

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FIFTY-FIRST LEGISLATIVE DAY

MAY 9, 1973

10:00 O'CLOCK A.M.

THE HONORABLE W. ROBERT BLAIR, SPEAKER

IN THE CHAIR



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

A Roll Call for attendance was taken and indicated that all were present with the exception of the following:

- Representative Ben C. Blades - illness;
- Representative Peter C. Granata - illness;
- Representative Merle K. Anderson - no reason given.



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The House will be in Session. The

invocation will be by Doctor Johnson."

Doctor Johnson: "We pray. In the words of the sonnets, Oh, God, be gracious to us and bless us this day. Make your face shine upon us, that your way may be known and your saving power realized among us. Let us praise your name oh, God, and rejoice because you execute judgement with equity among all your people. Let us praise your name, Oh, God, because the earth continues to yield its increase and because you have richly blessed us in the past. Let the very ends of the earth stand in awe and reverence before you and continue to cause the light of your favor to shine upon us in all we undertake and accomplish this day. Be pleased, also, almighty God, to look with favor upon all the Members of this Assembly who stand in particular need of your preserving grace. We ask you to look especially again Representative Ben Blades and according to your most gracious will, deal with him as a heavenly position, granted all who are absent from us, might speedily return to their duties and our midst. Bless it be the name of the Lord, God. Amen."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Roll Call for attendance." Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, will the records show that Representatives Blades and Granata are absent because of illness?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The Record will so indicate. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."



Shea: "Would the Record indicate that Representative Harold Stedelin is absent because of illness?" He's back."

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

F. B. Selcke: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the following Joint Resolution, in the adoption I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House. Senate Joint Resolution Number 37, adopted by the Senate May, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Ah.... Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed a Bill with the following title, and passage I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House, Senate Bill 388, 389, 390, 392, 394, 395, 403 and 410. Passed the Senate May, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed a Bill with the following title, passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House. Senate Bills 419, 1141. Passed the Senate May, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed a Bill with the following title, passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House. Senate Bill 400, 436, 437, 438, 439, 446, passed by the Senate May 8, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. No further messages."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Introductions."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 1928. Matijevich. Makes certain transfers within the totals appropriated and an act to make an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expenses, Department of Mental Health. First Reading of the Bill."

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

F. B. Selcke: "House Resolution 290. Gene Hoffman. House Resolution 293. Borchers. Where did Jack go? We have to have copies made of this."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, these are the agreed resolutions. The first one, House Resolution 290 congratulates Mrs. Velma Craine on her distinguished public service as vice chairmen of the Illinois School Problems Commission. House Resolution 293 requests an investigation of the activities of Federal agents from the Bureau of Narcotics who terrorized Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Giglotto of Collinsville, and it requests that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to Mr. Elliott Richardson, Attorney General of the United States and to each Member of the Illinois delegation to the Congress of the United States. And I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, discussion? Gentleman from



McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members of this General Assembly understand how large a problem this is. I'm not certain it was agents from the Bureau of Narcotics who pounded on my door the day I moved into the apartment last July, but they did identify themselves as Treasury agents. I did call all of the Treasury numbers in the City of Chicago, and four days later, I was informed indeed it was Treasury agents banging on my door with my wife standing terrified in the kitchen. Apparently, they couldn't tell the difference between Apartment A and Apart.... excuse me, Apartment E and Apartment F, because subsequently, the inhabitants of Apartment E, at least the male inhabitant, was arrested in Detroit by Treasury agents. Now it seems to me this is extremely sloppy to say the least. Fortunately, what happened to these people in Collinsville did not happen to my wife or to myself, but it seems to me that investigation is certainly in order."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, question's on the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor, say 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. For what purpose does the gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, arise?"

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, fellow members of the House, I did my level best to get around and get everybody's signature, so that they could actually be on that Resolution, but I'm sure I missed a few, so if anybody would like to get



on it, well, inform the Clerk of the House and I'm sure this could be taken care of."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Senate Bills. First Reading."

F. B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 309. An Act authorizing and directing the Department of Transportation to make an engineering examination in DuPage County. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 319. An Act to amend an Act relating to telecommunications service. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 357. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 359. Appropriation for expenses of Data Information Systems Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 360. An Act creating Data Information Systems Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 365. An Act creating Anemia Radication Act. First Reading of the Bill."

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

F. B. Selcke: "We've got one more, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 376. An Act to amend the brucellosis among swine act. First Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Houses Bills. Second Reading."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 510. McMaster. Is he here? You going to take it for him? Ah.... An Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amend House Bill 510, Page 1, by inserting between lines 20 and 21, the following the so forth."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I move the amendment, the adoption of amendment number 1."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question's on the gentleman on the question of the Amendment, Mr. Wolf, J. J."

J. J. Wolf: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear what the explanation of the amendment was, and I thought it would be nice to know what it was before we vote on it."

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

Skinner: "There are two purposes for the Amendment Number 1 to House Bill 510. One is a Catch-22 clause, which says that if the assessor fails to pick up a new piece of property that he may pick it up the next year, and back tax it or back assess it, if you will. The second one is one requiring any municipality or county that issues occupancy permits to send them promptly to the assessor, so that he will know when occupancy occurs."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Yeow, ah. . . . Representative Skinner, I'm not so sure how you do what you said the amendment wants to do. I assume it's an amendment to Section 525, the Revenue Act."

Skinner: "Yes, Sir."

Shea: "All right, that Section now says that the assessor may only go in where there's quadrangular assessment districts"



only may go into a quadrangular assessment district, not up for reassessment only if there's been a change in the property. You're saying now that he may go in if there's a change and if he finds out it's over a year, he can go back and tax for the preceding tax year?"

Skinner: "The ah..... purpose of this, at the present time, the law reads that the assessment is made as of one date. They take a slice, well, sort of a slice of the ah.... property as of January 1. If it's filled, then it gets assessed for the preceding year. What this Bill attempts to do is put property on the tax rolls that are built after January 1 of year 1, but before January 1 of year 2. And at the specific request of the Cook County assessor, we are putting, because... and the explanation was that the ah.... they closed the.... you can't predict when the books are going to be closed. In order to alleviate any problems with cycling; that is, books being closed earlier one year than another year, they are being given the ability to assess for let's say five months and one year and maybe.... excuse me, maybe eleven months in one year and thirteen months in the other year according to this formula." Should I try again?"

Shea: "I don't see how you can assess 13 and 11, but I'll take a look at it and see."

Skinner: "Well, you see, the books, if the books were turned in and were closed as of June 1, at least I have to speak



to the downstate counties, the books are suppose to be turned in by June 1, but the books in my County, McHenry County, didn't even get out until October 10, so there was no way on earth they could have been closed by June 1. Now that was in the quadrangular year. In the non-quadrangular year, the succeeding year, the books were out by, I think, by Sept... maybe July, August or September. So there.... when you're talking about the assessing the property that was in existence as of January first, there's no problem, but if you're picking up property after January first, you may not pick up the same number of months each year. You may pick up more months one year then you would another year. So if the books were, let's say closed by September first, through some miricle, and a piece of property went on the rolls, or became occupied in October, you'd have to pick up those two months, well those three months or part of three months, in October, November and December, sometime in order for this legislation to work, and this just says that the assessor can pick them up next year instead of having to keep his books open until the end of the calendar year."

Shea: "All right."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Further discussion? Question's on the adoption of the amendment. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, because of the din, I couldn't hear a word that was said."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, if we'd all hold down the ah.... noise level a little bit, ah... I know it's early. Would you ah.... care to hear ah.... from Mr. Skinner or Mr. Shea again? All right, the question's on the adoption of the amendment. All those in favor, signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the amendment's adopted. Are there further amendments? Third Reading."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 518. Bill for an Act to amend the Inheritance Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amend House Bill 518, Page 1, Line 3, by deleting 'issues' and inserting in lieu thereof 'cases' and line 9 by deleting 'legacies' and inserting in lieu thereof 'legacy' and in line 10 by deleting 'cases' and inserting in lieu there of 'cases'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from McHerny, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, in case anyone noted that these were minor, insignificant changes, they certainly are. They're merely typographical errors in the Reference Bureau."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? All right, the question is, shall Amendment Number 1 be adopted? All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the amendment's adopted. Are there further amendments. Third Reading."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 540. D. L. Houlihan. Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amend



House Bill 540, Page 5, by deleting lines 29 and 30 and so forth."

Murphy: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I'm informed that the copy of the Committee Amendment, which was distributed to the Members, contains a typographical error. On Page 2, at line 24, the words 'or adopted from the description as it reads' or', it should be 'on the petition.' This Committee Amendment which was offered by Representative McPartlin in Committee at my request as the sponsor of the Bill. The substance of the amendment is the same as the original intent of the Bill, but it is designed to specify that the notice and due process provisions which are embodied in the Bill are specifically designed to relate to precinct referendums, and I move the adoption of the amendment."

Murphy: "Is there a discussion? Question is, shall Committee Amendment Number 1 be adopted. All those in favor, say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? Bill is advanced to the Order of Third Reading."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 544. Rayson. Is he here?"

Murphy: "Just a minute. I don't see Mr. Rayson on the Floor. Hold that Bill for a moment."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 545. Mugalian. Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Ah.... one Committee Amendment. Apparently, Committee



Amendment Number 1 was tabled in Committee. Committee Amendment Number 2. Amend House Bill 545, Page 1, by deleting lines 8 through 13 and so forth."

Murphy: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Amendment Number 2 moderates the Bill in its effect and has been endorsed by Members of the Bar, Members of the Illinois State Bar Association, the Chicago Bar Association, Committees on Probate, and I move its adoption."

Murphy: "Is there discussion?" The question is, shall Committee Amendment Number 2 be adopted. All those in favor, say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and Committee Amendment Number 2 is adopted. Are there further amendments. Bill is advanced to the Order of Third Reading."

F. B. Selcke: "Representative Schneider's not here. House Bill 593. Fennessey. A Bill for an Act relating to State Revenue Sharing. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Murphy: "Are there any amendments from the Floor?"

F. B. Selcke: "Amendment Number 1. LaFleur. Amend House Bill 593, page 1, on line 13, by deleting 'or public libraries' and inserting in lieu thereof 'public libraries or park districts' and so forth."

Murphy: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from DuPage, Mr. LaFleur, with respect to this Amendment."

LaFleur: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This amendment



came about at the Committee hearing and it is only to include park districts along with public libraries, so that they may participate, too. Since this amendment has been introduced, I understand Ron Hoffman had a separate bill that would address itself to park districts and he has agreed that if this amendment is placed upon this Bill, there would be no necessity of hearing the other Bill, and I move for the adoption of this amendment."

Murphy: "Is there discussion? All right, the question is, shall Amendment Number 1 be adopted? All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? Bill is advanced to the Order of Third Reading."

F. B. Selcke: "Representative Krause is not here. Barnes Bill is held. House Bill 623. Gibbs. Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Murphy: "Are there any amendments from the Floor? Mr. Gibbs, I understand there's an amendment by Mr. Rayson and he is not in his seat. Do you want to hold this Bill for the time being. What's your pleasure?"

Gibbs: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess, by Mr. Rayson. He hasn't given me a copy of it. I'm in the process of preparing an amendment also. And I'd like to have it just put down later on the calendar. I talked to Mr. Blair earlier about this."



Murphy: "Take it out of the Record."

F. B. Selcke: "What about....."

Murphy: "What about 624, Mr. Gibbs?"

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 624. Gibbs. An Act to affect the rights of person conscientiously opposed to abortions. Second Reading of the Bill."

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

Murphy: "Just a minute."

F. B. Selcke: "One Committee Amendment. Amend House Bill 624, page 1, by adding after line 24 the following and so forth."

Murphy: "All right, the gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Gibbs."

Gibbs: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is House Bill 624 and the other day, we passed House Bill 650, and it was the same provision of 624, so at this time, I would move to Table my House Bill 624, as amended."

Murphy: "Ah.... the Chair wants to be sure as to your Motion, Mr. Gibbs. Will you restate it."

Gibbs: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, at this time, I'd like to move that House Bill 624 as amended be tabled on the grounds that House Bill 650, which we passed out the day before yesterday is the contains the same provisions."

Murphy: "All right, does the gentleman have leave to Table House Bill 624? Hearing no objections, House Bill 624 is tabled."



F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 638. Londrigan. Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to State Finance. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amend House Bill 638, on page 1, line 26, by inserting after 'days' the following: 'to a maximum of 60 days'."

Murphy: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan."

Londrigan: "I move that Committee amendment be accepted."

Murphy: "The gentleman moves that Committee Amendment Number 1 be adopted. Is there discussion? All those in favor, of committee amendment number, please say 'aye'. Those opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Committee Amendment Number 1 is adopted. Are there further amendments? Bill is advanced to the Order of Third Reading."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 649. Hart. Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act of 1939. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee amendments."

Murphy: "Are there any amendments from the Floor? Bill is advanced to the Order of Third Reading."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 655. Porter. Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Murphy: "Are there any amendments from the Floor? Bill is advanced to the Order of Third Reading."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 659. McGrew. An Act concerning public utilities. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."



Murphy: "Are there any amendments from the Floor?"

F. B. Selcke: "Amendment Number 1. Huskey. Amend House Bill 659 on page 1, line 1 by deleting Section 36.1 and so forth."

Murphy: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey.:

Huskey: "Mr. Chairman, ah.... is it in order to explain the committee or just move for its adoption? Ah.... amendment I mean."

Murphy: "You should explain the amendment and then move for its adoption if that's your desire, Sir."

Huskey: "Mr. Chairman, it is a very simple amendment. It is to only ask that the telephone company give the address when requested when an information on a number is asked, is to read off the address, if requested by the person calling, limited to no more than two requests for the address."

Murphy: "Is there discussion? Gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Amendment Number 1 is in essence another Bill. I have no particular qualms with this....."

Murphy: "Just a moment, please. Let's get a little more quiet here if we can."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, Amendment Number 1 to House Bill 659 is essentially another Bill. I certainly agree with the content of it. My only problem



is that I don't think it is really germane to my Bill, as a totally different and unrelated topic except as it may relate to the telephone company. My Bill would cover all public utilities and I wonder a little bit about the constitutionality of this particular amendment and again, I don't think that it really pertains to my Bill. I think that the amendment would be a good Bill and I certainly would like to support it, but I don't think it belongs on House Bill 659."

Murphy: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Chairman, it is our contention that this fits in hand in glove with this Bill, and I move for its adoption."

Murphy: "All right, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Point of Parliamentary Inquiry, Mr. Speaker. I would like a ruling from the Chair, if this amendment is germane to my Bill."

Murphy: "Just a moment. It appears to the Chair that ah... the original Bill applies apparently to all public utilities, and the Chair is stating that the telephone company is surely a public utility, and therefore it appears to the Chair that it is germane, so the amendment is germane, in the Chair's opinion, to the Bill. Now the gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew, desire recognition?"



McGrew: "Well, not only is this only one of the specific public utilities, but my Bill relates to advertising and this has absolutely nothing to do with advertising. Again, I say it's a good Bill, but I don't think that it.... or would be a good Bill, but doesn't belong here at all."

Murphy: "Ah.... is there any other discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House I know the sponsor of the amendment has cleared this with the Reference Bureau. The Reference Bureau prepared the Amendment, and they agreed that the amendment was germane and appropriate in this Section, so ah.... I don't think the sponsor of the Bill really has anything to fear from a technical standpoint from this Amendment."

Murphy: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Walsh, I don't know about the Reference Bureau saying that it's germane, but many times they grab amendments and I'm Chairman of the Reference Bureau, and if anybody on that staff told you that that amendment was germane, I'd like to know who it was. The purpose of the Reference Bureau is to be the bill drafting arm of this General Assembly and certainly not to pass on the law or to pass on whether its germane. That's the job of the Speaker of this House."

Murphy: "Gentleman from ah.... Moultrie, Mr. Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to



speak to this amendment if I may. You know, it's sort of a custom here in this House that a sponsor can have a Bill in the condition that he wants it in. And I think that in this case, this is especially true. It's my understanding that this amendment that is being offered was originally in the form of a fill. And this Bill was beaten in the Committee to which it was assigned, and the Sponsor of this amendment is now trying to get his Bill in as an Amendment to this Bill, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that is just not the way we do business here and ah.... this amendment should be soundly defeated."

Murphy: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Matijeitch."

Matijeitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, ah.... Representative Stone said about what I wanted to say, but ah... I was in the Public Utilities Committee on another Bill when Representative Huskey and Representative Walsh presented their Bill to the Committee, and I agree with the thrust of that Bill. However, some of you may recall that Representative ah... McGrew did sort of the impossible, took a Bill that failed miserably I believe, 13 to 1, in Committee and brought it to the Floor of the House. If we accepted this Amendment, we'd have two Bills actually that both failed and he's going to have a difficult enough time with his Bill, which I support and I don't think we ought to further burden him with adding an amendment which is in effect a Bill



which also failed in Committee, so I would hope that the Members on both side of the aisle do defeat Amendment Number 1 to this Bill."

Murphy: "Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I can't speak to the parliamentary maneuvering going on at this point, but I can speak to the Amendment, and it certainly looks like an excellent amendment. I would suggest that the ah.... that those who are inclined to vote 'no' read the Amendment and then reflect on whether they would like to be in emergency situation where they needed to know an address, and the address was printed in the telephone directory that they did not have available, and then to call Directory Assistance and be told 'I'm sorry, Mr. Legislator, of course they wouldn't know you were a legislator, but I'm sorry but we can't give out that information anymore. Now this started during last summer. I first noticed it in July, in the Moline area, where one could not get an address and it is slowly, like a cancer, working its way across..... through a body, has worked its way across the State of Illinois into the ah.... 312 area code. And I would suggest that some legislators may not yet know that they cannot get addresses from Director Assistance anymore and it seems to me if the telephone company is not going to give out addresses, they ought to change their designation from directory assistance; instead of answering it that way, they ought to answer it and say telephone number, what



telephone number do you wish or something like that. So I would urge the adoption of Amendment Number 1 to House Bill 659."

Murphy: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Emil Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Amendment. I don't know whether or not this particular amendment is germane to the Bill itself, but it is a very, very good amendment. Many of us in this House, when we have tried to call our constituents, we ask for Directory Service and they in turn will tell us that they cannot give us the address. But in the same print, that the directory service operators saying we do not render this service, she in turn can say, your address is 1430 South so and so. During testimony in the Committee on Utilities, it was brought out that this service will not cost the Utility Company anymore money. It's a very, very good amendment and I urge both sides of the aisles to support this amendment."

Murphy: "All right, the question is, shall Amendment Number 1 be adopted? Gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Ah.... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ah.... once again, I would just like to go by, whatever is the pledge of the House. I've said that I think this is a good Bill, but allows the Amendment. Ah.... I think that it really doesn't have too much to do with it, and ah.... I would also suggest if I may to a Senior Member here that ah... I certainly would support him in the route that I took,



and if it's impossible for one, which it turned out not to be, I certainly would do all that I can to see that he would discharge. If that is not the case, then I certainly commend him on taking the easy route to get 89 votes. Thank you."

Murphy: "All right, the question is, shall Amendment Number 1 be adopted? All those in favor, say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. All right, ah.... do five members desire a roll call? All right, we shall have a roll call. The question is, shall Amendment Number 1, be adopted? All those in favor shall vote 'aye' and opposed 'nay'. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think Representative Emil Jones put his finger on what this does. It improves the Bill. It doesn't hurt it one bit. What the Amendment does is require the telephone company to give the address of a subscriber when it is requested by the person dialing information. Now that's all in the World it does. It's a question of germaness has been decided by the Speaker. The Sponsor of the Bill, himself, said that it is a good idea and doesn't really have a whole lot of objection if I understood him correctly. Now, Mr. Speaker, this Bill was heard in the Public Utilities Committee and got a substantial number of votes, considering it was in the Public Utilities Committee. I urge you to improve the gentleman's Bill with this Amendment."



Murphy: "Is there further discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey, is recognized."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the gentleman that had the red light would take the time to read this good Amendment. The original Bill calls for the relief... to relieve the telephone company of the dollars of advertising and give it to the general public. All this Amendment does is to ah.... ask the telephone company to give an address. To give a public service to serve the people, as you people are down here to serve the people and for your red light, it is a disservice to the people and I wish that you would pick up the amendment and read it rather than just to turn a red light for the political rhetoric that's taking place in the House."

Murphy: "All right, is there further discussion? Oh, excuse me, were you.... I'm sorry, Mr. Huskey. All right, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jones, to explain his vote."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all of you who have your red lights turned on, I wish you would go out to the phone booths and call directory assistance and ask for a telephone number for a constituent in your district. You might want to send that constituent a letter and you have no other means than the telephone operator to give you this information. This is a very good amendment and I would like to see more green lights on the board."



Murphy: "All right, is there further discussion? All right, have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, take the Record. Vote J. J. Wolf 'no', on this roll call. On this question, there are 58 'ayes'....., 71 'nays' and the Amendment is lost. Are there further amendments? Ah... for what purpose does the gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner arise?"

Skinner: "I rise to a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Murphy: "State your point."

Skinner: "Ah.... the House has now left me with the alternative of ordering all the telephone books in the State of Illinois, or not being able to get addresses from people I need to correspond with. I would like to suggest that it would be much more costly for the telephone company to supply all the books in the State of Illinois, to everybody that wants to know all the telephone numbers, then it will be to have the Directory Assistance Operator to give telephone numbers as well as the addresses."

Murphy: "All right, the Bill is.... Are there further Amendments, Mr. Clerk? All right, the Bill is advanced to the Order of Third Reading."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 661. Gene Hoffman. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code....."

Murphy: "Just a moment. I think Mr. Hoffman requested that be held."



F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 665. Porter. Bill for an Act to amend the Income Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Murphy: "Are there any Amendments from the Floor?"

F. B. Selcke: "Amendment Number 1. Porter. Amend House Bill 665, page 2, by deleting lines 5 through 10, and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Murphy: "All right, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the purpose of Amendment Number 1 to House Bill 665 is technical only. It puts the Bill in the language that would be preferred by the Department of Revenue and I move its adoption."

Murphy: "Is there discussion? The question is, shall Amendment Number 1 be adopted? All those in favor, say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay' and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments?"

F. B. Selcke: "Amendment Number 2. Porter. Amend House Bill 665 as amended on page 1, lines 1 and 5, by deleting Section 506 and so forth."

Murphy: "All right, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ah.... would like to point out that Amendment Number 2 is a suggestion by the Department of Revenue to ah.... make the Bill ah.... work back a couple of years. It's, again, technical in nature, drafted by them. I move



2020

it's adoption."

Murphy: "All right, is there any discussion? The question is, shall Amendment Number 2, be Adopted. All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is Adopted. Are there further Amendments? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

F.B. Selcke: "House Bill 672. Schraeder. Ah... a Bill for Act to provide for reimbursing for certain Tax and bodies to the loss of certain Property Tax Revenues. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment, Amend House Bill 672 on page 1, by deleting lines 9th to 12, inserting in lieu thereof the following: School District which levies Property Taxes."

Murphy: "Ah... the Chair recognizes the Gentlemen from Peoria. Mr. Schraeder!"

Schraeder: "Speaker, Members of the House, this is a Committee Amendment, and it removes from the ah... language of the Bill ah... the probation against ah... payment of Revenue sharing funds to unite ... unites already receiving ah... Revenue sharing, and I agree with it, and I would like to move it's Adoption."

Murphy: "All right, is there discussion? All right, the Gentlemen moves that Amendment Number ... that Committee Amendment Number 1 be Adopted. All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the



Amendment is Adopted. Are there further Amendments.

The Bill is advanced to the Third Reading."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 682. Lundy, Bill for an Act to Amend the municipal code) Second Reading of the Bill. I Committee Amendment. Amend House Bill 682 on page 1, line 20, by inserting after period the following; and so forth."

Murphy: "All right, the ah... Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy. Ah... just a moment, for what purpose the Gentlemen from ah... Champaign, Mr. Hirschfeld arise."

Hirschfeld: "Mr. Speaker, ah... I apologize ... I tried to get your attention a second ago, but on the last Bill we had ah... House Bill 662, I don't show that Bill in my calendar."

Murphy: "672, is what the calen... what I indicate."

Hirschfeld: "I'm sorry, the ah... It said up there on the ah... on the screen 662, that why I was wondering. My fault."

Murphy: "Okay now, the Chair recongnizes the Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment which was Adopted unanimous in Committee, simply adds the standard exception ah... in ah... for contracts under \$5,000.00, which ah... exist presently in the municipal purchasing Act, and I



ask a favorable vote on the Amendment."

Murphy: "Is there discussion? All right, the question is, shall Committee Amendment Number 1, be Adopted. All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is Adopted. Are there any further Amendments? Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

F.B. Selcke: "House Bill 684. Boyle, I don't see Mr. Boyle in his seat."

Murphy: "Take it out of the record for the time being. Okay, Mr. Boyle isn't here, Mr. Clerk so lets take it out of the record for the time being. Call the next Bill."

F.B. Selcke: "House Bill 685. Pierce..... no you gave me the wrong one. Bill for Act to Amend school code. Second Reading, of the Bill. 1 Committee Amendment, Amend House Bill 685, on page 1, but strike lines 26 thru 32, on page 2, by striking lines 1 thur 7 inserting in lieu, the following and so forth."

Murphy: "The Gentlemen from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, House Bill 685. Ah... makes a maximum of 60 day period, that students refered for ah... special education, or for testing for special education, gives the school authority 60 days to determine there eligibility, and to determine the class that they should enter. Amendment ah... Number 1, I worked out with the



Superintendent of Public Instruction, and it's now in satisfactory shape and he has no objections to it. Ah... the Amendment, re... re-phase, and refines the Bill, and provides that when a child is referred by the schoolroom teacher, or the parent ah... for ah... Special Education that the school district determine, with in a 60 day period where or not he is eligible, and what class he should be placed, and makes it clear that the responsibility for education remains on the school district during that period. It prevents a child from having to sit home for 6 months or a year while the school authorities determine what class setting is appropriate for him. I move the adoption of Committee Amendment Number 1, the House Bill 685".

Murphy: "Is there discussion? The Gentlemen has moved that Committee Amendment Number 1, be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Committee Amendment Number 1, is adopted. Are there further Amendments? The Bill is ordered advanced to the order of Third Reading."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 686. Ah... Fleck. A Bill for an Act to Amend the Litter control Act. Second Reading of the Bill. 2 Committee Amendments, Committee Amendment Number 1. Amend House Bill 686, on page 8, by inserting between lines 2, and 3, the following as to forth."

Murphy: "The Chair recongnizes the Gentlemen from Cook, Mr.



Fleck, with respect to Committee Amendment Number 1."

Fleck: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Committee Amendment Number 1, is merely a ah... Amendment of form, given to me by the Reference Bureau, all it does is to complete the statute of which this Bill ah... preports to Amend. Part of the statute was deleted from the original Bill; and this puts the whole statute into the Bill which is being Amended. May I ask the Adoption of Committee Amendment Number 1."

Murphy: "Is there discussion? Question is, shall Committee Amendment Number 1, be Adopted. All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Committee Amendment Number 1, is Adopted."

F. B. Selcke: "Amendment... Committee Amendment Number 2, Amend House Bill Number 686, on page 3, line 10, by inserting directly after the period, the following as to forth."

Murphy: "Gentlemen, from Cook, Mr. Fleck, with respect to Committee Amendment Number 2."

Fleck: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Committee Amendment Number 2, is an Amendment presented by the Department of Transportation, this too is an Amendment of for, rather than substance, and also clarify the responsibilities of the Department of Transportation and also gives ... invest in them the rule making ah... authority to ah... promote the purposes of this Bill."



And I ask the Adoption of Committee Amendment Number 2."

Murphy: "Is there discussion? Question is, shall Committee Amendment Number 2, be Adopted? All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Committee Amendment Number 2, is Adopted. Are there any further Amendments? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading. Now we hold House... at the request of the sponcer.... Hold House Bill 687."

F. B. Selcke: "Ah... Is J.J. Wolf here? Ah... House Bill 708. J. J. Wolf. Bill for an Act to Amend the election code, the Second Reading the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Murphy: "Are there any Amendments from the floor? Bill is advance to the order of Third Reading."

F. B. Selcke: "We are getting a new machine in there, ah... House Bill 709. Ah... Washington, a Bill for an Act to provide for the location of low and modern income housing within certain communities of this state."

Murphy: "Just a moment, the Gentlemen desires that be taken out of the record, for the time being."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 711. Tipsword."

Murphy: "I don't see Mr. Tipsword, on the floor. Take it out of the record for the time being."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 717. Day, Bill for an Act to Amend the Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill, ah... let's see... I think.... was this..... Amendment



Number 1, Adopted, "Mr. Day?... down hum... ah... this Bill was read a second time, and Amendment Number 1, /ossed... lossed, and we now have... Amendment Number 3, Day. Amend House Bill 717, line 1, by deleting Sections, 11 - 12 - 13, and so forth."

Murphy: "Chair recongnizes, the Gentlemen from Peoria, Mr. Day, with respect to Amendment Number 3, is that correct, Sir. Proceed, Mr. Day."

Day: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker.... This Bill... this Bill was advanced to Third Reading last year.... last week, and then it was returned, because Amendment Number 2, was inconsistent with Amendment Number 1. Now what I would like to do at this time is to move, to table Number 2, Amendment Number 2, and to Adopt Amendment Number 3."

Murphy: "Just so the Chair understands, I didn't understand the motion, with respect to Amendment Number 1."

Day: "Amendment Number 1, has been Adopted."

Murphy: "You desire to table Amendment Number 2?"

Day: "That's right. I so move."

Murphy: "The Gentlemen moves that Amendment Number 2, be tabled. Does the Gentlemen have leave? The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Will the Gentlemen yield for question?"

Murphy: "He indicates that he will, proceed."

Shea: "Bob, ah... Amendment Number 2 was a Committee Amend-



ment, was that correct?"

Murphy: "The Clerk, informs me it was a Committee Amendment."

Shea: "Could you tell me, why you want to table a Committee Amendment?"

Day: "Well, inadvertently the... the Committee Amendment ah... was inconsistent with Amendment Number 1. Fact it... it eliminated Amendment Number 1, material in the Amendment Number 1, inadvertently."

Shea: "So, is Amendment Number 3, then going to be the substance of Amendment Number 2, but without eliminating Number 1."

Day: "Exactly the same as Amendment Number 2, but it does not eliminate Amendment Number 1. That's right."

Shea: "All right, thank you."

Murphy: "All right, the Gentlemen... does the Gentlemen have leave, to table Amendment Number 2? Hearing no objections ah... Amendment Number 2, is tabled. Are there further Amendments?"

O'Brien: "Amendment Number 3, Day, Amends House Bill 717, line 1, by deleting section, so forth."

Murphy: "Gentlemen from Peoria, Mr. Day."

Day: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, I would move for the adoption of Amendment Number 3."

Murphy: "Is there discussion? The Gentlemen moves the adoption of Amendment Number 3. All those in favor say



'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and Number 3, is adopted. Are there further Amendments? Bills advanced to the order of Third Reading."

O'Brien: "House Bill 718. Day, a Bill for an Act to Amend... an Act provides the law in relation to plats Second Reading of the Bill."

Murphy: "Gentlemen from Peoria, Mr. Day."

Day: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ah... House Bill 718, is a companion Bill, to 717, and we have the same problem ah... on that Bill that we had on 717, I would like to move at this time to table Amendment Number 2."

Murphy: "Do the Gentlemen have leave, to table Amendment Number 2? Hearing no objections, Amend... Committee Amendment Number 2, is tabled. Are there further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

O'Brien: "Amendment Number 3, Day, Amends House Bill 718, in line 1, by deleting Section 5 (d), and so forth."

Murphy: "Gentlemen from Peoria, Mr. Day."

Day: "Ah... Amendment Number 3, again incorporates all material that was in ah... Amendment Number 2, and ah... corrects the problem that existed ah... so far as the inconsistency was concern, and I would move for the adoption of Amendment Number 3."

Murphy: "Is there discussion? Is there discussion? Th... th... do you desire recognition, Mr. Fennessey? On



the Amendment."

Fennessey: "No"

Murphy: "Okay, just a moment then. Ah... the Gentlemen moves that Amendment Number 3, be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments? Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading. Ah... the Gentlemen, from LaSalle, Mr. Fennessey, for what purpose do you arise, Sir."

Fennessey: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege. I would like to introduce to the House, the fifth grade class, of St. Columbus Grad School, from Ottawa, who are here observing the Legislature in operation. Their accompany by their teacher, Mrs. Lucy Thompson... Thomas, and several of the mother's and father's. I would like them to stand, their in the rear of the balcony here, and asked the House to recognize them."

Murphy: "Let's proceed Mr. Clerk"

O'Brien: "House Bill 725. W. B. Walsh, a Bill for an Act relating to the prevention of develop mental disability, Second Reading of the Bill. 2, Committee Amendments, Amendment Number 1, Amend House Bill 725 lieu of the following."

Murphy: "The Chair recongnizes the Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Walsh, with respect to Committee Amendment Number 1."



W. B. Walsh: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There are 2, Committee Amendments to this Bill. Ah... the first one was taken care by the second one ah... so I'm going to move to table the... Committee Amendment Number 1, however ah... since committee Amendment Number 2, was Adopted by the Committee ah... we have had further in-put by ah... the ah... technical people who are working with a sub Committee that worked on this Bill, and made some suggestions for changes, minor indeed, but suggestions. And so we got Committee or we got an Amendment Number 3, that we hope to Adopt, and so at this time I would like to move to table, Committee Amendment Number 1."

Murphy: "Does the Gentlemen have leave, to table Committee Amendment Number 1? All right, hearing no objection Ah... Committee Amendment Number 1, is tabled."

O'Brien: "Amendment Number 2, Amends House Bill, 725, on page 1, so forth."

Murphy: "Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

W. B. Walsh: "Ah... I move to table ah... Committee Amendment Number 2. "

Murphy: "Gentlemen have leave. Hearing no objections, Committee Amendment Number 2, is tabled. Are there further Amendments? "

O'Brien: "Amendment Number 3, W. B. Walsh, Amends House Bill 725, on page 1-2-3, by deleting, Sections 1 - 10



inserting in lieu...

W. B. Walsh: "Ah... may I ask the Clerk, does he have an Amendment Number 4?"

O'Brien: "yes"

W. B. Walsh: "Ah... Amendment Number 3, unfortunately ah... there was an error in printing in ah... numbering the Sections. And ah... so it had to be replaced also, and so I move to ah... table Amendment Number 3."

Murphy: "Does the Gentlemen have leave to table Amendment Number 3? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Amendment Number 3, is tabled. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

O'Brien: "Amendment Number 4, W. B. Walsh, Amends House Bill 725, on page 1-2-3, be deleting Sections 1, thru 10, so forth."

Murphy: "Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

W. B. Walsh: "Ah... now Mr. Speaker, Amendment Number 4, is a result of the Sub-Committee, of the Human Resources Committee, that worked on this Bill with Dr. Stubb, from the Rockford School of Medicine. Ah... who is the Chairman of a group of Doctors who is working on the prevention of ah... develop mental disabilities and ah... I move the adoption of Amendment Number 4."

Murphy: "Is there discussion? Ah... Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "You delete Section 1, thru 10, is that about the whole



Bill, and then re-write them?"

W. B. Walsh: "Yes"

Shea: "Ah... can I ask wha..."

W. B. Walsh: "Except... except the Section 11, and ah...
12, remain in the Bill as written."

Shea: "Are 1, and 10, new material that you put in, was
this a new Bill."

W. B. Walsh: "Ah... this material that's in this ah...
Amendment, was put in by the Sub-Committee of the
Human Resources Committee."

Shea: "No, Bill what I'm asking you was 1, thru 10, new
material..."

W. B. Walsh: "Oh yes, new to the Bill, right."

Shea: "All right, so that in effect what you're doing
is taking out 1, thru 10, which was new material, and
substiuting 1, thru 10, the Sub-Committee material."

W. B. Walsh: "Correct"

Shea: "All right, and then this will be the summom subs-
stance of the Bill, Amendment Number..."

W. B. Walsh: "Except, except Sections 11, and 12, remain
in the Bill as it's written."

Shea: "Right,, but then I say 1, 2, and 3, have absolutely
nothing to do with the Bill, anymore."

W. B. Walsh: "Right"

Murphy: "Is there further dis... is there further discussion?
All right, the question is shall ah... Amendment



Number 4, be Adopted. All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is Adopted. Are there further Amendments? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

O'Brien: "House Bill 726, Palmer, A Bill for an Act to Amend Sections, and the repeal Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill."

Murphy: "Are there any Amendments from the floor? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer, desires recognition."

Palmer: "Mr. Speaker, there was an Amendment that was put on the desk, sometime ago, Amendment from the floor."

Murphy: "Are there any further Amendments?"

O'Brien: "Amendment Number 1, DiPrima, Amends House Bill 726, from page 2, lines 19 and 32, by deleting the words, so forth."

Murphy: "The Gentleman ah... the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. DiPrima, with respect to Amendment to... Number 1 House Bill 726."

DiPrima: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Ah... this Amendment is the same ah... part of the Bill that passed out of here pertaining to the down state employees and it conforms with House Bill 768, which I sponsored and passed out of this House. And I move for the Adoption of Amendment Number 1, to House Bill 726."

Murphy: "Is there discussion? Question is, shall Amendment Number 1 be Adopted. All those in favor say 'aye'."



Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments? Bill is advanced to order of Third Reading."

O'Brien: "House Bill 735. Hart, a Bill for an Act to Amend Sections of the school code, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Murphy: "Are there any Amendments from the floor? The Bill is advance to order of Third Reading."

O'Brien: "House Bill 736. Williams, a Bill for an Act to Amend Sections of the Park District code. Second Reading of the Bill, 2 Committee Amendments, Amendment Number 1, Amends House Bill 736, from page 1, line 20, by inserting "municipality" after reference and so forth."

Murphy: "Ah... the Chair reconognies the Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Williams, With respect to Amendment Number 1."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 36... ah... 736, provides that in municipalities where 2, Park Districts exist, within that municipality, a proceeder by reprimand for the simultaneous annexation and disannexation from one that they shall be the 2, Park Districts in the same municipality. Ah... the original Bill ah... actually did not establish any kind of mechanism for providing the annexating district with an option, to except or reject.



the disconnected territory. Ah... Committee Amendment Number 1, provides that in the referendum, if a majority of the votes that were cast upon the question by those in the territory proposed to be disconnected, and of those voting within the remainder of the municipality is in the form of proposition ah... then this annexation and disannexation could take place. It is an excellent Amendment, and I move adoption of Committee Amendment Number 1."

Murphy: "Is there discussion? The question ah... shall Committee Amendment Number 1, be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Committee Amendment Number is adopted."

O'Brien: "Amendment Number 2, Amends House Bill 736, on page 2, by adding after line 12, the following, so forth."

Murphy: "Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Williams."

Williams: "Ah... yes Mr. Speaker, Committee Amendment Number 2, is a good addition to it, the original Bill provides that the disconnected body ah... may not be exempt from taxation for the purpose any indebtedness. A contract by the corporate authorities of the Park District, prior ah... to the disconnection. Ah... such a situation has been pointed out, could actual result in a disconnected area being subject to a form to a



double taxation. This was not the intent of the original Bill, the Amendment was prepared by Mr. Stewart, the Legislator Consul for the Illinois Association of Park Districts, it's a good Amendment and I move the adoption of Committee Amendment Number 2."

Murphy: "Is there discussion? Question is as to adoption of Committee Amendment Number 2. All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments? The Bill is advance to the order of Third Reading."

O'Brien: "House Bill 743, Waddell, a Bill for an Act ah.. to create the Data Information System Commission, to find his powers, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Murphy: "Are there any Amendments from the floor? Bill is advance to order of Third Reading."

O'Brien: "House Bill 751. R. H. Holloway, a Bill for an Act relating to medical experiments ~~perform~~ on human beings. Second Reading of the Bill. 2 Committee Amendments. Amendment Number 1, Amends House Bill 751, on page 1, by deleting line 10, 11, and 12, and inserting the lieu there of the following, so forth."

Murphy: "Chair recongnizes, the Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Holloway, with respect to Committee Amendment Number 1."

R. H. Holloway: "Mr. Char... Mr. Chairmen, I move the adoption of ah... Amendment Number 1."



Murphy: "Is there discussion? Ah... Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Is this Committee Amendment Number 1."

R. H. Holloway: "Yes it is."

Shea: "I thought that was tabled in Committee."

R. H. Holloway: "Oh, you're right, your're right Mr. Shea. Ah... I withdraw that ah... motion and I move that Amendment Number 1, be tabled."

Murphy: "The Gentlemen moves to table Committee Amendment Number 1."

R. H. Holloway: "Yes."

Murphy: "Is that correct sir?"

R. H. Holloway: "Yes"

Murphy: "All right, is there discussion? The Gentlemen has moved to table Committee Amendment Number 1, does the Gentlemen have leave. All right, Committee Amendment Number 1, is tabled. Are there any further Amendments?"

O'Brien: "Committee Amendment Number 2, Amends House Bill 751, on page 1, by deleting everything after the enacting clause, inserting the lieu there of the following, and so forth."

R. H. Holloway: "I move th... the adoption Amendment Number 2."

Murphy: "all right, the Gentlemen has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment Number 2, is there discussion?"



All right, all those in favor adoption of Committee Amendment Number 2, say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment Number 2, is adopted. Are there further Amendments? Bill is advance to order of Third Reading."

O'Brien: "House Bill 754. D. L. Houlihan, a Bill for an act to Amend Sections of the school code. The Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Murphy: "Are there any Amendments from the floor? Ah... for what purpose does Mr. Houlihan, the Gentlemen from Cook, arise?"

D. L. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker will you take this out of the record, we're preparing an Amendment."

Murphy: "All right, take House Bill 754 out of the records for the time being. For what purpose does the Gentlemen from Adams, Mr. McClain arise?"

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise for a point of personal privilege, if I may."

Murphy: "State your point."

McClain: "Representative Schisler, Representative Kent, and myself would like to introduce to the members of the House, a youth to Springfield tour, ah... There are 41 finalist in a state wide essay contest, some from Adams Electrical Co-op, some from Western Illinois Co-op, and others from Illinois Rural Electrical Co-op."



And if you would be kind enough to give them a warm welcome. They are on the right, on the Republican side. Thank you."

O'Brien: "House Bill 757, Kempiners, a Bill for an Act to Amend Sections of an Act to rent fraudulent and corrupt practices in making or excepting official appointments, and contact for public officers. Second Reading of the Bill. 5, Committee Amendments. Amendment Number 1, Amends House Bill 757, on page 1, line 16, after property, adding so forth."

Murphy: "The Chair recongnizes the Gentlemen from Will, Mr. Kempiners, with respect to Committee Amendment Number 1."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Committee Amendment Number 1, expands the coverage of this Bill to situations where ah... the element domain procedure is used, and I move that it's ah... adoption."

Murphy: "Is there discussion? Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Would you explain, I'm sorry I must have missed what th... Amendment Number 1, does."

Murphy: "Just a moment, let me get a little more quite, if I might."

Kempiners: "Ah... Representative Shea, it expands the coverage of the Bill to ah... cases in which element



domain procedure is used."

Murphy: "Is there further discussion? All right, the Gentlemen moves that Committee Amendment Number 1, be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and Committee Amendment Number 1, is adopted."

O'Brien: "Committee Amendment Number 2, Amends House Bill 757, as follows. On page 3, after Sub Section (e), add Sub Section (f), as follows, so forth."

Murphy: "Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Kempiners From Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment Number 2, also extends the coverage of this Bill to a case in which the Governmental unit is the vender or the seller. It also makes povision for Corporations and Stockholders Incorporations with regard to discloser, and I move it's adoption."

Murphy: "Is there discussion? The question is, shall Committee Amendment Number 2, be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Committee Amendment Number 2, is adopted."

O'Brien: "Committee Amendment Number 3, was evidently tabled in Committee."

Kempiners: "Ah... yes Mr. Speaker, Amendment Number 3, is incorporate into Amendment Number 4, and I move that



we table Amendment Number 3."

Murphy: "It was tabled in Committee, the Chair understands."

O'Brien: "Committee Amendment Number 4, Amends House Bill 757, as follows: On page 1, line 19, delete everything after the coma, and on page 1, so forth."

Murphy: "Gentlemen from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment Number 4, accomplishes (4) purposes, Number 1, it is a House-keeping Amendment. There were some minor ah... clerical er... errors in the Bill that are corrected in this Amendment. Ah... the second thing it does is ah... it places the burden of procuring affidavits on to the unit of local government, rather on to the shoulders of the agent or managing or trustee, of a land trust. Ah... Secondly ah... thirdly, it clarifies the nature of the interest to the disclose, and finally clarifies the role of a Cooperation President in procuring discloser affidavits from the ah... stockholders in this cooperation who will hold more than 5% of the stock. I move it's adoption."

Murphy: "Is there discussion? The question is, shall Committee Amendment Number 4, be adopted: All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and Committee Amendment Number 4, is adopted."

O'Brien: "Committee Amendment Number 5, Amend House Bill 757, as follows: On page 2, between line 6, and 7,



add, and so forth."

Murphy: "Gentlemen from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, am... Amendment Number 5, alters the Bill, which has a provision that should be provisions of the Bill not be followed, the ah... contract or agreement would be void. There were some concern expressed by members of the Committee that if this occurred after a significant period of time and the governmental unit had already, say, built a building on the land, that ther... more harm would be done than good, so this Amendment will make the ah... ah... purchase or transaction voidable in such a case ah... without affecting discloser ah... on the ah... will of the governmental unit involved."

Murphy: "Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "I... I get the idea of why you want to do this, how long after the sale can the governmental unit voided at its option."

Kempiners: "The ah... ah... it's anytime, rally because we don't know when it will be discovered that ah... ah... that the provision of the Bill had not been followed in... in disclosing ah... are receiving affidavits from all of the trustees."

Shea: "Well, let... lets assume that we got an land trust involved and we got 35, beneficial interest, you know about 34, of them, when it comes to light, ten years



after the sale, that somebody has not disclosed their part interest in the 35th beneficial interest. Now, the state could then add it's option ten years later, or the governmental unit void that contract?"

Kempiners: "That is correct, but I would like to stress that this would be in the event that the provisions of this law had not been followed by those involved in the trust agreement."

Shea: "Well, what I'm saying, that we usually have a stature of limitation some place along the line ah... What your telling me is, there will never be any finality to a contract with governmental unit, unless you can go, I think beyond what's ah... giving title."

Kempiners: "I think your question is valid, Representative Shea, you have a suggestion as to ah... what would be an apporite ah... stature of limitations."

Shea: "I think what I would like to do, I... I have never seen this Bill before this morning. Ah... if you could hold it on Second Reading, I would like to sit down and talk to you about it."

Kempiners: "Okay, Ah... I would like to take it from the record, Mr. Speaker."

Murphy: "Now, Committee Amendments Number 1, 2, and 4, have been adopted. Now what's your request..."

Kempiners: "My request would be that we hold it on Second Reading ah... with a possible 6th Amendment, to ah..."



could I ask Representative Shea, a question on this?

Murphy: "Mr. Shea"

Shea: "Would you be willing to go along with Amendment 5, and I keep it on Second Reading and then, put a possible 6th Amendment on it."

Kempiners: "Ah... why don't you put... put Amendment 5, on and then Bill's in the shape you want it, then we can talk about it, in that shape."

Shea: "Okay, that's fine."

Kempiners: "Or ah... if you would rather, if you would rather take it in the shape that you have got it in, advance it to Third Reading, so enrolling and engrossing can put it together with all the Amendments, we can look at it when it's on Third Reading, all in one form, and if we have to, you.... would you bring it back to Second Reading?"

Shea: "I would prefer holding it on Second, if you have no objections to that."

Kempiners: "Ah... I have got none, I just thought we would let enrolling and engrossing do some work for us."

Shea: "Okay, why don't we adopt this Amendment, move to Third, and then I'll bring it as their problems... I'll bring it back to Second for ah... Amendment."

Kempiners: "Fine."

Shea: "Okay, I move the adoption of Amendment Number 5, Mr. Speaker."



Murphy: "All right, the question
Number 5, be adopted. All
Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes'
is adopted, and the Bill is
Reading."

O'Brien: "House Bill 760, Ewell..."

Murphy: "I don't believe Mr. Ewell
it out of the record."

O'Brien: "House Bill 764, Rayson
Amend Sections of Public Ju
Reading of the Bill. No Com

Murphy: "Are there any Amendmen

O'Brien: "Amendment Number 1, R
764, on page 1, line 10, by
serting in lieu there of \$21

Murphy: "Gentlemen from Cook, M

Rayson: "Mr. Speaker, and membe
Bill passed out of Committe
flat grants to Junior Colle
hour, per pupil to \$24.00.
a Senate Bill that was Repo
\$19.00, and ah... we feel t
ropriate and pragmatic to a
of flat grants, so this Ame
\$21.00. And I now move the
Number 1, the House Bill 76



Miller: "Is there discussion? The question is shall amendment No. 1 be adopted. All those in favor say aye, opposed nay, the ayes have it. And amendment No. 1 is adopted. Are there further amendments? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 770. Waddell."

Miller: "Just a moment. I don't see Mr. Waddell in his seat."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 775. Mahar. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Miller: "Are there any amendments from the floor? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 784. Berman. A bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No committee amendments."

Miller: "Are there any amendments from the floor? The bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 789. Alsup. A bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Revenue. Second Reading of the Bill. One committee amendment. Amends House Bill 789 on page 2, line 17, by deleting and so forth."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Alsup."

Alsup: "I move the adoption of Committee Amendment No. 1."

Miller: "Is there discussion? Alright, the question is shall Committee Amendment No. 1 be adopted? All those in favor say aye, the opposed nay, the ayes have it and the amend-



ment is adopted. Just a moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "I wonder if the Gentleman would explain the amendment."

Miller: "Mr. Alsup, the Gentleman from Macon. Put on Mr. Alsup, the Gentleman from Macon."

Alsup: "Well, the amendment deletes a...\$2,740, 175 from the appropriation. They took out 40 of the new auditors: they wanted to hire. They took out the amount of money for the refund on automobiles that a...due to court decision, and I think that would be \$1,949,986. They took out \$6000 from the legal group. They took out \$576,392 from the operations group. They took out \$85,000 from the management service group. Wait a minute, the operation group, they make that a total of \$699, 187 instead of \$576,000. Because they took some out of the motor fuel fund too. Is that enough explanation?"

Miller: "Is there further discussion? Alright, the question is and I'll repeat it again. Does Mr. Walsh care to be recognized? Alright, the question is, once again, shall Committee Amendment No. 1 be adopted? All those in favor say aye, opposed nay, the ayes have it and the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? The bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading. At the request of the sponsor, House Bill 790 is held for the time being. Also at the request of the sponsor, House Bill 799 is held for the time being. Just a moment, Mr. Clerk. On the Speaker's table is House Resolution 113



And with respect to this Resolution, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. R. L. Dunne."

Dunne: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this to me, is one of the most serious items that we are going to consider in this General Assembly. In the 28th District that I represent, last summer we had a dedication for a medical center called Friendship House. I attended that dedication and this Friendship House was lauded as a great boon to the community for providing health services for families, for children, for the elderly. And since March 2nd, 1960, approximately according to the news, 4000 murders have been, in my opinion, murders have been performed at Friendship House. It's an abortion mill. I have talked to the State's Attorney of Cook County. I've talked to the Department of Registration and Education, which are investigating the activities of Friendship House. While we are waiting for important legislation in regard to abortions, 100 abortions a day are being conducted at Friendship House. Three women have already died as a result of mistreatment in the performance of abortion at Friendship House. But why do we find ourselves in this dilemma, ladies and gentlemen. We find ourselves in the dilemma because of the action of the Supreme Court of the United States. And I think the statement of a group of Episcopale Bishops best expresses my view and I'd like to take this opportunity to read it. It says in 1857, the Supreme



Court in the Dred-Scott Case found that the Constitution did not provide rights of citizenship or any other rights for black people descended from slaves. So the Constitution had to be corrected. Abolitionists lead the fight to eliminate this fundamental injustice. It was ultimately corrected by passage of the 14th amendment. On January 22nd, 1973, the Supreme Court again found the United States Constitution incomplete in that it does not protect the life of the unborn human being. The Constitution, at present, leaves the mother and her physician free to determine whether he should continue to live or shall be destroyed. This is a fundamental injustice against the life of the most helpless in society. We must not permit, in our country, the principle that we can solve our problems by killing people at any age. That some human lives are worth more than others. That a certain degree of humanness must be attained to warrant the protection of our society. The remedy lies in the amendment of the Constitution so that the fundamental right to life of every human being from conception to natural death may be invaluable. We call upon men of good will to become modern abolitionists to work to abolish permissive abortions from our society. My Resolution requests the Congress of the United States to pass a Constitutional Amendment to protect the unborn life and I strongly urge its passage and ask for your support in this measure."



Miller: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Harold Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Relative to this piece of legislation, I have two comments. First of all, I would suggest to the members of this House that they never resort to the tactics which were used by the sponsor of this bill. I think it is unconscionable to stand on the floor of this House and to indict individuals or institutions in our community without due process. The allegations printed in the newspapers in the City of Chicago relative to the clinic that was named here are simply allegations. I don't think we should further those allegations. Individuals in our society and institutions, hospitals or otherwise, have a right to be freed from criticism on this level, unless, until, ... may I have some order, Mr. Speaker? have a right to be free of any such charge from us until they have been proved guilty in a court of law. I would hope that we would refrain from that sort of conduct. We have to be not only tolerant, but understanding. And I would hope in the future, no one in this House would resort to a character assassination of any individual or institution in our community whether it is in our district or not. My second point, Mr. Speaker, is this. The Supreme Court has ruled on this issue. A strict law and order Supreme Court has ruled on this issue. I see no reason to appeal to the emotions of the people of this State by



continuing to beat a dead horse. The Court has ruled. Law and order, it seems to me, would follow that rule. We are simply making a political issue out of this whole abortion business. And I, for one, am getting a little bit sick and tired of it. Every two or three days someone jumps up here with a resolution or bill castigating the Supreme Court simply because they think it will pay off in their community. I think it is political. I think it is unfair. I think it is unwise. I think it demeans this House. And I think we should start off by defeating this particular Resolution."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow members of the House, I'd like to ask the sponsor a question or two, if I may."

Miller: "A...proceed sir."

Borchers: "From what I can see of the bill, it means that in case there is concep...a...the a...a...unborn is protected from the moment of conception. Now suppose does this mean in case of rape, or incest, which unfortunately, is present in our society, that that unborn child is protected or the fetus is protected?"

Dunne: "Its not a bill, Webber, its a resolution."

Borchers: "Pardon."

Dunne: "Its not a bill, its a resolution."

Borchers: "Alright, the resolution, though, would protect even incest and rape, is that correct? If we have conception from that point?"



Dunne: "Have you read the a...have you had an opportunity to read the a...?"

Borchers: "No, but I'm just asking you. Does it protect conception from rape or incest?"

Dunne: "It doesn't mention that in the resolution."

Borchers: "Pardon."

Dunne: "No, it doesn't mention rape or incest."

Borchers: "Well, in other words, it does protect because its blanket. It does protect for rape and incest. And a girl, for example, suffering from an attack, having been raped or from incest could not be forced to, if that resolution were the law, be forced to bear the child because it doesn't exclude it."

Dunne: "Well, Webber, the intent of the resolution is to put us in Illinois back in the same position we were prior to a...prior to a...these Supreme Court rulings."

Borchers: "Well, what I'm afraid of, the resolution isn't clear enough and though I'm certain amount of sympathy for what you are trying to do, I'm afraid this resolution is not a good resolution, because it doesn't clarify certain aspects of the possibilities of social activity."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe."

Wolfe: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. One of the aspects of constitutional government is that each branch of government is a separate branch, and yet, there is a check and balance on those branches. Now United States Supreme Court in two recent decisions reviewed on a 51 page



is a guarantee that is presently contained in both the United States Constitution and the State of Illinois Constitution, and for that reason, I oppose this resolution."

Miller: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege at this time to introduce directly above in the gallery, seated behind the Speaker, directly, the Lamont Girl Scout Troop No. 69, and their leaders Mrs. George Smolin and Mike Smolin, Mrs. Cliff Mullen, Mrs. Robert Bell, Mrs. Rod Maddox, and these young ladies are represented from really two districts, which the districts are represented in turn by Representative Huskey, Yourell, Palmer, and then in our 41st, of course, by Representatives Schnieder, and Dyer, and a...myself, and I...they're down here to witness the goings on and proceedings in our legislative chamber, and I would ask that you greet them and that the young ladies stand up at this time and take a bow."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde, is recognized."

Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I happen to think that this is one of the most important resolutions that will face this legislature. What this resolution seeks to do is to meet the problems created by the United States Supreme Court's decision of January 22, which said that the unborn, even up to 10 seconds before its birth, has not rights whatsoever to life, to liberty,



is a guarantee that is presently contained in both the United States Constitution and the State of Illinois Constitution, and for that reason, I oppose this resolution."

Miller: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege at this time to introduce directly above in the gallery, seated behind the Speaker, directly, the Lamont Girl Scout Troop No. 69, and their leaders Mrs. George Smolin and Mike Smolin, Mrs. Cliff Mullen, Mrs. Robert Bell, Mrs. Rod Maddox, and these young ladies are represented from really two districts, which the districts are represented in turn by Representative Huskey, Yourell, Palmer, and then in our 41st, of course, by Representatives Schnieder, and Dyer, and a...myself, and I...they're down here to witness the goings on and proceedings in our legislative chamber, and I would ask that you greet them and that the young ladies stand up at this time and take a bow."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde, is recognized."

Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I happen to think that this is one of the most important resolutions that will face this legislature. What this resolution seeks to do is to meet the problems created by the United States Supreme Court's decision of January 22, which said that the unborn, even up to 10 seconds before its birth, has not rights whatsoever to life, to liberty,



to property, no Constitutional rights to equal protection rights to due process if his birth, or her birth will interfere with the life of the mother or the health of the mother. And then they proceeded to define health as meaning a State of well being, not merely the absence of disease, but a distressful situation, would exist then the human life that is about to be born can be exterminated like a dog, or like a cat. Now I was amused ironically, at the statements of the Gentleman from Cook who said that everytime the Supreme Court makes a decision why we try to pass a resolution or a bill to avoid the decision. I am sure he's the last one I need to remind of the 1857 Dred-Scott decision, which held black people to be chattled, and articles of personal property and so it took 11 years to pass a constitutional amendment to obviate that monstrous decision, and in my judgement, the Supreme Court, by a vote of 7 to 2 was guilty of a monstrous act because if you read the opinion, and you read it with any thought, you have to worry whether you will get old, and you will get poor, and you will get friendless, and thus loose any right to life because Mr. Justice Blackman said that the State has no interest in the unborn until after viability, which he proceeded to define as capable of having a meaningful life outside the womb. Now you tell me what meaningful is? Does a handicapped person have a meaningful life? Does an old



sick person have a meaningful life? And are there human rights, are there constitutional rights abregated because five or six or seven people don't think their life is meaningful anymore? That is what this resolution is all about. And this resolution doesn't seek to attach the Supreme Court. It says alright Gentleman, if unborn life is the same as the animal life, I might point out that Mr. Justice Douglas thinks that trees and rivers ought to have standing before the Supreme Court. But an unborn child ten or fifteen minutes before birth. Well, I don't agree with the Supreme Court and I don't say impeach the Supreme Court, I don't say pack the Supreme Court, I say let's go to Congress and have Congress specifically spell out that human life is a little different from a cat or a dog and is entitled to the protections of due process of law. I urge everybody that thinks that there is a little something special and different about human life and everybody that knows as medicine knows, that human life begins at conception and ends at the moment of death, and everyone that knows that abortion is violence and is reaching in and pulling apart a growing human being will support this resolution. Thank you."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson."

Rayson: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, we've heard some talk this morning about the Supreme Court, and most recently we heard some talk about the rights of the unborn."



And I'm concerned with this problem, as I have been. Its a very serious problem, and I think the court has ruled under the 4th, 5th, 6th, 9th and 14th amendment, that the rights of the unborn aren't constitutionally protected. Now I would like to support this resolution because in our law and order fashion in a Democratic process to effect the rights of the unborn in the manner in which many of us feel they should be protected, does, in fact, require a federal Constitutional amendment. Of course, I think that this resolution is an exercise in futility. One that only memorializes, but it only treats the problem of abortion. And I suggest under the 14th Amendment, which was articulated by Justice Blackman on three pages, when he said the word born cannot be prenatally applied unless we move in the direction of a constitutional amendment to equate the rights, the constitutional rights of the unborn, to those of the living. Unless we really do that, this is an exercise in futility. And I would want to encourage any and all people to want to move in that direction because that's honestly confronting the problem where it is at. Not suggesting we have a constitutional amendment for the unborn with regard to abortion, because that contravenes the 14th Amendment. But if we equate it with the rights of the unborn with the rights of the born, then this is proper. The only question is do we know what the significance of that would be. Do you want to be 9 months



older? Anyway, I wish I could support this amendment. I think it is- an exercise in futility. Its unconstitutional on its face if Congress did what they asked, but I would support an amendment, or at least the opportunity for the amendment to go the orderly process of constitutional amendment and that is equate the rights of all equally. I don't think we can do that. So I suggest that this is not a good resolution and with great restraint I can't support it."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in favor of this resolution. I think it is sad that a member of this body would be castigated for seeking to have this House memorialize or petition the Congress of the United States, which I understand, is one of our most fundamental rights. For that Congress to do something which he and a great number of people in this State. Particularly, based upon my mail and the people who have spoken to me on the subject, indicate it is of extraordinary importance to them, to say that the implications of those comments was that to petition Congress to amend the Constitution would be unconstitutional, at least the amendment to the Constitution would be unconstitutional. Now I suggest that is just absolutely hogwash. If we desire the people of this United States desire to amend this Constitution, then the amendment,



of course, has to be constitutional. I would suggest one other thing and that is based upon the Supreme Court's decision, in *Roe vs. Wade*, they held the Supreme Court held the majority that because scientists, religious, educators, and so forth could not agree that the unborn were entitled to any rights whatsoever, that therefore, they didn't have any rights. I would suggest that the benefit of doubt ought to be with the living organism. No matter what you want to call it. A fetus, an unborn person, or whatnot. I think the decision is clear based upon interpretation of the Constitution. If we don't like it based upon our law and order, we have to amend the Constitution. This resolution seeks to accomplish that fact and I urge everyone to support it.

Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, no more significant issue will be heard by the 78th General Assembly than the one before us this morning. We consider on behalf of the people of Illinois and all of the people of the United States, the significance and the value of innocent life. Not a political issue. But elemental in our society, the relationship of the citizen to society. All the way back in the fundamental philosophies in our day, from *Natural Rights* and the social contract to the pamphlets of Thomas Paine, the right and the relationship of the individual to his government has been fundamental to this Democratic republic. The people have a right



to be heard. All of our laws have been changed by this ridiculous Supreme Court decision. Our laws on family, inheritance, negligence, and many others, have been changed by this piece of judicial legislation, which stresses the right to privacy not even mentioned in our Constitution, and thoroughly and totally avoided the right to equal treatment under the laws. The Court has given us an abominal decision. Are they the supreme beings? Has liberal humanism so permeated our world? That the privacy of one person has overwhelmed the very privilege of life itself? Shall 9 men, by a quasi judicial, legislative fiat, or shall our nation have the right to decide this elemental question? I think that it is an excellent suggestion that this come before our body for deliberation. For anybody to suggest that this has any purpose other than to consider the most serious issue before this nation today, I think it is entirely unjust to the sponsor."

Miller: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart, who is on the Republican side."

Hart: "I'd like to take the time of the House to introduce a portion of the 8th Grade Class from Webster Junior High in Benton, which includes my son, Paul. Would you all stand up please?"

Miller: "The Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer, is recognized."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it seems to me that we have here a situation where the



purvue of this legislature is under question as to whether or not we should make our feelings known to the collegues on the national level, the United States House of Representatives. It has been said that the Court has avoided the issue and was unwilling to decide as to when life began. Fortunately, in this case, the Court has stayed out of this area, but it seems to me that it is perfectly proper for the Congress of the United States to define by a constitutional amendment when life does begin. If we are going to be in the legal process of protecting life, of protecting human rights, we have to have a definition, and it seems to me that we should have a definition that no body of nine men can over turn. This needs to be written into constitutional law. It seems to me, also, that the power to change the law under the separation of powers, which was mentioned here, is certainly the right of the legislative body of the United State's Congress. This is the proper place. Once again, we as a legislature, we as the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, should advise our congressment, the whole Illinois delegation as to what our sense of propriety is. What we think ought to be in that law. This is our opportunity to make an input into federal law. The question has been asked whether or not rape and incest and other questions of conceptions have been pointed out. I think that the resoltuion as it is drafted, goes quite far enough, because it very specifi-



cally calls attention to the right to save the life of the mother. Now we recognize that there are physical which could bring about death. There are also mental pressures which could bring about death. This would be in the hands of a physician or a board of physicians, and it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we are taking a perfectly proper position, because when we put in there, in the resolution calling for the amendment, we have said save the life of the mother. We are recognizing that if we cannot save and protect two lives, then we must save and protect one. We are making a choice, that's true. But we are in the position of saving the most life. I heard in a speech in this House just a few weeks ago, the idea that that a...when they came for the Jews that I didn't speak, and when they came for the old people, I didn't speak, and when they came for me, there was no one left to speak. And it seems to me that the Supreme Court decision that permits abortion is one step down the path that lead to its logical conclusion would have a situation whereby, by law, we could decide to destroy members of a religious group, members of a race, the genocide, which was present in Nazi Germany, all too few years ago, is a logical extension of the path that we have started down, starting with the Supreme Court decision. I think that it is definitely time for this House to memorialize Congress and call for a clear definition of law regarding this and forbid-



ding abortions. I am in strong support of the resolution."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Murphy."

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

Miller: "Alright, the previous question has been moved. All those in favor say aye, opposed nay, the ayes have it, and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Now we'll return to the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. R. L. Dunne, to close the debate."

Dunne: "Well, I want to make one comment on Representative Washington's remarks. He suggested that my motives are political for this resolution. I want you to know that for as long as I am in this General Assembly, this is probably going to be one of the most personal, serious matter to me, and I assure you, it isn't political. I think all that has been said, all that has been said that can be said, about this important resolution. If you Gentleman see fit to pass it out, I personally after the General Assembly convenes, will deliver the resolution to the members of the Illinois delegation in Washington and urge them to pass the Constitutional Amendment. Thank you very much."

Miller: "Alright, the question is on the adoption of House Resolution 113? All those in favor say aye, the opposed, nay, Does five members join requesting a roll call? Yes, I see about 15 and I'll not call their names when there are that many. Alright, you shall have a roll call."



Alright, all those in favor of the adoption of House Resolution 113 will vote aye, opposed nay. Now for the explanation of votes, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Harold Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, and responding to the last speaker, the main thrust of my remarks were not that it was political motivation. The main thrust of my remarks went to the fact that in introducing this bill or resolution to the House, the sponsor had resorted to character assassination, and I felt that such allegations have no place on the floor of this House, and I don't think any individual or institution should be castigated by a member of this House solely based upon allegations read in the press. That was the main purport of my remarks. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the previous Majority Leader, the fact that there is no analogy between this and what happened relative to the black movement for freedom in this country. Blessey vs. Ferguson was not overridden by constitutional amendment. No, what black people did, was got their horses together, got their legal talent together, and trekked back and forth to the Supreme Court for a hundred years until we overrode that decision. That's the fundamental difference, we didn't go crying about a constitutional amendment. We went back to the source of our problem, and made them,



after a hundred years, reverse that decision. There is no connection between these two at all. This particular resolution, as far as I'm concerned, is innocuous. Its the by-products, the debate that came out of it that disturbs me, I vote no."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as a co-sponsor of this measure, I rise to support. The position of this House, in the past, has always been the position taken in this resolution when we have consistently beaten the abortion on demand bill. This issue will not go away. It is the most important issue facing this House this session and probably for some sessions to come. Since the Supreme Court made us powerless in this field, our only recourse is to do what we are doing in this resolution and to ask Congress to pass the law which would take care of this abortion problem and reverse the Supreme Court decision. On every occasion in the past, we have arisen, and I have arisen, to speak for the rights of these unborn children. Until the Supreme Court's decision, they did have rights in the law, as I have on either occasion, and as you have seen many, many pictures of the living fetus, no one can say that that fetus was sucking his thumb and has all the members of its body. No one can look at that fetus and say its not living, and no one has the right to take



the rights of this fetus, the rights of the unborn child. So I rise again, and I shall continue to rise in support of the rights of these unborn children. I ask your support."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Cpok, Mr. Kelly."

Kelly: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen in the Assembly, this is the first time and maybe it'll be the only time that I'll speak on this House floor, but I think that is, as Bob Dunne, had indicated, the most important piece of legislation as far as I'm concerned that this assembly may have to face itself with. I for one, think that the unborn child has rights that have been completely denied to him, that the Supreme Court of the United States has decided that in ...up to three months that a life could be taken, and that there was not human life, and that at three months and one day, the rights would be installed. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, there isn't much difference in 24 hours, and the size of a baby, and this is a real important issue, and I ask that everyone join me, at least those that feel that the unborn child rights are as important as the womens' rights, and as everyone else in the United States. And I definitely voting for this and ask for your support to join Representative Dunne."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Walters."

Walter: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I see



we have the support, but I would like to comment that this bill is a first cousin to a bill that I have, House Bill 1822. It gets to the point, it was brought up earlier, by the distinguished Representative from the other side of the aisle, who is watching me very carefully. He spoke about the Supreme Court's inability to decide when life begins, and their famous decision, they talked about this and the court concluded that there has always been strong support that life does not begin until birth, but the judiciary at this time points out in their review that the point of development of man's knowledge up to date, we are not in a position to speculate of this answer. We...they did not look into the medical science and take the testimony of some 200 doctors, in that particular case, and when our bill is heard, House Bill 1822, we plan to have some medical experts from all over the United States, and some from New Zealand, and we hope to testify and to prove the Supreme Court medically when life begins and therefore pass 1822, and I support House Resolution 113 also. Thank you."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe."

Wolfe: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I have never supported or condoned the doctrine of abortion. I do not wish to substitute my judgements for the disciplines that were before the United States Supreme Court, and which disciplines could not agree and this was not the Court's



decision, it was the decision of doctors and medical people, hospital people, sociologists, religions leaders, in all walks of life and their testimony in the records before that Court came to the conclusion that the Court would not determine, not would the Court fix in this opinion, the time "in which life begins" and I do not wish to substitute my judgement in that area. I wish to preserve the 14th Amendment, the 1st Amendment, and the other Amendments that guaranty in the United States Constitution that the Court spoke about. This resolution does not solve the question of abortion. This resolution only states that I, who do not believe, as this resolution states, must accept it as a belief, and this the Court said, was wrong. Now the right of privacy guaranteed under the Constitution was emphasized by the United States Supreme Court, and all I am saying today on the floor of this House again, is that I do not condone the act of abortion. We have guidelines, we have legislation being introduced in the Senate and this House that will preserve the guidelines established by the United States Supreme Court, that will set up guide lines to create quality medicine in the area of abortion. With respect to the other questions, I don't think this House, I don't think the Congress of the United States can make this determination and come to this decision, because if we would believe this resolution, we have murdered, guilty, by the pregnant woman, one second after



conception, and I'm sure that nobody in this House will adopt or buy that particular doctrine."

Miller: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't happen to be an attorney nor a constitutional expert, but from what, in explaining my vote, Mr. Speaker, from what I can understand of the Supreme Court's decision, the decision left a void in our understanding of human problems and that void was simply whether or not life does exist in these first three months. And I won't suggest that unless a decision is finally made on this question that something will fill that vacume or that void and that will be one of two things. It will be either an increase disregard and callessness toward human life, or it will be an in creasd concern and desire to protect human life. And it seems to me that if the State has any responsibility at all in this area, it is in the direction of protection of human life. Now if we are to err in one way or another, I personally prefer to see the error made in the direction of protection of human life rather than the callus disregard of it. I think the decision here is almost as simple. I see nothing wrong with at least memorializing Congress to address its attention to this question that must be answered. We once had to determine whether or not this nation could exist half slave and half free, and we did determine it. Perhaps, this question is paramount to that. Can we



hold the fabricate of our society together. If we do not come finally, to a conclusion as to when life starts, whether or not it needs protection, I believe this decision has to be made, it will be made, one day, and I believe it will be made in the direction of recognition of life and protection of life at the earliest stage. I urge support of this amendment."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson."

Rayson: "To explain my vote, Mr. Speaker, it seems we are all head-up over a rather innocuous resolution, and I guess we are discussing this thing from our hearts and not our heads. The last speaker I certainly agree with if we can ever determine that great question, I hope we can. I want to say the Supreme Court said they didn't have to decide when life begins. Because the 14th Amendment says every person born or naturalized is a citizen of the United States and every citizen is entitled to privilege of immunity, and equal protections of law. And the word "born" means born. And that is where its at and I suggest to you newcomers who haven't been in the this heretofore, we had a law for a hundred years that didn't work. First, it was a grind to the woman, secondly it didn't deter a legal abortion, in fact, one day we clocked fourteen illegal abortions going into Cook County Hospital from 9:30 in the morning to 1:30 in the afternoon. So the law is phony. The point is where are we



going to go constitutionally. Should we regard this as a religious question and be honest, and suggest that the minority has been viewed by religious viewpoint should impose it on others in our society? I'm not ready for that, and I don't think we've touched on the first amendment, but we are moving in that direction. All I suggest to these Gentlemen who are very strong on this issue and are not constrict constructionists when it comes to the Constitution, and bear in mind the right of privacy in the 9th amendment is only one of five a...a...aspects of the Bill of Rights that the Court touched upon. Let us recognize that we are a government of constitutional authority, and that's what is important in this land, and let us use every discouragement device that we can in the discouragement policy of the State to deter abortions, and I think we can, but let's not get hung up on this."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Gibbs."

Gibbs: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in briefly explaining my vote, this of course, is not in any sense of the word an innocuous resolution. As has been stated by several legislators previously, this is one of the most important things that we will be considering before the Illinois General Assembly. When the Supreme Court ruled in *Roll vs Wade*, they said we cannot decide, we don't know when life begins. Yet, what do they do, they break down into three trimesters,



and say one second after third trimester, or before, that you can or you can't, so what they're doing, they say on the one hand you can't regulate and we don't know, and on the other hand, they go ahead and they do regulate and control. So this type of resolution is definitely needed. We have a House control bill coming up tomorrow, House Bill 623, to regulate abortions. As a result of this decision, as a result of this decision in Illinois, we don't have an abortion controls. Anyone at any time at any place can perform and get an abortion. And that can be done, it is being done, without any controls at all. And the Supreme Court says that we can have some controls, so this type of resolution is absolutely necessary to put in some controls on the Supreme Court. It is said we don't know, but they go ahead and say this is the way they are going to do it. I urge your support for this resolution. Have all voted who wished?

Miller: "Have all voted who wished? Just a moment, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter, to explain his vote.

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this resolution memorializes through Congress, to adopt a Constitutional Amendment that would not only state a broad principle of law, but goes farther; namely, that it presumes to legislate when abortions shall be allowed. That is only to save the live of the mother. It ignores the problems of pregnancies resulting from cases of rape



or incest. It ignores pregnancies where there is no doubt, medically, that the child will be born with a irremedial mental or physical defects, consistently with the positions that I have taken in the past, this entire matter belongs under the criminal laws of the State of Illinois, I must vote no on this resolution. I think the resolution, perhaps, goes too far. Perhaps, the Supreme Court also went too far, but I think the resolution must address itself properly to this question. I think it does not do so in my mind, and I vote no."

Miller: "The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my vote. When I campaigned, I said that I would abide by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, the highest law of the land, on the question of abortion. And if the Supreme Court says that there cannot be abortions, I would abide by that decision. I feel that everytime we don't like what the Supreme Court does, we should memorialize it, its not the induced essence of justice or fairplay. I, myself, have mixed abortions about abortion. My church is against it. But I pledged myself to follow the decisions of the Supreme Court, and I feel it is high time that we honor the highest law of the land, and therefore, I'd like to vote no on this subject."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."



Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I cannot say when life begins, and I'm not sure if anyone can definitely say when life begins. But I submit to you that I know when life ends. Life ends when the executioner destroys a criminal, a convicted criminal. An life ends in a war when our men are required to kill or be killed. I think that this resolution is incomplete. I'm surprised that this resolution does not also memorialize Congress to abolish capital punishment in all cases, and to completely and totally abolish war."

Miller: "Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, is recognized."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, of all the issues that have come before this House for consideration, the one which has distressed and disturbed me the most and has given me most cause for soul searching and has been all the bills that we have considered relating to abortion. I find the decision here, most perplexing. On the one hand, I can't understand the need for the liberalizing of our abortion laws; on the other hand, I know and feel that we need a law and more law, which will protect life. In all of the discussions in this very divisive issue, we have looked to those whom we trusted in the medical field and in the courts to give us decisions. We have looked to the judges and the judges, rather than giving answers, have



2225

confounded us. And to paraphrase St. Luke, woa until you judges for you have confounded the minds of men. I am more perplexed now, than ever before on this issue. I repeat that I understand the need for liberalizing abortion laws, but my concern and respect for life, and whether that comes from a religious background and up-bringing in a particular faith or not, I'll leave that to your determination, but I cannot find myself or bring myself to vote for legislation which will take away, what I considered to be, God's given life. I vote aye."

Miller: "Record the Gentleman as aye. On this quetions there are 122 ayes, 30, was it 32 nays? 32 nays and 2 present. And this resolution having received the majority of the vote is hereby declared passed.' For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ike Simms rise?"

Simms: "Please record me as voting present."

Miller: "Record the Gentleman as present. Mr. Hirschfeld, the Gentleman from Champaign."

Hirschfeld: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think in three years down here, I don't believe I have have arisen on a point of personal privilege, but I would like to bring the House's attention to a matter that somewhat troubled me. A...I received in the mail today, a clipping which is apparently in some type of brochure that put out by the Illinois Educational



Association, and the title of the clipping is quote Hirschfeld moves to abolish tenure. And it states as follows: Representative Hirschfel, Republican of Champaign, has been awarded the dubious honor or becoming the most anti-teacher member of the Illinois House of Representatives. Thank you. He was closely followed by Representative Charles Clabaugh, Republican of Champaign, Charles Campbell, Republican of Danville, and John Lauer, Republican of Logan. Now Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I suggest to the members of this House that this was probably written by Senator Bruce's brother, who thoroughly castigated those of us who supported the amendment to abolish tenure that we tried to put on Representative Hanahan's bill. And I would like to point out to the members of this General Assembly that I think we have the same right to try and amend bills that the Illinois Educational Association opposes as they do to make thousand dollar contributions during campaign, to members that they support. I did not receive one of their contributions, I don't expect to receive one in the future, but I think that the members of the I.E.A. have got to be told that freedom of speech is a two-way street, and if they can try to solicit support from Representatives by making thousand dollar cash contributions, we have the same right to try and solicit support for our stand on this issue by putting an anti-tenure



amendment on a bill. In conclusion, I would like to say this. I do not believe that I am an anti-teacher Representative, but I can assure the teachers in the State of Illinois, that if they don't start spending more time paying attention to the needs of the schools and the students, and less time paying attention to their hours wages, and working conditions, I won't have to put an anti-tenure amendment on a bill, they are going to bring it on themselves."

Miller: "Alright, for the information of the members, it is the Chair's intention to call one more resolution. Its on the Speaker's table, and then proceed to the order of Third Reading in accordance with the rules, to pick up those bills for which the time is expiring. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer, arise?"

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, point of personal privilege, since my name was mentioned. I simply rise to say that I concur with Representative Hirschfeld in his remarks and I refuse to be in anybody's leading strings."

Miller: "Alright on the Speaker's table is House Resolution 151. A...just a moment, for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos, arise?"

Maragos: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. You stated that you are going to hear bills on Third Reading that'll expire in the next day or two. I want, also, a general ruling from the Chair, if it can be given at this time, Mr. Speaker, regarding the anomaly which appears on the



calendar showing that some bills have until June 6 or May 31st before they are going to be heard. Now, does that overcome the rule that all bills have to be out of the House by May 25 now? Now that is the question, is there any opinion on that?"

Miller: "The present rules of the HOuse provide that all bills must be called or have action by May 25. That's the present rules of the HOuse. As I stated previously, the Chair has stated in accordance with the rules, also, that we are required those bills which will be expiring today and tomorrow."

Maragos: "I understand the ruling on that, but the question is don't you think we should put on the calendar to remind everybody that the June 6 and May 31 date is not the date, or put on some measure, because there may be some confusion on this issue, and I think it should be taken care of."

Miller: "WE'll sure consider that Mr. Maragos, and the rules committee is going to meet tomorrow morning."

Maragos: "Thank you."

Miller: "Alright, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry Mr. Skinner, with respect to House Resolution 151."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, would I be in order at this time to move the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Resolution 151?"

Miller: "Yes, I believe amendments are in order at this stage."

Skinner: "I would do so, and in explaining the amendment, I



would say that this resolution creates a committee to study the Fezone proposal of the Corps of Engineers. The resolution, as it was originally drawn, would create a five member special study committee. The resolutions amendment expands the committee to six members; three from the majority, and three from the minority."

Miller: "Is there discussion on the amendment? The Gentleman from DuPage, I'm sorry, Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the sponsor yield for a couple of questions?"

Miller: "A..proceed sir."

Schlickman: "What are the objects or concerns upon which this resolution is based?"

Miller: "Now we are discussing the amendment first. The amendment has not been adopted."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Miller: "Alright, Mr. Skinner moves that amendment No. 1 be adopted to House Resolution 151. Is there discussion? All those in favor of adopting the amendment say aye, opposed nay, the ayes have it and the amendment is adopted. Now, there is no other amendments, Mr. Clerk? Alright, Mr. Skinner is recognized to explain the resolution."

Skinner: "If I may, in explaining the resolution referred to, a...Representative's Schlickman's first question. I first learned of the Corps of Engineers Fezone proposal when I read the ...when I read the minutes of my local



conservation district and say that a public hearing was going to be held at Woodstock to explain the proposal. Unfortunately, or fortunately, well, unfortunately, I was unable to attend this public hearing because it was during the period in which the legislature was in session. But I did obtain a copy of the pamphlet that the Corps of Engineers did put out. They have proposed to cover approximately 20% of the area in McHenry County with waste water, and they proposed to pump approximately 13 feet of waste water to McHenry County and to percolate it through what they call, a living filter, which is in effect, the land of McHenry County each year. Now immediately, questions sprung to my mind as to where we put an additional 13 feet of water in McHenry County when we are experiencing flooding throughout the County, both in the eastern section along the Fox River, and the western section in the Meringo area. And having read the pamphlet I had more questions than I had answers, and subsequent to that, I found that constituents of mine had talked to the corps of engineers and have gotten different answers from what appears in the pamphlet and what was presented at the public hearing. And the intent of this motion is to have a committee of the House of Representatives study the problem and bring back some information that is more explicit than what is now available. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Miller? If



Mr. Miller has further questions, or other people have further questions, I would be happy to attempt to answer them."

Miller: "Is there discussion? Alright, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Will the sponsor yield to further questions?"

Skinner: "Yes."

Miller: "Proceed."

Schlickman: The Army Corps of Engineers, about a year ago, by Congressional authority, announced that it was going to develop a plan for waste water management disposition disposal in the south Lake Michigan area of the region. The Corps of Engineers, before commencing its study, invited Representatives of all interest groups within the region to participate. It further established a number of alternatives that it would consider. To my knowledge, the Corps of Engineers has not finalized its plan, which would be simply that, there is no authority or basis that I am aware of for implementation of that plan. And I further suggest that such a plan would be for the northeastern Illinois counties area, plus the northwestern part of Indiana, the Counties of Lake and Porter, in Indiana. The legislature has created a planning commission for this region, and I'm wondering if before we burden the House, expend money, it wouldn't preferable to secure through that statutorily created agency, the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission, its comments,



report, relative to the activities of its Army Corps of Engineers, and in addition to that, I also inquire as to why you have such a late reporting date, which is in 1975?"

Skinner: "I would answer the a...the first half of your question by saying that I certainly would welcome the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission's participation. In fact, they certainly, it would be within their mandate, in fact, I would think it would almost be a necessity for them to be now doing a study on this. However, we have not yet felt their presence. I would further point out that if, indeed, all interest groups, were notified of this program, why 600 people showed up in Woodstock to hear about it, none of which had any prior information on it, why approximately 3000 people showed up in Iroquois County for a meeting to talk about the Fezone Proposal, why 6000 people showed up in the Kankakee area, excuse me, in the Kankakee Valley area, in Indiana, approximately two days after the hearing in Woodstock, I would assert flatly that all of the interest groups were not notified by the Corps of Engineers. And I think this is in keeping with the Corps of Engineer's reputation. Throughout a...well, at least recent history in this country, they were the ones that were dumping sludge in Lake Michigan. They were the ones that were channelizing natural streams in order to facilitate the flow of water.



They are not, traditionally, an organization that has been dedicated to the preservation of the environment. In fact, one might even go so far as to contend the reverse, that they have been dedicated to destroying the environment. A..my personal experience with the Corps of Engineers, and one of the reasons why I definitely want the legislature involved in anything that the Corps of Engineers is planning to do of such a magnitude, was when I was working for the Budget Bureau, which is now called the Office of Management and Budget, in Washington, in 1965 and 1966. At that time, I had the good fortune to meet the Budget Examiner for the Corps of Engineers, and much to, well not really much to my surprise, because I had read several studies and a...about the corps, let's say, I had it confirmed that the Corps of Engineers often got projects approved that could not be a...supported through cost benefit studies and I really have no reason whatsoever to trust the Corps of Engineers' decision to to anything. I'm not suggesting that their program is illfounded, all I'm suggesting is that the State should investigate it. That the State Legislature should investigate because it will have impact on approximately 70% of the population in the State of Illinois. In further answer to your question why Nippsi should be supplemented, if indeed, Nippsi is running a study on this, I would point out that some of the counties I have named and some that I haven't named, that are effected by this



program, are not in the area covered by the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission. I don't believe Grundy County is, I'm not certain about Kendall, it may be. I'm not sure, perhaps, you could tell me whether Kankakee is. But at any rate, the area covered is an extremely large area, and I believe that there is a a..a place for the legislature in studying this Plan."

Miller: "Alright, the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Sangmeister."

Sangmeister: "Thank you. I rise on a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, rapidly not to break up debate here, but we have some students here from the Parkview School in Will County, and on behalf of Representative Leinenweber, Speaker Blair, and myself, I would like the House to greet them if they would stand up please from the Parkview School, the Sixth Grade."

Miller: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell, is recognized."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this resolution. I don't think that the two are going to be in conflict at all, as far as planning is concerned and as far as this resolution is concerned. I think that what we have here again, is one of those federal ploys whereby they come in and study and study and then finally come along with the solution in which we get over the head with. I think in this particular case that if we go along with this resolution,



we will have a tool at our disposal whereby we can alert our Congressment as to just exactly what is going on. Without it, I suggest to you that we have nothing. I feel that this is a good resolution and I think that we should vote it aye."

Miller: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, arise? You have already spoken on this sir."

Schlickman: "No I haven't Mr. Speaker, I directed inquiries to the sponsor, but I haven't had an opportunity to comment with regard to the merits of the resolution. I should simply like to say that I share with the sponsor of this resolution in not having any sympathy with the Army Corps of Engineers in its lack of environmental interest and concern. But I do say, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that this body, the Illinois State Legislature, has created a planning commission for the area under consideration, the region under consideration. Its mandated that body to develop a comprehensive general plan, and more specifically, functional plans, one of which is waster water management. The federal government requires a designated agency for the region to come up with a particular functional plan and it is simply my thought, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, before we create a special body of this House, that we communicate, that we communicate with the regional planning commission that we created, get its response, get its comment, and then, on the basis of that, determine at a subsequent time



whether it be two weeks, three weeks, or four weeks, from now as to whether or not we feel that this body should proceed into such an investigation. I don't know, and I don't see, that there is an emergency involved, and this is particular emphasized by the late reporting date that the sponsor has for the resolution, which is in January of 1975. I should not like to vote against the resolution, but I do think that it would be proper and appropriate for further consideration for this resolution to be deferred for a couple of weeks."

Miller: "A..does a...alright, the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move the previous question."

Miller: "Alright, the previous question has been moved. All those in favor say aye, opposed nay, the ayes have it and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Mr. Skinner care to close?"

Skinner: "I would merely like to reiterate that Kankakee, Grundy, Iroquois, and Kendall Counties are not in the Nippsi planning area, and I think that this area goes the...the problem goes beyond their boundaries. I certainly think they have jurisdiction within their area, but the problem is much larger than that, and I would urge a favorable vote."

Miller: "Alright, the question is shall House Resolution 151 pass? We'll have a roll call on this inasmuch as there may be some expenses involved. All those in favor vote



aye, and opposed nay. This will take 89 votes. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, to explain his vote."

Schlickman: "Not to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker, but simply to ask that I be recorded as voting present."

Miller: "Record the Gentleman as present. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Record Mr. Piotrovich as aye. Record Kenny Miller as aye on this roll. On this question there are 111 ayes and no nays, and the resolution is adopted. On the order of Second Reading, is a bill which the time is going to expire this week. House Bill 623 on Second Reading. The bill...its been read a second time, and does the Clerk have amendments? A question for Mr. Gibb's the Gentleman from Sangamon, is there an amendment No. 1 there are some amendments here, can you help us sir."

Gibbs: "I believe that my amendment No. 2 is the one I just filed. I think Representative Rayson, I was told, has previously filed amendment No. 1, but I didn't..."

Miller: "Alright, the Clerk has found it. Mr. Clerk read Amendment No. 1."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment No. 1. Rayson. Amends House Bill 623 on page 1, by deleting lines 18 and 19, and inserting inlieu thereof the following."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson."

Rayson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 623 is an abortion bill. And I suppose our debate earlier should be rethashed on this question. My amendment,



and I would like to explain it, is an attempt to make what I consider a bill unconstitutional on its face, at least constitutional. Its an attempt to make proper a very strict abortion bill. The bill as reported out of committee allows the natural father to consent to procedures. It sets up various kinds of criminal abortion, not being able to file forms in triplicate as an act of criminal abortion. If you don't have resusitator equipment standing by, you are guilty of criminal abortion and a...it...it does other things with regard to the poor doctor, and it makes it guilty of criminal abortion whether or not he performs an abortion. It further suggests that you can appear in court at any time and point a guardian and determine the question by ability. All I'm saying by the amendment is to set up a procedures where these procedures, as allowed, the sponsor wants them to be allowed, but suggesting in certain cases that they cannot be allowed until after the first trimester of pregnancy. The amendment allows for the reporting of forms to the hospitals and not to the Vital Records Act, and the amendment I propose, knocks off those various sections which makes a doctor guilty of abortion, or criminal abortion, in a manner other than performing one criminally. It also changes the word "unborn person" to an unborn, to save the right of the unborn, to a...have the right of the parents consent, and so forth. In other words, its a very strict abortion bill, and the amendment



is trying to remove the bludent attempt, I might add, this totally contravenes the Roll vs. Wade decision of the Supreme Court. Now, I'd like to say further in regard to the amendment, and that is this. I have Attorney General Scott's opinion, that says right now, a...and I'll quote, at the present time there is no law prohibiting abortion through any clause, by any person, in the State of Illinois, which means that a... a...an unlicensed person can perform an abortion and get away with it. So its important that we have a criminal abortion statute. So I would hope to support this bill and I would hope that the House would adopt this amendment and I would now move for the adoption of amendment No. 1 to House Bill 623."

Miller: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Gibbs."

Gibbs: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this amendment. This form of amendment was proposed in committee, and it was turned down. I might add that I do have amendment No. 2, which incorporates several of these points that were recently, or were just brought up. No. 1, for instance, I have excluded the language, which it was believed to me, the act unconstitutional in the first trimester. And then, No. 2, I said the abortion, when it is performed in a hospital, and I added or any other licensed medical



facility. And then No. 3, in my amendment, which is not covered here, is that the original bill, precluded and forbade an experimentation on fetus. The hospitals are performing experimentations on fetuses provided that they are not live fetuses. So I have changed the bill to read that they cannot, it makes it an abortion or a violation of this law, if they would perform an abortion or an experimentation of the live birth as defined under the Vital Records Act. So I believe that amendment No. 2, which encompasses many of the problems that were just raised under amendment No. 1. I ask that amendment No. 1 be defeated."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I can't find a copy of this amendment. Has it been distributed?"

Miller: "The Clerk informs me that they have been distributed. The members have amendment No. 1 on their desks. Would you...those who are interested, would you check your bill book? Alright, the question is, a...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Harold Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, I can't find the amendments either. Will the sponsor of the amendment yield for a question?"

Miller: "He indicates he will, you may proceed."

Washington: "Representative Rayson, I'm somewhat confused as between what your amendment does and what the proposed amendment of Representative Gibb's does. Would you tell



me what your amendment does that his does not do?"

Rayson: "Alright, do you have the bill? Do you have the bill?"

Washington: "Yeh, I have the bill."

Rayson: "The first section with regard to a...a...abortion, you must first obtain written consent of the natural father, or consent of the parents if there is an unmarried minor. I'm changing that from an unborn person to the unborn. I'm trying to save the intent of his bill. On page 2 he says if done during the state of pregnancy subject to the time when the unborn person is viable pursuant to court order, a hearing may be held to determine reasonable grounds of viability. I'm trying to say after the first trimester of pregnancy upon a physician's certificate that there is viability, court proceedings may be had, and a guardian may be appointed to determine the question of viability. A...another point, he said if abortion is performed during the second trimester, he said it must be performed in a hospital where resuscitation equipment is there. I say or any other licensed medical facility, to make sure there is resuscitation equipment. And then, a...he says to fill out forms in triplicate to the Vital Records Act. I say fill it out in triplicate to the hospital in which it is performed. And then he has four categories of criminal abortion. You get 1 to 10 years in the pokey, if the doctor doesn't fill out the forms, or if the resuscitation



equipment isn't there."

Washington: "Well not the Supreme Court used the language dealing with the right of privacy. Do you know if Representative Gibbs in proposed amendment, changes the recordation from the Vital Statistics Office to keeping personal hospital or clinical records?"

Rayson: "Well, I'm unclear on that. I think it is still the records of the Vital Records Act, and I see that it bears no reasonable relationship to the abortion procedures defined by the court. What I'm trying to do, Representative, is present that this bill is unconstitutional in its face, and even though the amendment I offered may be unconstitutional, yet I think it is a help that I try to preserve his intent, but at the same time, knock off those ridiculous provisions of criminal abortion to a doctor because he doesn't fill out records? Or that resuscitation equipment isn't standing by? Yes, let it stand by, but should he go to jail in case it doesn't? Can he control that and other kinds of things that I consider are improper, a felony, for what a doctor what otherwise might consider a medical practice. That's all."

Miller: "We have some problems here, may I interrupt you sir? I understand that Amendment No. 2 has not been distributed yet, so I think the Chair is going to be compelled to hold this bill for the time being. The deadline is today on moving it, but we'll have to hold it for the time being



and to onto Third Reading bills with the understanding that we'll have to come back to this bill. Alright, now it is the Chair's intention to call the bills on Third Reading. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Gibbs, arise?"

Gibbs: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you referred to Amendment No. 2. I also know there is some objection, the Representative said they did not have Amendment No. 1, so could I request that Amendment No. 1 be redistributed at the same time 2 is."

Miller: "I think that is very much in order sir. Alright, for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson, arise?"

Rayson: "The Amendment No. 1 has been distributed. As a matter of fact, I have more than one copy..."

Miller: "Well, several members indicate they don't have Amendment No. 1."

Rayson: "Alright, I was going to say we could procede on this and go to Amendment no. 2 later, but if it is the will of the sponsor, wants all this to, its alright with me."

Miller: "The Chair recognized the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, while you are on Second REading, Representative Porter and myself have House Bill 1680, which is an emergency piece of legislation, that will help the suburban bus company stand in operation between



now and July 1st. And I would like to make a motion that the appropriate rules of the House be waived so we may consider this bill on Second Reading at this time, and hopefully, have it on Third Reading tomorrow."

Miller: "Alright, the Gentleman has moved that with respect to House Bill 1680, that the rule 37 be suspended for the purpose of considering this Bill out of order. This will take 107 votes. Those in favor vote aye, and opposed nay. Have all voted who wished? Take the record Mr. Clerk. Mr. J. J. Wolfe, aye. Mr. Hill, aye. Mr. Katz, aye. There's many of them aye here. I suggest if you would like to vote on this, please give your names to the Clerk. On this question there are 121 ayes and no nays, and this motion being successful, having received 107 votes, is hereby declared passed. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, arise?"

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker I rise on a point of personal pleasure. I would like to introduce to the members of this House a two distinguished delegations from Lawrence County in the Speaker's gallery immediate to the rear, the ladies from a political organization, of which I am affiliated. And also the ladies from the Lawrence County Home Extension. Ladies would you stand up so that you might be seen? I should note, Mr. Speaker, that the third from the left in the right Speaker's gallery, is Mrs. Garald Bergoo, whom many of you will remember, my distinguished predecessor, Garald Bergoo from the 54 District."



Miller: "Alright, the Gentleman's motion having prevailed with respect to House Bill 1680, which is now on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk read the bill."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1680. Porter. A Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act making appropriations to the Department of Transportation for certain emergency transportation. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amendment No. 1 amends House Bill 1680 on page 2 by deleting 6 through 21, and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Miller: "In connection with this amendment, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative McCourt and myself are again indebted to you for allowing us to bring this emergency measure a step further along the way. Amendment No. 1 is an amendment suggested by the staff. As you know, our bill was rather hastily drafted. This is a technical amendment that tightens up the original draft, and I move its adoption."

Miller: "Is there discussion? The question is shall committee amendment No. 1 be adopted. All those in favor say aye, opposed nay, the ayes have it and the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment No. 2. Porter. Amends House Bill 1680 on page 2 by deleting 6 through 21 and inserting in lieu



thereof the following and so forth."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, I move that amendment No. 2 be tabled."

Miller: "Alright, the a...does the Gentleman have leave to table Amendment No. 2? Hearing no objection, the Amendment No. 2 is tabled. Are there further amendments? The bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen we are going now to Third Reading and it is the Chair's intention to call those bills which expire on May 9th. The first bill on that list is House Bill 368."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 368. Catania. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unemployment Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Miller: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania."

Catania: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, House Bill 368 was amended in committee, so that the bill is now Committee Amendment No. 3. House Bill 368 would include domestic workers in the Unemployment Compensation Act. Domestic workers have been included in the Unemployment Compensation Act in the State of New York, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia for several years. In New York, it's been for a very long time and the program has worked very successfully. Domestic service, as you will see if you read Amendment No. 3, is defined to mean work ordinarily performed as an integral part of household duties that contributes to the maintenance of the employer's residence



or administers to the personal wants and comforts of the employer and other members of the household and guests. And then it lists all the people who are included in this. This is the standard definition of domestic service which is used by the Social Security Administration. Now Amendment NO. 3 makes this provision considerably weaker, really, than it was originally. Originally, any domestic worker would have been included under the provisions of this bill who earned \$500 from one employer in a calendar year. However, Amendment No. 3, weakens that provision greatly, and now, domestic workers are covered if they earn \$500 from one employer in a calendar quarter, so that domestic worker who works one day or even two days a week, for one employer, would not be covered under the provisions of this bill. The cost of administering the Unemployment Compensation Act, incidentally, is paid in full by the federal government. This is not a cost that would have to be borne by the State of Illinois.

Miller: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As the sponsor of House Bill 368 indicated, this was heard in committee and it got quite a bit of static in committee to the point where she did amend it upward to the \$500 figure for any quarter. She characterizes this as a weaker bill, and that's true, but it is still instituting a brand new



practice in the State of which I object to, and I would like for Members of the House, particularly those that aren't aware of what the provisions of this bill provide. And that is to put domestic help under the Unemployment Comp. Bill. Now I've requested a fiscal note, and the sponsor has been attempting to get that fiscal note, from the Employment Security Administrator. She did have a fiscal note indicating that the cost of administering the Unemployment Comp. by approximately 94,000 on a \$500 basis. Now it would probably be lowered somewhat as a result of this amendment that went on the bill, but I doubt that it would be lowered that much to make it that, well, that secure, really. Actually, she points out that this is born by the federal government, and that could be very true, but I submit to you that regardless of who is paying the bill, it is still part of the taxpayers dollar, whether it be federal or State. I just think it is a bad concept, I think what it would do is really the opposite of what the sponsor is attempting to do and encourage people who do have domestic help in their home to work up to a point of increment of that quarter, and then possibly say, well I'm sorry, I don't need you now for the next three or four weeks, but you come back in the second quarter, or the third quarter, and so on. So I think what he is attempting to do is laudible, but I think the provisions of this bill would



have just the opposite effect, and I would urge you to vote negatively on this bill."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

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

Miller: "She indicates she will, proceed sir."

Totten: "Representative Catania, you indicated that there are several States which have done this. Do you have any indication from those States as to the number of people who were employed as domestics before enactment of such a provision and what has happened afterwards."

Catania: "I don't have exact figures from those States. The Illinois Department of Labor, however, indicates that the unamended bill would have extended the coverage of the Unemployment Compensation Act to an estimated 47,000 workers. Now if this number is going to be considerably lower for the amended bill since we are no longer able to include people who work only one day a week for a week for a given employer, so its less than 47,000 workers in Illinois."

Totten: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the bill, please?"

Miller: "Proceed sir."

Totten: "I can concur with the Representative from Peoria, that although the purpose of this bill may be laudible, I think the reverse is going to happen. It appears to me that what we may be doing is creating a full unemploy-



ment bill and discouraging the employment of domestics. And I think tha the reason for this bill is otherwise, and this legislation would be harmful in that area, and I too, would urge a no vote on this.

Miller: :The Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, I am informed that this is the day upon which will happen the first official practice of the House of Representatives ball team. And as a token of the esteem of the House for my distinguished colleague, seat mate, and running mate, I thought that it would be well to recognize that it is necessary for the inner-man to be well served. And knowing his affinity for roast duckling, I think it was appropriate today that his lunch would be duck with special sauce and who knows, maybe, the House team will become known as the Chinese bandits."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in support of this bill. I think that there are a whole legion of very hard working people within the domestic help category. People who are employees and deserve the protection that are afforded to other employees throughout the State. These are forgotten people, people that put in a long hard day's work. They are as apt to suffer unemployment as anyone else. They ought to be protected, they have no protection now. They are treated like



orphans under the law. I think that this is a good bill. I commend Representative Catania for presenting it, and I urge you to support it. Just think for a moment of the position of those who are domestic servants, who are working hard to save money to put kids through school, who have large families, who have to travel long distances to and from work. Why shouldn't we give them the protection that we give other people. As I said before, they are orphans in our society. They have no protections whatsoever. I think they ought to be protected. I think this bill deserves your support."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Will the sponor yield to a question?"

Miller: "Proceed sir."

Hirschfeld: "Representative, under the bill as it is now amended, I didn't quite hear this. Does the person who's earning the income have to make \$500 in any one quarter, or would it be possible, for example, for this particular domestic to make \$400 in one quarter, and then \$100 in the second quarter, and those two could be tacked together to make the \$500."

Catania: "No, it has to be in one calendar quarter."

Hirschfeld: "And as my second question, once the \$500 is made in calendar quarter, then he or she will automatically qualify for unemployment comp with regard to that particular employer is that correct?"

Catania: "if he or she meets all of the other provisions



of the Unemployment Compensation Act, which are fairly rigid."

Miller: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in support of this bill. What you are talking about are the people who work the longest, the people who work the hardest, and the people who do the dirtiest form of work. You are talking about those people who scrub your floors from the dirt you bring in. You are talking about people who do the most menial jobs, who care for the babies when you are there, who sit up and make life look luxurious, who make what's known as this protected and pampered bit that women want to protect. It is nice of you to provide a domestic for your wife and some help for her at home and so she can have the finer things in life. But when you stop and consider that these domestics do the actual work, they cook your meals, they perform all the menial tasks that you will not allow the children to do. They are the ones, if any one needs protection they too, have families. And as Mr. Mann has pointed out, they travel great distances to get to work. They arise early in the morning before you have arisen, so that they can travel 30 miles by C.T.A., or some other means, to get to the job. They arrive home late. These are the people that have to make due with what is known as soul food, or the leftovers from cooking. These are the people that we



say very graciously to, look how nice I am to you, I am giving you my disguards. But these are the people who are grateful. These are the people who are the foundation of this society. These are the people who believe in working for a living, and I suggest that if you turn your back on them you are turning your back on the very salt of the earth, because these people are worthwhile. They need protection and when they cry out to you now, I ask only that you hear them. Mrs. Catania has brought about a bill that is not popular to talk about these people because they don't have the large number of votes, they don't have the influence. But yet, I say to you, it is a great injustice which you do, and I ask you to hear her plea as she talks about the people who are truly poor, the working poor. Thank you."

Miller: "The Gentleman from McClain, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Lady would yield for a question."

Miller: "She indicates she will, proceed sir."

Bradley: "I'm wondering what would happen if a Lady was working for one employer, or one employee, or one employer, one lady, and she was laid off at the end of a year and went into apply for unemployment compensation, and she was given unemployment compensation under this bill. Now normally, an employer after laying somebody off of work, his employment insurance rate goes up. I don't know if you are familiar with that, but I imagine



that you are. It increases. But here we have a case where a lady lays off a person who has been working for her and does not contribute anymore to the unemployment insurance, and so because she doesn't have an employee, or is her rate going to go up even though she doesn't have an employee?"

Miller: "Mrs. Catania."

Catania: "Well, first of all, I think we have to consider the person who is applying for unemployment compensation. Now, that person has to go and apply for the unemployment compensation benefits, and must register with the Illinois Unemployment Service, where she will find that there are 200 jobs waiting for her. So in order to get unemployment compensation, she is going to have to say that she is available for work, and she is going to have to be willing to go for interviews for each of those jobs that meet the requirements that she places with the Illinois Unemployment Service. A...right now, there are between 100 and 150 requests for domestic workers for every 1 domestic worker who goes to the unemployment service because this system isn't functioning the way it is for everything else. Now I just wanted to make that point before I directly answered your question, which I am going to answer. If the woman decides that she is not going to have domestic help anymore, then she would have to continue to pay unemployment compensation insurance as long as that



woman was receiving unemployment benefits, but I think it is highly unlikely that that woman would continue to received unemployment compensation benefits for very long. As a matter of fact, I doubt that she would every be able to start receiving them once she reported to the Illinois Employment Service and found these 100, 150, 200 jobs waiting for her. This is really a move to get the economy going in that one area. You see, it is just not functioning in that area, the way in it is in other areas. In other areas, the Unemployment Compensation Act covers employees and the employees do report to the Illinois Unemployment Service and they find jobs if the job is available, but there aren't always jobs available. In this area, however, there are so many jobs available, that they just far far outnumber the number of applicants."

Bradley: "Thank you for the discertation. If there were that many jobs available, we wouldn't need this bill. But my concern is that after the person has been relieved of her job, she goes in an accepts the unemployment compensation. Generally, what happens to an employer, his rate goes up quite drastically to help pay for the unemployment of this person. And that was my question, is the lady or the man or the householder going to a...be subject to an increase in their rate even though they have no employee at all. I'm thinking, to give you an example, if an employer went out of business and laid off five employees,



he does not have to continue to pay that insurance. The rate doesn't go up because he's not an employer, he's not even in business. And that is what I'm wondering here. If the person does not continue to employ anybody they've laid them off, are they subject to an increase or not. An increase in their unemployment insurance."

Catania: "Well, you're right, you are talking about the definition of an employer, and such an employer who no longer was employing anybody would not meet the definition of an employer in the Unemployment Compensation Act, and therefore, could not be required to pay unemployment compensation insurance."

Bradley: "Well, thank you."

Miller: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn, is recognized."

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

Miller: "Alright, the previous question has been moved. All those in favor, say aye, the opposed no, the ayes have it and the Gentleman's motion prevails. I'll return to the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania, to close the debate."

Catania: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we are talking here about a group of people here who are not protected by unions. We are talking about extending the coverage of the unemployment Compensatin Act to this group of people who are not organized enough to come and ask for this protection themselves. Now many of us have feelings that unions are good. Others feel that unions are not always quite so good. I see no way that it is going to



cause domestic workers to unionize more quickly than to not take care of them in a fair way and just way on our own. I would like to repeat that there is no cost to the State of Illinois to the administration of this provision of the Unemployment Compensation Act. This cost is borne by the federal government. And Mr. Cohen tells me, at the Bureau of Employment Security, that the allotment has already been made by the U. S. Labor Department for the fiscal year of 1974, and they are currently rearranging their procedures and that this would not cause any great deal of trouble, that this would simply be appropriate, this would be adopted along with all of their other procedures that they are changing around right now. I would also like to repeat that this would really be an enhancement to the whole economic situation of domestic employment. As any of you know, who's ever tried to hirer a domestic worker, it is not easy to find someone who's reliable and responsible. This would add a little bit of dignity and a little bit of security to that job, and therefore, would make it easier to find these people. Also once, people in this position go to apply for unemployment compensation, they would be told that they must report to the Illinois Employment Service in order to qualify, and they would find that there were several job openings, so that the people who are looking for domestic workers would have



applicants. We don't have them now. And I say we, because I am one of the people who hires these domestic workers. I have two housekeepers in Chicago, so that I can be down here with you during the week, and I'm probably the one who is going to be most effected by this bill. I think it is a very fair bill, and I think it protects a group of people who do not now have protection. I solicit your aye vote."

Miller: "The question is, shall House Bill 368 pass? All those in favor vote aye, and those opposed, vote nay. Have all voted who wished? Alright, the Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Kennedy, to explain his vote."

Kennedy: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my yes vote. I believe that if you look on page 520 of your latest digest that you'll see that the young lady introduced her bill on the 20th of February. It received a very sensitive and thorough hearing. It had proponents and opponents. She met every objection by amendment. It came out of committee 14 to 2. It is a very laudible bill. Obviously, its a new field, it is an advance in social legislation and I think she deserves a yes vote."

Miller: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 116 ayes, 23 nays and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. The next bill which would



expire today, under the rules, is House Bill 446. Mr. Clerk, read the bill."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 446, and Act to amend an Act relating to alcohol liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate, is recognized."

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 446 is a quite simple amendment to the Dram Shop Act. The only way I've become aware of it is because of a happening in my district in the past year or so. I talked to the Liquor Control Commission about this provision, as far as the Dram Shop Act is concerned, some year ago and they approved wholeheartedly this amendment to the Dram Shop Act. It is a simple thing that if one holder of a liquor license is in violation of the Dram Shop Act at the present time, not only is he penalized for a year or more, but the premises themselves, are penalized also for a year or more. Consequently, this does work a hardship as far as the owner of those premises are concerned. As an example, some two years, 18 months ago, there was a tavern in my district that was in violation of the Dram Shop Act, and no one was opposed to the penalties that the owners of those license and the operator had to sustain. However, in the meantime, a legitimate operator in another tavern who has had more than twenty years of a clean operation with the Liquor Control Commission, purchased the property and desired



to open his own tavern 'in' this property because he had lost his lease on the property in which he had been operating for a considerable amount of time only to find out that he could not open a tavern in those premises for more than a year. I think this is in the interest of the owners of property of this nature. It's sustained as far as I know by the Liquor Control Commission. It was by the previous chairman. It's sustained by the various agencies and organizations throughout the state who are involved in this type of business. And I would encourage the Membership to give this Bill, 446, a favorable vote."

Speaker Miller: "All right, is there discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Miller: "He indicates he will. You may proceed."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Choate, I'm wondering if you could explain whether the situation is covered in your Bill, where the owner of a tavern is suspended, his license is suspended for any reason, is there anything to cover the situation of him selling his interest out to his son, his wife, or setting up a dummy corporation to continue business rather than the other situation that you explained?"

Choate: "No, I don't think that he would be able to do that because as I said, I worked with the Liquor Control Commission on this Amendment and I'm sure that they took that into consideration."



Speaker Miller: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Richard Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, ...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it seems to me that this is not a good proposal although I'm sure the Gentleman has very good reason for introducing a Bill to correct what he feels is an inequity in his district. Up in our part of the state it is very rare when you find the owner of real estate also having a license in his name. In most cases you'll find he'll own the property in one name and have the license in another name. Very often on the real estate in a trust, possibly, or the names of himself and his wife but have the license issued in a corporate name. We're all familiar with the potential liability under the Dram Shop Act of licensees, and for that reason most licensees have licenses in the name of corporations. Now the whole purpose of this Act is to protect the public. It's to require as much care and caution and consideration on the part of the landlord in granting a lease as we possibly can. This Bill would provide that the...that a licensee or that a...that a Dram Shop with a tavern could continue to operate in a location notwithstanding the fact that the owner might have been extremely careless in granting a lease to a person to whom he should have known would be a careless operator. It seems to me the purpose of the law as it now stands is for the protection of the public. If we adopt this proposal and pass out Bill 446 the public would or could be harmed. And I would oppose House Bill 446



and urge my colleagues to do likewise."

Speaker Miller: "All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fary."

Fary: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a very good Bill. Premises are closed and tied up, equipment and fixtures, supplies and everything else cannot be moved or disturbed. It's true that a new business can be opened up, a shoeshine parlor or grocery store or butcher shop. But the transfer of all the equipment for a temporary time and the difficulty in disposing...the fixtures and equipment in a tavern after it has been closed, quite frequently through no fault of the operator, and very few operators lose their license because of flagrant violation of the laws. Most of them are intentional, minors phony I.D.'s and so on. There's no sense of seeing a premises closed and locked for a year. I think an excellent, this is an excellent Bill and will permit the opening and the operation and the use of the premises where the landlord is not getting stuck."

Speaker Miller: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to ask a question of the Chair. Does this require a 107 votes for passage or 89?"

Speaker Miller: "Would you inform the Chair if you have knowledge that there's something in this Bill that would require more than 89 votes?"

Mahar: "Well, I'm wondering. It affects the home rule powers and municipalities and counties."



Speaker Miller: "I think Chapter 43...of the Statutes applies to all municipalities whether they're a municipality or a county of 5,000 population or 500,000 population. Question of Mr. Choate. It's a little difficult to tell here but it appears this has only to do with the state license, is that correct, Sir?"

Choate: "That's correct and I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that the state at the present time regulates the Dram Shop Act and this deletes one of the provisions rather than adding in a provision. So I would think that it had nothing to do with home rule power."

Speaker Miller: "Well, it would appear to the Chair then that this would take 89 votes, in answer to your question."

Mahar: "Mr. Chairman, may I speak on..."

Speaker Miller: "Yes, Sir, you may."

Mahar: "It seems...it seems to me that by state statute if the Liquor Control Commission was also the head of the local government whether they be village president, mayor or president of the county board, there is some area here which brings it in line with what we're talking about as far as home rule. Now the authority of the Liquor Control Commission, there was, I think the original example of home rule at its best was one area in which there was no question about who had the authority to operate in the area of controlling liquor licenses and administering the liquor ordinance as passed by the city council or village board. Now it seems to me that when you make an



amendment to this particular Bill which says that, really the business of revoking license for a total year is not effective; there can be a great deal of pressure on the Liquor Commissioner to issue that license to somebody else for the same premises. In the past one of the real powers that the Liquor Commissioner has had is the fact that he had the authority to revoke a license for a year. When you revoke a license for a year it automatically, statutorily says that nothing else from the...nothing else can be sold as far as liquor is concerned on those premises for one year. Now this is the type of thing that makes the landlord be cautious as to who he is renting his property to. And if the landlord happens to be the liquor license holder he's very cautious because he does know he can get into a great deal of economic trouble by losing his license for one year. And for that reason I think what we're doing here is taking some authority away from the Liquor Commissioner that they really need in this day and age of administering with the licenses. And I think we should vote against this Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill. We have had quite a bit to do with taverns on lands and buildings that have had taverns in them. And as the last Representative just brought out that it may help and it may not. You see, the case has often arrived from employees selling. A tavern operator who has a license does not necessarily and simply can't be



in his place of business all the time. So the landlord's further position of not only having to trust the tavern operator, he also has to trust the employees of the tavern operator. And could be put into the serious financial difficulty based on many possible factors. Now, if there's a university town in the area, and the way the young 18 year olds now attempt....16 or 17 attempt to...to falsify their ages, it puts indeed a great hazard upon any man owning a building in which a tavern may be located. It's completely unjust to penalize the owner for something that he knows nothing about; has nothing to do with; has not...he's not even there and yet he can suffer grievous financial loss through no fault of his own. And this is a very good Bill."

Speaker Miller: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill. I have had the experience of seeing some very dire hardships worked upon owners of property that are used for taverns. As the previous speaker indicated, using all of the diligence that one might you can get a bad apple. And when the operators of a tavern in rental property fail to carry out the rules and regulations and laws and is forced to closed his business, that should in no way work a hardship upon the owner of the property. I think that this Bill addresses itself to a...a situation that needs correcting in our society. And I cannot understand the opposition to it. I vote...I'm going to vote in favor of this Bill and I



would urge all of my colleagues to do likewise."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Boyle."

Boyle: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we've debated this fine Bill long enough. I move the previous question."

Speaker Miller: "The previous question has been moved. All those in favor say aye; opposed nay. The ayes have it and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate, is recognized to close the debate."

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this attempt to amend the Dram Shop Act boils down to only one thing. Are you going to penalize the perpetrator of a violation, the holder of the license, or are you going to penalize both he and the premise, a piece of land, or a building? Now the building and the piece of land has nothing to say whatsoever about the activities and the actions of the holder of that license. Now you and I know that regardless of what the debate has said here about placing the burden on the landlord, that the Liquor Control Commission itself in the final analyses is the one that either approves or disapproves the applicant as far as the license is concerned. I'm saying to you that you cannot no more hold the landlord responsible in this position than you can a landlord who leases premises to an insurance agency who runs off with the policyholder's dough. Or you cannot more hold the landlord responsible than you can the landlord who leases premises



to a used car agency who brings about a car theft ring. You can't no more hold responsible the premises in this instance than you can in banking premises when somebody embezzles that bank dry. The only thing that this is doing is denying the holder of the title to this piece of property the opportunity to invest it from a sound standpoint for a year. You're also denying the State of Illinois revenue that would be derived from that property for a year. I say that this is legislation that is in the interest of good government. It's in the interest of providing more revenue to the state. The Liquor License Commissioner, as I said rightfully so penalizes the holder of that license but it's forced because of the wording of the statute to penalize a piece of ground or a building. It doesn't make sense. It deprives, it creates a revenue loss. I would encourage a favorable vote."

Speaker Miller: "The question is, shall House Bill 446 pass? Those in favor vote aye; opposed nay. All right, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Richard Walsh, to explain his vote."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just briefly in explaining my vote, we're not penalizing a piece of property because it happens to be occupied for purposes of a tavern; we're penalizing the owner of that property because he was careless in leasing his property to a saloonkeeper who had his license revoked. Just to demonstrate to you how easy it



would be to circumvent the law if this Bill passed. I can own a piece of property and lease it to the ABC corporation in which I own all the stock. If the ABC corporation has its liquor license revoked, I can then lease that property to the FYZ corporation and own all the stock and just continue in operation ad infinitum with licensees whose licenses are revoked. I believe the owner of the property should be charged with some responsibility as to the manner in which that property is used. I would urge a no vote."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fleck, is recognized."

Fleck: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was going to explain my vote and in doing so I was going to be at ends with Representative R. Walsh who I seldom disagree with. And I was going to disagree with him despite his well-known reputation for being an expert in the area of Dram Shop. However, I think this is a very good Bill. Since it has a 109 votes I'm going to remain mute and maybe you'll have a Roll Call."

Speaker Miller: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 115 ayes and 21 nays. Mr. Skinner, aye... 122 ayes, 21 nays. And this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. The next I see expiring today is House Bill 631."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 631. An act to provide treatment for alcoholics and empower the Department of Mental Health to establish rehabilitation programs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Miller: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Gibbs."



Gibbs: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 631 is a result of efforts of the House Alcoholism Study Committee comprised of Representative Duff, Dyer, Matijevecich and Barnes. And as a result we came up with two significant Bills. One that Representative Matijevecich put in the other day which passed out of here and this is the second one. Now what this Bill does, it takes into consideration the alcoholism problem within the state...after the National Commission on Drugs met and said that the number one problem in the country today is not marijuana, is not LSD, it's not cocaine or any other drugs, it's by far and large alcohol. And that is our number one drug problem. What we're trying to get at with this type of legislation is better state control and better facilities for treatment of the alcohol...and to treat the alcoholic not as a criminal and to take the fines out of the Criminal Code for the alcoholic and remove all penalties for treating the alcoholic and treat him as a human being and treat it as a disease as it should be treated. I believe by this legislation we will be taking steps toward the massive problem of alcoholism which exists in the state today. Now what this Bill does is 25 pages plus the Amendment and I'll just briefly run over and hit the headlights of the Bill. Agree to a division of alcoholism within the Department of Mental Health which we do not presently have. We define, of course, the term of alcoholic and what it is. We set up a citizen's advisory council which will be recognized under statute and will report to the superintendent of the



division. The Bill provides for a coordinated system of services including regional detoxification centers one of which has been set up at Rockford, Illinois, and proven extremely successful. One question that will come up I know is what is this going to cost the State of Illinois? At the present time it will not cost us anymore than we've already allocated for the treatment of alcoholism. But, if these detoxification centers prove to be successful, and they can come back to us in another year or two years and show the success they've had, then, at that time they would ask for additional appropriations to set up additional facilities. It prohibits the counties or cities or the other political subdivision from enacting local ordinances contrary to state law relative in regarding intoxication as criminal rather than civil. The provisions in this act are mandatory and they're not permissive. Mandates the Department of Mental Health to set up this division and comply with the act. The Amendment as such was the result of meeting with the Department and taking out certain objections that they had which had to do with duplication of record keeping, visitation hours and such, and also commitment. However, I might say, the Department still says that they are not completely in favor of this Bill but the results of the meeting with them ended in the Amendment. We...we have telegrams from all over the state, from Marion, Illinois; Champaign; Homewood; Chicago; Rockford; East St. Louis; Peoria and Bloomington; all in favor of this



type of legislation. We have not received any adverse comments concerning it. We have the joint sponsorship of both the Republicans and the Democrats in the House. In closing I might add, the alcoholism has caused a ten billion dollar loss to industry in this country. It causes crime, accidents, deaths, and the worst of all, causes the broken marriages and families which we've all witnessed as a result of alcoholism. And I ask for your support and vote on this Bill."

Speaker Miller: "All right, for discussion, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Douglas."

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as a Member of the Committee that heard this Bill, I was particularly interested in the hesitation that was exhibited at that time by people from the Department of Mental Health; and have taken the time since then to speak with them and to explore further because of the intense interest in the area that I represent where we have some very difficult problems in the area of chronic alcoholism. To discuss further with them about the present program and what this new section of division of alcoholism would do. And I'm thoroughly convinced that this is an excellent idea. The Bill is a good one. What the Bill would intend to do is very important. It would not cost anymore than is presently being done. It would upgrade and improve the present system. Under the Department of Mental Health, it would look upon alcoholism, as Representative Gibbs so ably expressed, as a disease and not to deal with it as a law enforcement problem.



And I would strongly encourage support of this Bill."

Speaker Miller: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

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

Speaker Miller: "You may, Sir."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Gibbs, inasmuch as we believe this House in its wisdom saw fit to pass the Bill to encourage teenage drinking, I think it's imperative that we create this division for alcoholism. And I support this Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. LaFleur."

LaFleur: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I had the opportunity to serve on, the opportunity to serve on the Alcoholism Council of DuPage County and I can say it's a rewarding experience when we have the ability to recognize this problem and get the cooperation of the people to see what can be done of getting down and putting these people back into a useful life. And I would certainly urge each Member here to put on the green light for this. I think it's a long step forward into not only recognizing the problem but seeing that something is done about it."

Speaker Miller: "Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, so many of the Bills that we consider here including some of mine have no long term meaning effect, they're just a mouthful of nothing, fragile and lasting as a snowflake. Happily, this Bill doesn't fit into that category. This Bill is most important. It's a giant step by government to meet its responsibility to a segment of society



that has been too long neglected. My years in the court house indicated to me that there is no facet of government in which a group who received less meaningful treatment than that given to alcoholics. For that reason I was particularly proud to see this Commission come forth for this good Bill and let me be a cosponsor in it. But I am surprised that those who speak for it shy away from admitting to you that it will cost money. We need to add to that old adage 'talk is cheap' but it takes money to buy whiskey and it also takes money to cure alcoholics. And I, for one, will be proud to vote for whatever expenditures are required to make this program meaningful. I'll be watching the Department of Mental Health budget and I hope that they recognize that it takes money to cure this problem. But if the problem...solution is long overdue it deserves unanimous support of all of us."

Speaker Miller: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, rise to support this Bill because I think it's something that needs to be done. And after reading the Study Report from the Committee on Alcoholism and the facts that are shown there it's something that is very, very important. It seems to me that the previous speakers have talked a great deal about the fact, and they stressed the fact, that it's not going to cost anymore money; that the money is adequate to take care of this thing. Now, I'd like...I'd like to just say for a minute that when you have 547,000 alcoholics in the State of Illinois, which



they say is a conservative figure and you're appropriating \$32,000,000 in the current fiscal year; and the next fiscal year it's going to be \$300,000 less than in the current year. You're not going to make very many great strides as far as taking care of these people are concerned. Now what...what is \$32,000,000 going to do? It takes care of 4.6% of the present number of alcoholics that we have in the State of Illinois. Now if you're going to treat 10% out of the recognized figure it's going to cost \$70,000,000. A total income from the liquor industry today as far as the State of Illinois is concerned is \$72,000,000. So if you took all the revenue from the excise tax that came in you still couldn't take care of 10% of the people that are afflicted with this particular situation. It seems to me that while we're talking about bringing this particular division of alcoholism under the Department of Mental Health we also have got to consider what it's going to cost and be prepared to dig down and pay for the cost of those expenses that are needed. Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Committee that helped develop this Bill and as a Member of the Chicago Council on Alcoholism, I'd like to point out that surely there'll be some cost to Mental Health in this area but there are going to be enormous cost saving in the area police efficiency, police work, corrections institutions, reduced loads in the county jail, the increased capacity of wage earners to take care of their



families and under rehabilitation programs and to create tax money. I think in the long run this Bill will save enormously both in terms of tax cost as well as human costs."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Randolph, Mr. Springer."

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

Speaker Miller: "The previous question has been moved. All those in favor say aye; opposed, nay. The ayes have it and the Gentleman's motion prevails. We'll return to the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Gibbs, to close the debate."

Gibbs: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, briefly in closing I'd just like to say that I certainly appreciate and thank the efforts of the Committee, especially Representative Matijevich who worked so hard on this in the past years, and along with Representative Dyer, Barnes and Duff. And I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Miller: "The question is, shall House Bill 631 pass? All those in favor vote aye; opposed, nay. Have all voted who wish? Record Mr. Kempiners as aye. Well, he's on this Roll Call. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 157 ayes and no nays. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby passed. The next Bill is House Bill 706."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 706. A Bill to regulate real estate appraising and require examinees and licensees of real estate appraisers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, is recognized."



Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 706 would create the Real Estate Appraiser Licensing Act. The Bill would provide for licensing of real estate appraisers by the Department of Registration and Education in conjunction with a seven member examining committee; five of these members would earn their living as appraisers and the other two would be public members. Certain requirements are set out in the Bill before a person will be entitled to take the examination. These qualifications relate to educational background, citizenship, residency within the State of Illinois and age. There is a grandfather clause to provide for the licensing of those who are presently practicing the profession of real estate appraising within the state and that clause will operate for one year after the effective date of the Act. I ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Miller: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we ought to think along a long while before we create another profession or trade that is licensed. One thing that we have to look at if we're going to license somebody or some trade is whether that licensing is in the public interest or in the interest of the group that seeks to be licensed. I submit to you that in this instance the licensing is solely for the group that seeks to be licensed. What they want to do and what others have done in the past is have gotten themselves



licensed to freeze out other people to be in a position to increase their fees, charge the public more and not work in the public interest. This particular Bill I have some knowledge of, I do some appraising and I have found that other appraisers have come into our office when they're appraising property in our neighborhood, and they can be appraisers who a Master's Appraisers Institute degree or certificate and they'll say after all is said and done, what does a bungalow go for over on such and such a street and we'll tell them and that'll be it. Now, Mr. Speaker, the people who order appraisals by and large, and probably 95% of the cases, are courts, attorneys and other sophisticated people and groups. Now these sophisticated people are certainly able to judge whether a real estate company or others who do appraising are capable of doing the work they seek to have done. It's not the little old lady who goes into a store, or needs protection from whoever...whomever she's buying from that is ordering his service. This can do nothing, Mr. Speaker, can do nothing, but increase the cost to estates and others who may not have the money to pay for it but are paying for it through the courts and through attorneys and these fees are passed on. They're going to be paying more and they're not going to get any service for it. I implore you to vote no on this Bill."

Speaker Miller: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. LaFleur."

LaFleur: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, also as a member of



the profession I feel Mr. Madigan has come up with a much needed Bill and a well drafted Bill and I certainly hate to disagree with my good friend, Mr. Walsh, on this side of the aisle. But I do believe that this would add to the integrity of the profession and the necessity and need of being assured that the people that participate in this profession have a high degree of skill and are able to compete on the marketplace with other people in the field. And this would be one way of beginning this without working a hardship on anyone now practicing in this profession. And I would certainly solicit each Member of this House to add their support to this and certainly give the support to Mr. Madigan on this fine Bill."

Speaker Miller: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in support of this measure. I had a similar measure introduced because I was unaware that Representative Madigan had filed it. However, my Bill met an ignominious death in Committee yesterday because of that fact there was a tool like House Bill 706 which came into being and has been amended. In answer to Representative Walsh's remarks is the fact that this Bill has presently been amended not to prohibit a real estate broker who takes a listing on a residential property from himself giving an opinion of what that property may be worth. However, from my experience as a lawyer in probate work and other work, I find time and again that we cannot get qualified people to do their proper appraising for estates and for loaning purposes because the only ones



that are qualified and can be certified are those from the MAI who are outstanding men but are very limited and their fees run rampant. However, if we had a group that would be more...would be more apt to come in and would do not only the big industrial and the big commercial appraising but would do the residential and other appraisals we need for the financial institutions and for estates, I think this would be a great boon if we passed this Bill. It will...many people have supported it and the members of the appraisal industry, some are for it and some are against it, but I can say generally this would be a step in the right direction to have proper standards for the appraisal purposes. Therefore, I ask for your favorable support of this good Bill."

Speaker Miller: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe."

Wolfe: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Miller: "He indicates he will."

Wolfe: "Mr. Madigan, will you yield for a question?"

Speaker Miller: "Proceed."

Wolfe: "Will this affect the MAI designation for appraisers that are prevalent now in the State of Illinois?"

Madigan: "No, Representative Wolfe, it will not affect the designations which are currently granted by the Professional Real Estate Appraiser Organization. The purpose of the Bill is to provide a uniform standard of criteria for judging the actions of appraisers. Today there are several professional real estate appraiser organizations which grant designation and therefore



grant status within the profession. However, if a member of one of those associations is guilty of wrongdoing there is no vehicle available to penalize that member and to reprimand him, that's the purpose of the Bill."

Wolfe: "One other question, will it deprive units of local government from licensing in the same professional area?"

Madigan: "No, it will not."

Wolfe: "Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, to close the debate."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, despite remarks of the distinguished Majority Leader, I feel that this Bill has great merit. Those of us who are familiar with the failure of savings and loan associations over the years to know that whenever these associations have gone bankrupt, or gone into insolvency, generally speaking the prime cause is that a faulty appraisal in the portfolio of the associations. In these instances there has never been a vehicle available to reprimand these people, or to penalize them. If this Bill is passed, if a licensee system is set up, then that vehicle will be available; the state will be in a position to regulate the appraisers within the state. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Miller: "The question is, shall House Bill 706 pass? Those in favor vote aye and opposed, nay. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh, to explain his vote."

Walsh: "Well, just...just to respond to the Gentleman's closing



statement, I...I think if he expects this licensing act to correct the situation where savings and loans are making bad loans, he's badly mistaken. Savings and loans, as you well know, are very...very much regulated and are audited with great frequency and there's no warning of when they are going to be. So their portfolios are subject to state examinations and some cases federal examination. I submit to you that the savings and loans, if they're corrupt as most of the savings and loans to which referred that have gone under because they've made bad loans will continue to make bad loans under this Bill and continue to take money under the table. This goes...this takes no step at all toward correcting the situation that he mentions, and as we mentioned before, all it does is cost the little guy more money."

Speaker Miller: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Show Jones, aye, on this Roll Call. David Jones. On this question there are 103 ayes and 21 nays. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. All right, Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 623 which is on Second reading was called, it's been read a first time; there was a question where Amendments were distributed or not, I'm informed now that the Amendments have been distributed. Amendment #1. Amendment #1."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #1. Rayson. Amend House Bill 623, page 1, by deleting lines 18, 19 and so forth."

Speaker Miller: "Well, now, just a moment. I don't see Mr. Rayson



in his seat. Is Mr. Rayson on the floor? Well, Mr. Clerk, this is his Amendment. In courtesy to him we'll have to take it out of the record for the time being. Senate Bills Third Reading. On the Calendar are two Bills which are going to expire today, Senate Bill 140."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 140. A Bill for an act to amend the Revenue Act of 1939. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask leave of the House to hear Senate Bill 140 and 141 together, they are companion Bills."

Speaker Miller: "Does the Gentleman have leave to consider these two Bills together? Hearing no objections, Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 141."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 141. An act to provide the manner of levying and imposing taxes for the creation of special services to areas within the boundaries of home rule units. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Miller: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 140 provides the manner of imposing taxes for special service within the home rule units of government. This legislation would permit the village of Oak Park to install a shopping mall, or a shopping district into a shopping mall. No individual taxpayer would be affected by this Bill. The merchants in this special service district will be liable for the taxes. Senate Bill 141 authorizes the county clerk to determine the rates and



produce the sums needed. I would ask for your favorable support of these two Bills."

~~Speaker~~ Miller: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

~~Speaker~~ Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I respectfully challenge the statement that the Sponsor just made relative to Oak Park. These Bills don't pertain just to a special situation in Oak Park. They pertain to every home rule municipality in this state and there are home rule municipalities very close to my home that are very small; one of which has 2500 people, another has fewer than 700. We all know of several other instances where home rule communities are not all that responsible. This pertains to every single one. I challenge another statement that the Gentleman made and that is it sets out the procedure for establishing special tax districts. It sets out no such procedure, all it says is that the...all we say with these Bills is that they may do whatever they damn please. That's what we're saying. This says, and we've debated these at some length and I don't want to repeat what we said before, Mr. Speaker, but it what it says briefly is that an alley may be paved and called a special taxing district and the people who are to benefit and pay, or presumably benefit but definitely pay, have got to pay the tax that's assessed to them by the village council and they have nothing whatever to say about it. They will have no knowledge at how it's happening until it's in the process of being done. There's



no notice requirement; there's no referendum requirement; there's no nothing. And, finally, let me point this out, Mr. Speaker, and this I did not know when we were talking about House Bill 369 and 370 which are, as I understand it, identical to this. On the floor of the Senate when these Bills passed, and passed in the form before us now, the Senate Sponsor rose and made the statement that these Bills would be amended in the House to answer to certain Republican Senators' objections. Now we have attempted to ask the Sponsor and ask the Democratic Assistant Minority Leader to take these Bills back to Second Reading for Amendments and they have refused to consider it. Now I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the only way we can attempt to have these Bills amended so that they will be responsible is to defeat them now and defeat them soundly."

Speaker Miller: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as the distinguished Majority Leader stated, this isn't a Bill to one community. It's a Bill for all home rule units within the State of Illinois. Now I respectfully refer the Members of this Body to the 1970 Constitution..."

Speaker Miller: "Just a moment, Sir, the noise is getting a little higher, may I give you some attention. Proceed, Sir."

Schlickman: "Thank you. The local government article of 1970 Constitution in Section VI, Powers of Home Rule Units, Subsection 11 says this. 'The General Assembly may deny or limit the power



of home rule units to...' and in Part II of Subsection L., says, 'to levy or impose additional taxes upon areas within their boundaries in the manner provided by law for the provision of special services to those areas and for the payment of debt incurred in order to provide those special services'. And, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in succeeding Section VII dealing with counties and municipalities other than home rule units, the same language is found, 'to levy or impose additional taxes upon areas within their boundaries in the manner provided by law for the provision of special services to those areas and for the payment of debt incurred in order to provide those special services'. Now the special service concept is brand new to the State of Illinois. It was developed by the Constitutional Convention as a more progressive way by which to meet the needs for improvement of benefits to specific limited geographic areas within a municipality or a county whether it's home rule or non-home rule. of the deficiency and the growth, absolute deficiency, in these Bills are twofold. Number one, these Bills apply only to home rule units. They do not apply to nonhome rule units. And to compound the matter in a growth way these Bills are shells, they are emptiness, because they do not provide a manner. If you will read these Bills you will see that there are no prescription as to notice, as to hearing. And this is what the Constitutional Convention delegates intended. We have in these Bills an attempt, an attempt to avoid the Constitution. And attempt to avoid the Supreme Court decision. I should like to



the attention, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that yesterday the Cities and Villages Committee reported out with the recommendation, do pass House Bill 1359, that directly and completely implements both of these sections of the new Constitution; one dealing with home rule units, one dealing with nonhome rule units. And in this Bill there is a manner as provided by law. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I earnestly solicit the defeat of this Bill and anticipate the subsequent passage of House Bill 1359 which we will have the opportunity of voting on shortly."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this is a very important Bill and we have an opportunity to defeat it today because what the State of Illinois has never permitted to be done since it was admitted to the Union. And as far as I know it permits to be done in this state what no other state permits to be done. The law is that generally speaking a municipality can expend taxes for the entire municipality or for the entire park district, or for an entire county. What this Bill permits a home rule municipality or unit to do is to take a part of that municipality and by mere ordinance and without referendum to tax that area for special assessments for improvement for services from mosquito abatement districts. It's unprecedented under our system that you can carve up a municipality isolated area and tax it and not give those people being taxed any opportunity for hearing or for referendum. I...I



hesitate to use the term worst Bill, or bad Bill to any legislation introduced into this Chamber. But I think if you think about the full implications of this and if you think about the tax freeze suggestions made and our request for property relief where we say municipalities cannot tax on property to any degree beyond what they're now taxing. And then at the same time pass a Bill which permits a municipality to take a subdivision within that municipality and double its taxes, well this is exactly what you'd be doing if you pass this Bill, and your constituents, I believe, will be outraged if this Bill passes. Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of House, I rise on a point of personal privilege to introduce five very good distinguished citizens from my Lake County 31st District, James Harris, the Chairman of the Lake County Regional Planning Commission. On the left, Glen Venier, the Executive Vice President of the Zion, Winthrop Harbor, Beach Park Chamber of Commerce. Bill Stevens the President of our Chamber of Commerce. Mayor Bruce 'Dunbar' of Zion and Kenneth 'Hank' 'Keys' the Supervisor of Benton Township.....We're very happy to have them here with us today."

Speaker Blair: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McPartlin, to close. Mr. McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in Section III of Senate Bill 141, it states that the ordinance shall provide



'for such hearing and notice of hearing as a corporate authority shall prescribe'. These Bills do have the support of Illinois Municipal League and I would appreciate your support on those Bills. Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "All right. The question is, shall Senate Bill 140 pass? All those in favor will vote aye;...all right, there was leave to have them both considered on the same Roll Call. So the question is, shall Senate Bill 140 and Senate Bill 141 pass? All those in favor will vote aye and the opposed no. And the Clerk will take two Roll Calls. Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I originally wanted to ask the Sponsor a question, wasn't able to do so. I'd like to...."

Speaker Blair: "Well, you can...in explanation of your vote you can ask a rhetorical question and then in the explanation of his vote perhaps the Sponsor can give you a rhetorical answer."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two concerns, one was related to whether or not the, say for example, the President of the Cook County Board would be able to tax unincorporated areas under this Bill. And the second question was, whether the House Bill and I forget the number that Representative Schlickman spoke about, answered the specific problem of Oak Park Mall. Those were important questions to me and I'm sorry I didn't get a chance to answer them, this is just a rhetorical question which I'd like more than a rhetorical response."



Speaker Blair: "Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from DuPage,
Mr. Redmond."

Redmond: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to explain my vote. I really can't understand why there would be much opposition to this Bill because from my experience as a municipal attorney it's a...it's a vehicle which is very sadly needed. I can recall the city of Elmhurst, for instance, where they had an annexation and they needed where they had an annexation and they needed sewer in that area and they thought they would pay for the sewer extension by having differential rates to charge more in the area that was serviced. And the Supreme Court held that you had had to have a uniform rate throughout the entire city. Now the result of that was the sewer was never installed in that area. It seems to me that there was an intergovernmental commission of the General Assembly some years ago and this is one of the recommendations, that there be some method that areas that would be benefitted by services would be able to pay for the services because if you're going to insist upon spreading it throughout the entire community there's no way in the world that these much needed special services will be provided. Therefore, it seems to me that this is a very much needed piece of legislation and therefore I vote aye."

Speaker Blair: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman...Mr. McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Mr. Speaker, I request a poll of the absentees, please."

Speaker Blair: "All right, when we get to that point of the business



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

why we'll give it to you. The Clerk will take the record. All right, at this point we've got 82 ayes and 64 nays. The Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees and the Clerk will proceed to do that."

Clerk Selcke: "Anderson, Barnes, Barry, Blades, Bluthardt, Borchers, Catania, Chapman, Collins, Cunningham, Deavers, Deuster, R. L. Dunn, Dyer, Getty, Granada, Harpstrite, Hart, Ron Hoffman, R. Holloway, J. Houlihan, Martin, Lundy, Murphy, Palmer, Pierce, Schoeberlein, Sevcik, Sharp, J. J. Wolfe, B. B. Wolf."

Speaker Blair: "McLendon, aye. McLendon's already voted one time. Getty. How is he recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Speaker Blair: "Record him aye. Mr. Lundy, did you want recognition?"

Lundy: "Please..."

Speaker Blair: "All right."

Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to be recorded as voting present. I voted for the earlier House Bill but it...it does seem to me that at the very least we have to give people public notice. My city of Evanston wants this Bill and I'd like to be able to vote for it but I cannot unless we can take it back to Second Reading and add a requirement that at least the taxpayers be given notice that they are being notice that they are being placed in a special assessment district. I respect the motives of the Sponsor who is handling this Bill, he wants to get it through for his local area, and I understand that. But it seems to me the Bill's implications go far



beyond the shopping mall in Oak Park and for that reason I vote present and until such time as the Bill can be taken back to Second Reading."

Speaker Blair: "All right. Barnes."

Barnes: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Clerk Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Barnes: "Vote me aye."

Speaker Blair: "Record him aye. All right, give me a Roll Call, Mr. Clerk. There are 84 ayes, 64 nays, 1 present. And...Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McPartlin."

McPartlin: "I'd like to put it on postponed consideration."

Speaker Blair: "All right. You have an expiration date today. All right, the Gentleman's asked for leave to place both these Bills on postponed consideration. Is there objection? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Point of order. Is this the last day?"

Speaker Blair: "Yes."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, last week a similar motion was made and the motion with respect to two Bills and both motions were defeated. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we have more than adequately concerned ourselves with this issue. And I think that there's too much further business confronting the House to further delay in engaging dilatory practice with regard to this particular Bill. I would respectfully suggest that the motion be defeated, and I, for one, object."

Speaker Blair: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."



Matijevich: "I have a point, I don't know if it's a point of order, but he...he maintains that a similar motion was made last week. Actually we allowed Representative Macdonald to postpone the Bill 'til further in the day. The motion that was defeated was to extend it for a week. So, we did give that courtesy to her and I think one other. So I think we ought to extend this courtesy to Representative McPartlin as we did to the Members last week."

Speaker Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. on the advice of the Majority Leader I withdraw my objection."

Speaker Blair: "All right, now those Bills are on postponed, if that's all right. Senate Bill 144."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 144. An act to providing for the creation, operation of hospital districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Cox."

Cox: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, down in Coles County, my home county, we are in the process of building a new medical hospital; a new medical center; the Sarah Busch Lincoln Medical Center. Local donations of 2.6 million, five million to be loaned by a lending institution and the rest by federal grant. We are consolidating the Charleston Hospital and the Mattoon Memorial Hospital and in doing so we found that the, under the present Hospital Act, that there...it was necessary to dissolve the Mattoon Memorial Hospital because it was a tax supported and a...in a hospital district. In so doing we must do this in



order to...to...so that we can have the new hospital take over the assets and the liabilities of the Mattoon Memorial Hospital. And as, I said, under the present Hospital Act, we found that there was no way to dissolve this district. So Senate Bill 144 does take care of this problem and does not hurt the 21 remaining hospital districts in the state. This came out of the Senate without a dissenting vote and I would appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Blair: "Discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 144 pass? All those in favor will vote aye and the opposed no. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. This question there are 130 ayes, and 2 nays. And this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bills Second Reading. House Bill 623."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 623. A Bill for an act to amend the Criminal Code of 1961. Second Reading of the Bill. Have we got any Committee Amendments? No Committee Amendments? Any from the floor?"

Speaker Blair: "Any from the floor?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #1. Rayson. Amend House Bill 623, page 1, by deleting lines 18, 19 and so forth."

Speaker Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson."

Rayson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we discussed this Amendment a bit earlier this morning and I won't belabor the point. As a matter of fact whatever I might say I'm sure won't be really heeded. I did discuss Amendment #2 with the Sponsor of



this Bill and what...we're virtually in agreement except for the tailend of the Bill because his Amendment and my Amendment both do the same thing with regard to certain procedures or certain rights that inure to others with regard to abortion procedures. So we might resort ourselves to the four points in question that are the difference between Amendment #1 and Amendment #2; or the Bill itself. In this Bill he's got criminal abortion which is a Class III Felony and it applies to a physician who fails to fill out forms. Now this is whether he performs the abortion or not, if he fails to fill out these forms he can go one to three...one to ten years in the penitentiary plus three years parole. The other point is if resuscitation methods are not used in the facility at the time of this so-called abortion, that's criminal abortion. Now the doctor could well be busy and not know the resuscitation equipment is not there and I suggest that's a flaw on the Bill. The third thing he's saying that nobody can experiment with fetal tissues. I say there's nothing wrong with that but it shouldn't be a criminal abortion. Fourth, he says that anyone who conspires or abets in an abortion which wilfully deprives somebody's inheritance is criminal abortion. Now, all I'm saying, that my Amendment is an attempt to make what I consider a Bill unconstitutional on its face constitutional. The only difference between this Amendment and the Amendment #2 in the Bill are these four points. These should not be crimes of a doctor. Bear in mind under the present law the Attorney Gen-



eral ruled, has ruled that there is no abortion statute and anyone can perform an abortion now even if he's unlicensed as a physician. This Bill would allow a medical practitioner to be subject to four different new areas of criminal abortion. And I suggest therefore, Mr. Speaker, that Amendment #1 to House Bill 623 should be adopted."

Speaker Blair: "Gibbs. Gibbs. Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Gibbs."

Gibbs: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as was stated by the recent...by Representative Rayson we have discussed this earlier today and there's no sense of me going into the merits other than I think that this Amendment that is being proposed by Representative Rayson tends to lightly treat the last section. Now let me just briefly go over these four sections because when these are amended out, if this Amendment would pass then it is gutting the Bill more or less. Let me preface my remarks by...refer to line of language debated effective that this is unconstitutional for one reason or another based on the cases of Roe versus Wade. And let me just read one short paragraph from that decision. In other words, what right does the state have to come in and set up some controls. And I quote, 'the Supreme Court said we therefore conclude that the right of personal privacy includes the abortion decision but this right is not unqualified and must be considered against important state interests and regulations'. So we certainly definitely, most definitely, have the right to regulate. In the Chicago Tribune in April 12, 1972, or 1973, the National



Institute of Health proposed that they wanted to use live ...live...they wanted to use live fetuses to experiment on. This is what they want to do in Chicago. And that's what one of these provisions does with my section. It makes it a criminal offense and it makes an abortion an offense and therefore they should be penalized the same as an abortion if they perform experimentation on a live fetus. How far can we go? Another section there it says if they do not have resuscitation equipment on hand that that would be...constitute the crime of abortion. In other words we tell these hospitals and these other licensed medical facilities if the fetus comes out alive, if you have a viable fetus then you must have, you must have resuscitation equipment on hand and if you don't that's a criminal offense. And I think that's extremely important to my Bill. And therefore I don't want it amended out. The other sets out the procedures that have to be followed. We're telling the doctors if they're going to do these abortions you follow these procedures and if you don't then it is a criminal offense. I ask that this Amendment be defeated."

Speaker Blair: "Is there further...Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Gibbs."

Gibbs: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I respectfully request a Roll Call on this Amendment."

Speaker Blair: "All right, now Mr. Washington wanted to be heard."

Washington: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker. Whether they like it or not the law of the land is that abortions can be performed. But I think everyone here realizes that we must pass some regulations and guidelines pursuant to that Supreme Court decision. The



danger here is that in the original House Bill 623 I think that the Sponsor of the Bill agrees that he went too far and thus endangered the constitutionality of the Bill. I voted for this Bill in this Committee because I was assured as was the rest of the Members of the Committee that those constitutional objections would be cleared. Now I think in the proposed Amendment by Representative Gibbs he's gone a long way to do that but I have only one quarrel with the Bill and if he cleans that up I'm satisfied that the Bill meets the constitutional test. And that is that he's imposed on the first trimester some qualifications which I simply don't believe are constitutional. And if they are constitutional, if this Bill passes both Houses and is signed by the Governor, it might well be declared unconstitutional; we'll have to come back and do all of our work all over again. The thing that disturbs me is the section which requires the filing of a certificate...to file a fetal death certificate listing the name of the mother in all trimesters including the first trimester. Now I would have no trouble, no quarrel with the Bill if it required that the doctor keep a record, keep records. But to force him to file a certificate with the Vital Records people listing the name of the woman does two things. One, it quite clearly violates a right of privacy. But two, and even more important in this case, it runs afoul of the Supreme Court edict which quite clearly said that no regulations not related to the maternal health of the mother would be tolerated



in forthcoming legislation. Now unfortunately, unfortunately, we have two Amendments before us. Representative Rayson's Amendment, I think, cleans the Bill up. Representative Gibb's Amendment goes almost to the ultimate of refining and cleaning it up but it stops just short. And I think if he would add that additional clause in his Amendment I certainly would have no quarrel with him because Representative Gibbs what I think we want to walk out of here with is a Bill that we are satisfied meets the constitutional test. And I think if you clear up that records qualification we'd have such a Bill. But under the circumstances since he hasn't done that and since the business before the House is Representative Rayson's Amendment, I have to support it."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson, to close."

Rayson: "Well, I can't elaborate much further and the remarks the distinguished Gentleman from Cook who last spoke. That's what this attempt is to do, to give us a stringent abortion Bill, yes. But keep it constitutional. And as the Sponsor of the Bill said, that the right of privacy is not absolute. He's correct. But the decision also said for the stage prior to approximately the end of the first trimester, the abortion decision, and its perpetuation must be left to the medical judgment of the pregnant woman's attending physician. It goes on to say that you can regulate in the second trimester and regulate and proscribe in the third providing it meets certain tests as to the health and maternal welfare of the woman. Now, all we're saying is



that, please don't ruin a Bill that might make more stringent abortion procedures 'cause I think we're all interested in controlling abortion if we can. And that's all this Amendment does and it removes those almost absurd provisions regarding a medical doctor who makes them guilty of a Class III Felony for acts even unrelated to his abortion procedures. So therefore I would hope that this Amendment might be adopted."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the question's on the adoption of the Gentleman's Amendment. All those in favor will vote aye and the opposed, no. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. This question there are 84 nays and 23 yeas and the Gentleman's Amendment fails. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Gibbs. Amends House Bill 623 on page 1..."

Speaker Blair: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Gibbs."

Gibbs: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I again won't belabor the issue since it's already been discussed and also I think we discussed this Amendment in particular. I would like to point out to point out to Representative Washington that he brought up this question, I think it was a good question, in Committee concerning the availability of these records during the first trimester or even subsequent thereto. Are they public records? And is this a requirement that violates the woman's ...rights under the 14th Amendment. And I'd like to point out to him that under Chapter 111 $\frac{1}{2}$, Section 73-24, the Vital Records Act. The access to these records is specifically precluded and is not open to the public and is available only to the custodian. And therefore under the decision of the Supreme Court, it says



that the state has interest, that he could enforce and regulate. We have put this in there during the first trimester and they will not be public records and will not be accessible and open to anyone that would like to see them. And therefore I would like to have the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 623."

Speaker Blair: "Any discussion on this Amendment? Question's on its adoption. All those in favor say aye; opposed, no. The ayes have it. The Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading. What have you got now? Senate Bills First."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 189. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 233. A Bill for an Act to amend the Highway Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 244. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 258. A Bill for an Act to provide for the Law Enforcement Officer and Firemen who suffer disability and injury. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 304. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating State Highway Police. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 305. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to judicial review. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 308. A Bill for an Act providing for contingent expense to Military and Naval Department. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 310. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Transportation. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 317. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vital Records



Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 338. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Transportation. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 341. A Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Legislative Audit Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 367. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to pay for certain state officers. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 368. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Metropolitan Fair and Exhibition Authority. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 372. A Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 375. A Bill for an Act to amend the Hospital District Law. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 380. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to township organization. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 457. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Personnel. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1139. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Superintendent of Public Instruction. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1140. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 373. A Bill for an Act to amend the Radiation Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "General Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 296, Craig et al."

Speaker Blair: "Motions. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

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



has been a House Resolution introduced by myself, cosponsored by a number of the Members of the Assembly. This is House Resolution 281. Specifically, this Resolution deals with the question of senior citizens in the State of Illinois; and more specifically with the action taken by the Governor of the State of Illinois this last week, when he saw fit to dissolve the only Committees dealing with the problems of senior citizens in our state. It's most crucial that we consider the impact of this on all of the people of our state as senior citizens appear to be the one group in our state who have truly not been dealt with at all. And they have probably the largest growing numbers of any single group in our state. The Senior Citizens' Committee as was originally enacted by the last administration has been operating to answer questions of senior citizens throughout our state. And I have been told by the Chairman of the Committee that in this last year that his Committee feels that some 50,000 phone calls from senior citizens throughout the state. My Resolution, which has been introduced, suggests to the Governor that he not dissolve this Committee on Senior Citizens until some action is taken on House Bill 1405. I believe that if the Leadership of this House has, certainly, taken into consideration the seriousness of the needs of the senior citizens by House Bill 1405, as both the Speaker of the House and the Minority Leader have cosponsored this Bill, along with many other distinguished Representatives. Today, I'm requesting that House Rule 41(A) be suspended so that we can have immediate consideration of this most important Resolution. And, thereby, memorialize the Governor to keep this important Committee on Senior



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Citizens in operation until House Bill 1405 has been acted upon. And I would request that an appropriate vote be taken to waive the rule on House Rule 41(A) for this Resolution's immediate consideration."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "An inquiry, Mr. Speaker. And that is do we address ourselves to the motion at this point as to whether or not we would sustain or oppose the motion to hear the Bill or the Resolution at this time?"

Speaker Blair: "Well, he's asking to suspend the rules so that we can have immediate consideration and adoption of the Resolution."

Schneider: "I see. Well . . ."

Speaker Blair: "Do you want to be heard on that?"

Schneider: ". . . Yeah, I would like to . . ."

Speaker Blair: "On the question to suspend?"

Schneider: ". . . Yes, Sir."

Speaker Blair: "Okay."

Schneider: "All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The Bill or the Resolution, rather, is a very significant Resolution. I think characteristically we have tried to deal with far-ranging issues in such a fashion as to hear all sides of the issue. I think the Governor has for some reason made a significant decision that should not be dealt with lightly. I know I don't have the expertise, nor the background or the information to make a judgment on his decision from my distant seat in the General Assembly. I don't see anything wrong with saying that the Amendment can be placed into Executive Committee as we usually do and try to hear



the Resolution as quickly as possible. And then get the reaction from the executive branch. But to decide to hear the Resolution on the floor, as a Committee of the Whole, in fact, without any kind of information from the executive branch seems to me to be a waste of time and effort. I think we'd be more appropriately deal with the Resolution with an understanding from what the Governor's point of view is. So I think we ought to oppose over-riding, rather oppose the motion, to hear the Resolution immediately and refer it to Committee as is our practice."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I concur with the Representative DuPage, Representative Schneider, that the Bill should . . . that the Resolution should go to Committee. And as I told the Chief Sponsor of the Resolution, I would oppose the suspension of the rule for the immediate consideration and adoption. And the primary reason that I would oppose it is simply one fact, that if this needs to be aired, in Committee is the time to air it. If there's pertinent points that need to be made as to why this should not be done as far as the actions of the Governor is concerned, the Committee is the place to do it. This is where you can have the witnesses come in and you can have them testify. This is where you can have various agencies, associations and organizations throughout the state come in and testify as towards the worthwhileness of the overall program, not only the one agency. So I would urge the Members to have the Resolution go to Committee. Therefore, we can have a close and hard look at it. I don't think that we should pass the Resolution today."



Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of this Resolution;

and I think I can speak with a little bit of knowledge of this particular agency because the individual who is the head of the Governor's Committee for Senior Citizens is a very good friend of mine. I know the work he has been doing, and I know the way he was treated in his dismissal, along with those of his staff members. I just want to say one thing, we are dealing with a time limit here because this Committee which handled many, many, many complaints, requests, problems forwarded by senior citizens throughout this state will cease to exist on July 1st. The Governor certainly of this Legislature wants them to maintain that agency is going to have to provide for it in his budget and in preparation for after July 1st. Now, whether or not the same people still man this Committee or not after July 1st is not the question. Maintaining the Committee, which does serve the senior citizens, which are about 1.1 million people in this state is the point at issue here. And I think it is incumbent upon us as Legislators to speak up on behalf of these people. And I urge you to support this motion to suspend the rules and to hear this Resolution today."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the question's on the Gentleman's motion to suspend. It requires 107 votes. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 71 'ayes' and 43 'nays'; and the Gentleman's motion fails. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe, arise?"



Wolfe, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of parliamentary inquiry that I believe is important to every Member of this House. I note from the memo sent by the Speaker to the House Members that House Rule 36(B) requires that all House Bill be voted out of the House on or before May 25th. And in view of that House Rule, it would seem to me that all Bills must be out of Committee before the beginning of that particular week in order to be placed on the Calendar and to move up into their regular orders of debate, First Legislative Day on Second Reading . . . the Second Reading and then the Third Reading debates. Now, am I correct that this rule supercedes the 45-day rule and the 30-day rule that's in effect in this House?"

Speaker Blair: "Yes, the language at the start of 36(B) says, 'Notwithstanding the provisions of Rule 37', which is the 30 and 45 day, 'that no House Bill shall be called for a vote on final passage after May 25th of the year in which it was introduced'."

Wolfe, B.: "Now, I think the Members, all the Members, should be paying attention to this because one of their Bills may be affected by this ruling and the fact that it supercedes the other rules of the House. Does that mean that all House Bills will now be noticed for a hearing next week by the various Chairmen of the respective Committees of the House?"

Speaker Blair: "Well, perhaps the Majority Leader can make it clear as to the Bills for next week. The Gentleman's inquiry concerns the posting of Bills and we did put out a notice, which there's a little correction coming out on it right now on the 4 o'clock Committees at 5:30, the 2 o'clock at 1:30. But perhaps if the



Members would be attentive, I think this is important for you while the Majority Leader refers to the notice that was put out concerning when these Bills have to be handled, these House Bills. Your inquiry is certainly timely, Mr. Wolfe."

Wolfe, B.: "Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "So if the Members would lower the noise level and listen to what the Majority Leader is saying, you might save yourself some difficulty a little bit later."

Walsh, W.: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it was my intention to make a motion to suspend the provisions of Rule 18 so that the . . . that is, the 6½ day posting requirement for Committees on Tuesday and Wednesday only. So that the Tuesday Committees can post Bills up 'til noon tomorrow, and the Wednesday Committees up until noon, well, tomorrow also because tomorrow is going to be our last day this week. And it must be done while we're in Session. I would urge, though, everyone who is the Sponsor of a Bill that has not been set in Committee, they must see the Chairman or the Committee Clerk of that Committee and have the Bills posted for next week because last . . . next week is the last time that a House Bill can be heard in a House Committee. If it is not heard next week and reported out, then it cannot pass the House. So it would be acted upon in the House before May 25th, which is the last day for House Bills in the House. So with that, Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the provisions of Rule 18 so that the Tuesday and Wednesday Committees may have 5½ days posting instead of 6½."



Speaker Blair: "Is there discussion on the Gentleman's motion now. He's suspending the notice provision to provide that only 5½ days will be necessary for postings this week for next week. Is there a question about that? Questions? Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan, .: "I have a question to the Majority Leader about reference to the reason for creating this emergency situation. Was there any . . . what was the rationale for setting the 25th at this late date, which requires us to . . ."

Walsh, W.: "Oh, no, the 25th is in the rules that we adopted on January 10th. That is the deadline, it has been."

Houlihan, .: "Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "Is there further discussion on the Gentleman's motion now on the notice part, from 6½ to 5½? All right, we need . . . Mr. Mann. Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I was wondering about Bills that have an appropriation on them."

Walsh, W.: "Your question was on appropriation Bills?"

Mann: "Yes, say a Bill has an appropriation on it. Will that still be affected by this rule?"

Walsh, W.: "As the rules are written now, according to my understanding, yes. I think that's a matter, though, that the Rules Committee should take up tomorrow. And, incidently, the Rules Committee will meet tomorrow at 8:30 in Room M5. So, according to my understanding now about appropriations, revenue and reapportionment Bills have the same deadline as other Bills; but we intend to address ourselves to this question tomorrow at the Rules Committee meeting."



Mann: "Well, Bill, I wish you would because I have an important Bill that will first have to go to one Committee and then be referred to another Committee. And it wouldn't be physically possible to get it out."

Walsh, W.: "Right, yeah, that's partly the reason."

Speaker Blair: "All right, yes, the Gentleman's motion now will require 107 votes. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. This is 6½ to 5½ days notice this week on Bills to be heard next week. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. All right, 135 'ayes' and 3 'nays'; and the Gentleman's motion . . . Gibbs 'aye' . . . prevails. All right, now, Mr. B. B. Wolfe."

Wolfe, B.: "Yes. All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And now I have another parliamentary inquiry with reference to the memo that was sent to every House Member. In the May 21st week running through May 25th, the schedule indicates Regular Sessions only, and there's no indication in that week of House Committee meetings. Am I correct in that interpretation?"

Speaker Blair: "I think that's correct. The Majority Leader respond to that that the . . . in the notice that was put out in the second week that there's no provision for Committee hearings."

Walsh, W.: "That's correct."

Wolfe, B.: "All right, now in view of that fact, Mr. Speaker, and the fact that we're now principally in the passage of House Bills and the movement of those Bills through Committee, with respect to Senate Bills, I would suggest, and I'll make a motion to that affect if the Speaker deems it necessary, that Rule 37(C) and



Rule 23(D) be suspended as to all Senate Bills. Rule 37(C) briefly is the 30-day rule in Committee; and 32(D) is the 45-day rule on the House floor. And in view of the fact that we're moving House Bills, and confined to that, and should be in Committee until every House Bill is out, I see no practical reason for the rule with respect to Senate Bills and would probably cause some confusion in Committee if these Senate Bills have deadlines in Committee."

Speaker Blair: "Well, can we take that up tomorrow morning at the Rules Committee."

Walsh, W.: "Yeah, let's take that up at the Rules Committee meeting tomorrow, okay?"

Wolfe, B.: "All right, very good."

Speaker Blair: "8:30 tomorrow morning."

Walsh, W.: "Mr. Speaker, in connection with the notice that was sent out, I'd like to note this correction. The timetable distributed to you for the week of May 14 and May 24 inadvertently announced that all Committee meetings on May 15, 16 and 17 would begin at 1:30 p.m. This was an error. All Committee meetings which normally begin at 2 p.m. will convene at 1:30. All Committee meetings which normally begin at 4 p.m. will convene at 5:30 p.m. on each of those days."

Speaker Blair: "For what purpose does Mr. Hill arise?"

Hill: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I certainly can see where there's going to be a lot of problems next week in regards to Committee hearings. Those people that are serving on Committees and those people that are Sponsors of legislation. And, personally, I think that we have a problem. And the problem is,



that some of those Committee hearings are going to be held here in this building and others are going to be held over in the new office building. And I feel as though some of this running back and forth by the Sponsors and the Committee Members is going to lead to dire consequences. The possibility of heart attack is very strong in a situation like this. The stress is going to be strong. And I would suggest that the Speaker check into the situation whether or not we can have all of the Committee hearings held in one individual building."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the Gentleman's point is well taken. And the Rules Committee will discuss that tomorrow morning. And Douglas has a point."

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, I have been assured by the Purchasing Department that the intent of House Bill 1061 will be met by administrative means. And, therefore, I would like leave of the House to table House Bill 1061."

Speaker Blair: "All right, is there objection? Hearing none, it will be tabled. Mr. Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave of the House to table House Bill 1219. There's a duplication in House Bill 637, which I am the principal Sponsor, it's the same Bill. So I'd ask for leave of the House to table 1219."

Speaker Blair: "Is there objection? Hearing none, it will be tabled. Introductions."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1929, Philp et al, appropriates \$7,600,600 to the Comptroller. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1930, Collins, creates the Financial Institution Study Commission."



First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1931 appropriates \$50,000 to the financial Institution Study Commission. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask leave of the House to extend Senate Bills 140 and 141. It does require 107 votes. Until tomorrow would be fine."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh, W.: "Well, that's okay with me. Fine, we can extend it for one day."

Speaker Blair: "All right, perhaps in the interim something can be worked out. The question then is on the extension of the 30-day calendar rule for an additional day until tomorrow. House . . . Senate Bills 140 and 141 may be heard. It takes 107 votes. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 120 'ayes' and 2 'nays'; and the Gentleman's motion to extend prevails. All right. Announcements? Mr. Walsh."

Walsh, W.: "Mr. Speaker, the House baseball team will practice tonight at 6 p.m. at Lincoln Park at Diamond #5. And I ask you all to get plenty of rest in your Committees this afternoon so you'll be in good shape."

Speaker Blair: "Any further announcements? All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh, W.: "Now, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow morning."



Speaker Blair: "All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, stand adjourned until 9:30 tomorrow morning."

