Proceed."

Kriegsman: "If you want to see another disregard for the rights of the citizens of the State of Illinois, vote for House Bill 3. If you want to see a deterioration of workmanship in the State of Illinois, by State employees, vote for House Bill 3. If you want to put the power of ruling State employees in the hands of a few labor leaders, vote for House Bill 3. Therefore,



I vote against House Bill Number 3."

K. Miller: "Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Ah.... would it be.... point of inquiry, Mr.

Speaker. Would it be appropriate or inappropriate at this time, for me to ask for a verification from the Speaker, as far as the ruling was concerned a moment ago on 107 votes?"

K. Miller: "The ruling.... ah.... Representative Choate, was that it takes 107 votes."

Choate: "Is that your ruling?"

K. Miller: "That was the Chair's ruling. Yes, Sir."

Choate: "All right."

K. Miller: "Is there anyother discussion? The gentleman from McHenry may close."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. If I was back in 1934 or 1935 when President Roosevelt made his statement, I would tend to think that his statement fitted that era. It was an era when employees in the private sectors didn't have the rights or organizing. It was in an era of the time when we didn't have the National Labor Relations Act, and I say thirty years later, in Illinois, we haven't got a State Labor Relations Act. We're a little bit behind the times when it comes to the question of public employment versus private employment. In the year 1934, a province in the country of Canada, a very backwards province, called Sashkasuwan, graveled with the question and they passed collective



bargaining for public employees in Canada. Many states in the Nation have passed public employees labor relation acts. Some have prohibited strikes, some have penalized strikers, some have penalized the striking organizations. To date, you and I know that if a public employee does go on strike, the first negotiable item will be the removal of any penalty for the strikers in order for the strike to be settled. But that's another question. The question before us is House Bill 3, which has nothing, I say nothing to do with granting rights to a public employee at the present time does not have under law, even though the Chicago Tribune has not learned yet, that there is no law prohibiting strikes by public employees. I just suggest to those Members that want to prohibit public employees from striking, they should put in a statute, a bill, to that question, but to mingle a bill that is set up to preclude and prevent strikes by a statutory provisions of recognition, which in the onset, I said, 90% of all public employee strikes, are caused from recognition strikes, not from wages, hours, and conditions. When we have strikes in the public sector, it is generally because the public body and the public employees have not negotiated. To preclude this, we said by law, in House Bill 3, provisions of setting down an orderly procedure for recognition. If an impact happens after this, we provide for arbitration, mediation and consiliation. There are no gimics in this Bill. It





is a simple up and down Bill and I say in all seriousness that those who are in opposition to this Bill, I suggest would also be in favor of a right to work law. Would also be in favor of, a yellow dog contract law, or any other type of anti-union proposition that is to be brought before this general assembly. I have been here long enough to be able to judge other members ideas on areas of unionism and trade unionism. I suggest that Members who are against House Bill 3 would be for a right to work law. I suggest those same members would be for a yellow dog contract, and if you want to be aligned with that kind of opposition, don't give me the 107 votes, and I suggest that those Members who don't vote on the question are giving aid to the defeat of House Bill 3. We now need 107 votes under the ruling of the Chair, which I think is unfortunate, and unfair, because now it is going to put on the backs of many members who wanted to side-step the question, that we need your vote, we're asking you in support of the trade union movement, in support of working people, public employees, people who need this right, the right of being recognized as citizens, as human beings, with the same rights and desires of any other person working in the private sector. The public employee does not get a tax break. A public employee does not get bread for any less money or meat for any less money than a private citizen. I suggest there is no difference, economically in whether you work for a



private employer or a public employer when it comes to paying your bills. You don't get your cars cheaper. You don't get your clothing cheaper. You don't get your medicine cheaper. You have the same desires of getting something out of life as any person in the private sector. I think under the law, you have to recognize this. I think under law, we have to fill this void, where we have a no man land. I say once again, this House Bill 3 does not give any public employee any right to strike that he does not have right now. So if you want to prevent public employee strikes, vote for House Bill 3. At least you'll prevent 90% of them. If you want to prevent public employees from striking under any condition, then introduce a Bill to that effect and see if it will stand on its own merit. Don't attach a State Labor Relations Board Act with some sort of gimmick about public employees, policemen, firemen, prison guards, or whoever, in the public sector, that they are somewhat less than any other citizen in Illinois. They breathe, they got blood in their veins, and they've got desires like you, I and everyone else in this State. We need an Act. House Bill 3 provides them with it, and I urge 107 votes from the Membership of this Floor."

K. Miller: "The question is, shall House Bill Number 3 pass?"

All in favor, signify by voting 'aye'. Opposed 'no'.

The Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis, is recognized."



recognized."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, before I explain my vote, I rise on a point of personal privilege. I deplore and absolutely abhor the tactics of the Sponsor to label anyone and everyone in this room as anti-union, simply because they don't agree with his rotten bill, and I take issue on it. And now, my record is well known in favor of labor. I've sponsored many Bills for labor, and I will not have him cast against me because I'm going to disagree with him, and I disagree with him violently. This Bill would deter, would stop public employees from assuming the continuing function of the governmental units. I have every compassion with compulsory arbitration. The Supreme Court of the United States has already ruled on it and the Universal rule is in the Case of Brown vs. the Postal Clerks, 325 Federal Supplement 879, that the Constitutional right to strike is not the public employees, because of the inherent ability and responsibility to continue as a public function. It's really said, when we have to have reasons and must throw them against us as anti-labor. I would submit that I'm probably more for labor than he is, and therefore I cast my vote 'no' against a deplorable bill which would prevent the policemen from looking after crime and prevent the firemen from looking after fire, because of the right to strike under this horrible bill."



K. Miller: "Any other discussion? The Representative from DuPage, Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, take exception to the entrance that I am against the legitimate interest of labor simply because I oppose this Bill and some of the provisions in this Bill. I still hold to the right that I believe I have to object to the introduction of unionism in the public sector, particularly when unionism can lead to a close shop. As a matter of fact, implicit in this Bill, is the close shop provision, and I feel that if this Bill even were to pass, it should have in it, provide in it, the right of a public employee to join or not to join and that is not a part of this Bill. As a matter of fact, yes I do feel that all citizens of this country should have a right to join a union, and I support that right. He should also have a right not to join if he so wants to. To me this is liberty and freedom. Yesterday on the floor of this House, I listened to long and empassioned speeches about the stop and frisk law, and we were told that this was a ucerpation of our liberties and our freedoms, but where are the same arguments when it comes to right of a man to join or not to join a union. I think he has this right in this free country of ours, and I support his right to join and also his right not to join. I'm not even convinced the public employees want this Bill. This hasn't been shown to me or demonstrated to me. I don't



know what kind of a poll has been taken, but from what I can gather, no real poll has been taken and the public .... there is no proof offered that the public employees actually want what is being offered here. So I respectfully once again offer these comments as my reasons with all due respect again to the sponsor of the Bill but I offer these as my reasons for voting the way I'm voting here today."

K. Miller: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen, is recognized."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah.... I would just like to say that I am in favor of Public employees having the right to ah... bargain or negotiate for benefits as related to wages and fringe benefits and working conditions. And ah.... I probably would have supported this Bill if the Sponsor had accepted Amendment Number 2, sponsored by Representative John Grotberg, which clearly defined what a strike was, it did not prohibit a strike, except during the ah... time of negotiations, and ah... it clearly allowed, when there was an impasse reached, a 15 day notice of a pending strike was in order unless that particular strike would endanger the health and safety and welfare of the people of the State of Illinois, in which case an injunction would be issued by the courts, and ah.... as far as the Bill is concerned, if it had included this Amendment, I think I could have perhaps supported it, but I am going



to vote 'no', have voted 'no', and would encourage others to do join with me. Thank you."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Henderson, Representative Clarence Neff."

Neff: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, I'm voting no for the reason that I've received over 100 letters from employees, mostly state employees, that are opposed to House Bill 3. I have not received one letter in support of it, and therefore, to represent the People from my district, it is my obligation to vote 'no'."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, during the short time that I've been in this General Assembly, I've heard a great deal of discussion about the fact that we're here to serve people. We're a people oriented group, and we're working in their behalf. Visualize, if you would, the Mayor of a community whose been elected by the majority of the people in his community, who represent them, who has the responsibility for their health and their welfare and their safety, not being able to send orders to his police department or fire department without first checking with somebody else. He might find someday that in which he has some particular problem in his community, that his police department or his fire department are on strike. Now I ask you, would this be serving the people? Is this in their best interest? Can we afford



to do this at this time. I, too, like people who have spoken before, recognize the need for collective bargaining. For fair wages. For the right to be heard and the good way of life. But I think we're going just a little bit too far, and I vote 'no'."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Livingston, Representative Hunsicker, is recognized."

Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in regard to my 'no' vote on the board, I'd just like to say this. I have received a lot of communications on this particular bill, mostly state employees, and they are overwhelmingly the ones who are state employees in my district, are opposed to House Bill 3, and therefore my 'no' vote."

K. Miller: "Representative from Cook County, Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House and especially to the Sponsor of this Bill, I would like to point out that I have never been and will never be for the right to strike, right to work law, rather, in the State of Illinois, or a yellow dog contract, and I'm certainly not anti-union, but we're not talking about private enterprise here, where there's a manufacturer of a product involved, or there are corporate stockholders. We're talking about forcing the taxpayers of Illinois to join a union in order to work for the very state that they're a resident of and pay taxes to. And I would just



like to point out that the employees of this General Assembly are state employees and that includes your secretary, and I would like to see what you do when your secretary goes on strike and you look at the mail pile up in your office, because you can't answer your constituents. I'll tell you what you'll do. You'll go out and hire an outside secretary and voucher it out and in effect, be a strike-breaker, and I'm really worried when I see all these green lights go on the board, for an obviously poor piece of legislation, because you haven't got the guts to vote 'no', because you're afraid the unions might not give you a flag."

K. Miller: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Skinner wishes to be reported as voting 'present'. Representative Londrigan reported as 'aye', please. Representative Hart is 'aye'. Londrigan 'aye'. Representative Hart wishes to be recorded as 'no'. For what question, does the gentleman from McHenry, arise?"

Hanahan: "Point of order. Point of information, Im requesting, is how many votes does it take to over-ride the ruling of the Chair, in concerning whether it takes 107 votes or 89 votes on the passage of House Bill 3?"

K. Miller: "Ah.... Representative Hanahan, it takes 89 votes to over-ride the ruling of the Chair, if the gentleman so wishes?"





Hanahan: "Well, now, you know, you're my friend, and my neighbor and my compatriot and I hate to ask for an over-ruling, but in view of the fact that there's 90 votes up there on that board, saying that House Bill 3 should become law, I do suggest that that same 91 votes could represent an indication that it should only take 89 votes to pass this Bill, and ah.... I was just wondering if you want to recheck the point that I'm making on where in the Rules of the House does it give the Speaker the authority or acting speaker the authority to say that a Bill, does in fact, preempt local units of government. Where in the rules do you have that authority to suggest this, without a vote of this House?"

K. Miller: "Before I answer that, Representative from Cook, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, ah.... I would respectfully submit that the gentleman is too late in his request to ah.... repeal the ruling of the chair, number one, and the second point I would like to make, is that really what he would be attempting to do....."

K. Miller: "State your point, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "My point is, I haven't asked for an over-ruling. I was just asking for an indication from the Chair. I didn't make any motions or anything. I think the Majority Leader should hold that until such time as I do perhaps, or do not perhaps make that point. I'm asking for a clear indication from the Chair, under what Rule you have



a right to adjudicate to judge whether or not this Bill has to have 89 votes, which the Constitution calls for or a 107, which some judge should probably ah... interpret, not a Speaker of the House or an acting speaker."

K. Miller: "The Ruling, Representative Hanahan, was made under Rule 4, G, H and N, and especially N, to enforce all constitutional provisions, statutes and regulations applicable to the House of Representatives. For what question does the Gentleman from McHenry stand?"

Hanahan: "May I have the ah... call of the absentees, because I would like to know those who are present and not voting to at least have the guts enough to stand up one way or the other so that we know whether or not they want to be recorded on this roll call."

K. Miller: "O'okay, what is your point of order, Representative Geo-Karis?"

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I would like a tally announced, before he does anything else."

K. Miller: "I'll announce a tally, but he has a right to ask for the absentees to be polled. At this moment, the vote is 91 'ayes' and 51 'nays' and one voting 'present'. 54 'nays', one voting present. The Clerk will poll the absentees."

F. B. Selcke: "Bluthardt. Boyle. Caparelli. Carter. Collins. Collins 'no'."

K. Miller: "Collins 'no'."



F. B. Selcke: "Deavers. Ralph Dunn. R. L. Dunne. Epton.  
Granata. Grotberg. Hart. Ah.. Gene Hoffman.  
J. Holloway. Huskey. Kempiners. Kosinski. LaFluer.  
Lauer. McGrew. Palmer."

W. Murphy: "McGrew votes.. wishes to be recorded as  
voting 'aye'."

F. B. Selcke: "Palmer. Schoeberlein."

W. Murphy: "Just a minute. Gentleman from Cook, Representative  
Mahar."

Mahar: "How am I recorded?"

W. Murphy: "How's Representative Mahar recorded?"

F. B. Selcke: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Mahar: "I thought my name was called."

F. B. Selcke: "No."

W. Murphy: "Voting no."

F. B. Selcke: "Schraeder. Sevcik. Ike Sims. Telcser.  
Terzich. Wall. Walters. Williams."

W. Murphy: "Ah.. Representative Hart was recorded as voting  
'no'. Was he?"

F. B. Selcke: "Representative Hart is recorded as not voting."

W. Murphy: "No. He ah.. stood and asked to be voted 'no'.  
But I didn't give it to you. He voted 'no'." On  
this question there are 93 'ayes', 56 'no's', three  
recorded as 'present'. And this bill having failed  
to receive the constitutional majority of 3/5 is  
hereby declared.. What is your point, Representative  
Hanahan?"



Hanahan: "Point of order. It did not fail by a constitutional majority and I want it so stated in the record, Mr. Speaker. ERA may not be the only thing that's going to be in the courts."

W. Murphy: "This bill failing to receive the 3/5 majority is hereby declared lost."

F. B. Selcke: "If I could have your attention please.."

W. Murphy: "The Clerk will proceed with the next bill."

F. B. Selcke: "If I could have your attention, please.

Mr. Baltz is still up here at the rostrum awaiting all first term members who haven't selected their parking places. Please come up here. They'll help them." House Bill 10. I mean.. Excuse me. House Bill 13. Bill for an Act to amend the Mosquito Abatement District. Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Murphy: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes is recognized."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 13 is a very simple bill. Ah.. the whole thrust of House Bill 13 is to relieve a problem that many of my constituents has complained to me and the other elected officials in my area about.. concerning the South Cook County Abatement district which overlaps into the City of Chicago. The only thing House Bill 13 addresses itself to is the fact of the taxation of certain citizens of the City of Chicago for a service that they are no long in fact receiving. So, the up-shot of House Bill 13



is to ah.. relieve a problem .. a burdensome problem on constituents of mine in my district that feel that they should not be paying for this service since they are not receiving. I would solicit your 89 votes. This is not a bill of great importance to many of you. But, I'm sure that the constituents of mine in District 29 and many of the former constituents of mine in District 28 would appreciate ah.. your support on this measure."

W. Murphy: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson is recognized."

Rayson: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise to support this bill. My only concern with the bill is that it doesn't go far enough. I wish you would abolish the South Cook County Mosquito Abatement in its entirety. I wanted to put an amendment on the bill but in deference to the sponsor I didn't. But I feel that the mosquitoes will still come into a district, but at least you won't have to pay the tax to raise for the jobs and the pesticides which immunize m squitoes and cause them to breathe prolifically. So I suggest that that we all should be concerned about this local government as to what, if anything, it's doing for the betterment of the public and I commend this gentleman for his bill. At least I hope he wins and gets rid of something in his district even if it only means less taxes."



W. Murphy: "The Representative from Cook, Representative Collins is recognized. Let's have it a little quiet, please. So we can hear the discussion."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would rise to oppose this bill. I've heard from numerous organizations within my district. I can't speak for the 29th District ah.. which is represented by the sponsor of the bill. But I know in my district, the 30th, the majority of people are very much opposed to this legislation. They favor the Mosquito Abatement District. They know the problems that we have along the ah.. the eastern end of the City of Chicago ah.. the mosquito problems. I think the Mosquito Abatement ah.. District has performed a service. Maybe it's not as evident ah.. to everyone that they are because if the major activities of the Mosquito Abatement Districts is not spraying, but rather to attack the larvae at that stage and to ah.. to seed against the mosquitoes before they are actually hatched. I ah.. think that this legislation is dangerous. We see the ah.. every summer the mosquito problem seems to become more grievous. And I think that we're just asking for trouble ah.. if we enact such legislation. And I would urge the Members of this House to reject House Bill 13. I ah.. think that this is something that would do injustice to the people ah.. of.. I can only speak for the southeast side of the Chicago but I would assume that the problem exists throughout the



area, and ah.... I... I... think we are just begging for trouble if we enact such legislation and I would ask for a 'no' vote."

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

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support this bit of legislation that is long overdue. The People on the southwest side of Chicago have been paying for something that they have not been getting and it's to Representative Barnes' credit that he has introduced this Bill, and I urge you to support it."

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

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise to oppose this Bill here, along with Representative Collins. There's a lot of forest preserve and the park district and there are a lot of homes that are across the street, plus the picnic areas that have a lot of these mosquito nests in there, and this Bill is going to take away the money that is provided to eliminate some of these mosquitoes, and keep these things free, so these people can enjoy some of the things. We need this thing, until such time that perhaps maybe the districts are moved and the houses and the people are not close to these, ah.... we can't do anything about them, but ah.... I would ask my colleagues to defeat this piece of legislation until such time comes about."

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

Jones: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,



I rise in support of House Bill 13. At the time that Mosquito Abatement District was formed, over 50 years ago, everyone felt the various industry did not live there. It was marsh land. But through the years, this area has developed. We no longer receive the service from the Mosquito Abatement District. They do not come out and treat our area. Mosquito Abatement means treating the area where mosquitoes breathe. They do not breathe in the southside of the city of Chicago. As the gentleman from the 30th District spoke, which is adjacent to my district, the 28th District, the people in the City of Chicago do not receive the service. I have received complaints throughout the years, concerning this nuisance pack, and I urge the ladies and gentlemen in this House to vote 'yes' on House Bill 13."

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

Mahar: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support the defeat of this Bill or speak against it. The 9th District, where I come from, it has been effective. People have complimented the districts in the area for what they've done. They are efficient and while you have the fluctuation in the number of mosquitoes that you have from time to time last year it was the worst in 17 years, and there might have been some complaints. They overall do a good job. Their tax rate has been reduced the last three years to 20 cents, 22 cents, to 20 to 18 cents. The Board serves without pay."





This is the year of the 17 year locust. There will be more need for them now than there ever has been before. If this legislation is enacted, it's going to reduce the revenue by about 38%. And I think it would be bad if we enacted... if we repealed or took away this section of the Mosquito Abatement District, because I venture to say that those people in those areas, which are not going to be served by us, are going to have to have some mosquito control. They're going to have to go to private enterprise or some other source, and if they do, it is going to cost them more money, so I urge that House Bill 13 be defeated."

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

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Bill, mainly because mosquitoes cannot read city limit signs. Now I have introduced into this House a bill to dissolve the mosquito control. I will push that Bill only if this Bill is passed, because the ah... mosquito control district, will not be able to work effectively without the taxing bodies of all the municipalities concerned. Ah... the mosquitoes can easily be in the southside of Chicago, as well as into the southwest of Cook County. So until the time that they are able to read those city limit signs, I would say let's either dissolve the whole district or if you're going to defeat this Bill, or defeat this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."



Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, gentleman from Cook, Representative Holloway."

Holloway: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just want to add emphasis to what Representative Barnes said ah.... in my district, people are paying this mosquito abatement tax, and getting absolutely no service in return. And for that reason, I'm asking for an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

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

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman has moved the previous question."

All those in favor, signify by saying 'aye'. The opposed 'no'. Motion prevails, and the gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes, to close."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, ah.... to correct a couple of things that were said in the debate, which I really don't think is over-riding issue here. One is that it was said that People in the park district along the southern edge of this district was for this bill.... was against this bill. Well, the point is, is that the Mosquito Abatement District does not cover a park district area. That's a forest preserve and that is taken care of by the park district. The whole upshot of the opposition to this Bill is plain and simple, by the admission of a south Cook County Mosquito Abatement District themselves, 38% of their taxes is collected in the City of



Chicago. Now I would like you to realize and understand what I said. 38% of their revenue is collected in an area where they do not, by their own vilitation, give any service. That is their opposition to this Bill. Now the people that live in the south Cook County area, that are paying those taxes, that 38% of the People in Chicago, that is paying to subsidize, if you will, a service for townships in the south Cook County area, is just simply that shouldn't be demanded of them. They are the only people inside of the City of Chicago that pay a Mosquito Abatement tax. Only people in the City of Chicago. There are three other Mosquito Abatement Districts in the county of Cook, none of them overlap into the City of Chicago for the purpose of taxation. I think this is a good piece of legislation and I believe that if you are interested in seeing that people are not charged for something that they do not receive services for, you will support this Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Question is, shall House Bill 13 pass? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell, to explain his vote."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, very briefly, here you have the fundamental issue of taxation without representation. Representation in terms of services. There are no services rendered and indeed it is a far, unwise principle to allow this Mosquito Abatement



District to come in and tax us year after year without providing any services, without giving adequate explanations and in fact, ignoring the people in the entire City of Chicago in the southern end of the City of Chicago. It's unreasonable, it's arbitrary, and it's taxation at its worst, and if all you gentlemen can sit here and constantly talk about taxes upon the People, the fact that you want to give them a fair shake, all we're asking for in the City of Chicago is to give us a fair shake. They are not providing the services. We get nothing for our money. We don't want in this Mosquito Abatement District. Please let us out."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in explaining my vote, I would like to pose a question to the Sponsor, which I wasn't able to ask earlier and perhaps an explanation of his vote, he could answer it. My question is, does this District have general obligations bonded indebtedness which the People in the disconnected area would be relieved of by the disconnection?"

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

Barnes: "To the best of my knowledge, Representative Schlickman, ah.... that is not a problem that is facing the District at this time."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. Representative Neff votes 'aye'. Mugalian 'aye'.



Taylor 'aye'. Jacobs 'aye'. Lundy 'aye'. Duff 'aye'. Capuzi 'aye'. Oh, I'm sorry, Representative Duff, wishes to vote 'no'. McMaster 'aye'. Campbell 'aye'. On this question, there are 96 'ayes', 17 'nays', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 16. Merlo. An Act requiring automatic fire sprinkling systems in hi-rise apartment buildings. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

DiPrima: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have a group of our friends over here, representing the Illinois Police Association Executive Board, headed by Irvin McDugal, the President, and Victor Witt, Executive Secretary and Treasurer. They're right up there above the Speaker. Let's give them a nice, big round of applause."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Merlo, relative to House Bill 16."

Merlo: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, fires in hi-rise buildings have frequently and forcibly pointed out that present building concepts have demonstrated by many modern, well-built hi-rise buildings, are not adequate. Fire protection is an immediate concern as hi-rise buildings soar beyond the control capacity of existing fire equipment. Fire becomes a major concern



and adequate fire protection is imperative. The average citizen living in a modern country such as ours, expects that a combination of designs, skills and scrutinizing of public officials will insure his safety particularly in glistening, new hi-rise buildings. He expects to be protected from harm and to be able to go about his daily activities with confidence and without fear. Representative Telcser and I, the co-sponsor of this Bill, and Representative Douglas, live and represent the 12 representative districts, a district which there is perhaps more hi-rises than any other area in the City of Chicago. A district where tragedy has struck, so we are involved with people whose emotions still run high with concern over the vivid, gruesome, recollection of tragedy and the possibility of a reoccurrence at any time. For example, in January of 1969, tragedy struck, killing four persons and injuring 18 others when fire broke out on the 36th floor of a 40 story building at 3450 Lake Shore Drive in our Di-strict. On Sunday December of 1972, dozens of occupants of a 25 story building on East Chestnut Street were evacuated because of a fire, and on Sunday, March 6, 1972, a man and woman was killed, 8 persons injured and an estimated 300 persons fled into bitter cold when a fire struck out at 720 West Gordon Terrace in our district, and of course, you know the recent fire that occurred at the Hyatt House, the Conrad Hilton, and the Hancock Building, but to top all, on November of



1972, a building in New Orleans was caught on fire, five persons were killed and a dozen others injured when flames enveloped the upper two floors of a 16 story luxury building. Louis San Salvador, the New Orleans Fire Chief said 'there were no fire sprinklers. Firemen tried in vein to get ladders and ropes to those trapped in the high above floors'. As a result, Richard Bland, the Chairman of the National President's Commission on Fire Prevention Control said of the New Orleans fire, and this appeared in the Chicago Tribune, 'The fire could have been stopped if a water sprinkler system had been installed in the building'. He further stated, 'if States refused to require sprinklers in hi-rise buildings, the Federal government should do so.' He also said, 'there is no reliable way to fight hi-rise fires without having at least the aid of automatic extinguishing systems within the building. and you cannot expect the mobile fire services to be able to do much about a fire of this kind without having built-in extinguishing equipment'. As a result of his statement, I have here before me, HR 317, that was introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative Roy Bell, which would require sprinkler systems in buildings, and the provision reads, 'any building in any State or in the District of Columbia, constructed of more than seven stories shall be equipped with a sprinkler system in each room and in any common area.' Ladies and Gentleman, House Bill 16



if enacted into law, would require the installation of a sprinkler system in the construction of hi-rise apartment buildings more than eight levels above street level on or after January 1, 1974. And I urge all of you to support this Bill."

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

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "Under the 1970 State Constitution, the City of Chicago, as a home-rule unit, meaning that it no longer need expressed statutory authority to do a number of things. The City of Chicago, through its City Council, could enact an ordinance containing the prescription or regulations that you have in this Bill. My question is, why come to the General Assembly, when the City Council or the City of Chicago is equipped to accomplish the end that you're seeking?"

Merlo: "Well, Mr. Schlickman, in answer to that, I can tell you that the City of Chicago can pass an ordinance that would affect this. However, I would like to see this particular legislation done on a State level. As to the home-rule requirement, I think that this Bill is written, recognizing the home-rule problem, because first it recognizes that the interest of the State in protecting hi-rise residents from the danger of fire wherever they





live, but it leaves to the local unit of governments, and I think this is very important, the Bill leaves to the local units of government, the details as to the type of system that's required and the installation of such system shall conform to the ordinance and regulations of the local unit of government, so you see, I am recognizing that particular point. As a second statement, the State of Illinois, has had laws regarding public safety and health, including fires, and in fact, has had a fire marshall for a long period of time, pre-dating the adoption of the 1970 new Constitution."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, if I may, in addressing myself to the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Proceed, Sir."

Schlickman: "Through the Municipal Code, we have provided to municipalities zoning, enabling authority. In other words, municipalities can determine where they're going to have hi-rise buildings. Municipalities also, by statutory authority, can determine the specifications for these buildings. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that the tradition of this State is that the requirements, specifications for buildings, ah... should be determined by local officials, and for that reason, while I have such a high regard for the sponsor of the Bill and the objective which he is pursuing, I do not think this Bill constitutes sound policy and therefore shall be voting 'no'."



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

Thompson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,  
I rise in support of this Bill, House Bill 16. The fact  
is, this is my business. I've had more than 30 years  
experience, fire fighting and fire protection. I was  
in the Fire Prevention Bureau of the City of Chicago  
for a number of years and was eight years Deputy Fire  
Marshall for the State of Illinois. I know from once  
I speak the number one objective, first I would like to  
say, I think this should be a Bill that is on the State  
level. Lives are lost throughout the State of Illinois.  
The number one objective of this Bill is to promote the  
size and improve the methods of fire prevention and pro-  
tection. The number one purpose is to establish reason-  
able safeguards against the lost of lives and property  
by fire. Number one result is to advance technical  
progress in fire protection and engineering. Let us  
remember that the destructive fire is like a branding  
iron, leaving an indullible imprint upon the life of  
each person it touches. Each and every day, fires in  
the United States of America claim an average of 35 lives,  
more than 1500 homes, more than 20 schools, more than  
12 churches, more than 13 hospitals and nursing homes,  
more than 114 industrial plants and stores. Twelve  
thousand lives are lost annually in fires in the United  
States. I've cited a few facts that may interest you.



Annually, there are more than 13,000 deaths, there are 2,400,000 fires, there's more than two billion dollars in losses in fires in this country of ours as far advanced as we are in fire protection today. I think that this is a Bill that should be given the utmost consideration and sometime the developers of these buildings, the eyes of the mind are blinded by the dollar signs, and they could care less about the losses of life, but fire has no respect of person and someday, it might hit home. Long after the flames have been extinguished, the embers have cooled, and the smoke has drifted away, deep hurts remain from fire. These hurts are physical, emotional, financial and can be agonizing and permanent. The new Sears Building and all new buildings are installing these sprinkler systems, not only in what you they call the so-called fire hazard areas, but throughout, they have completely sprinkler systems, because they know that it is better that you come out wet then not come out at all. I urge your support on House Bill 16 as a co-sponsor of that Bill."

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

Merlo: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I very briefly want to call your attention to an article which appeared in the Chicago Tribune, and it's entitled 'SHA readies mandatory fire protection standards', and to be very brief, what it says in essence is, 'before the end of



the year, there will be no loans coming from FHA for hi-rise buildings unless a fully equipped sprinkler systems is included.' This Bill has the support of the Division of Fire Protection, the State of Illinois, the Fire Marshall, Chicago Fighters.... Chicago Fire Fighters, the Associated Fire Fighters of Illinois, and the Illinois Association of Fighter Districts, and I ask your support of this Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Question is, shall House Bill 16 pass. All in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. Totten 'no'. On this question, there are 119 'ayes' 60 'nays', McGrew 'aye', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 20. R. D. Cunningham. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to require mandatory death penalty. Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, request that House Bill 20 be moved back for an Amendment, and then hopefully return to Third Reading for passage."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any objection? Hearing none, House Bill 20 has been returned to the Order of Second Reading. Are there any Amendments?"

F. B. Selcke: "Amendment No. 4. Getty. Amend House Bill 20, by deleting everything after the enacting clause and



so forth."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."  
Getty: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move ah.... the Amendment No. 4 and I would like to point out to the House that there is a substitute page 1. The original version, as distributed, was incorrect. It had an incorrect clause in it, and subsequently, the ah.... Clerk's office distributed a substitute page 1, and that is the one to which we address ourselves to this time. Ah... the effect of Amendment No. 4, is to incorporate all of the original sub-committee ah.... ideas and to further delete what we felt was an unconstitutional section as applied to two of the special categories of Mr. Cunningham's Bill. It now provides for six classes of murder where there would be special findings by the trier of fact, upon conviction of murder. Ah..... it would then result in a mandatory death penalty if the trier of fact found these findings. In addition, without the necessity of special findings, because it would be a thing that would be inadmissible before the trier of fact, but after conviction where it appeared that the defendant has previously been convicted of murder or the murder was committed during a forcible felony where he was previously convicted of a forcible felony, the penalty would automatically be the death penalty. Ah.... I believe that this is ah.... in adopting



Amendment No. 4, we would make House Bill 20, the most constitutional of the death penalty bills which have been before this House, and I move its adoption."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment No. 4 to House Bill 20. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. The opposed 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? Third Reading." O'kay, Third Reading, House Bill 20."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 20. Bill for an Act to amend an Act to require a mandatory death penalty. Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, two weeks ago, we made a good beginning in meeting a desperate safety need. Two days ago, we passed a broader death penalty bill. That Bill reflects the genius of its sponsor, but it also contained a unique provision whereby a panel of three judges would be the final decider as to whether or not the penalty would be opposed... would be imposed. Many of us, the lawyers in this room, swallowed the nagging doubt in our own mind, as to the constitutionality of that unique provision. We wondered if perhaps it offended the constitutional guarantee for a jury trial. I want to assure each of you, that House Bill 20, has no room for such doubt. We



have here the time tested formula that has been the law since Illinois began, and that is, that the right to jury trial is preserved in this most important of all criminal proceedings. I would pause at this time to thank the members of Judiciary II, the subcommittee, and each of the Members thereof, for their splendid contribution to this Bill, which I urge you to believe meets every possible test under the Furman Case, and under the Constitution. You've heard all of the arguments, pro and con, for Capital punishment. I will not labor you with the repetition of those, except to say that you know the alternative to the adoption of this Bill. The alternative is the further deterioration of the public confidence in the government's ability to protect the very lives of those who are governed. Your duty in this matter is to reaffirm the public's responsibility in that department. I implore you to show the same determination and dedication that you have shown in the prior death penalty bills. I ask you to believe as was said by Representative Getty earlier, that this Bill is constitutional. We feel it will meet the test, when it reaches the highest court in the land. I ask you to believe that the innocent lives that you may well save today by the adoption of this Bill will stand as a monument to the action that you've taken. Please give us your green lights."



Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 20 pass? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty to explain his vote."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as this Bill appears before us, we are faced with the problem of having previously passed the death penalty bill, and that may account for the reason that a few green lights are missing that would be up here. I want to call to your attention the comments that I made the other day. Under the Bill that we passed this week, it set up a three judge panel. I had serious doubts as to the constitutionality of that Bill, because it requires only a majority or two out of three of those judges to make a finding to impose the death penalty. Does this not fly in the face of our standards of proof beyond a reasonable doubt, when we only need a majority of those voting? A majority in order to find somebody guilty of a crime and impose the death penalty? I suggest to you Members of this House, respectfully, that this is a Bill, where we do not have that infirmative, where it is kept to the jury system and we do not in-roads in our theory in a criminal case of proof beyond a reasonable doubt and I certainly solicit those green lights for this Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Have.... Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mann, to explain his vote."





Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief. It is true that we've debated this concept repeatedly during the past few weeks and therefore do not need I suppose more ah.. debate on it. But nevertheless, I am encouraged as I look at that board to see red lights on both sides of the aisle representing districts from all over the state because I think we're beginning to realize that ah.. the Supreme Court of the United States in declaring capitol punishment to be cruel and unusual punishment has made a very threshold decision. There will be bills before this House for legal aid to the poor. I hope that we will act quickly to place poor in the same stance as those who are wealthy in this country and this state so that they can bring the same resources in their defense when they are confronted with the capitol crime accusation. And finally I'd like to say that notwithstanding the votes, the mandate supposedly of the public referendum during the Con-Con, I'd like to point out only 1/3 of the people in the state voted on this particular issue. I still say that no matter how you try to slice it, you're going to finally realize that the Supreme Court is going to hold that capitol punishment is cruel and unusual punishment and therefore illegal and unconstitutional. And I thank those who are voting red."

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

Representative Maraños wishes to vote 'present'. On this



question there are 100 'ayes', 37 'nays', 1 answering 'present'.. Collins, 'aye'. And this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 25. Bill for an Act to amend the School Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Sevcik. Is the gentleman on the Floor? Take it out of the record."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 51. Pappas."

A. Telcser: "Take that out of the record."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 64, North."

A. Telcser: "Take those out of the record. I think the next one.. At the request of the sponsors, ah.. the next bill we'll be calling I think will be 212.

Is Representative Collins on the Floor? House Bill 212."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 12. 212. Collins. Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Philip W. Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.."

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

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I talked to Representative Collins on these bills and in an



attempt to try to work out some kind of an agreement on 212 through 220, ah.. I would respectfully ask Phil if he could hold these ah.. with leave of the House until after Easter Vacation. And that I will over the Easter Vacation attempt to spend a day or two with him to try to put it together."

A. Telcser: "Well, this would be a suspension of the Rules and I think it take an affirmative vote of somekind.. Ah.. gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think you're absolutely correct. With the exception of 212 I think it would take 107 votes to allow this delay. Ah.. I'm rather reluctant to postpone again but in ah.. with the assurance of the Assistant Minority Leader that we can work something out, I'm certainly amenable to ah.. discussion but I would like some assurance of having the 107 votes at this point."

A. Telcser: "Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise?"

Shea: "Well, I assure Representative Collins that I will sit down and try to work it out. Ah.. and if you want.. now if you want to put the motion to delay those bills until April 27th, I would be happy to support you."

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

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, then I would ask ah.. the House for the suspension of the appropriate rule so that



House Bill 212 through 220 could be heard on or before April 27th."

A. Telcser: "Okay. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea has moved that the provisions of Rule 37.. Or ah.. the gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins, has moved that the provisions of Rule 37 be suspended so that Bills 212, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 and 20 could be postponed until a date certain, that being April 25th, is that correct?"

Collins: "The 27th or before.."

A. Telcser: "The 27th or before. This.. all those in favor of the gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. 107 votes. Have all voted who wished? Telcser 'aye'. Take the record. Skinner 'aye'. On this question, 147 'ayes', 1 'nay', Miller 'aye' and these bills.. Huskey, 'aye'.. and these bills will remain on the Calendar until April 27th. House Bill 369. Do you want 369 and 370 out of the record, Representative McPartlin?"

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 369. McPartlin. Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, House Bill 369 under a recent Illinois Supreme Court decision presently prevents the Village of Oak Park from forming a special Service Taxing District to construct a shopping mall. The decision was that the 1970



Illinois Constitution gives home rule unit powers to create the district. That power does not become effective until legislation is enacted. And I would ask for your favorable vote."

A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Now are we hearing two bills together? Or.."

A. Telcser: "We've only called 369."

Walsh: "369 is under discussion now?"

A. Telcser: "That's right."

Walsh: "Wonder if the gentleman would agree to take these out of the record for just a few minutes?"

A. Telcser: "He indicates he will. Representative Barry on the Floor for House Bill 417? There he is. House Bill 417."

F. B. Selcke: "417. House Bill 417. Barry. Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Barry."

Barry: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this bill merely codifies what's been suggested by case law and the Supreme Court. Ah.. it's a rather technical matter. It has to do with Rules of Appeal recommended by the Chicago and State Bar Associations. And unless there are any questions, I would merely suggest that we do adopt the bill for the purpose of codifying as I said before what is already Supreme Court Ruled and case



law."

A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Question is shall House Bill 417 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Geo-Karis, 'aye'. On this question, 123 'ayes', 1 'nay' and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 433. Is Representative Huskey on the Floor? Palmer will take care of it."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 433. An Act to establish the penalty of death in certain cases and so forth. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Palmer: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave of the House to bring this bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of tabling an amendment and adding another."

A. Telcser: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, House Bill 433 will be put on the order of Second Reading. Are there any amendments? Okay, now."

Palmer: "I move that ah.. House Amendment or ah.. Amendment No. 1 be tabled."

A. Telcser: "Well, now the Clerk has just informed me that the amendments are not distributed. Is that correct? Are you aware of it? Okay. Let's take it out of the record. Okay. Let's do it this way. The gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer, has moved that Amendment



No. 1 to House Bill 433 be tabled. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion to table, signify by saying aye, the opposed, no. The Amendment is tabled. The Gentleman wishes to offer another amendment, when that is distributed, we'll go back to House Bill 433, so that Bill currently is on second with Amendment No. 1 tabled. House Bill 475."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 475. Berman. An Act to amend Sections 1 and 2 in the title of and repeal Sections 3 through 9 of an Act concerning disclosure. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Shea: "A...are you just going down in order now, or?"

Arthur Telcser: "I'm sorry, the calendar here is all marked up, and I inadvertently skipped over a couple of bills. I'll come back to them."

Shea: "Yeh, cause there's a..."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Rigney's bill I overlooked, and Representative Pappas."

Shea: "Yeh, Representative Pappas, yeh, but what about 419, Representative Taylor's bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Well, that's got a date of 5/4, we are trying call the bills today that are going to expire because of the..."

Shea: "Just those?"



Arthur Telcser: "Right."

Shea: "Alright."

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

Berman: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, House Bill 475 is the third of the shield bills dealing with the privilege regarding news sources and work products that are gathered in the news gathering processes. We have previously passed out a bill by Representative Hirschfeld and Representative LaFleur a...this is a...the bill which I have drafted after the introduction and passage of the bill that is presently the law in the State now, which provides a qualifying shield law. This bill has some a... approaches the problem from slightly different approach.. but...a...essentially the concept is the same of allowing the news media to protect their news sources. This bill, in addition, deals with the work product as the non-waiver privilege and I think, provides the type of safety and concept that was embodied in the first amendment, freedom of the press privilege. These bills have been debated at great length, I a...would be glad to answer any questions that anyone may have as to how these bills differ, one from the other, and I think that in line with the favorable vote given to the other two, I would urge a...a...similar positive affirmative vote on House Bill 475."





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

Hirschfeld: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I feel fairly certain that this Bill will not need a great deal of debate because so much debate was given on the other Bill. But I would like to say, with all humility, that a number of people do feel that Representative Berman does have the better of the three Bills and I do not have any pride and authorship in my own Bill, I was very happy that the Bill was voted out of the House and because there is a distinct possibility that Representative Berman will have the better Bill, I intend to vote for the Bill, and I hope that all of the people from both sides of the aisle who supported my Bill will also support Representative Berman."

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

Leinenweber: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Leinenweber: "I have not heard all of the debate. I asked the previous sponsor of one of the Bills a question. Representative Berman, are you aware of any specific cases of abuse of the existing Illinois law?"

Berman: "I am not aware of any cases of abuse, but I am aware of cases, one case in particular, that ruled on the existing Illinois law, was a case heard by Judge Higgins in the Circuit Court of Cook County, in which it dealt



with the quashing of subpoenas. He referred to the existing law. It had to deal with the news note of a reporter. He cited the existing law and the first amendment privilege. I believe that this Bill would be in line with that decision which is an updating of a decision by Judge Gripppo which was the basis of our existing law. I am not aware of any abuses of the existing law, and I think that that is to the credit of the judiciary in Illinois."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I feel that the support of this type of legislation will make people in the communications media even more consciencious of doing the right thing in being truthful in the way that they report their news. Therefore I urge everyone of us to support this bill because I am idealistic enough to feel that a step in the direction of freedom of the press in today's market will mean a step in greater constance for the people of the press, radio, and other communication media."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flynn."

Flynn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, because of the letter that I put out yesterday on everyone's desk. I would like that there not be any misunderstanding. I supported the previous



shield bill, so called shield bill, and I support Representative Berman's bill 100%, and I'm going to vote aye."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? If no, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman to close."

Berman: "I think there has been sufficient debate, Mr. Speaker, and I would urge an affirmative vote."

Arthur Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 475 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye, the opposed, no. The Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, may I please be recorded as voting present."

Arthur Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting present. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter."

Porter: "A..Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, I expressed to you earlier my concern with the balancing of freedoms guaranteed under the Sixth Amendment with those guaranteed under the First Amendment, my concern for that balancing remains unabated. However, as I mentioned earlier, I think it is essential that we pass out a bill that would provide almost all the protections that this bill provides. I think this is the best of the three bills. I intend to incorporate my amendment in House Bill 549, some of the provisions of this bill, and I'm going to vote aye."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. Record Representative Duff as voting present. Have all



voted who wished? Take the record. Randolph, aye.

On this question, 117 ayes, 15 nays, and one answering present, and this bill having received...Merlo aye, and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Now we're going to go back up and pick some more of these bills that will die in the 19th and 20th. House Bill 369. Okay, House Bill 412."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 412. Pappas. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code, third reading of the bill."

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

Pappas: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 412 deletes the requirement for displaying the name and address of the owner on the side of a vehicle to those vehicles having a gross weight of under 8000 pounds, or for further clarification, that would be a Class A or B license plate. I would move for its passage."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall House Bill 412 pass. All those in favor signify by voting aye, the opposed no. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question, 130 ayes, 1 nay, and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 433. Alright, that Amendment isn't distributed yet. House Bill 442."



Fred Selcke: "House Bill 442. Rigney. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to State Parks. Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Stevenson, Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of House Bill 442 is to clarify our State statutes in regard to fencing conservation areas that were formally railroad right of ways. It merely makes the State responsible for the fencing along these right of ways, and I move for its adoption."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall House Bill 422 pass?...Oh, I'm sorry, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Will the sponsor yield please?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Schneider: "Representative, I just got on the floor and I'm not so sure if I have the right bill or not. Is this the one where we discussed in committee that requires the fencing of an area that you are talking about? And that the Department of Conservation would assume the cost of that fencing?"

Rigney: "They would assume the cost of the fencing if they and the land owner adjoining decide that a fence along this nature trail or whatever have you is necessary."

Schneider: "Do we have a cost figure on that?"



Rigney: "Well, it's very difficult to give a cost figure on this because how do we know how many miles of this type of trail are they going to take over. A....I would estimate you could figure a cost on this of something in the range of about 60 to 70 cents a foot."

Schneider: "Now if the Department of Conservation, eventually, saw fit to purchase the walk ways, path ways of abandoned railroads and other a...unused easements, actually, that might exist, are we saying in this statute or this law for a bill that they would be responsible for any fencing that would take place and they would have to pay for the cost of that?"

Rigney: "Yes, this is the purpose of the bill. We must keep in mind when you are talking about one of these abandoned rail lines, a...and fencing them, you know now most of our farmers no longer have livestock and really are not in need of a fence themselves. You will find that it is the Conservation Department that is in need of the fence. They have found on these trails where they have not fenced them, that the people tend to wander off of the trail. Now this does not mean that you have to have the old style fence that was horse high and hog tight. It merely means that there's got to be a mutual agreement on what type of fence is to be constructed and if both parties are agreeable that one strand of barbed wire will serve as a boundary and tend to keep people on these trails, this is fine, they can negotiate any type of an agreement



they want."

Schneider: "Well, let me just suggest that I know that I really am sympathetic to the idea of the pathways and the walkways idea. But I'm a little bit reluctant to support anything which in the future is going to lock up the Department of Conservation's money for the simple purpose of building ah.. fences when we have a difficult time as it is in the ah.. purchase of property. So, not only am I a little bit suspicious of the cost of just this one bill but I'm afraid the future impact of the legislation will be that the Department of Conservation is going to wind up buying fencing that they cannot afford to pay for now or in the future at the expense of lost land. So I solicit a 'no' vote on the bill despite the fact that I'm sympathetic to the idea of walkways ah.. for the people of the State of Illinois. So a no vote at this time is in order until we can clarify the cost and until we can really clarify the impact of the bill on all future purchases regarding walkways."

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

Katz: "Will the gentleman yield to a question?"

A. Telcser: "Yes."

Katz: "Has the gentleman considered the problem that would be created if the.. we give this legal obligation to provide this fencing ah.. which would cover I assume many miles. The department does not provide fencing



for one area and someone wanders onto ah.. the territory and alleged that the absence of the fencing has caused a personal injury to him or to a child who wandered on this abandoned railroad track. Ah.. in other words is there not the possibility that there may be claims filed against the State of Illinois for personal injuries resulting from the failure of the Department of Conservation to provide total fencing along this area. The second part of the question is how many miles are we talking about of fencing that would be involved in this bill?"

Rigney: "Well, trying to answer your two questions Representative Katz.. ah.. first of all I might tackle the second one first. Right now, the reason that I've become interested in this bill is because in my district the Conservation Department is considering the purchase of an 83-mile abandon railroad. And I think you can see the position of the adjoining landowners. You expressed the concern of what might happen as far as liability and so forth. We could turn this around and say what would be the liability to the landowner in the absence of this kind of a fence. So it seems to me that the nature trail itself, first of all acts as somewhat of an inconvenience ah.. to those adjoining landowners. In most cases they would rather have back this property to put this property back ah.. under cultivation to use it in this fashion. The railroads,





since the year 1874, has had the fencing obligation along all railroad right of ways. So we're really not changing anything ah.. by this bill. The obligation remains the same. Furthermore, I'm not so sure, but even in the absence of this bill but what the Conservation would not have the legal obligation to do the fencing. Because, if you or I buy a farm and there are fences around that farm, we assume the fencing responsibilities of that farm and of that property at the time that we buy it. And the Conservation Department making such a purchase ah.. I think perhaps the court could even be held to be responsible for this. But the purpose of House Bill 442 is to clarify the issue."

A. Telcser: "Is there further discussion?" Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Representative Rigney, could you please tell me if this bill would apply to Conservation Districts?"

Rigney: "This only applies to abandoned railroads."

Skinner: "For Conservation Districts as well as for State Parks?"

Rigney: "No. It does not say that."

Skinner: "It has nothing to do with a forest preserve or a conservation district."

Rigney: "It does not."

Skinner: "Just state."

Rigney: "Right."

A. Telcser: "Is there further discussion? If not the gentleman



from Stephenson, Representative Rigney, to close the debate."

Rigney: "Well, I think if the State of Illinois is going to consider the purchase of this type of property for this type of use, that among the costs that they should assume and should willingly assume. In addition to preparing the path and so forth would be the obligations to provide at least some type of a fence along this right of way. I think I'm only asking for a measure of fairness to the adjoining land owners. I solicit your favorable support."

Arthur Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 442 pass? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye'. The opposed by voting 'no'. Gentleman from Henry, Representative McGrew, who has now joined our side of the aisle. Good to have you. Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Miller."

Miller: "In explaining my vote, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to call the Members attention that I believe this is Representative Rigney's first Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Ah..... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think this is a good Bill. I think that the ah.... State of Illinois, where they are acquiring these right of ways, should accept some responsibility for fencing and I would certainly hope that you would support it."



Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Craig." You don't want to? Have all voted who wished? Capuzi 'aye'. Tkae the Record. On this question, there are 103 'ayes', 22 'nays'; and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. O'kay, Resolutions."

F. B. Selcke: "House Joint Resolution 32. Walsh. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 78th General Assembly, State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, When the House of Representatives adjourns on Thursday, April 12, 1973, they stand adjourned until Wednesday, April 25, 1973 at 9:30 O'Clock AM, and when the Senate adjourns on Saturday, April 14, 1974, they stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 24, 1973 at 11:30 AM."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, so the Members understand, we still have a lot of work to do today. We're adopting the Resolution now, simply because we have to get it over to the Senate. The gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, as the Speaker said, this is the adjournment resolution. We are adopting it now, and I'd appreciate it if you would pay attention. When we adjourn today, much later, we will stand adjourned until Wednesday, April 25, at 9:30 O'Clock Perfunctory Session, 10:00 O'Clock Regular Session. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the adjournment resolution."



Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "I have an inquiry. If this is the schedule and we come back on Wednesday, does that drop the Committee schedule back one day?"

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

Walsh: "Yes it does. The Tuesday committees will meet on Wednesday, the Wednesday committees on Thursday and the Thursday committees on Friday of that week and that week only."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of the House Resolution, House Joint Resolution Number 32. All in favor, signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The resolution is adopted.' O'okay, on the Speaker's table appears House Resolution Number 34, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Merlo, is recognized."

Merlo: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I deeply regret that this House of Representatives did not adopt the amendment to House Resolution 34 that was presented by Representative Deuster on the Monday of this week. His Resolution, if adopted, prevailed upon the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to make available Federal funds or enable State and local governments through-  
out the United States to use highway trust funds monies for the support and operation of public transportation.



In presenting House Resolution 34 today, I do so fully realizing its fate. But I feel it is a means to again make it apparently clear that in the week of discussion that we have had, it was very apparent in committee and on the floor of the House, that the CTA crisis is not unique in Chicago alone, but that the grave nature of the transportation problem faces most transit systems in Illinois and throughout the United States. And I am certain at this point in time, we are all concerned about resolving the existing problem once and for all. Realizing that mass transportation is not a luxury, rather it is a business where you simply cannot pass along the increased cost of operation to the consumer, for as you and I know, the consumer, in most instances, is the person least able to afford an increase; namely, the old, the poor, the handicapped and the unemployed. Those for whom mobility in our modern society is a must. I honestly and sincerely believe that this time is now at hand for all of us to act responsible by supporting the concept set forth in House Resolution 34, which urgently requests the Congress of the United States to make some portion of the Highway Trust Fund money revenues available for mass transit systems throughout the United States, which need to insure the maintenance and growth of their system. In an article dated January 17, 1973, in the Chicago Today, it was revealed that the Highway Trust Fund now contains approximately four billion dollars and the Federal government



pays the fund five percent interest per anum on the unspent balance, equalling nearly two hundred million dollars per year and this principal is not currently being expended. Ladies and Gentlemen, we need assured Federal funding, so we don't have a transportation crisis every year. Federal programs subsidation, I feel, would provide a realistic solution to all transit systems and would perhaps not necessitate an increase in any existing tax. Both Illinois Senator Percy and Stevenson, supported this concept, and I certainly hope in your good judgement, you, too, would support House Resolution 34."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Madison, Representative Walters."

Walters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Merlo, did you say that Senator Percy was in favor of this?"

Merlo: "Was in favor of the concept. Yes."

Walters: "Thank you, very much."

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

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I... this is a resolution, of course, immoralizing Congress to do something and ah.... I would imagine they would react to it pretty much the way we'd react to Congress immoralizing us to do something. Happily, they don't do it as often as we do, or if they do, it doesn't filter down to me. I think that ah.... for anyone who is opposed to the concept of the use of motor fuel tax monies for



anything, but ah... roads, probably we ought to take a close look at it. I know when we get to the order of Resolutions, I think we tend to relax a little bit and not pay very much attention, but ah.... I want that aspect, a resolution like this is that it ah.... would tend, I think, in the eyes of some people, to state the position of the House of Representatives on this matter, and ah... I wonder if all of us are aware that this is what it is going to do, so I think we ought to consider this resolution and maybe not immortalize Congress in this instance."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? All those in favor of the Resolution, signify by saying 'aye'. The opposed 'no', and the Resolution is lost." Representative Washington, do you have your Amendment ready that you discussed with me? You have an amendment for today for House Bill 4 that you wanted to consider? Is it ready yet and distributed? O'kay, Consent Calendar, Third Reading."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 302. Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 351. Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 435. Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code....."

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

Holloway: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded, if possible, please, as 'aye' on House Bill 3. It will not



change the results."

Arthur Telcser: "Does the gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, the gentleman will be so recorded."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 462. An Act to provide authority to the Department of Public Health to license private sewage disposal contractors and so forth. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 532. Bill for an Act to amend the Governmental Ethics Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 533. Bill for an Act in relation to health and safety standards for youth camps and so forth. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 538. An Act to convey land in Lake County. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 595. An Act to amend the Library Systems Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 596. An Act to add Section 1.21 to an Act to limit of indebtedness to counties having a population of less than 500,000 and so forth. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 611. An Act to amend an Act concerning conveyances. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 660. An Act in relation to oil and gas and coal and so forth. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 719. An Act to amend the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 753. An Act to amend Section 2 of an Act requiring all owners of hi-rise apartment buildings to oppose appropriate instructions and so forth. Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Question is, shall the consent calendar of third reading, third day, pass?"



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye'. The opposed by voting 'no'. This is the consent calendar. Have all voted who wish? Record Representative Maragos as voting 'present'. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. Fleck and Kosinski and J. J. Wolf.... the switches are still open. Let a few get on. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On these questions, there are 133 'ayes', no 'nays' and these Bills, having received the Constitutional Majority, are hereby declared passed. Second Reading Consent Calendar."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 387. An Act relating to land in Kane County. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 493. An Act to amend Section 5.02, an Act to start Joint Legislative Reference Bureau and so forth. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 577. Amends the State Printing Contract Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 681. A Bill for an Act to amend the Governmental Ethics Act. Second Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Third Reading. On the Order of Constitutional Amendments, Third Reading, appears House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment Number 1, for which purpose.... Oh, the Clerk will read the Amendment."

F. B. Selcke: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment Number 1. Resolved by the House of Representatives, 78th General Assembly, State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State at the General Election next occurring at least



six months after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Section 5, Article IV, of the Constitution to read as follows: 'Article IV, Section 5, Sessions A. The General Assembly shall convene each year on the second Wednesday in January and may transact no business after June 30, unless provided for by this Constitution, in the even number of years, no bills shall be introduced or considered by the General Assembly unless it relates to revenue or appropriation matters. B. The Governor may convene the General Assembly or the Senate alone in special session by a proclamation stating the purpose of the session, and only business encompassed by such purpose, together with any impeachments or confirmation of appointments shall be transacted. Special Sessions of the General Assembly may also be convened by Joint proclamation of the presiding officers of both Houses, each as provided by law. C. Sessions of each House in the General Assembly and meetings of committees, joint committees, and legislative committees shall be open to the public. Sessions and committee meetings of the House may be closed to the public if 2/3rds of the Members elected to that House determine that the public interest is so required, and meetings of joint committees and legislative committees may be so closed if two-thirds of the members to each House so determine. Third Reading of the Resolution."



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

Hirschfeld: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In order to ah.... expedite this, I think it is very simple. This is called the limited annual sessions constitutional amendment. And it seems to me, and I realize that I do not have the experience that many of the Members of this House have, but it seems to me now being in my second term, that if there is one thing the Members of this House do, is spend too much time here in Springfield. We are in annual sessions at this time, and this is an attempt to reverse to the concept, not as it was before, where we were in biennial sessions, but to the concept of limited annual sessions, whereby we can discuss anything we want to in the odd number of years, such as this year, but in the even number of years, we will be limited to a revenue and appropriation matters, whatever matters are thought to be brought before this House by the Speaker and the President of the Senate and of course the handling of Governortorial vetoes. During the last session of the General Assembly, ladies and gentlemen, day after day we sat down here and watched a great number of hours wasted in the second year of the 77th General Assembly, due to the fact that many bills that had been voted on during 1971 and beaten very, very badly, were either on postponed consideration or were reintroduced and we were required to take the time of this



House to once again vote on them again. In particular I remember a Bill that we were asked as the General Assembly to decide what the state game fish should be. And we spent nearly four hours debating that Bill, at whatever cost to the taxpayer, and I must say in all sincerity, that the only cogent comment I heard came from Representative Harold Katz, who felt that the state fish should be the taxpayer, and the state fish is the taxpayer, so long as we stay in annual session. Now I would also like to bring up the matter of salaries, because I think this point will be raised. We're paid \$17,500 a year, and I congratulate the Speaker and the Majority Leadership and the Minority Leadership on finally getting us decent accommodations, at least a beginning in our staff and a decent salary, but it seems to me even at \$17,500 a year, considering the class of people who are working in the Legislature, we are underpaid, and we are certainly underpaid if we're going to be in full-time session, and if we continue the way we are proceeding now, where we will be in four and five days a week, all two years, we will rapidly reach the point where we are similar to the United States Congress and I do not consider that flattering, of paying about \$42,000 per year salary, we will no longer have citizen legislators. To you freshman members who are serving your first term, you 55, I can assure you if you ask your fellow members here, many many of the good people that were in this legislature



were forced to resign because of the fact that we are an annual session, and I am very much afraid that if we continue to do this, we will lose the housewives and the mechanics and the dentists and the small businessmen and the lawyers and the doctors and many others who are citizen legislators, and we will actually become a full-time legislative body, made up of nothing more than professional politicians in the wrong sense of that term. I think, then, we will be very much like our brethren in Congress, that when we are asked to come back to our District and speak, we will say well, we would like to but we have to be in session. We're in Springfield. And this is what far too many of our Congressmen do at this time. Too much time is spent in Washington, and I personally feel much too much time is spent in Springfield. If you had an opportunity to look at the study that was made by Senator Horsley, now retired, you would note that last year we spent 44 million dollars more of the taxpayers money by being in annual sessions than we spent when we were not in annual sessions, and I think if nothing else, this is a telling argument of why we must get away from this Annual Session concept and go back to the concept of at least a limited annual session providing for the Speaker and the President of the Senate to make the calls they feel should be made, providing for the handling of governtorial vetoes, but nothing else in the even number of years will be considered, except for revenue and

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

appropriation matters. This is a controversial bill. It did not make it out of Executive Committee with any room to spare whatsoever. It was voted out 9 to 8, and I certainly appreciate it did get out, but I would appreciate a favorable roll call and I frankly think that not only will you be doing yourself a favor as a member of the legislature, but you will be doing the taxpayers of this State a favor, because you will be saving them literally hundreds of millions of dollars in the years to come."

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

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, It's not easy for me to stand up and support this Resolution, but it's one that I feel compelled to speak to. I think that it's very important for those of you who have just joined the General Assembly to recognize with those of us who are now seeing what's happening to us as we spend this large amount of time working here in Springfield, how it actually impairs our effectiveness of legislators. I think that Representative Hirschfeld, as much as he himself works hard when he is here in Springfield, because he's one of the people that many of us see around working until all hours of the night, getting their jobs done down here, has brought up some points that should not go overlooked. Our jobs as legislators are not as effective as they could be, if we'd spend all our time or as much of our time down here and away from our



districts as we do. These last few weeks for me personally, have been an extremely great burden. When I call my district office on the telephone, and I ask what is going on back there, my administrative aide hardly remembers who I am, and that, I think, is a very telling and effective argument, in favor of this constitutional amendment. I ask for all of you, even though you may have to account to those who will think that you are begging off of your job by not voting for this or voting against it, to recognize that Representative Hirschfeld, is bringing up a valid and important point, which I think will improve our effectiveness, will keep us closer to the grass roots, from which we come, and I'm going to vote 'aye' on this Resolution."

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

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this is an excellent resolution. I think it should be supported, and I'd appreciate the support of the House."

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

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I didn't intend to speak on this, but I don't agree with the ah.... People who have endorsed it. One thing that this does, that I think is very important is that it affects the viability of the Legislature. Now, I don't think there's any question that this is a better Legislature today than the Legislature that we had before



Ralph Smith was speaker and we adjourned signe die on June 30 and that was the end of it. We came back subject to the call of the Governor. Now this goes a little bit further than that. It would permit the Legislative Leaders to call us back into Session, but I think that's not far enough. We are a body of 177 people, composing the House of Representatives. This attacks the viability of this group, of this House and Senate, and while I agree that we spend too much time here on nonsense, and I don't say that as the sponsor of the State Fish Bill, I say that we spend time on other nonsense. But I do think that we ought to give it serious consideration because it does affect our viability and I think if we will, by rule, in effect do this, that we will be a lot better off and a lot less hide-bound."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Henderson, Representative Neff."

Neff: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this is a good resolution. This is a resolution for the people, and the taxpayers in the State of Illinois. I cannot understand why each and every one of us won't support this Resolution. I'm sure that the delegation of the convention intended us to operate under these terms of Resolution No. 1 would put us in, and therefore, I would urge a yes vote on this Resolution."

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





Maragos: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Maragos: "Representative Hirschfeld, the concern that I have is, couldn't a lot of this be done by rule making powers of this General Assembly?"

Hirschfeld: "I think that's a very fair question, Representative, and it's possible that it could be done by the Rule making procedure to this House, but as a matter of fact, it has not been done, and I think we've had two years.... this is the third year in which it will... it could be done, and I would suggest to you that it will not be done by the rule making procedure, and it happens to fall within the legislative article, which is one of the areas that the ah... populus has kept to itself, and that's why I'm putting it in as a Constitutional Amendment."

Maragos: "The reason I'm asking these questions, it is a concern in my mind that ah... even though it may be limited and I agree with you in quite a bit of principal that the second year of each sessions becomes an anomally because many Bills that have been introduced the previous year and lost are reintroduced. I still think there's an area of concern. Giving an example now, that as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, I have some legislation we are studying and was able to do because of the deadlines of this Session, to introduce by the end of this week. However, further studies are being intended we hope



by next January, to bring in reports and legislation which is going to be for the immediate health and welfare of this State. Now, if a Constitutional Amendment of this nature passes, we are foreclosed from that, and a lot of times, we might not be able to get the Governor or the Leadership of both sides of the rotunda to call a special session for those purposes. As a result, that's the only concern that I have if we could do it with some amendments to the fact, the thing might not be agreed upon by the Leadership of two sides of the rotunda, besides the fiscal matters, I could buy your plan a little more easily or by rule-making powers."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Union....."

Maragos: "I asked a question, how are we going to avoid any ....."

Arthur Telcser: "I'm sorry, Representative Hirschfeld, wish to respond?"

Hirschfeld: "The only answer I can give you, Representative, is, of course, you would have to prevail upon the leadership to call and have your Bill included in the call, and I think that's a problem we all face. There may be some legislation we'd like to have introduced that we can't get in, if we don't get under the deadline. Of course, the other alternative would be, is if the leadership extended the deadline for the filing of bills, and I'm very sympathetic with your cause, because I think I'm a co-sponsor with you on that particular legislation, but I



think that overall the merit way in favor of going to the limited annual session, ah... even though it may mean it would be an extra year before some Bills can be introduced. We're still going to do the housekeeping of this State, the ah... appropriations and revenue matters each year, and I think that's necessary."

Maragos: "That bothers me, Mr. Speaker, and the House, that if ah... there would be an additional definition on this Amendment.... on this Resolution to the extent that might be additional matters which are of cogent nature and if we could define... if I had the wisdom at this sitting to do so, I would define it. Therefore, I'm going to have to vote 'present' on this Resolution at this time, until I'm fully satisfied that there is no other way that we can do what Representative Hirschfeld is trying to do with this Amendment... this Resolution, but I also would like to State further that in certain areas, we could do it by rule and restricting the reintroduction of bills that have loss in each session without reintroducing the second year. Cause I've lost bills in the first term and I've come back, but last year, I made it my point during the second year of the 77th General Assembly, not to reintroduce a lot of Bills, only to restrict it to the fiscal period or the fiscal areas that are reflected in this particular Resolution. Therefore, I will have to vote present at the present time."



Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

Choate: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,

I think this is a Resolution that addresses itself to a very important facit of the Legislative Branch of government. And I've got to say that as far as the Resolu- tion is concerned, it has much merit. But Representative Maragos has brought up an awfully important point as far as I'm personally concerned, and if we'll remember in the last session of the General Assembly, the House and the Senate was divided on this question, and the Senate addressed itself to the very thing the Resolution addresses itself to, but I do believe in view of the fact that we have accomplished much of the stuff, things that the ah... chief sponsor of this resolution has mentioned, primarily a viable working condition, as far as the individual member is concerned, we've increased our salaries to where it's not the best in the world, but it's not the worse, and we've told the people of this State that we want to pay attention to the matters that a Legislative Branch of government should pay attention to. I'm not going to vote for the resolution, because I don't think the resolu- tion, although it has merit, is necessary. What needs to be done is a joint rule, between the House and the Senate, addressing itself to this very important question. But it would still leave us with the prerogative it it's needed to address ourselves to annual sessions, to where we could talk about any and all kinds of legislation if



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

it needed to be. I would say that we should, we should address ourselves to joint rules and I would suggest that this is a thing that the Senate leadership should sit down with us, which we've asked to be done and talk about joint rules. Talk about joint rules that will address itself to this very important question, but I do feel that in - as much as we have the conditions, working conditions, and we have the salary, that we should leave the Constitutional provision the same as it is today, so that we can address ourselves to other problems in the need arises."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "As a new-comer, I think it's very difficult to address ourselves to this question and do an adequate job of passing judgement on. But there are some things that I would like to point out as a new-comer, and to the rest of us 55, who are here for our first term. It seems to me that we are truly limiting the legislative process if we take this approach to cure many of the ills that Representative Hirschfeld is talking about. It seems to me it can be done another way, through rules and through legislation, and the reason why I suggest this, is because if we.... I think we have to assume whether we like it or not, we're here for a two year period. I think we have to view this as a one term process, and if that's the case, and we only have from January 10 to April 15 to



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

introduce legislation, it seems to me that we're going to have a lot of bad bills introduced that are going to require many, many amendments. It seems to me the best process is one wherein we, as new-comers, have an opportunity to study, to take an enlightened approach as to what kind of bills we are going to draft, before we just toss them in the hopper, just to get them in by the April 15th deadline, and I would hate to see us preclude the opportunity of legislators who are here for about a two year period, from introducing well drafted responsible legislation, and I think that's what this does."

~~Arthur~~ Telcser: "Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Hunsicker."

Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in favor of this Resolution. Being in my sixth term now, I was in favor of annual sessions, but I see they're not working out as satisfactory as they should be. I know how the people of the district feel, as I travel over it, and many, many expressed themselves out out the annual sessions, you're wasting too much time, and too much money of the people of the State of Illinois. That you'd be better off if you went down there for one day, when you convened, collect your money and go home. The taxpayers of Illinois would be far better off and I'm going to support the Resolution."



1402

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative B. B. Wolfe."  
Wolfe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think our colleague, Representative Hirschfeld, has brought the attention of the House probably one of the most serious resolutions to come before us in this session. Everything he has said, we know, is absolutely true. But I think the objection to the approach is that in a constitutional amendment we place the burden on the people to make the change. And once the change is made, it's difficult to go back to a more extensive or liberal form of amendment. Now let's take a look at Section 5 under the sessions and if we have read the explanation of Section 5(a) we know that the constitutional convention did not intend that this body be on annual sessions. We, as a body, chose that approach on our own. Now Section 5(a) says that the General Assembly shall convene each year on the second Wednesday of January. The General Assembly shall be a continuous body during the term for which Members of the House of Representatives are elected. And there is no statement in that clause to indicate that we have to go on quote, annual sessions. Now if we can do the same job by rules and regulations that's the more logical and rational approach. I think that more seriously to be considered at this time is the effect of annual budgets. And this has cost the taxpayers of this state some \$500,000,000 and if you don't believe it, you go back."

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

four or five years to the day when we voluntarily assumed to go on annual sessions and to have annual budgets and you will see that the increase in the budgets in this State each year has amounted to approximately \$400,000,000 to \$500,000,000. This is the crux of bad legislative ah.. policy and fiscal policy of this State. I originally supported this concept as did many of you. But looking back now I see it was a tremendous mistake. And I think that we ought to sit down in Committee ah.. and in our Commissions and determine whether or not we're going to continue a bad policy that was established some four years ago. So I would oppose this approach to correcting two bad situations. It doesn't go far enough. It can be corrected through rule and regulation and through policy statements of both this body and the Senate. And I think that's the more rational and logical approach to take."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think we've heard considerable debate. I move the previous question."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman's moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. The opposed 'no'. The motion prevails. The Gentleman from Champaign to close."

Hirschfeld: "Thank you, M.. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'll try and answer the objections that have been raised one by one if possible. With regard to the point raised by the distinguished





Majority Leader that this bill is attacking the viability of the House and the Senate, all I can say is it's certainly not my intention to attack the viability at all but to try and prolong the viability of the Senate and the House and the taxpayers at the same time. Cause the taxpayers can only afford so much money and \$44,000,000 a year more just so that we can come down here and reargue bills and possibly, possibly be able to handle a few new items seems to me a bit much to ask the taxpayers to follow. Also, I might add that I have spoken with the Senate Leadership and I am insured that if we can get this bill out of the House it will be passed by the Senate and put on the ballot in 1974. So it's up to the House as to whether or not we're going to have to go back to limited annual sessions. With regard to the points raised by the distinguished Minority Leader, I would be very happy if we could get a joint rule. But we aren't going to get a joint rule and we're kidding ourselves if we think we're going to get a joint a rule. We won't even get a rule from this House that will put us in limited annual sessions. The only way we're going to do it is by a constitutional amendment. Once again, I think it's the cheapest way to go. Once again, I have to point out to the Members that have been down here before.. Look around you at the empty seats. They're filled with good, young people. But many of the people who are gone are gone because they



ment to my Constitutional Amendment. I really thought that you were with me. I'm sorry that you're not. And I would just suggest to you that the problems that you raised are legitimate and perhaps they should be brought up in another format. But you did not amend my bill and therefore I must run with it as it is. I think it's a serious, serious problem. And I can fully appreciate Representative Beaupre's comment: that the new members probably do not understand the problem as greatly as we do. But I think we've got to go back to limited annual sessions. I know that I have some opposition from the leadership. That's become very obvious. But I think if we're going to vote for ourselves, for our constituents, we will pass this constitutional amendment and get it on the docket. I would appreciate affirmative roll call."

A. Telcser: "Question is, shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment No. 1. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. The opposed by voting 'no'. It'll take 107 votes. Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, for over 100 years the Illinois General Assembly got along without offices and secretaries, too. Because crises do not wait for odd number of years, I'm voting 'no'."

A. Telcser: "Have all voted who.. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."



Katz: "Ah.. explaining my vote Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, ah.. ah.. this is ah.. a matter on ah.. which my ah.. judgment and my personal interest conflict. Because, frankly I share the same inconvenience that others feel with reference to the increasing time demands of the General Assembly. It is my conclusion that this is a matter that can better be handled by rules. Ah.. bear in mind that the last constitution we had ah.. lasted oh, 1870 for about 70 or so years. So that when you're amending the constitution you are amending it for a very long time. Circumstances do change and it would not surprise me that 10 or 15 or 20 years from now that it might be necessary to have annual sessions. Frankly, 15 or 20 years ago I think the situation in Illinois was quite different than it is today. And I do believe that this matter can better be handled by a joint rule. There is a meeting that is scheduled already immediately after the Easter Recess to discuss joint rules and ah.. if this matter is not passed, the matter will be pursued in the Joint Rules and I do hope that responding to the judgment of all of the members of the House, I would hope that there would be a joint rule that would try to accomplish the really excellent purposes that I know that gentleman from Champaign has in mind. Accordingly, I'm forced to vote 'no' here. Even though my heart is with him to a substantial extent in what he seeks to do."



Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it seems to me in this particular instance that one of the most compelling reasons why we should support this Resolution. Previously, we've listened to the arguments about the viability of this particular body, but I want to tell you that the citizenry of the State of Illinois should be entitled to have a little bit of time to access the legislation that goes through this Body and we can't do it if we're constantly changing the Statutes each and every year. And I think that's one of the real good reasons, particularly on your cat and dog bills to have this legislation to come in once every two years. Now, I am in accord with the annual budgeting in every respect, and also in a case of a demonstrable emergency, the leadership or the Governor can call special sessions to which we can address ourselves to, but it seems to me that we have gone much astray of what the intent and purpose of the Constitution was, and I think everyone should support this and certainly in behalf of the citizenry of the State of Illinois."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative B. B. Wolfe."

Wolfe: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, and particularly John, I told you several weeks ago I believed in this concept of your's, but I didn't believe in the



approach. I will join with you on a House Joint Resolution, not only to take care of the annual sessions, but the matter of the annual budget, and I think it's a matter for both Houses to determine and it can easily and readily be determined in Committee and in.... under the House Rules."

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

Leon: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am going to vote to support this Resolution for various reasons. One of the reasons is, that I believe that we should give the People of the State of Illinois the opportunity to vote to affirm or deny annual sessions or sessions as proposed in this House Constitutional Amendment. Secondly, I feel that the Members of the Constitutional Convention were very, very much undecided as whether to mandate continuous annual sessions. If you read the Constitution that we provided in that Constitution, that the House or this General Assembly as a continuous Body, but we also provided that we convene... mandated that we convene in January of each year. Therefore, there was some reluctance on part of the Constitutional Convention delegates to mandate annual sessions per se. If we are going to be in annual session, we will never have the opportunity of having a Peoples Legislature. You're going to develop into a general assembly of professional politicians, which at the present time, is an abhorant word to use. On the other hand, we will have to,



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

if we do go into continuous sessions, as this House is now in, we would have to strengthen our ethics bills to provide that Members of this Body shall be engaged in no other activity where they receive remuneration for the period of time that they are elected. This particularly, this particularly I believe would eliminate all attorneys for this Body. Now if you don't desire to have a Peoples General Assembly, I suggest that you continue 'no' as I see on the Board. If you feel that you wish to give the People of the State of Illinois an opportunity to decide whether or not they want a professional General Assembly or if they wish a Peoples General Assembly, I think you should vote green. In conclusion, I see that the State Farm Bureau has recommended the adoption of this Resolution, as well as the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce. I respectfully urge those of you who have voted red and who have not voted to switch on your green lights."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. Record Representative Maragos as voting 'present'. On this question, there are 70 'ayes', 77 'nays', 2 answering 'present', and the Gentleman's motion to adopt House Joint Resolution, Constitutional Amendment No. 1, fails. On the Order of Constitutional Amendments Third Reading appears House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment No. 12, for which purpose the gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley, is recognized. Oh, I'm sorry, the Clerk has to read it."



F. B. Selcke: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment No. 12. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 78th General Assembly, State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the electors of this State at the General Election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Section 2 of Article IV of the Constitution to read as follows: 'Article IV. Section 2. Legislative Composition. A. One Senator shall be elected from each Legislative District. Immediately following each desenateorial re-districting, the General Assembly by law shall divide the Legislative Districts as equally as possible into three groups. Senators from one group shall be elected for terms of four years, four years and two years. Senators from the second group for terms of four years, two years and four years, and Senators from the third group for terms of two years, four years and four years. The Legislative Districts in each group shall be distributed substantially equal over the State. B. Three Representatives shall be elected from each legislative district for a term of two years. An election for representatives and including those for nomination, each elector may cast three votes for one candidate or distribute them equally among no more than three candidates. Candidates highest in vote shall be declared elected.



C. To be eligible to serve as a Member of the General Assembly, a person must be a United States citizen, at least 21 years old and for the two years preceding his election or appointment, a resident of the District to which he is to represent. The General Election following a redistricting, a candidate for General Assembly may be elected from any district which contains a part of the district of which he resided at the time of the redistricting and reelected. If a resident of a new district he represents for 18 months prior to the re-election.

D. Within 30 days after a vacancy occurs, it shall be filled by appointment as provided by law. The vacancy if in a senatorial office with more than 28 months remaining in the term, the appointed senator shall serve until the next General Election, at which time a senator shall be elected to serve for the remainder of the term. If the vacancy is in a representative office or any other senatorial office, the appointment shall be for the remainder of the term. An appointee to fill a vacancy shall be a member of the same political party as the person he succeeds.

E. No Member of the General Assembly shall receive compensation as a public officer or employee from any other governmental entity for the time for which he is an attendant as a Member of the General Assembly. No Member of the General Assembly during the term for which he was elected or appointed shall be appointed to a public office, which shall have been created for the

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



compensation for which has been increased by the General Assembly during that term'."

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

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, so that we might expedite matters here this morning, I would like to call to the attention of each Member, that there is a possibility of conflict of interests on the part of each and everyone of us. For what we're deleting today is a sentence in the Constitution that reads 'no political party shall limit its nomination to less than two candidates for representative in any legislative district'. If we pass this Constitutional Amendment, and if the People adopt it, we will be back to where we were prior to the 1970 Constitution, and what that means is, that the Representative Committeemen for under the new Election Code, the County Chairman will meet and decide how many candidates will be certified to run in the General Election. Now we all realize that under the present system, that we run into a problem of party splitting between candidates in a particular district where it is very obvious that we are only going to elect one candidate. We run into a problem of ah.... bulleting, bullet voting as we've heard so much about. The voting in each district, we have an educational problem in every district, in educating the people how to split there vote one, two or three under this ah..... under the way that



we are electing our representatives under the 1970 Constitution. It is much simpler in some districts where it's very obvious only one candidate is going to be elected of that particular party, to have that party elect their representative in the primary election and not in the general election. I think it is a piece of legislation also, that in the new constitution, was hidden somewhat. If you'll recall, we voted separately on 1A and 1B, 2A, 2B and 3A and 3B, which means to me that the Constitutional Convention members could not decide themselves as to what should or should not be done, or how we should or should not be elected as representatives to the General Assembly. They left it to the People and I... personally I don't believe that it was clear to the People as to just exactly what they were voting on. I think we should take this back to the People, give them another chance when they are not being hindered in making a decision by the burdensome problem of voting on a number of issues. They can vote on this singly. I'm sure that every Member that votes on the issue will realize what they are voting on. It came out of the committee by a vote on 9,4 and no against. I think there were four or five Members who voted present, but I do call it to the attention of every Member of this House, because each and every one of you, it is an important issue. I'd be glad to answer any questions, although I think it's fairly obvious what the Amendment is asking. I ask for



your support on the Resolution."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to ask a question of the Speaker, if I may."

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates a yield."

Peters: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker, am I correct that we are... can only amend a section of the Constitution with three particular items? Art, Mr. Speaker, if I might ask you for this."

Arthur Telcser: "Oh, I'm sorry, proceed."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, am I right that the Constitution provides that we can only amend an Article with three different items? Is that right?"

Arthur Telcser: "That's my understanding, Representative."

Peters: "Now, just looking through the book, I see that we have before us here some twenty Constitutional Amendments. I know that a number of them deal with the Revenue article. Just a suggestion, Mr. Speaker, to you and the Members of the Rules Committee, that if we hear the Constitutional Amendments in the same manner in which we are hearing the other Bills, we might find ourselves in the position of having already approved three of the Constitutional Amendments and then being prohibited from any action on the fourth or fifth, which might relate to the let's say the Revenue Article. I wonder if the Rules Committee may consider a change in regard to ah.... the approach we have here with these Bills. You see my point, Art?"



Arthur Telcser: "Yes, I think it's a good point and that perhaps at the next Leadership meeting, ah.... we would take that up. Now the gentleman, however, is faced with a calendar deadline today and should he be successful in getting this passed, of course, it could be held up in the Senate. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I don't quite .... I don't follow your ruling. I think...."

Arthur Telcser: "I didn't make a rule. I just said...."

Shea: "Well, I think the Constitution says that not more than three articles may be attempted to be amended at one time, but it doesn't say you couldn't have two or three amendments to an Article, so in effect, you could have nine or ten propositions on the ballot, although you didn't seek to amend more than three articles."

Arthur Telcser: "I think the gentleman's point was, is that there is some type of constrictio:n as to doing this ah.... doing the Constitutional Amendments- and perhaps the leadership or the rules committee or whoever ought to consider it from an overview. The point may be well taken however, Representative Bradley is faced with a calendar deadline. I feel he has to act today if he wishes. Now is there further discussion on the ah.... Amendment? The gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart."

Hart: "Well, I ah.... assume everybody is familiar with what this Amendment does now that it has been discussed, but I think it's very unfortunate that this matter comes before



us. Certainly, ah... the Constitution ah... this didn't slip by in the Constitution inadvertently or in a hidden, obscure part of it. I think the People are more concerned because of the prior practice of letting a handful of persons decide whether or not one or two persons would be able to be nominated for the General Assembly. The last time that I ran in my district, before the Constitutional Convention, the Republican Party limited the candidates to one. And ah... there was a lot of unrest about it. As a matter of fact, there was an independent that ran just on that particular issue, that ah... the People ought to have a choice in November and not just in March. So I think that ah... with all difference to the Sponsor of this, that ah... it's an extremely bad piece of legislation and we ought to defeat it."

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

Bradley: "In closing, Mr. Speaker, in regarding the remarks of the last gentleman, let me just say... simply remind him, it does not limit to only one, you can still certify two or three and I think that ah... the Representative, Committeemen, that are also elected or whoever or under the new code the County Chairman who is also elected by the ah... Committeemen, form a nucleus ah... voice of the People to be able to make a decision as to, in their opinion, representing the People who elect them, whether they can ah... certify if it would help their party."



to certify two candidates in a General Election and I ask for the support of the Members of the House."

Arthur Telcser: "Question is, shall the House Adopt House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment Number 12? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. 107 votes. Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, it's somewhat the opposite of Representative Hart's position in this matter. In our district, it's so overwhelmingly weighted in favor of the opposition brand X party that if we had this rule, either Representative Blades or I would not be here because it would only have run one, and on the assumption that that would have been a loss to the House, I reluctantly vote 'no', although I always like to support the Sponsor's bills."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this question, there are 37 'ayes', 83 'nays', and the Gentleman's motion to adopt House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment Number 12 fails." On the Order of Constitutional Amendments Third Reading appears House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment Number 13."

F. B. Selcke: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment Number 13. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 78th General Assembly, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the Electors of the General Election next occurring at least six months after



adoption of this Resolution a proposition to amend Section 4 of Article IX of the Constitution of the State of Illinois, by the addition of a new paragraph D to read as follows: 'Article IX. Revenue. Section 4. Real Property taxation. D. The General Assembly may provide by law for incentives for the rehabilitation or improvement of residential real estate to deferral of an increase in assessment of that real estate'. Third Reading of the Resolution."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I believe here is one Constitutional Amendment that we can all support here today. This Amendment passed out of Committee by a vote of 13 to nothing, and I believe there was one answering present. This Resolution would enable the General Assembly to provide tax incentives for persons who improve or rehabilitate residential real estate. I personally believe that the approval of this Amendment, if it is adopted by the ah... voters, could well be the answer to ending urban blight and decaying neighborhoods. Since property taxes are assessed according to valuation, the only thing a property owner can count on when he or she makes improvements on their homes or other residential property, is the higher tax bill. And I believe the voters will approve this in overwhelming numbers, and if they do we could return in 1975 to work out specific details and



enact a program. I think the ultimate effect of this legislation would probably be some of the most significant tax reform undertaken by the General Assembly in recent years, and I think that tax relief for the homeowner is an absolute necessity, and right now as the Constitution as... presently reads, I think in some respects we are actually discouraging repair, renovation of and rehabilitation of our older properties, and I would solicit your support."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Question is, shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment Number 13. All in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. It will take 107 votes. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I concur wholeheartedly with the Sponsor in the remarks he made in terms of the need for this kind of an amendment in order to bring some order and some relief to the property taxpayers. As you well know, if you make some rehabilitation in your home now, if you add on a bathroom, if you remodel, if you add on an extra bedroom to the House, if you panel the basement, your county assessor, legally must come in, reassess that house in order to increase your taxes. While on the other end of it, if you've got an old building and you don't repair that building and you leave it go to rot, the chances are if you come before the assessor on the basis of the lower value





of that building, you end up getting a tax break. It seems to me our priority is all mixed up in this one. We ought to be giving the People who are maintaining our neighborhoods, who are conserving in rehabilitating property the benefit of our aid here in terms of some tax help. I urge all of you, we've got 107, to vote 'yes'."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. This question, there are 128 'ayes', 7 'nays', and the House adopts House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment Number 13, with the required three-fifths vote. Constitutional Amendments Second Reading."

F. B. Selcke: "Ah.... House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment Number 16. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 78th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the Electors of this State at the General Election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Sections 1, 3 and 7 of Article V, Section 2 of Article X of the Constitution to read as follows: 'Article V. Section 1. Officers. The Executive Branch shall include a Governor, a Lt. Governor, Attorney General, Secretary of State, Supt. of Public Instruction, Comptroller and Treasurer, elected by the Electors of the State. They shall keep the Public records and maintain a resident of seat of government during their terms of office.'



Section 3. Eligibility. To be eligible to hold office of Governor, Lt. Governor, Attorney General, Secretary of State, Supt. of Public Instruction, Comptroller or Treasurer, a person must be a United States Citizen, at least twenty-five years old and a resident of this State for three years proceeding his election. Section 7. Vacancies in other elective offices. If the Attorney General, Secretary of State, Supt. of Public Instruction, Comptroller or Treasurer fails to qualify or if his office becomes vacant, the Governor shall fill the office by appointment. The appointee shall hold office until the elected officer qualifies or until a successor is elected and qualified as may be provided by law and shall not be subject to removal by the Governor. The Lt. Governor fails to qualify or if his office becomes vacant, it shall remain vacant until the end of the term.

Article X. Section 2. Supt. of Public Instruction. The Supt. of Public Instruction shall have the duties and powers that may be prescribed by law and he may, except as limited by law, establish goals, determine policies, provide for planning and evaluating education program, and recommend financing. Schedule. At the end of the term of Supt. of Public Instruction elected in 1970 or upon the earlier existence of a vacancy in that office, the Governor shall make an appointment to fill the office until the election in 1976. A Supt of



Public Instruction shall be elected in 1976 for a term of two years. This schedule supersedes Section 7 of the transition schedule of the Constitution of 1970'. Second Reading of the Constitutional Amendment."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, House Bills, Third Reading. It's Third Reading for the Constitutional Amendment. Now, it's my intention to go back to House Bills Third Reading, pick up ah.... Representative Huskey's bill and go to consideration postponed and pick up those Bills which ah.... have an April 19th or 20th date. House Bills Third Reading. Is the Amendment distributed yet on 433? If the Amendments aren't distributed today, the Bills are going to die. O'kay, we'll go to Consideration Postponed. O'kay, on order of House Bills, Third Reading, House Bill 369."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 369. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act of 1939. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

McPartlin: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask leave of the House, to suspend Rule 37 to have these Bills heard, April 27 and I will work with the Majority Leader on an Amendment for these Bills."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, the Gentleman from Cook, a.... the Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh, indicates that the Sponsor has conferred with him. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McPartlin, moves that the House suspend the provisions of Rule 37 so that



House Bills 369 and 370 can appear on the Calendar up to the date of April 27. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. 107 votes. Kosinski 'aye'. Mann 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Springer 'aye'. Take the Record. Phil Collins 'aye'. Skinner 'aye'. J. J. Wolf 'aye'. This question, 132 'ayes', no 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. O'kay, Representative Washington, are your Amendments distributed, Sir? On the Order of Postponed Consideration, appears House Bill 4, which has been read a Third time and the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Washington, is recognized."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I ask leave to return House Bill 4 to the Order of Second Reading for purposes of Amendment."

Arthur Telcser: "The Amendment hasn't even been printed yet."

Washington: "It has not yet been printed?"

Arthur Telcser: "Not yet, Sir. It's being printed now for distribution. On the Order of Consideration Postponed appears House Bill 238. Do you have Amendments, Representative Ewell and have they been distributed?"

Ewell: "Yeow, Representative Katz has an Amendment and it has been distributed."

Arthur Telcser: "Have they been distributed? When did you bring the Amendments up? Amendments aren't distributed. Take it out of the Record. On the Order of Consideration Postponed, appears House Bill 291, for which purpose the



Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe is recognized."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah... we were a few votes short the other day, because of the heavy snow. Also the synopsis in the.... is wrong in the book, and I think the Bill was misunderstood at that time. I have to tell you that at the present time, the Bill now is supported by the Illinois Municipal League. It's supported by Attorney General Scott, and it's supported by EPA. And what it does is that it lessens the time from 90 days to 120 days in which a variation may be heard. And it takes away from the power of the Illinois Pollution Control Board the power to grant the variation by default. In addition to that, it will also suspend any time that the Board is unable to exercise this authority because they do not have a legally constituted quorum. As I indicated beforehand, it is a good Bill. It's been debated beforehand on the Floor, and I think we were a couple of votes short because of the fact of the heavy snow. Many of the Members were not down here at that particular time. I think many people were confused because of the synopsis which is wrong. I think I have straightened out many people with regard to the synopsis. It is supported by the Illinois Municipal League. It's supported by Attorney General Scott and it's supported by the EPA, and I would solicit an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Question is, shall



House Bill 291 pass? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. The gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe, to explain his vote."

Jaffe: "Well, I'll do some quick talking. I think, if there's any questions, I'd be very happy to answer it. I will stress the fact that it is now supported by the Illinois Municipal League, which helped me draft this particular Amendment. The Bill is now really the Amendment, so if you would look at your Amendment, you would find out what the Bill is, and do not look at your synopsis. Attorney General Scott was here on the Floor of the House just a week and a half ago and indicated that he wanted this Bill. He told me about how he had spent \$30,000 prosecuting a particular case and then that case went right down the tube, because the Illinois Pollution Control Board did not act within 90 days and they got a Variation by Default. The EPA wants this. I don't know anybody who is really against it, except maybe the Illinois Manufacturing Association, and I haven't heard them speak so far today, but I would appreciate some green votes on that board, and let us pass this good legislation."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this question, there are 93 'ayes', 37 'nays' and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"



Borchers: "I wonder, just to explain my vote, it's too late, but I just say that this is the most terrible bill I've seen against every industry and plant in the State of Illinois. You've made a terrible mistake. So think about it."

Arthur Telcser: "On the Order of Consideration Postponed appears House Bill.... Gentleman from Cook, Representative Maragos, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Having voted on the prevailing side on the previous Bill, I now ask that the vote by which that Bill is passed be reconsidered."

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

Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, I move that that question lay on the Table."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved that motion lie upon the Table. All in favor, signify by saying 'aye', Representative Borchers, do you...."

Borchers: "I request a roll call."

Arthur Telcser: "Are you joined by four Members, Sir? Yes he is. The question is, Gentleman from Cook, Representative Maragos, has moved the vote by which House Bill 291 be reconsidered, and the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lundy, has moved that motion lie upon the Table. The question is, on the Gentleman's motion to Table. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye'. The opposed by voting 'no'. This question will be decided by the



Majority of those voting. Have all voted who wish? Telcser 'aye'. Take the Record. On this question, there are 79 'ayes', 33 'nays, and the gentleman's motion to Table prevails. Harold Washington 'aye'. On the Order of Consideration Postponed appears House Bill 350, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Douglas, is recognized."

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on this very nonconversial matter of non-smokers bill of rights, where everybody was caught who would have come here and given me the votes that we needed the other day, because of the weather, I'd like to give to the Members of the House some information that I hope will help us to make the decision which I think is in the best interest of the People of the State of Illinois. The objections to this Bill, where a number of People have stated that they felt there was not enough teeth in the Bill to make it work, or where they felt that the offense that it might create to those large number of people who do smoke, I think does not warrant being opposed to this piece of legislation. What the Bill does is it establishes a State of Illinois policy, which would entitle the proprietor or manager of a place of public accomodation simply to set aside separate facilities for non-smokers without fear of recrimination by those who smoke. Those of us who do not smoke, who often express to each other the discomfort that we share in places of public accomodations





often express exapiration at the uselessness of signs saying 'no smoking'. And I, myself, expressed publicly the flustration that I have felt when I have gone to a proprietor of some place of public accomodation and shown him the smoke all around the no smoking sign on the wall. Now for those who say there is no way to avoid that, I say that it's vital in the interest in the health and welfare of the citizens of this state that we make an important step in that direction. The Bill, which is before you, would in every sense of the word, fulfill the intent of the Illinois State Constitution, wherein there is an article, which says that the citizens of the State of Illinois are entitled to a clean environment, and the General Assembly in that Constitution is given the prerogative to elaborate upon that so-called horditory statement. The additional advantages of this legislation are that it would add a potential new dimension to the public health responsiblities of the State, by protecting the rights of the elderly, the debilitated, and those who are highly sensitive to polluted air, especially in confined, public places. This Bill recognizes the reality and the scientific fact that second-hand smoke, not only creates an uncomfortable environment for smokers as well as non-smokers but an environment that is proven to be dangerous and detrimental to health. I might suggest that in places like jury rooms or police hearing rooms or other public places, where proprietors or managers might need



this extra inducement to put up a sign telling people that smoking would be in the poorest interest of effective performance of the duties of those people who work in those places that this Bill would have some bearing. It would begin to make some sense out of the no smoking signs that exist everywhere and are ignored by smokers. Now in final comment, I'd like to emphasize the extreme danger that can exist in some places because of the collection of smoke in confined spaces. In night clubs and restaurants and places of public accommodation where the proprietor makes a decision encouraged by his.... by the people who use those facilities, a proprietor can set aside places where non-smokers could be free of the lethal, yes the lethal effects of some carbon monoxide, of the content of the air of carbon monoxide. It has been shown in some places that the carbon monoxide content in the air reaches lethal proportions if breathed over a long enough period of time. And finally, in line with comments that have been made on the floor of this House, when we sit here long enough or people in other auditoriums or conference rooms sit long enough, breathing air, which is polluted by constant exellations of smoke from cigarettes, pipes and cigars, the impact on those who have upper respiratory difficulties, the impact on those who because of age have more difficulty in breathing because of a decrease in the elasticity of their chest muscles, is a matter which is of public concern and which I think could at



least begin to be dealt with if this Bill were to be passed. I would appreciate your favorable vote. Thank you very much."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I was indeed delighted that the good man who sponsored this fine Bill permitted me to be one of the co-sponsors, although I was well down the line on that list. The Surgeon General, more than ten years ago, pointed out that smoking was very hazardous and dangerous to your health. He attempted to blow the whistle on that foul, dirty, wicked habit. He's blown the whistle every year thereafter, but nobody listened. Now the right of this Body to pass laws, forbidding you to destroy yourself a lick at a time is questionable, but the duty and the power of this House to adopt a Bill to protect the innocent bystanders from being similarly contaminated is clear. I urge you to put aside your own personal pledges in this matter. Have the courage to stand up and give this the green light. In your lungs, you know that he's right."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, the gentleman from Kane, Representative Friedland."

Friedland: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the previous question."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question."



All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The gentleman's motion prevails, and Representative Douglas to close."

Douglas: "Enough said, Mr. Speaker. I would appreciate your support. Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Question is, shall House Bill 350 pass? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson."

Rayson: "I'd like to explain my vote briefly. My 'aye' vote. First, I've been a narcotic addict for many years and I'm not proud of it, and I'm sorry and I hope that I have not offended anybody by being one. But secondly and more importantly, that this is the kind of legislation that I encourage because it's an encouragement policy. It suggests that governmental bodies, buildings where there is custodial supervision should set aside rooms, public accommodations, there should be rooms set aside to consider the nonsmoker. Now, there's no penalties here. It's just sort of an encouragement policy and it's suggestive of many ways in which we can legislate rather than really pounce on something and pronounce penalties. For example, on the question of abortion, we could do it this way, to discourage abortions and I think it is commendable of the gentleman to have this kind of Bill."

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

Arrigo: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I



think many of you are aware that I have a deep feeling with reference to inhaling the exhaled smoke of other smokers. As a matter of fact, I'm in the process now of fighting a battle that I hope I have won. We only ask the support and the consideration of the rest of you for those of us who have to fight a very important battle which may very well even take into consideration the extinction of our own lives. And as an American of Italian descent, if I deplore anything that the discovery of America has brought to the World, it was the discovery of tobacco when the new World was discovered. Other than the filthy reed that the tobacco is, the World was much better for the discovery of America. As you all know, corn, tomattoes, the turkey, many other products, but tobacco was the worst product that the discovery of America gave to the rest of the World. I only hope that those of you who have not had to undergo lung surgery would only give a little consideration that some of us need all the air, all the uncontaminated air that we can breathe, and I urge for your support, please."

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

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

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, am I too late to explain my vote for about two seconds?"

Arthur Telcser: "Proceed, Sir."

Douglas: "There were 81 votes up there, and my reason for explaining my vote at the time that this Bill would go down



if it were not passed today, is obvious. I would like to just comment briefly that this is one step in the direction of Illinois becoming the first State in the United States to succeed in passing legislation which would in essence establish a policy where we recognize the rights of two-thirds of the citizens of our State. The reason that I'm voting green here is not only because it's my own bill. It's because two-thirds of the citizens of this State and two-thirds of the citizens of this country are not adequately represented if we fail to give them the right to be able to separate themselves when they asked to do it and I hope we can get the remaining votes for Illinois to make history in this country and move in this direction by getting this Bill out of this House."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, now we've got 83 votes right now. Mann 'aye'. Representative Stedelin, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Stedelin: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, just to explain my vote. I'm sorry to say I'm a smoker, but when I was a young man, in every train you had a smoking car, and you had smoking in other places, and I'm voting 'yes'. I think this is a step in the right direction and if a man smokes and loves it as much as I do, feel that way, then I think we owe it to protect those who don't smoke, because I've been in places, even though I'm a smoker, I hate it. So I would appreciate some more green votes."



Arthur Telcser: "All right, Barry 'aye'. Brummet 'aye'. O'kay.  
We have Barry 'aye'. Is he already on? Brummet 'aye'.  
Craig 'aye'. Mike Madigan 'aye'. Flinn 'aye'. Representative  
Duff, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Arthur Telcser: "How's the gentleman recorded?"

Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Duff: "Change my vote to 'aye', please."

Arthur Telcser: "Record the gentleman as voting 'aye'. Giorgi  
'aye'. Tuerk 'no!'. Schoeberlein 'aye'. Representative  
Peters, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Peters: "Mr. Clerk, how am I recorded?"

Arthur Telcser: "How is the gentleman recorded?"

Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as 'not voting'."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm  
not so certain that this is just a merely bill, an advisory  
kind of situation of various public agencies. On the  
face of the Bill, it does say 'State Officers and heads  
of State agencies and departments are directed to imple-  
ment with all practical speed the policies of this Act.  
Such implementation shall include the establishment of  
no smoking areas in cafeterias and work areas and the  
prohibition of smoking in conference rooms, auditoriums'  
and the Body of the Act in Section 2 lists 'department  
stores, taverns, restaurants, eating houses, hat stores,  
skating rinks, stages, auditoriums, boats' and all sorts  
of other things. I'm not sure what this might end up



costing the State or what it might end up costing the business people. It's a laudible kind of situation. I appreciate the sponsor's effort in this area, but I'm not sure what it's going to end up costing everybody and I'm going to have to vote 'present'."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, Representative Peters votes 'present'. Now, right now, we have 90 'ayes', so you know where we are at. Representative Borchers, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Borchers: "To explain my 'no' vote. I don't smoke. It bothers me. You put a lot of cigarettes around me and it makes me cough. I don't like it, but let me tell you something. This is invasion of personal privilege and right. It's against your own freedom, and I will never vote to destroy the freedom of the individual, and that's exactly what you're getting ready to do. Upon this same basis, we might separate a men's store into two sections - one for one purpose and one for another, and restrict it to that, and various other things, and ah.... I didn't say men and women. Nothing to do with ERA. But you're going in the direction of a dangerous direction."

Arthur Telcser: "Klosak 'aye'. Maragos 'aye'. Katz.... Representative Katz, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, I wanted to explain my vote in light of the gentleman's last remarks. It has been said that one man's freedom ends at the point when another man's nose begins, and I would like to say that somebody else's"





freedom ends at the point when they're polluting the atmosphere, then I have to breathe in order to stay alive, and it seems to me that the primary privacy and personal rights is the right of a citizen if he wants to breathe clean air, and that's what this Bill is all about."

Arthur Telcser: "Brinkmeier 'aye'. Now, the gentleman has 93 'ayes'. Let's try to save some time, huh?" All right, now, for those of you who wish to get on the roll call, come up to the Clerk's desk and get on. The gentleman has 93 voting 'aye', 34 'nay'. 2 answering 'present' and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Consideration Postponed, appears House Bill 382, which has been read a third time. The gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill which was designed to improve the control of obnoxious weeds in response to a suggestion of the way the law could be improved by the authorities of Lake County. It's supported by the Department of Agriculture and it simply provides that where Lake County or another County might want to agree with the township, that the township could do a more effective job of controlling weeds, that that could be done. Makes no other changes in the law and I urge its favorable consideration by the House."



Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 382 pass? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Want to try and talk it up Tom? Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say that I was concealing the real purpose of this Bill. Actually, it's a deceptively innocent Bill, but under the surface, it has some dyer consequences and they're namely two or three. One is there is a respected Member of the House who is growing obnoxious weeds on the back 40 and absolutely refuses to have those weeds irradiated, and for fear the township and the county might conspire to irradiate those weeds, and ah..... so ah.... I am... I believe it would be wonderful thing if each and every member of the Illinois House of Representatives were a law abiding citizen, setting an example for the great State, and so that's one of the hidden purposes of this Bill, to bring this resisting member of the Illinois General Assembly into compliance with the obnoxious Weed Control Act. And secondly, a purpose of this Bill is to stimulate, strengthen and encourage the Democratic Party of Cook County, by suggesting to the Democrats there, that should they ever lose the County election, the Republicans might take over and conspire with the townships to ah... establish all sorts of bureaucratic patronage jobs such as Fiscal Commissioners, Marijuana managers and other



sorts of jobs that might strengthen the Republican Party, so for those two reasons, I'm sure that every Democrat on the other side of the aisle would want to vote to put the green light up there and provide this wonderful incentive to strengthen their own Party, and I'm sure that my colleagues on this side will want to repent of his sins and put a green light on to."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, what bothers me about this Bill is this Bill was suggested by the Lake County Board of Supervisors but the Chairman of the Board and some of the members of the Lake County Board who suggested this Bill, are also serving as elected township supervisors. They are elected county board members and also elected township supervisors and I was originally for this Bill, but after studying it, I came to the conclusion that the purpose of the Bill was to find something useful for townships to do in the urbanized area and to find some excuse for their being, and so I think those gentlemen that serve on the Lake County Board and also serve as township supervisors were trying to find something for their townships to do to justify this Federal revenue sharing they're getting, and I don't think this is a good Bill. We put the power in the Counties ourselves here in the General Assembly. Let's leave it there and have uniform control of obnoxious weeds throughout a county and not different standards in each and every township."



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

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I don't know how Representative Deuster got onto my back 40, but with shame and embarrassment, I surrender. I vote 'aye'."

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

On this question, there are 43 'ayes', 43 'nays' and this Bill having failed to received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. O'okay, back on the Order of Third Reading, the Amendments to House Bill 433 have been distributed. The Bill has been read a Third time and the gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer is recognized. Oh, I'm sorry, it's on Second Reading. It has been read a Second time. Amendment Number 1 has been Tabled and now, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer, wishes to offer another Amendment."

Selcke: "Amendment Number 2. Palmer. Amend...."

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

Palmer: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment Number 2 constitutes a new Bill. Ah.... in trying to get around the Furman decision. We believe that we have done so with this Bill. It provides for the mandatory death penalty in cases of forcible felony listed in paragraph 1, that is, those parts of paragraph 1, on lawful distribution of heroin or other illegal controlled substance. If a death results from this, the ah.... the sentence shall be death. Includes the peace officer, the firemen, the employee of the Department of Corrections,



and the contract killer. I would like to say that we've worked on this thing considerably, and we feel it is constitutional and I ask that this Amendment Number 2 be adopted."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has offered and moved for adoption Amendment Number 2 to House Bill 433. All in favor of adoption, signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading. O'kay, on the Order of Third Reading appears House Bill 433, which has been read a Third time. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer, is recognized."

Palmer: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment Number 2 is the Bill and we provide by this Bill that if there's arson, a murder is committed in the perpetration of arson, rape, robbery, burglary, unlawfully and by force taking possession and control of aircraft, kidnapping, unlawful throwing or placing or discharging of a bomb or other destructive device, if a death resulted from the unlawful distribution of heroin or other illegal controlled substance, or if the person murdered was a peace officer or fireman. If the murdered individual was a employee of an institution or facility under the Department of Corrections, while in the course of performance of their duty, or if there is a contract killing involved, that these people shall be sent to death. I shall not go into the rational of this. We've had other



Bills that set forth the rational. In order to save the time of the House, I will ask for your favorable vote."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 433 pass? All those....Question is, shall House Bill 433 pass? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Fleck 'aye'. McAvoy 'aye'. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer, wish to explain his vote?"

Palmer: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is somewhat different from the other Bills that have been presented in that we have included a death taking place as result of the unlawful distribution of heroin. It is also different in other aspects, insofar as the murdered individual was an employee of an institution under the Department of Corrections, but we've also added to that, or a person by the.... with the... is present in the institution with the knowledge and approval of the Chief Administrative Officer which would take care of situations where they go into, in the case of a prison riot, where people go in there, sometimes attorneys, sometimes other people, if that person is murdered trying to quell that riot, then of course, the person that commits the murder, shall be sentenced to death. We've also added the category of bombing. If a murdered is connected or committed in the ah.... while a bombing has taken place, or in connection with a bombing, we've added that category.



We've given some broader.... a little broader umbrella here, believing that, of course, in these cases, that that person has no right to remain in the society in which we live. Now we passed out every other Bill of this category, mandatory death sentence and trying to meet the constitutional objections set forth in Furman, I see no reason why this Bill should not also and likewise be passed out."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? You've got two more votes by the way. Representative McAvoy and Fleck have asked to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Are they on. Fleck's not on, is he? Oh, LaFleur wishes to be voted as 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Maragos 'present'. Jones 'aye'. Take the Record. Getty 'present'. On this question, there are 94 'ayes', 37 'nays', Giorgi 'present', 3 answering 'present'. Oh, Giorgi 'present'. Giorgi 'aye'. Beaupre. Record Representative Beaupre as voting 'no'. Miller 'aye'. Tom Miller, and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Consideration Postponed appears House Bill 4, for which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Washington, is recognized."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to return House Bill 4 from the Order of Postponed Consideration to the Order of Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."

Arthur Telcser: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, House Bill on the Order of Second Reading."



Are there any Amendments?"

Selcke: "Amendment Number 1, Washington. Amend House Bill 4.."

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

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, ah.... I think you're all familiar with House Bill 4. It was debated at length yesterday. I'm not going into the merits of that again. Suffice to say that this Amendment simply does this. It provides that the present stop frisk laws of the State of Illinois shall apply only and exclusively to those cities and municipalities of less than one-half million population. As you recall, most of the charges and allegations and indictments, if you will, brought against police were confined in the main, to the City of Chicago, and we have the distinct impression that some of the downstate Members wanted to maintain the law in those areas and there were no allegations of abuse but simply could not go along with the total repeal because they wanted the law to stay in those districts. A substantial portion of the people in the City of Chicago maintain that they simply cannot live under this law. I am asking you, particularly the Members of downstate, to repeal the law only as it applies to the City of Chicago and that is what this Amendment does."

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

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would urge the defeat of House Bill 4. Under its...."





As....ah...."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman is offering an Amendment."

Collins: "I'm sorry, well, I would urge the ah... rejection of this Amendment. I think as applied within here, ah... with this Amendment, is that policemen everywhere in the rest of the country may be all right, but in Chicago, they are no good. Well I resent this kind of insinuation. I think that the City of Chicago has the most magnificent police force in the Nation. I say that not a day goes by, that we can't point to them with pride for the actions that they have taken. And if there is, if there is abuse now and then in a group of men that large, I think it's amazing that there isn't more abuse and I look at other cities where there has been much more scandalous behavior and allegations then in the City of Chicago. I think that here is a police force, that in the whole, can serve as a model for the Nation. I've always been proud of the Chicago police and I think that this Amendment is a direct slap at them and should be rejected."

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

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, may I have a ruling from the Chair? Does this take away the Home Rule powers and how many votes of this is required?"

Arthur Telcser: "I am informed that this does not affect the Home Rule powers."



Lechowicz: "Well, I dissent, Mr. Speaker, and if need be, I'll put it in writing."

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, may I address the Amendment?"

Arthur Telcser: "Proceed, Sir?"

Kosinski: "Then may I suggest to the Legislators of this House, that this measure imposing some thinking on the City of Chicago, of which my district is an integral part, and not necessarily in accord with Mr. Washington has effected. And we are legislating for the entire State of Illinois, yesterday on the entire Bill, it was with the consideration of downstate, that I voted against this Bill as much as the consideration of my district in the City of Chicago. In consequence, I now call upon you fellow members from downstate to support me, reject this Amendment, leave the House Bill in the original condition in which it was killed. This is a mutual problem. I thank you."

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

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition against this Amendment. Basically you are setting two standards, one for Chicago and one for downstate, and if any downstate legislator believes that if this Amendment is presented on the Bill and the Bill passes, they'll be back next session to change it to apply to downstate Illinois."



Its equally as bad as the Bill. I urge you to vote 'no'."

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

Rayson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I too join with the others in opposing this Amendment. First, I think it's unconstitutional, but secondly, it suggests that ah... this problem which is a very, very rampant problem, is particularly unique to Chicago. And I say it isn't, and I say we ought to all wake up and I would have hoped that this was a stop and frisk amendment to a stop and search bill, but I can't support this Amendment."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Washington to close."

Washington: "I'm amazed at the last speaker, alluding to the Constitutionality or lack of same to this Amendment. I think all the lawyers here know, and if they don't know it, they should be reminded or told, that the Constitution is what the Supreme Court says it is, not what we think it is. I don't see how it's possibly unconstitutional. I'm certainly not alluding to the uniformity of criminal statutes throughout the State, because this is a procedural section and not substantive. Another previous speaker, said support me, members of downstate. Well when I just oppose this statement with that, I think that statement sounds ridiculous. In support of this Amendment, you're supporting a good 50% of the People of the City of Chicago, and although I have great admiration and I extole the virtues and hold up high all of the



legislators, I don't compare any of them to half of the population of the City of Chicago. This is not a personal thing. Also, I heard remarks to the effect that in Chicago, we had one of the finest police departments in the Country. Well, Sir, that may well be true, but you can't prove it where I live. You can't prove it where I live. Those on the Judiciary Committee heard the documentation. I don't need to repeat it. It's very simple. This law has been used to abuse people in Chicago, pure and simple and I'm saying to you this, if the downstate members both democrat the republican, cannot live with the total repeal, then look north to the City of Chicago, give us some help, from the servants of the people, namely and to wit, a high percentage of the members of the Chicago police department. We are calling upon you downstate members to help us. We are in serious trouble. Our young people are being abused. Our middle aged people are being abused. Black people, Latin people, white people, university community people, are being abused every day in the week by the hundreds. As I said yesterday, stop frisk is stop to frisk and they have quotas and they are told by their commanders to bring in a certain amount of stop frisk reports every night. Every night, on every shift, they do this. Don't tell me about the high caliver of the Chicago police department. I say this to you, until the Chicago Police Department can be



cleaned up so that it functions adequately and professionally as some of the downstate police departments do, then I say to you downstate members, take this unusual and extensive and unnecessary power away from the Chicago Police Department. I ask your support on Amendment to House Bill Number 4."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment Number 1 to House Bill 4. All those in favor signify by saying ..... Do four members want a roll call. I'm sure they do. All those in favor of an amendment, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Gentleman from Cook, Representative B. B. Wolfe."

Wolfe: "Briefly, Mr. Speaker, ah.... I'm on a conflict of interest on this Amendment. It applies only to municipalities. I represent the northwest side of Chicago. The Village of Lincolnwood and the Village of Skokie, and they want the Bill repealed, and I voted for repeal of the stop and search because of my constituencies attitude. And I can't split my vote now between this concept and the original bill, so please record me as voting 'present'."

Arthur Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'present'. Have all voted ..... Berman 'present'. McClain 'present'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record." Yes, Peters present also. On this question, there are 34 'ayes', 74 'nays', five answering 'present', and the Gentleman's Motion to adopt Amendment Number 1 to House Bill 4 fails.



Now, does the gentleman wish to persit, or pursue the passage of the Bill? It's going to die today. Representative Washington, you are aware it will die? O'kay. Representative Griesheimer, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise on a point of personal privilege, if I may."

Arthur Telcser: "State your point, Sir."

Griesheimer: "This coming weekend, we're having the pleasure of having our facilities here used by the YMCA's throughout the State of Illinois for their use in government program. I hope that all of you know and appreciate that your local YMCA groups will be using these facilities to teach the youth of our communities exactly what we are doing down here and how this governmental system works. It is my pleasure today, I'd like to introduce to the Members of the House, the Waukegan YMCA group that's down here with their sponsor, Mr. Crisfolley, and the entire delegation from the City of Waukegan, and I'd like you to give them a big round of applause in the back of the room."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, I'm informed the Amendments to House Bill 238 have been distributed. On the Order of Consideration Postponed, appears House Bill 238, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell is recognized."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman, I have been talking with several members of some of the communities affected



by ah.. this beach bill and ah.. pursuant to that there has come and ah.. a more or less agreed amendment. Ah.. Amendment No. 5. And for the purpose of having.. for the purpose of having this amendment put on, I would ask that the bill be moved back to.."

A. Telcser: "Are there any objections? If not, House Bill 238 will be put on the Order of Second Reading. Are there any amendments?"

F. B. Selcke: "Ah.. Amendment No. 4. Ewell. Amend House Bill 238 as amended.."

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

Ewell: "Ah.. I would ask that Amendment ah.. 4 be tabled."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman's moved that Amendment 4 be.. You want 3 also?"

Ewell: "I would also ask leave of the House to table Amendment No. 3 and 4."

A. Telcser: "All right. The gentleman has moved to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #3 and #4 were adopted. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. And now the gentleman moves that.."

Ewell: "What we're doing in that affect, I'm tabling the other amendments because Amendment #5 strikes everything after the enacting clause and adds the bill.. the same substantive bill. And I would allow the sponsor of the amendment to more or less explain it."

A. Telcser: "Okay. The Gentleman now moves that Amendments No. 3 and 4 to House Bills 238 be tabled. All those in



favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The amendments are tabled. Are there further amendments?"

F. B. Selcke: "Amendment No. 5. Ah.. Katz and Matijevich."

Katz: "The House will recall that when House Bill 238 was debated at considerable lengths on the Floor, ah there was some of us who led opposition to the bill at that time. Ah.. Amendment No. 5 does carry out the original purpose of the sponsor which was the purpose which we endorsed. Ah.. this Amendment will guarantee to every citizen ah.. admission to any public beach on Lake Michigan. It is a principle that we endorse, those of us who imposed the amendment along with the sponsor. It also requires every municipality or other public body that owns such a beach to provide a reasonable daily charge. They cannot simply provide a season charge and thus inferentially deny access to those who may want to use the beach on a daily basis. At the same time, the bill protects the right that many of us felt was important from the point of view of our communities. Ah.. our communities pay a good deal of taxes necessary to the upkeep and support of the beach providing police protection and taking care of the beach and providing lifeguards. And so the bill permits differential charges to be made by the beach, by the local community in the use of the beach and I would move the adoption of Amendment No. 5 which is historic in providing legislatively that no unit of local





government may deny access to any person ah.. to a public beach in the State of Illinois."

A. Telcser: "Okay. The gentleman from Cook, Representative B. B. Wolfe."

Wolfe: "Ah.. point of parliamentary inquiry. Does the amendment require a 3/5 vote because it restricts units of local government and home... The amendment would not."

A. Telcser: "We wouldn't need it to adopt the amendment. We may to pass the bill. Now, the lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have a point of parliamentary inquiry.."

A. Telcser: "State your point."

Geo-Karis: ".. on Amendment No. 5. And I direct my inquiry if I may not only to the Chairman but also to the sponsor of this amendment. I presume that you intend by this amendment to state in it that nothing in this act precludes any unit of government from making charges for access to and use of the beach. Is that correct? Well, unfortunately it does not so state. It says here nothing in this act precludes any unit of government from making changes for access to and use of the beach."

A. Telcser: "That's right. Yes. We've been informed of that. The Clerk will make that change and for the Member's information that word is charges not changes. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter."



Porter: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the original bill that Representative Ewell had before you was to make uniform fees for residents and non-residents in the use of the beaches. Our objection to that bill was only that it was unfair to residents who made up the substantial difference between user fees and beach costs from their own local property taxes. The real intent of the bill was to establish the principle that public access to the lake should be available to all the people to the State of Illinois. It was suggested that the beaches were not available to all the people. I checked with the municipalities and park districts in my district having jurisdiction over the beach. I'd like to inform the Members of the House that all of them have a daily fee for both residents and non-residents and have had for a number of years. The fee ranges from 50 cents to \$1.50 per person to day which is certainly not an unreasonable fee. So I resent the implication that our beaches are not open to all. They are and they always have been. I've also checked this particular proposal with the communities of Kenilworth, the Wilmette Park District, ah.. Winnetka, Glenco and Evanston have also been consulted. None of them have any problem with this proposal. Because all it does is state exactly what they already do. So I support this amendment. Thank you."



A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Juckett."

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, point of parliamentary inquiry."

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

Juckett: "I understand we're working on Amendment #5. Do you know whether it's the intention of the ah.. sponsor of the bill to continue with Amendment #6 which is also on our desks?"

A. Telcser: "I have no idea, Sir." Does the sponsor wish to respond to that? Representative Ewell?"

Ewell: "It ah.. is my intention and understanding that we would ah.. attempt to since we've had so much agreement on this bill that we would attempt to leave it in the form of Amendment #5 which strikes everything after the enacting clause and see if we could not get the agreement of 107 members of the House. Ah.. if that fails, the only thing we might try to do is to amend it to strike the home rule clause which is all that amendment No. 6 does."

A. Telcser: "Ah.. the Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCourt."

Mccourt: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, I would just like to reiterate what Representative Porter said regarding the use of the beaches in our district. For many years we have charged a daily fee of \$1.50 for adults and \$.50 for children whether they be residents or non-residents in Evanston. As having been a Member of the Evanston City Council for the past twelve years, I'd like to call your attention to a resolution that we adopted on



January 8, 1973, one month before this bill was introduced. The resolution said, 'Be it resolved that it is the sense of the City Council that all City Parks be available to anyone who wishes to use them without need for a permit as long as such use shall not interfere with any other activity for which a permit has been granted. We have, will continue to allow our property our public areas to be open and utilize by all people. And I would respectfully urge all of you to adopt this amendment."

A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Vermillion, Representative Craig."

Craig: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'd like to ask the sponsor of this amendment a question. I would like to say to you, Representative Katz and the people who are sponsoring this amendment, I can't understand why that you feel that you should have this amendment wanting the cities to have a charge for protecting the beach and the shoreline when just a few days ago this week when we had the Scenic Rivers bill up, you wanted to take not only the shoreline you wanted to take the land back from the shoreline from the people who have bought the land, paid for it and paid the taxes on this land free of charge. And you didn't want to give them anything for this. Now I think this is being most inconsistent when you've come along with an amendment of this type because you want to control the shoreline in your



metropolitan area up there. I think it's being very inconsistent."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Duff."

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

A. Telcser: "Gentleman's moved the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. The opposed 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz wish to close? Was that your amendment there?"

Katz: "No. I only wish to say that it does seem to me.. I don't want to get this involved with other legislation.. this is a bill that Mr. Ewell's bill.. We believe that it does seek to establish a right that every Member of this General Assembly ah.. would share and that is the right of citizens of this State to have access to beaches on Lake Michigan. That is the purpose of the bill. That is the purpose of the amendment. Ah.. Mr. Matijevich, Mr. Porter, Mr. Duff and a number of us have worked with Mr. Ewell because we shared his feelings. We also wanted to make perfectly clear that our district does not believe in discrimination. Has not discriminated and is perfectly happy to support the right embodied in the statutes of the citizens of Illinois to use our public beaches when they desire to come and swim on Lake Michigan whether it is in our district our outside the district."

A. Telcser: "Representative Duff, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Duff: "Personal privilege."



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

Duff: "Ah.. I have talked with these gentlemen about this amendment and I don't want my name associated with this motion."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman has offered to move the adoption.. Representative Pierce, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Pierce: "I resent the last speaker making a.. moving the previous question when I wanted to speak. And then after after he moves it, he gets up and gives another speech."

A. Telcser: "The gentleman rose on a point of personal privilege."

Pierce: "Well, I have a point of personal privilege."

A. Telcser: "State your point."

Pierce: "I think this is badly drafted to require my community to have a daily charge."

A. Telcser: "What's your.. what's your personal point, Sir?"

Pierce: "My point is.. my point is the debate was shut off and then the mover was allowed to speak again. And those of us who had a question on it weren't allowed to speak."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman's offered to move the adoption of Amendment #5 to House Bill 238. All in favor of adoption signify by saying 'aye'. The opposed 'no'. Do you wish a roll call? Okay. The gentleman has offered to move adoption of Amendment #5 to House Bill 238. All in favor of adoption signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'." The gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce, to explain his vote."



Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, the ah... the intent of the Amendment is good. I'm just a little bit concerned of whether it mandates the charge. It states in the Amendment that there must be a reasonable daily charge for use by non-residents. What if the ah... community or the park district or local government unit doesn't want to have a charge? This could be read as mandating a reasonable daily charge for use by non-residents, where they wish to make no charge. It may also give a specific authority to make charges to the Chicago Park District and other agencies. It may not have that authority now, and I think this hasn't been carefully considered or thought out. All it does is restate the present law. There's no prohibition now. In fact, there's a requirement now that park districts facilities be available to residents and non-residents throughout the State. The Illinois Supreme Court has decided that question involving Wilmette Park District years ago, so I don't know if this... if the intent is good here. I just wonder whether the Amendment doesn't mandate a charge for non-residents. Perhaps it was worded inartfully. It should have been worded in the event that there is a charge, then there must be a reasonable daily charge for use by non-residents. It doesn't say that. It just says 'provided that there must be a reasonable daily charge for use by non-residents' and it may mandate a charge among park districts and local government units that don't wish to charge, for use of



the beaches, because their beaches have been washed away. Highland Park no longer has a charge because our beach has been washed away and ah.... we're polluted and closed by the Health Department, but you can go down and sit on the beach if you enjoy watching the garbage go by."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my 'no' vote. I have to agree with Representative Pierce's interpretation. Presently the Chicago Park District has no charge on its facility whether it be in the parks or on the beach itself. And as I read Amendment Number 5, ah.... they would have to compute a charge and charge a daily fee. I'm opposed to that concept and I would hope that the sponsor of the Amendment would take into consideration that where no fees are presently being assessed, that we do not pass a Bill which would mandate that we charge a daily fee on our beaches or in our parks."

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

Katz: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I confess that ah.... what was intended to be a fairly simple statement of a fairly simple right seems to be a little complicated. It seems to me that the gentleman from Lake ah.... by reading only one part of the Amendment, has really changed the meaning of the Amendment. If you will.... Those of you who have the Amendment in front of you, if you will look at lines 14 and 15, it says nothing in this act precludes any unit of government from making





charges. It doesn't require any unit of government to make charges. It simply says nothing in this Act precludes it. That is clearly not a requirement that every unit of government must make charges. It simply permits them to do so if they desire. Then there is a proviso to that provision that says that provided that they must make a reasonable daily charge for use by non-residents in that event. The Amendment is from the Reference Bureau. Ah.... we would certainly ah.... change the language to ah..... satisfy the gentleman from Lake and the gentleman from Cook. I think the language is clear. But our intent was certainly to do that. It is the last day for Mr. Ewell's Bill. We have tried to cooperate with him in establishing this simple right, and I would only say that I do not feel there is any basic merit from a legal point of view in the argument that this mandates the charge. The language that nothing precludes the making of a charge clearly, is not the language of mandating a charge. And I believe that this Amendment considered on its merits establishes clearly certain rights which are important rights and furnish the reason why I certainly tried to cooperate with the gentleman from Chicago, who felt on the basis of newspaper articles that he read, that there were communities that were, in fact, denying access to the beaches and we wanted to give him that legal right, because we didn't know of such breaches. Now, we are bogged down in a lot of legal

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

technicalisms in my opinion, not having merit and I would hope that this basic right to have access to the beach would not be lost on the basis of this language which appears to raise some doubts into distinguished members minds."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion?" Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. Leinenweber 'aye'. On this..... Kempiners 'aye'. On this question, there are 44 'ayes'.... Skinner 'aye', 45 'ayes', 41 'nays', and the Gentleman's Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading. Do you wish to go to your Bill now? All right, House Bill 238 has been read a Third time, and the gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell, on the Bill. Now this will take 107 votes. This is clearly a Homerule situation."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, very briefly, ah... I have labored long and hard in the field to make the beaches of the..... not only the City of Chicago but the entire lake front available to all of the People of the State of Illinois. This embodied in essence in the statement of this particular Bill. There is a provision for ah... reasonable daily charges, if there's going to be a charge. I think this cures about 98 percent of the problem that the People might have and I think as the water has risen and our tempers are cooled, I think we've come to a reasonable agreement and I would ask and urge the support of all the members of this Body." I have



attempted to go as far as I can. The entire Bill has been  
.... everything after the enacting clause has been re-  
written and I've hoped to comply with the wishes of all  
those who have opposed it."

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

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, the reason I asked to not be associated with the purpose of the Amendment was that I did work to try and find some good wording with the People who put on Amendment Number 6, which is now the Bill, and in fact, I voted for that Amendment, and that Amendment does, in fact, exonerate some charges that were made about our district and the districts north of us. It further corrected, as my colleague from Evanston pointed out, ah.... there were statements made about practices that were suppose to be taking place. Nevertheless, when I spoke against this Bill, the first time it was brought up on Third Reading, I made a point that this Bill intrudes into on principle and precedent, the activities of every park district in Illinois and of every municipality that might have recreational facilities. This Bill says 'beach', but this Bill says between the lines 'any referendum which you may want to pass in your local community on tennis courts, on swimming pools, on rivers and creeks and streams throughout the State will be in fact affected by this Bill on precedents'. Now, I'm glad the Amendment was put on and I'm glad the Bill is in the shape it's in as far as my district is concerned, I



suppose, but the obligation to all of Illinois says 'don't pass this Bill.'

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

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will." Representative Ewell, Will you respond to a question, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "What is the question? I didn't hear it."

Lechowicz: "I didn't ask the question yet. Ray, the Bill as it is amended, could there be a possibility that the Chicago Park District could establish a daily charge or a daily fee for the use of the beach?"

Ewell: "Yes, the way the Bill is written, if they decided to make a charge for use of the beach, they would have to have a reasonable daily charge by non-residents. Yes, they could ah.... they could make a charge if they wished. But there's nothing that says they must make a charge, as I read the Bill."

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

Rayson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Members, I was a good supporter of this Bill and I thought it had a good purpose. I think Amendment 6 destroyed that purpose and I can no longer support it."

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

Berman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I supported the Bill before it was put on Post-poned Consideration a couple of weeks ago, but my reading



of this Amendment that was just put on makes me believe that this Bill, a reasonable interpretation, could mandate the Chicago Park District to impose a charge on non-residents. I don't think that's what we want to do, and, therefore, I think it changes the purpose of the Bill. Vote me 'present', Mr. Speaker."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, the gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, there are days I wish I wasn't present, and this is one of these. Ah.... I did ah.... intend in working on this to provide a right for the citizens here. When the gentlemen say and ask the question, could the City of Chicago make charges for its beach, ah.... under this Bill, the City of Chicago could make charges without the Bill. This Bill has nothing to do with that. A number of beaches has made charges. The reason the City of Chicago hasn't done it or the Park District is not that they didn't have the legal right to do it, it's just that they have not had the desire to do it, and I think that's excellent. This Bill does not require them to do it. This Bill has nothing to do with that particular problem. The only thing it does, it says that any community that does have a beach, that that beach must be made available to non-residents as well as to residents and that if they choose to make charges, that there must be a daily fee that non-residents could use. It really is as simple as all that, and I really do not



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

accept the argument that in saying that citizens have access to the beaches of Lake Michigan that it means that we're going to provide in separate legislation for access to every tennis courts. I think that all of us recognize that Lake Michigan is one of the historic wonders, really of the World, that there is no comparable body of water and to compare Lake Michigan to the usual park district activity is not really ah... an accurate reflection of the fact. I believe that Lake Michigan should be available freely to those who don't live along the Lake, who don't happen to be in that community. That is the purpose of the Bill. I saw in good faith to assist the Gentleman from Chicago in his desire to write in to the Statute Book a right of all citizens to have access to Lake Michigan. That's what this Bill does. It doesn't require that there be charges. It doesn't require the Chicago Park District to make charges. It simply says that those that are now doing it can continue if they want to make charges, which they've been doing all along, but that they must provide a daily fee so that the citizens of Illinois, who desire to go to the beach on any given day, can go to any public beach they want to in the State of Illinois that borders on Lake Michigan. That is the purpose of the Bill. I think it is an historic purpose and excellent purpose, and I think it is being mired down here in a lot of very technical objections, which I personally do not feel have merit. I think that we sometimes lose sight of the really



historic things that may occur and in my opinion, the statutory right of every citizen of the State to have access to any public beach in Lake Michigan... on Lake Michigan is a significant step forward. I commend the Sponsor for having sought by legislation to do this, and that is the reason that I personally sought to cooperate with him in what I think is an excellent purpose. I regret that inadvertently, we appeared to have gotten involved in some legalisms and I assure the gentleman from Chicago that was not my intention. In good faith, I put the Amendment on and in good faith, I support the Amendment and the Bill."

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

Dunne: "Question to the Sponsor?"

Arthur Telcser: "Indicates a yield."

Dunne: "Ray, has there ever been a specific.... an incident where any ah.... individual has been denied access to the beaches?"

Ewell: "Ah.... yes, there has. We're calling from an Article that was written on June 19th in the Chicago Tribune. Talking about the Lake front, it's public, but not free. And what we're talking about are not as to the individuals but as to the public themselves, and let's say the most fragrant violators at that time were ah.... when Winnetka, which.... wait a minute, no, I'm sorry, strike that. Kennilworth, which had a \$10.00 seasonal fee for residents only, meaning if you were not a resident of Kennilworth,



under no circumstances could you use the beach. The other one was Lake Bluff, which had a \$7.50 residential only fee. Pursuant to this, we sent them a resolution by this House, asking them to change their particular practices and perhaps review the policy. We heard no response from them, and pursuant to that, we entered into a course of ah.... legislation, and what we're talking about is some of the differential rate that were charged between resident and non-resident. Such things as ah... Wilmette, which had \$8.00 for residents and \$15.00 for non-residents. Glencoe, \$13.50 per residents, \$26.00 for non-residents. Ah.... Lake Forest, residents free, and \$20.00 for non-residents. Now this represents a classic case of discrimination against persons who are not residents of the area. And we base this on the background that the Lake is the common resource and as the Lake rises and the erodes away the shore lines, I'm certain to hear the voices of all the gentlemen crying about our shore lines, our beaches, and as the result, I think when the Lake recedes and the sun shines once again, we should all journey and walk together children, down to the beaches."

Dunne: "Ray, more specifically, though, can you think of an instance where perhaps one of these communities might have denied access to the beach to an individual perhaps because of the color of his skin?"





Ewell: "No, No, it's not color, it's money. It has nothing to do with color. It's money. If you don't have those green dollar bills, let's say the \$20.00 for Lake Forest, they don't care who you are, you're not getting in. That's no problem, and we're not talking about, let's say Blacks with a lot of money can go there. That's no problem. In fact, Blacks with a lot of money can go most places. It's only poor Blacks who can't to, you know, most places." And what we're really talking about, the People who really use these beaches are the... the communities that are adjacent to them, but yet are not a part of the Lake front, and they're the ones. I mean we're talking about the little white kids from ah.... the inland areas who would like to go over and use the beaches- but they can't, because of these ah... restrictive and discriminatory clauses. We're not talking about Blacks in any number."

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

Porter: "Ah.... I'd like to set the record straight, Representative Ewell, in respect to Kenilworth. Ah.... you said twice now that it was not available. Their beaches were not available to non-residents. They are available. There is a daily fee. It is uniform for non-residents and for residents and it's \$1.50 on Sundays and Saturdays \$1.25 during the week. It's just factually incorrect that their beaches are any different that any of the other beaches. Now, let me address myself to one thing,



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

I like this ah.... draft the way Harold originally had drafted it. The Reference Bureau changed it. But I don't think there's any way that you can interpret the language ah.... on lines 14 and 15 and 21 and 22, to be mandating a daily charge by any beach, because it says nothing in this Act precludes any unit of government from making charges, provided that, meaning provided that if they do, there must be a reasonable daily charge for use by non-residents, and I think it's a cop-out to say that because the language isn't really exactly properly drafted that it could be interpreted that way. I don't see how it could be and I again urge the ah.... Members to support it."

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

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous Question."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman has moved the previous question.

All those in favor, signify by saying 'aye'. The opposed 'no'. The gentleman's motion prevails. Representative Ewell to close the debate."

Ewell: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have tried in all earnestness and all sincerity to come to a common and reasonable approach to this problem. Now, if there are people who were unhappy, I would have been very glad to have tried to work that out too, but I have done, to the best of my ability, to provide the People of the State of Illinois, in this Resolution, and I would ask that the Members try to see their way clear to support it."



Arthur Telcser: "Question is, shall House Bill 238 pass? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Gentleman from Cook, Representative D. L. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I support the intention of the Bill, but I feel that the Bill is ambiguous and I would like to be recorded as voting 'present'."

Arthur Telcser: "Record the gentleman as voting 'present'. Berman 'present'. Well, now, if you want to get on as 'present', why don't you come up to the Clerk's desk and we can save an awful lot of time. Have all voted who wished? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know I've talked too many times on this Bill, but I would like to explain my vote. Ah.... my colleague from Wilmette said that this might possibly establish a precedent in regard to the recreational facilities of municipalities. Ah.... I don't agree with that at all, because I think there's a great distinction here. Ah.... all the recreational facilities of municipalities and park districts lie wholly within those park districts. Lake Michigan lies wholly within no park district, no municipality, it's a facility of nature that's available to everybody in Illinois, and I don't think that there can be any possibility that a precedent could be established in reference to recreational facilities lying within a



municipality, by this ah.... Bill, and I'm going to vote 'aye' on this Bill."

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

Tipsword: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to explain my vote. I would like to point out to several of the Members from the area of the ah.... Lake Michigan shoreline, that I'm voting for this Bill and several other Members from downstate Illinois are voting for this Bill, because we would like to be consistent in our positions on similar bills, and we hope when the Scenic Rivers Bill comes up, you will remember that we have voted here to help you provide ah.... some protection to the taxpayers who live in your Lake Michigan area, cities and villages, in providing for the costs of the public lands for the use by the public and when the Scenic Rivers Bill comes up, remember the fact that that Bill provides for the taking and using of private land by the public without compensation and without regard to the costs that the private individual may have there or the losses he must sustain with the public stumbling over his crop and raising the price of the grains to feed the livestock that eventually reaches the butcher shop. Thank you very much."

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



Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm ah.... a little bit dismayed. I did enter into this situation in good faith, but ah... somehow, at this stage and in the waiting hours of light for this Bill, I feel somewhat like an Indian, who was invited into the great White Father's teepee to smoke the peace pipe. I have smoked the peace pipe, but alas, I still end up with no beach. I don't understand and I can only say that ah... perhaps next year, I'll have to try again."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this question, there are 88 'ayes', 20.... It will take 107. Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise?"

Shea; "Why: does this one need 107 in its amended form?"

Arthur Telcser: "Sponsor said so himself. I'm only concurring with him. Representative Ewell, for what purpose do your rise?"

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I have never been accorded the privilege of allowing to set how many votes this would take."

Arthur Telcser: "I simply said that no one asked me for a ruling. Ah....."

Ewell: "Well, what is your ruling?"

Arthur Telcser: "Are you asking for one?"

Ewell: "Yeow."

Arthur Telcser: "O'okay, let's look at the Amendment. Representative Ewell, what's your next move, Sir?"



Ewell: "Sir, having faith in the parliamentary process, I see that Mr. Katz has an amendment no. 6, which I'm certain would make only 89 votes. Could have leave to move the Bill back to Second Reading, for purposes of putting Number 6 on?"

Arthur Telcser: "Are there objections? Representative Murphy, do you seek recognition?" We're in the middle of a roll call. We're in the middle of a roll call and the Rules clearly state that you have one shot at Consideration Postponed only. The Chair is compelled to rule it will take 107 votes. Sorry, Ray, I love you. Even I'll vote 'aye'. Telcser 'aye'. On this question, there are 91 'ayes', 20 'nays' and this Bill having failed to receive the constitutional majority, 60%, is hereby declared lost. Oh, I'm sorry, Representative Hyde, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Hyde: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker, ah.... I asked the Clerk if he thought we'd go to Introduction and First Reading, and he thought perhaps after we adjourn formally, they would go to that order of business, and I wonder if I might have leave of the House to just make a very brief announcement about a Bill I did introduce and asked for co-sponsors."

Arthur Telcser: "Certainly, proceed, Sir."

Hyde: "Ah.... Representative Philip and I introduced this morning House Bill 1224, and it provides for a referendum on the question of the Equal Rights Amendment. We have agonized over that issue many months. We have all been



diluted by mail from both sides on this question, and I generally am opposed to referenda because I believe that's what we're elected here to do, make these decisions, but in this very important question of public policy, it seems to me the deliberations of this House, which I'm sure will go on and on, like Tennyson's Brook, from session to session, concerning this issue, would be greatly assisted if the ah... public were to have their say in a referendum, and so House Bill 1224 provides simply that at the election November 5, 1974, the following question of public policy shall be put: 'Shall the Illinois General Assembly ratify the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution of the United States?' Now the results of this vote will be advisory only, but I think it will be of great assistance to this House when we get the results of that. I'm a great believer in the consent of the governed, so anybody who wishes to co-sponsor this ah... Bill, it's House Bill 1224, I'd welcome you on it. Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Now, wait a second. Representative B. B. Wolfe, wants to make a parliamentary inquiry, I believe."

B. B. Wolfe: "Yes, ah... on ah... 238. Does the vote ah... the ah... Majority Vote, could that be effective only as it applies to units of local government that are not under Home-rule?"

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



Shea: "Well, I don't know how the gentleman's going to rule, on that question, but it seems to me it's impossible to separate the Bill. You can't say the Bill is passed. You can't say it's passed only for non-home units, and what you'd be doing is certifying a Bill as being passed and yet it's not passed in the form that it was introduced, so I think it's whole hog or none."

B. B. Wolfe: "The answer, Mr. Speaker, in answer to ah... Representative Shea, I think he's correct unless we put on the face of the Bill, this act does not apply to any unit of local government which is a homerule unit. An Amendment on the face of the Bill would correct that defect."

Arthur Telcser: "I think you've answered the question. Messages from the Senate." Oh, I'm sorry, Representative Chapman, do you seek recognition?"

Chapman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask a question of Mr. Hyde in regard to House Bill 1224."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Hyde, do you wish to respond to a question from Mrs. Chapman?"

Hyde: "I'd be delighted."

Chapman: "Ah.... I'm wondering if this is an advisory referendum or a binding referendum. I'm delighted to learn that ah.... the Representative believes this is an important matter. The Senate Executive Committee thought it was so important that they provided ten minutes for each side to present their case. Ah.... so I'm pleased to know





the Representative believes this is an important enough matter to which to involve the public, but is it binding?"

Hyde: "Well, first of all, let me say that I am dismayed that it took you this long to learn that I think this is an important matter. Secondly, it is advisory only and I welcome you as a co-sponsor."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, messages from the Senate."

Jack O'Brien: "Message from Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed a Bill with the following title, the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit. Senate Bill 154. Passed by the Senate April 12, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House Representative the Senate concurs with the House in the adoption of the following Joint Resolution, to wit, House Joint Resolution 32, concurred in by the Senate, April 12, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary."

Arthur Telcser: "Committee Reports."

Jack O'Brien: "Mr. J. J. Wolf, from the Committee on Veterans Affairs, Personnel and Pension, to which House Bills 426, 427 were referred, reported sending back with the recommendation the Bills do not pass. Mr. J. J. Wolf, reported from the Veterans Affairs, Personnel and Pension, to which House Bills 505, 726, 790 were referred, reported



sending back with the recommendations the Bills do pass. Mr. J. J. Wolf, from the Committee on Veterans Affairs, Personnel and Pension, to which House Bills 536 and 793 were referred, reported sending back with the recommendations that the Bills do pass. Mr. J. J. Wolf, from the Committee on Veterans Affairs, Personnel and Pension, to which House Bill 548 was referred, reported sending back with the recommendation that the Bill do not pass. Mrs. Dyer from the Committee on Higher Education, to which House Bill 647 was referred, reported sending back with the recommendation the Bill do pass. Mr. Washburn from the Committee on Appropriations, to which House Bills 485, 603 and 605 were referred, reported sending back with Amendments thereto, with a recommendation the Amendments be adopted and the Bills, as amended, do pass. Mr. Washburn from the Committee on Appropriations, to which House Bill 564 is referred, reported sending back with the recommendation that the Bills do pass."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh, in reference to the Rules Committee today. Do you wish to put a motion?"

William Walsh: "Ah.... did the Clerk read the Resolution?"

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay."

William Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, has the Clerk read House Resolution 209?"

Arthur Telcser: "He's looking for his copy now, Bill."

William Walsh: "All right."



Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 208. Rule 23 of House Rules as amended to read as follows: '23. Consideration of Bills.....'"

William Walsh: "That's fine, Jack. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're going to address ourselves to some rule changes that the rules committee this morning approved, and ah.... House Resolution 208 deals with the provision in Rule 23, on consideration of Bills and under subsection I of Rule 23, the provision that Bills may not be introduced after April 14. That rule is changed as follows: 'The provisions of subsection D of this Rule, notwithstanding any Bill or Resolution which would be tabled pursuant to the provisions of subsection D, between April 23 and April 27, inclusive, shall not be tabled pursuant thereto, until April 28!.' I move the adoption of House Resolution 208."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Now, the gentleman has moved the adoption of House Resolution Number 208. These are rule changes. I think we ought to have an affirmative vote. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Deuster, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, did I just hear you say that we were adopting a Resolution that had something to do with Rule changes?"

Arthur Telcser: "Yeow."



Deuster: "Is anyone going to explain what the Rules changes are?"

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Walsh just finished doing it.

Deuster: "Oh, he just did it?"

Arthur Telcser: "Yeow."

Deuster: "And everybody's for it. All right, thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "You want to ask.... Bill, you want to answer some questions from Tom?"

Deuster: "No, I don't need an answer. If it was explained to the House, that's it."

Arthur Telcser: "All right, have all voted who wished? Take the Record. On this question, there are 131 'ayes', one 'nay', and the House Resolution 208 is adopted. Are there further resolutions?"

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 209. W. D. Walsh. Rule 26 of the House Rules, which is amended to read as follows: 'Rule 26. Introduction....'"

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

Walsh: "House Resolution 209 deals with the introduction of Bills and says that if a sponsor has filed with the Legislative Reference Bureau a formal request for a draft of a bill on or before April 14, of a calendar year the Bill may be considered by June 30th of that calendar year if it has been filed on or before April 27 of that calendar year, and this simply provides that the last day for introduction of Bills is April 27 provided that



a formal request has been made of the Legislative Reference Bureau on or before April 14th, and I move the adoption of House Resolution 209."

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

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "Representative, in Line 14 of House Resolution 209, are the words 'formal request'. What is a formal request?"

Walsh: "I would interpret that to be a written request for a draft or approval of a bill."

Schlickman: "The customary procedure to follow in securing a Bill is simply to convey your request orally."

Walsh: "Yes, but it is then committed to writing by the person in the Bureau to whom you convey it."

Schlickman: "So once I orally convey and someone in the Reference Bureau takes it and puts it in writing on his prescribed form, that constitutes a formal request?"

Walsh: "Yeow, that would be my feeling."

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

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've discussed this with the Majority Leader and it's my understanding, Bill, that what we'll do is that anybody that goes to the Reference Bureau between now and Saturday, there will be an LRB number assigned to their request."



The last LRB number on Saturday, let's say it's 5434, whatever it is, that there will be no bills allowed to be filed after the 14th that do not bear that LRB number or an earlier one. Is that correct?"

Walsh: "Correct. That would mean that people who have Bills that have already been prepared by the Reference Bureau, that have not as yet been introduced, may be introduced before April 27th."

Shea: "All right, now, what about the person that has a Bill, that was prepared by some outside source? Does that Bill then have to be filed by today?"

Walsh: "No, they can get a LRB number for it by Saturday."

Shea: "But they must either file it by today or take it to the Reference Bureau and get a form only stamp plus an LRB number. Correct?"

Walsh: "By Saturday."

Shea: "All right, I just think we ought to explain it and make it perfectly clear to the Members so that nobody is precluded from introducing any Bills."

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

Rayson: "A question of the movant here?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates a yield."

Rayson: "Well, I don't know if he did or not, but ah....."

Arthur Telcser: "He did. He did. He winked his eye."

Rayson: "Has this..... ah.... what's the legislative process of this motion?"

Walsh: "I beg your pardon?"



Rayson: "What's the legislative process of this motion?"

Walsh: "We're amending the Rules."

Rayson: "I know, but I mean, did you file formally? Did you have a Committee hearing in Rules?"

Walsh: "Yes, we did. Yes, we did, and under the Rules, the Rules Committee, having approved these resolutions by 3/5ths majority, we may consider them today."

Rayson: "So it isn't Rules by those who have the power, it's rules by deliberative powers?"

Walsh: "Absolutely."

Rayson: "I'm glad to hear that."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman has moved that the House do adopt House Resolution 209. It is a Rules change, so all those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? My seatmate is.... you know, he's so use to voting me 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this question, there are 128 'ayes', one 'nay', and House Resolution 209 is adopted." Are there further Resolutions?"

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 210. W. D. Walsh. Rule 31 of the House Rules as amended to read as follows: and so forth."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this ah.... Resolution deals with a Rule change on a problem that has come



up from time to time and that is, appropriation bills and the substantive bill, which must accompany it or has accompanied it. ah..... we've had problems where the ah..... substantive bill has been on the calendar and time is running out on it, and the appropriations bill is in the Appropriations Committee and has not been heard. This change provides that the Committee on the Assignment of Bills may assign a substantive bill to a Committee at any time provided the sponsor of that Bill requests such an assignment in writing. And the purpose of this is so that the substantive bill does not die because of 30 days on the calendar before the appropriations bill appears on the calendar, and I move the adoption of House Resolution 210."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, the gentleman from Cook, Representative Fleck."

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

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Fleck: "What.... how do you consider when you have a substantive bill, which would relate to the appropriations bill? It seems to me that with this rule, you could use it to keep alive a lot of substantive bills and put in a \$10.00 appropriation bill just so it wouldn't be killed by a time limit."

Walsh: "Well, ah.... the Rule reads, Charlie, that the Committee on Assignment of Bills may assign. They're not required to assign, when they receive such requests in writing. It





says that they may, and this is the purposes to do what I suggested."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't really think this solves the problem of substantive legislation, not going along with the appropriation bills. What could happen, a substantive bill could pass this House and the appropriation bill could still be stalled in a committee. I think your Rules Committee could have been much stronger in this particular rule to mandate that ah... the substantive companion bill be exempted from the 45 and 30 day rule, but it must go in each committee with the appropriation bill. Ah.... and ah.... I think we would have been much better off if you had that ruling. I think we've still got the problem that a substantive bill is going to be somewhere else and the appropriation bill is going to be tied up in the Appropriations Committee. I don't think you've solved our problem at all."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in reply to the last speaker, in the previous sessions, the substantive bills were always re-referred to the Appropriations Committee. Basically what happens they may be creating a new Commission or ah..."



appropriation bill in a different area and in turn, you have another Bill in creation as far as the substance. As you know, according to the new Constitution, you have to have two separate bills, one of substance and one as far as the appropriation. I think this is a step in the right direction due to the fact that Representative Bud Washburn and I and other members of the Committee discussed the strong necessity of having the substantive bills reassigned to the Appropriation Committee, so both the substance and the dollar amount could come out at the same time. I have to agree with the Rules Committee and also with the Rule that is asked to be extended here. I think it is a step in the right direction."

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

Matijevich: "Well, I think it's a step in the right direction, but it doesn't go far enough. I think.... I think we're still going to have that problem. I think we should have taken one more step. That's my only reply to that."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, with regard to the Rules generally, I'd like to make one observation and one inquiry of the Sponsor of these Resolutions, who also serves as the Acting Chairman of the Rules Committee. My observation, number one, is this: These rules are



presented to us, unlike bills, we are not told in which line of the existing bills deletions are being made and additions are being made. And my observation is that henceforth, when we are presented Resolutions, which repeat the entire rule and do not indicate by line and by word, that the form of the Resolution be identical to that of a Bill, so that we don't have to pull out our rules and check the Resolution line by line with the existing rule to determine what the change has been. My inquiry is this, Mr. Sponsor, on February 1, we adopted the Rules of this House, and on that day, there was a number of us, who had amendments to the Resolution by which the Rules were adopted. We deferred consideration of these Amendments and in fact, agreed to their referral to the Rules Committee. Subsequent to that date, I attended or attempted to attend meetings of the Rules Committee and was subjected to a fair amount of frustration. Number 1, meetings were adjourned, because of no quorum. They were adjourned for other reasons. Finally, when I did attend a meeting that was held, the Amendments that I had offered and had referred to the Rules Committee were completely ignored. I'm wondering, Mr. Sponsor, if, those Amendments, which have been offered previously by Members of the House, could also be treated as Bills, and that we, as sponsors of those amendments, could be given notice as to when those Amendments will be considered by the Rules Committee?"



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Walsh: "Well, in answer to that, I ah.... can't account for why there was not a quorum. You'll have to go to each and every Member of the Rules Committee who did not attend a specific meeting or all of the meetings that you attended. There was a quorum of the Rules Committee this morning, and I might say, in my defense, that I have attended every scheduled meeting of the Rules committee. Now, it is impossible to amend the Rules by line, because there's no reference in the Rules to line, as you know. All you can do, is refer to the Rules. I think that ah.... a careful study of these things will direct you pretty rapidly to where the change is. Ah.... I think your participation in particular, I think, ah... I resent the inference that you were not permitted to say.... give your piece in the Rules Committee meetings. I have chaired those meetings, and I have attempted to give every Member who has appeared, who is not a Member of the Rules Committee, an opportunity to be heard."

Schlickman: "In response and very quickly and briefly, can I as a Sponsor of three Amendments to the Rules, be advised when those proposed Amendments will be considered by the Rules Committee, just as all of us are advised by Committee chairmen, when their bills are scheduled for hearings?"

Walsh: "May I suggest to you that the Rules Committee is scheduled to meet regularly on the last day of the week at 8:30 in the morning, the last day of the legislative week, at 8:30 in the morning, in Room 212, and you and



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

every member of this House is invited to attend these meetings and to make every suggestion or offering that you wish to."

Schlickman: "You haven't answered my question. I have three Amendments to the Rules that have been referred to the Rules Committee and now are on the agenda or within the control of the Rules Committee. Can I be advised as a Member of this House in writing, as I am with Bills that are referred to other standing committees of this House, when those Amendments will be heard?"

Walsh: "Well, I have only in two sessions been a Member of the Rules Committee, this being the second. I don't ever recall Members offering resolutions being given the same notice ah.... that Members offering Bills to standing committees are given. I'm sure that if you will attend the next meeting of the Rules Committee, we will undertake to take up the three resolutions that you're offering, the three changes that you're offering."

Schlickman: "And that meeting will be when?"

Walsh: "That meeting will be April 27th at 8:30 in the morning, Room 212."

Schlickman: "And my Amendments will be heard at that time?"

Walsh: "Well, ah.... the ah.... time ah.... and quorum and other considerations permitting, they will be heard at that time."

Schlickman: "What are the other considerations?"



Walsh: "A considerable backlog of work that we were not able to get to today."

Schlickman: "Thank's Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of House Resolution 210. All in favor of adoption, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Phil Collins 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. Hart 'aye'. Telcser 'aye'. On this question, 107 'ayes', 3 'nays', and House Resolution 210, is adopted. Now, the Members are informed that the intention of the Chair to continue now to do whatever has to be done. That is, whatever motions Members want to put, Resolutions, Announcements, what have you, and then perhaps go back to Third Readings and try to get a few things off of the calendar and adjourn sometime around four or four-thirty. Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm the Chief sponsor of House Bill 483, which creates the Local Government Tax Study Commission. Yesterday, House Bill 485, was heard in the Appropriations Committee and the appropriation was reduced and it was recommended out of the Committee do pass. Now 483 was on the Order of Second Reading and I asked to have it taken off of the Calendar and I wanted to get it with the Appropriation Bill, but through some negligence on Committee on Assignments, I think it rests there now, so I would make



a motion that House Bill 483 be taken from the Committee on Assignments and placed on the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day."

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

Walsh: "This is news to me, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if we could have a second to see what ah.... this is about?"

Arthur Telcser: "You want to hold that. We'll go back, Representative Shea."

Shea: "I'll go over and talk to Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "In the meantime, we have Agreed Resolutions." Representative Lauer, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Lauer: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Arthur Telcser: "State your point, Sir."

Lauer: "Whereas the Illinois House of Representatives Republican freshman politics and booze society has been trying to have its rest and rehabilitation period since March 20th, and whereas the date for the said rest and rehabilitation session has set for three different times, and had to be changed because of circumstances beyond its control, such as having sessions changed and not being in Springfield, and whereas this has happened again today, now therefore, I rise on a point of personal privilege, as Secretary of the said Illinois House of Representatives Republican Freshman Politics and Booze Society to announce yet another date; namely, Wednesday, April 25, 1973, at 7:45 PM, for perfunctory rest and rehabilitation, and



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

at 8:00 PM for Regular Session."

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

Skinner: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Arthur Telcser: "State your point."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, on the night of Wednesday, April 25, the Illinois Legislative Council is holding a seminar on property taxes for freshman members of the legislature."

Arthur Telcser: "Agreed Resolutions."

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution. 207. Getty. House Resolution. 211. Maragos. House Resolution 212. Murphy. House Resolution....."

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

Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask that ah.... Rule ah.... appropriate rule be waived that we could have immediate consideration of ah.... House Resolution 212 and that the Clerk should read House Resolution 212."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, the gentleman has moved for the suspension of Rule 41, for the immediate consideration and adoption of House Resolution 212, and requests that the Clerk please read the Amendment..... the Resolution."

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 212. Murphy et al. Whereas our esteemed colleague, the Honorable W. Timothy Simms, did on Monday, the ninth day of April, obtain the ripe old age of 30 years, and whereas this is a remarkable accomplishment for our friend, Tim, because of his vocation, he can get bargain rates at any time; and whereas,





he generously holds out the opportunity to all of his colleague for just pennies a day, he can provide us with an exciting and plush exodus from this vale of tears; and whereas he offers great savings to his colleague on shoes, false teeth, leadership ties, and so forth, and where he has been blessed with presents and sage advice of this fine young mouth piece of the Rockford Star for two terms here in this great body, and whereas it is generally agreed among the Membership of this House, that we don't care what other people say about Tim, we still love him; Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 78th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we extend our belated but sincere best wishes to our colleague, the Honorable W. Timothy Simms, on his achievement of his thirtieth year and encourage him to listen to his leader and become one of the great storts of this House; and be it further resolved, that a copy of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to the Honorable W. Timothy Simms."

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

Murphy: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we do wish Timothy a belated happy birthday. I move the adoption of this Resolution."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman has moved the suspension of Rule 41 for immediate consideration of House Resolution 212. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no', and the Resolution..... oh, we don't want to hurt his feelings. The Resolution is adopted. O'kay, roll call



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

has been requested. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. Sorry about that, Tim. And this Resolution, having ..... On this question, there are 177 'ayes', no 'nays' and House Resolution Number 212 is adopted. Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Simms.

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, as you might know, the distinguished ah.... Majority Whip has been dressing a little bit more up to date these days."

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

J. J. Wolf: "I'd just like to know how Representative Simms voted on that?"

Arthur Telcser: "How is the gentleman recorded? O'okay further Resolutions. Agreed Resolutions."

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 213. Jones et al. House Resolution 214. Caldwell et al."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have more than Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 207 by Representative Getty congratulates the great Hockey Team, the St. Jude's Squirts, and it says here in the Resolution that they have defeated teams from Canada, Missouri and Michigan and have done an extremely good job, and we'll get back to this one a little later. House Resolution 211, Representative Maragos, congratulates



congratulates and expresses condolence to Representative Bruce A. Farley, who is 30 years old today. Congratulations, Bruce. House Resolution 212 we've disposed of. House Resolution 213, by Representative Dave Jones and Jim Londrigan, and I'm sure Joe Gibbs ah.... congratulates Mr. and Mrs. Charles M. Bickhouse of Springfield on their 60th Wedding Anniversary, and ah.... Mr. and Mrs. Bickhouse are the parents of our good friend, Lorine Sponsky. House Resolution 214, by Representative Caldwell, congratulates Representative Langdon W. Patrick on his 59th birthday, and congratulations Langdon. And House Resolution 5012 by Representative Walters congratulates the Chicago Blackhawks on their smashing defeat of the St. Louis Blues..... ah..... Representative Walters urges that the Blackhawks not let these easy victories go to their heads because they're in the major leagues now and the St. Louis Blues are one of the teams that the St. Jude's Squirts took very handily when they defeated teams in Missouri. And I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

Choate: "I would just like to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that there should have been two more birthday resolutions in there that are being prepared. I guess we'll get them now, when we come back from our little leave of absence, but it's the happy season for a birthday time for Representative Toby Barry and also for Representative Bud Krause, and



those resolutions will be in when we come back."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, the gentleman from Madison, Representatives Walters."

Walters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the last Agreed Resolution that was read by the Majority Leader, the temporary Majority Leader of the House, ah.... said something about the St. Louis Blues and I would like to comment, if I may, on a point of personal privilege that ah.... first of all, as my son, Jim, says, this hasn't been my year. Ah.... sometimes the best horse doesn't always win, but I have seen the light. I just got back from retreat and long live the Blackhawks."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor, signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no', and the Resolutions are adopted. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I've talked to the Majority Leader about House Bill 483, which is the Study Commission, Property Tax Study Commission. I think we've got everything so he understands it, and again, I would ask that the House ah.... that I move that House Bill 483 be placed on the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day, on the Calendar."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? If not, the gentleman has moved that House Bill 483 be taken from the



Committee on Assignments, placed on the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day, on the Calendar. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. Mann 'aye'. This question, 113 'ayes', one 'nay', and the gentleman's motion prevails. 'O'okay, now, we'll go to Announcements, Motions and Announcements now. Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Shea: "Yeow, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you might have the Clerk check the Journal for March 22nd, 1972, on Page 43, there was some action on a House Bill 89, and I noticed the Speaker is voting both in the affirmative and the negative. So I'm wondering if they might check back and see which way he voted on that issue."

Arthur Telcser: "He's voting 'yea' and 'nay'. What's wrong with that?"

Shea: "Well, it does get one off the hook. You can answer all your letters."

Arthur Telcser: "That's right. O'okay, Representative ah.... Boyle, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Boyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move to suspend the appropriate rule to advance House Bill 783 from the Order of Second Reading to Third Reading. I had been holding it on Second Reading, thinking I needed an amendment and the Reference Bureau advised me today that there is no need for an Amendment to the Bill, and I'd appreciate a favorable roll call."



Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh, wish to comment on that? Representative Boyle has moved if and when we go to the Order of Second Reading, that we go out of order to take House Bill 783 from Second to Third. It has an expiration date of May 10."

Walsh: "I object."

Arthur Telcser: "Does the gentleman wish to persist in his Motion? O'okay. Ah.... Representative Bradley, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Bradley: "Point of information, Mr. Speaker, directed to the Majority Leader. I'm wondering under the ah.... House Resolution 208, amending House Rule 23, if ah.... this would include those bills under motions on the House Calendar. If they will be carried over until we come back on the 28th or if they are.... just what their position is?"

Walsh: "I would hope that we could get to them today, Jerry, if we cannot, why we'll suspend the rules."

Bradley: "That will be fine with me, if we have time to hear them today. I understand, they address themselves to a variety of issues. It's going to be quite a time consuming situation, but I would be very happy to....."

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

Choate: "I would only suggest to the Majority Leader that if we don't get to them today, that we do carry them over because we have been carrying them several days when he



could have called them."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Bradley, did you hear that Sir? O'kay. All right, yes, Representative Hyde, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Hyde: "Ah.... Point of information, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 25 has the Chief Sponsor, Mr. Sevcik, and if today is the last day for that, I would ask leave to ah.... represent Mr. Sevcik in moving the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Yes, we'll go back to Third Reading, Representative, and I was just informed you will handle it for Joe. Representative Pappas, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Pappas: "Ah..... Mr. Speaker, am I in order for Announcement at this time?"

Arthur Telcser: "Yes, Sir. Proceed."

Pappas: "Ah.....Mr. Speaker, Motor Vehicle Committee will meet immediately after adjournment in Room M-5."

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

McAvoy: "Purpose of Announcements."

Arthur Telcser: "Proceed, Sir."

McAvoy: "For the purpose of Announcements, Banks and Savings and Loans Committee will meet on the Floor of the House, immediately after adjournment."

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



Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Public Utilities Committee will meet in Room M-4 immediately after adjournment."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, Representative Blades, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Blades: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee will meet in C-1 fifteen minutes after adjournment. Now, Mr. Speaker, would I be in order for a Motion?"

Arthur Telcser: "Proceed, Sir."

Blades: "Ah..... Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee met last Friday, and two Bills were postponed, which meant that they didn't have time to publish them to hear them in the meeting today. I would now move that House Rule 18 be suspended in order that I might hear these two bills in Committee, House Bill 669 and 670 in Committee today."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman has moved the provisions of Rule 18 be suspended for the purposes of hearing House Bill 669 and 670 in the Agriculture Committee this afternoon. Is there any discussion? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Chaote 'aye'. Take the record. Geo-Karis 'aye'. This question, 110 'ayes', no 'nays' and the gentleman's motion prevails. Now, are there further announcements or Motions? Representative Stedelin, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"





Stedelin: "An announcement, Mr. Speaker. Ah... next week, I'm going to spend most of the time in the strip mines to see what the Reclaiming Act has done, and on the 18th, we're going to have Mr. Gene Filer, and we're going to tour the most acid producing strip mine in the State of Illinois in Saline County, and we're going to leave the great Plaza in Harrisburg at about 9:00 O'Clock, and I would appreciate anyone interested to make the tour with us."

Arthur Telcser: "Messages from the Senate."

Jack O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed a Bill with the following title and passage to which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit, Senate Bill 48, passed by the Senate April 12, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate adopted the following Preamble and Joint Resolution and adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit, Senate Joint Resolution 31. Adopted by the Senate, April 12, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary."

Arthur Telcser: "House Bills, Third Reading." House Bill 25."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 25. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



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

Hyde: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm handling this for Representative Sevcik, who has a doctor's appointment today, and ah... House Bill 25, passed out of the Higher Education Committee, 13 to nothing, and it is a simple bill and it permits a Member of the General Assembly to, in nominating persons to receive a General Assembly Scholarship to designate one nominee for four years, which is the current arrangement or he is permitted to name two nominees each for a two year scholarship, and this is for each one of his two scholarships. I think it is a very fine idea, and it permits the involvement of more beneficiaries in this program, and so ah... I respectfully urge a green light for House Bill 25."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, I was on the Committee that heard the Bill, and I think it's a very good Bill and I would like to urge you, along with Mr. Hyde, to support it."

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

Leinenweber: "Would Representative Hyde yield for a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Leinenweber: "What do we have now, Representative Hyde?"



Hyde: "You're speaking of what is the present arrangement on General Assembly scholarships?"

Leinenweber: "Yeow."

Hyde: "I thought that might have been covered in the freshman class, Mr. Leinenweber, I see they missed a few things. In any event, ah... you get one scholarship for four years to the University of Illinois and you get one scholarship for four years to any other State supported school that is a directly supported school by the State. So you get two four year scholarship. Now, as a matter of practice, ah... kids use them and then they don't use the full four years and you get a piece of a scholarship back and that sort of thing, so in practice, it isn't always a four year scholarship that you are awarding, but that is what you start out with, and this would permit you to take that one four year scholarship, and instead of giving it to one person, you can give two people a two-year scholarship, so it just permits you to give less of a scholarship to more people. It gives you flexibility."

Leinenweber: "What about the other scholarship?"

Hyde: "I'm sorry, I don't know what your question means. What about, what other scholarship?"

Leinenweber: "Well, we have two four year now, and this seems to say that one four year or two two-year."

Hyde: "No, Sir, you'll have two eight years then, if that's the way you want to look at it. You'll have two four year scholarships, but you may award the four year scholarships



in increments of two years, to two people instead of in increments of four years to one person."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, I think it is a fine Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Douglas."

Douglas: "Ah.... Mr. Hyde, ah.... excuse me, I would just like to ask one or two questions before voting. I know that the question applies to the present situation, but I'm not sure. Ah.... who pays for these scholarships?"

Hyde: "The taxpayer."

Douglas: "Are there allocations in the State budget for these scholarships?"

Hyde: "Yes, Sir, there always has been."

Douglas: "Is that money specifically allocated to those scholarships?"

Hyde: "I'm sure it is. I'm sorry, I'm informed by wiser heads that it is not."

Douglas: "Well, the reason I bring that up, is that I think it's very important as we vote, that we recognize that the money that we are spending on these scholarships is money that comes out of the Universities to which these students are sent. And the other question, just briefly, are there any specifications in these scholarship awards as to whom they can be given to, or what provisions the Members of the General Assembly should adhere to in giving, or can they be given to anybody?"



Hyde: "Well, they may be given to anybody. I'm not sure that's the best idea in the world but this law has not.. this bill has nothing to do with those provisions. Ah.. there's always been attempts to change that. They've been uniformly unsuccessful, I'm sorry to say."

Douglas: "Well, the reason I ask those questions is because of the fact that I am concerned about those issues even on this modification of the General Assembly Scholarship. I feel that I have great reservations about the absence of that in the original statute. Therefore, I'm going to be forced to vote present."

Hyde: "If I may say, there's one qualification. The award must be within your own district."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative B. B. Wolfe."

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

A. Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Wolfe: "Ah.. Henry, wasn't the bill amended in Committee to provide for one year increments rather than two year?"

Hyde: "I would have to yield to Representative Dyer who ah.. would have that information I trust."

Dyer: "Ah.. yes. Would the gentleman repeat the question, please?"

Wolfe: "The question is, was this bill amended in Committee to provide for one year increments rather than two year?"

Dyer: "Ah.. I'm sorry Representative Wolfe, I'll have to look



in the.. in my brown book and see. I'll have the answer for you in a minute."

Wolfe: "The other question is, when there's a lapse of time can you consolidate the scholar.. For example, you give one to two persons, you know, one each for two years and each one of them goes one year and lapses a scholarship. Can you reconsolidate the scholarship into one scholarship for a two year period?"

Dyer: "Yes."

Wolfe: "Thank you. What's the answer to the first question, yes or no?"

A. Telcser: "Is there further discussion?"

Dyer: "The answer ah.. excuse me, Representative Wolfe, I was looking up in the bill book the answer to your first question. Apparently the answer to both questions are 'yes'."

Wolfe: "Thank you."

A. Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Does the gentleman wish to close? Question is shall House Bill 25 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'." ... wishes to be recorded as voting 'yes'. You're still on the switches. Go ahead. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Gibbs, 'present'. On this question, there are 127 'ayes', two 'nays', two answering present and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Motions. Pardon? On the Order of Motions



appears House Bill 97 for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative B. B. Wolfe is recognized."

B. B. Wolfe: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, I took care of that yesterday, so you can table the motion."

A. Telcser: "Okay. On the Order of Motions appears House Bill 146 for which purpose the gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley is recognized. This is your motion Representative Bradley on House Bill 146."

Bradley: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. House Bill 146 addresses itself to a primary change which I think is definitely needed. The problem that we have, all of you are aware that when we are going to be elected in a general election in November, it's necessary for us to file 11 months prior to that day of election which means that the primary date is in as it was the last time, March 17, or that appropriate Tuesday. House Bill 146 moves the primary date closer to the General Election and eliminates the necessity of having such an early primary because of us being in session annually. If you'll recall last year, the primary was in March and we were in session April, May and June. So that eliminated the possibility of having a primary at that time. So I move that House Bill 146 moves the primary date to the third Tuesday in August that would allow us time to campaign in.. for the primary in August. We would have some carry over benefits into the general election. And



we would have two elections much closer together. The bill also provides for.. delegates to ah.. elect delegates to the National Convention although that will not be necessary next ah.. in our next primary next year.

And I think ah.."

A. Telcser: "Representative Collins, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

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

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

Collins: "I believe the gentleman rose on a motion to discharge and he is debating the bill."

A. Telcser: "I think your point is well-taken, Sir."

Bradley: "Thank you, ah.. Mr. Speaker. I'm rising on a motion to take from the table ah.. a bill that was heard in Committee, sent to a subcommittee ah.. a committee of which I am a member, brought back evidentially to that committee and I was away from the Committee on that particular day with another bill and I've been told that all three of ah.. these bills were recommended out, do not pass. And therefore, I now move Mr. Speaker that we move House Bill 146 from, take it from the table and place it on the order of calendar on Second Reading."

A. Telcser: "Okay. Now. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "First, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know how many votes it would take to take this from the table. The reason I ask that is you must recall that this bill is



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



about 60 days old or longer. The 45 days expired about 15, 18 days ago. The gentleman did have an opportunity, he had three or four days after the committee had acted on this bill. He did have that opportunity to come before this House and to take it from the Committee. He failed to do that. So my question is, does it take 107 votes, Mr. Speaker, or merely 89?"

A. Telcser: "Okay. Based on what you say, Representative Bluthardt, the gentleman did not file his motion within the two legislative days after the bill was reported out of the Committee. Now is that correct? Representative Bradley?"

Bradley: "Yes, sir. I did file within the two day period, the requirement to discharge committee and we did not.."

A. Telcser: "All right.. okay. Now, was it a do not pass motion or simply tabled? There's a difference."

Bradley: "It was.. it was.. the motion that I understand.. I said I wasn't there. It came out do not pass.. I moved to take from the Committee.."

A. Telcser: "Well, the Clerk.. And this is where the crux of the ruling is! The Clerk informs me that your bill was tabled in Committee by the rule. Now that is a.. that would then require 107 votes to take from the table. Now, if it was a do not pass motion and you filed within



the two legislative days, that would take 89 under the provision of Rule.... Section C, Rule 37. Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this and three other similar bills were referred by the Elections Committee to a subcommittee, who had hearings, who considered the matters and referred.... reported back to the Committee of the Whole, ah.... that all four Bills do not pass. The Committee then merely adopted the findings of the ah.... subcommittee and then left the Bill die as a matter of course without actually taking any vote on the do not pass recommendation of the subcommittee."

Arthur Telcser: "Well, what the Chairman says concurs with the information the Clerk's Office has. The Bills die due to the 45 day rule. They're on the Table. It will take 107 votes to take them from the Table. Is there further discussion? Gentleman has moved that House Bill 146 be taken from the Table and put on the calendar on the order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Gentleman from Madison, Representative Kennedy."

Kennedy: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I did try to secure your attention before you started to take the vote. I don't know what is in order or what isn't in order on this, and it's being called at



a very inopportune time. I understand myself by talking to a number of Members that sentiment has changed with reference to the primary date. It seems like when someone mentions primary, they get to shaking, but ah.... if we're going to hold a primary in March and come back here in April, May and June, you're going to have the same thing you had a year ago. You're going to have a lot of lame duck, legitimate lame ducks, men who are going to retire, women also, people who are defeated and I think it defeats the purpose of the annual session, and that's why I supported Representative Hirschfeld's motion to eliminate the annual session. It isn't good government. We're here for good government, to have a house that consists of a great number of legitimate lame ducks or however you want to refer to it....."

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

Totten: "Point of Order, Mr. Speaker."

Arthur Telcser: "State your point, Sir."

Totten: "The Speaker is debating the Bill rather than the Motion."

Arthur Telcser: "I think your point is fairly well taken. If he would confine himself to explaining his vote."

Kennedy: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't. You don't get a chance. I knew someone would do that. That's the way you can beat a Bill. Now this is a primary election Bill, and I'm going to rise to the point of personal privilege."



Arthur Telcser: "State your point, Sir."

Kennedy: "If I may, Sir. I think this is very important.

Particularly to the freshmen members of this General Assembly. To come back here to have a primary election the third Tuesday of March, which is March the 19th, and come back here with the 50 to 75 men who had planned to retire or men who were defeated in the primary and try to run the State with a seven million dollar budget and I'm going to support Representative Bradley. Thank you."

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

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my vote. I'm voting 'aye' for this Bill, because I'm very pleased that this proposes that the primary be moved back into August. This is not unique among the States. In fact, one of our neighboring State's holds their primary in August and has held their primary in August for years and years and years. I think it has one very good aspect. You run your primary campaign and all of you do in a very first part of the year. You have your primary and perhaps you are successful. I hope that you all are. But then once that primary is over with, you lose the complete advantage of the campaign that you have operated and every other candidate who is successful has had during that time. You have a four, five or six month gap in the real campaign. And then you start all over again. If our primary were in August, as this suggests, you'd have your primary



election. Your election would be over with. You would be just three months away or a little less than three months perhaps from the general election. Then your primary election would become integral part of your general election campaign. I know we say well you'd like to have a little bit of rest in there. Perhaps that's true, but you come back here to a General Assembly session after that primary, you're not going to get any rest and you're not going to get any campaigning done much of that time. I think this is an excellent suggestion. I think it fits much better. In the constitution that we have today against sustained of annual session, and I think it makes a much better campaign for you and everyone else who may be running in the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I'd like to make a suggestion. Certainly the general subject of when we're going to have a primary election is a very complicated subject in which we all have different opinions. I don't think this is any time to take it up. As it is, Representative Bradley has a motion, Representative Hirschfeld has a motion and I have a motion. I happen to have a Bill that was amended to provide for the April primary but I think the whole subject ought to be taken up after we come back. It is true that the Committee provided no opportunity in my case to testify before the full



committee and they just took a short trip through the whole thing. Killed them all. I think it would be very nice if the full Membership of this House had an opportunity to express this will, but I think since there's three different options, you know, a couple of fall bills and my April bill, that we ought to put this all off, and I'd like to see the Motion withdrawn if that can be done in a parliamentary way so we can take up the whole subject very carefully and thoughtfully after we come back."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. Record Representative Mann as voting 'no'. This question, there are 54 'ayes', 30 'nays' and the gentleman's motion to take House Bill 146 from the Table fails. On the Order of Motions appears House Bill 155, for which purpose the gentleman from Champaign, Representative Hirschfeld, is recognized."

Hirschfeld: "Point of Order, Mr. Speaker."

Arthur Telcser: "State your point."

Hirschfeld: "In light of the gentleman's last comments, I wonder if it's necessary that these motions be called today?"

Arthur Telcser: "No, if you wish to just let it pass by, we'll just pass it and...."

Hirschfeld: "They won't die, in other words?"

Arthur Telcser: "No, they won't, Sir."



Hirschfeld: "All right, then may I...."

Arthur Telcser: "Wait one second. Maybe I said.... Representative Walsh, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Walsh: "I don't think that's correct. I think they will die."

Arthur Telcser: "Well, now, Representative Choate and I think.... In response to Representative Bradley earlier..."

Walsh: "No, what I agreed to, I thought, was that if the .... we did not have time to get to this order of business, and if they were not called, then we would agree to extend the time, but since we do have time, and they are being called, I think it would waste our time to extend the time further."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay. Representative Hirschfeld, for what prupose do you rise, Sir?"

Hirschfeld: "Well, I have another... still the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. Ah.... we ask leave to have these matters ah.... taken outside the rules several weeks ago when we got caught in the switches on the day, and it was to the best of my knowledge there was no time certain as to when the time would expire to call these motions, and I'm wondering, therefore, why it would expire today?"

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, we extended these motions twice, each time to the last legislative day in the week, or before in that week. Today is the last day that they may be called under the previous motion."



Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, the gentleman from Champaign, Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Well, I might as well engage in an exercise in futility, then. Before I do that, may I have permission to table the motion to take from the Table for HJRCA 8 which is on the calendar by inadvertence?"

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, does the gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment Number 8 will be tabled."

Hirschfeld: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah... everything that Representative Bradley said would apply to mine except this happens to be a September primary date. I don't want to argue the merits of the Bill, because I don't want to leave myself open for any ah... points of order from the distinguished gentleman to my right who is smiling at me. It's a September primary date and the reason it was September was so that the students would not be disenfranchised, which is what bothered me about the August primary date, and ah... I realize it's going to take 107 votes, but I think we ought to have a vehicle available to change the primary date and not get stuck with a March primary, which we've been stuck with for the last two terms, and I would appreciate a favorable roll call."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentle.... You want to speak, Representative Kennedy? Did you seek recognition, Sir? O'kay, the gentleman from Madison... No, if





I overlooked the gentleman, I apologize. Gentleman from Madison, Representative Kennedy."

Kennedy: "Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to ask the Majority Leader a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "I think he would answer that."

Kennedy: "You heard Representative Hirschfeld say, Sir, that it would be a good idea if we had a vehicle to eliminate the March primary. Ah... you stated when you were on the floor a few minutes ago, that these Bills die today. Ah..."

Walsh: "It was not I that stated that, Lee. Ah... but I think there is a vehicle anyway, if that is the desire of this House. There... there..."

Kennedy: "I can't hear you, Sir."

Walsh: "It was not I that stated that. It was Representative Deuster."

Kennedy: "Then you said something else. You think there is another vehicle?"

Walsh: "Yes, I believe there is. I'm not certain of that. I would defer to Representative Bluthardt, the Chairman of the Elections Committee, but I believe there's another vehicle."

Kennedy: "Well, would I be in order, if I could inquire..."

Walsh: "Oh, I'm sorry, I'm wrong. He's shaking his head 'no'. There is not a Bill that addresses itself to the primary."

Kennedy: "In other words, then, Mr. Majority Leader, you're going to preside here next April with ah... a number of



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

lame ducks, legitimate and illegitimate, if I may say so. Do I understand that to be correct?" We could dialogue on this all day today, because this is very important. And it isn't political...."

Walsh: "Well, if the ah.... if there is an overwhelming reason to introduce a Bill to change the primary, we can do that by suspension of our Rules. Ah.... so as long as we're in session really, there's a vehicle. There's a way to do it."

Kennedy: "Well, I'll sit down on that, then."

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

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd just like to say I think this is a lesson for ah... many of the freshmen here. Ah... a lot depends on when a Bill is called. Ah.... But I'm very happy that at least they finally got around to calling my Motion, but I would like to throw all of my support behind this Bill for Representative Hirschfeld. Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Does the gentleman wish to close the debate? Well, I want to give the gentleman a little leeway. O'kay the gentleman has moved that House Bill 155 be taken from the Table and be placed on the calendar. All in favor, signify by voting 'aye'. The opposed by voting 'no'. 107 votes. Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Well, I want to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker. If we keep the March primary, we're going to be in the same



box that we've been in for the last three years, where we hold office for 11 months and run for 13. And I think it's sort of disgraceful. This is a September primary bill and would give us eight weeks between the primary and the General Election. Now all kinds of leadership positions have been taken on this Floor to cut down on costs for elections, to clean up the elections, and I think this would go a long way in doing that. Ah.... the costs between August and November would be much less, because there would be carry over. There would be less time necessary for debate. We wouldn't have lame ducks in the legislature from March until September. We'd actually just have them from September until November. There would be some continuity between the elections, which is what Representative Tipsword pointed out. I think it's a very good Bill. We got stuck with a March primary last time because Governor Ogilvie wanted a March primary, and very few of us on this side of the aisle, and I include myself on that, had an intestinal fortitude to vote against it. I did not vote against it, but I've seen what it does to it, and I think we ought to get rid of it. I think this is the best state, the students will be fully enfranchised under this, and I, too, am sorry that it is called at this late time, when many members are present, but I would like to see 107 votes if possible, so that we could get something a little closer to reasonableness in the primary elections."



Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. In explaining my green light on this, I, too, got a fast shuffle on my House Bill 210 in the Committee on Elections, and it was dismissed before I realized what had happened. Those of you who are voting other than green, your vote could be interpreted as a fear of primary opposition. If we're to make the legislative process work, we must invite everyone who wishes to participate. We should be sending the signal to inspire and to serve in elective office to come on in. That the water's fine. And it's difficult to campaign in March, to slush out in the snow. Let's extend the hand of hospitality even to those who want to run against us, by opening up this question and pick out a date that's more acceptable to everyone."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, there will be another vehicle. I understand that the proposed election code, the product of the Election Laws Commission, will be introduced in the State Senate before the deadline. That provides for a third Tuesday of May, or at least a May primary. That takes care of the problem that this primary doesn't. Under this primary, you couldn't elect your delegates to the Democratic and Republican National Convention, because the primary would be after the National Conventions. Now, true, next year there is no... there are no National



Conventions, but when we pass the Statute, it stays on the books until we change it. And there will be a ah... there will be a National Convention, of course, again in a few years, and if Mr. Singer allows the elected delegates to be seated at the Democratic National Convention, we'd want those Delegates to be elected prior to the Convention, not after the convention. So I would say that the ah.... primary proposed in this Bill is unrealistic and can't be carried on because you couldn't elect your delegates to the National Convention. There is no need to discharge this Bill. We'll be having the ah... Election Code come up again with the May primary. I might remind you of the last year, the House Elections Committee did approve my May primary bill, but it failed on the House Floor because of the Governor's opposition."

Arthur Telcser: "You're voting 'aye', Representative Pierce? You're voting 'aye'."

Pierce: "I'm voting 'no'. Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Oh, well, change your switch. O'kay. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as Roscoe said, if he saw the fast shuffle in the Elections Committee, I think he's mistaken. He must have seen me on the dance floor last night. There was no fast shuffle here. There were four bills. The first two were heard before the entire Elections Committee. It was then determined when two more bills came in that we would



refer them to a subcommittee. That subcommittee was headed by Carl Hunsicker. They did meet. They did consider it. Now, both the entire committee and the subcommittee heard the arguments, pro and con, and the report came back from the subcommittee that all four Bills do not pass. We did not take any formal action on a do not pass motion. We merely allowed the bills to expire by time alone. I would urge that you vote 'no' on this Bill."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would never deprive my colleague from Lawrenceville from using his own opinion, and I rather feel bad that he would cast espurgeons on my opinions, if I disagree in the color of light on my switch. I don't like either primary date. I'd rather have June. Therefore, I vote 'no'."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, now I don't know how the Gentleman from Champaign County campaigns. I don't know how the gentleman from Lawrence County does, and I don't know anything about Mr. Pierce in Lake County. But I do know this. The date of the primary makes very little difference to me. I know that those of us who run in the 47th District campaign all the time, so I don't care when the primary date is. Let it fall where it may. We campaign."



Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted.... Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Hunsicker."

Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me tell you exactly what happened. There was a subcommittee appointed, with myself as Chairman. Representative McPartlin, Representative Totten, Representative Hudson and Representative Hill. We had two meetings. And thrashed this thing around in real good shape and voted four to one recommend do not pass. Everyone I asked out in my district and wherever else what they thought about the campaign or what they thought about primary dates, and I never had a one suggest it be changed. Everybody said let it alone. The People are confused enough already, and therefore, the recommendation we brought back."

Arthur Telcser: "Have al..... Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "I just want to make one point perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, and to the extinguished Chairman of the Election Commission, and of the Members of the subcommittee. I was not, and I did not imply that there was any fast shuffle, as far as my bill is concerned, and I want you to know that. The Bill's going up or down on its merit and it just happened to be a bad day for me."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? All.... Representative Cunningham, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"



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

Arthur Telcser: "State your point."

Cunningham: "I was very anxious that the Members of this Committee and this House not conclude that my implied criticism of the Elections Committee and of the sub-committee was unintentional."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. On this question, there are 74 'ayes', 38 'nays', and the Gentleman's Motion to take House Bill 155 from the Table, fails. On the Order of Motions, appears House Bill 163, for which purpose the gentleman from Madison, Representative Calvo, is recognized."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'll try to be as brief as possible. It looks like the timing is about proper on these Motions. I don't know that we have 89 people on the floor or not. However, I would just like to say...."

Arthur Telcser: "Repre.... I'm sorry, proceed, Representative Calvo."

Calvo: "This Bill provides that the People who are now teachers in the State of Illinois in our Teachers System who served our country during World War II or anytime since, and then entered the teaching profession, can become covered under the Teachers Retirement System, if they pay in some \$80.00 more a year than the present people who are covered... who are in service are covered, or \$500.00 a year is the





requirement, plus interest compounded at the rate of four percent. Now for just a second, I'd like to point out that what this means is that the People in World War II who would be covered under this Bill, and I submit that's the Majority of the People that would be covered, would be paying in about twice as much as anyone else who is in the teaching field at the time. I think without question, that they're not only paying their way, but they're paying what the State should have contributed back in those years, had they been in the teaching profession. I think this is good legislation...."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Mann. One moment. Representative Mann, for what purpose do you rise?"

Mann: "A point of order. I'm sorry to interrupt you, Horace. Mr. Speaker, I just observed a person who is not a Member of the Assembly, walk up to the Clerk's desk and hand him some papers. I don't know whether it's a Bill. I'm not criticizing the Clerk, but I didn't know that nonmembers could introduce Bills into this House, and I'm just calling it to your attention, Mr. Speaker."

Arthur Telcser: "I think your point is well taken, Sir." Proceed, Representative Calvo."

Calvo: "Well, I submit that these Veterans will be paying their way in what they pay in, and the... in the committee at the time of the hearing of this bill, it was pointed out that the Teachers Retirement System was strained.



That there wasn't the funds there that should be and they couldn't afford to do this. Well I submit that these teachers, particularly the ones from World War II, will be paying more than was paid in by the persons teaching at that time, and the State. And if the reason the fund is short of money is that we've been funding it at a 34 and 38 percent rate in the last four years or the last eight years, the last ten years, then I submit that this should not be used to defeat legislation of this kind. I would like to point out that the Illinois Educational Association, the American Federation of Teachers, both organizations support this legislation. I think its a good bill, and I would appreciate 89 votes to take this Bill from the Committee and give us an opportunity to present it to the Members of the Floor and see how they feel about it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. First of all, I would like to point out that I believe it takes 107 votes to take this Bill from the Table, and if I may continue, Mr. Speaker...."

Arthur Telcser: "Well, let's get that clear. Ah.... I'm informed that the Gentleman filed a Motion pursuant to a do not pass motion by the Committee. Filed the Motion within the prescribed two days, under the provisions of Rule 237C, or 33C. This would then take 89 votes."



Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may, the Bill was assigned to Committee on February 7th, ah.... the Motion was filed on ah.... March the 27th and that leaves 21 more days in February and 27 days until the 29th of March, and to me that adds up to 48, and I believe the Bill is automatically tabled within 45 days, and so I raise the point once more, that it requires 107 votes."

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

Calvo: "Well, I don't believe that's correct. I'll await the Chair's ruling, but my understanding of the 45 day rule is the Bill must be heard in committee within 45 days. The Bill was heard, Mr. Speaker, within 45 days and the Motion was timely filed after the report at the time two days after the report was filed."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Wolf, I'm going to try and get this clear. The Bill was heard within the 45 days in Committee."

Wolf: "The Motion, Mr. Speaker, was filed as I see on the Calendar, on the 27th of March."

Arthur Telcser: "When was it reported do not pass out of Committee? That's the.... When was it voted do not pass? That's the issue."

Wolf: "Or the Motion was filed. It was tabled on the 27th, and if my arithmetic is correct, it was assigned to Committee on February the 7th. There are 21 more days in February. An additional 27 days to the 27th of March



when the Bill was tabled, which comes to 48."

Arthur Telcser: "What was the date, Representative Wolf, of the do not pass motion? Not the date in which the Committee Clerk reported the Bill out. Sometimes that is.... if it is a Thursday Committee, the Committee Clerk maybe didn't report it out until the following Monday. I don't know."

Wolf: "I thought it was the 27th, Mr. Speaker."

Arthur Telcser: "Maybe it was. Let's see if we can find out."

Wolf: "All right, well, if your ruling is 89 votes, then I'll address myself ah.... in opposition. As Chairman of the Veterans Committee on Personnel and Pension, I have to report that ah.... this Bill was ah.... given a very fair and extensive hearing. We had already defeated a similar Bill introduced by another Member of this House. I believe it was defeated by a vote of 12 to 4, and I think 2 of those 4 votes were gratis, so the Sponsor wouldn't look too bad. It's a very bad piece of legislation. It sets a fantastic precedent. Ah.... to allow credit for military service before they were teaching. Right now the law permits if you're drafted and your teaching job is interrupted, that you can then use this time toward your pension, but this is for prior military service, and this of course, could be extended to State employees, members of the General Assembly, and ah.... I think it's a very bad practice, and there's only, in my opinion, one way to go on that and that is to defeat this motion."



Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman from ah.... Madison, Representative Kennedy."

Kennedy: "Mr. Speaker, a point of order."

Arthur Telcser: "State your point, Sir."

Kennedy: "Is there any rule that says we have to have a copy of the Rules. I mean, it seems like maybe four or five times today, the 107 vote rule has been in effect."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative, ah.... when we adopted the Rules, shortly thereafter, mimeographed copies were put on every members desk. There is also in your Journal on your desk a copy of all of the rules, Sir."

Kennedy: "In previous sessions, Mr. Speaker, if I may continue, we had...."

Arthur Telcser: "We had the Rules in a little book."

Kennedy: "Beg your pardon?"

Arthur Telcser: "In a book, and I assume they are still at the Printers being whatever they do... bind...."

Kennedy: "Then my point is, then, if we can excuse the printer can we excuse the 107 and go to 89?"

Arthur Telcser: "Well, we're not excusing...."

Kennedy: "Well, we are, obviously we are, Sir."

Arthur Telcser: "Well, we're not clearly. Ah.... if you look in the digest at the times. Ah.... the Bill was heard within the 45 days, but reported out late, thereby giving it the 48 days. The Rule 33C clearly states that it takes 89 votes then to, in effect, ah.... take it from the Speaker's Table."



Kennedy: "I'll sit down. Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentlman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm also a Member of the Pension Committee that heard this Bill, and I agree with Representative ah... Wolf, that this is a bad bill, and it is a bad precedent. What this Bill is simply saying is that if you were in the military service, then you should be able to apply these here credits to any pension plan that you might go into. Whether it be a state plan, private plan, or any plan, and similarly, that these teachers ah... do have available, available to them, a cash sheltered annuity program, which they can participate, if there need is for greater benefits, and I think that this is a bad piece of legislation, and I urge your defeat of this Motion. Gentleman from Cook, Representative R. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is one of these rare occasions where we have an exceptionally fine sponsor, but an extremely bad bill. The concept of this Bill would apply itself in many cases to our retirement, any other concept, where we would anticipate rewarding veterans and I'm not saying that we should not encompass in our thought, rewarding veterans, but rewarding them outside the realm of realism on this. We cannot anticipate that when someone enters military service that they are going to commit themselves to a life of teaching in that particular field, and I



think later on after they have served the time as most of us here in the House have done and we have entered into a profession that we should all look back to try and encompass the thoughtfulness of the General Assembly in providing something extra on top of the professional commitment that we have. I think it's an extremely bad bill and support all of those voting against it."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Representative Phil Collins."

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Motion. Other speakers have alluded to the Bill, and I agree, it's a terrible bill. But I think more important, it's a terrible precedent that we're establishing here, if we vote for this motion. This Bill was roundly defeated in Committee by a vote of 12 to 4. Now, it appears from the Motions that we're hearing, that everytime a sponsor loses a Bill in Committee, he's going to file a motion to discharge, and I think this is wrong. We have a Committee system in this House, for a purpose. To hear legislation and to report on Bills and when a Bill is so resoundingly defeated as this one was, I think that we should support our Committee and defeat such a Motion, and I would urge all Members to join in voting in opposition to this Motion."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I respectfully move the previous question."



Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman has moved the previous question."

All in favor, signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'.  
The motion prevails and the gentleman from Madison,  
Representative Calvo."

Calvo: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,  
just to briefly try to answer some of the comments that  
have been made. It appears that no one realizes these  
Veterans are paying more than the present veterans who  
are allowed into this System. Instead of paying \$420  
a year plus four percent interest, they'll be paying \$500  
a year. Now, if this makes a difference, I don't know.  
You know, if some guy was a teacher six months. He went  
to service for three years. He came back and he can get  
in by paying \$420. The other fellow didn't go to service,  
. . . . went to service for his three years. Came back.  
Started teaching the next day, but he can't get in the  
program even though he's willing to pay another \$80 a  
year to do it. I don't really think this is fair. If  
the House thinks otherwise, of course, I'll be happy to  
abide by that decision. I would just like to say further  
that this is not and I would like to emphasize this, this  
is not a precedent. Every teacher in the college system  
in this State has this available to them now. Are we  
saying that our elementary and secondary teachers in  
this State are second class teachers, but the college  
teachers can have this program? I don't think we should.  
I think our elementary and secondary teachers have just





as much right to this program as the college professors and the college instructors do. And I solicit your vote in support of the Motion. I think this is a good Motion, the information that was given to this Committee was not true, was not backed up by any facts. They just get up and wave a big figure in the air and say this is what it will cost. I submit that every World War II veteran will more than pay their way. For the Korean veterans and for the Viet Nam veterans who are now getting home, it might be some additional costs, but I think we can well afford to give this privilege to the elementary and secondary teachers, the same as we do the college teachers. Thank you, and I solicit your vote, please?"

Arthur Telcser: "Question is, shall House Bill 163 be taken from the Speaker's table. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. Put the Speaker on 'no'. Blair 'no'. This question there are..... Record Representative Brinkmeier as voting 'present'. On this question, there are 49 'ayes', 30 'nays', one answering 'present', Geo-Karis 'present', two answering 'present'. The Gentleman's motion to take one.... take House Bill 163 from the Speaker's Table fails. On the Order of Motions appears House Bill 222, for which purpose the gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster, is recognized."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 222 is a transportation matter and another



legislative vehicle has been found to take care of it, and so I'm delighted to report to the House that I would like to move to Table the Motion to take House Bill 222."

Arthur Telcser: "What about 223? You want to do the same for 223?"

Deuster: "No, I'm sorry to say on 223 that it is a little different situation, Mr. Speaker."

Arthur Telcser: "Can't talk you into it, huh? O'kay, gentleman has moved to Table a Motion relative to House Bill 222. Hearing no objections, it will be tabled. On the Order of Motions appears House Bill 223, for which purpose the gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster, is recognized."

Deuster: "All right, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 223 as amended provides for taking us back to the old April primary that we had for years and years and years. However, as I expressed earlier, I think this is no time to take up such a serious subject as this. I think that we ought to put this off until after the Easter recess, and I want to tell you a little story to support that, why I think there's some interest in fair play in this. I was very much interested in the subject of the primary election. So I went down to the Committee, and I sat through one whole day hearing the advocates of moving it to the fall. And then they announced next week we're going to hear the advocates for the spring. So I went to the Committee



and I sat through a whole session and then at the end without an opportunity to be heard, I was notified that it was going to a subcommittee. Now it is true that I pursued it to the subcommittee and I had an informal meeting with a couple of the members of the subcommittee. However, I had no opportunity to appear before the full committee, and I just think on a subject like this that is so important and where we've had an April primary for years in Illinois. Seventeen or eighteen years ago, when I got active and many members of this House were active, we had an April primary. It was a wonderful primary. It didn't interfere with the farmers or anything else, and I think it's very important for the members of this House to have an opportunity to work their will on this subject, instead of letting it just be killed, and so I would ask leave of the House that the Motion to take House Bill 223 from the Table be postponed until after the Easter recess."

Arthur Telcser: "Well, that Motion, Representative Deuster, would amount to changing the rules. So you can put a Motion, and it would take 107 votes. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would respectfully submit that the gentlemen and all of the other gentlemen who've had their motions heard today, have been given every opportunity with their bills. Far more opportunities than many of the rest of



us with our bills, who have gone to committee, gotten beat and stayed beat. Now I think it's a ah.... an unjustified imposition on the time of the Members here who've got a lot more important things to do than re-consider actions that committees have previously taken. And I would oppose the gentleman's motion to postpone this ah.... Motion."

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

Fleck: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm rather amazed by some of these motions to discharge committees on these primary bills. I remember when my seat mate here, who's Chairman of the Elections Committee, is going to be smiling like a Cheshire Cat in a few minutes. Last session, I had a primary bill that would placed it on the First Saturday in April. We're talking about fast shuffles. Well, that got a fast shuffle to a subcommittee before I had even shown up at the Committee and when I heard the Bill was going to be called, I was notified by telephone not to bother to come down, because it was going to get killed anyway. So I didn't file a Motion to discharge the Committee and that was the fastest shuffle I ever received in my life, and I oppose this Motion for that reason."

Arthur Telcser: "Now, is there further discussion? Let the gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster, close."

Deuster: "Well, I want to elaborate a little more. I had no idea what happened to this Bill, but one day, on the



House floor, Representative Hirschfeld came over to me and said 'did you hear that they decided to kill these bills or table them or something'. I had no idea, and as a result of that, I then filed the Motion. And ah... I think it's one thing, the distinguished Majority Leader wherever.... well, the distinguished Majority Leader down there said he had an opportunity to be heard in the Committee and the answer is no, I did not. I mean normally there's a courtesy to the Sponsor, at least you have a minute to come in and say this is a good bill for the full committee, but I didn't. So it's not analogous at all, I don't think, and what I'm really trying to say is let's not take up the time of the House right now when we're trying to adjourn, get off. Let's put it off. Can't that fair? I think it's fair."

Arthur Talcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we've heard the complaint that they were treated unfairly by the Elections Committee, and I rather resent that, because I don't think I've treated anyone unfairly, and I don't think my Committee has treated anyone unfairly on any bill that's come before us. Now, Mr. Deuster did have an opportunity to appear before us. He spoke briefly. I explained to him there were three other bills on a similar subject. I don't know what he could have said that most of the Committee didn't already hear from other sponsors. I told him his Bill was being referred to a



subcommittee. The subcommittee would meet. The subcommittee did meet. The subcommittee considered all four bills and reported back do not pass, four to one. What's more fair than that?"

Arthur Telcser: "Now, the gentleman from.... Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Am I right that a Member that wanted to have a Bill heard on this important issue could still file it today or tomorrow or, you know, he could still file a new Bill couldn't he?"

Arthur Telcser: "Yes, he could, Sir."

Shea: "And would that take up less time than all this Floor debate?"

Arthur Telcser: "Yes, it would."

Shea: "Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "O'okay, now, the gentleman has ah.... moved that the.... Representative Deuster, either of your two motions will take 107. You want me to put the Motion, which is on the calendar, Sir?"

Deuster: "Well, ah.... your question, my first motion as that this be....."

Arthur Telcser: "Taken from the Table."

Deuster: "Leave be given to postpone this until we come back. That's what I'm asking. We'll get to the second thing later."

Arthur Telcser: "O'okay, all right, the gentleman has moved that the provisions of Rule ..... Representative Deuster,



for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Deuster: "I'm not sure, but maybe the distinguished Assistant Minority Leader can answer this question. It was suggested that I rush down to the Reference Bureau and have another Bill typed up or something like that, and I'm wondering whether it's contrary to the Rules of the House to just put another Bill in, that's exactly the same as another Bill, and is that what the Assistant Minority Leader wants? I think that's going to take more time. It's very simple for everybody to just put their switch on and let's have this after Easter."

Arthur Telcser: "All right, the gentleman has moved that ah... under the Order of Motions, the matter dealing with House Bill 223, be postponed and be put on the Calendar until the date of April 27th. All right, that will be a suspension of the Rules. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. 107 votes. Have all voted who wished? O'okay. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. J. J. Wolf 'aye'. This question there are 45 'ayes', 33 'nays', and the gentleman's motion fails. Now, you wish to revert to the Second Motion. Is that correct, Sir?"

Deuster: "Ah.... the ah.... the Rules of the House and the desires of this Body provide no other option."

Arthur Telcser: "O'okay. Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster. has moved that House Bill 223 be taken from the Table and placed on the Calendar on the Order of Second



Reading. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye'.

Oh, you want to discuss that Motion?"

Deuster: "I have spoken."

Arthur Telcser: "Oh, I'm sorry. Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, yes, I was going to say that House Bill 223 as amended provides for the old April primary we've always had in Illinois. It was a fine time. It avoided filing petitions at Christmas time. It did shorten the election by one month. You can talk a long time about it. This is out of some sympathy to the Members....."

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

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

Arthur Telcser: "State your point, Sir."

Stone: "He is speaking to the Bill and not to the Motion, Sir."

Arthur Telcser: "O'okay, I think he'll try his best to speak to the Motion."

Deuster: "The Speaker's right. I'll try my best to speak to the Motion. I think....."

Arthur Telcser: "You may not succeed, but you'll try."

Deuster: "This has the same element of fair play. I think it will bring to the floor of the House a vehicle. Somebody else can put.... offer an amendment. We can have it out on the House floor. I think that's the way that it ought to be done, and again, I want to say this, that





it is true, I was at the Committee. I was sitting there and the Chairman said to me, Representative Deuster, I believe if I can recall exactly what he said, your bill is going to be referred to a subcommittee. And I said 'thank you', and I was a little angry, but I didn't say anything else. I just politely left the room, and so, if that's an opportunity to be heard, it absolutely amazes me, and I hope that I can appeal to some of the Members of this House to let's provide a little fair play on the subject of this. I don't want to engage in a difficulty with any committee, but I think ah... if a Committee is going to have the proponents of one idea, have an opportunity to be heard, they ought to let everybody have their say, and so I urge ah... a favorable green vote on the Motion to take House Bill 223 and give us a chance to try the old April primary from the table."

Arthur Telcser: "Now, is there any discussion? The gentleman has ah... moved that House Bill 223 be taken from the Table and placed on the Calendar on the Order of Second Reading. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. 107 votes. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this question, there are 48 'ayes', 35 'nays', and the gentleman's motion to take House Bill 223 from the Table fails. Next Motion at the request of the Sponsor we're not going to call. On the Order of Motions appears House Bill.... Is Representative Londrigan on the Floor?"



Yeow, on the Order of Motions appears House Bill 349, for which purpose the gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Londrigan is recognized."

Londrigan: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is another one of a series to the sales tax bill, on food and medicine. This concept is a flat rate exemption on the income tax to provide a ten dollar exemption for each person exempted on your income tax in lieu of the sales tax on food and medicine. Now as you all know, this got wrapped up in politics at first and it was the policy to defeat these bills. But we cooperated and voted in, out unanimously almost, the speaker's bill on this subject, Sam Maragos' bill was changed from a formula to the same flat rate exemption as my bill, the same concept and three weeks ago, with the help on the Republican side, we voted out Sam Maragos' bill. The only thing I'm asking you to do is the same fair consideration to vote out my bill on the same subject and the same concept as you showed the Speaker on our side and as you on your side showed Sam Maragos, so if I have any friends on the Republican side, I would appreciate your support in getting this most important bill of the session out on the Floor so that we can have full debate on the subject of sales tax on food and medicine. Thank you for any support you see fit to give me."



Walsh: "Could the gentleman tell me what ah.... the physical effects of this are going to be?"

Londrigan: "One hundred and ten million."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a hundred and ten million dollars and ah...."

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

Hanahan: "I believe you ruled enough times today that we'll discuss the Motion, not the merits of the Bill, and instruct the Majority Leader to stay on it."

Arthur Telcser: "I think the question he asked is relative to the Bill, Sir. To the Motion, I mean. Proceed, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Absolutely. I was about to address myself to the Motion. I wouldn't in a million years address myself, Mr. Speaker, to this Bill. We're speaking strictly to the Motion and we're talking about how we, as a House of Representatives, have to operate by rules and under our rules, we have a Committee system for if we did not, we would already have some 1200 bills that we're considering. We would be considering on this floor without prior consideration by any group of us or testimony from any outsiders. Now, this Bill, which would cost the State of Illinois \$110 million and I'm sure that doesn't count the administrative costs, in effect, a negative income tax. This Bill was heard in the Revenue Committee.



It was given a good hearing, I know, and I have looked over the list of the Members of the Revenue Committee and know them to be a fine group, one of the finest committees in this House. I only regret that the Chairman is not here, who, and if he were, I'm sure he would get up and say that Mr. Londrigan got a fair hearing. The Committee considered that the effect of this was to cost the State too much money, and in consideration for all the things we're doing, the Governor has said recently that the legislature looks like it's going to appropriate a billion dollars more than even the Governor wants to spend, so I suggest to you that we ought to defeat this Motion right here and now."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm surprised to hear the Majority Leader talk about the cost of this piece of legislation, and the attempts to bring another vehicle on the Floor of the House to bring relief to the general public of this State. I'm surprised to hear him talk about costs, simply because of his affirmative vote a week or so ago in bringing a Bill sponsored by the Leader on his side of the aisle, which would cost as much, if not more, than this piece of legislation would cost. I'm surprised... I'm surprised to hear him say that we don't need another vehicle to put on Second Reading that might be amended to bring about a feasible relief, as far as the taxpayers of this



State are concerned, and attempt to do what we've all pledged to do and that is to do something about lowering the sales tax on the necessities of life, in which Representative Londrigan attempts to do. I would think that in the spirit of fair play, inasmuch as two other bills by actions of this House of Representatives have been allowed, have been allowed to be placed on the Calendar for the deliberation of this Membership, I'm surprised that I hear objections, from that side of the aisle. I would encourage them to give Representative Londrigan an 'aye' vote. I would encourage the Membership to give him an 'aye' vote, so that we might have all of these Bills passed before this General Assembly in the House at least, so that we don't say, only one Sponsor's bill, only one sponsor's bill from that side of the aisle was given the opportunity to be deliberated as far as this House is concerned. I urge you to reconsider your position, Mr. Majority Leader. I urge you to look at the cost that you were talking about and compare it with the Bill that not only did you help bring out here on the Calendar, but you also helped pass it, on Third Reading. And I didn't hear you at that time talking about placing the Governor in any dilemma, as far as the loss of revenue is concerned in this great State of ours."

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



Hirschfeld: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and just very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of order."

Arthur Telcser: "State your point, Sir."

Hirschfeld: "Ah....I did not want to raise this during the talk by the distinguished Minority Leader, ah.... but I do believe that these Motions that we are raising now are nondebatable. I know we didn't debate mine. I tried not to debate it, just to raise a question, and I think the Chair, in the past, has permitted the maker of the Motion to say a few words and then one opponent to say a few words, and then go to an immediate vote."

Arthur Telcser: "I think your point is well taken, Representative Hirschfeld. These motions are not debatable. Now, we've heard from both sides of the issue, ah.... we'll give Representative Londrigan a chance to make a couple of closing remarks and call for the question."

Londrigan: "Just in reply, Mr. Speaker, the cost of this Bill is no more than the cost of the other two bills that we have voted through here. When the Speaker took my Bill last session and introduced it as his own, I didn't play politics and vote against it. I stood on this floor and voted in favor of it. I want sales tax relief. I don't care who sponsors it. In that same vein, both sides of this House, voted through Sam Maragos' bill. Sam Maragos' bill was changed to be exactly like mine, except \$8.75 insteal of \$10.00. Everybody voted for Sam Maragos' bill. I am merely asking for the same consideration



we gave Sam Maragos and the Speaker, to get this out on the Floor so that we can discuss all the worthwhile Bills on sales tax exemption. Maybe vote through all of them if they are good bills. That's what I intend to do. And we will then get some tax relief. The people don't care who's bill it is, but let's give them a choice. Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman has moved that House Bill 349 be taken from the Speaker's Table and placed on the Calendar. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. 89 votes. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. On this question, there are 102 'ayes', 11 'nays' and the gentleman's motion to take House Bill 349 from the Speaker's Table and place it on the Calendar prevails. Prevails. Prevails. Passed. Now, is Representative Maragos on the Floor? Did he leave. O'kay, now Representative Maragos is not on the Floor. His Motion is going to die. House Bill 383. Just so everyone realizes that, so that ah.... Representative Ewell, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, point of order. Ah.... I realize Mr. Maragos was the first sponsor, but there were other sponsors in that bill who had equal interests in it. Now it's true that everybody can't be first, but I think to allow a Bill to go by default is obnoxious and so I would simply, not that I would make the plea, but perhaps would you call the second sponsor on the Bill?"



Arthur Telcser: "Well, Sir, I'd be glad to call anyone and that's the reason for my stating it. You can be rest assured the Chair does not wish to be obnoxious, but if a Member chooses to leave while he has matters on the Calendar, then that, Sir, is his responsibility." I made the announcement, simply to see if someone was interested in handling it for him. Perhaps Representative Shea would know." Sir, Representative Maragos has a motion relative to House Bill 383. He has left. If we don't call it, it will die on him, and I just don't want that to happen. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Yeow, Mr. Speaker, I think ah... and maybe somebody can clarify it, that 383 was Representative Maragos' no-fault bill and its jointly sponsored by a number of members and I think there's an identical bill that was put in to avoid that 45 day rule, and I wonder if we might just hold that for a minute and check it rather than take up a fight on a no-fault bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Sure, this is about the last thing we want to do today, and we can adjourn."

Shea: "I believe your parliamentarian is now checking."

Arthur Telcser: "O'okay. Wait a second, Representative Shea, for whatever purpose the parliamentarian is looking at this Bill isn't going to answer your question."

Shea: "Well, is Representative Epton on the Floor? On the Calendar, appears a notice that on Monday, April 30, 1973, the Insurance Committee of this House will hear in Room





212 all the no-fault bills."

Arthur Telcser: "Well, Bernie is not on the Floor. Do you know? Representative Shea, I don't think this is a no-fault Bill. I'm not quite sure that it is. O'kay, Representative Duff, for what purpose do you rise?"

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, that is a no-fault bill."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, Ann said it wasn't, but it is a no-fault Bill. Right, and the only reason I mentioned it is as a courtesy to the sponsor that ah.... he doesn't get caught in the switches. Representative Holloway, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Holloway: "Mr. Speaker, is it my understanding, then, that this Bill is going to be heard in Committee when we come back?"

Arthur Telcser: "Well, Representative Choate and the Speaker are discussing it. I've only made a point of it, because if we don't call it on Motions today, it will die and I just don't particularly care to see Representative Maragos get hurt, simply because he left early. So."

Holloway: "Well, in lieu of that, Mr. Speaker, I would move to suspend the appropriate rule that keeps this Bill alive for Committee hearing when we come back the 25th."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, that's a good idea. Representative Totten, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, in view of the ah.... Motions, I would like to move that under House Rule 73, we suspend House Rule 14."



Arthur Telcser: "What was that again, Representative?"

Totten: "I would like to move that under House Rule 73, we suspend House Rule 14."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, let's go to House Bills, First Reading for a few minutes while we get this matter taken care of."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 1211. Hyde. Amends the Illinois Savings & Loan Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1212. Tipsword. Amends the Environmental Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1213. Tipsword. Amends School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1214. Arrigo. Amends the Adult Education Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1215. Shea. Amends the Business Corporation Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1216. Shea. New Act to reform Banking Office Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1217. Tipsword. Amends the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1218. Bradley. Amends School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1219. Kozubowski. Amends Liquor Control Act. First Reading of the Bill. What's this? 1220, I guess. I hope. Left the number off of one. House Bill 1220. Douglas. Amends the General Assembly Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1221. Kosinski. Amends School Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1222. Garmisa. Amends Civil Administrative Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1223. Fleck. Amends the School Code. First



Reading of the Bill. 1224. Hyde. Provides for submission to the Electors of the State, election of question to public policy. First Reading of the Bill. 1225. Washington. Amends the Illinois Small Business Construction Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1226. Washington. Amends the Illinois Purchasing Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1227. Washington. Amends the Fair Employment Practices Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1228. Caldwell. Amends the Illinois Small Business Purchasing Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1229. Barnes. Requires the use of apprentice trainees in all State construction projects. First reading of the Bill. 1230. Barnes. Creates the State's Apprenticeship and Training Council. First Reading of the Bill. 1231. Philip. Makes Appropriation for personal and property taxes replacement commission. First Reading of the Bill. 1232. Philip. Creates a Personal Property Tax Replacement Commission. First Reading of the Bill. 1233. DiPrima. Amends the Chicago Teachers Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill. 1234. Craig. Amends the Highway Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1235. Emil Jones. Amends an Act in relation to attorneys and counselors. First Reading of the Bill. 1236. Emil Jones. Amends the Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1237. Keller. An Act authorizing and directing the Department of Transportation to make an engineering



examination survey in Hamilton County. First Reading of the Bill. 1238. Keller. Amends the Public Accountants Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1239. Keller. Amends the State Forest Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1240. Ron Hoffman. Amends the Park District Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1241. Ron Hoffman. Requires Judges elected for park district election. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1242. Springer. Amends Motor Fuel Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1243. Madigan Amends Act in relation to regulation of real estate, brokers. First Reading of the Bill. 1244. Madigan. Amends Eminent Domain Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1245. Madigan. Amends the Illinois Inheritance Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1246. Madigan. Amends an Act in relation to State Revenue Sharing. First Reading of the Bill. 1247. Amends the Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1248. Melic. Amends an Act requiring payment of interest by lessors. First Reading of the Bill. 1249. Blades. Amends School Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1250. Brunmet. Amends the Bow Line Act. First Reading of the Bill. House 1251. Londrigan. An Act authorizing the transfer of 500 thousand in excess funds. First Reading of the Bill. 1252. Tom Miller. Amends the Park District Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1253. Kosinski. Amends the Retailors Occupation Tax Act. First Reading of the



Bill. 1254. Nardulli. Amends a Title of an Act to provide the dedication of land for seminary purposes. First Reading of the Bill. 1255. Leon. Amends Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1256. Giglio. Amends the Chicago Teachers Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill. 1257. Patrick. Amends Civil Administrative Code. First Reading of the Code. 1258. Kent. Amends an Act permitting investmenets by minors. First Reading of the Bill. 1259. Dyer. Amends the University Civil Service System Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1260. Amends an Act abolishing discrimination between sexes. First Reading of the Bill. 1261. Geo-Karis. Amends the wrongful death act. First Reading of the Bill. 1262. McDonald. Amends the Divorce Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1263. Catania. Repeals an Act concerning hours of employment of females. First Reading of the Bill. 1264. Catania. Amends Public Employment Offices and Agencies Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1265. Chapman. Amends the Mechanics Lien Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1266. Martin. Amends the State Housing Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1267. Martin. Amends an Act prohibiting discrimination. First Reading of the Bill. 1268. Katz et al. Amends the Workmen's Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1269. Katz. Amends the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1270. Katz. Amends an Act in relation to bicycle routes. First Reading of the Bill. 1271. Katz.



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Provides for permissibility of topological reports.

First Reading of the Bill. 1272. R. A. Walsh. Amends the Probate Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1273. Farley. Amends the Illinois Savings and Loan Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1274. McMaster. Appropriates \$10,000 to township government laws commission. First Reading of the Bill. 1275. McMaster. Creates township government laws commission. First Reading of the Bill. 1276. McMaster. Unclaimed Land Restoration Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1277. McMaster. Amends Surface Mine Land Conservation Reclamation Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1278. McMaster. Amends the Surface Mine Land Conservation Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1279. Leinenweber. Amends the Environmental Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1280. Leinenweber. Amends the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1281 Stedelin. Amends the Plumbing License Law. First Reading of the Bill. 1282. McPartlin. Amends the Purchasing Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1283. Farley. Amends the Chicago Policemen's Article Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1284. Mugalian. Amends the Civil Practice Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1285. Lemke. Amends the Interstate Compact Act. First Reading of the Bill....."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, one moment, please. Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"



Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that if you look in your ah.... digest that House Bill 950 introduced by Representative Maragos and others, amends the same section of the Code. I think it's a little different, but it took the place of 383, so I think you can just leave that Motion die on the Calendar."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay. Proceed, Fred."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 1286. Rayson. Amends the Department of Corrections Fiscal Year 1973 Appropriation Section. First Reading of the Bill. 1287. Rose. Vacates Highway easements in Scott County. First Reading of the Bill. 1288. Rose. Amends Illinois Highway Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1289. Maragos. Amends Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1290. Maragos. Appropriates five million dollars as a grant to the Chicago Regional Port District. First Reading of the Bill. 1291. Hart. Repeals the Court of Claims Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1292. Matijevich. Retail Food Establishment Licenses Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1293. Mann. An Act providing for loans to Registered nurses and so forth. First Reading of the Bill. 1294. Mann. Appropriates one million, three hundred and forty thousand dollars to State College Gift Commission. First Reading of the Bill. 1295. Mann Amends the Illinois Harness Racing Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1296. Philip. Provides four year term



of Chairman of County Board. First Reading of the Bill. 1297. Thompson. Amends the Consumer Fraud Act. First Reading of the Bill."

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

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House recess to a perfunctory session, which will take place immediately for the purpose of reading house bills a first time, and that perfunctory session will adjourn us to Wednesday, April 25 at 9:30 AM for perfunctory session and at 10:00 O'Clock AM for regular session, so we'll be back here at 10:00 O'Clock in the morning on Wednesday, April 25."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has moved the House do now stand in recess for a perfunctory session, which will then adjourn to April 25th at the hour of 9:30 AM perfunctory, 10:00 O'Clock regular session. All those in favor, signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. And the House stands in recess."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 1298. Mann. Amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1299. Mann. Amends Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1300. Maragos. Amends the Radiation Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill.





House Bill 1301. Mann. Amends the Public Aid Code.  
First Reading of the Bill. 1302. Redmond. Establishes  
Civil Service Classification System for employees. First  
Reading of the Bill. 1303. VonBoeckman. Amends School  
Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1304. Thompson. Amends  
an Act relating to compulsory retirement of judges. First  
Reading of the Bill. 1305. Madigan. Authorizes the  
Department of Agriculture to participate in funding  
and so forth. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill  
1306. Madigan. Appropriates 172 thousand to Department  
of Agriculture. First Reading of the Bill. 1307.  
Madigan. Authorizes the Department of Transportation to  
make improvements West Frankfort, Dupage River and Cook  
County. First Reading of the Bill. 1308. Madigan.  
Appropriates \$1,500,000 to the Department of Transportation.  
First Reading of the Bill. 1309. Madigan. Authorizes  
the Department of Transportation improvements in Willow,  
Higgins, Water Shed, Cook County. First Reading of the  
Bill. 1310. Madigan. Appropriates \$1,500,000 to  
Department of Transportation. First Reading of the  
Bill. 1311. Madigan. Amends the Chicago Sanitary  
District Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1312. Madigan.  
Amends the Chicago Sanitary District Act. First Reading  
of the Bill. 1313. Duff. An Act to provide law in  
relation to notices. First Reading of the Bill. 1314.  
Madigan. Amends the Chicago Sanitary District Act.



First Reading of the Bill. 1315. Madigan. Amends Motor Fuel Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1316. Madigan. Amends Chicago Sanitary District Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1317. Madigan. Amends the Chicago Sanitary District Article Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1318. Dyer. Amends an Act in relation to water supply, drainage, sewage and so forth. First Reading of the Bill. 1319. Matijevich. Amends the Illinois Health Care Facility Care Safety Fire Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1320. VonBoeckman. Makes additional appropriation to the Department of Labor. First Reading of the Bill. 1321. Brandt. Amends the State Universities Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill. 1322. Madigan. Amends the Chicago Sanitary District Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1323. Jacobs. Amends the Savings and Loan Act. First Reading of the Act. 1324. Neff. Appropriates two million dollars to the Department of Transportation. First Reading of the Bill. 1325. Brinkmier. Supplemental appropriation to Superintendent of Public Instruction. First Reading of the Bill. 1326. Taylor. An Act setting standards for work week for both government and private employment. First Reading of the Bill. 1327. Taylor. Creates a Commission to study abandoned buildings. First Reading of the Bill. 1328. Taylor. Appropriates \$25,000 to urban area study Commission. First Reading of the Bill. 1329. Martin. Provides for the



deposit in the Manpower Development Training Revolving Fund. First Reading of the Bill. 1330. Pierce. Amends the Pet Shop Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1331. Douglas. Act requiring the registration of Department of Public Health with the City Public Health employees. First Reading of the Bill. 1332. Thompson. Amends the Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1333. Cal Skinner. Bill for an Act clarifying the responsibilities of County Board on the County Public Health Department Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1334. Douglas. An Act placing restriction on performance of abortions. First Reading of the Bill. 1335. Brummet. Amends State Employees Retirement System Article. First Reading of the Bill. 1336. Capparelli. Amends the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1337. Amends the Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1338. Amends the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1339. Craig. Amends Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1340. Dyer. Creates construction by technological assistance act. First Reading of the Bill. 1341. Kempiners. Amends the Consumer Fraud Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1342. Kempiners. Illinois Consumer Credit Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1343. Gene Hoffman. Amend School Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1344. Chapman. Amends School Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1345. Lundy. Enact a residential landlord tenant act. First Reading of the Bill. 1346. Cunningham.



Amends School Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1347. Cunningham. Amends Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1348. Collins. Amends Downstate Firemen's Pension Fund. First Reading of the Bill. 1349. Day. Creates the Model Notice and Hearing of Provisional Remedies Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1350. Skinner. Amends the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1351. Jaffe. Amends an Act relating to State Revenue Sharing. First Reading of the Bill. 1352. Jaffe. Amends the Mental Health Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1353. Jaffe. Enacts Uniform duties to disabled persons act. First Reading of the Bill. 1354. Chapman. Amends Use Credit Card Act. First Reading of the Act. 1355. Dyer. Amends Used Credit Card Act. First Reading of the bill. 1356. Catania etal. Amends the Used Credit Cards Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1357. Catania. Amends the Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1358. Bluthardt. Amends the Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1359. Bluthardt. Amends the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1360. Bluthardt. Amends the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1361. Bluthardt. Amends .... Adds new sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1362. Lauer. Amends unified code of corrections. First Reading of the Bill. 1363. Skinner. Amends the Senior Citizens Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. First Reading of the



Bill. 1364. Duff. Amends the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1365. Lemke. Amends Workmen's Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1366. Lemke. Amends Workmen's Occupational Disease Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1367. Stieh. Amends the Sanitary Districts Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1368. Catania. An Act to make it a business offense for supermarkets to close one department. First reading of the Bill. 1369. Gene Hoffman. Amends Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1370. Gene Hoffman. School Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1372. W. D. Walsh. Amends the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1373 Schneider. Amends School Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1374. Schneider. Amends School Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1375. Brummet. Amends the Downstate Teachers Retirement System Article. First Reading of the Bill. 1376. Brummet. Amends the Downstate Teachers Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill. 1377. Brummet. Amends the Downstate Teachers Retirement Article. First Reading of the Bill. 1378. Brummet. Amends the Downstate Teachers Retirement Article. First Reading of the Bill. 1379. Brummet. Amends the Downstate Teachers Retirement Article. First Reading of the Bill. 1380. Matijevich. Consumer Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1381. Mugalian. Amends the Consumer Fraud Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1382. Hill. Amends an Act relating to



wage reductions. First Reading of the Bill. 1383. Lemke. Prohibits assignment of wages. First Reading of the Bill. 1384. Taylor et al. Amends the Motor Vehicle Retail and Installment Sales Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1385. Beatty. Amends Retail and Installment Sales Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1386. McLendon. Amends Retail and Installment Sales Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1387. Beaupre. An Act to limit expenses of certain retail and installment companies. First Reading of the Bill. 1388. Stone. An Act to amend certain acts in relation to water and attorneys fees. First Reading of the Bill. 1389. Barnes. Amends the Civil Practice Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1390. Berman. Prohibits confession of judgement. First Reading of the Bill. 1391. Martin. Amends the Consumer Fraud Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1392. Chapman. Amends the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1393. Caldwell. Creates an Act to authorize the director and so forth. First Reading of the Bill. 1394. Giglio. Creates the Motor Vehicle Repair Licensing Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1395. B. B. Wolfe. Amends the Replevin Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1396. J. Houlihan. Amends the Retail Labor Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1397. Hudson. An Act authorizing the Director of Department of Transportation to make a study of Winfield Creek and Union Ditch in DuPage County. First



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Reading of the Bill. 1398. Griesheimer. Amends the Unified Code of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill. 1399. Griesheimer. Amends the Unified Code of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill. 1400. Fleck et al. Amends the Principal and Income Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1401. Fleck. Amends the Probate Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1402. Fleck. Amends the Common Turst Fund Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1403. Madigan. Creates the Illinois Health Facilities Service Planning Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1404. Madigan. New Act requiring owner of mortgaged land to record a contract for sale of this land. First Reading of this Bill. 1405. Blair et al. Creates Department of Aged. First Reading of the Bill. 1406. Tuerk. Amends School Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1407. Tipsword. Creates an act to provide disclosure of contributions and expenditures by political candidates. First Reading of the Bill. 1408. Gene Hoffman. Amends the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1409. Gene Hoffman. Provides for an organization of school districts in the State. First Reading of the Bill. 1410. Emil Jones. Amends the Athletic Exhibition Registration Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1411. D. Houlihan. Amends the Blood Labeling Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1412. Pappas. Amends the Illinois Nursing Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1413. North. Amends State Employees Retirement System Article. First Reading of



the Bill. 1414. Matijevich. An Act to health Care Licensing Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1415. DiPrima. Amends the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1416. McGrew. Amends the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1417. Redmond. Authorizes the Department of Conservation to Quit Claim Land in DuPage County. First Reading of the Bill. 1418. Skinner. Amends Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1419. Amends the Hospital Licensing Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1420. Dyer. Amends Physical Therapy Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1421. Dyer. Amends the Medical Practice Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1422. Lundy. Amends the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1423. Madigan. Amends Sanitary District Article. First Reading of the Bill. 1424. Amends Sanitary District Article First Reading of the Bill. 1425. Walters. Provides for the organization of School Districts. First Reading of the Bill. 1426. Catania. Amends the Fair Employment Practices Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1427. Martin. Declares State policy that the consumer should have free choice and so forth. First Reading of the Bill. 1428. Stiehl. Amends Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1429. Stiehl. Amends the Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1430. Amends the Toll Highway Authority Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1431. Berman. Amends School Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1432. Douglas. Creates the





Illinois Hand Gun Licensing Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1433. Huskey. Amends the Downstate Firemen's Pension Article. First Reading of the Bill. 1434. Skinner. Amends Public Junior College Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1435. Skinner. Amends the Junior College Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1436. Giorgi. Provides for State grants for community action agencies. First Reading of the Bill. 1438. Pappas. Creates the Firemen Collective Bargaining Act. First Reading of the Act. 1439. Martin. Amends the Illinois Nursing Act. First Reading of the Act. 1440. Giorgi. Amends the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1441. Giorgi. Amends the Park District Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1442. Craig. Amends the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1443. Berman. Amends School Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1444. Collins. Amends the Firemen's Annuity and Benefit Fund Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1445. Collins. Amends the Firemen's Annuity and Benefit Fund Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1446. Collins. Amends the Firemen's Annuity and Benefit Fund Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1447. Collins. Amends the Firemen's Annuity and Benefit Fund Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1448. Berman. Amends the Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1449. Porter. Establishes the Energy Crisis Study Commission. First Reading of the Bill. 1450. Porter. Appropriates \$15,000 to



the Energy Crisis Study Commission. First Reading of the Bill. 1451. Stone. Amends the Community Mental Health Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1452. Stone. Amends an Act in relation to Township organizations. First Reading of the Bill. 1453. Stone. Amends the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1454. Stone. Amends the Counties Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1455. Boyle. Amends the downstate policemen's pension fund article. First Reading of the Bill. 1456. Boyle. Amends Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1457. Ewell. Creates the Animal Care Organization Study Commission. First Reading of the Bill. 1458. Ewell. Appropriates \$10,000 to the Animal Care Organization Study Commission. First Reading of the Bill. 1459. Gene Hoffman. Amends School Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1460. Juckett. Amends the Illinois Horse Racing Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1462. Juckett. Amends the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1463. Juckett. Amends the Act defining the powers and duties of the Department of Mental Health. First Reading of the Bill. 1464. Juckett. Amends the Mental Health Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1465. Juckett. Repeals an Act to provide transportation for school children in metropolitan areas. First Reading of the Bill. 1466. Juckett. Amends the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1467.



Juckett. Amends the Illinois Aeronautics Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1468. Ewell. Contractor's Licensing Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1469. Ewell. Appropriates \$50,000 to Department of Registration and Education. First Reading of the Bill. 1470. Gene Hoffman. Amends School Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1471. Giorgi. Amends the Unemployment Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1472. Neff. Amends the Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1473. Walters. Amends the Unemployment Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1474. Matijevich. Creates a Health Care Commission. First Reading of the Bill. 1475. Juckett. Creates State Board of Comprise and so forth. First Reading of the Bill. 1476. Juckett. Amends the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1477. J. Houlihan. Amends School Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1478. Skinner. Amends an Act requiring law in relation to counties. First Reading of the Bill. 1479. Juckett. Appropriates \$15,000 to Mental Health Fund Advisory Committee. First Reading of the Bill. 1480. Catania. Amends the Unemployment Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1481. Catania. Creates the Occupational Noise Control Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1482. Catania. Requires company issuing policy and insurance and so forth. First Reading of the Bill. 1483. Catania. Amends Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1484. Gene Hoffman. Amends



School Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1485. Giorgi. Appropriates \$3,000,000,000 plus the Revenue Sharing Fund. First Reading of the Bill. 1486. Alsop. Appropriates to the Superintendent of Public Instruction. First Reading of the Bill. 1487. Collins. Creates a mobile currency exchange act. First Reading of the Bill. 1488. Collins. Amends the Community and Ambulatory Currency Exchange Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1489. Collins. Amends the Currency Exchange Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1490. Collins. Amends the Currency Exchange Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1491. Day. Provides for the Peoria Civic Center Authority and defines its powers and duties. First Reading of the Bill. 1492. Arrigo. Creates the World Columbian Centennial Commission. First Reading of the Bill. 1493. Juckett. Provides for the licensing and regulation of residential facilities for persons in need of mental treatment. First Reading of the Bill. 1494. Juckett. An Act to provide for the licensing and regulation of residential facilities. First Reading of the Bill. 1495. Mann. Amends an Act authorizing free breakfast and lunch programs. First Reading of the Bill. 1496. Caparelli. Amends the Chicago Teachers Retirement System Article. First Reading of the Bill. 1497. Cunningham. Amends the Code of Criminal Procedure. First Reading of the Bill. 1498. Ryan. Waste Water Land Treatment Site Regulation Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1499.



Amends the General Assembly Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1500. Skinner. Waste Water Transportation Act. First Reading of the Bill. 1501. Harpstrite. An Act to study the feasibility of constructing a dam and reservoir in Ogle Creek Watershed in St. Clair County. First Reading of the Bill. 1502. J. Houlihan. Amends Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1503. Cunningham. Amends the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1504. Washburn. An Act to make an appropriation to the Supt. of Public Instruction. First Reading of the Bill. 1505. Washburn. Provides for an appropriation for the Teachers Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill. 1506. Washburn. An Act to provide for appropriation to the Teachers Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill. 1507. Keller. Amends the Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1508. Porter. An Act to require disclosure and so forth. First Reading of the Bill. 1509. Neff. An Act authorizing Western Illinois University to construct and operate a noncommercial education television station. First Reading of the Bill. 1510. Neff. Make an appropriation for the education television station. Western Illinois University. First Reading of the Bill. 1511. Blades. Amends Retailors Occupation Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. Get Kosinski up here. Hey, Mr. Kosinski. You want to get up here in the Chair? I want you to say



General Resolutions. Turn the light on there."

Kosinski: "General Resolutions."

F. B. Selcke: "House Resolution 211. Ewell. Now then,  
say that ....."

Kosinski: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Sims,  
moves that this House stand in adjournment until  
Wednesday, April 25, 1973, at 9:30 AM."

