

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FORTY-NINTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

MAY 7, 1973

12:00 O'CLOCK NOON

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 Ben C. Blades - illness;  
Representative Peter C. Granata - illness;  
Representative Richard O. Hart - no reason given;  
Representative John C. Hirschfeld - no reason given;  
Representative Gene L. Hoffman - no reason given;  
Representative Henry J. Hyde - no reason given;  
Representative Romie J. Palmer - no reason given;  
Representative Leland H. Rayson - no reason given;  
Representative Eugene F. Schlickman - no reason given;  
Representative Harold D. Stedelin - illness;  
Representative Celeste M. Stiehl - no reason given;  
Representative Harold Washington - no reason given;  
Representative Jack B. Williams - business



W. Robert Blair: "The House will be in order and the invocation will be by Dr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Let us pray. All Mighty and compassionate God, as we begin a week of work as Representatives of a government which has been ordained by you and which exercises its authority in your name, we pause to ask for your guidance and direction in all that we in this week undertake. We thank thee for the strength and the ability to work as well as for the opportunity to use moments of leisure and rest profitably so that we might be in top form to function effectively as your servants in this state. Be a haven of refuge and a comfort to us at the end of each day and view us with enthusiasm for the next day. Watch over our families as we are separated from them and according to your good and gracious will return us safely to them at the close of this weeks session. Upon the death of Bill McGrath, we beseech your comfort and your strength for all who moarn and we ask you at the same time to remind each of us that our times are ultimately in your hands as our creator and our preserver. Hear us know in the name of him who said, 'I came to do the works of my father.' Amen."

W. Robert Blair: "The ah... Roll Call for attendance. The gentleman from ah... Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, will the record show that Representative Granata and Blades are absent because of illness and



we are delighted to see that Representative Fleck has returned."

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

Choate: "Well Mr. Speaker, would you have the record to please indicate that Representative Harold Stedelin is absent because of illness and our distinguished colleague, Representative Jack Williams is absent because he is being sworn in as the Mayor of Franklin Park today."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the Journal will so indicate.

Alright, we're going out of the order of the business to take a death resolution."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Resolution #286, Choate et al.

Whereas Members of this House were extremely sad to hear of the passing on Saturday, May 5, 1973 of William T. McGrath, 1139 1/2 West Edward, Springfield, a long time dedicated employee of the Illinois General Assembly, and whereas, Bill was beloved by Members and friends and neighbors in his native Springfield where he was born November 7, 1910, a son of James F. Margaret Cody McGrath, and whereas Bill was also known affectionately as 'Mac' by his multitude of friends in state government, only recently celebrated his 50th year of service to the Legislature, and whereas Mac rendered outstanding service to the General Assembly in many capacities since 1923 when at the age of 12, he began work as a page under Representative Micheal Judge Ikgo and whereas Mac worked for many Speakers, Majority Leaders and Minority Leaders



during his long tenure in the House of Representatives beginning his work under Gathard A. Dalberg, Speaker in the 52nd General Assembly, and whereas Mac served for a time as an employee of the Senate, working in that body during the depression year of 1933 when he was married to the former Louise DeWan and whereas Mac served his country with honor and distinction in the United States Army during World War II and whereas Mac also served his community with distinction holding various government positions over the years, including services as Health Inspector for the City of Springfield and whereas Mac, a loyal and dedicated Member of the Democratic Party was one of his parties candidates for the House of Representative in 1968, in the former 51st House District, and whereas Mac was always greatly helpful to the Members of the General Assembly using his knowledge of state government to capably fulfill the requests of the Membership, and whereas Mac was respectfully loved by all Members of the House who appreciated his good humor and his personable manner, and whereas Mac will be fondly remembered and sadly missed by all who had the privilege of knowing and working with him over these years, be it therefore resolved by the House of Representatives, of the 78th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that the Members of this House expressed their great sorrow at the passing of their beloved friend, William T. (Mac) McGrath, a fine man and a distinguished servant of the



people of Illinois and be it further resolved that Members of the House extend their heart felt deepest sympathies to Mrs. McGrath, widow, Mrs. Louise McGrath, and to his sister, Mrs. Ann Cribbs of Springfield, and be it further resolved that a suitable copy of this preamble be presented to Mrs. McGrath."

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

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent of the House for suspension of the appropriate rules that the resolution might be ah... considered and adopted immediately."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, is there leave? Alright. The question is on the adoption of the resolution. All those in favor say 'aye', the opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it and the resolutuion is adopted. Messages from the Senate."

Fredric B. Selcke: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives has passed Bills of the following title the passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House: Senate Bill 259, 263, 264, 265, 266, 270, and 273 passed the Senate May 4, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secreatry."

W. Robert Blair: "Committee Reports."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Mr. Pappas, from the Committee on Motor Vehicles to which House Bill 812, 1098, 1116, 1117, 1161 and 1539, were referred, reported the same back with the



recommendation the Bills do pass. Mr. Pappas, from Motor Vehicles, to which House Bills 839 and 1147 were referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bills do not pass. Mr. Pappas, from Motor Vehicles, to which House Bills 1052, 1120 and 1121 were referred, reported the same back with amendments thereto with the recommendation that the amendments be adopted and those amended do pass. Mr. Schoeberlein, from Public Utilities, to which House Bills 762 and 1049 were referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bills do not pass. Mr. Schoeberlein, from Public Utilities, to which House Bill 992 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bill do pass. Mr. McMaster, from Counties and Townships, to which House Bill 406 was referred, recommended that the Bill be assigned to Interim Study Commission pursuant to Rule 23(e). Mr. Bluthardt, from the Committee on Elections, to which House Bill 747 was referred, was recommended that the Bill be assigned to the Interim Study Commission, pursuant to Rule 23(e). Mr. Collins, from Executive, to which House Bill 676 was referred, recommended the Bill be assigned to the Interim Study Calendar, pursuant to Rule 23(e). Mr. Cupuzi, from Human Resources, to which House Bill 74 was referred, recommended the Bill be assigned to the Interim Study Calendar, pursuant to Rule 23(e). Mr. Rose, from Judiciary I, to which House Bills 901 and 1291 were referred, recommended that the Bills be assigned to the



Interim Study Calendar, pursuant to Rule 23(e). Mr. Randolph, from Revenue, to which House Bills 810 and 956 were referred, recommended that the Bills be assigned to the Interim Study Calendar, pursuant to Rule 23(e)."

W. Robert Blair: "Agreed Resolutions."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Resolution 278, Schraeder et al. House Resolution 283, Choate, et al."

W. Robert Blair: "Ah.... Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, these are the Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 278 ah... by Representative Schaefer commends the Peoria Police Chief, Robert Latham, for the manner in which he handled the episode ah... at St. Cecilia School in Peoria ah... last week and House Resolution 283 by ah... Choate and all of the Democrats congratulates ah...Mr. Keith Pike Rieker and Miss Francis Rose Crafase on their wedding which took place ah... Saturday. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

W. Robert Blair: "Any discussion on the Agreed Resolutions? All those in favor of those resolutions say 'aye', opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Are there further resolutions? Alright, Introductions ah... First Reading of House Bills."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 1925, Bradley et al. Appropriates \$12,500 to the Commission on Urban Education. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1926, Bradley. Establishes a Commission on Urban Education. First Reading of the Bill."





W. Robert Blair: "House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 468.

We're going down ah... in numerical order with those Bills that expire today. The first one is 468."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 468. An Act creating the Right to Privacy Commission, defining its powers and duties. Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, Mr. Caldwell is handling that for Mr. Washington."

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, ah... House Bill 468 is ah... Representative Harold Washington's Bill, which ah... which establishes the Right of Privacy Commission. It provides for a membership on the Commission and defines its' powers and duties. Ah... this Bill was heard in the ah... Executive Committee and came out with a recommendation of do pass with 16 'ayes' and no 'nays' and 1 'present'. I would appreciate your cooperation in passing this Bill."

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

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

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

Sevcik: "What does the Right of Privacy Commission do? What is its purpose?"

Caldwell: "Give me a minute. The Right of Privacy Commission ah... which I indicated would ah... consist of four Members of the Senate, two of whom would be appointed by the President of the Senate and two of whom would be appointed



by the Senate Minority Leader. Four Members of the House, two to be appointed by the Speaker of the House and two whom shall be appointed by the House Minority Leader ah... then if a vacancy occurs in the Commission ah... a Legislative Member is not re-elected to serve in the House in which it's appointed. The vacancies in the Membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments....."

W. Robert Blair: "Ah... just a moment. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sevcik."

Sevcik: "Ah...I do not want to know the composition, but what is the purpose of this Right of Privacy Commission?"

Caldwell: "The Right of Privacy Commission ah... and I indicated that I'm not ah...this is the last day and ah... Representative Washington cannot be here until later ah....do you want to hold it up. Would you take it out of the record, would you please, Mr. Speaker. Take it out of the record."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, we'll come back to that. 474."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 474, R. A. Walsh. Amends the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "Take it out of the record. He's not here. 555."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 555, ah... Giorgi. An Act to implement and regulate a lottery within the state. Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, some of the people who were involved



in Municipal Elections in the Chicagoland area are being sworn in today and they ask me if I would ask the House to have this Bill extended by one day so that we could hear it tomorrow morning. One day."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, under the rules, it takes 107 votes because it expires today. The gentleman has moved to suspend the provisions of that rule so this Bill may be considered tomorrow. An extension of one day until the 8th of May. All those in favor vote 'aye' and the opposed, 'no'. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Are we ah... is this final passage on the Lottery Bill?"

W. Robert Blair: "No, this is to extend the time in which it may be considered until tomorrow, that's all. It needs 107 votes. This is the Lottery Bill, that's right. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 129 'ayes' and 1 'nay' and ah... the gentleman's motion prevails and this Bill will be extended one day until ah... 5/8 ah... within which time it may be heard. 581."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 581, Rayson. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "Is the gentleman here? Take it out of the record. 587."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 587, McPartlin. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

2459



W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McPartlin."

McPartlin: "A...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 587 effects the employees of the Chicago Park District. This bill makes several changes in the laws governing the Park District. Making future pension changes is changed whereby all pension payments would be made on the first day of each month. Retirement after 35 years of service regardless of age is provided in accordance with the commission policy and an employee would be permitted to make contributions for a waiting period prior to membership, which is 6 months. Children's pensions are increased to meet current economic standards. This does have the approval of the Illinois Pension Laws Commission and I would appreciate your support."

W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? The question is shall House Bill 587 pass? All those in favor will vote aye and the opposed no. Fave all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 ayes and no nays and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 591."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 591. A Bill for an Act to provide for the Ordinary Expenses of the Illinois Historical Library. Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Arrigo."

Arrigo: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the appropriation for the Illinois Historical



Society. It was amended by the bipartisan action of the Appropriations Committee by deleting \$31,700 and then adding a \$3500 item for the repair of the steps of the David Davis home in Bloomington, that is now part of the historical library's assets as a museum. The amount of money involved is \$1, 628,700. Of course, needless for me...a...the historical library is the repository of some of the greatest documents that pertain to Lincoln and the history of the State of Illinois and I urge the adoption of this appropriation."

W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? The question is shall House Bill 591 pass? All those in favor vote aye and the opposed no. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 131 ayes and no nays and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 594."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 594. Macdonald. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Local Libraries Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this bill, while it seems to be relatively simple, is extremely important to our community and to their libraries. The bill, under its present law of course, the corporate authorities have power to set penalties for failure to return a library book. Our libraries in our various communities have certainly expanded their services



11.

and their facilities to the public. We now have films in libraries and in my own library, we our even talking about adding a...very valuable paintings that can be taken out on loan, so this Act merely allows and provides that new penalties shall extend, not only for the failure to return a book, but for any library material. This bill, of course, enjoyed a unanimous vote in committee, and I would ask for your support of this bill. Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall House Bill 594 pass. All those in favor vote aye and the opposed no. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 130 ayes, no nays and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 600."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 600. Ebbesen. A Bill for an Act to amend the Composition Election County Boards in certain counties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Ebbesen: "A: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 600 amends the act relating to the composition and election of county boards in certain counties. Now if adopted, this bill authorizes county board members from counties with multi-member districts to determine by lot, by districts, as to which members shall serve for two years and which for four years. This is to insure that in each district the number of members drawing two year terms and four year terms respectively will be equal



or nearly equal as possible and it provides that this procedure may be used in the organization of county boards in the future and also ratifies the action of any county board that so organized previously, and I would encourage all House Members to support House Bill 600."

W. Robert Blair: "Are there questions? The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Will the sponsor yield to a question?"

W. Robert Blair: "Yes."

Geo-Karis: "Joe, all I want to know is, if I may ask you, when you mean multi-member districts, what do you mean? It is not quite clear in my mind."

Ebbesen: "Oh, in other words if a county was just one district there's more than just one district within the geographical confines of the county. Let's take DeKalb County as an illustration. We have 12 districts with two county board members from each district giving us a 24 member board."

Geo-Karis: "I see. Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? The question is shall House Bill 600 pass? All those in favor vote aye and the opposed no. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 120 ayes, no nays and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 610."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 610. Pierce. Out? Oh, we'll come back to it. Take it out."



W. Robert Blair: "621. Mr. Walsh is not here. 622?"

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 622. Terzich. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 622, which we are considering today is to provide a most important consumer service for millions of Illinois workers who pay into employee pension funds. They are part of 34,000,000 people in this country who participate in such funds. These funds represent a 160 billion dollar industry nationwide, which is the biggest concentration of wealth in the United States. The shocking thing about these pension funds is that half of the 34,000,000 participants may never realize one penny from the money they pay into regarding a highly regarded consumer study. The legislation we are considering would give employees some place to turn to if they feel they have been wrongly denied pension benefits. This bill would allow the Department of Insurance to act on specific complaints by interested persons who now only have our court systems to turn to when they have grievances. This will give the little guy a State agency to handle his case instead of having to pay a lawyer. The bill is aimed at providing an effective consumer service facility. It would not set up a high





bureaucracy. It would not harrass well managed funds. The Department of Insurance would act only when it has received a complaint from an individual. In other words, the powers of the Department are wholly reactionary in nature and dependent upon receipt of complaint. The need for this legislation is based upon experience that clearly indicates that many inequities can result from inadequate or improper fund administration. An Internal Revenue Service study shows that 22,000 manufacturing firms in Illinois have pension funds. Most of these firms employ less than 50 persons. There are approximately 3,000,000 Illinois residents currently participating in pension plans throughout the State of Illinois. The objective of this legislation would be namely, that benefits received must be based on a equitable application for contract provision. All kinds of unusual situations can arise from a Bill of Pension Fund, which interfere with equitable application of these provisions. What we are dealing with is a matter of crucial importance to millions of people who rely on pension plans to provide them with a decent income in their retirement years. These pensions can mean the difference between poverty and a modest standard of living for the people who have paid into funds with their hard-earned money. I strongly urge approval of this bill on behalf of the working men and women of Illinois."



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

Pappas: "Will the sponsor yield to a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Pappas: "On this particular bill, many companies who are union shops have grievance proceedings set up in their contracts. Now if the employee is able to come down here to the State, or to this Department, to take care of a complaint, wouldn't this be by-passing the grievance committee, the union, and the employee relationship?"

Terzich: "From the man in the Department of Insurance who would administer this program, it is our understanding that this would not be in conflict with the grievance committee. In other words, it simply states that as long as they are in compliance with the contract, this does not alleviate any solution by the grievance committee."

Pappas: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just one moment on the bill. It would appear to me and I'm not...I'm not a...a...a...union person to know exactly how these contracts work. But it would appear to me that with the setting up of this Department that you are possibly breaking down the employee-employer relationship with regards to grievances. A...the employee wouldn't even have to go to the grievance committee of his union, he could go direct to the Insurance Department. So I personally don't think this is too good a bill from that standpoint."



Arthur Telcser: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Representative Katz."

Katz: "Would the Gentleman yield to another related question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Katz: "Is there a provision in the bill that obligates the person to exult the procedures that are available to him before he can get the State Department of Insurance involved?"

Terzich: "None whatsoever. This simply states that right now the only place a person can go if he has a grievance in regard to any pension benefits would be to either get a lawyer or you would have to go to the Attorney General. And there are 3,000,000 in the State of Illinois that depend upon their livelihood in pension plans and there is not one place where they can turn to to get any advice or even to find out whether or not their contracts or provision are being lived up to. Here its costing a person a substantion amount of money just to obtain a lawyer just to get some corrective action."

Katz: "Well, Representative Terzich, I'm not trying to get business for lawyers, I'm concerned about the problem that Representative Pappas has raised. I don't know any reason why if there exists a grievance procedure that the individual doesn't first pursue it. I don't know any reason why we have to fund a State Department with those grievances for those situations in which there is a remedy. Now the law generally is that before a member



of a union can go into court, he must exhaust his internal remedies. I gather from what you say that you don't have a provision in this bill that says that a person who is deriving his benefit through a union or through a collective bargaining contract, must first exhaust his remedies before he can go to the Department of Insurance. I don't know of any reason why you don't have a provision like that. I'm not trying to cut out those people who have no remedy. I'm not saying those people ought to be cut out, but as to the individual who is getting his insurance under a collection bargaining agreement through his union, he ought to first have to exhaust the remedies provided under that collective bargaining agreement or in his union struction, before he goes to a State agency that we have to fund."

Terzich: "Under the bill, the Department of Insurance would act only when it received a complaint from an individual. In other words, that he would have to exhaust his utilization of the grievance provision in his contract. If there is a grievance provision in the contract and he has not exercised that approach it would be the Department's position to refer him to the grievance committee. The Department would only act upon a receipt of a complaint from an interested person, the same as it would if it received a complaint on any other insurance such as your automobile insurance or any other health and welfare program."



Katz: "Well why don't you include, Representative Terzich, a specific provision that obligates the individual who is deriving his insurance through a collective bargaining agreement with the obligation to exhaust his internal remedy. That is the stipulation in every State court in Illinois. That's the situation in every federal court that exists in the United States, that an individual must exhaust his remedies. Why don't you put such a provision specifically in this bill, then you will eliminate the whole problem?"

Terzich: "Well, Representative Katz, many of the people who participate in health and welfare funds are not lawyers, they do not understand contracts, and I think it is incumbent upon anybody, whether its the Department of Insurance or an individual legislator, if you receive a letter or if you receive a complaint, you reply to it. Now you tell me when you are supposed to have a complaint until you receive it. And as I said, it was the Department's position that if they are...if they have a grievance provision in the contract, that they would refer that individual to pursue the grievance provision. This is all the Department is doing, they are only going to act upon a complaint. So you tell me how you know a person has a complaint until you get one?"

Katz: "Well, all that I'm really suggesting, Representative Terzich, if the Department says as a matter of policy that's what they are going to do, well that's very good, but you



know that the present heads of the Department of Insurance may not be the head of the Department of Insurance five years from now, or ten years from now. The way to solve that problem is to put a specific provision in that embodies the statement that the Department shall not act until a member of the labor union has exhausted his remedies under the collective bargaining agreement."

Terzich: "Well, Representative Katz, rather than pursue this issue, we did discuss this with a number of people from American Motors, General Motors, union officials and what have you. And a...if a...you have a remedy to this solution I...I...will certainly be more than happy to have this amended in the a...Senate; however this bill does not harrass any well managed funds, it is only acting upon a complaint and the only thing that it is making sure that it is in compliance with their own contract." And this is all it does, it doesn't set up any provision. It says you are to be in compliance with your own contract."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Would the sponsor yield for a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Tuerk: "As I understand it, is there not federal legislation that speaks to this issue now and would not your bill, in fact, apply in the face of that legislation?"

Terzich: "Nothing in House Bill 622, would conflict with what is being discussed in Washington at the present time. No



it would not."

Tuerk: "As I understand it, further, there has been some questions by business people relative to the content of this bill, and as I understand, were they not meeting with you the last few days. What were the results of those meetings?"

Terzich: "The results of that meeting, there were approximately, as I mentioned before, there were members from the..."

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

Terzich: "I said that there were members from the Illinois Retailers Association, the Manufacturers Association, a number of law firms, the Caterpillar Corporation, John Deere Corporation, American Motors, General Motors, and a....a...we a...discussed the provision. I would have to say that there were a group of lawyers there and they even couldn't make a decision on it. I've got all favorable reaction on this bill, and in good conscience I said that I would sit down and I would take any constructive change to make this a better bill and that I promised them that if they could strengthen the bill, I will accept these amendments in the Senate, but they haven't come up with anything."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? If no, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich, to close."  
Oh, I'm sorry. Representative Holloway, did you wish to a....? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Holloway."



Holloway: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this is a very good bill. I've had the experience of dealing with the questions coming from union members in regard to their rights under pension. A...the question has been raised relative to the use of the grievance procedure in union contracts. 99% of the time in such cases as this, this is not an employee-employer problem. This is normally a problem that exists between a union and a union member. So the employer does not get involved and that being the case, the grievance provisions of the union contract does not become involved. A....there is no a...provision in our Illinois law, there is nothing a...empowering the Department of Labor, State of Illinois, in any way to give help or assistance to a union member when he has a question relative to his pension rights with the union. The union contracts normally apportion a certain amount of money from the employer which goes to the union and at that point, it comes entirely under the a...control and jurisdiction of the union. I think that this is a good bill and that we should pass it because there are hundreds of thousands of instances where union members can get no information relative to their rights under their pension plan."

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

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the





House, you know, it would really be ashamed that we have here a State which involves 3,000,000 people. We have serious problems with pensions and we've seen things that have happened in the a...Elgin Company; we've seen things happen in the Studebaker Corporation, the International Harvester, and here is little Joe guy that has his whole life tied up on pension benefits and pension benefits which are supposed to be a promise, that he can't even have one place to turn to in the State of Illinois when he's got pension problems. It is a shame that not everybody in the State of Illinois is a lawyer and understands the contractual verbage involved in the contracts. This is a needed bill in the State of Illinois, it is a first step forward and it is good legislation and I urge your support."

Arthur Telcser: "The question is shall House Bill 622 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye, the opposed by voting no. The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, only because I have been a grievance committeemen in the past, and also an officer of a local union for many years, I'd like to point out to you that this definitely is a good piece of legislation. I'd also like to say to you that the people that are going to utilize this piece of legislation are the grievance committeement and the officers of the various locals. We have more problems in this



particular field that people would realize. And it is very difficult sitting down after negotiating a contract relative to pensions, to get the company to give you an outline of what it was all about. Even though the contract is signed. And I think this is a bill that will eventually stop a lot of heat in arbitration and a lot of heat in negotiation. And I think the possibility would exist that because a bill like this would pass, that there would be less strikes in the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Barry, to explain his vote."

Barry: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen, this isn't limited, believe me, to just union negotiations. Over the weekend I spent no less than two or three hours trying to help a group of employees who had money in a pension system when, in fact, the company they worked for sold out to another company and they were dictated to very simply by saying don't worry about your 80 or 90,000, you fellas, it'll be taken care of by this new company, maybe. So I think that in all fairness to people who have difficulty in understanding this kind of thing. It is very necessary that we provide this service."

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

Geo-Karis: "A...Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that this is a very important bill and in explaining my vote, I'd like to congratulate Representative



Terzich and his other co-sponsor for bringing something like this to the attention of the legislature because it is very necessary. We've had enough boondiving around where people won't give any answers and they don't know what to do about these pension funds and I'm all for these bills and I vote yes."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. Tuerk, no. On this bill 125 ayes, 2 nays, and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House...The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

J. J. Wolf: "On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Arthur Telcser: "State your point, sir."

J. J. Wolf: "In the gallery to the rear of the Speaker and to the rear of the hall, are members of numerous German-American Societies throughout the State of Illinois, primarily from the Northeastern six county area, who are here tonight for the German-American dinner, which will be held at the St. Nicholas Hotel at 6 o'clock. There is also a special guest with them, Mr. Sargeant David, who represents the Chicagoland Aserian Associations, and we hope to see you all at 6 o'clock and I hope you will welcome everybody in the gallery."

Arthur Telcser: "Record Representative R. Dunne as voting yes in the last roll call. House Bill 629."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 629. Matejevich. A Bill for an Act



to include coverage for the treatment of alcoholism in the medical insurance and health plans. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Matejevich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, last session the House Alcoholism Study Committee was commissioned to study the problem of alcoholism and on February of this year, it gave its report to us here in the House and the General Assembly. I'm going to quote from that report. "Testimony during the committee hearings pointed out the dilemma of the alcoholic, who has been told that he is an ill man, but who has great difficulty in procuring adequate medical services. General hospitals and private providers of care are reluctant to treat persons for alcoholism due to the great difficulty which those institutions have in securing payments for the services provided. Health insurance policies do not ordinarily cover treatment for alcoholism. And the cost of acute medical management or more long range in-patient treatment for alcoholism is very often prohibited for the alcoholic. Mandatory group health insurance coverage for alcoholism may be a partial solution to the cost problem. Therefore the committee recommends that amendments to the group accident and health insurance section of the Insurance Code, the Voluntary Services Health Plan be adopted. Mr. Speaker, and Member of the House, House Bill



629 is an outgrowth of the House Alcoholism Study Committee and does so mandate that group insurance plan do cover alcoholism. It recognizes alcoholism as an illness and I believe, Mr. Chairman, or Mr. Speaker and members of the House committee as do others who have indorsed this bill, including the Illinois Medical Soceity, which works on legislation last session, which relates to alcoholism. The Illinois Association of Mental Health, the Illinois Hospital Association, the Department of Mental Health, which supports this legislation, and the Illinois Federation of the A.F.of L. C.I.O, and by the way, my prime witness in committee, was the Director of the COPE committee of the Illinois Federal of the A.F.L.C.I.O. who came to committee and although his wife was a member of Alcoholics Anominous, did say in committee, after a very moving testimony, that she wanted everybody to know, to remove her animinity, so that everybody know what a serious problem, the matter of alcoholism is. The Illinois Church Action of Alcoholic Problems came into committee also. Mr. Speaker, I solicit your favorable consideration of House Bill 629."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Robert Johnson."

Johnson: "I have a couple of questions for the sponsor, if he will."

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Johnson: "Do we have any major group policies now in the State



now, that provide for alcohol coverage?"

Matejevich: "I don't know. To my knowledge, no. I don't know, though."

Johnson: "What kind of facilities do we now have for treating alcoholics that you would envision would be used in this bill?"

Matejevich: "There are some facilities, for my information, in the Rockford area. There are excellent facilities. A...Chicago has a...a..alcoholic treatment center. Some of the general hospitals are now going into the area of alcoholism treatments with detoxification centers. Our testimony in committee was that this was a problem that has a...must be solved by both the general hospitals and a...the cooperation of law enforcement people, and we felt, as did the State of Wisconsin, that by providing and mandating that group insurance plans do cover alcoholism, that it will be a major step in trying to solve this problem."

Johnson: "Well, do you have any a...do you have any estimate what this might do to the cost of group insurance now in the way of increasing it?"

Matejevich: "Well, I don't have any estimates. I understand that....a...let me read a letter from the Kemper Insurance Company. In our committee, it was testified that ...that this would not have a measurable increase. Evidently, from the testimony in committee, that some alcoholics are being treated in general hospitals, but not for alcoholism."



And it goes to the real root of the problem of alcoholism. Until alcoholics realize their illness, as the illness that really is, you have a very difficult problem of combating the illness of alcoholism. Let me read a letter from the Kemper Insurance Company a...and the Director of its Rehabilitation Services...a...I quote from the letter "the bill, House Bill 629, requiring the removal of the Alcoholism Disease exclusion clauses from group insurance policies is both feasible and long overdue. Such action would cause no significant rise in insurance claim or premiums cost. Industrial experiences with alcoholism control program and group health coverages have long shown that severity and frequency of health claims involving alcoholics persons are reduced when alcoholism is treated, rather than camouflage under other diagnosis permits repeated detoxification and emergency accident claims." That coincides with the testimony that we had at our committee that there would not be measureable increases."

Johnson: "I'd like to speak to the bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Proceed, sir."

Johnson: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, while I think this bill has a good purpose in mind, it concerns me. I don't like the idea of mandating something for every policyholder in Illinois without a better estimate of what its going to cost you. What it is going to cost employers, what it is going to cost



individual policyholders, and what it is going to cost the State of Illinois, with respect to the public employee group coverages? It seems to me that if the A.F.A.C.I.O. for example, will support this legislation, then this should be part of arbitration in some major group policies where we will see proper facilities develop. We'll get an idea of what it is going to cost via some major group union plans. But to go ahead and mandate alcoholic treatment coverage in all group insurance policies without any idea of what it is going to cost us, what it is going to cost our employers and the State taxpayers, that's troubles me deeply and I think...I think this bill is a little ahead of itself, its getting the cart in front of the horse, and I urge every member of this House to vote no on this bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Gibbs."

Gibbs: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I served on this committee with Representative Matejevich who has been in it much longer than I have. And we worked together to come up with three bills and this is one of them. And there was testimony in Chicago and also Springfield to the effect that these hospitals are not recognizing that a person has a disease when he is an alcoholic, and there admitting them now under different names. I want to quote, just briefly, from the Wall Street Journal, here, where it says that combating





alcoholism will cut insurance costs. The companies won't end up paying for a guys liver when it goes to a...when it rots out. This is from the Wall Street Journal of April 17, 1973. So this is more or less preventive maintenance in a way. Now we have all kinds of testimony that came before our committee to the effect that the doctors in the hospitals as such are not recognizing it as a disease because they weren't getting paid. In other words, if you were admitted as an alcoholic, you wouldn't have the coverage under your policy. This is more or less the subtrofuge that they were working in the past and this can be stopped with this type of legislation. this recognizes the fact that alcoholism is a disease and it puts it in the type of a policy and it should be covered. And I ask for your support."

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

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker, would the sponsor yield to a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Hudson: "A...Representative Matejevich, I am quite simpathetic to what you are trying to do here and I recognize the seriousness and the gravity of the problem, certainly. My question to you would be, what effect, in your opinion, this might have on people who want to procure insurance policies and yet, who by viture, perhaps of their religious beliefs or other convictions, alcoholism is no problem to....in other words, the abstainers, and I'm



thinking of a...7th Day Adventists and other groups of that kind who still want to get insurance, and I'm wondering if this will intend to raise their rates when the problem really is not applicable to them?"

Matejevich: "Well, a..Representative, my answer to that would be I think if they were entirely one group, it probably wouldn't raise at all, because of the insurance being negotiated, I think that would be taken into consideration. If there are some of those who had that religious belief, and being Christian people, I think they would feel like I do, that they would pay just there right share, even if there is a slight increase to try to combat this very serious problem. I think the Chairman of the Insurance Committee worded it the best when he said in committee that this is such a problem in society, and by the way the Federal Drug Administration, rates it as the number one drug problem in America, that it is such a problem that he fees that if it were an increase in a group plan that he belonged to, he surely would go along with it." And I feel that way to and I think that there are many more than 89 members of this House that feel that way."

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

Terzich: "A...John, there was a statement made that there are a number of hospitals that admit people in under different diagnosis, other than alcohol, now is this a subtrofuge to



have a group insurance companies pay for these claims?"

Matejevich: "Well, its a problem that we have and it stems ...it stems right from the stigma that we have regarding alcoholism because many will not really come down to the bear facts that one suffers from alcoholism. So very often, a physician knowing that, and knowing that one would have an impossible time of covering the cost through insurance, will diagnose it as some other illness and try to treat the person in such a regard. It may be a subtrofuge if you want to call it that. I say it all stems from the real stigma that we have in our society much as we have with mental health and we've gone to great strides in eliminating that stigma and I think we are just touching the bare surface in trying to erase the stigma of alcoholism."

Terzich: "Well, you know, I have...I've had some thirteen years experience in the group insurance field and I personally, I don't know of any contract that eliminates any illnesses if you are admitted in a general hospital whether it was mental illness or alcoholism or subtrofuge or drug abuse or appendectomies or whatever the case may be. And I don't understand why the insurance industry should be responsible for alcoholism? Why not a tax on alcoholic beverages, finance alcoholic hospitals, why put the burden on the insurance carrier which has to provide benefits that are requested by the individual or the group?"



Matejevich: "Well, the problem, as I say, is that even though the American Medical Association long since, many years ago, has decreed that alcoholism is an illness, it really isn't recognized as such and we don't recognize it as such in our law either. And this is...the reason that we have this particular legislation as far as I'm concerned, if all would recognize that it is an illness, if the hospitals would recognize that it is an illness, if all physicians would recognize that it is an illness, we wouldn't need this bill. The truth of the matter is that they don't recognize it and that's why we come in with this legislation. The testimony of the Illinois Hospital Association in committee in our House committee, comes out and says definitely that hospitals do not pay for the cost of alcoholism through insurance claims, this is a problem and this is what we are trying to counteract through this legislation."

Terzich: "Well a...if I may speak on this bill, a.... the the problem with this is that the legislation is requiring that the citizens of Illinois purchase insurance which they may not desire. Now in addition to this, all group policy holders, all the group plan simply consists of a group of benefits which a employer may want to purchase. So group policyholders, such as employers in unions, tend to set limits on the amount that will be spent for an employer union member, now through collective



bargaining payments or otherwise. Therefore, legislation mandates for a specific coverage, not only deprives the employer or union of a free choice of coverages, but also may result in a reduction of other coverages to bring the group plan within the employers' union budget. The employer or union is best able to determine the needs of specific group coverages and should be permitted to determine how the money should be spent. In other words, if you have a dollar to spend and you want to bargain for benefits, you know, why not bargain for higher room and board allowances, for mental illness, or drug abuse, or pregnancy, or anything you want, that the insurance industry determines what their benefits are by the demands of the people and a...a...I personally I...I haven't seen any coverages that eliminate alcoholic sickness from coverage unless it is provided in a general hospital, so I would tend to say that if this is a problem that they take the problem to the hospitals who are not admitting them or the medical department. But I don't see why we should mandate people, they should have a right to purchase whatever they want to."

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

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, no one is denying that alcohol isn't definitely a problem. At the same time, this bill does not address itself to the true problem. As I see it, this interferes with the normal contractual relationship



between an employer and an employee in deciding what coverage should be in a normal health insurance policy. It would mean that 95% of the people would be paying for insurance that possibly 5% would be using. I feel that this definitely is something outside of our realm. Especially when you consider that the cost will increase 15% for the normal group coverage and I hope that this bill will be defeated."

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

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

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Cunningham: "Representative Matejevich, the present State employee hospitalization plan, does that cover alcoholism or not?"

Matejevich: "I answer once."

Cunningham: "I didn't hear you."

Matejevich: "I answered once, I do not know."

Cunningham: "Well, is not that policy up for renegotiation at the present time?"

Matejevich: "I imagine, but I don't know."

Cunningham: "Has your study commission given any thought to anticipating this passing and try to include that so a high risk group would be eligible for the benefits that you seek to provide?"

Matejevich: "No, our House Committee tried to solve the



whole gambit of alcoholism in Illinois. We didn't just character the ah... thrust of state employees only. Although in a companion Bill that Representative Gibbs has this is one of three Bills all recommended by the House Committee ah... we do relate to the problems of alcoholism in state government in all of governments ah... but this Bill in itself ah... has the primary thrust of getting to group plans and trying to mandate ah... alcoholism coverage to a group plan."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, if I may speak briefly on this particular Bill?"

Arthur Telcser: "Proceed, Sir."

Cunningham: "The Members will note that the vote in Committee was 10 to 2. I'm embarrassed to remember that I voted one of the 2 negative votes. The reason for my apprehension then was that the fear that the rate might be unduly be raised by the coverage increase proposed, but I have since learned that other programs in other states that the rate increase has been rather small in comparison with the benefits that resulted. I think that it is high time that here in Illinois that we do something positive about the alcoholism problem and quit just giving lip service to it. For many years that only treatment available in Illinois for those who suffered from alcoholism was to confine them in the mental hospital with those who were mentally disturbed and the general proposition when



they were sobered up they were sent back to the community from which they were originally sent with no benefit whatsoever. I think that it is most important that this House pass this good Bill and tomorrow pass the companion Bill, which is Section 631 that will move us in the direction that we need to go of giving positive help to a great problem here in this state."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Lake, Representative Matejevich to close."

Matejevich: "Mr. Speaker, I ah... in spite of the few remarks about the position ah... I think that this is such a good Bill ah... if it looks like I need it ah... I'll explain my vote, but I... I just can't see this House not passing this Bill so I would ask for your favorable vote."

Arthur Telcser: "The question is shall House Bill 629 pass. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and the opposed by voting 'no'. The lady from DuPage, Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I had the privilege of serving on this Acoholic Study Committee with Representative Gibbs and Representative Matejevich. This is a good Bill. It does recognize the fact that alcoholism is a sickness and should be covered medically like everything else. Since we have enough votes ah... I'm just going to ask for a favorable vote."

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





Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, I ah... I would like to explain my vote. I..I'm definately not against ah... something to help out the problem on alcoholism, but I ah... I've known my experiance in the Health and Welfare field for a number of years and the only thing that I can really see this Bill doing is when it goes into effect, it's going to bring the attention of alcoholism and then all of these group policies are then going to put in limitations the same as they do on mental illness, the same as on pregnancy and the same as many other illnesses and that ah... rather than trying to expand the benefits that I believe that they presently enjoy now, it's going to limit the coverage by putting limitations as to the amount of benefits that will be expended on alcoholism."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Representative Mahar, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Mahar: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Arthur Telcser: "State you point, Sir."

Mahar: "In the balcony to the right rear, we have with us today, from the 9th District, the children from St. John's Lutheran School in County Club Hills, here with their teacher Mr. Rose."

Arthur Telcser: "On this question there are 117 'ayes', 13 'nays' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Now House Bill 641, Representative Williams. 641. Representative McPartlin, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"



McPartlin: "Mr. Speaker, could I ask leave of the House to have House Bill 641, which is Representative Jack Williams Bill postponed until tomorrow, May 8th. He is being sworn in as Mayor today?"

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman has moved that ah... the gentleman has moved that the provision of Rule 37 be suspended so that ah... House Bill 641 could be postponed until a day certain, May 8th, tomorrow. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. It will take 107 votes. The gentleman from Cook, Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, ah... along that same line, ah... Representative Harold Washington has ah... House Bill 468 which is called first this morning. Representative Washington ah... is unavoidably detained and will not possibly get here before Third Readings are over. I would appreciate it if the House would ah... extend that same courtesy to Representative Washington and ask to have this Bill heard tomorrow."

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

Caldwell: Well, ah... included in this same Roll Call."

Arthur Telcser: "Well, ah... o'kay. Are there any objections including 468 in this same motion? O'kay, hearing none, the question is shall the provision of Rule 37 be suspended so that House Bills 468 and House Bill 641 could be postponed until a day certain, May 8th. Have all voted who..... Representative B.B.Wolfe, for what purpose



do you rise, Sir?"

Wolfe: "Ah... my seat mate, Leland Rayson is absent at this time and I notice that we called his Bill and I think that today is the last day, could we include that Bill..."

Arthur Telcser: "Well, is he going to be here yet today, Representative Wolfe?"

Wolfe: I don't think he is, but I really don't know."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, what number is that then. 581. Is there leave. Are there any objections to including that in the motion? O'kay. Have all voted who wish? Representative R. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I have ah... two Bills on the calendar that I'd be happy to call, but I think in view of all of the absentees, some people have expressed that they would like to be recorded if they could be included. 474 and 621."

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

Shea: "Well, I just ah... wonder if might just continue everything until maybe Thursday and then we could all come back on Thursday."

Arthur Telcser: "Your point is well taken, Sir. O'kay, we've got these three Bills. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. We'll take three separate Roll Calls. On these questions there are 125 'ayes', no 'nays' and these Bills will be postponed until tomorrow. House Bill 642."



Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 642. A Bill for an Act to authorize and direct the Department of Transportation to make engineering surveys and study of the lower Rock River.

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 642 is exactly as the synopsis says. It just directs the Department of Transportation to study the lower Rock River with regard to flood control and report back to the General Assembly by March 1, 1974 with any remedies or reports that they have."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Why is there not...excuse me. Thank you Mr. Speaker. A Representative Pappas is there no appropriation for this bill?"

Pappas: "No there is no appropriation. In talking with John Galoo, he has advised me that they can handle it with their regular appropriation."

Schneider: "Does he need statutory authority to that or can he not make that a kind of a in house project and not have to go through the legislative process?"

Pappas: "Well, if you look at the bill the statutory authority, I think that he requests that it allows and and also to work for the district corps of engineers with the survey and project that they are looking at. And he recommended



John Galoo, recommended that I put in the bill for him."

Schneider: "A...there has been no previous survey made of that same area before?"

Pappas: "A...not in the lower end of it in its entirety, as far as I know, there has been some piece-meal, but not in its entirety."

Schneider: "Just one more, Pete, when was that?"

Pappas: "I don't know."

Arthur Telcser: "The question is shall House Bill 642 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting aye, the opposed by voting no." Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 127 ayes, no nays, and this question having received a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 644."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 644. Farley. A Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code." Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Farley: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 644 is a very simple bill, it attempts to do a couple of things. Number 1, it attempts to make a direct payment to the service units from the Illinois Department of Public Aid to those service units that service the medically indigent in counties of population of over 500,000. It also calls for uniformity of these services as far as the amount and nature of these care services. It eliminates the lapse appropriation problem,



which was suggested to me and pointed out to me by the Illinois Department of Public Aid. It does not interfere with any county procedure now as far as the public aid program in any county under a population of 500,000. House Bill 644 would also facilitate operations to suppliers and give medically indugents a choice of suppliers. The bill came out of committee with no opposition and I would appreciate your favorable vote here."

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

Tipsword: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question, please?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Tipsword: "A...the synopsis of the bill indicates that these payments shall be made from funds allocated to local governmental units for public aid purposes.. Does that mean that its from the specific...the funds allocated to that specific local government?"

Farley: "A....yes...yes, Representative, the funds...this bill effects the Cook County area, which is given their payments from the Illinois Department of Public Aid. The other counties in the State already have allocations through their present county system of supplying medical aid for these services."

Tipsword: "It doesn't come out of the general local fund monies then. It comes out of the monies for that particular locality."



Farley: "That is correct."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mann."

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

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Mann: "A...Representative Farley, I'm not sure of the scope of this bill in terms of a....does this apply to the green card? What are we talking about in terms of the scope to this bill?"

Farley: "Well, presently there is a bureaucratic operation as far as these people are concerned that receive public aid through the service unit in Cook County. In other words the Cook County Department of Public Aid certifies that these people are entitled to these services. Now the services as far as what they receive, it all those services as far as medical, social, a...programs that service units provide for the people on public aid. This bill attempts to eliminate the waiting period that the service unit has to wait for. In other words, they have to go through Cook County, and instead, this bill provides that they would go directly to the Illinois Department of Public Aid."

Mann: "Well, I'm still....are you saying that that this bill would deal with the entire payment system for medical care?"

Farley: "Yes, direct payment."



Mann: "Well, I'm still not sure how this differs from the present arrangement. The State pays for it now. I wonder, Senator, could you do me a favor? Could you take this one out of the record...a so we can talk it over?"

Farley: "In answer to your question, right now the service unit service or bills the Cook County Department of Public Aid and, in turn, the Cook County Department of Public Aid bills the Illinois Department of Public Aid. This bill eliminates that billing to the Cook County Department of Public Aid."

Mann: "Could you take it out of the record?"

Farley: "Well, does that answer your question, Representative?"

Mann: "It does. But could you take it out of the record? I'm not going to obstruct it, I just wanted to chat with you about it."

Farley: "Alright, could I request to take it out?"

Arthur Telcser: "Okay, but we'll have to call it today. Today is the last day. Okay? You wish to take it out of the record sir?"

Farley: "Yes."

Arthur Telcser: "Alright, take it out of the record. House Bill 650."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 650. A Bill for an Act concerning rights of medical personnel in hospital to refuse to perform abortions. Third Reading of the Bill."





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

Kucharski: "House Bill 650 upon which I am requesting your favorable vote action today is a bill which essentially extends the right of hospitals, physicians, nurses and other hospital personnel to decline to participate in an abortion. This bill, if it becomes law, protects the aforementioned from liability for exercising such definition of conscience. This bill, I am sure, meets any constitutional test. It does not make the abortions illegal. Its legitimate purpose is to protect those individuals and institutions, who in conscience, in the performing of such an operation from so doing. I do not think anybody can legitimately object to a law which upholds the legal and moral law of those who wish to preserve the sanctity of life from abstaining from any act that is opposed to this belief. I urge your approval of House Bill 650 today."

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

Wolfe: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Wolfe: "House Bill 97 and 1196 that a...well, 97 was tabled but in Section 3 of that bill and Section 3 of 1196 is a statement of exception or exclusion on the basis of belief. A...do you know whether your bill follows the guidelines set forth in either one of those two?"



Kucharski: "No I don't."

Wolfe: "Well, does this apply to doctors, hospitals, a...  
any participant that might be involved in this procedure?"

Kucharski: "Yes."

Wolfe: "In other words, it is a broad exclusion bill?"

Kucharski: "Yes."

Wolfe: "Is that right?"

Kucharski: "Yes."

Wolfe: "And does it contain, in other words, does it contain  
does...does the bill only confine itself to the exclusion  
of ...of...of the hospitals and medical personnel and to  
no other area within the confines of the decision of the  
Supreme Court?"

Kucharski: "Yes."

Wolfe: "Thank you."

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

Katz: "Yes, would the Gentleman yield to another question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Katz: "With the general idea of protecting the rights of  
hospital personnel who may have conscience with reference  
to participating in abortions, I'm in complete agreement.  
However, I recall seeing an amendment that went by my  
desk that provided, and I'm not sure whether it was this  
bill or another one, I've just sent for the amendment, is  
this the one that provides that the damages shall be no  
less than \$2000 regardless of proveable damages? Does  
this happen to be the bill that I am talking about or was



somebody elses?"

Kucharski: "Yes, same bill."

Katz: "Well, why would you provide 2000 dollars damage even if there is no damage? In other words, what I'm concerned about is this problem. If an individual does not participate in a hospital a...in a...procedure relating to abortions and if sometime later that individual alleges that they are not given a transfer or something like that the individual then contends that the reason they aren't given the transfer was because of the fact that they are discriminated against due to the fact they didn't participate in an abortion and then you get a lawsuit involved in which you are before a jury and it becomes a question of fact as to if the jury is unsympathetic with the hospital, they can return a 2000 dollar judgement against the hospital or against the doctor, or whoever it was, even though there are no damages proven. Even though the individual has no damages of any kind, as I read the amendment, the jury can just award \$2000 of the hospital's money, or the physician's money who's being sued and it may only be a question of the word of this individual against the word of a very responsible hospital and I wonder why you have the provision in that automatically gives the individual the right to collect \$2000 even if they were not damaged by an episode?"

Kucharski: "The protection of the damages is taken from a



statute in Minnesota, I believe. And we used that as the basis for it."

Katz: "I really a...if I were in the Minnesota legislature, I'd ask the same question. I really don't see any reason why the hospital should be stuck for \$2000 if there are no damages involved. And I don't really believe that the fact the Minnesota may have passed the bill means that there is any logic or good sense in the bill. I still do not see any reason why a hospital or physician should be required to pay damages if there was no damages proveable as a result of the episode. And I really don't see that you need it. I can understand that if there are damages that you would want to provide a remedy to collect the damages. But what this bill says is that even if there weren't any damages, the hospital would have to pay \$2000, or the physician, even though the individual was in no way damaged and cannot show that he was damaged in any way and so it seems to me that that is not a fair provision or a fair provision. I'd be very much in favor of the rest of your bill, but it seems to me that that provision, I gather you say comes from Minnesota, doesn't seem to me to be fair to hospitals or physicians since it requires them to pay damages when, in fact, the individual wasn't damaged and accordingly, it seems to me that that part of your bill is not fair, and even though I would support the rest of your bill, it seems to me that that is in the bill, I would personally not be inclined to



support that kind of provision but it seems to me to be punitive and does not constitute a requirement that an individual pay for those damages that he caused because, here, the hospital may have caused no damage or the physician and yet, punitively, they are being stuck for \$2000 and that doesn't strike me as good law or fairness, so I'll have to, myself, oppose the bill with that provision in it."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Representative would a...Mr. Speaker, thank you. would you yield for a question?"

Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Grotberg: "Does this mean, Representative, that if a doctor refuses an abortion and said woman gets an abortion from another doctor on the same medical staff, and this operation has a flaw, a punctured uterus, or one of the many things that can go wrong with these operations, does this mean that the \$2000 amendment statutory fee claim would kick in that point, its a readily available ceiling on a flat law suit for anything going wrong?"

Kucharski: "I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you."

Grotberg: "I'm sorry, Eddie, if a doctor refuses an abortion, Ed, and a second doctor...and a second doctor...and a second doctor on that staff performed one, does the...and it goes a little wrong, there's an injured party, does the



\$2000 statutory limitation kick in there, can she claim up to \$2000 for a bad operation?"

Kucharski: "The protection provided in the bill is there for the staff of the hospital."

Grotberg: "The protection is for the staff of the hospital?"

Kucharski: "Yes. I may have misunderstood you."

Grotberg: "Who gets the \$2000? The woman or the staff member?"

Kucharski: "The employee that has been discriminated against in the hospital for his a...."

Grotberg: "Refusing?"

Kucharski: "Excuse me?"

Grotberg: "Refusing to perform one?"

Kucharski: "If that may be the case."

Grotberg: "I still don't quite understand it, thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolfe, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Wolfe: "Point of parliamentary inquiry, please."

Arthur Telcser: "State your point, sir."

Wolfe: "A...Mr. Speaker, when I left the House last week, I had a bill book containing most of the bills from 1 up to 1000, my bill book is gone. Can you tell me why?"

Arthur Telcser: "I really can't did you ask the pages on either side of the aisle?"

Wolfe: "Thank you, I got the answer."

Arthur Telcser: "You got it? Okay. The Gentleman from



Macoupin.....Representative Petrovich, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Petrovich: "Mr. Speaker, in address myself to the bill and to the question proposed here by Representative Katz, Representative Katz, if we check the amendment, the amendment does say be answerable in civil damages equal to three times the amount of proved damages. It does indicate that they must be proved."

Arthur Telcser: "Well, Representative Katz, you've had your time."

Katz: "Well, my name was mentioned in debate, Mr. Speaker."

Arthur Telcser: "Are you rising on a point of personal privilege?"

Katz: "I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Arthur Telcser: "State your point."

Katz: "Because if the Gentleman would continue reading, he's absolutely right. Must be answerable in civil damages equal to three times the amount of proved damages, but then he stops, but the amendment goes on, but in no case less than \$2000. So that if there are no damages, if the damages are 12 cents, they cannot in any case be less than \$2000, so what I said was absolutely true and it is in the amendment itself."

Kucharski: "I think what we are saying here, Representative, is that in whatever civil case there may be, the plaintiff in the case must prove a certain amount of damages, and I think what we are saying here is that in



terms of being deprived of his job or having aspersions cast on his medical ability because of any action taken by the hospital that at a minimum, that kind of damage is worth \$2000. Nevertheless, there has to be proved damages."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I have a...asked several of the House lawyers sitting around me, here, and they don't seem to know the answer to the question. I'd like to ask the sponsor what is the liability on a doctor or a hospital for refusing to perform abortion? I didn't know that there were any liabilities."

Kucharski: "Now, there could be some liability involved and there are some pending now."

Boyle: "How could there be any liability? It is not a common law torch to my knowledge and there is no statutory liability."

Kucharski: "Now, for refusing to perform, they could be fired or they could be refused promotions."

Boyle: "Thank you."

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

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker would the sponsor yield to a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Mugalian: "Mr. Representative, are there any provisions in





this bill as to notice to employees or other agents of the hospital that they will not participate in the performance of abortions."

Kucharski: "I didn't hear the first part of your question."

Mugalian: "Are there any provision that require persons who do not want to participate to give notice to the hospital or to the patient, or to the doctor in charge, in the event it is a nurse?"

Kucharski: "No."

Mugalian: "There are no such provision?"

Arthur Telcser: "Is the Gentleman, Representative Huskey, on the floor? He wanted recognition. No?" The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolfe."

Telcser: "Did you want recognition sir? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "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 and Representative Kucharski to close."

Kucharski: "I simply urge the passage of this bill for it is very very important to many many people here in the State of Illinois. I ask your favorable action today. Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "The question is shall House Bill 650 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting aye, the opposed by voting no. The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Alsup."



Alsup: "Its kind of late now, but I was asking for recognition."

Could I ask the sponsor a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "Oh, you can ask him a rhetorical one, I imagine he'll grant permission."

Alsup: "Okay, now this damages. Is this if you kill the baby or perform the abortion, or if you don't, does it work both ways? Or only one life, or if you perform the abortion and there are damages to the mother, is that what you are talking about? I'm confused, I don't know what I'm voting on."

Kucharski: "This is just to protect the agencies, the hospital, the institutions, personnel of the hospital who refuse to participate in the performance of an abortion."

Alsup: "If they refuse to participate, they could be sued for \$2000? Is that what it says now?"

Kucharski: "No, no, its only if the institution takes action against such an employee, then that employee is protected under this bill with the minimum liability of \$2000 and maximum three times the liability."

Alsup: "Well, are you in support of this amendment?"

Kucharski: "Oh yes, yeh."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from...no? No? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative B. B. Wolfe."

Wolfe: "Ah...the intent of the bill does not express really what the sponsor wants to do on behalf of the hospitals. It is not broad enough.. If the bill were broad enough,



it would excuse anyone, hospital, doctors, nurses, any participant and would absolve that person from any civil criminal, recriminatory, administrative, any kind of liability that might result from the refusal. Now the amendment, first of all, the bill doesn't say that. Secondly, the amendment establishes a minimum of a \$2000 liability, and that posture, if the bill was correctly worded, you would not need the amendment, because they would not be liable for civil damages, or any kind of liability whatsoever, so we are passing something here that is really not going to do the job in protection an individual on the basis of conscience or any other reason from participating in the abortive procedure and for that reason, I am voting no."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question, there are 120 ayes, 7 nays, 1 answering present, and this bill having received a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed." Go back to House Bill 644." Huskey, aye."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 644. Farley. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Farley: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I did resolve or answer the question by Representative Mann and the explanation of the bill you did already hear, so I again, would appreciate a favorable vote."



Arthur Telcser: "The question is shall House Bill 644 pass?

All those in favor signify by voting aye, the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wished? Brinkmeier and Merlo aye. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. Telcser, aye. Kosinski, aye. On this question there are 118 ayes and no nays and this bill having received a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 677." Fleck aye."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 677. Jones. An Act to provide for the ordinary and expenses of the Supreme Court. Third Reading of the Bill."

Jones: "This is the annual appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Clerk of the Supreme Court and I move for its passage at this time."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall House Bill 677 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye, the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. McGrew, aye. Geo-Karis, aye. On this question 135 ayes and no nays and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed." House Bill 695."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 695. An Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative D. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 695 permits schools to use instructional material which the



teachers have an interest, if that interest is based upon authorship or development off the materials. It also requires that an annual statement certifying that interest be filed with the board. The two sections of the School Code to which this bill is directed presently contain a flat prohibition on the use by a school of instructional material developed by a teacher who is connected with the school, where the teacher has a financial interest in those materials. The historical purpose of the two sections apparently was to prevent a possible conflict of interest. However, as drawn there is an inflexibility which prohibits the school board from using such materials even though it is the board's judgement that such materials best meet the needs of the educational goals and needs of the district. A school district with creative, highly qualified employees cannot take full advantage of their abilities and efforts. So that in certain situations, the present provisions can operate as a barrier to a school district of which is attempting to provide the best educational programs possible. The requirement that the teacher file, the requirement that the teacher file an annual statement with the board certifying his interests insures that that interest is public knowledge and that there is no hidden conflict of interest. The disclosure of such an interest will encourage a full and open debate and in a decision based upon the merits of the instructional



material. The decision to use such materials remains that of the school board and the bill, of course, refers back to Article 28 of the School Code, which prohibits, or strike that, which provides penalties from properly inducing the use of such materials. I ask your favorable consideration of the bill."

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

Duester: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the sponsor would yield for a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Duester: "I might inquire, you know, legislators and those of us who are elected to various positions of public responsibility are always subject to the suggestion that we have a conflict of interest of some kind, and I was just wondering whether, if we pass this bill, that the school teachers and school officers and legislators will all be in the same basket? Will there be one standard of morality or ethics, you might say, that will effect us, as well as school teachers, or will this result in any disparity, that you know?"

Houlihan: "I can't say that it arises a problem, Representative. The provision here in the bill of a disclosure, makes it a matter of public knowledge. The decision to use the materials will remain that of the School Board, it simply makes it open and completely public knowledge before the Board should act in a specific situation."



Duester: "Thank you for the explanation. I'd like to express my strong support for this bill because I think its good, but I just hope that some later time, we are not going to come attacking the legislators and try and set up some stringent standard for us that we wouldn't insist on for school teachers and others too. Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, would the sponsor yield to a question, please?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Ebbesen: "Yes, does this apply to institutions of higher earning?"

Houlihan: "No."

Ebbesen: "Just elementary and secondary?"

Houlihan: "That is correct."

Ebbesen: "It has to have the approval of the Board of Education in that particular district, is that correct?"

Houlihan: "That is correct."

Ebbesen: "Thank you."

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

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question, really not from the sponsor, either from Representative Clabaugh or Representative Hirschfeld, or Representative Stone. I know this has to do...my question has to do with authorship, but it might have the same implication as in a high school, for example. That is I've heard, and I don't



know that it is so, but I have been told that there are certain professors for example at the University of Illinois who write their text books and put them on the required list for their students and a few years later they would make some minor changes and do this all over again and make quite a bit of money. Now this is so, and I again don't know, but they may have knowledge of this, I would say this might be a suspicious bill and it maybe should be voted against, but I don't want to condemn it without hearing if there is any knowledge amongst those people that represent the University of Illinois that I heard was occurring at. I would like to know because it would influence my vote."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? If not...the Gentleman from Cook, R. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Will the sponsor yield for a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Hoffman: "On any particular text or any volume that is authored by an instructor, they can, in turn, then, upon approval from the Board, deem this as required reading?"

Houlihan: "I'm sorry, I'm not quite sure that I understood your question."

Hoffman: "Any material, any text, that is authored by an instructor, upon approval of the Board, can then require this as required reading for the class?"

Houlihan: "Well, its the Board that determines what the





education text materials or instructional materials that are going to be used in particular school district."

Hoffman: "And you would not consider this a direct conflict of interest inasmuch as the author is deriving royalties from the publication of this?"

Houlihan: "Well, that is the purpose of the disclosure that there be a statement submitted to the board as to what the financial interest is of the author...where that author is a teacher in the school district."

Hoffman: "However, the only person that would know would be the Board that this individual instructor is receiving royalties. It is in direct conflict inasmuch as he then will be requiring this as part of the course and deriving royalties off this book at the same time."

Houlihan: "Well, I refer you back to the fact that the Board will be the one who makes the decision as to what instructional materials are going to be used in the school district."

Hoffman: "And you do not feel that there could be possible collusion between the two? Inasmuch as the instructor would then be promoting the sale of his own material and deriving benefits therefrom?"

Houlihan: "Well, the bill refers back to Article 28 of the School Code, which provides penalties for improperly inducing the use of such materials. And, what this is designed to do is to cover the situation where you have



a teacher who has authored what is the standard text in the field. And as the present law is, that that can be used in all school districts except the school with which he is connected. And that is the purpose of it and I think we have provided for with the requirement of the disclosure with the State in certifying interest... (financial) to be filed with the Board. If this is public knowledge and it will lead to an open and complete discussion prior to the adoption by the board of particular instructional material or text."

Hoffman: "Wouldn't it then be more proper to include in this type of legislation if the thrust of this is to emulate more information from the professors into the class room to relinquish any royalties derived from the publication of these to used in these classrooms?"

Houlihan: "I disagree. I think the law, as it presently is, and as you are suggesting, I would think that would be too prohibitive and that it would intend to discourage teachers with the skill and ability and author valid materials for school use."

Hoffman: "I don't think it would discourage the individual from completing these text, the only thing I fear here is the direct enrichment of their own names by possible collusion with the Board where the Board approves this type of material. And it is then required in the individual classrooms and he at the same time is promoting his own enrichment from the royalties from the material."



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

Houlihan: "I feel that the law as it presently stands works hardship against the very community that it is designed to protect. It is prohibitive and it does tend to discourage teachers who have the skill and ability to develop and author valid materials for school use. I feel that we should encourage rather than discourage participation and the fact of fair remuneration to teachers who materials are published and used, should not be a deterrent. I ask for your favorable consideration for the bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The question is shall House Bill 695 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye, the opposed by voting no. Board representative, J. J. Wolf is voting present. Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Clabaugh."

Clabaugh: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. I think this is a good piece of legislation. I think that the fears that several people have expressed here about a piece of laboratory equipment or slides or books or anything that an elementary or high school teacher might work up...a...the sale of it to there own school wouldn't be enough for anyone to do it. A...good many school districts give increments to teachers....a...for doing just these things and I think that the good far out ways



the bad in this peice of legislation and I urge your 'aye' vote for it."

Arthur Telcser: "Record Representative Peters as voting 'present'. The gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I would like to explain my 'no' vote on this ah... the response from the Sponsor is that it does not apply to ah... institutions of higher learning and it says here on line 9 that no state, county, township, or district school office ah.. or teacher ah... now ah... a state teacher would be one that works in a institution of higher learning and I would be very happy to change my vote if this was clarified for by the Sponsor. Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative R. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I think that this is a very bad precedent when we talk of conflicts. Now in any situation such as we have with the professors in our universities and the school teachers that we have, we're encouraging them to emulate their knowledge into statistical or textbook material, but then to have the school board promote this by letting the teachers, the individual professors, require this reading when the author is deriving ah... revenue from the sale of this material, I think that we're setting a bad precedent.



What we're talking about ethics, ah... even though the school board is aware of it, or the higher education field if aware of it, I think we're putting in something here in the law that we ourselves would be chastised on and I would solicit a 'no' vote."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Representative Borchers, for what purpose do you rise?"

Borchers: "I'm voting 'present'."

Arthur Telcser: "O'kay, record Representative Borchers as voting 'present'. On this question there are 115 'ayes' and 12 'nays' and 5 answering 'present' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 696."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 696. An Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask for leave to consider House Bill 696 with House Bill 697."

Arthur Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, will the Clerk please read House Bill 697?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 697. A Bill to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 696 and 697 were prepared by the Office of the Secretary



of State and the combined effect of the Bills is to provide that those who have been convicted of certain criminal offenses will be ineligible to drive a school bus. The general intent of the legislation is to keep certain undesirable people away from the scholl children and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield to one question?"

Arthur Telcser: He indicates that he will."

Barnes: "Mike, the amendment on 697, is that the amendment that sets a time period for reconsideration on that problem that was brought up during the Committee Hearing?"

Madigan: "Yes, the amendment that was added on Second Reading, provides that after a certain period of time ah... those who were ineligible will become eligible and the authority is given to the hiring agency."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The question is shall House Bill 696 and 697 pass. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. The Clerk will take two records. On these questions there are 134 'ayes' and no 'nays' and these Bills having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 724."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 724. A Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Development Disabilities Act. Third



Reading of the Bill."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 724 creates a new Department of Developmental Disabilities. The effect of which is to take the Division of Mental Retardation Services from the Department of Mental Health and to place it in this new department with the Cerebral Palsied and the epileptics. The ah.. Bill is a product of a House Committee that ah... worked for several months on this question ah... together with the Illinois Association for the Mentally Retarded, The United Cerebral Palsy of Illinois Inc., both of which organizations enthusiastically support the Bill. One of the objections heard to the Bill is that it ah... enlarges the bureaucracy, but I submit to you, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, that the Department of Mental Health is a very large bureaucracy in another self. The Department has 23,000 employees. Far more employees than many states have in total and the new department would have approximately 6,000 and would then become the third largest Code Department in the state, ah.... less only The Department of Mental Health, The Department of Public Aid and The Department of Transportation. I solicit your support for this good Bill."

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



Douglas: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, ah... I was one of the two people in Committee who voted 'present' on this Bill and have spent a great deal of time meeting with Representatives of both the Department of Mental Health and the people who support this Bill since that time. The main question I think here is not simply rather we should have a new Code Department, ah... in the State of Illinois in this area. I've come to the conclusion that that is necessary, but it's also whether anything could be any worse than the present situation with the hospitals and the other sub-institutions under the Department of Mental Health that fall into this new area. I think that the situation historically has been an indication of the Department of Mental Health a dismal inability to deal with this extraordinary important numerically and qualitatively this important area of ah... of life. The mentally retarded and the other physically disabled people who have been treated as ah.. as things under the Department of Mental Health through the years are a clear indication that the Department of Mental Health, even under a new Director and even in a new administration are not in a position to say, 'Give us another chance and we'll do the job better.' After a considerable amount of investigation and discussion with people in this field, I feel firmly that the intent of this Bill and the thrust of the Bill is a good one. I urge the Members of this House to support it. I think that we should move





in the direction, not simply of agreeing that the status quo should be dealt with and that we should continue to do this in a manner that has not worked in the past. I think what we need is this new department and we need the encouragement of the Illinois Legislature to get this new department to work with the Departments of Mental Health and Public Health to work out the obvious administrative problems that will develop as a result of the development of a new department and I ask the Members of the House for an 'aye' vote on this important piece of legislation."

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

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to the Bill that ah... the distinguished Majority Leader and Dr. Douglas has just spoken in favor of. I believe that it is a bit ironic that the afternoon that this Bill was called is the very afternoon that the Illinois Senate is holding a Committee of the Whole Hearing on another Bill to combine all of the departments that relate to human welfare and human health into a single department. The ah... what is wrong with this Bill is that it seeks to fragment the treatment of people who have problems ah... in the field of psychiatry or adjustment or their own individual health. If you have a situation of a child who is ah... an exceptional child, a retarded child ah... or whatever terminology you want to use, they are frequently associated with other kinds of



emotional problems. So what this Bill is going to do is to set up a parallel structure. We will have to first provide a Department of Mental Health and then we will have a Department of Developmental Disabilities and so that this child, this single individual child, who is going to have a problem that would be characterized as a developmental disability problem who also has a psychiatric problem, ah... we're going to have to have a separate set of psychiatrists in the Department of Developmental Disability or separate set of psychologists to treat that child ah... that will just be a situation of expense to the state, failing to take into account that fact that we are fragmenting the treatment provided for that individual child. What we really oughta do is what they are talking about in the Senate now, we really ought to recognize that human beings are single individuals, that all of the health problems of an individual, whether they be public health or psychiatric or developmental disabilities, they oughta be treated in a separate structure. We should not have to have separate bureaucracies created to fragment the individual and to treat each different aspect of the individual. We're talking about a single human being, whether it is a child with a developmental disability. The next thing we'll be doing is taking the Department of Mental Health and creating a separate department for schizophrenics or separate problem or ah... separate department for other



kinds of psychiatric disabilities. This Bill is a step in the wrong direction. It is opposed by most of the professional organizations that I know of that have been involved for years in the ah... treatment of health problems. It has been discussed at meetings at the Board of Mental Health and very critically reported on at the meetings. All it does in my opinion is to aggravate the problem. I think that if we have extra money, that we oughta use that extra money to fund it to have a single department that would provide as good as services as possible. By creating extra departments, in my opinion, what you're going to do is to waste alot of that money in a separate bureaucracy. A few weeks ago, I visited down in Anna ah... and while I was to visit the State Mental Hospital there ah... and I had a fairly lengthy discussion with the staff at the Anna State Hospital, which is one of our best state hospitals, and ah... discussed the impact of this particular Bill on Southern Illinois, on the 27 counties in Southern Illinois that are set up, that fall within the region of Region 5 that Anna State Hospital. They have a whole structure of social workers and a whole structure of ah... in each one of those counties to take care of the patients when they are discharged from the hospital and go into the community. So now by creating a separate department, we're going to have a separate structure in every one of those 27 counties. We will end up providing a separate series



of social workers so they will each have their own little structure in each one of those counties and accordingly, it seems to me that the fragmenting of health care is a very bad thing, it is an expensive thing, we are spending so much money in this field already that we should want to spend the money for health treatment within the department and not for setting up separate bureaucracies. Now I do recognize that the Sponsors are very well motivated. They believe that by setting this up, they will provide better health care for a certain group of citizens. I believe that we will provide better health care for all of the citizens if we do not fragment it, if we treat people in a single department. If we do not set a parallel bureaucratic structure that involves a waste of funds. So accordingly, I think the Bill is a step in the wrong direction, that the Bill being heard this afternoon in the Senate, that combines all of these various departments, is the step in the right direction and I would urge opposition for this well intention, but in my opinion, extremely expensive Bill."

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

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

I rise to speak in favor of this Bill. I'm sorry that I have to disagree with the prior Speaker because I do feel that this Bill is a step in the right direction.



Mental retardation, cerebral palsy, epilepsy and other similar neurological disorders do not mean that a person is insane. All this Bill does is it separates, it separates the departments for all of these ailments, because you and I both know that in many cases these people can be helped. Because one has epilepsy, does that mean one is insane? Certainly not. Too long... too long the Department of Mental Health has treated these cases as the parental stepchild and instead of the warehousing system we still have, I do feel that under the new plan every develop.... ah.. disabled person will be given individual case management to determine how his needs best be met. In comparison with that, it's the United Cerebral Palsy of Illinois. I might add that you and I both know how some of our institutions have been. We know that these particular ailments, which can be helped and which occur early in life, usually at or around birth and which result in a substantial handicapping condition, which probably implies continually protective care and presumably a life long condition needs some particular interest in them. We have not given them the proper interest, as far as I'm concerned, under the Department of Mental Health the way it stands and I am in favor of this Bill because the cost is little, also the departments will be separated because more care can be given to these particular types of ailment and I think they deserve it. My constituents in my district are overwhelmingly in



favor of this Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Fayette, Representative Brummet."

Brummet: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, one of the previous Speakers gave the very reasons, Mr. Katz, of why I am sold on dividing this department. Naturally your not going to a bureaucracy and have them to say that they want to split this into another part, but in this same section of the country, we have in each one of these counties a separate organization which today is receiving money from 6 or 8 different sources. This would bring it down to where you would have one source of funds for all your mentally retarded and your other disabilities. These types of people that we're talking about under this Act, do not need all of this psychiatric care. What they need mostly is food and shelter and clothing and medicine and kind and loving care. These aren't the type of people that get discharged back into the communities. We spend quite a bit of time on this, on this Disability Commission and I am convinced that this is a good Bill and I would appreciate your vote for it."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Representative Juckett."

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, it is really with great reluctance that I rise on this Bill because I know that the Sponsor and what he is trying



to do in order to help those who are mentally retarded, but I think that the Bill does not accomplish everything that he thinks it will. It is good to have a separate division or a separation of retardation and mental illness. I don't think that anyone would dispute that and I agree wholeheartedly with the Sponsor of the Bill on that provision, but he has got some problems that he doesn't realize. It is not just within the Department of Mental Health where all of these problems arise. First of all, you've got the old age conflict with the Department of Public Aid, because the vast majority of those who are retarded will at some time or another be a recipient of Public Aid and if and when discharged from a facility will have to fight the battles. This Bill will not in anyway solve that problem and then we have the age old problem with the Department of Public Health and just be creating a new department you will not solve the problems of life insure or the problems of inspection just because you have a new department. So those two factors are things which will detract and subtract from the creation of a new department. Now we all remember when the Department of Mental Health was formed. They had 2500 employees in 1962. Now they started 1968 and basically up until now, somewhat well over 25,000 employees. The answer is not really in creating a new department. The answer instead is abolishing the departments which we now have of the Department of Public Aid, the Department



Public Health, the Department of Children and Family Services and the Department of Mental Health and creating a new department. This was brought out in the Governor's Task Force on the reorganization of state government. Bills were introduced to do this in the last Session, but the then Governor didn't think too highly of those Bills. The same concept has been re-introduced in the Senate, as the gentleman from Cook in the other aisle has indicated. The better way, the best way.... let me reiterate that, the best way is to abolish the department, create divisions of mental illness and divisions of mental retardation, so that retardation would no longer be a step-sister or a step-brother of mental illness, because they are in fact, different. They do require different treatments. They do require different sources, but a new department fighting this same battle against Public Aid and against Public Health is not the answer. You need a department where they are separate but equals and where the Department of Public Aid and Public Health no longer exists, but divisions will exist to assist those who are retarded. I commend the Sponsor for his diligence. I commend the Sponsor for his ability to see the problems, but I most regretfully must disagree with his answer because it is not the right one. I don't think that we should vote against the Bill, I just don't think that the Bill should pass."

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





to close the debate."

Walsh: "Well Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, to briefly answer some of the objections and to thank Representatives Geo-Karis, Douglas and Brummet for ah... good arguments for the Bill, I'd like to say that first of all there is a great difference between the mentally retarded and the mentally ill. There is the same difference that there is between a person with a broken arm, who would require public health and a person who is mentally ill or a person who is mentally retarded. There is not necessarily a relationship at all. Now I have no objection at all to a reorganization of State Code Departments. As a matter of fact, I think it kinda makes sense. The departments range in a number of employees from the 23,000 in the Department of Mental Health down to the Department of Aeronautics where they have 58. So some reorganization certainly is needed, but I disagree with the gentleman that spoke against this Bill that it should not be done at this time. The problem is that we need a change now and we need to put mental retardation on a parallel plan. It must be the same as mental health. Unfortunately mental retardation now is vertical and we must look, those of us who are interested in the mentally retarded, to a Director of the Department of Mental Health for anything and everything that goes to the mentally retarded. Just as an example, in the Zone Centers in the past year the mentally ill ah... there were 815 served



and there were 114 mentally retarded served in the Zone Centers. This indicates to me that the emphasis is on the mentally ill. As all of us know who have any connection with the Department of Mental Health, they are interested in cures and we who are interested in the mentally retarded realize that we are not going to have any dramatic cures. We're interested in good, clean, substantial custodial services with some program in order to get the very most we possibly can from the mentally retarded. This is a good approach, Mr. Speaker. It's all we have before us right now to solve the very serious problems of the mentally retarded and I solicit your vote."

Arthur Telcser: "The question is shall House Bill 724 pass.

All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and the opposed by voting 'no'. The gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "I'd like to explain my vote, please."

Arthur Telcser: "Proceed."

Tipsword: "I'm going to vote for this Bill because our mentally retarded are in need of some additional attention from the State of Illinois in giving it's best kind of service we possibly can to them and I hope that this is the right program. The only thing that has caused me to hesitate at all is because our experience with new departments of government has been very disappointing in the last few years. Regretably the new departments of government that have been created for each time a very



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

laudable purpose has resulted in creating only a new vast expensive bureaucracy with very little, if any, increases in services to the people of the State of Illinois. I'm willing to give this one more chance in creation of a new department and hope that this department gives us much better service in results for our money and in the undoubtably increasing bureaucracy it will provide than we have experienced in the other reorganizations in government in the last few years."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 130 'ayes', 6 'nays' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 748."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 748. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Ogle, Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 748 does exactly what the synopsis in the digest states and that is that it provides the school districts to provide transportation service for children participating in organized recreational, cultural, educational or public services programs. I'd like to point out that this is a permissive thing and that if it is done that the board shall make a charge for such transportation in the amount equal to the cost thereof and that also includes an allowance for depreciation. Now the necessity for this



Bill is that at the present time it is not possible for small communities ah.. to school buses during the summer months for recreational purposes as is done through many years. Now this means that the small community that doesn't have a park ah...a swimming pool ah.. doesn't have any roller rinks or what have you, ah... they're practically without any recreational facilities. Now this Bill has been amended so that it will not be in competition with School Boards, it will not be in competition with any public or private transportation systems if they are available. I know of no opposition to the Bill. I know that the Illinois Association of School Administrators have endorsed it and I would appreciate your vote."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall House Bill 748 pass. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Telcser, 'aye'. Ralph Dunn, 'aye'. On this question there are 139 'ayes', Campbell, 'aye', and no 'nays', Peters, 'aye'. This question having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Now let's see. We want to go back and pick up the Bills that expire today."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 474. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

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



House Bill 474 would abolish teacher-adult education tuition wavers. In 1961 ah... Senator Hines ah.. passed a Bill which abolished all teacher education tuition wavers except those which are ah... the subject of House Bill 474. Many of us thought at that time that the ah... \$500 per year or \$2000 at any one time of teacher-adult education tuition wavers were also included in Senator Hines' Bill. Now ah.. it is our feeling that it was omitted inadvertently. At this time we have an opportunity to correct that error. Ah... again the program is that the Superintendent of Public Instruction can certify 500 adults, that is people over the age of 21, each year to attend four year colleges and universities for teacher education programs. Ah... I believe there are two very good reasons why we should support this Bill. One is that no financial need must be demonstrated by applicants for this program. A second very good reason is the over abundance of teacher education ah... graduates or available positions. Now Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I think we have the opportunity here to strike the blow for economy and also for young people who are attending our four year colleges and universities. There is not need for teacher education tuition wavers at this time. If there is a need in the future, the General Assembly can appropriate the dollars necessary to encourage people to enter these programs. If this program did not exist at the present



time, I don't believe that there is anyone in this Assembly who would vote to appropriate money for such a program because it is not necessary. So Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I would urge your affirmative vote for House Bill 474."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall House Bill 474 pass. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? LaFluer, 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 112 'ayes', 8 'nays'... Douglas and Maragos, 'aye', McGrew, 'no' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 610."

redric B. Selcke: "House Bill 610. An Act to provide for the ordinary contingent expenses of the Bureau of the Budget. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, this is Representative Pierce's Bill and he isn't here now. I understand that this Bill had a thorough hearing in the budget and the cuts that were in this Bill were agreed on between the Republican and Democratic Staff that there was some \$175,000 taken out and I would appreciate the support of the House in the passage of this Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is



shall House Bill 610 pass. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and the opposed by voting 'no'. The gentleman from Cook, Representative Juckett."

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, I didn't have time to ask the distinguished Sponsor a question, but...."

Arthur Telcser: "He'll yield to it now."

Juckett: "Is it true that ah... the Governor ah... had a rejected nominee for ah... a State Director's spot on the Budget.... of the Bureau of the Budget?"

Shea: "No to my knowledge."

Juckett: "My understand that Mr. Fogle was actually paid out of the funds of the Bureau of the Budget."

Shea: "Well, I think that you were on the floor at the same time that Mr. Washburn or somebody on your side raised the point that prior to the time that Mr. Fogle went to I.L.E.C., that he may have been paid out of the Bureau of the Budget. I don't have any idea about that, but I'm sure that if you would come to Appropriation Hearings ah... tomorrow ah... you could ask Director Moore that question."

Juckett: "Well, of course that's after this Bill is passed, but I'm sure that you would get the information if it were true and....."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 140 'ayes' and no 'nays' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 621."



Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 621. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Richard Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill that I think would be of some interest to ah...the entire Membership in that it would abolish the General Assembly tuition wavers effective January 1, 1975. It also specifically provides that any people that have been awarded General Assembly tuition wavers prior to that date, ah... may continue in the program ah... until the ah.. four year period of their scholarship has expired. This is a Bill that ah... has been up before the House ah... in the past and I would like to think that's gathering more support and I hope that it can pass this ah... year. At the present time, that is at the fall term of 1972, there were 1,788 students attending our four year colleges and universities under General Assembly tuition wavers. The annual amount of tuition waved was \$850,000. Now that's just the tuition waved, it's not the cost of the education because as we all know ah... the state subsidizes ah... our students in four year colleges and universities by a considerable amount of money. I believe that this is a good Bill and I believe that it deserves your support. The ah... there are many reasons, my primary reason for introducing this Bill is that the recipients qualify without establishing any ah...





need requirement. There w  
ing these scholarships. w  
nuisance involved in having  
these scholarships at... w  
ah... aggravate more p  
For whatever the reason  
General Assembly should  
should be abolished

Arthur Telcser: "The  
Friedland."

Friedland: "Mr. Speaker,

Arthur Telcser: "

Friedland: "Rep  
prior to the  
are not ah...  
be awarded to

Walsh: "Any....  
1975. So if  
left school  
awarded to  
just that no  
January 1, 1975

Friedland: "Tha

Arthur Telcser:  
Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Mr. S

Arthur Telcser: "



Cladwell: "Ah.... Dick, ah.... what is your reason, ah... I've been here almost seven years and I think that you've had this Bill almost every Session I've been here? What is your reason for wanting to eliminate the General Assembly Scholarship?"

Walsh: "My reason for wanting to abolish it is because I do feel that anyone should receive a scholarship to one of our colleges or universities without establishing a basis ah... qualifying on the basis of need. Now others who support this Bill feel that legislators are not qualified to make the award and I feel that that is true. Others who support this program feel that it's an administrative burden, which we shouldn't be concerning ourselves with ah... I think there are many reasons, but my prime reason is that ah... the need is not established and we have many wealthy children who are applying for scholarships such as these who probably should be paying tuition."

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill?"

Arthur Telcser: "Proceed, Sir."

Caldwell: "I rise in opposition to this Bill. Ah.. in my district for the last ah... six years ah.. I have used considerable expertise and called upon organizations to get me qualified applicants for the two scholarships that I have been able to award and it's based upon need and I find that for every scholarship that I have been able to award, I've had ten of fifteen applicants. It's



been very useful and very beneficial in more ways than one and I can testify to the fact that some of my scholarship awardees have made the honor roll at the University of Illinois and I'm convinced that they would not have been able to go to college had not these scholarships been available. I'm not convinced that the Scholarship Commission ah.... is in a position or has taken on the people who should know the conditions that some of us represent, whether or not they are selecting on an impartial basis ah...students to receive scholarships. I haven't ah... seen the necessity and it doesn't move me at all in attempting to abolish this scholarship. I don't know how long it has been in existence, but I can assure each of you that the ones that I've had excess to, they have been used very very well and have been able some youngsters to go on to college and get an education and become useful citizens. Had the scholarships not been available, I'm afraid that they would not have gone to college. I urge all of us to defeat this Bill as we have done in the last three Sessions."

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

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this annual and perenial bad Bill for many reasons. One of my recipients ah... this time of the scholarship is a child from a family of fourteen. Now I don't care how the parents qualify or don't



qualify in a case like this, but as any of you know who have any children involved, when you start to get to this kind of a figure there is no way that you can come out and you need every bit of help you can get. I have quite close rapport with all of those who have received scholarships in the past and intend to do so in the future for they also make an effort to report what they are doing and how they're doing it. I think that if you take a personal interest, this scholarship takes on a much different meaning other than just merely having it or not having it as the case may be. I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Mann: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I know that it is a burden on legislators to have to administer the granting of scholarships. On the other hand I think that in this day and age when education ah...is so important in terms of getting along in this society, I think that we ought to perserve every avenue we can to help young people get the kind of education that they will need in order to not only mature, but to prepare themselves for life. We all know now a days that that diploma is like a license. It's a license to employment and it's a license to upward mobility and I would hope that even though I would be the first to agree that this is a difficult job of administration, I have confidence to the Members of this House that we will award scholarships



not on the basis of favoritism, but on the basis of need.

Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to defeat this bill soundly."

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

Dunne: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I rise to support this bill. The sponsor has already pointed out the tremendous cost, the burden on the taxpayers for this scholarship program. Its always troubled me to see pictures in the paper of a United States Congressman standing along side of young people that they have appointed.... a made appointments to the academies, and this particular scholarship legislation program troubles me for the same reason. It seems to me that we are using this all too often for political purposes only, and I point out that we have, under the Illinois State Scholarship Commission, over \$74,000,000 awarded scholarships now. When we talk about need, we have the scholarship program established in this State and its administered by professionals who are in the business of scholastics and awarding scholarships. And it seems to me it is not really in the fervor of the State legislature to be awarding scholarships and I think that it is an excellent bill."

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

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, this has always been a dilemma for me. I have 40 to 50 applications and I have honestly tried to give them on the basis of need and their grades, and when



you have so many nearly all straight A's, and you don't know for sure whether if the letters you receive, the information that you need is true, its a most difficult thing. I can only take two of them, allowing at least 15 or 20 in a category that leaves me in doubt as to my own judgement in making the final decision. Its hard to make such a decision, I personally prefer to be relieved of the responsibility because for the two I give, I'm... I'm not helping, though I would love to, and like to, many 20,30,40 others, so I think it would be to our interest to be relieved of this tremendous responsibility of choosing between so many worthy and practically equal recipients."

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

Thompson: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this bill for more reasons than one. Each session that I have been here we have had this bill come before us and it has been defeated. I'm urging a resounding defeat for this bad bill, today. One of the proud speakers spoke of cost. What better purpose could this money be spent for that to give some needy child a chance for an education, because on the shoulders of these young people that we are helping today will rest the responsibilities, not only of our State, cities and counties, but our government. And it is up to us to do what we can to help them to get the required education,



because in this day and age, you must be prepared. I urge a no vote on this very bad bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Ogle, Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I would also urge a no vote on this bill. During the years that I served as a high school teacher, I did some part-time work as a counselor, and I'd like to give you one example of how I feel the Illinois Scholarship Commission has not seen fit to award scholarships when there was financial need. I illustrate one example in a district at home. A professional man living in a beautiful new home had a son who qualified for a scholarship from the Illinois Scholarship Commission. The very same committee, there was a widowed teacher, a daughter still in high school, and they disqualified her son on the basis of need. Now obviously, maybe there wasn't some truth betrayed in one of the applications, or the other. But the point I'm trying to make is this, we can't rely on the Illinois Scholarship Commission to aware scholarships to all those youngsters who need financial aid. I feel this is one way that we, as legislators, if we are sincere and are really trying to help youngsters who need help, we can help a couple of youngsters each year to further their education. I would urge a no vote on this bill."

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



Duff: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the sponsor of this bill spoke most aptly when he called this scholarship system of legislative scholarships anachronism. There defined as a bone of political thieftom. A bonè of political perogative. A perogative often abused and a perogative for which there is no justification. I speak in support of the bill."

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

Duester: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of the previous speakers suggested that this bill was a perennial bad bill. I think it is a bad bill, but as a freshman, I wouldn't know if it is a perennial or annual, but I would like to say this about the bill. We...or the General Assembly is in the process of transition, we are trying to strengthen and upgrade and improve the Illinois General Assembly, our State Legislature, and this is no time to be stripping perogatives from the General Assembly, but the time to strengthen what we have. The mere fact that in the past some members may have been awarding these scholarships on political basis or without any thought or anything else is no reason why at a time when members of the General Assembly now find themselves strengthen with a staff, that we cannot use this, and I would speak from personal experience with members of Congress, that the beauty of this particular activity in





responsibility, is that it forces you to take an interest in our institutions of higher education. Many members of Congress wouldn't know much about the Merchant Marine Academy or the Air Force Academy, except that they appoint young men there and they learn about it, and so this scholarship provides us, as State legislators, with a fine opportunity to take a continuing interest in the quality of higher education in the State of Illinois and I urge a strong no vote against this bad bill."

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

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

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor say aye, the opposed by saying no. And Representative R. Walsh to close."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a...I know this bill always engenders quite a bit of discussion. I hope that this will be the last time, because, hopefully, we can pass it. Let me a...respond to those gentleman on the other side of the aisle, who had examples of students who attended college under General Assembly scholarships, who may say might not have received them otherwise. Now I think in just about all those cases, the people of whom they speak would have been able to qualify on the basis of need. Those people would have received scholarships from the Illinois Scholarship Commission which has had...has been pointed out, we are



funding with increasing numbers of dollars, every year, to the point where this year, the request in the budget book is, I believe, \$74,000,000. Now, I'm not pointing this bill to any legislator. It is not in response to ...or any reaction to any particular a....incident. I'm proud of those scholarships that I awarded. As a matter of fact, I had one scholarship, a young man from the Village of Oak Park, who was not able to obtain any assistance from the University in Illinois, and ended up being the most valuable player on the University of Illinois football team, in addition to being an excellent student. Now I think we all probably do the best job we can, with a very difficult situation. But those specific cases to which we all can refer can be taken care of by the Illinois Scholarship Commission, can be taken care of by institutional tuition waivers. We have programs whereby every institution can grant a scholarship on its own initiative. That can take care of those hardship cases which some of you feel may escape the attention of the scholarship commission. And for those of you who feel that this is a perquisite of our office, its an amalument of the office of State legislators, I can just say I think you're wrong, I think the day has come when we shouldn't be concerning ourselves with these things. I urge an affirmative vote."

Arthur Telcser: "The question is shall House Bill 621 pass?"



All those in favor signify by voting aye, the opposed by voting no. The Lady from DuPage, Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "A...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm hardly in support of this bill and I would like to urge some of you that put your red lights on quickly to stop for a moment and think. In the Higher Education Committee we are trying to get a more coordinated method of handling scholarships so that they are either on the basis of merit or need. Now the State Scholarship Commission has the time and the staff and the expertise to do this job and I think if we...each of us analyze our office staff objectively, we really don't have that kind of time or that kind of expertise. I think if you look at it politically, you make about 50 enemies for the two friends you make each year. I really think this would be a moment to take a step forward and let these scholarships be handled by the scholarship commission. I really urge a reconsideration of some of those red lights and let's give it a green light."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Walters."

Walters: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. In explaining my vote, it is very seldom that I rise to oppose the Majority Leader's distinguished brother, but I did, in the Higher Education Committee, cast a vote to get this out on the floor, but now I'd like to cast my no vote because I feel that this



is a good bill and Representative Sevcik's bill, House Bill 25, which passed earlier this session, which will allow us to have four one year scholarships, or two, two year scholarships, will solve some of the problems. And the only argument I have heard is the fact that a few Representatives don't want to be bothered with this particular bill. Now I would say to you Gentleman, that you do not have to give your scholarship, you don't have to be bothered. But some of us do, some of would like very much to help some people in our area and I urge a no vote. Thank you Mr. Speaker."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? The Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my vote against this bill because I had someone in my employ who worked for the Illinois Scholarship Commission and she tells me that only young people in extreme need can get those scholarships. Whereas the people...the youngsters from the middle-class that have some need and find it very difficult to continue education, cannot avail themselves of the opportunities of the Illinois Scholarship Commission. Therefore, I rise and vote yes... a...no rather, pardon me."

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

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in



explaining my no vote, there. I would respectfully suggest the 50 odd of you who are voting green are making a terrible mistake unless you switch your lights over to red, we'll have to beat this bill again in the fall and again next year. This is a very bad bill, it just increases the frustrations of all of us because our constituents expect many more things than we can do for them. If your constituents are the same as mine, they want you to build highways, they want you to bring government offices into your district, they want you to furnish employment for them. and it is such a rare pleasure to have one situation where we have absolute power and we have two little scholarships that we can hand out and make two worthy children happy. I wanted to echo the comment that was made about Representative Sevcik's bill. He has quadrupled our authority, our capacity to do well. Those of you who are voting green, strike a lick here for the strength and dignity of the Representative body by switching it all over to red and we won't have to do it again in the fall and again next year."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 55 ayes, 71 nays, and this bill having failed to receive a constitutional majority is hereby declared lost. Okay, on the House Bills Order of Third Reading, we'll go back to the beginning of the list and start picking up those bills whose expiration date



fall within this week. Is a...Representative Wolf on the floor? J. J. Wolf? No? House Bill 45."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 45. An Act creating the Public Utilities Investigating Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Caldwell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. House Bill 45 is a proposal to form a legislative eight man commission to study the methods which are used by public utilities to have some type of guidelines where customers can know when there services are cut off, a ...when they are threatened to be cut off, how they can be adjusted. This bill comes out of many many requests over a period of years for some uniformity to have this commission study the rules and suggest to the public utilities how they could better carry on their services to the public and at the same time, allow those of us who have stock in the public utilities to make an equitable profit. this bill was heard in the Public Utilities Commission Committee. There was no opposition and I would suggest that we would be doing the public utilities a favor and the general public by voting this bill into law and I urge your support."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Springer."



Springer: "Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield?"

Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Springer: "Representative Caldwell, what happen to House  
Bill 46?"

Caldwell: "It was referred to the Appropriations Committee."

Springer: "In other words, there is no appropriation on this  
on House Bill 45."

Caldwell: "I beg your pardon."

Springer: "There is no appropriation on this House Bill 45."

Caldwell: "No sir."

Springer: "Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Livingstone, Representative  
Hunsicker."

Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,  
I rise in opposition to this. I don't know why we should  
spend \$100,000 to investigate why people are cut off.  
As far as their public utilities are concerned, all they  
have to do is pay their bill and the service will be  
continued."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The question  
is shall House Bill 45 pass? All those in favor signify  
by voting aye, the opposed no, by voting no. Have all  
voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative  
Caldwell, to explain his vote."

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, I'm hoping that the members of the  
House will read this bill. Its a simple request that



we establish an 8 man or women legislative commission which would sit down with representatives of public utilities throughout the State of Illinois and council with them so that we could suggest some uniform guide lines so that many people throughout the State would not be frustrated as to how the rules are applied in determining service. Now I discussed this bill with the Commerce Commission. They had no position. As a matter of fact, they wanted to help me draft a resolution to solve this problem. All of the public utilities were aware of it and many of them were in the hearing room when the committee met, and there was no opposition from any of the public utilities. I would suggest that this is not an attack upon public utilities. I would suggest that hopefully, if you pass this bill and it is signed into law, and in 1975, at least from that time, we would be doing the public a service and we would also be doing the public utilities a service. They have various rules that are not uniformly applied in various communities and I think that this is the time that the General Assembly should assist the Commerce Commission and the public utilities in bringing about some degree of uniformity in applying, not two rates, that's the job of the Commerce Commission. This has nothing to do with rates. It has to do with the manner in which the..."

Arthur Telcser: "Would you conclude your remarks sir?"





Caldwell: ".....the various public utilities would reestablish some guide lines as to how to collect the monies that are due them in the ...in the area of shutting off service and re-establishing, etc. I would appreciate enough votes to pass this bill."

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

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the sponsor of this bill has a very good idea in mind. But when I see the \$100,000 price tag, and I realize that we already have an Illinois Investigative Commission, that is presently staffed, that would see the need of the appropriate matters to handle this problem, for the sponsor to make a resolution that would be acted upon by the Illinois Legislative Commission and it would save the State \$100,000, so for this reason I am going to vote no."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Holloway."

Holloway: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this bill. I want you to know as one who works in this field, that there is a problem concerning deposits....a...consumer deposits and the like and I think that this bill would not only help the consumers but would also be a help within the industry and I welcome and I urge each and everyone to support it. I think it is good for all concerned."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Representative



R. Carter."

Carter: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we are confused here as to the bill that we are voting on. This bill is House Bill 45. I think House Bill 46 has to do with the monies which will be expended for this service and that is now in Appropriations Committee and will be considered by the Appropriations Committee. We are concerned only with House Bill 45. I would like the number of votes necessary to pass this legislation."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in considering a bill of this type, I think that we, here in the General Assembly, can have an opportunity to have a clear cut definitive study on some of the practices of the utilities as they now exist. I had the opportunity of sitting in and was a witness on this bill in the public utilities committee. And it was pointed out there that there are many questions that need to be answered in some definitive way concerning rates and other things in terms of the various utilities. We have not seen any definitive studies that I know of, in recent years, addressing themselves to those particular things. It seems to me that each year the Illinois Commerce Commission, seem to be perennial with the



various utilities coming in to request adjustments in their rates and adjustments in various...various servies that they give to the public. I think that at this point in time that we should have some kind of study to make some kind of determination whether or not the kinds of service and the kinds of rate increases that the various utilities are requesting are the kinds that are best for the interest of the people that they are to serve. We only need about three or four more votes up there on that board. I think that the public needs this kind of study and we need to be able to go back and in some manner, be able to explain to our constitutents what these various utilities are or are not doing. And I would solicit those other three or four votes to be able to bring about that kind of a study."

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

McGah: "Vote aye, please."

Arthur Telcser: "Record Representative McGah aye. Pierce, aye. Londrigan?"

Londrigan: "From no to aye."

Arthur Telcser: "Change Representative Londrigan from no to aye. That's 88. One more. Look quick. Representative Beaupre, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the HOUSE, I rise in support of this bill. I would like to reiterate some of my past experiences as the President of the



Kankakee Land and Legal Aid. I know, and I can tell you, that in the last two years in our community in downstate Illinois, that nearly 3% of the cases that we handled were complaints against public utilities. Now that is not to say that all public utilities are operating incorrectly or in derogation of the law. I think it is true that this is an area that deserves some degree of investigation. I think it is an area where we can do a real service to the public and I would like to ask for everyone to put on a green light."

Arthur Telcser: "On this question there are 88 ayes, 34 nays, 1 answering present. Oh, Huskey...how is Representative Huskey recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "The Gentlemen is recorded as not voting."

Arthur Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting aye."

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

Maragos: "Am I recorded as voting aye?"

Arthur Telcser: "Is Representative Maragos recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Arthur Selcke: "Representative Fary, for what purpose do you rise?"

Fary: "How am I recorded as voting?"

Fred Selcke: "Aye."

Arthur Telcser: "Okay, on this question, there are 89 ayes, 34 nays, one answering present. This bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."



If you wish to be on the roll call come on up here and we'll put you on. Is Representative Yourell on the floor? Is Hanahan? No. Rayson isn't here. Is Representative Hart on the floor? Rayson, no. Choate, no. Juckett? House Bill 458."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 458. A bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from....Representative Juckett do you wish to have that out of the record?"

Juckett: "That was the one that I talked to you about on making the motion."

Arthur Telcser: "Oh, I'm sorry. Take it out of the record. Bill 553."

Fred Selcke: "House bill 553. A bill for an Act to amend the Fair Employment Practices Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 553 is a bill dealing with exconvicts not having the right to work. This bill, I think is very much needed, and if you heard the news commentator the other day when he announced that Secretary of State Howlett is in favor of this type of thing. And I applaud him for his stand on that bill because this bill does not hurt anyone at the present time. It has been amended and I think it is the type of bill that we should pass and I would hope that you give it



your consideration and give me an aye vote on this bill."

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

Duester: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the sponsor of the legislation worked very diligently with our committee and I know an amendment has been adopted which makes, I suppose a substantial change in the proposal, and I wonder if the sponsor would...just so every member of the House knows what the bill now provides, if you would explain the amendment, I think that would be helpful and I would appreciate it."

Taylor: "Mr. Chairman, will you take it out of the record just for a moment, let me get my bill together, please?"

Arthur Telcser: "Okay, we'll take it out of the record? House Bill.....Representative Lemke on the floor? Okay, House Bill 651."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 651. A Act to amend Section 17 of an Act that provides into law in relation to promissory notes and so forth. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Lemke: "This bill simply amends the Negotiable Instrument Act to make the Monday of March a holiday in commemoration of Casimir Pulaski, a Polish revolutionary war hero, that came to this country and that died at the age of 32 in Savannah, Georgia, fighting for the freedom of our nation. He was born on March 4, 1748, and this would conform to make the first Monday in March a holiday. This does not



close the schools or close the State government."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall House Bill 651 pass? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Arrigo."

Arrigo: "Would the sponsor yield to a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Arrigo: "A..Representative Lemke, I wonder if you could name some of the non-Anglo-Saxons heroes of the Revolutionary War, who were associates of Pulaski?"

Lemke: "A...General Cusiasko, Von Stuben, there's other ...Giovanni....a.....a....what's his name?"

Arrigo: "You don't mean Phillip Mageé, the man who was responsible for the phraseology in the Declaration of Independence, of independence that all men are created free and equal, that Tom Jefferson borrowed and put into the Declaration of Independence?"

Lemke: "Well, you are a better student of Italian history than I am."

Arrigo: "Well, you would say he was a colleague of Pulaski?"

Lemke: "He was a colleague of Pulaski and a college of...."

Arrigo: "Of course, you know, there was a regiment of Italians who were also fighting in the revolution. They belonged to the Purmaintage French Regiment. Are you familiar with that? Mr. Speaker, this is a very good bill and I support it whole heartedly."

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



Katz: "Yes, would the sponsor tell us what the effect of declaring something to be a legal holiday is in Illinois? I gather it doesn't change the schools. Does it close all the banks and all the savings and loan associations in Illinois and what else does it do?"

Lemke: "It merely commemorates the holiday and makes it a legal holiday. Its a voluntary thing. If the banks want to close, they can close."

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

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I am a co-sponsor of this wonderful piece of legislation but in answer to Representative Katz's remark, I could tell you many of the savings and loans will close on that day because many of the savings and loans operate with people of Polish extraction who are very thrifty and law abiding and have contributed much to our communities. And I think they will do it on a voluntary basis and close their doors on that day for a wonderful hero and patriot of the United States."

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

Fary: "This, Mr. Speaker, is the sponsor's first bill. Let's give him the traditional Christmas treat."

Arthur Telcser: "The question is....the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Duester."

Duester: "I may have missed it and normally, I'd wait to





explain my vote, but could the sponsor just list again what legal holidays we have and what in the world Pulaski's done to qualify himself to be included? I'm just .... Mr. Speaker, I'm always willing to be educated and informed and just because I come from a poor background and I haven't heard about this man. There's a high school in Milwaukee named after him, but maybe if would be helpful for fellows like me and maybe some of the lady members who don't know about Pulaski too. I'd appreciate it."

Arthur Telcser: "Does the Gentleman wish to respond?"

Lemke: "For those who don't know what Pulaski did, I see that the founders of the State of Illinois seen fit to name a county after him. Casimir Pulaski came over to this country at the age of 29. In short of 4 days, he saved the Battle of Brandywine and saved Washington's troops. He was a personal guard. At that time, a week after, he was made Brigadier General of the Horse, which is with the calvary. At the age of 32, he enlisted his own calvary troop, financed them, \$50,000 worth at that time, paid for the horses and the uniforms and went to battle in Savannah and he was killed fighting for this country. He was a true American of Polish and Slovik decent, like all of us have been, to lay down his life, and I think it is only right for him to be commemorated in a holiday in the State of Illinois."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Duester, we are still asking



questions now."

Duester: "Well, there were two questions. One, what has he done? And second, who are all the other people we've honored? So we can see what the list is and I think that might be helpful in making our judgement in whether Pulaski ought to be added to the list."

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

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just want to add one name to the list and that name is the man who was first to die. His name was Christmas Attox and a record to him a Green's Hill, there in Boston, is a statue to a black man who was first to die. In fact, he died before General Washington was placed in command of the Army of the Revolution. And he had less to die for than anybody else, but he died for our freedom."

Arthur Telcser: "Okay, the Gentleman from Kane, Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "For the edification of Representative Duester and the good deacon on the other side of the aisle, to speak to the bill. The first man to die on Calvary was neither Pulaski nor the black man nor any other. On Calvary, it was a man that we already have the day off on Sunday, and I thought we'd clear that up."

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

Geo-Karis: "Being a co-sponsor of this bill and knowing that some of the Greeks fought in from St. Augustine, fought in



the Revolutionary War, I am very pleased to be one of the co-sponsors. And Don Duester, I've known about Pulaski for many years. Where have you been?"

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

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I would like, because I have always been an admirer of Christman Attox, to point out to the earlier Representative who mentioned his name, that Christmas Attox died at Haymarkers Square in the Boston Massacre and not on Green's Hill."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ike Sims."

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

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying aye and those opposed by saying no, and Representative Duester, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Duester: "Mr. Speaker, as a matter of personal privilege, my distinguished college from Lake County mentioned my name and I still have not gotten an answer from anyone as to who we have legal holidays, why don't we know?"

Arthur Telcser: "And the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lemke, to close."

Lemke: "I ask you...this House...for a favorable vote for this martyred hero."

Arthur Telcser: "The question is shall House Bill 651 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye, the opposed by voting no. Telcser, aye. Have all voted who wished?"



I'm sorry, Representative Leon, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Leon: "I would like to explain my vote by reading a telegram I have in my hand."

Arthur Telcser: "Proceed, sir."

Leon: "The Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans urge you to do all your utmost in connection with the adoption of House Bill 651. The Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans certainly endorses and believes that the last Monday in March of each year should be a legal holiday of Casimir Pulaski. Signed, Charles Perselli, President of the Joint Civic Committee. And I vote aye."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, hoping that at the appropriate time we will institute holidays honoring Susan B. Anthony and another great poet citizen, Marie Sqedowck Curee, I vote aye."

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

Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as present. I'd like to explain my vote. I'll probably be ostracized for not voting for this bill because I have a very large Polish segment in my district. But I think we are dealing with an emotional thing here. We recently passed another holiday bill, which I didn't support. I



don't intend to support this one, I wouldn't vote for one for Frederick Von Stueben, I wouldn't vote for one for Lafayette, because if we keep up at this rate, voting for additional holidays or State holidays on emotion. Pretty soon, we are not going to have school at all and the banks will never be open. Record me as present."

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

Davis: "Yeh, let me reply to the Gentleman who said that Christmas Attox died on Haymarkers Square. I don't know whether he means in Boston, but I was in Boston, ...I was in Boston...this year, and Christmas Attox died on Boston's....what is Boston's Common and if you want to go over there and look at it, we'll go over there and look at it. Boston Common, now I don't know if they call it Haymarkers Square or not, but it's Boston Common and if you mean Haymarkers down here in Chicago, he couldn't have died there because he didn't live in Chicago, but I know who the father of Chicago was. I know who the first settler of Chicago was. I know who named Chicago. He was a black man too. By the name of Gene Packsès Poinses Harvard. And I know where he's buried. He's buried right down here in Charleston, Missouri. Do you want to go down here and look at his grave?"

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question 113 ayes, 12 nays, one answering present."



And this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed, House Bill 652,"

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 652. A Bill for an Act to amend the North Shore Sanitary District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Groesheimer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to speak on House Bill 652 which is a bill limited to an area solely covered by the Lake County North Shore Sanitary District. It gives to the Sanitary District the power for a special form of condemnation, referred to as quick-take powers. This was presented to the North Shore Sanitary District for the sole reason that it is under a court order at the present time to complete its sewer projects by January 1, 1975. I believe that we are the only sanitary district in the State of Illinois that is under such a court order and we must comply with this or find ourselves in contempt. The quick-take powers merely gives to the sanitary district the authority to take hold the property if, after the passage of the necessary legislation, which would mean after October 1 of this year, and at the same time would allow those property owners that the quick-take is affecting to pursue their actions in the court room. The committee suggested that an amendment be attached to drastically



limit this power and it was attached to the bill on Second Reading. The quick-take is now limited to coincide with the court order of January 1, 1975. We sorely need this in Lake County in order to comply with the court order completion of our sanitary facilities and as a practical matter, we rather look upon this that we will not be able to comply with the court order if we are not given this power. And I certainly ask each one of you a green light, a yes vote on this particular bill as it is limited by the amendment. Thank you."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, will the sponsor yield to a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Geo-Karis: "Ronald is this bill simply a quick-take for easements, is it not?"

Groesheimer: "I couldn't hear the question."

Geo-Karis: "Is this bill a quick-take for easements or for land?"

Groesheimer: "This particular bill is a general quick-take provision, it is not limited to just easements. Although, right not, I have discussed this with the North Shore Sanitary District and what they are really looking for are sewer easements."

Geo-Karis: "Now the order of court that has been entered, can you tell me, was that the one directed to the easements?"



Groesheimer: "The order of court that the North Shore Sanitary District is operating under now is a general order directing them that they must comply with certain standards concerning pollution and affluent control. I don't think it merely runs to just easements. I think it is a general statement that the sewer system must be completed as of a certain date."

Geo-Karis: "Okay, thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Okay, the Lady from...a...the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "A...Mr. Speaker, would the sponsor yield to a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Pierce: "Mr. Groesheimer, the trustees of the North Shore Sanitary District, are they elected or are they appointed?"

Groesheimer: "I believe they are appointed."

Pierce: "Now I understand the Metropolitan Sanitary District has a similar power but their trustees are elected by the people every two years for a six-year term. I question giving an appointed board the right to condemnation quick-take. A board that isn't at all responsive to the people as far as coming before the people for election. I don't know why they can't go through condemnation like every body else. Quick-take is an extraordinary remedy and it has its place, I suppose, although it is often abused. But I, for one, would hate to give an appointive board the power to condemn or to take by quick-take, the private





property of others and although they may aim this at easements, as you say, the bill before us includes all kinds of real estate, if they may decide they want to take in a hurry and take on a quick-take method before any court determination, so I intend to vote no on this bill."

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

Skinner: "Would the sponsor yield to a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Skinner: "Could you please tell me if this quick-take power will be limited to Lake County?"

Groesheimer: "In response to the question, this would not only be limited to Lake County, it would be limited to the North Shore Sanitary District and be further limited that they would only have this power through January 1, 1975 when the court order is terminated."

Skinner: "There is no way you can ease land in McHenry County, then?"

Groesheimer: "A...Representative Skinner, I assure you there is no way we can expand our powers into McHenry County. Thank you."

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

Maragos: "A..Mr. Groesheimer, when you were before the Judiciary 1 committee with this bill, you say you were going to amend it, which you did, by putting a time limit



to comply with the present court order that is hanging over the head of the district. Well, since that time stated and asked if you could possibly amend the bill to provide for this particular project only, by designation. What happened to that amendment, if any, was the purpose to amend it that time?"

Groesheimer: "We had hoped to limit it to the project it also, but when we check into the legality, it was the opinion and the consensus of those checking it that it would have been unconstitutional to put in this type of legislation, some form of limited project. We also had the problem that we couldn't get an accurate description of this project because of the scope and nature of the work involved. So as there is only one possibility of this particular work going on because there is only one project going on in Lake County as pertains to the North Shore Sanitary District, we let it stand on the time limitation, rather than the project limitation."

Maragos: "Is this, as you said, only easement powers that we are trying to have, or is this also going to take land and condemn it fully?"

Groesheimer: "I believe the way the bill reads right now, it would give them full power. But as a practical matter, the sanitary district needs the easement power."

Maragos: "One more question. Assuming this bill does not pass, what will be the status then of the district's position



on what the court, or in what, or can they do something with this project without using the necessity of this legislation?"

Groesheimer: "I'm advised by the Executive Director of the North Shore Sanitary District that if this bill does not pass, there is absolutely no hope whatsoever of complying with the rather rigid standards as applied to the North Shore Sanitary District by the court. They have set up an entire criteria and a date when we must comply and the property owners are holding out on this and will not talk settlement with us and thereby maintaining their property in their possession and we cannot proceed with our construction during the favorable construction months."

Maragos: "One more question, I'm sorry I...what will the penalties be if they do not comply with the court order?"

Groesheimer: "It is my understanding that the sanctions taken can be in the nature of fines on a daily basis. The dollar amount I'm not actually sure of. Something in the area of several thousand dollars a day."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I am going to support this bill even though I had some questions about it. Because of the fact that we all are supposed to be pollution control minded and as a result, from the statements that have been made by Representative Groesheimer in committee and on the floor of this House, I think they need this very badly and even though, generally, I'm



against the quick-take, as long as it has a time limit on it I trust the word of this man who is a Representative in this House and he will not abuse his power, I will probably support this piece of legislation."

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

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, fellow members of the House. Should we destroy the Democratic processes in fear of one agency, our servant, and theoretically upon which we should maintain leadership? I think it is a sad state of affairs that this sanitary district can be fined \$10,000 a day for non-compliance for an agency we created that goes beyond control without any checking reign. Now, I'm going to help support the bill because of the dier need. I don't trust these people. Radical kooks or radical kooks, no matter where you find them. And so I intend to help my fellow representatives, but I want you to stop and think of what we have created here that influences and mandates against the entire sanitary district and I don't know how many thousands of people without any regress or without any mercy."

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

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

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Jaffe: "Ron, isn't it true...isn't it true that they can take land outside of the borders of their district?"



Groesheimer: "I'm sorry I couldn't hear the question."

Jaffe: "Now isn't it true, we discussed this in Committee and you stated, at that time, and as I recall this bill, that they could take land outside the borders of the sanitary district."

Groesheimer: "Well, to answer that directly as a possibility they could always expand the district before January 1, 1975 and thereby using the powers outside the present district, but this would strictly be a possibility and not a probability because we are fiat of money at the present time to do anything other than the very limited projects to complete the terms of the court order. So that even though this is a possibility, I can tell you as a practical matter, our sanitary district is in no position in any direction other than merely complying with a rather restrictive court order."

Jaffe: "Well, I still don't think you answered my question. Can't they, under this bill, take land outside the borders of the sanitary district? All you have to do is give me a simply yes or no."

Groesheimer: "As an attorney, I don't think I have a simple yes or no for any answer. But I would say as a possibility yes, as a probability no."

Jaffe: "Well I would suggest to you that if you read the bill, which I know you may have, that the answer is yes that they can take land outside of their own borders and



I think that this is a very bad precedent and I intend to vote against this bill."

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

Groesheimer: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to respond to Representative Pierce's comment with regard to the authority given the North Shore Sanitary District. I am advised that this is not a unique power given to an appointed board, that the Greater St. Louis Metropolitan Airport Authority, which is appointed, also has a similar power. I would also say that as the Chicago Metropolitan Sanitary District, even though it may be elected, was given this power last year, so that it could comply with various terms and orders of court and other directives. I think this is a prerequisite to the completion of our project in our area and I would again emphasize this is extremely limited. It is limited only to January 1, 1975. It will apply only to the project that we are working on now even though it doesn't say that in so many words in the bill, as a practical matter, we are limited by financing and all we are trying to do is comply with the court order directing us that we must have these affluent standards in complete production by January 1, 1975. I would urge your support for a very important bill to our local area."

Arthur Telcser: "The question is shall House Bill 652 pass?"



All those in favor signify by voting aye, the opposed by voting no. The Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, inasmuch as I live in the same district as my co-sponsor, the sponsor of this bill, and we do need it in our area for the particular project involved, would like to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill."

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

Matejevich: "Mr. Speaker, as a third member of the district, I've often come on the floor of this House and argued against quick-take, I can't in good conscience, even though it is for my district, vote for the bill and would vote against it."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? A...Jim Houlihan, no. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Groesheimer, to explain his vote."

Groesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I would again emphasize the fact that this a very very limited power given only for the purpose of complying with a court order which has been entered against our sanitary district. It is my understanding that we are the only sanitary district in the State where the action was taken and you will recall the League of Women Voters filed an action in court against the North Shore Sanitary District, it went all the way through to the Supreme Court of Illinois, we are the only sanitary district in the State



of Illinois under this rather strict and rigid rules of court to comply by a definite time. This is the only reason that we are asking for this authority. Normally, we would comply with the standard type of condemnation proceedings, but these are just not the type of procedures that will allow us to comply with the court order. We drastically need this in our area, it is a matter of millions of dollars to us. Everyday we delay, costs go up and we must comply with the court order, we are only asking for your consideration to this rather small and limited area of East Lake County."

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

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, during the explanation of this vote, the noise has been very very loud on the floor. I'm quite convinced that most of us here have not been listening to the explanation of this bill or we would understand the plight that these people in Lake County and we would be voting green. Now, I do wish that those of you who are not voting would inform yourself as soon as you can so that you will know that these people must have this bill in order to do what the court says they must do. If they can't have this bill, then the people who own this property are going to have to go through, are going to have to set there and demand exorbitant prices for the property. They'll be forced to pay it if they meet the court order, and if they do not





meet the court order, then they are going to be penalized very very heavily. It seems to me that if we had been paying attention, we'd be voting green. This is a very limited bill, it only applies as long as the court order is in effect and when the court order expires, they'll no longer need this power, they will no longer have it. I would hope that you could find out what the bill does and if you do this I'm convinced that you'd be for it."

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

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I wish the sponsor would stand up so I could get a nod of his head one way or the other so I don't violate the rules of this House. I did understand the Gentleman to say that the League of Women Voters was opposed to this type of legislation and filed a suit. If that is not correct,....a...that isn't correct. Okay, thank you Mr. Speaker."

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

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that in the next four to six weeks, we are going to be seeing an awful lot of bills on creeks and bridges and study commissions and people that have local problems and measure interests. In the past it seems to me that we have been responsive to any number of people who had those local problems. Here, I think we have got four or five of our Representatives from the same area, who have a severe local problem that is really not



much different from those who vote a few weeks hence that we've already seen come out of committee when, downstate, for example, somebody needs a creek appropriation, I think all of us have seen this kind of bill before and this time, in this case, it seems to me the merits are even stronger. It seems to me that we could easily give Lake County, of which I represent no part, but it seems to me we could easily give Lake County some consideration in this area."

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

Borchers: "I would like to explain my vote. In doing so, maybe get a couple of lights changed, I hope I can. I see a couple of liberals up there. Real good liberals who helped this matter over on us that are now turning around and refusing to help a community out of the very trouble they contributed to. I see some of my very good conservative friends voting red up there that I hope will reconsider. I tell them now that it pains me no end to have to vote green on this and help these people who, through no fault of their own, are in the position they are. But I think we should because it is also a lesson to us all what we can get into by the haste with which we have operated in the past in granting power to one agency in this government who have unjustly used them against these particular people. Now as far as the League of Women



Voters is concerned, it seems mighty strange that they are the instigators of this action and help the people into the position they are so I think we should consider all aspect of this and have a few of the conservatives up there change green, not because they want to help the E.P.A., but they want to help the people in need and the liberals that are up there who got us all into this kind of a mess to atone a little bit for their action."

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

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I went over this with the sponsor when it was on Second Reading. He assured me that the quick-take portion of this bill was only for the duration that they needed it to comply with the E.P.A. I think it is a good bill and ought to be voted out of this House."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all....the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I don't know what kind of deals have been made between the Republicans in Lake County and the Democrats in Cook County, but let me tell you this, John Matejevich and I haven't made any deals, because the people in our area don't want the North Shore Sanitary District seizing their land without a court hearing. Now I don't know what this has to do with the Lake Michigan Bill of Rights or scenic rivers or what deal it has to do with. We haven't agreed to this. We don't want it. The



people in our district don't want it. This district is unresponsive. It is appointed by the county board. It is made up of former Republican precinct committeemen. They want to retire them. Like in Cook County, they put them on the county board. In Lake County, they put them on the North Shore Sanitary District. If you want to seize our property fine. And I'll tell the Gentleman from Macon one thing too. The Environmental Protection Act was sponsored into law by Governor Ogilvie, a Republican. It was passed by this House, which is Republican and by the Senate, which is very Republican back in 1970. Republicans in both Houses passed the Environmental Protection Act, not Democrats, not liberals, or whatever else he wants to call it. Not only that, but the a...but the a... Director of the Environmental Protection Agency the last few years, has been a former Republican member of this House of Representatives. This isn't a Republican-Democrat issue, its government seizing people's private property. If that's what you want, vote for the bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The Lady from Lake on a point of personal privilege, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am sure the prior speaker did not really mean all that he said. I know of no deals, I have not been a part of any deal and I am one of the members from Lake County here. I am supporting this bill because we really need it in our



area. And believe me, Dan, much as I love you, I'm telling you the truth."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this questions 110 ayes, 18 nays, and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 656."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 656. A Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act to empower counties to acquire, own, construct, manage, maintain, and operate and lease airports. Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, This bill....this bill is an attempt to resolve a long standing conflict between DuPage and Kane Counties regarding the DuPage County Airport. It amends the 1941 Airport Act under which there are eight airports in the State of Illinois. This amendment precludes the runway length of the DuPage County Airport, now at 4000 feet, to be limited to 5400 feet to allow for safety factors plus the difference in elevation and temperature differential needed by the aeronautics department, adding 400 more feet for a total of 5400 feet altogether. There are 19 co-sponsors of this bill from the Kane and DuPage County Representatives in this room. All of the municipalities involved have met. The Kane County Board, the Villages



of St. Charles, of Geneva, of Wayne, the School Board, which is building a \$10,000,000 school off the length of this runway. It is in support of this bill. I would urge very much that you would join with us from Kane and DuPage County in the restricting in the length of runways at Kane and DuPage County Airport and keeping it in general aviation field within the framework of 5400 feet.

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise,reluctantly, to oppose this piece of legislation. I'd like to point out to you that the bill, as it now stands, does allow DuPage County to increase the footage of their runways from 4000 feet to 5400 feet. Just to point out to you the problems that we have had in this particular area for the last eight years for you people that have been here for quite some time, you can recall an appropriation going through the House of Representatives for a half a million dollars for this. The local authorities have been fighting this particular extension for many years. Now we find that the local authorities have gotten together and agreed on a piece of legislation, but they left out one ingredient. And that is ingredient the people from this particular area. The area of DuPage County, the area of Kane County, and they oppose any bill that would allow an extension of these runways. There are



three runways involved. And you can feel well assured that if this piece of legislation becomes law, all three runways will go up to 5400 feet and the people in that area are opposed to this. And I'd appreciate very much, very much, if you would vote against this piece of legislation."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Originally, I was a co-sponsor of this bill, but after a number of discussions and after reading the bill thoroughly and after reflecting on the problems that the county has had in regard to an airport, I felt it incumbent not to remain as a co-sponsor. One of the clear problems that ought to be called to your attention is that this particular issue in DuPage County was perhaps the hottest issue during the time of the recent gubernatorial election. People were outraged by the notion that the failure of an airport to be built on the Lake, or the possibility of that, meant that other areas would have to be considered. Now, DuPage County appeared to be an obvious choice, inasmuch as its accessibility to the metropolitan area. So individuals in our county by the thousands hoped via petition, or through us in correspondence, about their resistance to such an a...a...despoiling of their area and an attack on what has been commonly a highly residential and rural area. Certainly the history of the airport is



clear. It is an airport designed to deal with private aircraft of small size and I think that is a big contribution and that is probably the way it should stay, but the minute we begin to extend the boundaries to...or the length of the runway to 5000 feet, we also have to take into consideration as to the future history of aircraft in our area. We are becoming more and more sophisticated in the landing of aircraft and the taking off of aircraft on shorter runways and I think although the intention of the sponsor is a good one, inasmuch as he felt he was limiting the growth and size of an airport to 5000 feet, inevitably, we will solve that problem and we'll have to come back to the legislature to try to reduce the number of feet of the runway in order to combat allowing large transports into DuPage County. So I think we ought to resist the bill and if there is really an interest in a third airport, I think we ought to have a thorough investigation as to the need and whether or not 5000 feet is sufficient or not. Maybe this isn't major runway size, presently, but I think the future holds poorly for us, if we support the bill so I ask for a no vote also on this bill.

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Friedland."

Friedland: "Mr. Speaker, would the sponsor yield for a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Friedland: "Representative Grotberg, would you a...help me





clear up a problem in my mind. With or without this piece of legislation, could the existing runway at DuPage Airport be extended to your knowledge?"

Grotberg: "Yes, this is the only legislation that has attempted to restrict the runway. They are now planning a 7500 foot land parcel to accomodate the full runway that would take freight, jets, and the whole business."

Friedland: "But this would limit it, right?"

Grotberg: "That is correct."

Friedland: "Thank you."

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

Grotberg: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, and those who rose to speak against this bill. I would remind you that I live in the shadow of this airport and I think I'm the only Representative here that does. I would remind you that a family of five people, who were my dearest friends, were killed trying to come into DuPage Airport for lack of instrument landing I.L.S. systems. The F.A.A. and safety regulations are requiring that DuPage Airport build an instrument landing system. That accounts for the next 1000 feet of runway. The 400 additional feet is a temperature and altitude differential. The ...the craft that can land on the extended runways are restricted to, according to the Department of Aeronautics, the small executive type craft and executive



type jets that are already landing at DuPage Airport. This bill merely takes this thing from the courts where it now resides and makes it something that all of this community can live with from hereon. I would very much appreciate your remembering the citizens of St. Charles and Geneva and those municipalities who have gotten together finally to resolve this long time problem. Thank you very much for your support."

Arthur Telcser: "The question is shall House Bill 656 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye, the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wished? Do you wish to explain your vote sir? The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Grotberg, to explain his vote."

Grotberg: "Once again, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, this does not effect any airport in the State of Illinois, except the DuPage County Airport. It is the first general attempt to resolve a two-county problem. It is not a partisan issue. Those who have spoken against it have several precincts in the nearby area. I can appreciate their stand. We, of St. Charles, desperately need this legislation."

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

Dyer: "I would like to speak in favor of this bill. In looking through my constituent mail, the latest communication I've had from the DuPage County Board, the Chairman of the County Board and the Chairman of the Public Works Committee is that this really an essential piece of legislation



to complete what the counties set out to do after painstaking negotiations with Kane County. The upset in that area was when the people thought there was going to be a 7000 foot runway. And the message I have from the County Board is that setting the limit on the runway at 5400 would relieve the fears of these people, they would recognize that there was going to be a limitation, and it would remove the objections to the airport. I really urge a green light because it would be very helpful to our area."

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

Bluthardt: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I just want to observe that it seems mighty strange that some years back this legislature enacted amendments to the Municipal Airports Code that gave the City of Chicago tremendous powers over surrounding municipalities. Powers to to a...take over the jurisdiction of those municipalities that may overlap. Powers to govern, powers to police, powers to extend runways. And one of those powers was to extend runways without any limitation whatsoever, so that we now have runways that run into other municipalities that are 10 and 12,000 feet long and yet we will not give DuPage and Kane 5400 feet long. I think it is mighty strange thinking."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 56 ayes, 23 nays, and



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

Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker, this bill dies on Wednesday?"

Arthur Telcser: "That's right."

Grotberg: "May I take postponed consideration?"

Arthur Telcser: "You certainly may, sir. The Gentleman has asked for postponed consideration. He is entitled to that under the rules. House Bill 656 will be put on the order of postponed consideration. House Bill 657."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 657. Redmond. A Bill for an Act to amend the Local Mass Transit District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Is Representative Redmond on the floor? Take it out of the record. House Bill 737."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 737. Getty. A Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 737 is a bill which will raise a second or subsequent conviction of carrying a concealed weapon from a misdemeanor, as it is now, to what it should be, a felony. I want to emphasize that in this bill the penalty is a Class 4 penalty that is one to three years in the penitentiary. As the law stands now, someone who is arrested and convicted ten times, could be sentenced to no more than a misdemeanor for penalty. In view of our rapidly growing crime rate,



in view of the situation that we have prevalent with the abuse of hand guns, I suggest that this bill is much needed and I ask for your support."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall House Bill 73.....the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Would the sponsor yield to a question, please?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Barnes: "Mike, just for my own edification. What is a Class 4 felony?"

Getty: "That is one to three years in the penitentiary. That is the lowest grade of felony. It is one grade above the highest grade of misdemeanor."

Arthur Telcser: "The question is shall House Bill 737 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye, the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. Hill, aye. Peters, aye. On this question there are 112 ayes. McGrew, aye. No nays, and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 749."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 749. A Bill for an Act imposing certain conditions."

Arthur Telcser: "If the Gentleman wishes to be recorded, if he comes up to the Clerk's desk, we'll get you on."

Jack O'Brien: "...upon mass transportation, carriers, receiving financial assistance from the State under this



program. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Catania: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House...a.. when this bill was amended on Second Reading, there was a slight mistake so that it was the original bill and not the amended bill that was amended. I ask leave of the House to return it to Second Reading to amend it correctly."

Arthur Telcser: "Does the Lady have leave?" Hearing no objections, House Bill 749 is on the Order of Second Reading. Are there any amendments?"

Catania: "Yes, I would like to withdraw amendment No. 2, moved to table amendment No. 2."

Arthur Telcser: "The Lady has moved to table Amendment No. 2 House Bill 749. All in favor of the motion signify by saying aye. Opposed, no. Are there further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 749."

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

Catania: "I propose the adoption of the Amendment No. 3 which inserts the word "registered" in lieu of the word "certified" in the bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Lady has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to House Bill 749. All in favor signify by saying aye, the opposed no. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading."

Catania: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. House Bill 749 was amended in committee so that it does not, as the original bill



reads, require a State audit mass transit carriers receiving money from the State. The amendment provided that all of these mass transit carriers need do is file an audit which has been conducted by a registered public accountant with the State. The bill further provides that such mass transit carriers file an affirmative action program with the Fair Employment Practices Commission and the Attorney General."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall House Bill 749 pass? All those in favor signify by voting....The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Juckett."

Juckett: "Would the Lady from Cook yield for a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "She indicates she will."

Juckett: "A...when you say an affirmative action program to insure equal employment opportunity, just what is that?"

Catania: "An affirmative action program is one that is adopted by a company that keeps out a large enough cross section of the population for its hiring that it does not discriminate on the basis of any of the characteristics listed in the bill."

Juckett: "Well now in other words, if someone from a minority group would come and ask for a job and they had job opportunities available and they refused to higher them then they would be in violation of this law. Is that correct?"

Catania: "Well, the person certainly would have to qualify



for the job."

Juckett: "Yeh, assuming they qualified, Now does this bill go further, does this bill say you not only must higher any qualified person who seeks employment and you have that employment available? Does it go further and state that you must actively seek people of minority groups and that you must say, train them or work with them, so that they would become qualified?"

Catania: "Well, this bill does not spell that out. But affirmative action is usually understood to mean that as far as the company can, it does seek out a broad enough cross section of the population that it is able to, within reasonable limits, which would be set certainly by the particular characteristics of the population in that company's own area, that that company would be able to employe people of a variety of ages, of both sexes, of a variety of races."

Juckett: "Okay, thank you Mr. Speaker."

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

Kempiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, would the Lady yield for a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "She indicates she will."

Kempiners: "Sue, on the filing of this affirmative action program, how complicated or sophisticated a procedure are we talking about."

Catania: "I think it depends...I think it depends on the size





company. I think for a small company which as routinely attempted to reach everyone in its immediate geographic area to employ and which has not had discriminatory promotion practices, would simply be a letter stating that this is the case and perhaps presenting some relevant statistics."

Kempiners: "If I have a small bus company which is on the verge of bankruptcy running through my district, which I have, and it only runs several buses a day, as you state, would it just be a letter to the appropriate person stating that they do not discriminate in their hiring practices so that it would not take an added employee which would throw the company into bankruptcy to complete this program?"

Catania: "I think that a letter is all that would be necessary if they met the requirements that I mentioned before."

Kempiners: "Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Does the Lady wish to close the debate? The question is shall House Bill 749 pass? All those in favor signifying by voting aye, the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wished? Getty, aye. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 109 ayes, no nays, and the bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Now we'll get back to House Bill 553. And it has been read a third time. The



Gentleman from Cook, Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, thank you Mr. Speaker for calling this bill a second time. It is true, as Representative Duester, that the amendment has considerably changed this bill and the amendments reads as follow in the Amendment No. 2, Section (E) for any employ or labor organizations who refuse to rehire a person discharged totally because of a person who has either been acquitted or the charges are dropped or not prosecuted. This happens all to often in many cases. The other portion is also for the employment agencies of labor organizations from automically disqualifying an exconvict for a job solely because this person has indicated conviction of a crime on a written application. The amendment provides that the employ must conduct a person interview with the applicant. As indicated bs the criminal record on the written application. Thereby the amendment incurs the employ to examine the exconvict's qualifications for the particular job. For a more through examination and review on the written application. Now in no way does this amendment force the employ to hire an exconvict. If the employ does not feel that the applicant has been rehabilitated, he has the option to refuse employment. This amendment suggests that one can rehabilitate for a crime and that the employ takes an extra step to give the exconvict fair consideration of the employment.



Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I urge your support for House Bill 553."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall House Bill 553 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye, the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. Telcser, aye. On this question there are 94 ayes, Mann, aye. 95 ayes, 9 nays, and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Now, we'll go back up the list on Third Reading and try and pick up some more of those that expire this week. House Bill 483."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 483, Shea. A bill for an Act creating the Local Government Tax Study Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave of the House to hear House Bill 485 at the same time. House Bill 485 is the appropriation bill for this Study Commission, \$5000 for the remainder of this fiscal year."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any objection? Hearing none, will the Clerk please read House Bill 485."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 485. A Bill for an Act making appropriation for Local Government Tax Study Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is



a Local Government Tax Study Commission. Its 8 members of the House, 8 members of the Senate, 4 public members. Its to study the effect of the loss of the personal property tax on units of local government and the effects of the real estate tax. I urge the support of the House."

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

Walsh: "Isn't this being done through another bill? Isn't there something substantially the same as this being offered in either a Senate or House bill?"

Shea: "Not to my knowledge, Bill, there was a joint revenue study commission by Senator Ted Clark, which was just members of the appropriations or revenue committees. There was a property tax revenue law study commission that was an interim committee that Senator Coulson and I were co-chairman of, but it a...to the best of my knowledge this is not being done by any other commission or joint study commission."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Walsh, proceed sir."

Walsh: "Well, he then, by resolution, is attempting to do pretty much the same thing that you are doing, is that correct?"

Shea: "No, I supported Ted Clark's resolution and Kenny Miller handled it. I think the two of them are different."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."



Peters: "Will the sponsor yield to a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Peters: "Jerry, do you envision that this commission will undertake a study of the real estate tax and how its applied and how we may make changes so that it might be more equitably administered or there might be different classifications or rates?"

Shea: "Well, there's a question and I think we answered that in the House with regards to classification. Just recently, when we affirmatively voted out REpresentative Skinner's constitutional amendment. Probably, the most perplexing subject that faced or faces this House since I've been here, is this continuous real estate problem, the multiplier, what's the function of the department, what's the function of the local assessor, a...where does the property tax fit into the sceme of things, and local financing, what bodies depend on it and why? I think there's a whole meriad of questions. And I think it is important enough to this General Assembly that we go ahead and find out what the answers to those problems are."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker..."

Arthur Telcser: "Yes sir."

Peters: "I wholeheartedly agree in what the sponsor is attempting to do here. Local governments are having a tremendous problem in making up funds that are lost because of the change in the personal property tax system



and I think the real estate taxpayers also are looking for some change in our system so that the law might be more equitably applied to them, and I am hopeful that this study commission will make recommendations for us in this regard and for those reasons support this."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the sponsor a question."

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates a yield."

Skinner: "Will the four public members be drawn from among those who are commonly known as taxeaters or from those who are known as taxpayers."

Shea: "I don't know, Hal. Where are you?"

Skinner: "I would say I'm more of a...I'm both."

Shea: "You're both?"

Skinner: "The question is ...."

Shea: "The four members are to be appointed by the leadership of the four houses."

Skinner: "Will they end up being public officials or will they end up being representatives of citizens taxpayers organizations, or what?"

Shea: "I would...I would presume that what we, or at least, if I were to ask the four leaders from each side of the aisle in each House, if they were to ask me what type of men I would prefer, I would say I'd like the caliber of men that understand the property tax system and could help



give us some guidance in how we use the property tax.

Skinner: "Thank you."

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

Dunne: "I have a question too." Jerry, how does this conflict what was trying to be accomplished with the a...recent property tax commission hearings that were carried on earlier in the year? I attended one in Chicago. I thought they were addressing themselves to that same problem."

Shea: "Well, that seems to be the problem. I've discussed it with Senator Harris. The Economical and Fiscal Commission of this House was...or the House and the Senate was set up to study State finance and I think, if we are going to get into the problem of local finance, we ought to have a commission to specifically do that. The Economic and Fiscal Commission, I think has got a big enough job cut out for it to worry about the revenue and the appropriations at the State level."

Dunne: "So you'll be going...with this Commission, you'll be going through a lot of the same exercise they did, however."

Shea: "Absolutely not, I have a copy of their draft proposal and all their material and I'm sure will be made available to the Commission along with the numerous studies that have been made over the years."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative



McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I arise in wholehearted support of this legislation. I think that it is high time that we sit down and study the problems of local taxation in regard to the local level. I think that the change that has been taking place over the last couple of years make it imperative that we address ourselves to this problem in a reasonable way. I think this is good legislation and I support it and urge your vote in support of it."

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

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would appreciate the support of the House in this legislation."

Arthur Telcser: "The question is shall House Bill 483 and 485 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting aye, the opposed by voting no. The Clerk will take two roll calls. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On these questions there are 134 ayes, 1 nay, and these bills having received the constitutional majority are hereby declared passed. House Bill 547."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 547. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

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





House, a...House Bill 547 amends a section of the Public Aid Code to prohibit the Illinois Department of Public Aid from making payments under the A.F.D.C. program on behalf of unborn fetuses. This bill provides a statutory basis for what is now a policy of the Illinois Department. But has, until this time, had no statutory requirement. Under the current policy A.F.D.C. benefits are not provided on behalf of unborn fetuses. In fact, it just means that a childless pregnant woman is not eligible for A.F.D.C. because the Department requires that a family have actual dependent children, not unborn fetuses in order to qualify for the program. I amended this bill in committee so that to safeguard Illinois' entitlement to federal funds for these families with dependent children and I a...passed it out of committee with a vote of 9 to 2 and I ask your support."

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

Mann: "Buz, I'm sorry, I was off the floor when you were explaining the vote...a...I mean the bill rather. Would you mind explaining it again?"

Yourell: "Yes, all this bill does, Bob, is to provide statutory basis for what is the policy of the Illinois Department of Public Aid."

Mann: "Which is?"

Yourell: "Which is not to provide, and the current policy benefits are not provided, on behalf of unborn fetuses."



Mann: "Are you saying that a...that in the case of an unborn fetus, what would the effect be on the woman?"

Yourell: "In fact, it just means that a childless pregnant woman is not eligible for A.F.D.C. because the Department of Public Aid requires that a family have actual dependent children, not unborn fetuses in order to qualify for the program."

Mann: "And your bill provides the statutory basis for what is already being done now by the Department of Public Aid that is denying, not paying for unborn fetuses?"

Yourell: "Right."

ARTHUR TELCSER: "The question is shall House Bill...the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Polk."

Polk: "Will the sponsor yield to a question."

ARTHUR TELCSER: "He indicates he will."

Polk: "Mr. Yourell, does this then state that a woman who is pregnant and on A.D.C. cannot receive funds for prenatal care?"

Yourell: "No, this bill was amended in committee to safeguard that requirement on federal funds for the aid to families with dependent children."

Polk: "She may receive funds for prenatal care?"

Yourell: "Right."

ARTHUR TELCSER: "Is there further discussion? The question is shall House Bill 547 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye, the opposed by voting no. Have all voted



wished? Brandt, aye. Take the record. On this question.  
..Duff, no. On this question there 112 ayes, 6 nays,  
Georgi, no. Geo-Karis, aye. Huskey, aye. And this  
bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby  
declared passed. Deavers, aye. House Bill 519."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 519. McMaster, A Bill for an Act  
to amend sections of an Act to provide to a law in  
relation to township organizations. Third REading of the  
Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative  
McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,  
House Bill 519 gives the authority for the Board of Town  
Auditors to authorize funds for the payment of activity  
and guidance centers for the elderly out of the township  
fund. I would ask for any questions and urge your  
support."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is  
shall House Bill....the Gentleman from McHenry,  
Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "There is a question of philosophy here involved  
in whether you trust people or not. There has been many  
movements in the past three years to take power away from  
the township collectors at the annual township meeting and  
give them to the township officials. Now, I think its...  
well, I'm personally opposed to this philosophy and have



a bill that has been introduced and will give all the powers that the legislature has taken away from the electors back to the electors. This bill, it seems to me, well...it seems to me that if people want to take away the power from the people that this bill certainly should be passed. If, on the other hand, they do not and think the people can be trusted to act responsibly at townships annual meetings, they should vote no."

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

Yourell: "Would the Gentleman respond to several questions?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Yourell: "Tom, Senate Bill 851 in 1971 provided that the section that your being repealed apply to all counties?"

McMaster: "I find it difficult to hear him. Would you a..."

Yourell: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 851 in 1971, Tom, are you acquainted with that bill?"

McMaster: "No I'm not."

Yourell: "It provided that the section we are talking about being repealed applied to all the counties. Formerly, it only applied to counties over half a million. Now in transferring this section that we are talking about, some important safeguards were omitted. And I would ask you these questions. Is it not true that formerly two-thirds of the electors at a township meeting were required to approved the appropriation?"

McMaster: "I believe you are right, Mr. Yourell."



Yourell: "Now, is it not true that this bill provides only that the town board of auditors do this?"

McMaster: "Yes, it is Mr. Yourell. It is true and I think that we have passed legislation in the past several years, many pieces in relation to this. I think the occasion arose from the fact that town meetings were quite often attended by very few people. It became a case that it was very easy to pack a town meeting with enough people to cut a township budget in half, or put it to the point where the township could not operate. I think that whether you are for or against the town meeting in regard to the Board of Auditors approval is a mute question."

Yourell: "Representative McMasters, is it not true that with this bill, what formerly was a position that a special notice had to be provided, if this action were to be taken now, under this bill, if this bill becomes law, that that notice is no longer necessary, and that it can just be brought up at any time and passed and wasn't it true that there was a limit on the funds to be expended in the amount of \$10,000?"

McMaster: "I believe this is true."

Yourell: "Now is there any limit on these funds now?"

McMaster: "I believe the same limit is in there."

Yourell: "And is this to be paid for out of revenue sharing or is it going to appear in the budget?"

McMaster: "I think it would have to appear in the budget, Mr.



Yourell. Whether it came out of revenue sharing or out of the township general fund, probably in my estimation, I think that the State Federal Revenue Sharing Act provided for payment to the elderly. So I would assume that it could come from that if we pass legislation which might come up later."

Yourell: "Well, is it your judgment or opinion that this will be passed out with a levy or is it just going to be grouped into a general expenditures or out of the general revenue fund that nobody will know what is going on?"

McMaster: "If you were acquainted with township budgets, Mr. Yourell, I'm sure that you have to put in a township budget the various places where you expect to expend that money. Therefore, I would assume that it would have to be an item within the general funds of the township budget."

Yourell: "Yeh, well I'm very well aware with township budgets and Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to speak to this bill." I'm very well acquainted with township budgets and I find in my own township that line items are generally depleted, not put in there, and that many items of expenditures and the appropriation ordinance is passed prior to the annual town meeting, are not put into the budget and are lumped into several ...one fund and they pay out of that fund all of these different things. Now, presently, in this



House there is a bill that will becoming before us in committee and on Third Reading, eventually, I'm sure, to take back to the township electors their perogative that was lost some years ago when they did away with the annual town meeting where the electors, which of course, was the principle argument for the continuation and substance of township government, that the electors via the grass roots argument, would be in charge of the township. But that was eliminated some years ago and now the town auditors do all of the voting on the appropriations and the expenditure of funds. So I'm a co-sponsor of that bill to give back to the townships the right and the responsibility of the town electors to have something to say about how their township is being run. So until that bill passes, I would hope that everybody would vote against these bills and see what happens to that bill which is the important bill in township government this year. I urge you to vote no on this bill."

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

Jaffe: "Would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Jaffe: "Tom, could you tell me under this bill, what is the definition of a guidance center."

McMaster: "This would be very difficult to define. I would



think it would involve counselling and general guidance for the elderly."

Jaffe: "In other words, what you are telling us is that these places do not have to be licensed, they don't have to be supervised by the State or by the county or anyone else, is that correct?"

McMaster: "I think that the authority to spend township funds on these various things already available, I think that all we are concerned with is the approval of the expenditure, whether it is with the Board of Audit or with the town meeting."

Jaffe: "Well, Tom... I...I...I...I have to say this, but you are not really answering my question. I could open up something in the back of my house and let it serve as a guidance center for old people under this bill and the township people could give me money for it, isn't that correct?"

McMaster: "I would doubt very much if this statement would be correct."

Jaffe: "Well, where would it be false? I mean, they don't have to be licensed. They don't have to be supervised, so I could in essence open up a guidance center in my back room and ask the township for money, and if the township was friendly to me they could actually give me that money and I don't see where you could look in the bill and tell me that that isn't the case."





McMaster: "Well, I'm not sure as far as the license requirements are concerned."

Jaffe: "Well, let me just say this, then I'm going to, of course, vote against this bill. It is another one of these township bills that want to preserve our cash forms of government and I think it is just bad from beginning to end and I urge everyone to vote no on this bill."

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

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as far as the right of approval of expenditure whether it is with the Board of Auditors or with the town meeting, I think it is something that will be decided by future bills. I think we have passed many pieces of legislation in this regard and I certainly feel that the expenditure of township funds for the elderly is a good practice, I would urge your support of the legislation."

ARTHUR TELCSER: "The question is shall House Bill 519 pass? All those in favor signify by saying aye, all opposed, by voting no. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 65 ayes, 26 nays, and this bill having failed to receive a constitutional majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 615."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 615. Londrigan. A Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative



Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a bill by which the municipal employees will received full reciprocity with the other State employees in their Acts. They are now receiving approximately 6 years towards reciprocity. This will permit them the alternative formula. It will give them full reciprocity. All of your municipal employees and the city and everyone that I know of support this bill, or at least, is not opposed to it. I know of no opposition and I ask for your support."

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

Kempiners: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Londrigan: "Yes."

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?"

Londrigan: "Yes."

Kempiners: "A...Representative Londrigan, I have a couple of questions. Does this apply, lets say, to a person who is working for a municipality and then goes to work for a junior college, is the type of reciprocity you are talking about? That the equity that they would have developed while working for the municipality would transfer to the other under the Pension Code?"

Londrigan: "That is right, that is the twelve or thirteen that are not reciprocal under the Act. This will join the municipal employees to this reciprocity with the other



twelve."

Kempiners: "Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The question is shall House Bill 615 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye, the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wished? Take the record, J. J. Wolf, aye. On this question there are 115 ayes, Kozubowski, aye, Lemke, aye, Leon, aye; no nays, and the bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Madigan, aye. Schoeberlein, aye. House Bill 23."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 23. J. J. Wolfe. An Act to provide for the specification of repaired products and services by repairmen and to provide penalties for violation thereof. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, what this bill does is require that any persons in the business of repair shall give an itemized receipt for all repairs, repairs listing parts and labor separately. There is one amendment on the bill which was put in at the request of the Attorney General giving injunctive relief and another section of that amendment was for the a...to relieve automotive industry who normally uses a work order sheet which contains the separation of parts and labor just to make sure that they would not be required to give an additional receipt. This bill is really, to some degree, supported



by an editorial on Channel 2 which has been primarily interested in television repairmen. It seems that that particular station, there news investigation team had set out nine black and white sets to nine different dealers in good working order except for a small diode, a 75 cent part, and the repairmen should have been able to spot this trouble in a short time, and the repair costs from the various nine different dealers varied from \$24 to \$38 dollars. And so while this bill is not primarily concerned with the television repairmen, the idea and constant business name that any member should know how much they are being charged for parts and for labor. I would solicit your support."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall House Bill..., the Lady from Adams, Representative Kent."

Kent: "Would the sponsor yield to a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Kent: "Has it been amended to have a limit so that the shoe man, the shoe repairman, is not covered?"

Wolf: "No it has not been amended. I know there was discussion earlier on a amount limit. However, there are numerous large corporations that seem to charge a flat rate, such as \$10, or \$8, even if you need a 15 cent part, and that is primarily, what we are trying to get at, at this bill, for the small consumer, the average citizen who goes down and has a small repair job done, which may take in 15, 20,



30 cent parts, and then get a flat rate charge of \$8,50 or \$9 or whatever it might be, so to answer your question, no, it has not been amended to limit the amount."

Kent: "Thank you."

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

Kosinski: "Will the sponsor yield for a question, please?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Kosinski: "Very selfishly in my particular business, if we repair a watch, will we be required to list the part that is used or the labor that is used?"

Wolf: "Not each part, but you will be required to list parts by....you're correct....parts and labor separately."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Craig."

Craig: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I realize, I think Jake, what you are trying to get at, but I happen to come from the rural area of downstate, and we, now are large implement dealers, our large car dealers, or our car dealers, they do this at the present time. But out in the rural area there, in the small towns where the farmers and people need a garage mechanic, where there is only one man that may be operating, or two at the most, I think you are going to put an undo hardship on him, if he's got to keep these books like this. Now we are quickly loosing the small town mechanic just as this thing for the records that they have to keep, and for that



matter, and I ....in my area, these people are all personally known by the individuals who go in there. And I don't believe they are supported by them because they are afraid of being cheated. And that's....for that reason I can't support this measure because I think you are really going to put out of business the small town garage man or mechanic that is really doing quite a service to a community and your large dealers in my area, they are already doing this anyway. It is just the small ones, and I think you are going to have fewer and fewer of them, and the one reason that some of the people in my area go to them is because of the cost. They are more reasonable because of the overhead that they don't have to take care and for that reason I have to oppose this bill."

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

Wolf: "Well, in response to the last Gentleman, a...I...I... think he possibly has the wrong concept of this bill. It doesn't require any record keeping whatsoever on this bill. And I did talk to the man at the corner gas station from my house and I ask him how he felt about such a bill, if it would inconvenience him and he said no, because what he normally does in the course of his business, when he makes out his receipt, he does say I put in a carburetor and whatever the amount was for the part and showing his labor separately, which he normally would have to do



because of the occupation tax and sales tax anyway, so he said it would not create any hardship on him and that is just a two-man gas station, two brothers that operate it and he felt that is would be a good idea and restore some of the public confidence in businessmen."

Arthur Telcser: "The question is shall House Bill 23 pass?

All those in favor signify by voting aye, the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wished? Getty, aye.

Skinner, aye. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 97 ayes, 14 nays, and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed." House Bill 627."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 627. B. B. Wolfe. An Act to provide into law in relation to contributory negligence. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Wolfe: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of the harshest rules of common law with respect to to torts is the doctrine of contributory negligence. Now, under the present law in the State of Illinois, a person sues for injury and damages, that action can be defeated, no matter how serious the injury or damage, by this doctrine called contributory negligence because its a defense and its a bar to any recovery whatsoever. In a recent Supreme Court case in the State of Illinois, in Mockey vs. Frelk, and for the lawyers, the



citation is 40 (Ill.) Second 193, our Supreme Court recognized the harshness of this doctrine, but on the appeal where the lawyers contested the constitutionality of the doctrine, the court there said that the doctrine should be disregarded in favor of a more modern comparative negligence doctrine, but felt compelled to defer to the legislature to make the change. Now the case was again reviewed in the United States District Court, in the United States District Court of Appeals for the 7th Circuit, the court there, under consideration again on the question of constitutionality, cited the Mockey case that was decided in the Illinois Supreme Court and said that the so called doctrine of contributory negligence is of course, regrettable, that the State of Illinois here bars one of its citizens so seriously injured from any recovery whatsoever simply because of its confined adherence to this cruel and antiquated doctrine inherited long ago from the courts of England and long since disregarded by that country. Two of the judges on the Appellate Court panel were from the State of Wisconsin in which the doctrine that I am here purposing has been in operation for a good number of years and that State has disregarded the contributory negligence doctrine. And there again the courts said in the United States District Court Case that if there is to be any change at all, it is hoped that the Illinois legislature would make the change in the best interest of its citizens, and I ask





you to support this much needed legislation."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall House Bill 627 pass? All those in ...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Will the sponsor yield...or will the sponsor answer a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Peters: "Representative Wolfe, is there anything before us now which would set up a comparative negligence statute or guideline?"

Wolfe: "This bill hopefully sets up the guidelines and the necessary jury instructions and is taken from the laws of three of the States of the United States, and we put together what we hope to be, is the best of these...of each of those laws."

Peters: "Now, Representative Wolfe, being a laymen and not always understanding the full impact of the law, but lets say my yard is fenced and I've got a dog in the yard..... and I've got a dog in the yard, and I've got a sign out there that says Beware of the Dog. You see the sign and you walk in and the dog takes a chunk out of you. I take it, right now, there is some contributory negligence on your part by having seen the sign, observed the danger, and walked in at any rate. Now would this remove that kind of a situation?"

Wolfe: "Well, you are talking about an area of the law that



is covered by a State statute. You are talking about two aspects. If the person is trespassing, the duty as an owner of the dog, and as an owner of that property are under a different duty than that in which you have an invitee invited on you premises under the same conditions. I would say that either the case where the party was a trespasser and not an invitee, there would be no liability.

Peters: "Bernie, let me ask you another question. Assuming a part of my sidewalk caves in, as it has, and I put up a little barracade with a light on it, you know, danger ahead, and somebody just doesn't pay attention and walks ahead, falls into the hole and twists his ankle. Now is there any contributory negligence on his part?"

Wolfe: "Where did this occur?"

Peters: "Let's say right in front of my house."

Wolfe: "On the city sidewalk?"

Peters: "Alright, let's say its either myself or the city, either way."

Wolfe: "Well, you have a different set of facts. If its a city sidewalk, there is an area of responsibility by the city. If the plaintiff is more negligent that the defendent, there is no recovery whatsoever."

Peters: "Alright then, Bernie, let me ask you this. Exactly what kind of..."

Wolfe: "This is a matter for a jury and a judge to determine."

Peters: "Alright, let me ask you this. What kind of a situation are you exactly attempting to give by avoiding



the particular defense of contributory negligence?"

Wolfe: "I'm trying to get at the cases where the plaintiff is only one degree or one per cent negligent than the law in this State says that that party cannot recover any damages whatsoever."

Peters: "So then what you are advocating here would be, if I'm not mistaken, somewhat of the system they have in Wisconsin?"

Wolfe: "I just said that Wisconsin is one of the States in connection with the degrees of comparative negligence and it has worked very well in that State."

Peters: "Thank you, Judge."

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

Mugalian: "Will the sponsor yield to a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Mugalian: "What effect or impact will no fault legislation have on your proposal, if any?"

Wolfe: "This is a half-way house for the no fault doctrine and would implement any no fault legislation which this House and the Senate jointly agree to pass."

ARTHUR TELCSE: "The question is shall House Bill 627 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye, the opposed by voting no. Better talk fast, Bernie." The Gentleman from Cook, Representative B. B. Wolfe, to explain his vote."

Wolfe: "Briefly, to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker, was before this House last session and passed out by 128 votes. The



Supreme Court of this State and the Appellate Court of the United States have both stated that the existing doctrine is harsh and unfair. Both courts have indicated that it is up to the General Assembly to make a change in the law and this is one area in which the Supreme Court and the United States District Court of Appeals did not assume to legislate in a area of law that requires legislation. And I would ask each member of this House to seriously consider that and they have directly replaced the burden and responsibility of a change in the law on the General Assembly. And both have indicated that it would be in the best interest of the citizens of this State that this law be changed."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill as a co-sponsor. The law, as it is now, on contributory negligence, if the plaintiff, the one who brings the suit, is 5%, 10%, or any percent negligent, he can recover nothing. Now the defendant can be very very negligent, but if the jury feels that the plaintiff is at all negligent, he can recover nothing. Under this comparative doctrine of negligence, if he is 10%, 50% or whatever percent negligent, he will be able to recover that percent of the whole. Now this seems fair and equitable and it is done in many other States. I believe, if I remember correctly, this bill passed out of this House before. I



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

think it is good legislation, it is equitable and fair to all, and I suggest that we support it."

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

Wolfe: "Motion to postpone consideration, there is no point in belaboring this with that..."

Arthur Telcser: "Okay, the Gentleman asks that House Bill 627 be put on the order of postponed consideration. He has that right and will be so placed on the order of postponed consideration. Now it is the intention of the Chair to adjourn around the hour of 5:30 in order for us to make the German dinner, so maybe we can take a couple of more bills or motions. Do you want to get your bill first, Bernie? Your next bill?"

Wolfe: "Hold that bill and take the motion because otherwise we may lose 675."

Arthur Telcser: "Okay, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolfe that the provisions of Rule 37 be suspended for the purpose of extending for one day, House Bill 675, until a day certain made haste. Is there any discussion? If not, all those in favor...all those in favor signify by voting aye...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Is the sponsor now here, Mr. Speaker, is that..."

Arthur Telcser: "That's right, All those in favor signify by voting aye, the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wished? Macdonald, aye. Take the record. One more, Ryan, aye. Porter, aye. Leinenweber, aye. R. Dunne, aye."



On this question, there are 112 ayes, no nays and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Now Representative Wolfe, did you wish to have me call House Bill 628?"

Wolfe: "Hold it."

Arthur Telcser: "Hold it? Okay, House Bill 712."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 712. An Act to amend the Probate Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this bill is a bill that merely provides that administrators to bonus non and administrators to aswill as nec will have the same powers under a will as an executor would have. This is solely and only so that the will of a testator will not be thwarted by fact that his executor is deceased or unable and willing to serve. It grants no powers that an executor would not have. I request the vote of the House in the passage of this measure."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall House Bill 712 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye, the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. Thompson, aye. Lundy, present. Lemke, aye. On this question there are 130 ayes, 1 nay, 1 answering present. And this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 739."



Fred Selcke: "House Bill 739, McMaster, A Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to township organization. Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 739 authorizes the Board of Auditors...to a Township Auditors to contract with respect to expenditures of revenue sharing funds for purposes defined as priority expenditures under Federal, State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972. This would give the township the right to extend their federal revenue sharing money in cooperation with another local governmental candidate as long as it conforms to the requirements of the State Federal Revenue Sharing Act. I would urge your support of the bill."

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

Jaffe: "Tom, I hate to do this do you, but what powers do they not have at the present time?"

McMaster: "Erin, I think this is involved in the expenditure of federal revenue sharing funds. And there is a question by some State's attorneys whether the township has the right to share cooperatively with the Federal Revenue Sharing Fund. I personally think that perhaps we need this legislation in order to authorize the sharing of



Federal Revenue Sharing Funds on the local level."

Jaffe: "Well, let me understand you. You are not really worried about the Federal Revenue Sharing Funds because they already have that power to it inofficially, but what you are worried about is the power to do it collectively? Is that what you are worried about?"

McMaster: "Yes, cooperatively, Erin. With other local entities."

Jaffe: "Yes, well I still don't really understand the thrux of the bill. In other words, now two townships that get together, or a township or a city, or a township or an individual, a township or an association? I'm looking at this bill and I really can't make heads or tails out of it. Could you..."

McMaster: "I do not think it would be a township and an individual or a township and an association. A township and a city or village, yes."

Jaffe: "Well I ask to differ with you because under...if you could clarify this for me, it says the Board may enter into any cooperative agreement or contract with any other ...."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear him."

Jaffe: "It says that they may enter into a cooperative agreement or contract with any other governmental entity and the contract and otherwise associate with any individual, associations and corporations. So a...where do you draw the line. I just don't like the way this is





worded. I think this gives the town law too much power."

McMaster: "Well, I think this is taken care of in regards to the requirements of the State Federal Revenue Sharing Act, Erin." I think the requirements of that Act are stiff enough so they cannot go beyond the direction of this."

Jaffe: "Well, Tom, that is exactly it. I think they have the power to do that which they have to do under federal revenue sharing and I don't think that this law really means anything except it gives them additional powers to contract what they don't have a right to contract and, at least that is my understanding of it, and if you could clarify it differently, I would appreciate it."

McMaster: "Well, Erin, a...the question is by some of the State's attorneys or the Attorney General's office, it has been told to me that the Attorney General had said that we needed this clarification. I'm not sure whether he has or not, but this is the rumor that has been brought to me. I certainly feel...I see no harm in stating that as long as this conforms to the State, Local, Federal Revenue Sharing Act, I can see no harm in it. Some of the State's attorneys seem to think that we need it."

Jaffe: "Well, Tom, as I say, I still don't understand it. I don't think that the law really does anything more than give the township a little bit more power and I'm just going to have to probably either vote present or no on it."

McMaster: "I think this is merely a clarification of the Local Revenue Sharing with the State Federal in conformance



Act, Erin."

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

Shea: "Will the sponsor yield for questions?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Shea: "Tom, there were in the Act setting up township government, there is enumerated certain powers that you can levy for. In the Act under Federal Revenue Sharing, there are certain things that federal revenue sharing money can be used for. Now some of the things that federal revenue sharing money can be used for are outside of the scope of what a township can levy for. Is that correct?"

McMaster: "I would assume that you are right."

Shea: "Then, under this bill, what thks would do would expand the power of township government to use federal revenue sharing money to contract with, as I read the bill, other units of government, individuals, association, or private corporations, to do any of the things that are allowable with federal revenue sharing money."

McMaster: "I believe that is right."

Shea: "So you are, in effect, tremendously expanding the powers of townships?"

McMaster: "Only in reference to the federal revenue sharing fund."

Shea: "Well, yeh, but some of my townships get a quarter of a million dollars."

McMaster: "I would not know what you are talking about, Jerry."



Shea: "Thank you."

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

Leinenweber: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield for a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Leinenweber: "Representative McMasters, is one of the purposes for which revenue sharing funds under this bill, their townships are going to spend money, for example, in contributions to the county forest reserve district?"

McMasters: "I do not believe that forest reserve districts would be under the pervue of the State Federal Revenue Sharing."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

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

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Tom, a...would you respond to a couple of questions?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Yourell: "A...the governmental entity mentioned in the bill, does that mean that that governmental entity must be a share too, of the federal revenue sharing funds?"

McMaster: "I question that exactly, Buz, but I...certainly there might be some of the expenditures possible under federal revenue sharing where the local entity might not be a sharer of federal...state revenue sharing funds."



Yourell: "Well, if that is not the case, then the question just previously asked about whether the forest reserve district can share with a township in promoting some kind of land acquisition or other purpose...a...I don't think that this bill covers that and that they could, very well, enter into an agreement or a contract with a governmental unit not presently receiving federal revenue sharing funds." The thing that discouraged me about the bill, Tom, and I'm not particular opposed to the bill, except in my township they are going to get in excess of \$300,000 in revenue sharing according to reports that I've heard. And it says that a...remember those bills that we passed out about the police contracting with the township, making contracts for police protection, but this bill says associate with individuals. Can you explain that to me?"

McMaster: "Well, Buz, I think the program involved is applicable under the State Federal Fiscal Assistance Act. You remember there are somewhat nine priorities expenditures allowable. Isn't this true?"

Yourell: "Well, everything is covered except their vacation." Because you just changed the titles and the only way you can spend revenue sharing funding monies is for education. Now, I'm going to vote for the bill, Tom, and I think it is totally unnecessary because Section 10 of Article 7 of the Constitution already gives the governmental cooperation in that Article, that you can share monies



from Federal Revenue Sharing and Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972. But I would hope that you take a good look at that association. Maybe we can do something with it in the Senate."

McMaster: "This I would be agreeable to, Buz, and I certainly feel that there is some question whether the right is given under our 1970 Constitution. But as I say, there is this disagreement by the State's attorney that whether that specific authority is given. This is the reason that they feel that this bill is necessary that we specifically do it."

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

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentleman, we've had townships and local municipalities in the area which I represent that have wanted to get together in a cooperative adventure on some of the several expenditures and so I had occasion to pull out the local government section of the Revenue Sharing Act and see what this might provide for them. But I think the only expansion that we find under this Act is in the area of non capital expenditures. Under capital expenditures, the revenue sharing fund can only be spent for those things, that in general, it says are specifically are authorized to the local government at the present time. So I don't think this bill probably is very broad, but I think there are some areas in which we need this clarification. To be sure that there can be



some cooperative interest in those things that are authorized and those few non capital expenditures that are additionally called priority expenditures under the Federal Revenue Sharing Act and so I would recommend that we vote for the bill."

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

Alsup: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I can see a very necessary use for this and that would be where two, three, or four townships wants to establish a nursing home in the area around a small town. And often times they get contributions from some of the citizens and set up a non-profit home for the aged. Most of these people don't like to put their aged in a home along way from home. They like to have them close enough that they can drive and see their parents or their aunts or their uncles and the old people like to stay in the small communities in which they are familiar. And so if it could be used for this purpose, I think its a most worthwhile bill."

ARTHUR Telcser: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: Mr. Speaker, 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, and the Gentleman's motion prevails and Representative McMasters to close."

McMasters: "A Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the HOUSE,



I believe we have had sufficient discussion on this legislation, I would urge your vote in support of it."

Arthur Telcser: "The question is shall House Bill 739 pass? All those in favor signify by votin aye, the opposed by voting no. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Duester, to explain his vote."

Duester: "A..Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In a way, this is a good bill which should be supported, it is designed to correct an error made by Congress in that they sent all this Federal Revenue Sharing money out here to Illinois and gave the townships and municipalities directions on how it should be used, but the Congressmen didn't realize that some of the townships, the power they had was not really too clear, so this bill makes it clear that all the purposes, such as public transportation, could be supported by the townships. And it is conceivable that a Cook County township could, after this bill is passed, enter into a support of mass transit and I support this bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell. Telcser, aye on this bill."

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'm going to vote for this bill because the sponsor has indicated to me that he may amend it to take out that word"individual" that appears so prominently in the bill because I'm afraid that we are going to have collectors back in the townships and the salary of that collector could very well be paid through



Federal Revenue Sharing. You know, the Supreme Court has outlawed and ruled against township collectors and the fees by which they were paid. So with that thought in mind, Representative McMasters, I'm going to vote for the bill and I hope we can get together with that amendment so that township collectors will not have their salaries paid through federal revenue sharing. Getty, aye. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. Record Representative Getty as voting aye. Maragos, present. On this question there are 103 ayes, 8 nays, well, around 3 answering present. If you wish to be recorded present come to the Clerk, he'll do it. And this bill... Lechowicz, present. And this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Fary, present. Okay, messages for the Senate."

Fred Selcke: "Messages from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm instructed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House for the adoption of the following Resolutions. House Joint Resolution 42, concurred in by the Senate May 3rd, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker I'm instructed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the following Joint Resolution to which Joint House Resolution 41 concurred in by the Senate May 3rd, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm





directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed a Bill with the following title and the passage of which I'm asked to ask the concurrence of the House. Senate Bill 145, 183, 184, 186, 232, 233, 244, 245, 252, 256, 258, 262, 457, passed by the Senate, May 3rd, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary."

Arthur Telcser: "Agreed Resolutions. Do we have an Agreed Resolution? Did you check with the Democrat Representative Shea and Choate to agree. Get it agreed? You don't, its not agreed."

Fred Selcke: "House Resolution 287, Juckett. "

Arthur Telcser: "Is that okay? Okay, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "This is another Agreed Resolution, Mr. Speaker, and it commends the honorable Paul S. Badger, the Committee Clerk of the City of Park Ridge. upon his retirement and for his many years of distinguished service to his community, his State, his nation, and I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolution."

Arthur Telcser: "A...is there any discussion. We then move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolution No. 287. All in favor signify by saying aye, the opposed by saying no. The Resolution is adopted. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Now, Mr. Speaker, pretty much along the same line, I've been asked to read the following, a motion by the



Illinois Legislative Correspondents Association. And the motion is to take from your wallet, or purses, as is the case of the guy in front of me and place on the desk of Shelby Vasconcelles the sum of \$20 for your ticket to the Illinois Legislative Correspondent Association's dinner and Gridiron Show at the St. Nick this Wednesday night. If you miss this annual event, you may also miss your big chance to make a bundle on a slander suit. To heighten the suspense, the press corps has offered unequal time for a rebuttal to the three other branches of government. This is an emergency measure and requires no votes, just cash. See Shelby or Les Pauley in the Press Room to get on this important roll call."

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

Murphy: "The fellows should be so happy that we come, they should give us a free ticket, I move that that motion lies on the table."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh. Representative Lechowicz, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, just to make an announcement to Democratic members of the Appropriations Committee, we were supposed to meet immediately after adjournment, but due to the dinner this evening, we will postpone that meeting until tomorrow morning at 8:30 in Room M-4. If that is agreeable with them."



Arthur Telcser: "Are there any further announcements? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn until tomorrow morning at 9:30 A.M. for regular session. There will be no perfunctory tomorrow."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved that the House do stand adjourned until the hour of 9:30 A.M., Tuesday, May 8th. All those in favor signify by saying aye, the opposed no. The House stands adjourned until 9:30 A.M. regular session."

