

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTIETH LEGISLATIVE DAY

MAY 22, 1973

10:30 O'CLOCK A.M.

THE HONORABLE W. ROBERT BLAIR, SPEAKER

IN THE CHAIR



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

1.

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

Representative Peter C. Granata - illness;

Representative C. L. McCormick - illness in family.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Blair: "...Will be in Session, the invocation will be by Dr. Johnson."

Dr. Johnson: "We pray, Creator and Ruler of Heaven and Earth, we confess with thanksgiving that you have ordained Civil Government for our common goods. For this reason we pray now for the men and women who hold Public Office in our various communities in our Nation and especially in this our commonwealth. Help them to ascertain those things that tend to our well being and to seek these things in their daily labors. We recognize that human government is never perfect, but then, we aren't either. Enable us to do all we can for the welfare of our people, and continue to bless our Nations State and Communities as you will extend your hand over us today in this Session. Hear us as we pray in our Redeemers Name, Amen."

Speaker Blair: "Roll Call for Attendance. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, will the journal show that Representative Granata is absent because of illness and Representative McCormick is absent because of illness in the family."

Speaker Blair: "That will be journalized. Messages from the Senate."

Fred Selcke: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary, Mr. Speaker, I am directed the House of Representative.....to pass the Bill of the following title, House Bill 1680, passed by Senate May 21st, 1973, Ed E. Fernandes, Secretary, Mr. Speaker, I am directed the House of Representativespass the following Bills of the following title.....Senate Bill 424, 423, 428 444, 447, 448, 455, 456 and 467 passed by Senate May 21, 1973, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary."

Speaker Blair: "Committee Reports."

Fred Selcke: "Mr. Harpstrite from Agriculture and Natural Resources which House Bill 942, 959, 960, 962, 1002, 1108, 1109, 1148, 1148, 1237, 1239, 1305, 1314, 1417, 1457, 1543, 1594, 1655, 1767, 1768, 1769, 1771, 1804, 1819



refer reports ...by recommendation of Bills passed.

Mr. Harpstrite from Agriculture and Natural Resources to which House Bills 961, 1031, 1041, 1112, 1142, 1306 1458 refer for same....recommendation Bills to be passed to be referred to appropriation, Mr. Harpstrite , Agriculture to which House Bills 1030, 1057, 1122, 1222, 1498, 1585, 1673, 1746, 1770 referred for same typerecommendationamendment be adopted, amendment be passed. Mr. Harpstrite, Agriculture and Natural Resources which House Bill 1189, 1397, 1634 refer to the same type or recommendation to Bills to be passed. Mr. Harpstrite, Agriculture and Natural Resources which House Bill 1257, 1772 refer to same type recommendation to Bills do not pass. Mr. Harpstrite, Agriculture and Natural Resources which House Joint Resolution #34 refer reported same type recommendation Resolution be adopted, Mr. McAvoy, from Bank..Saving and Loan in which House Bill 904, 1133, 1906 refer reports back with same recommendations, amendments have to do with adopting Bills be passed.Mr. McAvoy, Bank, Saving and Loan for which House Bill 987, 988, 1211, 1273, 1323, 1383, 1576, 1882 and 1884 refer reports ...recommendations Bills be passed. Mr. McAvoy, from Banks to which House Bill 1390, 1596, 1597 refer back to same recommendation Bills do not pass. Mr. McAvoy, from Banks, which House Bill 1615, 1645 were referred same back with recommendation Bills to be passed. Mr.North, Cities and Villages, House Bill 782, 834, 891, 894, 1313, 1448, 1728, 1774 refer for same back with amendment number two, recommendation amendments be adopted Bills be passed. Mr. North, Cities and Villages, which House Bill 887, 1085, 1287, 1722 referred for same typeBills be passed. Ms. Dyer, from Higher Education which House Bill 1514, 1671 refer report back with same recommendation Bills be passed. Mr. Tuerk, from Industrial Affairs which House Bill 1073



1075, 1226, 1227, 1426 refer report same back for recommendation Bills do not pass. Mr. Tuerk, from Industrial Affairs which House Bills 1225, 1229, 1480 were deferred for same back recommendation Bills do not pass. Mr. Tuerk, from Industrial Affairs which House Bills 1382 is referred same back to recommendation Bills do pass. Mr. Tuerk, from Industrial Affairs which House Bills 1471, refer same back for recommendation for Bill do pass. Mr. Tuerk, from Industrial Affairs which House Bills 1532 and 1640 were deferred for same back for amendment for recommendation amendments be adopted and Bills be passed. Mr. Duff, from Judiciary II which House Bills 844,1058,1196 and 1829 were deferred report same back for amendments ..recommendation amendments be adopted, Bills be passed. Mr. Duff, from Judiciary II to which House Bills 983 was referred for same back with amendment for recommendation amendments Bills do not pass. Mr. Duff, from Judiciary II to which House Bill 1042, 1169, 1235, 1336, 1720, 1732, 1739, 1747, 1744, 1752, 1754, 1758, 1894 refer back to same report back with recommendation Bills do not pass. Mr. Duff, from Judiciary II to which House Bills 1342, 1738, 1741, 1742, 1743 and 1914 were deferred for same back recommendation Bills do not pass. Mr. Duff, from Judiciary II from which House Bills 49, 715, 3118, 2218, 3118, and 58 were deferred for same back of recommendation Bills do pass. Mr. Wall, from Registration and Regulation to which House Bills 1078, 1112, 1194,1341, 1391,1394 were referred for same back of recommendation Bills do not pass. Mr. Wall, from Registration and Regulation to which House Bills 1131, 1238,1281, 1330, 1566, 1642, and 1734 were deferred for same back recommendation Bills do pass. Mr. Wall, from Registration and Regulation to which House Bills 1150, 1243,1412,1414, 1419, 1420, 1421, 1427, 1439, 1474, 1573 refer same back for recommendation Bills do pass. Mr. Wall, from Registration



and Regulation for which House Bills 1151,1574,1810 were referred for same back with amendments set to recommendation be adopted and Bills be passed. Mr. Wall, from Registration and Regulation which House Bill 1682 is referred report same back with recommendation Bill do not pass. Mr. Wall, from Registration and Regulation to which House Bill 1706 referred for same back of recommendation amendment, recommendation amendment be adopted, Bills not to do pass. Mr. Wall, from Registration and Regulation to which House Bill 1723 was referred for same back with amendment... recommendation amendment be adopted, Bills not to do pass. Mr. Wall, from Registration and Regulation to which House Bills 1726, refer for same back with recommendation Bill do pass. Mr. Wall, from Registration and Regulation to which House Bills 1735 was referred for same back with recommendation Bill do pass, to be re-referred back to appropriation. Mr. Epton, from Insurance to which House Bill 817 was referred was returned the ...23D the Bill was ordered tabled. Mr. Harpstrite, Agriculture and Natural Resources to which House Bills 1114, 1115, 1123, 1276,1277, 1278, 1500 were referred recommend the Bills be signed Interim Study Calendar. Mr. McAvoy, from Bank Saving and Loan from which House Bills 1381, 1384, 1385,1393 refer recommend they be signed to Interim Study Calendar. Mr. North, from Cities and Villages to which House Bills 1096 were referred to recommend Bill be signed to Interim Study Calendar. Mr. McMaster, from County and Township to which House Bills 924, 925,971, 1322, 1520, 1864, 1896,... 1909, 955, 1523, 1583, 1296, 1674, 1857 be referred to Interim Study Calendar. Mr. Soderstrom, fromSecondary from which House Bills 1014, 1346,1372,1409, 1518, 1197 were referred recommend they be signed Interim Study Calendar. Mr. Collins from Executive from which House Bill 872, 944,1208,1588, 1460, 1461, 1602, 1806 and 1808 were referred recommend they be



signed Interim Study Calendar. Mr. Collins, from Executive to which House Bills 943, was referred recommend Bill be signed Interim Study Calendar. Mr. Collins, from Executive to which House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 23, 24 refer recommend signed to Interim Study Calendar. Ms. Dyer, from Higher Education which House Bill 1509, 1510, 1826 refer recommend they be assigned Interim Study Calendar. Mr. Capuzi, from Human Resources from which House Bills 1301,1521,1522,1537,1679, 1782, 1783, 1786, 1789 refer they be assigned to Interim Study Calendar. Mr. Tuerk, from Industrial Affairs which House Bill 1186, 1187, 1230, 1368, 1396 and 1473 were referred they be assigned to Interim Study Calendar. Mr. Epton, from Insurance which House Bill 1347, 1466 were referred they be recommended they be assigned Interim Study Calendar. Mr. Rose, from Judiciary I, House Bills 1146, 1193, 1244, 1345, 1329, 1352, 1404, 1530, 1577, 1683, 1684, 1685, 1686, 1687, 1688, 1689, 1690, 1717, 1794 and 1876 were referred they be assigned to Interim Study Calendar. Mr. Duff, from Judiciary II to which House Bill 1016, 1432,1691, 1757, 1778,1785,1787,1789 were referred they be assigned to Interim Study Calendar. Mr. Pappas, from Motor Vehicles from which House Bills 1255, 1429, 1693, 1727, 1833 were referred they be assigned Interim Study Calendar. Mr. Schoeberlein, from Public Utilities which House Bill 1692 is referred recommend they be assigned to Interim Study Calendar. Mr. Wall, from Registration and Regulation to which House Bills 1667, 1823 referred recommend they be assigned Interim Study Calendar. Mr. Randolph from Revenue to which House Bill 1697 was referred recommend the Bill be assigned to Interim Study Calendar. Mr. Wolf, from Veterans Affairs, Personnel and Pension which House Bills 1137, 1139, 1375, 1376, 1444, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1455,1456, 1496, 1551, 1636, 1694, 1707, 1712, 1713, 1715, 1716, 1717, 1747, 1796, 1801, 1802, 1865 were referred they be recommend- ed to be assigned to Interim Study Calendar.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Blair: "Introduction of First Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1948, B. B. Wolfe appropriates \$6000 sudden Infant Death Syndrome Study Commission, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1949, Duff, appropriates \$10,000 to Illinois Council and Criminal and Juvenile Justice, First Reading of the Bill, House Bill 1950, Maragos, ..Capital Development Board Act, First Reading of the Bill, House Bill 1951, Maragos, amends Capital Development Board Act appropriates \$5,000,000, First Reading of the Bill, House Bill 1952, Maragos, appropriates \$5,000,000 Capital Development Board, First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "While we're waiting on the Agreed ResolutionsYeah, you're here. Next door to business Agreed Resolutions. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook,"

Fred Selcke: "Let me read them first."

Speaker Blair: Ah, yes."

Fred Selcke: "House Resolution 327 showed ...House Resolution 328, Hirschfeld, House Resolution 329, Lemke....House Resolution 330, Fary...House Resolution 331, Fary.... House Resolution 332, Calvo...House Resolution 333, Harold Washington, House Joint Resolution 49, B.B. Wolfe, House Resolution 335, Choate...."

Speaker Blair: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, these are the Agreed Resolutions House Resolutions 327 congratulates our colleague Bob Brinkmeier on his 51st birthday which was last Sunday, House Resolution 328 congratulates Ms. Lela Wimmer upon the occasion of her professional retirement and her retirement from Unity High School at Tolonto, Illinois, House Resolution 329 congratulates Mr. John Sovenik on 50 years of dedicated service as Music Director for the Chicago Boys Club, House Resolution 330 congratulates



Father Morganthaler on the recent celebration of his 35th anniversary of his ordination to the Priesthood, House Resolution 331 congratulates the Reverend Michael Witsill on the 40th anniversary of his ordination to the Priesthood, House Resolution 332 asks that we join with the people of Granite City and the student and faculty of Granite City High School in congratulating Bill, 'Red' Schmidt on his induction to the Illinois Wrestling Hall of Fame, House Resolution 333 commends William C. Ives, the former Director of the Illinois Fair Employment Practices Commission on his retirement from that Commission. ...and House Resolution 335 congratulates a colleague, Representative Peggy Smith Martin on her birthday, which is today, and House Resolution, House Joint Resolution 49, by B. B. Wolfe, requests that the day for reporting be extended on the Sudden Infant Death Syndrome Study Commission and that this be extended to January 9th, 1974 and the reason for this is I'm told by Representative Wolfe, that the appointments were not made. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Blair: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman has offered ...move the adoption to Agreed Resolutions ..All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The Resolutions are adopted. House Bills, Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 349, Londrigan, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Can we wait until a little longer in the day for this, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Blair: "Do you want to take it out of the record?"

Londrigan: "Can we go later on it?"

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman wants that taken out of the record..."



Fred Selcke: "496, House Bill 496, Douglas, a Bill for an Act to amend Section 206 and 208 of the Illinois Controlled Substances Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Douglas."

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave of the House to return House Bill 496 to Second Reading for purposes of tabling Amendment #1 and replacing it with a new Amendment?"

Speaker Blair: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, House Bill 496 will be ordered to Second Reading. Will the Clerk please read the Amendment?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #2, Douglas, amends House Bill 496..."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Douglas."

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 496 is a result of discussion that started with agents in the Illinois Bureau of Investigation and their concern is for the over availability of a number of very dangerous drugs. There are approximately 7 or 8 major drug. Problems that we are living with in the State of Illinois today. This original Bill 496, included all of these drugs and would have moved them on Schedule II of of the Controlled Substances Act. Moving them under Schedule II in essence makes it much more difficult for them to reach the illicit market. After discussion we decided approximately six weeks ago, to change the 7 or 8 drugs simply to 2....and the amphetamines. This Bill passed out of Committee with no problem with methaqualone and the amphetamines. This Bill passed out of Committee with no problem with methaqualone and amphetamines remaining on House Bill 496. In the meantime, there have been very rapid strides at the Federal level and in the State with recommending that each of the other drugs that had been included originally on this Bill be moved also under Schedule II. Now, at the same time House Bill 892, Sponsored by Representative Telcser, is on its way through the House. House Bill 892 would allow the Department of



Law Enforcement to classified drugs as what will be called designated substances which will eliminate the problem of the triplicate prescription form. I am now asking for your support in amending this Bill to replace as Amendment #1, the same components of the original House Bill 496, which would keep on the Bill all of the drugs which have been widenedregarded as dangerous drugs....that are available on the streets ...that are causing a great deal of trouble....and which with the support of the Department of Law Enforcement and the knowledge of the Dangerous Drugs Advisory Council.....it now appears sensible would be returned to the Bill and I ask for your support in adoption of the new Amendment #1. Excuse me, I think I failed to table Amendment #1 and I think I should do that before asking for support."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman's moved to table Amendment #1 to House Bill 496. All those in favor to tabling Amendment #1 signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The Amendment is tabled. Now, on the Gentleman's motion of adopting Amendment #2. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Will the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Blair: "He indicates he will."

Kempiners: "When this Bill was heard in Committee....first there was quite a few organizations that were interested in what it would do. Have you checked this Amendment out with....., for example, the Pharcuetical Association to see what their feelings are?"

Douglas: "....Ah..., Representative Kempiners, because this has taken place during the last few days....there has not been the same opportunity to check this out with each of the groups that were concerned with the passage of the



original Bill, however, with Representative Telcser's assistance because the 2 Bills in a sense become companion Bills now with the knowledge of those who support his Bill. What we're going to do if this Bill passes out of the House, is work on these 2 Bills concurrently in the Senate so that we can get agreement from the different groups that are involved. We felt that with Law Enforcement being very concerned about these drugs that it would be more expeditious and sensible to pass both these Bills out of the House and then to deal with any possible changes that may be made in the Senate and we can eventually agree on this in a Conference Committee."

Kempiners: "If we adopt this Amendment, will you check with each organizations prior to Third Reading so that they're aware of what's going on?"

Douglas: "Well, I'll do everything I possibly can to do that. That may not be possible because of those and the 'lateness' of the hour..ah..I don't know that I can manage before Third Reading but I'm sure with hearings due in the Senate on this Bill and ah..our watching how House Bill 892 goes, if there be no problem, Representative Kempiners certainly not going to be signed into all pass through the Senate without concurrence and the proper number of votes."

Speaker Blair: "Further discussion? The Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 496, all in favor of adoption by saying 'aye' opposed 'no' the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading. The gentleman has indicated that he wishes to take this Bill on Third Reading at this time. Third time, the gentleman from Cook, Representative Douglas."

Douglas: " Ah, Mr. Speaker, this Bill has been discussed in as much detail as the complicated issue of this kind I think can be discussed from the floor. I'll be very happy



if there are any questions to answer them and I ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Blair: "Is there any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 496 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? B. B. Wolf and Merlo 'aye', have all voted who wish? Take the record. J. J. Wolf 'aye' and this question went on 17 'ayes' 1 'nay' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 501."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 501, Rayson, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson. One moment, please, the gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, in the gallery to my right the third grade pupils from the Auburn School District with their teachers and some of the mothers and one of the mothers is a good friend Reeve Evans daughter and one of the third pupils is Reeve's granddaughter."

Speaker Blair: "Now, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson who represents House Bill 501."

Rayson: "Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, House Bill 501 is a slate Amendment to the Correction Code last year and it merely says that upon petition of any one, the Juvenile Court Judge may make a determination as to whether or not a juvenile 13 years of age or over charged with a felony could be heard, could be charged either as a felony or as a juvenile. The law right now makes it permissive if its moved by the State's Attorney, because it's a 'substantive right' of Juveniles that this matter be heard, seems to me that any proper person of interest beyond the State's Attorney should have this right to make this motion to hear this matter. Its a permissive matter and its discretionary with the court and its



supported by the Department of Corrections and the council for the diagnostic and evaluation of prisoners Commission. I would urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Blair: "Is there any further discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 501 pass, all those in favor signify by voting "aye" those opposed by voting "no". Have all voted who wish? Kozubowski "aye". Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, there are 119 "ayes" 2 "nays". This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 576."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 576, an Act to Amend Section I of an Act in relation to jury commissioners and soforth, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "Is Representative Pierce on the floor? Take that out of the Record. House Bill 718. 718 is an error. 723."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 723, Murphy....."

Speaker Blair: "Well, lets take that out of the Record. House Bill 727."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 727, McCormick and Hart, an Act to authorize directing the Department of Transportation to make examinations study of the Little Saline River, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart."

Hart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill provides for a study of the Little Saline River in Pope and Saline County has the approval of the Department of Waterways, there's no money involved in it and I would appreciate the support of the House for this very important Bill for the 59th District. I'm handling for Representative McCormick ..ah..this, will appreciate the support of the House."

Speaker Blair: "Is there any further discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 727 pass? All those in favor signify



by voting 'aye' those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Jefferson 'aye'. Kempiners 'aye' and this question 133 'ayes' no 'nays' this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 541."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 541, Holloway, a Bill for an Act to amend to add Section 2.1, Electric Supplier Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Holloway."

Holloway: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, House Bill 541 amends the Electrical Suppliers Act, it implements the 1970 Constitution...It provides that the powers and functions set forth in this Act will continue to be the exclusive powers and functions of the Illinois Commerce Commission. I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Blair: "Is there any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 541 pass, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye' the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, there are 135 'ayes' no 'nays' this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Is Representative Philip on the floor? If not we'll pass over House Bill 620. House Bill 668."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 668, R. L. Dunne, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative R. L. Dunne."

Dunne: "House Bill 668 merely prohibits anyone but properly authorized law enforcement people to use the word "police" on their vehicles. It was amended to include properly authorized University Police Department. Its a Bill supported by all of the various Police Associations throughout the State and..ah.. its purpose is to correct



misuse of police powers by unauthorized private security organizations, and I urge its support."

Speaker Blair: "Is there any further discussion? The gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn.."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Blair: "He indicates he will."

Flinn: "Representative Dunne, would this, how would this affect the campus police, would this prevent the campus police from having"

Dunne: "No, its amended to absolutely assure them of being able to continue to use plates on their car."

Speaker Blair: "Is there further discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 668 pass, all those in favor signify by voting "aye" the opposed by voting "no". Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Kosinski "aye". On this question 126 "ayes" no "nays", Macdonald "aye", Yourell "aye", this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 669."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 669, Keller,"

Speaker Blair: "Keller on the floor? He's not...Take that out of the record. House Bill 780."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 780 passed yesterday."

Speaker Blair: "That's also an error on the Calendar. The Bill was passed yesterday. House Bill 510."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 510, McMaster, an Act to amend the Revenue Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 510 and the one following it 518 were Committee Bills, they were introduced by Representative Krause and my names upon them, they have been handled in Committee ah.. Revenue Committee, I believe by Representative Skinner. For that reason I would ask that Representative Skinner explain and answer questions on both House Bills



510 and the following one 518."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, the two Bills that..ah..two different ...matters so I won't ask that they be considered together. House Bill 510 is an attempt to make new home owners pay their fare share of the taxes, at the present time taxes are assessed as of every January 1st and any new construction following January 1st is not picked up until the next January 1st. This Bill would mandate that there be a proportional share of taxes paid for the proportion of the year that the house was built. Notice is required for these changes in effectBill and it is..ah.. well if anyone has a questions I'll be happy to try to answer them. It merely ...it will help growing areas because it will put the taxes ..it will make the tax payment coincide more closely with the services demanded by the new revenue."

Speaker Blair: "Is there any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 510 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Kozubowski 'aye'. Take the record. On this question, 134 'ayes' 3 'nays' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mann 'aye'. House Bill 518."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 518, a Bill for an Act to amend Section 21, an Act to tax ...legacies and inheritances ..., Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "House Bill 518 results from the provision of the Illinois, the new Illinois Constitution that forbids the charging of collection fees based on percentages. Prior to the 1970 Constitution adoption County Government collected the State Inheritance Tax and the County was



paid for 4% of the amount of the Inheritance Tax. The County is now paid nothing, this Bill will allow the County to be paid a \$50 profit for each case."

Speaker Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Could you tell me how much this will cost us in Cook County?"

Skinner: "As a matter of fact, I can't. In Cook County I understand you don't process small cases, I'm not an expert on Cook County...."

Shea: "The reason I ask you this Cal, is I've got some indication and I ask you to hold this Bill, that this will be a substantial cost..ah..as far as what the treasury is in Cook County and I would like to check it out before I go ahead with the Bill."

Skinner: "Excuse me, but there will be no cost to the treasury of Cook County. This will be a transfer of funds from the State to the County."

Shea: "I realize how it works now, right now we get 4% of the collections plus"

Skinner: "At the present time you get nothing. You used to get 4%, but with the new Constitution just as the collector, the 3% collectors fee went out the window for property taxes so did the 4% fee for Inheritance Tax."

Shea: "Well, would you just hold the Bill and let us check it out?"

Skinner: "I'd be 'happy' to, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "O.K. we'll take that out of the record. House Bill 540."

Fred Selcke: " House Bill 540, D. L. Houlihan, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to alcoholic liquors, Third Reading of the Bill"

Speaker Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative D. L. Houlihan."



Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 540 seeks to amend several Sections of Article 9 of the Illinois Liquor Control Act. Article 9 is the local referendum Article of the Act. The Amendment proposed by this Bill do not, and I would emphasize this, they do not affect the substance of concept of the Act. Rather there is designed to provide procedural safeguard and notice provision to implement the operation of this local referendum Article and to do it in conformity with realistic due process provisions and in conformity with rational of two recent out of court cases which have construed Section 4 of the Act to the effect that it could challenge to the proposition petition which gives right to an election under this Act must be challenged prior to the election and cannot be used as a ground to challenge the validity of the election subsequent to the election. So that as far as the essential change proposed to the Bill we specifically now spell out in Section 4 of the Liquor Control, of Article 9 to the effect that it is incumbent upon one who is going to challenge the proposition that he brings such a challenge prior to the election. The other change is..from that we have changed the date for filing the proposition from 60 days as it presently provides to 90 days prior to the election. The purpose of this change is to allow the court sufficient opportunity to consider whatever challenges may be brought and to do it prior to the election. In addition the Bill provides for notice to the licensees effected of the fact that a proposition petition has been filed that they have the right to examine such proposition that they have the further right to bring a challenge to the proposition petition informing them that such a challenge must be brought prior to the election. Finally, the remaining changes in the Act refer to the fact that in a precinct referendum



under this Act which by definition this is voted on a precinct basis only in cities, villages and incorporated towns and access of 200,000 population. In such, referendum the proposition petition is to contain a common description of the boundaries of the affective precinct and a list of the licensees who will be effected by the election to be held on the proposition. Finally, the Bill provides that on the ballot itself in a precinct referendum there shall be a common description of the boundaries of the precinct affected and the of the licensees effected ..ah..or if the judgement of the election official..ah..it would be..ah..inapplicable to have that on the ballot itself, it would be required to place such notice in a prominent place in the individual polling place. This Bill passed Committee without a descending vote, I know of no opposition to the Bill and I ask for your favorable consideration."

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

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

Speaker Blair: "He indicates he will."

Geo-Karis: "Dan, is this Bill..ah..predicated of petitions for local option whether or not to sell liquor on election days?"

Houlihan: "No, its a ...refer to election days specifically whether or not a it refers to a local referendum to determine whether an area should be wet or dry."

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

Speaker Blair: "The gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."

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

Speaker Blair: "He indicates he will."

Pierce: " Representative Houlihan I know back when I had time to practice law on these issues came up they used to use the ...lines of the 1933 in the city of Chicago rather than the current ...lines, does this Bill do



anything to change that or is that practiced..ah..still in effect? Or was it stopped by other Legislation, what precinct lines are used when you have the vote to go dry, the current or the old days when Chicago went wet in 1933?"

Houlihan: "No, it refers as a Statute as it now reads stands the precinct lines will be the precinct lines as of the last General Election preceding the date of the election to be held on this proposition."

Pierce: "So, it will be pretty much the modern precinct lines unless there has been a recent..ah..changing of the precincts then."

Houlihan: "That is correct."

Pierce: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Washington."

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

Speaker Blair: "The Sponsor indicates he will, yes, Sir."

Washington: "Representative Houlihan, in reference to the notice, now do I understand you correctly that notice must come from the Clerk?"

Houlihan: "That is correct."

Washington: "That all licensees within the prescribed area must be notified."

Houlihan: "That is correct."

Washington: "What would happen in the event that one licensee was not notified due to the fault of the Clerk?"

Houlihan: "Just a moment please. The Bill itself Representative Washington or the change we propose is silent on the matter, however, the present Act which is not changed contains this language. The only publication which is called for in the present Act is to the effect that the publication of this submission of the proposition to the voters of the precinct effected, shall be in a manner provided by law for the publication of the list of



nominations to be voted for at an election, and that it specifically states provided, however, the failure of the Clerk to cause such notice to be given or the failure to make publication of this submission proposition shall not effect the validity or binding force to vote upon the proposition. Now that I have not changed."

Washington: "Now who must give the list to the Clerk? The petitioners?"

Houlihan: "The change that we proposed here in the Bill provides that on the proposition petition itself, there must be listed all the licensees who will be effected within the prescribed area..ah..the Clerk would simply have to take the list then from the proposition petition which is filed with them."

Speaker Blair: "The gentleman from Kane, Representative Friedland."

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

Speaker Blair: "The gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying "aye", Friedland, opposed "no" previous question has been moved and the gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan to close."

Houlihan: "I would simply emphasize Ladies and Gentlemen of the House that the Bill does not effect the ...of the passage of Statute these are due process notice provisions and I ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Blair: "Question is, shall House Bill 540 pass? All those in favor signify by voting "aye" those opposed by voting "no". Have all voted who wish? Shea "aye". Take the record. J. J. Wolf, "aye". On this question, 127 "ayes", 3 "nays" and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 544."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 544, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code in 1961, Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson."

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

As you know, when we adopted our Constitution we clearly stated that there would be no discrimination as to sex and discrimination as to the physical and mental handicapped. Last year we had a Bill which took care of the mental, mentally handicapped. This is a Bill to forever put it in the Public Accommodations Act that we don't discriminate as to sex. So the Bill says that in addition to the other grounds such as race, religion, color, natural origin or physically and mentally handicapped we had no discrimination as to sex and public accommodations or in the employment or if you are a public official in the privileges of your office. And I would move, Mr. Speaker, for the adoption of House Bill 544."

Speaker Blair: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer."

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

Speaker Blair: "He indicates he will."

Palmer: "Would this, does this, Representative Rayson, do away with the separate penal facilities, say Dwight and some of the other facilities?"

Rayson: "It doesn't apply, Representative Palmer, because it only refers strictly to public accommodations which are numerated and it doesn't refer whatsoever to any governmental institutions."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Will the Gentleman yield for a couple more questions?"

Speaker Blair: "He indicates he will."

Leinenweber: "Representative Rayson, would this Bill apply to dormitories and our public and private colleges?"

Rayson: "No."



Leinenweber: "Why?"

Rayson: "I checked that out. It's not a public accommodation as enumerated by the statute."

Leinenweber: "Would it apply to the YMCA and the YWCA's, particularly those that have hotel facilities?"

Rayson: "It will not apply to the YMCA or YWCA because..."

Leinenweber: "Why?"

Rayson: "Because the law has interpreted them as not being public accommodations."

Leinenweber: "A YMCA is not a public accommodation?"

Rayson: "No, under the law."

Leinenweber: "Well, what about the YMCA's facilities being places of public amusement?"

Rayson: "Well, even if it is, it's still not a, see there's a distinction between a legal public accommodation and other public places that hold out to the general public and because of this distinction it's only applicable to specific areas under the Public Accommodations Act."

Leinenweber: "Well, wouldn't it be held to be as broad as the previous applications of this Act and this State and other States for similar Acts for all places of public accommodation and amusement that the racial discrimination has been prohibited on."

Rayson: "Well, to use your question, in a YWCA there was a game room for bowling and pinball and so forth and that the other sex wanted to come and he was denied he well could have a court case and the court could well broaden the Public Accommodations Act to put them under that. But as of now I can say it doesn't really cover that."

Leinenweber: "All right, one final question. Why did you feel it necessary to exclude restrooms if your Bill is as clear as you say it is?"

Rayson: "Because of all the discussion we had on ERA and I just wanted to make sure that this doesn't apply. That's



all."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to the Bill if I could."

Speaker Blair: "Proceed, sir."

Leinenweber: "I think this is an extremely dangerous, wide-ranging Bill which will change the patterns of custom in the United States in an extraordinary manner. I would suggest to strike Representative Rayson's disclaimers that all of these institutions that I have suggested, the institution that Representative Palmer has suggested would indeed come within the pervue of this Bill if enacted into law. I would suggest if you want to do away with all facilities in the athletic, in the entertainment, in the private accommodations, overnight accommodations, if you want to do away with discrimination on sex and all of these areas, then you ought to vote for the Bill. I really feel that you ought to, if you want to do this, you ought to remove the discriminations for the restrooms also. I would suggest that the reason the restrooms were put in here is because of the fact that this Bill is so clear that all places that people, that are open to the general public and I believe has been construed to also apply to places such as the Playboy Club and so forth which are not open to the general public, but membership, membership is open to the general public, all of these places are included. I would suggest to you that you are going to do away with an extraordinary right of privacy here that we have heretofore enjoyed. I would suggest that if you feel this way that you ought to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Blair: "Is there further discussion? If not, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson to close."

Rayson: "Members of the House, the speaker who last spoke, I am sure his views are sincere but they are misdirected. The Public Accommodations Act has been on the books in



Illinois for almost 100 years. Its primary purpose was not to allow discrimination as to race, religion or color or national ancestry in public accommodations. They define public accommodations such as hotels, taverns, innkeepers, motion picture theaters, these sorts of things. But because it is statutory and it's of strict construction it doesn't come in the area as suggested by the last speaker. Last year we added that there can be no discrimination to the physical or mentally handicapped in these public accommodations. We are merely implementing the Constitution to make the Public Accommodations Act appropriate so that we do not discriminate as to sex. It doesn't evade the providence of the Playboy Club which is a private thing or it doesn't even in hotel when you have your private affairs for men only or a group only. This doesn't apply. It just merely says that if you want to go to the restaurant in Springfield and you want to take your girlfriend that they shouldn't, you know, discriminate as to sex. That's all it says and I urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Blair: "The question is, shall House Bill 544 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed, he was closing the debate, Representative. Do you want to explain your vote? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "I wanted to explain my vote and I thought that it might help get 89 votes."

Speaker Blair: "Go ahead. You still have time, sir."

Mugalian: "This seems to me like a relatively simple Bill and it does what we say we are going to do when we talk about the Equal Rights Amendment. We are going to legislate so as to remove inequality on the basis of



sex....so I just can't see why there aren't 140 votes up there."

Speaker Blair: "Does someone wish to change their vote?....

The Lady from DuPage, Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "I'm just wondering where all of the green lights areof the people who said...during the debate on the Equal Rights Amendment...that of course we believe in equal rights for women...and of course we're against discrimination on the basis of sex and of course we believe in implementing our Illinois Constitution which we have to do anyway but you've come in with a sledgehammer to kill a mosquito and so we can't go for your big fat Amendment but they said come in with individual Bills implementing the Illinois Constitution and we'll vote 'yes' to those even if it takes one-hundred years to do the job we'll vote yes. Now, where are all those people who promised to vote 'yes' on the individual Statutes...."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster...."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my distinguished colleague to the left wondered where all of those green lights are....ah...I didn't hearah.. a full explanation of the importance of this Bill and I want to identify myself as one of those who will vote 'yes' for the Bill.....and would you record me as 'yes' on this Legislation."

Speaker Blair: "O. K....We're going to take another Roll Call. O. K. Now, let's go back to the debate.....Oh, you don't want another one? O. K. The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers, to explain his vote."

Borchers: "Ah, Mr. Speaker and Fellow Members of the House. I just pulled in and I'm not sure that I have been able to receive a full explanation of this but I am certainly for equal....equal rights except in relation to combat



andah...and as I understand it....and as I understand this....ha...in explaining my vote I'm looking at Mrs. Dyer and I wish she'd nod her head 'yes'...is this just...'yes' or 'no'? Is this just equal.....if I would voteif I vote 'yes' on this ...this means that they have all equal rights in relation to public facilities... ah....except the toilets....is that correct? Or is this why I'm voting for this Bill now?.....I'd like to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Blair: "Record Representative Borchers as voting 'aye'.....Borchers 'aye'....Pappas 'aye'....out of a number of Members seeking recognition ...we can save a lot of time with another Roll Call....unless everyone is upset about another one. If the votes are there..... they are there. O. K. then, let's dump that Roll Call... take a new one. The question is shall House Bill 544 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Does someone wish to.....the Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "I'd like to explain my 'no' vote if I may, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Blair: "Proceed, Sir."

Wolf: "Ah...I for one did not support the Equal Rights Amendment and I think I am one of those that Mrs. Dyer alluded to and I said 'yes' if you come in with individual Bills, I will support them, and I have supported almost all of them. But I feel there should be some room for reasonable differences and I don't think it's too much to ask that if they want to have men's bars or women's tea rooms that they should be allowed to maintain those and that's why I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote I was one of those who was absent on the Equal Rights Amendment vote, I was in the hospital,

and I'd like certainly to make that up....the ladies and the Equal Rights supporters at this time, however, as....the twenty-five year executive of the Y.M.C.A. I was disturbed by Mr. Leinenweber's ...ah...message and I do not thoroughly understand the implication of this Bill and I presume now the Sponsor is not going to put it on Postponed Consideration, I will vote green on this but after investigating further on this I may have to ...ah...go to work on it in the Senate....Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, and particularly explaining my vote to the ...ah...the Lady from DuPage County....ah...Representative Dyer....she knows I was a strong supporter of the Equal Rights Amendment from....all through my campaign...and on the floor of this House. And I recall specifically.....the leaders of the Equal Rights Amendment specifying that ... ah...this was equal rights not sameness, now I suggest to you that there are places in...ah...in....ah...the world today that ...ah...ought to be open for people of different physical characteristics provided they are not discriminated against and the basis of some artificial ...ah...basis such as ...race, creed or color. I would suggest to you that ...ah...the Y.M.C.A definitely is a place of public accommodation and a place of public amusement ...I suggest to you that all of our private clubs that ...ah...are generally open to ...ah...public membership are places of public accommodation and places of public amusement. All of these....if you want to walk into your favorite steam room and find it filled with women....fine....then you ought to vote for this Bill. Now, maybe I've talked myself into changing my vote but I would suggest the fact that they had to specify restroomsto leave this out of the Bill....



shows you the extent this Bill goes to and I urge....a...
more red votes up there."

Speaker Blair: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record.

On this question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Rayson."

Rayson: "Mr. Speaker....ah.....can I explain my vote?"

Speaker Blair: "No, we're beyond that point, Sir."

Rayson: "I respectfully request a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Blair: "O. K. the Gentleman has requested a poll of
the absentees. The Members will please be in their
seats."

Fred Selcke: "Anderson, Arnell, Arrigo, Beatty, Berman, Blade,
Bradley, Brandt, Brinkmeier, Brummet, Calvo, Capparelli,
Capuzi, ..."

Speaker Blair: "Record Representative Capuzi as voting 'no'."

Fred Selcke: "Carter, Clabaugh, Collins, Cox, Craig, Deavers,
DiPrima, Ralph Dunn, Farley, Fary, ..."

Speaker Blair: "Wait a second....wait now....Representative
Calvo wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Fennessey
'aye'. Craig 'aye',..."

Fred Selcke: "Fennessey, Friedland, Gibbs, Giglio, Granata,
Hanahan, Hart, Hirschfeld, Gene Hoffman, Ron Hoffman,
D. Houlihan, Hudson, Hunsicker, Huskey, Hyde, Dave Jones,
Juckett, Keller, Klosak, Kosinski, Kriegsman, Kucharski,
...."

Speaker Blair: "Hart, 'aye'..."

Fred Selcke: "Lauer, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leon, Madigan,
McAuliffe, McAvoy, McCormick, McCourt, McGrew, McMaster,
McPartlin, Tom Miller, Molloy, Murphy, Nardulli, Neff,
North, ..."

Speaker Blair: "North, 'no'."

Fred Selcke: "Philip, Peters, Randolph, Redmond, Rigney,
Sangmeister, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Sevcik, Springer
Stedelin, Stone, Totten, Tuerk...."

Speaker Blair: "Totten, 'no'..."



Fred Selcke: "VonBoeckman, Waddell, Wall, Walters.....Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Murphy."

Fred Selcke: "89 'ayes'...."

Murphy: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Blair: "How is Representative Murphy recorded?"

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

Murphy: "Susan.....er...Representative Catania.....just made me a little deal.....on the steam bath. I think I'll vote 'aye'."

Speaker Blair: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'.... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Robert Dunne.."

Dunne: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Blair: "How is the Gentleman recorded? Robert Dunne?"

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

Dunne: "Change it to 'no', please."

Speaker Blair: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Record Representative Lechowicz as voting 'aye'. Lauer...'no'. Brinkmeier...'aye'."

Fred Selcke: "Oh, Boy..."

Speaker Blair: "Piotrowicz, 'aye'.....Representative Leinenweber...no?...O. K....Representative Randolph 'aye'. Kucharski 'aye'. McAvoy 'aye'. O. K. Gibbs 'aye'. Leon 'aye'. If any others want to change their vote why don't you come up and tell the Clerk. We're well over the amount required."

Fred Selcke: "97 'ayes'97 'ayes' Arthur and...15 'nays'.."

Speaker Blair: "On this question there are 97 'ayes', there is 15 'nays'. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber.....No...This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority it's hereby declared passed.... The Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

Choate: "Mr. Speaker, I have an extremely important announcement to make. This being either the happy or unhappy



day of the year for our colleague on this side of the aisle, Representative Peggy Smith Martin, being her birthday, I am happy to advise the membership on both sides of the aisle that Mrs. Smith has in.....Mrs. Martin has invited themif they desire to do soto come to the cloakroom and have a piece of beauti.....beautiful birthday cake. It's a nice....real beautiful birthday cake in the cloakroom.....ah....ah....and noah.. champagne.....and no pickles."

Speaker Blair: "The Lady form Cook, Representative Martin."

Martin: "Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that the piece of cake was clarified.....ha...ha.....I would realy love to have everyone to have a piece of cake and I would suggest that everyone bring with them a pencil and paper because there is a message on the cake and I'd also like to invite the members of the press to have a piece of cake, thank you."

Speaker Blair: "Representative Caldwell, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Caldwell: "I'm trying to find out what cake the Lady is talking about, Sir, I haven't seen any."

Speaker Blair: "House Bill 588."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 588, Deuster, a Bill for an Act to Amend Section 2, an Act to revise the law in relation to notices, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is Public Notice Act. It's the same as House Bill 203 and 204that previously passed the House. Itah...provides very simply that where a unit of government must make public notice....there are two ways they can do it. One they may publish notice in a newspaper ...which is published in the unit of government... and...ah...which circulates in the unit of government... or if there is no newspaper published in that unit, which



is often the case then the notice should be published in the newspaper ...published in the county and circulating in the unit of government. I urge a favorable vote.....on this Bill."

Speaker Blair: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall House Bill 588 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who....
....the Gentleman from Kane, Representative Hill."

Hill: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question, I wonder if
....ah...."

Speaker Blair: "He'll answer it now."

Hill: "Are you eliminating, under this Bill, that instead of putting it into a newspaper in the area or district that all they would have to do is put up ten notifications?"

Deuster: "The answer to thatah....I might say to the Gentleman, the synopsis is wrong in suggesting it has something to do with ten public placestacking up signs.... that was ...ah...deleted. No.....the answer to your question is 'no'. This simply provides that ...ah...it...
...ah...no part of the law is going around tacking up signs on telephone poles or that sort of thing."

Hill: "They still would have to advertise in anewspaper in that district or in that locale?"

Deuster: "Yes, absolutely, they must either advertise in a newspaper that's published right in that area...that's published in the area or if there is none published there then they have to advertise in a newspaper that is published in the county and circulates in that area."

Hill: "How does your Bill differ from the existing law?"

Deuster: "The existing law still includes the provision as I understand it, for the ...ah....tacking up signs I believe in some cases in five public places ...and in other instances ten public places....and I might say this Legislation was suggested by the Committee that heard the earlier Bills which were more narrowly drawn to Fire Protection



Districts, Mosquito Abatement Districts and other smaller units of government. They suggested that why don't you do this generally because it seems like a good idea. Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "The question now, have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question.....Shea 'aye'....147 'ayes', no 'nays', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 593."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 593, an Act to amend Section 3 of an Act in relation to State Revenue Sharing with local governmental entities, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Representative Fennessey."

Fennessey: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 593 amends the Revenue Sharing Law. Under the present law portions of the State Income Tax is refunded to local governments units. The unit of government receiving the money has absolute discession over its use. All that this Bill does is permit ...ah...these local governments to use these funds for public libraries or park districts if they see fit. It's only permissive legislation, it's not mandatory, and I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Blair: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall House Bill 593 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Totten 'aye'. Take the record. This question..... Washington 'aye'. On this question there are 148 'ayes'... Tom Miller 'aye',.....no 'nays', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 637.....637."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 637, Kozubowski, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to Alcoholic Liquors, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "Take that out of the record, the Gentleman is



not on the Floor. What.....he's not here,where is he? If the Gentleman is not here we can't call his Bill. Is he here? House Bill 638."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 638, Londrigan, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to State Finance, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill which will benefit all State employees. We have had problems in the past with sick leave in the State of Illinois. Many take sick leave without really being sick and when they accumulate a good three or four months and are ready to retire, they take their sick leave before they retire. Others who are doing a very good job who are very capable and conscientiously come and report to work every day, accumulate much sick leave, and never use it. In order to reward the good employees and as an incentive to the others to come to work properly, we felt that upon their termination of service, if we gave them credit for fifty percent of their accumulated leave not to exceed 60 days, that the Stateem...would prosper because they would get more work time out of their employees and at the same time that the employees who faithfully performed their service would get this added fringe benefit upon retirement. We ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have to rise and oppose this particular Bill. It did get out of the Pensions Committee by a very small vote and I might add the only reason it got out was because no one was there from the Governor's office. The Bill had been postponed twice...ah....and was really defeated. We allowed



the Sponsor to postpone once more. Nobody appeared from the Governor's office to take a position on this. I have since received a letter from the Governor's office saying that they would take a position in opposition to this. First of all, this Bill is strongly opposed by the Illinois State Employees Pension Laws Commission because the basis of giving sick leave was not as a reward for the people who....through the grace of God...were never sick, it was for persons who were unfortunately ill so they wouldn't be docked when they had to take off of work. Now it also would cause serious administrative problems, for example when there is a transition we could take for example the Secretary of State's Office or any office in State Government where there is a transitional period of employees right now an employee ...ah...would be entitled to use up his unused vacation time if we were going to further complicate this by allowing them to take time forah...unused sick leave...would the pay slots created in the budget...the various...the certain department where this employee was leaving, they wouldn't be able to hire a new employee for quite some time. This could cause some serious problems. I mention the Secretary of State's office ...right now there is license plate season and the public would not be served. So I would certainly urge the Members ...ah...of this General Assembly to take a very strong hard look at this....aside of the fiscal implications....and vote 'no'."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Walters."

Walters: "Thank you.....will the Speaker yield for a question?"

Speaker Blair: "He indicates he will."

Walters: "Jim, I didn't hear what Jake said. Did you....ah.. did you...ah...say what the amount of money was involved in this particular Bill? Do you have any idea?"

Wolf: "No, we cannot ...ah...estimate it.....Ah...Ah...we don't think it would be too much because what we're doing is



encouraging the State employees not to use their sick leaveto store it up so they will be getting more during their employment they will be spending more days at work.....so when you subtract this from what they might get at the other end...there is really no way of telling exactly what this will cost....but we're using it as an incentive. There is a problem here....and this is an attempt to solve that problem.....it is like most of our solutions...it is not the best ...ah...perfect solution... but we think it is an improvement."

Walters: "I wonder if you could tell me Jim, at the present time some of the.....ah...Members of the other party are being laid off by the State and I understand they are not being paid their accumulated sick leave. Is that correct?"

Wolf: "That's true. In fact this will benefit your party more than mine but I don't think that's the issue here. We're doing what I believe is good for the State of Illinois and the employees."

Walters: "It might not be the issue for you but it might be for me. Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I would just like to speak in behalf of this Bill very shortly. I think that this may result in a savings for the State of Illinois rather than for a loss. Because....I know there.....I've had State employees speak to me on various occasions I've got to take my sick leave days....I haven't used them up....and unfortunately with many employees, and quite rightly so, ...ah...they feel that this is some days that are rightly coming to them if they haven't been ill they are going to take those days and I can't really blame them. They use them then as...ah...as personal leave days, although they count them against their sick day time or vacation time. So I think we may effect some savingsah...in encouraging them



not to take the sick leave days unless they are actually sick and actually need those days....and....consequently whenever they cease their employment with the State of Illinois they know that they can have this additional pay coming to them ...for....for not having taken these days awake from their work and the State will have benefited by having all of the additional hours and time devoted to their employment and not having to replace them from ...ah ...time to time or having people available who can fill in for these people who are gone on their sick leave time. So I can certainly encourage a vote for this Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, when this Bill came up in Committee it was pointed out by a number of witnesses including the Taxpayers Federation that this was a very bad principal for us to condone. Sick leave isas Representative Wolf said....is what it it called. 'Sick Leave'. It is not vacation pay, it is not something that should be added onto the last month of the last year's salary. If we pass this Bill it means that a State Employee will be paid for fourteen months for the last year of employment and that rate of pay will be used in determining the amount of remuneration the employee will get for the remainder of his or her retirement. I think this is a very bad precedent for us to go on and I urge everyone to vote 'no'."

Speaker Blair: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ...ah...I would like to speak directly to the Bill and that would be that 'here we go again into a very gray iffy area of attempting to reward people for an unknown quantity' ... will they or wont they accept ...ah..longer working periods to use up said sick leave. The concept of sick



leave being entirely different in its initial concept than what we are now about to do. I can understand paying people time and a half for overtime. I cannot understand paying time and a half as a buy-out ofah....unused sick leave which is a moral commitment for each of us to get out of bed every day and go to work and yet we have already softened the thing so that it's cumulative ...I regret that we would have to take it further and reimburse people at an extra fee. If they've got it coming; get off the payroll and stay home....but why go a time and a half and delay the personnel practices of any organization, including the State of Illinois with a fifty percent buy-out. Thank you."

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

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hesitate to rise in opposition to a Bill that appears on the surface that it might save money if it is enacted into law.....but I agree with exactly what the previous speaker said, that an employee ...in this instance...is morally bound to his employer to the extent that he will use his sick leave time in the manner in which it is intended in his behalf and that is to allow him the days that he is truthfully ill to the extent that he will not be penalized financially by the employer. It was not intended to give him a reimbursement or an add on as far as his salary is concerned if he happens to be fortunate enough not to be ill throughout that year of working time. I realize as well as anyone on the Floor of this House realizes that probably in many instances State employees will say that they are sick to their employer and they will take advantage of the sick leave time to the extent that they may not be on the job 'so to speak' when they feel that they might leave.....loose accrued sick leave time. I also realize that in many agencies of State



government that the administering officer will let the employee use sick leave time in his vacation time and this isn't right because morally these statutes were enacted so that this man would not be penalized if he was unfortunate enough to be ill. I think this is only an add on to his State salary and I am not going to vote for the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Blair: "He indicates he will."

Skinner: "Have the fiscal notes been obtained for this or if there haven't been can you estimate how many tens of millions of dollars this will cost annually?"

Londrigan: "There has been no fiscal note requested. There can be none given as indicated to you. It's a guesstimate of whether or not it will cost the State anything."

Skinner: "Well, I'm, excuse me but I am positive that it will cost something so I would ask that at least the guesstimate be filed with the Clerk of the House."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Clabaugh."

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

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The Gentleman's motion prevails and Representative Londrigan to close."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, everyone admits that we have a problem here. This is an honest attempt and a good attempt to solve this problem. It will not be a perfect solution. This has nothing to do with time and a half. The only thing you are giving the State employee upon termination is one half of his sick leave but not more than 60 days. This will be an incentive to employees to come to work. It will benefit the State. It will benefit the employee and



we can talk about concepts but what we really should be interested in is the result. The result will be good and I ask for your support."

Speaker Blair: "The question is, shall House Bill 638 pass. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and the opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Hunsicker to explain his vote."

Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I simply can't support this Bill. Sick leave is sick leave in my book and was put in that if a person is incapacitated and can't be on the job that their salary goes on and not as an increase of pay when they quit and I think this is wrong and it should be stopped. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Blair: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to explain my 'yes' vote on the board, the one of the consequences that would flow from this Bill would be to keep the employee honest instead of going down with a runny nose to ask for his time off and then goes down to the beach. It will encourage him to stay on the job. Now, at the present time most of these people use up all of their sick time. I think there is a growing trend certainly in this time to encourage the diligence in the performance of their duty. I think it's a good Bill and I don't think it is going to cost the State that much money."

Speaker Blair: "Have all voted who, the Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "I understand some problems have come up with this through the administration and I would ask to pull this from the record till we see if we can resolve them."

Speaker Blair: "O.K., Gentlemen, it can't be taken out of the record. It will be put on postponed consideration. The Gentleman has asked to put House Bill 638 on the



order of postponed consideration. House Bill 655."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 655, an Act to amend Section 2 of Public Act 772062, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a simple Bill that deals with a rather complex subject, the Illinois income tax. In 1972 we passed a fine Bill and enacted it into law that exempted pension and profit sharing plans from the Illinois income tax. That same year a court case, the Mitchell case, held that the August 1, 1969 valuation limitation applied to these items and that case was applied only to 1969 and 1970. That decision was then succeeded by a Bill, Senate Bill 1135, which carried the principle of the Mitchell case forward and put the August 1, 1969 valuation limitation on a legislative basis and it was passed in response to that Mitchell decision. Then the Department of Revenue interpreted Mitchell to apply to exempt all pension and profit sharing income from the Illinois income tax for 1969 and for 1970. Now, the Illinois Department of Revenue is taking applications for refunds for such income that was declared for 1969 and for 1970 under their interpretation of the Mitchell case. But they are not taking applications for refunds for 1979, 1971 income because of Senate Bill 1135. 1972 and after are exempt. So what we have is a situation where in effect 1969 and 1970 are not taxed, 1971 is taxed and 1972 and after are again not taxed. This is not equitable and it's not what the Legislature intended. After a full hearing before the Revenue Committee this Bill was passed with 19 'yes' votes, no 'nay' votes, 1 voting 'present' and the 1 who voted 'present' will now support the Bill. This Bill simply corrects an obvious inequity between years in the application of the law and I ask your favorable consideration."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Blair: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. John, would you help me out a little bit on the court decision? This law, I think is Representative Duff's Bill if I am not mistaken. I recall supporting it. Now, was it not to go into effect for the next year, the year we are presently in?"

Speaker Blair: "Recognize Mr. Porter."

Porter: "Glen, that Bill which was 4644 went effect for tax years 1972 and after."

Schneider: "So what you want to do is move it back another year?"

Porter: "That's all I want to do because already 1969 and 1970 have been treated the same as the 1972 law. So we have one year that is treated differently than all the others."

Schneider: "They have been treated, treated, I'm sorry, they have been treated in reference to this law as far back as '69?"

Porter: "Yes, they..."

Schneider: "Exempting income from pension on their income tax?"

Porter: "That's right. For 1969 and for 1970 the Department of Revenue is taking applications for refund for pension and profit sharing income. They will not take it for '71 because of another law and of course '72 and after are exempt so you have got one year that is treated differently than all the other years."

Schneider: "Well, were the '69 refunds, refunds contingent on last year's legislation?"

Porter: "No, the '69 refunds and the '70 refunds were made in response to the Mitchell decision."

Schneider: "Well, how much money do you think would be involved if we allowed the refunds without, say under your legislation?"



Speaker Blair: "Just a moment, please. Let's have a little quiet if we might. This is important legislation, please."

Schneider: "The money, the question I asked, John, the money involved according to the estimate that I received from James Mitchell of the Department of Revenue would be between \$600,000 and \$1,000,000 and that's as good an estimate as he can give. He says that it's probable that it's the lower figure but it could go as high as \$1,000,000."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it was not my intention to speak on this Bill but as long as it was referred to another piece of legislation I would like, which passed two years ago, I feel it's necessary to make clear that this piece of legislation is substantially different from the exemption which was passed of the Illinois income tax for pensions last year. First of all, that Bill was an exemption. Second of all, it referred to the actuarial reports which must be made at some significant expense to the employers and the revenue which we received from it was demonstrated not to be significant in any way, shape or form. This Bill is not an exemption, this Bill is a refund. The previous Bill was not retroactive. This Bill will substantially aid persons who receive large lump sum distributions. In order to gain a refund, the pensioner, who probably would have a refund under this Bill of about, on the average, five to ten dollars will not have a tax attorney to tell him that he has a refund coming and if indeed, he does, it will cost more to get it than he will receive. There is an equity problem here in that there were some very large lump sum distributions to certain individuals in the State of Illinois approximating 25 to 30 who are in effect injured by the fact that the exemption was an exemption and not a refund. I am not taking a position on this Bill but I do think that



it should be made substantially clear that it is significantly different from the exemption of the pensions."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Friedland."

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

Speaker Blair: "All right, the previous question has been moved. Is there discussion? All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion to the previous question say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion prevails. And now the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter is recognized to close the debate."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, my distinguished colleague from the first district is correct. This is a refund Bill and it's not the same as the exemption Bill. Our problem here is that 1969 and 1970 are being refunded in full and so they are being treated exactly as 1972 and after and why should we have one year, 1971, treated any differently than any other year? I urge your favorable vote."

Speaker Blair: "The question is, shall House Bill 655 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and opposed 'nay'. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich to explain his vote."

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I did want to ask a question. Representative Porter did mention profit sharing and I was wondering, you know, if someone received \$100,000 from a profit sharing trust whether or not that this would be excluded from the tax. I think the purpose of the Bill was to set up those people who were receiving pension benefits on a monthly basis rather than a lump sum, large lump sum payment which there are many profit sharing trusts that do reach \$100,000 and I do believe they do have to pay federal tax, either on a capital gains tax or something but I don't that the Bill was set up to exclude someone who might receive \$50,000 to \$100,000 from paying



State tax. I am under the impression it's for the little guys who might be receiving \$500 or \$600 or \$300 a month and I don't know whether or not this is included in the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "Does Mr. Porter care to answer the question on his explanation of vote?"

Porter: "Yes, sir, Representative Terzich, if that was a distribution that had been made in 1969 or 1970 it would be exempt exactly as '72. If it happened to have been made in 1971 it would be subject to the valuation limitation. Now that to me is an inequity and that's what this Bill is designed to take care of. It's fortuitous as to what date it's been received on. It seems to me that it should be exempt all the way or not at all and since we are exempt for '72 and after and for '69 and '70, '71 ought to be treated the same."

Speaker Blair: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 118 'ayes' and 2 'nays' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Next Bill, House Bill 659."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 659, an Act to add Section 36.1 to an Act concerning public utilities, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 659 is a non-controversial Bill that relates to the way that the public utilities shall get their rate set and I would be more than happy to answer any questions about this Bill."

Speaker Blair: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman recognizes the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Blair: "He indicates he will. Proceed."

Kempiners: "Would this prohibit, for example, Illinois Bell



from advertising to tell me how I can cut down my phone bill?"

McGrew: "This Bill does not prohibit anyone from advertising for any reason."

Kempiners: "Well then what does it do?"

McGrew: "It says that when they go back and ask for a rate increase that they cannot say that advertising was an expense of running the business."

Kempiners: "Well then if they advertise where are they going to get the money?"

McGrew: "Well, if they are advertising they are going to get the money from you and I I assume. That's their only source of revenue."

Kempiners: "Right, which means it's got be through our rates, isn't that correct?"

McGrew: "Yeah."

Kempiners: "So then, in effect they will either advertise and charge us or they will keep the rates they've got and not advertise at all."

McGrew: "I think it's a fair assumption to say that it would drastically cut down on advertising, yes."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

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

Speaker Blair: "Proceed, sir."

Tuerk: "What's your rationale in excluding public utilities from using their advertising budget as an expense item?"

McGrew: "You can still use it as an expense item, the only thing..."

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

McGrew: "You can still use it as an expense item for your income for Illinois income tax and as far as I know, federal income tax. The only time that it cannot be considered a legitimate business expense would be when they go back before the Commerce Commission and ask for more money. So in essence, it would still be tax deductible and all the rest of these things, except when



they go back and ask for more money we are not saying that's fine, you go right ahead and blow it all on advertising because you need it. You asked my rationale though, is that correct?"

Tuerk: "Yeah. You are just trying to apply this toward the rate structure, is that what you are saying?"

McGrew: "That is correct. It is my belief that they do have a monopoly, a state licensed monopoly I might add, that there is very little, if any, justification for advertising. They have no competition. You know, when you hear, Bell Telephone bringing you the basketball tournament do you go over and pick up the phone and call mother? I think it's a waste of money."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Pappas."

Pappas: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman answer a question?"

Speaker Blair: "Proceed sir."

Pappas: "Is this the Bill that was defeated in the Public Utilities Committee, I think wasn't it about a 16-1 vote and then you moved to Discharge Committee on?"

McGrew: "Yes and no. It was the Bill they defeated but the Bill was 13-1-1."

Pappas: "And then you moved to Discharge Committee?"

McGrew: "That is correct."

Pappas: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Blair: "Proceed, sir."

Mugalian: "Will this include all advertising of utilities, for example, will it include the kind of advertising that the phone company sometimes uses to show you that you shouldn't dig in your backyard without notifying the phone company, it tells you how to best use your equipment and other certain public service elements?"

McGrew: "I would suggest that in lieu of nationwide or statewide television we would have a much more responsible system of advertising as each utility must, by State



law, by rule of the Commerce Commission send you a bill once a month with a return envelope in it. To me they have ample opportunity to do any advertising that they deem necessary. Common sense will tell you you don't go digging around the telephone cords and whatnot....ah.... I think that this Bill would make them much more responsible, would save the taxpayers millions of dollars and would quite honestly tighten any loopholes that we now have in our public utility laws....."

Mugalian: "Another question then. Does this only cover media television advertising and not printed advertising of a kind that's in your Bill?"

McGrew: "It covers all advertising. Be it mailing, newspaper, television, radio or any other media."

Mugalian: "May I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Blair: "Proceed, Sir."

McGrew: "I ...I...think this is a difficult Bill. I'm not sure how I'm going to vote. I know that it....it can be identified as a consumer Bill and I certainly am for the consumers. I know that....I...I resent for an example the advertising of the power companies which try to promote the additional use of power, electrical and otherwise. I think that kind of advertising ...ah...probably should be banned....but it certainly ought to not be considered in determining rate structure. But I think the utilities differ in their approach to advertising and I....my personal experience is....that much of telephone advertising and some other utility advertising has to do with public service information and I recognize that these are utilities and have....and are natural monopolies so that would argue in favor of this Bill....but I....I wish there had been some Amendments to this Bill that would properly cover competitive advertising in order to increase usage and distinguish that from the kind of communication which I think is in the advertising budget. That covers such



things as 'watch where you dig it might destroy a cable', 'how to best use long distance telephone service', and 'how to use the limited facilities available in a...in a utility'."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Schoeberlein."

Schoeberlein: "Ah....Mr. Speaker, I happen to Chair this particular Committee the day the Bill was heard....and it was defeated 12-1...and I was as much surprised as anybody when this Bill was called....out of Committee. If I'm a stockholder in a company and I don't like the way the company is run I go to the management of the company and drop them a letter. This particular Bill is really a Commerce Commission...ah.....ah...Bill, they have had it under consideration for the last four months, as have many other states and ...ah...I believe it should come out of the Commerce Commission. We in the House seem to know all of the answers to everybodys business. I believe that many of us that have been in business for thirtyforty years and know there must be an advertising budget, know that this has to be done. As far as what was seen in Champaign, Illinois, everybody enjoyed it. I think that it was a good ad for the telephone company, they told of many features and the Sponsor himself told how he enjoyed the game. They told of many features that we did not know of. And I feel Bills like this shouldn't clutter the Floor when we have a Commerce Commission and we interfere with their duties. I wonder how we would feel if the Commerce Commission come over here and tell us what you're doing belongs to the Commerce Commission. I for one feel that the Commerce Commission should be recognized to regulate all utilities and that we perhaps should get in touch with them if we are in opposition to some things they are doing. I'm voting 'no' on this because we don't know what the next Bill is going to do and we don't know what's going to happen to it in the Senate but it sure clutters the Floor



of the House when these things are continuously brought up...in the Legislature."

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

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

Representative, would the effect of this Bill be, if it is passed, would the effect be that the utilities would tend to cut down on their ...or....try to eliminate as much as possible the advertising?"

McGrew: "That is very much correct, in my....in my...ah...whole hearted attempt ...ah..in the whole Bill here is that they still are allowed to advertise but they certainly need to cut back and I think few people will argue with that concept."

Gibbs: "Well, if I might speak to the Bill, I....if that is the main effect and the main purpose of the Bill then these utility companies such as the telephone company and other utility companies will not....er will try to cut back and almost eliminate the advertising if they do....and I can... it just brings to mind maybe three situations, one where they are advertising today to conserve the fuel....to turn off switches and such, I think that that is very good advertising and that should not be eliminated. Another one I can think of that comes to mind would be the advertising that they say the reasons for dialing direct rather than person to person...rather than to tie up the telephone lines and also the financial benefits that the individuals get when they dial direct. Another big one and very important one I thinkthe utilities use...very effectively is ...the....ah...wires that are down in a storm, how to treat them.....so that no one is electricuted and if this type of legislation is passed I believe that if the utilities ...not having the benefit of being able to use this expenditure to get a rate increase would be eliminated and therefore I would be very strongly against this type of aof a Bill."



Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

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

Speaker Blair: "Proceed."

Kosinski: "Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, I'm much concern-
ed.....that this Bill has been entered. If another Bill
...similarto tax freezes or motherhood a 'damned if
you do and damned if you don't situation'. Of course we
have to support our constituents in terms of reducing
costs of living ... but at the same time there is a right
and a wrong to business and I don't know of any business
in these United States who cannot list advertising as a
cost of doing business. If it is the intention of the
Commerce Department to limit the percentage of cost that..
it...an industry of this sort may expend I would be in
accordance with it. But to attempt to cut that adver-
tising as a cost of doing business to me it is not a real
and sound approach in business. I cannot support this
Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fleck."

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

Speaker Blair: "All right, the Gentleman has moved the
previous question. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed
'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion
prevails. Now the Gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew is
recognized to close the debate."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and
Gentlemen of the House. In considering this Bill I have
found many things that are even worse than I had antici-
pated. Let me give you an example. One of the three
Gentlemen that testified against the Bill in Committee,
was a Gentleman from CIPS Company. He testified that they
had about 750,000 customers and that their budget for
advertising was \$625,000. Now that's almost a dollar per
person per customer. So for a household of four that is



\$4 a family. This is nothing new. The States of Virginia and Wyoming have the same thing on their law books. It does not even stop advertising all it says is your're going to be extremely reasonable when you are advertising. That you are not going to come out with all sorts of public gimmickry and then ask for a rate increase to justify that expenditure. I think the Bill is an entirely reasonable it's an approach that was trying to solve a problem of util....of misutilization of the mass media. The public utilities still will be able to take it off of their income tax so there won't be any expense as such. They can still use the very common mailing procedure because they are required to mail out your bills. In short I think that this would go far in making the public utilities prudent in their advertising in a time when we are all concerned with physical responsibility, inflation and consumer protection. I certainly thank you for indulging me on this Bill and I certainly encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the question is, shall House Bill 659 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye'. and opposed 'nay'. All right, the Lady from ...ah...Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I question as I questioned at the Committee Meeting, the Constitutionality of the Bill inasmuch as both the State and the Federal Government do allow advertising expenses as deductions and I question the Constitutionality of it Therefore, I would like to recorded as voting 'present'."

Speaker Blair: "Vote Mrs. Geo-Karis as 'present'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, to explain his vote."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to explain my vote.. The gimmickry that the Sponsor talks about when he proposed this Bill....some of that gimmickry is very profitable...and when my wife buys a princess phone or a....or a.... long extension cord or something these various profitable items tend in the long run to increase profits for the



utilities and tend then not to encourage them to go for rate increases...and I think that what we are doing by this is just enhancing the timeor in speeding up the time that the telephone companies or other utilities will go to the commission and ask for rate increases. I think this is a bad Bill and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, to explain his vote."

Giorgi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support McGrew's Bill. I'm advertising because I've been watching advertisements in my Rockford Land Area. They buy full page ads and advertise natural gas and you can't get it, then they advertise for a television telephone and you can't get it. I've been watching that ad for ten years. Then there... 'NI' Gas and Commonwealth Edison by law I can't go anywhere else to buy any gas or any electricity so I think this is a good Bill and I thinkI hope that the new appointment to the Commerce Commission will start denying some of the rate increases because they haven't denied a rate increase since I've been in the General Assembly. I think this is a good 'peoples' Bill and you ought to vote for it."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Walters."

Walters: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote I'd like to remind the Sponsor and also all those who are voting green that if this Bill were to passhad it passed several years agolast spring we would have not been able to see Representative Bradley's son Mike playing basketball in the State Basketball Tournament....thanks to the advertising public service...the telephone company. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ma....I'm sorry from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, before the debate was cut off ...ah..I was going to ask Representative



McGrew because I was aware as everybody else was that he wouldn't get many votes on this Bill but I don't think that we ought to completely throw this Bill overboard. I was going to ask him if he would be amenable to holding this on postponed consideration and coming up with some Amendment which would control the advertising that the public utilities use. I think Representative Mugalian hit the nail on the head that very often the public utilities, all of them, have used advertisements to show how you can use more power and now we have an energy crisis. If this Bill fails I would hope that the House Study Committee chaired by Representative Pierce would go directly into this problem because I think that it may well be that they could come up with a recommendation to control advertising and another factor that we ought to remember. You know so often public opinion is what we read in the newspaper. What is going to be the public opinion when newspapers and television get a heap boodle from the public utilities? It's going to be biased. The editorial writers are going to be concerned because they are getting some income from these public utilities and maybe the editorials are going to be slanted. So I would hope that we, in spite of the vote on this Bill which does have some problems, let's face it, that we shouldn't throw it overboard and we ought to try to amend it to get at the problem that we all realize does exist. I'll vote 'aye' strictly on the intent of the Sponsor."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, I would just like for all present to know that once a month I hate the phone company and I hate the gas company and I also hate the electrical company. I am voting 'no' on this Amendment because there is another side to this whole thing. I can address myself particularly to the electrical and telephone



services in that I believe that their public relations and their advertising budgets are single budgets as far as we are concerned in this matter. I would each of you to pause and consider in your community who takes the leadership in most everything that is going on in your community. Where do you go first besides the corner druggist and the bank? You go right to the utilities. Most of them don't forget you. I believe these dollars are in the same budget. Am I correct? They are very helpful. They make too much money off of me but they are so huge that the numbers that we are dealing with are almost beyond the comprehension of us and when you talk about full page ads, they use full page ads like you and I would run a one line want ad. There is no comparison. I have to vote 'no' against this highly discriminatory measure. Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones."

Jones: "In explaining my vote I want to respond to the remark made on the other side of the aisle in that the, the advertising of the utilities is being used only to increase their consumption. Contrary to that, the one utility in this area on local television station has been encouraging and instructing people how to save electric energy in the energy crisis and I want to say to him also that I am a member of Dan Pierce's special Committee and we might use the utilities advertising to obtain some of the objectives desired by this Committee. I am voting 'no'."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have to tell you that I don't have much faith in the Commerce Commission and I don't have much faith in the public utilities of this particular State and I am not going to sit here and cry for Commonwealth Edison and I am not going to cry for Illinois Bell Telephone and I am not going to cry for Northern Illinois Gas. It just



is shocking to me that when something comes out with regard to the EPA everybody here comes out with their axe and is ready to do murder. When something comes out that deals with the Commerce Commission and the public utilities everybody here just lies down, rolls over and plays dead. I think that this is a good Bill, it should be supported and I am surprised to see so many red lights on the board."

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

Rayson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to explain my vote I don't think I can elaborate any more than what the Gentleman from Lake said about the need to get it back to Second Reading for a restrictive Amendment and pass this very good Bill. In fact it's a pretty good Bill as it stands right now. Particularly when the budgets of the utilities companies with regard to advertising have soared in the last three years. Take the case of Commonwealth Edison. Since their last rate case in 1969 and 1970 they have tripled their advertising budget and tripled it with respect by having intermissions at the ballgame with these lovely ladies walking down the lanes with the rice clear water of the brooks flowing and saying we are concerned about your total environment. The federal EPA has said that Commonwealth Edison is the third largest industrial polluter of the State of Illinois. It's about time we restrict these budgets to keep them from becoming propagandized so that they do not affect advertising for their own public relations and instead affect advertising only insofar as it relates to public interest, that being the user. So we should have some more green lights on that board."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote in favor of this legislation, as Representative Giorgi said over a period of years up in Rockford we have seen time and time again where rate increases were asked for. Now this



time Commonwealth Edison wants 12%. But I can remember not too long ago when one of the utility companies was in a labor dispute and they ran large newspaper ads all over the State of Illinois explaining exactly their position and their attempts to defeat organized labor in their attempts at negotiating. Now this certainly was not to promote the welfare or sell their product. It was plain political activism so I do think that if the utility companies want more and more money from the consumers in the State of Illinois they have that obligation then to see that individuals have the lowest rates possible and for this reason I am voting 'yes'."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Calvo."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't want to take up a lot of time explaining my vote when I don't know whether I, it will make any difference. That's the problem. But I just would like, I think some things haven't been pointed out here or maybe we are not aware of. My colleague, Representative Walters mentioned about not being able to watch Mike Bradley play in a Class A tournament this spring. Now I submit that Illinois Bell can well continue to sponsor that tournament and continue to advertise. This Bill doesn't prohibit any utility from advertising and if this advertising is valuable to them then of course they will continue to do it. The only thing it does, it says we cannot use that in computing the utility Bill that everyone pays and I say that I don't mind the utility advertising and so I can see the tournaments, but I don't think I should pay for it, I think they should pay for it and I don't, if I am a stockholder, fine. They can take it out of my profit if I, if it's valuable to them and doing them some good, then that's the way it should be done, the same as other people's advertising is paid. There is many people that cannot advertise at all or some people, including the attorneys of this State



and they would be happy to pay some money for advertising and they wouldn't necessarily or at all be passing it on to their clients. I just tell you that this doesn't prohibit advertising at all but they should not, and I, in contrary to what one man said about not being critical about the Commerce Commission, I would have to say in a recent experience, the Commerce Commission presently is doing a good job. But of course they have to follow the law and if we pass this law then they will be able to segregate out advertising of public utilities in determining what increase of rates should be allowed. In a recent experience, a utility in my area asked for a 28% increase and it was granted something like a 6.5% increase, I think the Commission did an admirable job. This matter hasn't been completely resolved before the Court but let's give the Commission a little more material to work with and let's pass this good Bill and if they wish to advertise all right, but don't keep it in the rate structure. Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to explain my vote if I might. I voted against this Bill when it was before the Public Utilities Commission. I voted against it at that time because I did have some worries about the fact that there was some informational advertising that perhaps should be permitted to be charged as a part of the cost of rate making in the State of Illinois. But when it came here to the floor I voted for this Bill to bring it out on the floor on that motion, not because I felt that the Committee had done anything wrong in the Committee hearing of this Bill but simply because I felt that this was an issue that was important that should be debated and perhaps the whole House should be in on it. These motions are not an attack upon the Committee system. Committees consist of only a few of us. But the motions are for



the purpose of important measures that the Committee felt should not be passed and nevertheless should be aired before the whole body and being of importance to all the people of the State of Illinois. Now this issue of whether there should be advertising or not, perhaps it should be varied somewhat. But I am still voting for this Bill because I know if this Bill gets over to the Senate it's going to spend some time there. The Senate is not going to act very rapidly upon this. I think a great number of the Senate is going to be of the same attitude, unfortunately, as past Commerce Commissions have been in the State of Illinois and I have very little faith in what they are going to do in behalf of the people. I know the Commerce Commission is going to do their best for the public utility. I just want to be sure that they also, at the same time, do their best for the consuming public. So I would urge everyone to vote for this Bill and let's give them our feeling that everybody should be considered in the Commerce Commission and not just one side of a rate making case."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote I would like to clarify some things here. It slays me a little bit to sit here and listen to people say, oh, but they need to advertise. That is part of our business procedure. Well, my answer is, Ladies and Gentlemen, if that is part of our American institution, part of our heritage, then let them advertise out of their own pocket the same as you and I will do if we had a business. We don't then turn around and say, oh give me more money. We say we are doing it to increase our usage. My Bill does not say they can't do that. What it boils down to, basically, is do you want the consumer to pay for it or do you want the people running the utilities to pay for it. I am not even saying they can't take it off of their Illinois income tax. I am



giving them a break. It boils down to black and white. Who is going to pay for it? Are you to help the people in your district or are you to help the public utilities? Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter. All right, have all voted who wish? Take the record. Now Mr. Bradley, is it, desires to explain his vote. He may proceed to do so."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to be recorded 'present' in view of the fact my son's name has been used in the debate so I would like to be recorded as 'present' on this vote."

Speaker Blair: "Will you vote the Gentleman as 'present'. Mr. Pierce? Vote Mr. Pierce as 'present'. Mr. Sangmeister 'aye'. Mr. Terzich 'present'. 'present' Mr. Terzich. Record Mr. Terzich as 'present'. Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was trying to get your attention to explain my vote."

Speaker Blair: "Well, I said Mr. Bradley could, so proceed. We are trying to wrap this up if we can. Record Mr. Brandt. Mr. Brandt, how did you care to vote? Vote Mr. Brandt 'aye'. Proceed, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a people's Bill to protect consumers from gouging, this is it. I would just like to point out that Commonwealth Edison has asked for 12% rate hike from the Illinois Commerce Commission. This will bring in \$147 million in revenue. I would also like to point out that although Commonwealth Edison says it spends \$1.1 million in annual charitable contributions they come from general revenues, not from profits and if a company wants to make these contributions, they should come from profits only. A lot of states have prohibited utility companies from this practice but it is prohibited, it is permitted here in Illinois. Now it's true that a lot of these companies talk about the



environment but the question is, what do they do about it. They plan to build nuclear power plants along our river beds and along our lakes. So I am not so much interested in what the utilities talk about, I am interested in what they do and I would really ask all of the Members of this House to support this very fine, consumer oriented Bill. I think the day ought to be ended here in Illinois when public utilities have it all their way, although I do want to say this, that under the new director, Marvin Lieberman, I have the utmost confidence in the Commerce Commission. But let's turn it around. Let's let the consumers have it their way for a change. This is a good Bill."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Vote me 'present', please."

Speaker Blair: "Vote Mr. Caldwell as 'present'. Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I understand I was inadvertently voted 'no'. Vote me 'yes', please."

Speaker Blair: "Be sure Mr. Telcser is voted 'aye'. May I have a count, Mr. Clerk? There are 66 'ayes', 84 'nays', 5 'present'. Now, the Gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Mr. Speaker, I think I have a good Bill here for the consumers and I would like to have it on postponed consideration so we can do something for the utilities too."

Speaker Blair: "Does the Gentleman have leave to place it on postponed consideration? All right, hearing no objections, the Bill is placed on the order of postponed consideration. Now the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Clabaugh."

Clabaugh: "Mr. Speaker, the first time in my long time here, I rose, I am rising on a point of personal privilege, not because I have been offended any more than a lot of other Members of this House but because I have been through this so many times, there are, I counted this morning and if my count was correct, there were 467 Bills on our Calendar aside from those on the Consent



Calendar. We have probably gotten 25 or 30 off today. Now I want you to divide that by the number of days and see how much more we have to do if we are going to get out of here with the House Bills by Friday and what you, the amount of time that we are absolutely wasting on this floor by explanation of votes when there is no chance to change the vote. I have no grief at all to hold for somebody who explains their vote when their side is overwhelmingly ahead. Maybe if they are behind, that is a different thing. Now you will all regret this the last week of this session, just as sure as the world. Now I am not scolding anybody, I am not preaching anybody, I am just trying to tell you that you are just heaping coals on your own head and for heavens sake, let's see if we can't act a little bit more like adults."

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

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just prior to the motion for recess which the Majority Leader is about to make, I wish that the Democratic Members especially would give me their attention because I want to advise them that when we come back to regular session that I am going to ask for a Democratic conference so I would appreciate your being on time so that we might go to the conference and then get back to the floor of the House."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to say amen to the Gentleman from Champaign's remarks and move that we recess for one hour for lunch to return here at 2:00 o'clock promptly."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the Gentleman has moved that the House recess until 2:00 o'clock. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the House stands in recess for one hour. May I have the Members attention a moment, please? I think most of you



know that the Transportation Commission is meeting in Room 212. The Leadership leaders are essentially in that Commission. I have been asked by the Speaker to say that they are going to try to finish in about ten or fifteen minutes so still stand at ease."

Telcser: "The House will come to order. Will the doorkeepers please clear up the aisles? Representative Ewell, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Ewell: "A point of information."

Telcser: "State your point."

Ewell: "How do we get back to Second Reading from Third?"

Telcser: "The Clerk just asked me what we are going to be doing and I said Second Reading and we are Second Reading. Representative Lechowicz, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Lechowicz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I thought we had rules of this House that when there is a Committee meeting that the House cannot go, revert back into its order of business until the rules of the House have been suspended and to my knowledge those rules were not suspended. I think it's an injustice to the Committee Members that we go back into session."

Telcser: "Did you want, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "I just wanted to point out to the Gentleman that this is not a House Committee that is meeting. It is a Commission that is in session and I don't think that rule applies to the meeting that is going on now."

Telcser: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Well, I would like to know the membership of the Commission, if they are House Members or are they lay people?"

Telcser: "Representative, the Speaker and although I didn't hear from Representative Choate I assume they both send word up here that we should start. Now I, Representative Ewell."



Ewell: "A parliamentary inquiry, I mean not to be facetious but if we are following the rules of the House and we are on Third Reading then we can't get off of Third Reading unless we complete it, suspend the rules or change it and you are saying that just arbitrarily you can flip back and forth."

Telcser: "Representative Ewell, you are in error in making that point. Throughout the session the Speaker has had the prerogative of moving from one order of business to another."

Ewell: "Well, if you read the rules that has always been with leave of the House or, wait a minute."

Telcser: "Well, why don't you get the rule out, Ray, and we will just hang on for a couple of minutes and give you a chance to read it. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, is that your ruling then if there is a Commission meeting consisting of legislative Members that this House can go back in order and have those Members off the floor during whether it's Second or Third Reading?"

Telcser: "Yes, the parliamentarian informs me that that rule applies to standing Committees of the House, not Commissions. Now Ted, I am assuming that both Bob and Representatives Blair and Choate indicated we should get started although I did not talk to Representative Choate."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind to have the Clerk read that Section for my own edification?"

Telcser: "Which Section, the rule?"

Lechowicz: "Yeah."

Telcser: "Rule 21, Ted."

Fred Selcke: "Rule 21, meetings during session, no Committee may meet during any session of the House."

Lechowicz: "And this is a Commission, right?"

Telcser: "Yes, sir."

Lechowicz: "Well, my point was that the Commission consists of



legislative Members and we are going to be adopting or not adopting Amendments to Bills on Second Reading. And I still think it's an injustice to call this House to order where there is a Commission or a Committee meeting meeting and there are Members off the floor, especially leadership who may be wanting to vote on that matter."

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

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there really, I appreciate Representative Lechowicz's point but I think he has got it a little bit backwards. It's the House that has priority. We are in session and whether it's a Commission or a Committee it's no concern of ours. Now as far as the leadership is concerned, I respect his wish that they have a right to vote on these Bills but they can rectify them when they come back on the floor. My understanding is the same as yours. Both the Democratic and the Republican side have asked us to go ahead and expedite the movement. So it's not an attempt to impede or take away from any of the Representative's rights and I would suggest that the Chair proceed with the business at hand."

Telcser: "O.K. Now, Representative Ewell, is your point, Representative Ewell, is your point...?"

Ewell: "My point is not well taken. I am sorry."

Telcser: "O.K. House Bills Second Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 602, Barnes, a Bill for an Act to amend the Fair Employment Practice Act, Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Telcser: "Are there Amendments from the floor?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #1, Barnes, amends House Bill 602."

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

Barnes: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment #1 to House Bill 602 was an Amendment that was agreed on in the Committee. It wasn't ready at that time but I instructed the Committee that it would be offered on



Second Reading. It was pointed out that some of the Bill language might conflict with the federal laws in terms of financial institutions and what Amendment #1 does is correct that to say that nothing in the Act would supersede any federal laws or regulations concerning federal banking institutions. I move for the adoption of Amendment #1."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 602. All in favor of adoption signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading. House Bill 684. Is Representative Boyle on the floor? Take it out of the record. 892. Take that out of the record. Is Representative Katz on the floor? Take it out of the record."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 806, Stone, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code, Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Telcser: "Are there Amendments from the floor? Third Reading. Is Representative Rayson on the floor? No, take that out of the record."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 768, DiPrima, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code, Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Telcser: "Are there Amendments from the floor?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #1, J.J. Wolf."

Telcser: "Is Representative Wolf on the floor?"

Fred Selcke: "Amends House Bill 768 on page 2."

Telcser: "Wait a minute. Is Representative J.J. Wolf on the floor? Do you want to move to adopt it? The Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 768. All in favor of adoption signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading. Is Representative Getty on the floor? No, take that out



of the record."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 991, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend Section 2 of an Act in relation to payment for governmental services fees or taxes, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Telcser: "Are there Amendments from the floor? Third Reading. Is Representative Mann on the floor? No, take it out of the record."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1403, a Bill for an Act to provide for the planning of Illinois health facility services, Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment to amend House Bill 1403, page 1 by deleting..."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #1 to House Bill 1403 was adopted by the Human Resources Committee and in effect put the Bill in the form that I wished to put it in for consideration by the Committee and by consideration by the full quorum. I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1403. All in favor of adoption signify by saying 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #2, Madigan, amends House Bill 1403..."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #2 is offered from the floor and is intended to answer certain requests of the medical society relative to the Bill. I move for adoption of the Amendment."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hudson. You are waving your arms, Ray. Is there any discussion? O.K., you have got an 'aye' to your credit, Representative. The Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 1403. All in favor of adoption signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Amendment is adopted."



Are there further Amendments? Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 842, Calvo."

Telcser: "Is Representative Calvo on the floor? Take that out of the record. House Bill 1212."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1212, Tipsword, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Telcser: "Are there Amendments from the floor? Representative the Clerk tells me that Amendment has not been printed so we have got to take, no wait a second, Representative Tipsword says it is on his desk."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #1 amends House Bill 1212, page 1, line 1 and so forth."

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

Tipsword: "This is an Amendment clarifying the bonds on the permit section, Section 39 of the Environmental Protection Act that was suggested in Committee when this Bill was heard by the representative of the EPA."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1212. All in favor of adoption signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1295, Mann, are you ready, 1295, a Bill for an Act to amend the Harness Racing Act, Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment to amend House Bill 1295 on page 1 by deleting line 1 and so forth."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of Committee Amendment #1."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Committee Amendment #1 to House Bill 1295. All in favor of adoption signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1535, Giglio, 1535, a Bill for an Act



to amend an Act relating to Civil Administration of State Government, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Telcser: "Are there Amendments from the Floor?"

Fred Selcke: "Wait a minute....just a minute. Amendment #1, Giglio, amends House Bill 1535, page 1, line 35, and so forth."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah...Amendment #1 is ...ah..just a....insert after the word University the following: 'or by the Secretary of State', in other words these are house cleaning Bills, to put all the billings under the ...ah...General Service Department and to exclude the Secretary of State from this. That's all."

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

Walsh: "Well, it would seem to me that if the ..ah...it's a good idea for the Department of General Services to ...to have control over all vehicles for all departments then the department ought to have control of the vehicles under the Secretary of State....and I'd like some explanation from the Gentleman why the Secretary of State and not other State agencies are excluded from this provision?"

Giglio: "Well, it's my understanding that these ...ah...these particular institutions are all under the auspices of the Governor's ...ah...Staff or the Governor's Department now and the Secretary of State is taking care of everything under his jurisdiction and this is just a clarification to keep the thing separate the way they are."

Walsh: "Well, how about vehicles assigned to the Comptroller's Office, the State Treasurer's Office, the Superintendent of Public Instruction and others, why aren't they excluded?"

Giglio: "That...I'm afraid I can't answer. I'm afraid I might need a little help."

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



House ifas I understand this Amendment...."

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

Lechowicz: "I think we better take this one out of the record for the time being. It came out of the Executive 9-8..... by one, it was close there, it will be a lot closer here."

Telcser: "O. K. Representative Giglio indicates that....ah.. he'll take it out of the record. Is that right? O. K. take it out of the record. "

Fred Selcke: "Take it out of the record, George.....House Bill 1536, Giglio.....got an Amendment on this one.....a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to Civil Administration of State Government, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Telcser: "Amendments from the Floor?....Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1628, Dyer, she's not here, is she? Giddy Dyer? Dyer.....Giddy do you want this? 1628? House Bill 1628, a Bill for an Act to provide for non-voting student representation on various governing boards, public junior colleges and so forth, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Telcser: "Are there Amendments from the floor?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #1, Dyer, amends House Bill...."

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

Dyer: "Yes, Amendment #1 to House Bill 1628 is in response to suggestions made in Committeethat a referendum be held on each college campus to choose the method of selecting the student member. Ah....I move passage of Amendment #1."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Lady has offered to move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1628. All in favor of the adoption signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no', the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "Ah....Shea isn't here. House Bill 609, Schneider,



a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of Pollution Control Board, Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amends House Bill 609 page one, line 10 and so forth...Schneider."

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

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Amendment is merely the reduction of \$27,000 ...ah...agreed to by Members of the Appropriations Committee....Staff... and I ask ...its adoption."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 609. All in favor of adoption signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Is there further Amendments? Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 825, Yourell, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to administer licensing of marriage counselors, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Telcser: "Are there Amendments from the floor? Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1367, Stiehl, a Bill for an Act to amend the Sanitary District Act, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Telcser: "Are there Amendments from the floor?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #1, Stiehl, amends House Bill 1367 on page 1, line 16."

Telcser: "The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill, Amendment #1 to House Bill 1367 changes line 16 by deleting the word advice and inserting in lieu thereof advise."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion?"

Stiehl: "I ask for a favorable vote."

Telcser: "The Lady has offered to move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1367. All in favor of adoption signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading."



Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1442, Craig."

Telcser: "Is Representative Craig on the floor? Take that out of the record."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1477."

Telcser: "Take it out of the record."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1638, Redmond."

Telcser: "Is Representative Redmond on the floor?"

Fred Selcke: "A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code, Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 1638."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Redmond."

Redmond: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Amendment provided for a method of establishing an election commission by a referendum. As far as I know there was no objection and I ask the adoption of the Amendment."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh." If you will wait one second, let me ring the bell again. There are some more Members out in the hall. Now, we are still on Second Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Is this a Committee Amendment, Mr. Clerk?"

Fred Selcke: "Yes, sir."

Walsh: "Was there any, may I ask the Sponsor of the Bill, was there any opposition to this Amendment in Committee?"

Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1638. All in favor of adoption signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1813, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Telcser: "Are there Amendments from the floor? Third Reading. Representative Choate, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"



Choate: "Mr. Speaker, I have advised the House that when we went back into session I was going to ask leave for a conference of the Democratic Members. I would like to do that at this time and I would assume that we can have room M-5."

Telcser: "They are checking now on the rooms, Representative Choate. Be at ease for a moment. O.K., the Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate, I am informed that M-5 is available."

Choate: "Well, then, Mr. Speaker, I wish we would have a little order so that we can hear. Then, Mr. Speaker, I would move that the House stand in recess for 30 or 40 minutes that we might have a Democratic conference in room M-5, M-5."

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

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the Republicans have a conference in room 212 where we recess and that we return here at a quarter to 4:00."

Telcser: "O.K., the Gentleman has moved the House to stand in recess until the hour of a quarter to 4:00."

Speaker Blair: "House Bills Second Reading. We left off, I am informed at 6-17-73 with 1813 so we are at 1836."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1836, McPartlin."

Speaker Blair: "Take it out of the record."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1836, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code, Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Blair: "Any Committee Amendments? Third Reading. Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 851, Kucharski, a Bill for an Act to provide housing loans to Vietnam veterans who served in southeast Asia, Second Reading of the Bill. Two Committee Amendments. Committee Amendment #1 to amend House Bill 851 on page 1, line 1 and so forth."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook on Committee Amendment #1."



Kucharski: "Amendment #1 merely deletes the word Vietnam to let it read as veterans of southeast Asian conflict. This is just so to broaden the Bill as much as possible. I move for the acceptance of Amendment #1."

Speaker Blair: "All right, is there discussion on the adoption of Committee Amendment #1? All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "Committee Amendment #2, to amend House Bill 851 on page 1, line 1 by changing housing to real estate, line 2 by deleting and so forth."

Kucharski: "Amendment #2 is merely changing, changes the word housing to real estate and adds to those that would come underneath this Act the unremarried widows of veterans and it, it clarifies the language of the Bill. I move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Blair: "Discussion? The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments? Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 981, Berman, a Bill for an Act to amend Section 7 of an Act clarifying the powers and duties of the Department of Mental Health and so forth, Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amendment #1 to amend House Bill 981 on page 1, line 17 and so forth."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman."

Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 to House Bill 981 is a Committee Amendment to outline the patients that come within the scope of this Bill. I move the adoption of Committee Amendment #1 to House Bill 981."

Speaker Blair: "Discussion? The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments? Third Reading."



Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1011, Schlickman, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code, Second Reading of the Bill, one Committee Amendment to amend House Bill 1011 on page 1 by deleting line 1 and so forth."

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

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 1011 would prohibit insurance companies from reducing accident and health benefits based on increased income from social security due to increases in the cost of living. The Bill as it was originally introduced amended irrelevant sections. By this Amendment we eliminate those Amendments and add a new section obtaining the objective of the Bill. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Blair: "Is there discussion? The question is, shall the Amendment be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye', the 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."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1017, Lundy, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code, Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment: to amend House Bill 1017 on page 1, line 1 & 5 by deleting Section 357.9A and so forth."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy."

Lundy: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I agreed before the House Insurance Committee to make some certain additional Amendments to this Bill and those Amendments are not yet drawn so I would ask that this Bill be taken out of the record."

Speaker Blair: "All right, Mr. Clerk, take it out of the record for the time being."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1032, Rayson, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Practice Act, Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amend House Bill 1032, page 1, line 1 and so forth."

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



Rayson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a very genuine Committee Amendment to kind of rebound the Bill in the shape the Committee desired and I move the adoption of Committee Amendment #1 to House Bill 1032."

Speaker Blair: "Is there discussion? The question is, shall Committee Amendment #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."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1081, Skinner, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act of 1939, Second Reading of the Bill. Two Committee Amendments. Amendment #1 to amend House Bill 1081 on page 3, line 21 and so forth."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I am really not sure what the first Amendment is. One Amendment has, the only significant Amendment has to do with lowering the number of days from 30 to 20 days. Is that number 1? All right, Committee Amendment #1 allows taxpayers to have 20 days to appeal assessments after notification instead of 30 days as had been the original Bill. I would move its adoption."

Speaker Blair: "Is there discussion? The question is shall Committee Amendment #1 be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted."

Fred Selcke: "Committee Amendment #2 to amend House Bill 1081 on page 1, line 1 & 5 by deleting 108 and 108B and inserting in lieu thereof and so forth."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Committee Amendment #2 allows residents of Cook County to do the same thing, to have 20 days to appeal their assessments."

Speaker Blair: "Is there discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Committee Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #2 is adopted. Are there further



Amendments? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1083, Stone, is Mr. Stone here?

A Bill for an Act to amend Section 36B of an Act to create the University Civil Services systems in Illinois and so forth, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Blair: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?

The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1097, excuse me, House Bill 1095,

Palmer, a Bill for an Act to authorize the Department of Transportation to convey and so forth in Cook County, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendment."

Speaker Blair: "Just a moment. For what purpose does the

Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea arise?"

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I would assume that you are on Second

Reading and the priority of call is dated 6-20-73. I notice we went from 1017 to 1032 but we didn't call after that 1081. Was there some reason some of these Bills are not being called?"

Fred Selcke: "We called 1081 and we also called 1083."

Shea: "I didn't hear 1081 called. I am sorry."

Fred Selcke: "It was called."

Shea: "Your order now is to go through these Bills in the

order they are on this preference of call. Is that correct?"

Speaker Blair: "That is correct."

Shea: "Thank you."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill, no Committee Amendments on 1095."

Speaker Blair: "All right, are there any Amendments from the

floor? The Bill is ordered advanced to Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "1095 out of the record. House Bill 1097-

Clabaugh, a Bill for an Act in relation to State rebate school districts and so forth, Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amend House Bill 1097, page 1, line 1 and so forth."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Clabaugh."



Clabaugh: "I move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1097, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Blair: "All right, is there discussion? All right, the Gentleman has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Committee Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1125, W.T. Simms, Timothy Simms, a Bill for an Act to regulate air carriers operating within the State and so forth, Second Reading of the Bill. Two Committee Amendments. Committee Amendment #1 amend House Bill 1125 on page 11 and so forth."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Yes, Committee Amendment #1 strikes Section 16 of the Bill and allows the new Aeronautics Board to be refunded out of the Department of Aeronautics budget. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Blair: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Are these Amendments to the best of my knowledge have not been distributed as of yet."

Speaker Blair: "Do the Members have this Amendment? The Clerk advises me these are Committee Amendments and they should be distributed on every Member's desk."

Shea: "I think we have found them. Thank you, sir."

Speaker Blair: "All right, is there discussion concerning Committee Amendment #1? All right, the Gentleman has moved that Committee Amendment #1 be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and Committee Amendment #1 is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Committee Amendment #2 amend House Bill 1125 on page 14 by inserting between line 16 & 17 the following Section 17 and so forth."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."



Simms: "Yes, Committee Amendment #2 was offered by Representative Giglio. It establishes the Advisory Board within the Department of Aeronautics made up of Members of the General Assembly. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Blair: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman has moved that Committee Amendment #2 be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and Committee Amendment #2 has been adopted. Are there further Amendments? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1234, Craig, a Bill for an Act to amend the Highway Code, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Blair: "Are there any Amendments from the floor? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1242, Springer, a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Fuel Tax Act, Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amend House Bill 1242 on page 2, line 2 and so forth."

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

Springer: "Mr. Speaker, Committee Amendment #1 changed the motor fuel allocation from 15% to local road districts back to 12 and giving 2% to counties less than a million and 1% increase to counties over a million. I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Blair: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "I didn't quite get that. Now, what you are telling me, Doc, is the Bill originally increased from the allocation going to the Department of Transportation or actually, this is the motor fuel tax fund, right?"

Springer: "Yes."

Shea: "O.K., now this is the money that is distributed after the top."

Springer: "This is, we've got 7.5¢ gas tax. Off of that, we take a penny and put it directly into the road fund."



We take the other 6.5¢ and put it into the motor fuel tax fund and that's split in a formula between the municipalities between the counties and between the State."

Shea: "That's right."

Springer: "Now, the Bill itself, as introduced was reducing the State take from 35 to 30% and giving the road districts, township and road districts an increase of 5%. The Amendment changes that that it gives the counties over a million a 1% increase, counties under a million 2% increase and the township and road district a 2% increase."

Shea: "Could you tell me what 5% of that fund amounts to in millions of dollars?"

Springer: "As far as the State is concerned? About 16 million. About 16 million."

Shea: "So you are telling me that that's 320 million dollars is the total gas going to MFP out of our 6.5% going to the road fund?"

Springer: "Approximately 6 million to the road fund, township and road districts, Cook county will pick up about 3.5 million."

Shea: "I am more concerned about the 16 million the State is going to lose. Could you tell me what that \$16 million will do to the road program on a state wide basis?"

Springer: "Well, it will be 16.5 million as far as the, the reason I put the Bill in is to help the township and road districts. Now, it passed out of Committee and I have been waiting for any Amendments and so forth and I haven't received any and you know, it's getting to the end of the time so I just moved the adoption of the Amendment. I will be glad to bring it back."

Shea: "This is the Committee Amendment?"

Springer: "Yes."

Shea: "I won't comment now but on Third Reading I will."



Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as it happened the Transportation Committee had three Bills on this very same subject, one of them was sponsored by the distinguished Gentleman on the other side of the aisle, Representative Garmisa. One was sponsored by myself and one by the Sponsor of the Bill before us. I thought it was the understanding that this Bill would be held on Second Reading for the purpose of receiving Amendments. I have submitted to the Clerk two Amendments. I do not think they have been printed and distributed and in view of that fact I would request that the Sponsor hold this Bill on the order of Second Reading."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Deuster, the Clerk advises me that the Amendments are printed and are being distributed right now."

Deuster: "I thank the Chair."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the Gentleman has moved that Committee Amendment #1, you want me to stop right now? All right, the Sponsor has requested that House Bill 1242 be taken out of the record without further action. So the Bill is out of the record."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1245, Madigan, a Bill for an Act to amend the Inheritance Tax Act, Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amend House Bill 1245 on page 5, line 26 by deleting wife and inserting in lieu thereof spouse."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Amendment would make the Bill apply to a surviving spouse rather than simply to a surviving wife. I move adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Blair: "Is there discussion? The question is shall Amendment #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? "

Fred Selcke: " Amendment #2, amends House Bill 1245 as amended page 5, line 26, by deleting wife and inserting in lieu thereof, spouse."

Speaker Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "That's the same Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Fred Selcke: "That's what I thought when I was reading them, but the First Amendment says by deleting wife and inserting in lieu thereof husband or wife and the Second Amendment says by deleting wife and inserting in lieu thereof spouse."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker I would ask leave of the House to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Miller: "Does the gentleman have leave to table Amendment #1? Hearing no objection Amendment #1 is tabled."

Madigan: "And I move for adoption for Amendment #2."

Speaker Miller: " All right, the gentleman now moves that Amendment #2 be adopted. Is there discussion? All right, the question is, shall Amendment #2 be adopted? All those in favor say 'aye' opposed 'nay', the 'ayes' have it and Amendment #2 is adopted. Are there further Amendments? Bill is advanced to order of Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1246, Madigan, a Bill for an Act to amend Section 2, an Act relating to Revenue sharing and support, Second Reading of the Bill, One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 1246 by deleting line 24 and 25, inserting in lieu thereof the following and support, Second Reading of the Bill."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #1 proposes certain technical changes in the Bill, I move its adoption."

Speaker Miller: "Is there discussion? The question is, shall Amendment #1 be adopted? All those in favor say 'aye' opposed 'nay' the 'ayes' have it and the Amendments adopted. Is there further Amendments? The Bill is advanced to order of Third Reading. "



Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1253, Kosinski, a Bill for an Act to allow Retailers being taxed for Retailers Occupational Tax or Use Tax on their gross receipts in retail sales be given credit against such tax by ability, Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment, amend printed out Bill 1253, page 3, line 17 by inserting the following phrase immediately after the word Resale and"

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. The Committee Amendment offered by the Department of Revenue on the Department of Revenue Bill to narrow its import. I see suggest its passage."

Speaker Miller: "Is there discussion? The question is, on Committee Amendment #1, shall the same be adopted? All those in favor say 'aye' opposed 'nay', the 'ayes' have it and the Committee Amendment #1 is adopted. Are there further Amendments? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1268, Katz, a Bill for an Act to equalize treatment of male and female employees in disfigurement cases under the Workmens Compensation Act. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Miller: "Are there any Amendment from the floor? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading. The Sponsor has requested that House Bill 1270 be held for the time being."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1293, Mann, a Bill for an Act providing for loans to Registered Nurses for pursuing the course of study for a Baccalaureate Degree in Nursing and soforth. ..ah..Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Miller: "Just a moment, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea is recognized."

Shea: "I didn't think Mr. Mann was here, but I see he's there. ah.. I'm wondering if he has any question about this Bill



or is it all right to move...cause I know this is a subject he was deeply interested in."

Speaker Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann is recognized."

Mann: "Thank you very much, Representative Shea. Thank you Jerry.

I want to clarify...ah...ah.. certain point ; Mr. Speaker. I've asked about it before and I'd like a further clarification. There is a companion Bill, House Bill 1294, which contains an appropriation and its my understanding correct that House Bill 1293 can stay on the Calendar alive until the companion Bill catches up with it."

Speaker Miller: " Well, Mr. Mann, I notice by the Calendar that House Bill 1293 has an expiration date of June 20th, now the problem we have of course is that House Bills are supposed to be moved this week. So it..be passed this week. Now is this a companion Bill to an Appropriation Bill, its now in Appropriations Committee?"

Mann: "Well, it was referred from Human Resources to Appropriations. Whether they physically have it or not, I do not know, but I wonder if we could involve the Majority Leader in this discussion, because I had asked him about this particular point."

Speaker Miller: "Did I understand you to say this is a companion Bill to an Appropriation Bill?"

Mann: "That is right."

Speaker Miller: "Then its my understanding on advice of the Parliamentarian that it is now exempt under the May 25th deadline."

Mann: "In other words, ..ah..it is alive until June 20th, is that what you're telling me?"

Speaker Miller: "That in affect is correct, in other words, it will not be stricken from the Calendar on the May 25th deadline and it will continue until the Appropriation Bill arrives and the only problem then would be the June 20th deadline. Thats my understanding of the present rules. Mr. Shea."



Shea: "Well, that's what we wanted to clarify and maybe Ms. Lazane can get it straight for us. We amended the rules the other day to say that Bills that were companion Bills to Appropriation Bills do not die on the 25th, they don't have to be out of the House, but are they still bound by the thirty day rule, no matter what the shape the Appropriation Bill is?"

Speaker Miller: "May I call the attention of the House to Rule 36D, like in David, which in effect says, that not withstanding the provisions the rule 37, no House Bill other than those concerning Revenue Reappropriationment or Appropriations and Companion Bills to a Appropriation Bill shall be called for a vote on a final passage after May 25th of the year of which they were introduced. So it appears that this Bill in specifically you requesting that May 25th will not resolve in the tabling of this Bill, if it is a Companion Bill to a Bill thats an Appropriation Bill. The thirty day rule, it is my understanding will still apply as we have in the past."

Shea: "All right, then let me ask you the next question, Mr. Speaker. Would it..is it still we can't implate it in the rules, would a motion lie to rerefer a Fill of this nature to the Committee and Assignments so that it may be sent to Appropriations and then not be bound by the thirty day rule?"

Speaker Miller: "Well, first it was my understanding that this Bill hadn't the Appropriation Bill had been referred to Appropriations."

Shea: "But at one time, I know I did it with 483 and 485, I sent the Bill even though it had been on the Calendar with leave of this House, back to Committee on Assignments which referred it to the Appropriation Committee and then they moved both of them out so that they could stay together. For the information of the Members, I'm referring to House Bill 31, start paragraph F, which refers, and I'm



not going to read it all, which refers to ..ah..when there is a Companion Bill..ah..that has been assigned to the Committee on Appropriations, that the Committee on Assignment Bills may assign the Companion Bill or Bills to the Committee on Appropriations at any time if the Sponsor of the Bill requests such reassignment in writing of the Committee on Assignment of Bills. It seems to the Chair that that should definitely answer the question that has been raised. Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann arise."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, that still does not answer the specific question insofar as the thirty day rule is concerned. "

Speaker Miller: "I don't see any need at the present time to make a decision on the thirty day rule inasmuch as the Bill to which you have referred to does not expire under the thirty day rule until June 20th."

Mann: "But, Mr. Speaker, it might influence whether or not I want to rerefer it to Appropriations."

Speaker Miller: "Well, thats something we'll take up when the time arrives to consider that, I don't think its a proper question at this time. Ah, for what purpose does the gentleman from Lake, Mr. Murphy, arise?"

Murphy: " Well, Mr. Speaker, just to follow this a little further, I thought it was already ruled, if you had a Bill that had an appropriation and that Bill was in Committee and being held up in Committee you could take a Bill from the Calendar, as you said, and have it assigned to that Appropriations Committee with your Bill and that ended the limitation on the date for that Bill and it would come out with your Appropriation Bill when it came out of Committee. Now thats my understanding."

Speaker Miller: "Its the Chairs understanding that Appropriation Bills are still bound by the thirty day rule, the same as all other Bills."

Murphy: "No, that is not correct. "

Speaker Miller: "Can you refer me to the rule where it says



different than that?"

Murphy: "A ruling from the Chair about 2 or 3 weeks ago."

Speaker Miller: "I don't recall any such ruling, there may have been, the Chair is not informed."

Murphy: "Well, I had a Bill on Third Reading, I took it from Third Reading had it reassigned Committee the day before expiration day, and its setting there with its Appropriation Companion Bill and it was ruled that that would not be dead."

Speaker Miller: "Well, the Bill that may have been through the Bill would be referred then or reported from the Appropriation Committee, both Bills would be, from the Appropriation Committee."

Murphy: "And the date then would not count."

Speaker Miller: "That would be my understanding. Are there further Amendments to this Bill? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1332, Thompson, a Bill for an Act to amend Insurance Code, Second Reading of the Bill, One Committee Amendment, amend House Bill 1332, by striking lines 1 through 3, page 1, and soforth."

Speaker Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Thompson."

Thompson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to table Committee Amendment #1, but I would first like some information. Amendment #2 which is not ready for this Bill, could I table this #1 Amendment and when the Amendment #2, number 2 Amendment is ready hold it on Second Reading."

Speaker Miller: "May the Chair make this suggestion. Why don't, if the Amendment that you are referring to is not ready why don't we just take this Bill out of the Record for the time being until you are ready?"

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1353, Jaffe, a Bill for an Act to provide for the use of identifying devices for the duty owed disabled persons, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee



Amendments.

Speaker Miller: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #1, Matijevich, amends printed out House Bill 1353, on page 1 and soforth."

Speaker Miller: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1353 relates to identifying devices which may be helpful in order to treat persons in medical emergencies. The Committee in Human Resources suggested that 3 lines of the Bill be deleted because they didn't relate to specific areas of medical treatment and I would move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1353 as suggested by the Committee."

Speaker Miller: "Is there discussion? The question is, shall Amendment #1 be adopted? All those in favor say 'aye' opposed 'nay', the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #2, McClain, amends House Bill 1353 on page 2, line 4, and soforth."

Speaker Miller: "The gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 to House Bill 1353 is a simple Amendment, it's just a legal protection clause placed in the Amendment and I talked with the Sponsor, he's in full agreement and I move the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Miller: "Is there discussion? The question is, shall the House Adopt Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'aye' opposed 'nay', the 'ayes' have it and Amendment #2 is adopted. Is there any other further Amendments? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1357, Catania, a Bill for an Act to amend the Income Tax Act."

Speaker Miller: "Just a moment, for what purpose does the gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan arise?"

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, I would move to spend the appropriate



parts of Rule 37 so that we could have leave to immediately hear House Bill 349, a Sales Tax Bill, which is on the first call priority tomorrow."

Speaker Miller: "Does the Gentleman have leave? I hear objection, Mr. Londrigan, so leave is not granted. He requested leave, I heard objections. Now does the gentleman care to move? Murphy, Cunningham, Walsh, now does the Gentleman care to make a motion? "

Londrigan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move that appropriate section of Rule 37 be suspended and that we have leave to immediately hear House Bill 349, the Sales Tax Bill, and ask for Roll Call."

Speaker Miller: "All right, I want to state the motion first as I have understood it and you tell me, Mr. Londrigan, if the motion is..as I say is correct. The Gentleman now moves that the provisions of Rule 37 was calling a Bill. That House Bill, what's the number, Sir? 349 be called out of order at this time. Is that your motion, Sir? All right, is there discussion? All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the Gentleman's motion take 107 votes. Is that correct?"

Speaker Miller : "That is correct."

Walsh: "Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be heard on his motion."

Speaker Miller: "All right, just a moment, Mr. Shea, on a point of order."

Shea: "I think the Gentlemans first motion was to go from Second to Third Reading and thats Rule 10, isn't that what you wanted to do, Jim? So once we get to Third Reading if possible and I think that takes only 89 votes or the Speaker can do that if he'd like to do that, would you like to go to Third Reading, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Miller: "I have no intention of doing so now, Sir."

Shea: "Oh, all right, then I think then maybe Mr. Londrigan's motion is in order."



Speaker Blair: "All right, is this correct, Mr. Londrigan, that you are moving to suspend the provisions of Rule 10 with respect to changing the order of business? Is that a proper statement of your motion?"

Londrigan: "Yes, so that we can go to Third Reading to hear House Bill 349."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Murphy."

Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the distinguished Gentleman that when we do go to Third Reading we are on House Bill 661."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan."

Londrigan: "When we get there I will suspend it so that we can go to House Bill 349."

Speaker Blair: "All right, is there discussion concerning the Gentleman's motion with respect to suspending Rule 10? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, generally, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this is dilatory and dilatory at a time when we can ill afford it. We have got an awful lot of business to do here. We have got to complete it by Friday according to our rules and I would suggest to the Gentleman that he permit the Speaker to stay on the order of business he is on. I would expect that we would get to, I would expect that we would get to Third Reading before the afternoon is over and then if he wishes to make the motion that he seems to desire to make to get to whatever House Bill he is interested in, we can. I can't see the rush for it now. Everybody here has got Bills that they are anxious for and we certainly aren't going to get to them if we are discussing dilatory motions such as this."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I certainly don't think the Gentleman is making this motion at all to be dilatory. The Bill that he seeks to



call is a sales tax relief Bill for people of the State of Illinois. Although, the way that our rules are now written every morning when we come in, the Speaker is required to call the Bills in the order which they are on the Calendar and since his Bill was an early order of preference Bill and the Bill printed by the Clerk or the Calendar printed by the Clerk, he consistently has to have his Bill called early in the morning where sometimes we are short a little enrollment here in the House. Now, all the Gentleman would like to do and I am sure the Speaker would like to accommodate him is to have this important sales tax relief Bill called at this point so when we have a full membership so that we can all be recorded on how we feel on this important issue in the State of Illinois and I think that perhaps the Majority Leader would want to change his tact and help us get this Bill called now so we could all be recorded on this important issue."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Pappas."

Pappas: "Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Hasn't this Bill been called on Third Reading at least two or three times?"

Speaker Blair: "It's the Chair's regulation that it has been called more than once."

Pappas: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to cause any problems on this particular Bill but as somebody said, many of us have Bills on the Calendar and we have been waiting patiently until these Bills are called. Now, if someone's Bill is called, they shouldn't be taking it out of the order of business and go ahead and call the Bill. I have three little Bills on the Calendar and I have been waiting patiently for a couple of weeks to have them called and I think the Sponsor of this Bill and any other Bill should wait their turn and if the Bill is called, then go ahead and proceed with it."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr.



: Boyle."

Boyle: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe this motion, I don't believe this motion is debatable but if it were, I could say that this Bill has been on the Calendar for two weeks and was never called and finally this week for the first time it's been called the first Bill in the morning and I think that it's time we give Mr. Londrigan a chance to have this Bill heard and I would ask that we vote on this motion now."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the Gentleman has moved that House Rule 10 be suspended. This is the one that changes the order of business. His motion is to change the order of business and go from Second Reading where the House now is to Third Reading Bills. That's his motion. All right, now this will take 89 votes. All those in favor of this motion will vote 'aye' and opposed 'nay'. All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, as the Gentleman from Rock Island pointed out, this Bill has been called twice before. There are many Bills that expire on the same day, namely tomorrow that have not been called at all. The Speaker has shown the Gentleman the courtesy of taking his Bill out of the record for whatever reason the Gentleman wanted that done, the Speaker has done it and now he presumes upon our time to suspend the Rule and get to his Bill immediately. Now, in view of the fact that if his Bill is passed and enacted by the House and Senate and signed by the Governor, it doesn't become effective until January 1, 1974, I think this is an undue presumption upon the time of this House and I think that we ought to vote 'no'."

Speaker Blair: "All right, is there further discussion? Have all voted who wish? All right, the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan, is recognized."

Londrigan: "Now, I have tried to do the right thing by this but I must answer such charges. This Bill has been on



first call for three weeks. It was not called until the first time Friday when some of us were absent. It has been called the last two mornings when not enough were present. We all know the facts of life. The only thing we are asking here is that we have a fair hearing on this very important sales tax Bill so that all of us will have an opportunity to vote on it for the people and we will all have an opportunity to register our vote. That's all we are asking for."

Speaker Blair: "All right, is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain my vote. I would like to explain my vote this way that it's nobody's fault, it's no one's responsibility other than the individual Member that we be on time when the legislative sessions open. However, due to the number of this Bill that we are talking about, each and every one of us realize that at the opening session the Membership is thinned, there is Members late and there are Members in their office and other matters they are attending to rather than being on the floor of the House at the time that we open a session. And due to the fact that this is a low numbered Bill as far as priority is concerned in accordance with the rules, the Speaker is entirely within his rights in accordance with the rules in calling the Bill early. But every time that the Majority Leader has mentioned that the Bill has been called it is at the very opening of the session when the Membership is light and Representative Londrigan is full well knowing that it is controversial as far as the two parties are concerned, has not had the 100% attendance that it would take to pass this Bill and this is the principal reason that he is requesting that we now have a final Roll Call on it at which time there is Membership present and I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Blair: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr.



Clerk. On this question there are 95 'ayes' and 18 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion having received more than 89 votes is hereby declared, hereby prevails. Now the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan, is recognized."

Londrigan: "Now do we not start with the priority of call?"

Speaker Blair: "All right, the House is now on Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "Next Bill Number is 661."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding that the Speaker announced that there was printed on the Calendar a priority of call at any time that we were on Third Reading. Now it's my understanding that you would start with that priority of call and the first Bill, I believe, is Representative Londrigan's Bill. That's the oldest Bill on the Calendar in the priority of call dates."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Assistant Minority Leader isn't here in the assumption that House Bill 349 should be called at this time. We started on the order of Third Reading earlier in the day and pursuant to the rules House Bill 349 was called, the Sponsor requested it be taken out of the record. The proper position for the Chair at this moment now that he is back on Third Reading is to call the next Bill in order according to the rules which would be House Bill 661."

Speaker Blair: "All right, is there further discussion? All right, Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 661."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill..."

Speaker Blair: "All right, just a moment. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan."

Londrigan: "First of all, Mr. Speaker, are you going to rule on that?"

Speaker Blair: "I don't think any ruling is particularly necessary. We are back on Third Reading and the next Bill



according to today's business is House Bill 661. Mr. Shea, the Gentleman from Cook."

Shea: "Yes, I asked for a ruling from the Chair pursuant to what I thought was the Speaker's announcement that there was printed on the Calendar a priority call on House Bills Second and Third Reading. Now if, when we go to the order of Third Reading, we don't go in that priority of call, would you explain to me for what purpose it's on there and then explain to me why my motion, or my request is out of order that we start at the first Bill on priority of call."

Speaker Blair: "Well, in the first instance, Mr. Shea, we were on Third Reading, the Calendar record here at the Speaker's rostrum indicates that every Bill up to 661 was called today. Now it's the Chair's intention then to continue with House Bill 661 and that's pursuant to Rule 37."

Shea: "I understand that, Mr. Speaker, but I thought, I think it was Monday, or perhaps Friday of last week, that the Clerk put a priority of call list on the Calendar. It had not appeared before that time and then, Speaker Blair informed us that when we started on an order of business that the priority of call would prevail. Now we went from Third Reading to Second Reading at the call of the Chair which I am sure House Bill, or I mean House Rule 10 permits us to do. 95 Members of this Chamber just expressed a desire to return to Third Reading. I thought that then in order to accommodate a majority of the number of Members of this Chamber that we would then start with the priority of call because we are going back to Third Reading again."

Miller: "Well, Mr. Shea, as far as the Chair is concerned, he is trying to be as lenient as he can. Rule 37 and the principles already established by this House would dictate that now that we are on Third Reading that the Chair must call House Bill 661."



Shea: "What part of Rule 37 is that so I may mark it, Mr. Speaker."

Miller: "Well, it's a ruling of the Chair that House Rule 37 gives the Speaker the choice under the Rule."

Shea: "Could you point that part out to me, sir, so that it would be perfectly clear?" Because I just want to make sure in the future that I have got this ruling down."

Miller: "The last part of A says the point at which an order of business is left shall be the point at which business is resumed when the House returns to that order of business and that is the Chair's ruling, sir. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, arise?"

Cunningham: "A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Miller: "State your point."

Cunningham: "Would it be proper for me at this time to introduce a motion to suspend the rule that I might point out that Sumner Grade School is in the East rear balcony and it's the school where I went to school and where my..."

Miller: "You are out of order, sir."

Cunningham: "Or must I wait till the motion period to introduce that motion to suspend the rules?"

Miller: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, may I have consent of the House to go to House Bill 349?"

Miller: "The rules of the House provide that this should be in the form of a motion, sir and the Chair did hear numerous objections so therefore, leave is not granted."

Londrigan: "I would then move for, move to suspend appropriate rules, Rule 37 so that we may go to House Bill 349."

Miller: "All right, so we have no misunderstanding, the Gentleman now moves that this House suspend House Rule 37 for the purposes of changing the order of business so that the order of call, so that House Bill 349 can be



heard at this time. Is that your motion, Mr. Londrigan? All right, is there discussion? All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, so that we may all understand the motion, is it not true or is true that under provisions of Rule 37F this would take 107 votes?"

Miller: "It will take 107 votes. All right, is there further discussion? All right, the question is on the Gentleman's motion to suspend Rule 37 so that House Bill 349 may be taken out of order and called at this time on the order of Third Reading. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed 'nay' and it will take 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Would you please poll the absentees?"

Miller: "Well, just a moment. I will do so in that you request after we determine how many have voted on this issue. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 101 'ayes' and 16 'nays'. And now, Mr. Londrigan, you are recognized."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, would you please poll the absentees?"

Miller: "All right, will the Members please be in their seats and the Clerk will call those who have not voted on this issue."

Fred Selcke: "Anderson, Arnell, Bluthardt, Campbell, Capuzi, Catania, Day, Duff, Ralph Dunn, R.L. Dunne, Dyer, Ebbesen, Granata, Grotberg, Harpstrite, Gene Hoffman, Ron Hoffman, R. Holloway, Hudson, Hunsicker, Huskey, Juckett, Kent, Klosak, Kriegsman, Kucharski, LaFleur, Lauer, Macdonald, Mahar, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McCormick, McMaster, Kenny Miller, Tom Miller, Molloy, North, Palmer, Pappas, Philip, Peters, Polk, Porter, Randolph, Rigney, Rose, Ryan, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Skinner, Springer, Totten, Waddell, Wall, R. Walsh, Washburn, J.J. Wolf, B.B. Wolfe."

Miller: "All right, what's the count now, Mr. Clerk? There are 101 'ayes' and 16 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion



fails. Now we are on Third Reading. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, arise?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, as long as we are on Third Reading I thought we could stay there and do something constructive. I have a Bill that must get out of here today according to the Department of Mental Health and I talked to the Speaker about it and he is in agreement so I would like to get it 107 votes that Jim couldn't and suspend Rule 37A so that we can go out of the numerical reading in order that we may call House Bill 1928. It's a transfer of funds Bill within the Department of Mental Health that must be signed by the Governor by June 1 so that they can meet their main payroll. I move to suspend the provisions of Rule 37A so that this can be done."

Miller: "Is there discussion? All right, the Gentleman has moved that House Bill 1928 be called out of order on Third Reading so it can be heard at this time. All those in favor, this will take 107 votes. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "I wonder if the Gentleman would mind discussing that with me before we do this, maybe call a couple of Bills and we can get to this later. He hasn't mentioned a thing about this to me."

Matijevich: "Bill, I spoke to the Speaker about it and he told me it would be done. I would be happy to but I thought as long as we are on Third Reading."

Walsh: "Yeah, come over and talk with me, John. We will get it maybe later."

Matijevich: "Be happy to."

Miller: "O.K., Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 661 on Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 661, Hoffman, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Miller: "All right, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Gene Hoffman."

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



House Bill 661 is the School Problems Commission Bill for the establishment of a State Board of Education. I distributed considerable material on the issue. As you know it provides for a 17 member State Board of Education to be appointed by the Governor with the confirmation of the Senate. It provides that the representation will come from judicial districts that not more than 9 Members can be from the same political party, that Board members will be reimbursed for necessary expenses and \$50 per diem. The Board will select their own chairman and they will have the jurisdiction over pre-school through grade 12 and vocational ed. It also provides for a committee to be established with the Board of Higher Education, three members from each to deal with those issues which overlap both of the areas. This Bill is supported by many civic groups including the PTA, the Illinois AG Association, the Illinois School Board Association, the State Chamber of Commerce, the League of Women Voters, American Association of University Women and others. I distributed a number of endorsements at newspapers in regard to this and I would appreciate your support of House Bill 661."

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

Berman: "Will the Sponsor yield for some questions?"

Miller: "He indicates he will. Proceed, sir."

Berman: "Gene, this Bill didn't come out of the School Problems Commission with a unanimous vote, did it?"

Hoffman: "This is correct. This Bill came out of the School Problems Commission with, I think it was 11-6 with 6 voting 'present' if I remember, my memory is correct."

Berman: "Am I correct in saying that, am I correct in saying that the major point of disagreement with this Bill with those of us who voted 'present' in the School Problems Commission was on the method of selection, appointment versus election."

Hoffman: "Yes, that has turned out to be the key difference."



Berman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may address myself to the Bill."

Miller: "Proceed, Mr. Berman."

Berman: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 661 is one of several Bills on the Calendar which deals with a very important subject and that is the State Board of Education and I invite your attention not only to this Bill but also to a Bill that also provides for a State Board of Education, a Bill sponsored by Representative Brinkmeier, House Bill 1053 which is on the Calendar and really is the alternative to this proposal as far as the method of selection of the members of the State Board of Education. House Bill 661 proposed by Representative Hoffman provides for the appointment of members of the State Board of Education. House Bill 1053 calls for the election of the State members of the State Board of Education with an additional member to be appointed by the Governor and I submit to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that when we talk about education, unlike many of the other boards that function in our State government, boards which are appointed by the Governor, when we talk about a State Board of Education we are talking for the first time about a vehicle, a Commission which probably affects more people in the State of Illinois than any other single board that we have in State government. And I think that we have all seen that with the great concern, the great amount of tax dollars, both local and State, that our citizens of the State of Illinois commit to education, that if we equate a State Board of Education with almost any other State Board, I think we are doing a disservice to the role of education in our government. Mr. Speaker, could I have a little order, please? Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that the people of the State of Illinois in poll after poll after poll have stated that education is their number one concern. Those of us who



have children in the public schools and in the private schools, I think also vote for education as being our number one concern. And in House Bill 661 we are being asked today to determine the future role of State government in education. Now, I submit to you that traditionally, Illinois has had as a major policy decision body for education, a person who has been elected as the Superintendent of Public Instruction and I point out to you that that has been an elected office. He has been the chief policy maker for educational policy throughout the State and he has been elected by the people of the State of Illinois and I think, in particular, in regards to that office, that when you have seen that the will of the people have dictated it, there have been some dramatic changes, not only in the person who has held that office but in also the direction that the policy decisions take out of that office and I, for one, think that in recognition of the recommendation of the Constitutional Convention which allows the Legislature to determine how the State Board is going to be selected, whether by appointment or by election, that we have been given the responsibility of determining what is best for the people of the State of Illinois in the makeup of that State Board and I submit to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that we should not, at this point in the formulation of a new State Board of Education, that we should not at the outset depart from the traditional method of going to the people and allowing the people to choose who is to set the policy for education throughout the State of Illinois. We have always had an elected policy maker in the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction and I submit to you that at the outset, that the State Board of Education should be continued to be chosen by the people of the State of Illinois. There are several proposals which we will have the opportunity of voting on. I mentioned



Representative Brinkmeier Bill, for it to be an election Members of the State Board by Districts. There are other alternatives also dealing with the election of Members of a State Board. None of this method of selecting a Member of the State Board is chisled in granite, we will always have the opportunity of Legislature to review the operation of the State Board. And, I think that before we take away from the people of the State of Illinois their right to have a voice in the people who will determine Educational Policy in the State of Illinois, that we should not depart from tradition that we should continue to allow the people to have a voice in the decision making through the ballot box. And for that reason I urge either a 'no' vote or a 'present' vote, but certainly not a 'aye' vote on House Bill 661 as of this date. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Miller: "The gentleman from Ogle, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: " Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. In my humble opinion this is one of the most important things that's going to confront us in this Session of this General Assembly. In my opinion this Board, the School Board, will be one of the most powerful Boards in the State of Illinois. They'll be talking about Appropriations that is going to amount to billions of dollars. They'll be making recommendations for massive Education Appropriations. For example, in 1970 the other 2 Counties in the State of Illinois collected over \$2,788,000,000 of local taxes. Now approximately 60% of that amount or roughly \$1, 673,000,000 went to education. Now in addition to that, the State Grant approximately \$1,000,000,000 each year for Elementary and Secondary Education. So we're talking roughly about 2 and 3/4 of \$3,000,000,000 of dollars the State is spending annually on Education for Elementary and Secondary Education. Now we all know that in the future that this State Board of Education will exert a tremendous amount of influence on Education Policies, Priorities and Appropriations. And



I'd like to point out to you that having been a Teacher for 25 years I dislike being so bragmatic, but, I feel if we are, we're going to receive the confidence of the Public in the State of Illinois, the people are going to pick up these tabs that we should have a Board that is directly responsible for the people that are paying these taxes. Now, I know there are many other areas that I'd like to cover at this point, but, I would like to point out to you that I have conducted a survey in the 35th Legislative District and to you downstate Members I'd like to call your attention to the results of this survey. This questionnaire was sent to every Board Member and to every Administrator in northwestern Illinois and the 35th Legislative District. Of the 128 responses that I had, only 19 wanted an all appointed Board. I'd like to point out to you that on Record the Illinois Association of School Board, the Illinois Association of School Administrators, they both said that their membership wanted an appointed Board. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have the signed questionnaires on my desk indicating that only 14 % of those people wanted an appointed Board of Education and I'll submit to you also, that you conduct a telephone survey or whatever you're going to find this a lazy ...educators are going to want a Election Board even to a greater extent than that. So, I would like to urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Miller: "All right, the Lady from Cook, Ms. Chapman is recognized."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the ...before us now, House Bill 661 is clearly superior, to any proposal that has been introduced in the General Assembly which implements the requirement of our new State Constitution to set up a State Board of Education. I join with the Educational and Civic Organizations of this State. Ask the media of this State which believes the scope, the authority and the matter of selection in this Bill. Make it an excellent Bill. In addition if in the operation



at a time which provides the Board an opportunity to prepare for their tests, but let me speak directly to the question that has been raised, that of the election as posed to a point. Surely each one of us here, as an Elected Public Official supports the election of other Public Officials. Except, let's look at the involvement now in Public Education. We elect most of the School Boards of our State, we elect our County Superintendents all over the State, we elect our Governor and what is most important we elect our Illinois General Assembly. And, make no mistake about this, the Illinois General Assembly is and will remain the elected School Board of the State of Illinois because we are the ones who pull the purse strings. This State Board of Education, no matter how it is selected or constituted will not control expenditures. It is the Illinois General Assembly which levies the taxes, raises the revenues appropriates the sums, fixes up the formulas for distribution. We are the State School Board, we are elected by the people, we are responsible to the people and that's the way it should be. This School Board which should be appointed by the Governor, and approved by the Senate, needs to be responsible to the Governor and the Legislature to make recommendations to us. We are the ones who should make the final decisions. I hope each one of you will cast an affirmative vote for House Bill 661."

Miller: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, we have heard 3 eloquent speakers give us their philosophy on this and I'd like to speak in favor of this Bill, I think there's a pragmatic approach which we must also consider on this Bill. And that's the practicality of having someone elected from a very large District which would be much larger than most of the Representative Districts. It would be virtually impossible for anyone to run a



campaign from a District of this size without a very substantial wardship to carry his campaign. We would in essence if we looked to elected offices for these elected people to the State School Board be turning over the positions to interest groups who could afford to compromise themselves efficiently, to pay money out to the Candidate. I don't think this is what we want on the State School Board. We want people who have some keen interest in it, who are not partisan as much as possible and people who will be willing to work and extend themselves with practically no compensation. I think that if we turn this over to strictly elected phase what we're going to have is many, many people on the State Payroll, or excuse me, on the State School Board who owe an election to an organization who funds them for their election. I think we ought to think in practical terms when we're thinking about this Bill and I think, therefore, we should give our full support to Mr. Hoffman's Bill here, and urge everyone to vote for this fine Bill for appointed School Members or Board Members for a State Board of School Electors."

Miller: "The gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Pope."

Pope: "Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, I think this Bill points out to me the beauty of the system of government that we have here in the State of Illinois. I came to this Legislature with the intention of feeling that the elected board would be the most workable and beneficial to the State. And through our system of government presenting of the Bill, sitting in on Committee, listening to the testimony, I was convinced that the appointed Board with ratification of the Senate was the most accable for all, and therefore, I rise support of this Bill and I move the previous question."

Miller: " I'm sorry, Mr. Pope, the gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."



Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I was hoping that someone would point out that between the extremes appointed Members, elected Members, there is a very reasonable compromise and its called House Bill 1660. Sponsored by Representative Deuster, Catania, Gibbs, McGrew and myself. Now I'm not going to stand up here and take a dog in manger approach and urge you to vote against the Bill that's before you, there's nothing basically wrong about that Bill except that it renounces the confidence in the public to have sense enough to elect their best people to represent them. The right of having people to vote for those that would serve them is a cherished right, and shouldn't be lightly started. But, even if you do decide to vote for this Bill and pass it, I do hope that you do save 1 vote for 1660 when it comes up later in the week. Thank you."

Miller: "All right, the gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Boyle."

Boyle: "I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to a couple of brief questions. Number 1, Representative Hoffman, I wonder what restrictions and provisions in the Bill there are, what respect to the appointment by the Governor, I wonder what , in other words, is there any qualifications or limitations with respect to the appointment by the Governor or is the Governor free to choose anyone at will?"

Hoffman: "In response to the question, Section 1A-20 qualifications provides they should be citizens of the United States, whether its the State of Illinois and be selected as far as maybe the knowledge on their interest and experience of problems of Public Education. An Amendment which was offered by Representative McClain, and adopted by this House, eliminated the restriction that they not be involved in any way or with Education at the time they serve on the Board."

Boyle: "But there's no requirement there that they have to be a teacher , or there's no requirement there that they have to be qualified professional administrators, there's no



requirement there that they have to have a degree in administration or anything of this sort?"

Hoffman: "That's correct."

Boyle: "So, in other words, it would be possible to take lay people as, ..ah..and have them serve on the Board."

Hoffman: "We can even have an Attorney serve on it."

Boyle: "That's wonderful, because that's what I was getting at cause I may not be around here much longer. My 2nd question, is with respect to these Judicial Districts. I don't, the synopsis of the Bill provides that there are 5 Judicial Districts, but you have 17 Member Board. And, I was wondering how you get 5 into 17, who gets the most Members on the Board, in other words, who gets what?"

Hoffman: "In a .. which I distributed to the Membership, I indicated that there 8 from the 1st Circuit which has approximately half of the State's population, and 2 from each of the 4 other Circuits for a total of 16 and 1 appointed at large."

Boyle: " So the last Member would be the one appointed at large, in other words, the 8 from Cook County, or the City of Chicago area, that Circuit .. Dupage and 8 downstate with 1 at large. Is that right?"

Hoffman: "There are 8 from Cook County which comprises the first Circuit and 2 from each of the other 4 Circuits."

Boyle: "All right now, what's the pay of your Board?"

Hoffman: Expenses plus \$50 a day."

Boyle: "Thank you."

Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Arnell is recognized."

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

Miller: "All right, the previous question has been moved. All those in favor say 'aye' opposed 'nay', the 'ayes' have it. And the gentleman's motions prevails. Return to the gentleman from Dupage, Mr. Gene Hoffman to close the debate."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I appreciate the discussion that has taken place on this



Bill: today, I have talked with the individuals involved and have been discussing this with great length and there is on it a difference of opinion on it. I would point out however, though, whenever we talk about tradition and Boards, we're talking the State of Illinois about an appointed Board. The Board of Higher Education, the Board of the Environmental Board, we have a tradition of appointing Boards in Illinois, so when we speak of tradition we're talking about following tradition with this particular process. The other point I'd like to make in closing is, that the General Assembly will determine who pays the tab, not this Board of Education anymore than the Board of Higher Education as the final determination. This General Assembly which has been selected by the people can directly responsible to all the people in all areas will remain in their dominate positions.to me that we here who are responsible to the people in all areas would be inclined to be interested in electing people to have to serve on a Board which deals with one such particular area. Therefore, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on the basis of this and the other material that you've had an opportunity to see I solicit your 'aye' vote for House Bill 661."

Miller: "The question is, shall House Bill 661 pass, all those in favor will vote 'aye' and opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The gentleman from Dupage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, briefly explain my vote.

I recognize that there are large group which prefer elected Board and who feel perhaps we go to the people to speak to the issue of electing Members to the Educational Board for the State of Illinois. But, I happen to feel that from my experience that when we speak to a point we seek excellent in that process and I think that debates have both sides for question whether or not tradition will uphold either perspective in this question. However, it seems to me that



we're looking at continuity for programs in Education that we're willing to make alterations for whatever needs are necessary for Education, it takes position of a Governor, a man who is willing to go out and make those kinds of appointments and be accountable for them, for the kind of quality that we hope to obtain in the last part of this century. I don't think we're going to get that in elected Board. I find that the Elected Board be a second choice, I would hope that we could support to pass this Bill out so that we are given an opportunity to make some decisions about Illinois Education, that deals with questions for children, that its going to be in the hands of people who are in many cases not only qualified in the area of Education and the questions of Educations, but they're going to be dedicated to the cause. I think you're going to get those kind of people when they're appointed by a Governor who has the people, has all the people of the State of Illinois looking over his shoulder at that choice, so I think the matter of excellent and accountability is better served by such a Bill, that's House Bill 661, and I hope we can pass the Bill out tonight."

Miller: "All right, the gentleman from Ogle, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to call attention..ah..call your attention to a fact that in addition to Representative Cunninghams Bill, there is also another House Bill, 1053, which provides for an elected Board, which is also have 1 appointed Member from the Governor. Now this Bill would provide that 1 Member would be elected from each of 2 Congressional District comprising a total Membership of 13, and I would point out also, that they would be elected on a non-partisan basis. Now, I know that there is some people that question whether or not the elected Members would have the necessary expertise as far as Education is concerned, but, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, let me remind you that each one of you came



down here on the wishes of the people of your District. I think you admire, I hope you would admire, their recommendations in this respect. They sent you down here, and I submit to you that they would make a good choice when they elected the Members of the Board of Education. Now, very briefly in closing, I'd like to read a letter for you from one of the largest High School Districts in my 35th Legislative District. And, this gentleman did not know that I was going to Sponsor this Bill, as you will know as I read this letter, too, and I'd like to read this letter, if I may. It says, Dear Sir, I'm very much interested in House Bill 1053, which pertains to the selection to the State Board of Education. I believe House Bill 1053 would provide public confidence of the Educational System, which is badly needed. We're quick to say that Schools belong to people, but, if we appoint a State Board instead of electing one, we are not trusting the voters and I submit to you Ladies and Gentlemen that's what we're doing when we selected a appointed Board. We say, we don't trust you, He closes by saying, I'm in favor of House Bill 1053 and trust you will support the Bill. Obviously, he didn't know I was going to support one. But, Ladies and Gentlemen again, I submit to you, that we owe this to the people of our District to give them the option to select their Members of this State Board of Education. And, again, I would urge a 'no' vote."

Miller: "The gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I have agonized over the various Bills that have been presented to us this time on how we should have this Board. I'm convinced that this is by far the best of all of the Bills that have been introduced. I'm aware of the fact that the people should have a voice in the election of their Officials. However, I believe that because of the size of the State of Illinois, and the largest of the Districts that we would have, that



very, very few, if any of us, would know the qualifications of the people that were running. In addition to this, if we had 12 more people on the ballot, the ballot would become more and more unreality, it'd be harder and harder to know who to vote for. Now, in Illinois, in Higher Education only the trustees of Illinois are elected. All others are appointed by the Governor. And, if you will look to the performance of all of the Board that have been appointed by all of the Governors of both parties, I think you will find that Higher Education and the young people of the State of Illinois have been served very, very well, by the appointed Board. The Illinois Board of Higher Education is appointed by the Governor. The Board of Regents is appointed by the Governor. The Board of Governors and all of the other governing Boards for Higher Education. I believe that this is by far the best Bill that we were able to come up with and we should vote "yes".

Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I would simply like to point out that approximately 86% of the School Boards across are elected by popular vote. The School Boards with Districts over 100,000, such as Detroit, St. Louis, Cleveland, Milwaukee, Atlanta, Miami, all School Board Members are elected. New York has a 5 Member Board appointed by each of the 5 Boroughs, with each Borough of the branch, Queens, Brooklyn having elected a 10 Community Board Member. I think we ought to have a look at the statement of our Superintendent of Public Instruction. When he said we must revise the idea that the Schools belong to the people. He said it is his view that the direction of Educational Policies must be decided through the Public Agencies, chosen by the people, are responsible to the people, and vested with efficient authority to perform those functions, the public demands. I think we looked at the problem that



appointed School Boards, they are very insensitive to the needs of the people. Now, we through an elected School Board, we do have the option of taking those people out of office who are not representing their District. Since when is it a fact that everyone is asking for neighborhood School Policy, neighborhood participation, to determine what direction the School Policy would go and goes into the ears of insensitive appointed School Board. There's a article stated that the woman stated as an Act of furor of school affairs who can I go to with my school problems. Well, one can speak at Board Meetings, Policy Hearings, or Budget Hearings, in my opinion, these Hearings are held for the appeasement of the Public, if each District had an elected representative there would be a better place to have my school voice heard. This is one small way toward decentralization as I truly believe, and always have, that an elected School Board could only be better than what we now have of the School Board in this Country, 85% are elected Boards, isn't it worth a try. Since when does the Public have to be ignored. If the Public is smart enough to go and elect the Legislature into Office, then I think they are smart enough to know what they want in our Educational System and who they want for representation. It always appeared to me that everyone who was appointed to School Board should we have to have a Phd. to have to be in the upper 5% of the Income Bracket, and I would think that most of the people in the State of Illinois cannot fall into this bracket, so let's give the people a chance to be heard, let them elect the School Board."

Miller: "The gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Boyle."

Boyle: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker. Explaining my vote very simply, I would just like to point out that the honored 101 Members who are voting for this Bill that you're telling the people of the State of Illinois, you're telling the taxpayers, you're telling your constituents, that you're too dumb to



elect a School Board. That somebody else can do it better for you. And, I'd also like to point out to the Membership that it won't be very long before there will be Bills in this House to do away with your elected School Boards and have them appointed, too. There is already Legislation in the hopper to do away with Township form of government. This is just another Bill in the trend toward appointed government. We're just taking the government away from the people, the people who put us here. I think this is a bad trend. I'm opposed to this type of Legislation, I have faith in the American people, I have still faith in the people who put me here and the people who elected the Board of Education, to educate our children and I say I think we're making a terrible mistake by telling these people that you're too dumb to elect a School Board."

Miller: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk.

On this question there were 102 "ayes" 49 "nays" and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Record Mr. Phil Collins as 'aye' on this Roll Call. Mr. Maragos, 'present'.

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 665, ..."

Miller: "Ms. Geo-Karis 'present' on this Roll Call."

Fred Selcke: "Porter, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Miller: "Just a moment, Mr. R. L. Dunne 'present' on the last Roll Call. Mr. Caldwell 'present'. If there's any more please, please come up here so we can proceed. All right, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

You'll be delighted to know that this is a non-controversial Bill. To subject the House to a second tax Bill today..ah.. but I think this one is much more easily understood than what your digest shows. This Bill also is aimed at correcting inequity that is peculiar to Illinois taxpayers. I'll explain it briefly. Presently the Department of Revenue



when a Federal Income Tax is filed showing an operating loss carryback, which would change the Illinois base income will not make a refund of tax until the Federal Income Tax Return has been audited or until the three year statute of limitations has run. This is so even though a tentative carryback adjustment is made by the Federal Government and the Federal Government makes an immediate refund. This Bill simply provides that refunds will be made at the same time that the Federal Government makes them, that is when they make their tentative carryback adjustment. The taxpayer will not have to wait two or three years to get the money that would be coming to him. The Department of Revenue actually drafted Amendments #1 and #2 which are the Bill, there is no fiscal impact except to same the interest that would otherwise have to be paid by theah..Department of Revenue...by the State ...to those taxpayers during the time that their refunds were held. It correct....corrects an inequity ..ah...it passed the Revenue Committee 18-0 and I ask your favorable consideration."

Miller: "Is there discussion?.....The question is, shall House Bill 665 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye' and opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 144 'ayes', and no 'nays', this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 672."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 672, Schraeder, a Bill for an Act to provide for reimbursing certain taxing bodies for the loss of certain personal property tax revenue. Third Reading of the Bill."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Sp.....Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill attempts to relieve some of the financial burden that has been imposed upon the units of government for the loss of personal property tax for the period of 1971, which moneywas payable in '72, which was held in escrow.



what we are attempting to do is to alleviate some of the hardship that was caused because many of the taxing districts w.....were unable ...in fact a great bulk of them were unable to offset this by raising the tax levels because they were already at their maximum. And while I think most of you realize the problems these taxing units have gone through in the loss of the personal property tax. Unless there are any questions....why I'll just ask for a favorable vote and I'll take the vote or stay with the last Bill."

Miller: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "If the Sponsor would yield to a question. Would you please explain exactly what will be replaced through your Bill."

Schraeder: "I'm sorry, Mr. Skinner, I couldn't hear you."

Skinner: "Will you explain what will be replaced through your Bill? What is the definition of personal property tax?"

Schraeder: "What will be the replacement?"

Skinner: "What are you replacing?"

Schraeder: "The personal property tax lost in 1971 payable in 1972."

Skinner: "Now does this mean that is the difference between the collections of personal property tax in 1972 and 1971?"

Schraeder: "It was the amount held in escrow in 1972."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the Bill if I might."

Miller: "Proceed, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "There is an extremely significant difference between this Bill and Representative Clabaugh's Bill that any Representative from the suburban Chicago district ought to know about. This Bill, if it is signed in preference to Representative Clabaugh's Bill will give less money



to Will county, DuPage, Kane County, McHenry County, and there are probably, well there, it will give less money to about 80% of the counties in the State of Illinois. Representative Clabaugh's formula gave back to the various tax districts that amount of money that is presently being held in escrow plus the difference between 1972 collections and 1971 collections for personal property tax. This Bill only gives back the rebate. Now the difference is an extremely significant amount of money for the counties that I have named and it is a measurable amount of money for a number of other downstate counties and I would suggest that if we give the Governor the choice between Representative Clabaugh's Bill and Representative Schraeder's Bill that the Governor will choose Representative Schraeder's Bill because it is simpler, because it is a cheaper Bill, not because of the Sponsorship of either of the Bills and for that reason I don't think this Bill should be passed."

Miller: "Is there further discussion? All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

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

Miller: "Proceed, sir."

Jaffe: "Could you tell me what this would cost the State of Illinois?"

Schraeder: "47 million."

Jaffe: "\$27 million, is that correct?"

Schraeder: "47."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, if I might speak to the Bill."

Miller: "Proceed, sir."

Jaffe: "It seems to me that these taxing bodies or these municipalities and counties have received \$172 million in federal revenue sharing. It seems to me that if we give them another \$47 million we are really sweeping their pot something terrible. I think we have really gone overboard in dealing with municipalities and



counties in giving them tremendous amounts of money. I think that this is a bad Bill and we ought to vote it down."

Miller: "Is there further discussion? All right, the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder, to close the debate."

Schraeder: "Well, I was sorry to hear the speaker on the other side of the aisle bring political consideration into this matter by mentioning names. I am quite sure that I have no intentions of bringing parties into this because I am not so sure the Governor will sign my Bill if it passes anyway because I have had no assurances from him in any way, shape or form and I have not asked him. But I do not intend to come to this body and ask that all the units of State government be given the full amount of money because I don't think we can afford that. In addition to that, they did receive some federal revenue sharing and that should offset some of the loss. And I would say in further, in some of the districts, in particular this was aimed at the school districts. I have one letter from the Educational Service Region with a request which states as follows, 'as of this time no alternative to offset these losses are anticipated to be realized. The primary course will be to increase the various fund levels, but since the vast majority of districts are currently at their maximum level this alternative is hardly feasible.' So you can see their hands are tied. I have one from the Greater Peoria Mass Transit District which states that they lose some \$12,000 in revenue and they had to curtail bus service because of it and it says as follows, 'night bus service was started in July for '72 and discontinued because of losses incurred. The estimated loss was approximately \$10,000.' Now, when we are talking about mass transit we are all talking about transits all over and this also will help transit



authorities and if you are interested in CTA you are certainly interested in transit downstate as well. And I would say I am interested in CTA. I voted for it. I voted for other revenue funds to the units and districts that lost them and I think this is an exceptionally good Bill. It helps alleviate the situation and I ask for a favorable vote."

Miller: "All right, the question, for what purpose does the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner arise?"

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. The previous speaker has misunderstood what I said. I said that it is not because of the Sponsor that the Governor would sign his Bill rather than Representative Clabaugh's Bill but it's because Representative Schraeder's Bill is cheaper than is, in the long run than is Representative Clabaugh's Bill and I was not attempting to inject partisanship whatsoever in this Bill. It is the difference in concept in the formula."

Miller: "The question is, shall House Bill 672 pass. All those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? It's still open, Mr. Shea. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote I would just like to read down some counties and tell the individuals in the chamber how much more Representative Clabaugh's Bill gives than this present Bill does. Adams County, \$276,000, Bureau County, \$372,000, Carroll County, \$199,000, Champaign County, \$150,000, Cumberland County, \$98,000, DeKalb County, \$299,000, DeWitt County, \$100,000, DuPage County, \$617,000, Edgar County, \$261,000, Fulton County, \$222,000, Henry County, \$417,000, Iroquois County, \$303,000, Jackson County, \$162,000, Jasper County, \$132,000, Jefferson County, \$242,000, JoDavies County, \$122,000, when it turns red I will stop talking, Kane, 848, LaSalle, 502,000 again, Lee County, \$205,000,



McDonough County, \$111,000, McLean County, \$55,000, it goes all the way through. It's about 80% of the counties that get more under Representative Clabaugh's Bill."

Miller: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 72 'ayes', and 26 'nays' and this Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed but record Mr., lost, is hereby declared lost, Mr. Londrigan would desire to vote 'aye' on this Roll Call. Mr. Redmond, 'aye'. Call the next Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 682, Lundy, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Miller: "Just a moment, now, before I recognize Mr. Lundy, I have been advised that it is the intention of the Speaker that we should run until about 7:00 tonight. That's about another hour at which time we will adjourn for the day. Now, so the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe. Mr. Lundy, I'm sorry."

Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the purpose of this Bill is a rather simple one but I think it's important and in fact, I think this Bill does something which the General Assembly probably thought it was doing when it first authorized the City of Chicago to operate airports many years ago. What the Bill does is to require that in the operation of airports the City of Chicago must publicly advertise for bids and accept the bid of the lowest responsible bid in the case of contracts or the highest bidder in the case of concessions and it seems to me that recent history has amply demonstrated the value of competitive bidding in the letting of contracts or the granting of concessions at O'Hare and other Chicago airports. I would be glad to respond to any questions. I ask for a favorable vote."



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

Shea: "Joe, I wonder, would you mind taking this out of the record? There is a question on some of the contracts that are backed up by revenue bonds that I would like to go over with you. I don't care about bidding on most everything else except there are some bids, or some questions out there that I think that you ought to look at before you proceed."

Lundy: "Well, I would like to accommodate the Gentleman. It seems to me the Bill has been on the Calendar for quite a while and it would have been possible for us to discuss this at an earlier time. If it isn't a tremendous inconvenience to you I think I would like to get a vote on it."

Shea: "Well, I just wanted you to understand that there are certain contracts negotiated between the airlines and the airport that I don't think are susceptible to bids that you ought to be looking at because in many instances you have got revenue bonds backing up the building of hangars that in effect are used by the airlines and I think you will find that if you have to go to competitive bid in all those contracts you are going to be hurting that airport and airports much more than you think you want to so I suggest that maybe you hold this up until I have that information. It's supposed to be on its way down here. If you want to proceed without it, that's, you know, I can't do much about that."

Miller: "Is there further discussion? Mr. Walters desire recognition? Mr. Lundy."

Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, I really would like to accommodate the Gentleman but in light of the deadline on this Bill and the fact that it's been on the Calendar for a long time, if I may, will agree that I would be amenable to an Amendment in the Senate if it appears to be necessary



based on the information that he is presently awaiting."

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

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

Miller: "Proceed, sir."

Maragos: "Representative Lundy, does this have any conflict with the present legislation having to do with the letting of public contracts for the amount of \$1,500? Do you think in any way that why is this exceptional that should not be the full \$1,500 as compared to the \$5,000 that you wanted for this particular situation?"

Lundy: "My understanding is that there are two separate municipal purchasing acts, that the municipal purchasing act applicable to Chicago has a minimum \$5,000 level. Below that, the competitive bidding is not required. Under the Amendment #1 to this Bill that is the applicable minimum in this Bill. It's only municipalities of less than 500,000, I believe, which have a competitive bidding minimum of \$1,500 so there would not be any conflict."

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

Walters: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question? Representative Lundy, I read by your Bill that there are some problems at the fields and airports in Chicago. Would you tell us how they handle their bidding practices now?"

Lundy: "Well, I am not an expert on the subject but from what I read in the newspapers it has now been determined administratively by the Mayor of the City of Chicago that at least certain contracts will be publicly advertised and the bids accepted by the lowest responsible bidder. I frankly can't tell you precisely what procedures are followed in all other contracts although it has come to my attention and in some cases the contracts are negotiated."

Walters: "Thank you."

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

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, I think this is one of the finest



pieces of legislation that I have seen in the House this year and actually, this is the type of a thing that will put faith back in the politicians and give the people a little more confidence in us. I commend Representative Lundy on such a fine piece of legislation."

Miller: "For what purpose does the Lady from Lake, Ms. Geo-Karis arise?"

Geo-Karis: "Am I correct, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill would take a 3/5 vote according to the summary in the book?"

Miller: "Mr. Lundy, does this affect home rule units?"

Lundy: "It does, Mr. Speaker, specifically upon the home rule units and my understanding is that it would require a 3/5 vote."

Miller: "All right, if it does affect home rule units then it will take 3/5 or 107 votes. All right, is there further discussion? Mr. Lundy, care to close the debate?"

Lundy: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that competitive bidding in operating government is about as American as apple pie. I don't see really how anybody could be against it. Indeed, as I indicated, I think the General Assembly probably thought that the existing Municipal Purchasing Act did require the City of Chicago to seek competitive bids in running its airports. However, a circuit judge..."

Miller: "Just a moment, Mr. Lundy. May I get you a little more attention?"

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the General Assembly probably thought when it first authorized the City of Chicago to operate airports that competitive bidding would be required under the existing Municipal Purchasing Act. However, a court decision by the Circuit Court of Cook County a number of years ago was to the effect that since the General Assembly had not said specifically that competitive bidding was required, therefore it was not required. What this Bill does is



give us a chance to say specifically to the City of Chicago, 'we want you to follow competitive bidding procedures in operating airports which you operate in the City of Chicago', and I ask your favorable vote, I think it's a good government kind of Bill and....ah...I'd appreciate a favorable vote."

Miller: "The question is, shall House Bill 682 pass? This takes 107 votes. All those in favor vote 'aye', and opposed 'nay'. Now the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea is recognized."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I want to be recorded as voting 'present' I don't know how anybody can enter into bids and accept the lowest bids for such things as landing, such things as that forah....with United Airlinesthere's only one United Airline and I don't think that we ought to be getting the Airlines in competition with each other on landing fees...ah....etc. and that's what one of the paragraphs in this Bill do so I'd like to be recorded 'present' please."

Miller: "All right, is there further discussion? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Record Mr. Ebbesen as 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 76 'ayes' and one 'nay'....and this Bill having....the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy."

Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, I think maybe I can work out my differences with the Minority Leader and I'd like to put on Postponed Consideration."

Miller: "What is your desire, Sir?"

Lundy: "May we put it on Postponed Consideration?"

Miller: "Does the Gentleman have leave to put it on Postponed Consideration?All right....the Bill will be put on Postponed Consideration.The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Ah....Mr. Speaker, it turns out we're going to adjourn now and not an hour from now and ...ah...I move Mr. Speaker



that the House adjourn until 9:30.....O. K. the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "I had a Resolution up there,ah....it's a Birthday Congratulatory Resolution for one of our Members.....ah... but I don't even see him here now.....ah....There he is our good friend 'Sparkla' has a birthday and I'm wondering if we could get a Resolution read, Mr. Majority Leader? And the other one.....there is two of our Members that have Birthdays today and I'm wondering if we might get them read."

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

Walsh: "Well one of them has been read, Mrs. Martin has been read and adopted....ah....but the other one maybe we could take tomorrow with Agreed Resolution. We've got a Death Resolution too that we overlooked and that's going to be read and we're going to adjourn on that....Jerry....So maybe we could take care of the Birthday Resolution tomorrow morning."

Shea: "All right."

Miller: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos arise?"

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker...ah....I rise on a rule of Parliamentary Inquiry. There are several Bills that were ...I think.... postposed until today to be heard today before the Transportation Committee and now the Transportation Committee is on meetings this week and I was wondering what action we're going to take on those Bills that are still in that Committee?"

Miller: "Could the Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff enlighten us on this request."

Neff: "...Ah....Mr. Speaker, the Bills that we heard, except Representative Maragos and I would like to see him get the extension on timeI'm not sure whether or not he got it last week, he may have just got one week extension, and we'd like to hear his Bill....ah.....ah...next week or



next Tuesday, approximately when we hear the other Bills pertaining to Metropolitan Transit System."

Miller: "Mr.....A question of Mr. Neff....Were these Bills set for hearing and there wasn'tah...they were not heard but were they set for hearing at one time?"

Neff: "Ah....Mr. Speaker, they were not set for hearing at the request of the Leadership, on both sides.....it's my understanding.....of the aisle, that we hold off on these Bills and hear them all together and most of the Bills that we have in that Committee are the Mas.....Mass Transit Authorityah...different types that we're trying to work out and it was my understanding that the....the original Bills that I requested leave for to hold that they could be held for another week."

Miller: "All right. Does that solve your problem, Mr. Maragos?"

Maragos: "I think, Mr. Speaker, after talking to the Parliamentarian that I have to suspend Rule 18, applicable provision of it, so they can be heard next week because they were supposed to be heard this week and since....this....that we are not having a meeting...I think that we should postpone the rules and have it heard on the following week when the next....where the next....when the Transportation Committee Meeting meets again."

Miller: "Is this just one Bill, Mr. Maragos?....The Gentleman moves that the appropriate rules be suspended so House Bill 1776 can be heard in Committee next week."

Maragos: "I want to suspend it to whenever the Transportation Committee meets because I don't want to be caught in a bind again."

Miller: "All right,the Transportation Committee next week....is that agreeable with the Chairman?"

Maragos: "Yes it is."

Miller: "All right, this will take 107 votes, just a minute, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Now, Mr. Chairman, with regards to the Transportation



Committee....next week....there are a number of Bills that were in the Transportation Committee, to the best of my knowledge were kept alive until today. And what I want to make sure is that all those Bills stay alive until next week and the next hearing. I believe Representative Garmisa has got six Bills, Representative Houlihan has got a Bill, I think Representative Dunn and Deuster have a Bill, just what is our posture with those Bills?"

Miller: "I want to recognize anyone that has.....that wants to discuss the problem which we are not facing,.....not something else, please. All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Ah...Mr. Chairman, er.....Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address this inquiry to the Chairman of the Transportation Committee. Ah....Are you there, Clarence?"

Miller: "Proceed, Mr. Garmisa.....He's right near his seat."

Garmisa: "All of these Bills that were postponed as of last week...and of this week.....they are going to have their hearings in the next meeting of the Transportation Committee and will still be alive on the floor of this House when.....pass their deadline....."

Neff: "Mr. Speaker....Mr. Speaker...in answer to Representative Garmisa....ah..the requests that I ask for should have extended these indefinitely and I checked with the Clerk's Office and I think that's the way they are. A total of 18 Bills originally as I recall in this packageah...picked up by Representative Garmisa and to my knowledge these Bills should be alive and are alive and we can be able to hear them next....ah....next week ...without any problem...."

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

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, with regard to the issue that I'll confront this. The rule that we suspended last week is Rule 36-D which provides that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule 37...'no House Bill shall be called for a vote on final passage after May 25th



of the year in which it was introduced.' If everybody who has a Transportation Bill would please look at his digest he probably will note that the suspension of this rule was applied to his Bill. Now, there is one other rule which you have to be concerned about and that's the 45 day rule in Committee. Check that out."

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

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the point that I am concerned with. Are we going to have the required amount of days to bring these series of Bills on to Third Reading where they will comply with the 45 day rule and this is my concern at this time."

Miller: "Were you finished, Mr. Garmisa? I'm sorry."

Garmisa: "I would like a ruling from the Chair as to whether or not these Bills getting out of Transportation Committee some of them I am fearful will not be under the 45 day rule on account of the, I think's it's almost three weeks now that these Bills have been posted and not heard and I am very much concerned with where the 45 day rule would apply to the passage of these Bills if we came to that stage."

Miller: "Can Mr. Walsh, the Gentleman from Cook, enlighten us on this question?"

Walsh: "Well, Representative Schlickman, I think, put his finger on it. We passed a Resolution or a motion last week which exempted Bills, certain Bills and they were specified in the motion and I don't have the list with me but maybe Representative Schlickman does. I believe it was his motion that exempted certain Bills dealing with the subject of regional transportation and they are not subject to the May 25th deadline."

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

Garmisa: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the House suspend the appropriate rule so that in the event that the Transportation Commission or Committee sees fit to pass House Bill, now I am only referring to the Bills



that I am sponsoring. There are other Members here that have their Bills. I know that Representative Houlihan has a Bill, that Representative Deuster might have a Bill and would you like me to read the specific Bills that I would ask leave of the House to suspend the appropriate rules. Do you think, sir, that the 45 day rule would not apply in this event?"

Miller: "I am going to need the numbers of your Bills but I will recognize the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we will certainly suspend the 45 day rule on the Bills that were on the motion that Representative Schlickman made last week and that is to the effect that they will be heard at the same time by the Transportation Committee. And if the Gentleman will talk with us about it we can get all of the Bills that are affected and suspend the rule for all of the Bills at the same time and not do it piecemeal by having each Sponsor get up and do it. So, why don't you do that then?"

Miller: "Mr. Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Then, what our Majority Leader is saying that these Bills that are going to be heard in Transportation Committee next week will not be affected then by the 45 day rule and I will go along with that."

Miller: "The Chair would like to say that we are going to need the Bill numbers. The Clerk is going to need the numbers of all Bills which are involved in this discussion. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "My, House Bill 1776 which I am concerned with and as chief Sponsor, was not in that list of Bills originally and that's why I made this line of motion in conjunction and cooperation with the Transportation Committee Chairman who is also interested in this Bill to see that it stays alive because we only had expected one week to be heard as it has to do with the applicable rules."



Miller: "The Chair understood that if the Bill numbers are turned into the Clerk every Bill would be protected that has been discussed here in the last moment or two."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, then is it that all applicable rules will be suspended to be heard at the 45 days as the time limit to get out of the House? That's my question."

Miller: "May I make a suggestion which I am not sure can be carried ..out if I can get the attention of the Majority Leader in a moment. Mr. Majority Leader, would it be agreeable from your standpoint, sir, if we had those people who have Bills in Transportation Committee that are discussed, if they present the numbers to you so, rather than to the Clerk. Do you have some comment on that, sir?"

Walsh: "Maybe we can resolve this by simply moving to suspend the rules relative to the 45 days in Committee on all of those Bills that Chairman Neff submitted by motion that they be heard together by the Transportation Committee last week and I don't recall the date of it."

Miller: "Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Yes, that was made, Mr. Speaker, that was made last Tuesday. I don't have a list on my desk but they were turned in and I would like suspension of the 45, the appropriate rule on the 45 days so these Bills will be heard. As long as I am talking here, Representative Maragos has a different Bill that was exempted, held over and he needs a little bit different action than we do on the regular Transportation Bills."

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

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, to start off with, on May 15 the Representative, the Chairman of the Transportation Committee ruled that the May 25th deadline be suspended relative to a list of Bills which is in the journal. The rule relative to the 45 day requirement is Rule 23 D. I would therefore, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, move that Rule 23 D



be suspended as to those Bills which were subject to the motion made and adopted on May 15."

Miller: "Mr. Schlickman, can I make a suggestion concerning your motion that perhaps it should be to a day certain rather than just an indefinite suspension? Will you consider that, please?"

Schlickman: "May 29th."

Miller: "All right, the Gentleman has moved that the provisions of 23 D be suspended for the purpose of consideration of the House Bills that were listed in the journal of May 15 on a motion made by Mr. Neff that the, so that these Bills will stay alive until May 29. Now is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Well, isn't it, the motion that these Bills may be heard in Committee up to May 29, the next date for the Committee hearing? Because these Bills will not die on the 25th, the only question is will these Bills die for want of being heard within 45 days within Committee."

Miller: "Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well I would say either May 29 or 45 days following their assignment whichever comes later."

Shea: "Well, Gene, if the Committee will not meet again until the 29th and those Bills come out on the Calendar, would they then die because they won't be reported back until the 30th or the 31st. That's my problem."

Schlickman: "Well, instead of 7 days let's make it 14 days. How about June 10th?"

Shea: "That's a really nice day. If he will amend his motion to June 10th I will be very happy."

Miller: "Now, I will state the motion as the Chair understands it that the Bills listed in the May 15th journal under the motion by Mr. Neff to suspend the provisions of 23 D, that these Bills listed in that journal on that motion will be continued until June 10th and that the Transportation in the meantime can hold hearings on these Bills. That is the motion I understand."



Now the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, subsequent to the time that those prior Bills were extended I had a Bill which was in process. It had been introduced properly. It was House Bill 1921 and it had not yet been..."

Miller: "Let's get this out of the way first."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I am simply asking that since this is a mass transit Bill which I understand has been assigned to Transportation that it also be included in that list. House Bill 1921."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, in the interests of retaining our sanity I object and I would suggest that on the Gentleman's motion we make it on or before June 10th."

Miller: "All right, the, I have stated the motion now. Are you ready for the motion, the question? All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that motion then that the Bills would die on June 10th even if the 45 day limit extended them beyond that date? As I, I have a particular Bill, 1820 which the 45 day limit takes beyond June 10th and I would not like to be restricted to June 10th."

Miller: "I think the way the motion was made that these Bills would have to be heard in Committee before June 10th so that they could be passed before June 10th."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, as I understood there was also a suggestion to include June 10th or the 45 day limit whichever is later. Was that put in the motion?"

Miller: "Well, Mr. Schlickman is the one that made the motion. Can you clarify your motion, Mr. Schlickman?"

Schlickman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I intended or later so that if a Bill had 45 days in Committee and the 45 days was after June 10th that Bill would stay alive."

Miller: "All right, now do we understand? I am not going to state the motion completely again but this has only



to do with the Bills that were shown in the journal under a motion made by Mr. Neff. That's the only Bill, including this motion. All right, all those in favor of the Gentleman's motion will vote 'aye' and those opposed 'nay'. This will take 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Duff 'aye' on this Roll Call. Take the record. On this question there are 145 'ayes' and no 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Now, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, since I was the originator of the parliamentary inquiry I would like to have House Bill 1776 receive the same treatment because it was going to die today because it was supposed to be in Transportation Committee today and the Chairman, Mr. Neff wanted this so I would like to give the same treatment to House Bill 1776 because it was not in the original motion last week."

Miller: "All right, the Gentleman has moved, the Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff, care to be recognized?"

Neff: "Yes, I would like to see this motion pass because Representative Maragos asked for this permission and I told him they would be heard, his Bill would be heard in the next Committee hearing and it wasn't held this week and so we would like to have permission to hold it there until next week."

Miller: "All right, the Gentleman moves that the provisions of Rule 23 D be suspended so that House Bill 1776 can be heard in Committee next week and that it will stay alive until on or before June 10th. All right, all those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed 'nay'. This again will take 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? All right, take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 133 'ayes' and no 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Now the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

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



I would request that the same consideration be given to House Bill 1921."

Miller: "The Gentleman moves that the provisions of House Bill 23 D with respect to posting and keeping this Bill alive until on or before June 10th, that that Bill be suspended, that rule be suspended with respect to 1921, House Bill 1921. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this Bill falls into a different class altogether and it looks to me like it was introduced after the deadline for introduction and I think we are getting a little bit ridiculous here. I do object to this and suggest that if we are going to do this then we are going to have to do away with our deadlines altogether and get into continuous sessions. So I object, Mr. Speaker, to the Gentleman's motion."

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

Shea: "Well, I thoroughly agree with the Majority Leader and I think that perhaps I might be partly responsible for it but our rules clearly provided that Bills that did not deal with appropriations, revenue or reapportionment could not be introduced after the 27th, in fact it was the 14th and then it was extended and this Bill, unless I read it wrong theoretically should be lying on the Speaker's table. Is that right, Mr. Majority Leader? So, I am wondering if the Gentleman might hold this motion off until tomorrow morning when we get this straightened out?"

Miller: "All right, the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Desuter: "Yes, in response to the question, I wasn't aware that this Bill was a different category but if it is, I will respond to his suggestion and hold it off until tomorrow. I thought it was just another one of the Bills. Thank you."

Miller: "All right, the Gentleman withdraws his motion. All right, now, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman



from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "There is a death Resolution, Mr. Speaker, if the Clerk,,if the Clerk would read it."

Miller: "Read the Resolution, Mr. Just a moment, before we read that are there announcements? Now, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Washburn with respect to announcements."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The House Appropriations Committee will meet tomorrow morning at 8:00a.m. in Room 212. Tomorrow morning in Room 212 at 8:00 and I urge every Member to be prompt because we have about 50 Bills to consider in about an hour and a half. So please be present at 8:00. Thank you."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to advise the Democratic Members that in Room 212 at 7:30 tomorrow morning we will review the Bills prior to going into full Committee and I welcome everyone being there. Thank you."

Miller: "All right, are there further announcements? All right, Mr. Clerk, read the death Resolution."

Fred Selcke: "House Resolution 323, Choate, Barry et al., whereas Members of the House learn with great sadness of the death of former Lieutenant Governor Henry Sherwood Dickson on Thursday, May 17, 1973 and whereas Governor Dickson was born June 19, 1896 in Dickson, Illinois where his family has lived since the organization of the community in 1830, was a distinguished public servant of the people of Illinois and whereas Governor Dickson served his country in both World Wars including service as an Infantry Sergeant in World War I and as a National Guard Officer in World War II leaving the service in 1946 as a Colonel of Infantry and whereas following World War II Governor Dickson provided valuable leadership in the reorganization of the



Illinois National Guard and whereas the people of Illinois elected Henry Sherwood Dickson in 1948 to the second highest office in the State, Lieutenant Governor under the late Governor Adlai Stevenson and whereas the Democratic Party chose Henry Sherwood Dickson as its candidate for Governor in 1952 and he waged a noble campaign even though his effort was unsuccessful and whereas after retiring from public office, Governor Dickson further distinguished himself in private law practice in Dickson which he engaged in until his retirement two years ago and during which time he served as referee in federal bankruptcy court and whereas Governor Dickson will be missed by his multitude of friends throughout Illinois as well as by his widow Helen, his six children Henry, Mary, William, Louise, James and David and by other members of his family, therefore be it resolved by the House of Representative of the 78th General Assembly of the State of Illinois that the Members of this House express their deepest respect for the memory of a great public servant, Henry Sherwood Dickson and their sincere sympathy to the members of his family and be it further resolved that a suitable copy of this preamble will be presented to Mrs. Dickson and as a further mark of respect this House can now adjourn."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, out of respect for the memory of Governor Dickson, I move that the House adjourn until tomorrow morning at 9:30 for regular session."

Miller: "The Gentleman has moved that the Resolution be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Now the Gentleman has moved that we stand adjourned until 9:30 tomorrow morning. So the House stands adjourned."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	1.
1		Speaker Blair	House to order.	
1		Dr. Johnson	Invocation.	
1		Speaker Blair	Roll Call for attendance.	
1		Walsh	Excused absences	
1		Speaker Blair	Messages from Senate	
1		Clerk Selcke	Reads Messages from Senate.	
1		Speaker Blair	Committee Reports	
1, 2, 3, 4, 5		Clerk Selcke	Reads Reports.	
6		Speaker Blair	Introduction First Reading	
6		Clerk Selcke		
6		Speaker Blair		
6		Clerk Selcke		
6		Speaker Blair		
6		Clerk Selcke	House Resolutions	
6		Speaker Blair		
6		Walsh	Agreed Resolutions	
7		Speaker Blair	Moves adoption of Agreed Resolutions.	
7		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 349. Third Reading.	
7		Speaker Blair		
7		Londrigan		
7		Speaker Blair	Out of record?	
7		Londrigan		
7		Speaker Blair		
8		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 496. Third Reading.	
8		Speaker Blair		
8		Douglas		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
8		Speaker Blair	Ordered to 2nd Reading.
8		Clerk Selcke	Amendment #2-H.B. 496
8		Speaker Blair	
8		Douglas	
9		Speaker Blair	Amendment #1 tabled.
9		Kempiners	
9		Speaker Blair	
9		Kempiners	
9		Douglas	
10		Kempiners	
10		Douglas	
10		Speaker Blair	Amendment #2 adopted.
10		Douglas	
11		Speaker Blair	H.B. 496 passed.
11		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 501. Third Reading.
11		Speaker Blair	
11		Walsh	Introduction
11		Speaker Blair	
11		Rayson	
12		Speaker Blair	501 passed.
12		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 576. Third Reading.
12		Speaker Blair	Out of record.
12		Clerk Selcke	H.B.723.
12		Speaker Blair	Out of record.
12		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 727. Third Reading.
12		Speaker Blair	
12		Hart	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
12		Hart	H.B. 727 passed.
13		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 541. Third Reading.
13		Speaker Blair	
13		Holloway	
13		Speaker Blair	H.B. 541 passed.
13		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 668. Third Reading.
13		Speaker Blair	
13		Dunne	
14		Speaker Blair	
14		Flinn)	
14		Speaker Blair)	
14		Dunne	
14		Speaker Blair	H.B. 668. Passed.
14		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 669
14		Speaker Blair	Out of record.
14		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 780
14		Speaker Blair	Passed yesterday.
14		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 510. Third Reading
14		Speaker Blair	
14		McMaster	
15		Speaker Blair	
15		Skinner	
15		Speaker Blair	H.B. 510 passed.
15		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 518. Third Reading.
15		Speaker Blair	
15		Skinner	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
16		Speaker Blair	
16		Shea)	
)	
16		Skinner)	
16		Speaker Blair)	Out of record.
16		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 540. Third Reading.
16		Speaker Blair	
17		Houlihan	
18		Speaker Blair)	
)	
18		Geo-Karis)	
18		Houlihan	
18		Geo-Karis	
18		Speaker Blair)	
)	
18		Pierce)	
19		Houlihan)	
)	
19		Pierce)	
19		Speaker Blair)	
)	
19		Washington)	
19		Houlihan)	
)	
19, 20		Washington)	
20		Speaker Blair	
20		Friedland	Move previous question.
20		Speaker Blair	Moved
20		Houlihan	
20		Speaker Blair	H.B. 540 passed.
20		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 544. Third Reading.
21		Speaker Blair	
21		Rayson	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
21		Speaker Blair)	
21		Palmer)	
21		Rayson	
21		Speaker Blair)	
21		Leinenweber)	
21		Rayson)	
22		Leinenweber)	
23		Leinenweber)	
23		Speaker Blair)	
23		Rayson	
24		Speaker Blair	H.B. 544 passed
24		Mugalian)	
24		Speaker Blair)	
25		Dyer	
25		Speaker Blair	
25		Deuster	
25		Speaker Blair	
25		Borchers	
26		Speaker Blair	H.B. 544 dump Roll Call
26		Wolf	
26		Speaker Blair	
26		Wolf	
26		Speaker Blair	
26		Grotberg	
27		Speaker Blair	
27		Leinenweber	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
28		Speaker Blair)	
28) Rayson)	Poll of absentees
28		Clerk Selcke	Polls absentees.
28		Speaker Blair)	
28		Clerk Selcke	Continues
28		Speaker Blair	
28		Clerk Selcke	Continues poll.
28		Speaker Blair	Hart 'no'
28		Clerk Selcke	Continues poll.
28		Speaker Blair	North 'no'
28		Clerk Selcke	Continues poll
28		Speaker Blair	Totten 'no'
29		Clerk Selcke	Continues
29		Speaker Blair	
29		Clerk Selcke	
29		Murphy	How recorded?
29		Speaker Blair	
29		Clerk Selcke	Murphy not voting
29		Murphy	'aye'
29		Speaker Blair	
29		Dunne	How recorded?
29		Clerk Selcke	'Aye'
29		Dunne	'No'.
29		Speaker Blair)	
29) Clerk Selcke)	
29		Speaker Blair	Passed
29		Choate	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
30		Speaker Blair	
30		Martin	
30		Speaker Blair	
30		Caldwell	
30		Speaker Blair	H.B. 588.
30		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 588. Third Reading.
30		Speaker Blair	
30		Deuster	
31		Speaker Blair)	H.B. 588
31		Hill)	
31		Deuster)	
31		Hill)	
32		Speaker Blair	H.B. 588 passed.
32		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 593. Third Reading.
32		Speaker Blair	
32		Fennessey	
32		Speaker Blair	H.B. 593. Passed.
32		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 637. Third Reading.
32		Speaker Blair	
33		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 638. Third Reading.
33		Speaker Blair	
33		Londrigan	
33		Speaker Blair	
33		Wolf	
34		Speaker Blair)	
34		Walters)	
34		Wolf	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
35		Walters)	
)	
35		Wolf)	
)	
35		Speaker Blair	
35		Tipsword	
36		Speaker Blair	
36		McCourt	
36		Speaker Blair	
36		Grotberg	
37		Speaker Blair	
37		Choate	
38		Speaker Blair)	
)	
38		Skinner)	
)	
38		Londrigan	
38		Skinner	
38		Speaker Blair	
38		Clabaugh	Move previous question
38		Speaker Blair	So moved.
38		Londrigan	
39		Speaker Blair	
39		Hunsicker	
39		Speaker Blair	
39		Palmer	
39		Speaker Blair	
39		Londrigan	
39		Speaker Blair	Postponed consideration.
40		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 655. Third Reading.
40		Speaker Blair	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
40		Porter	
41		Speaker Blair	
41		Schneider	
41		Speaker Blair	
41		Porter)	
41)	
41		Schneider)	
42		Speaker Blair	
42		Schneider	
42		Speaker Blair	
42		Duff	
43		Speaker Blair	
43		Friedland	Move previous question
43		Speaker Blair	Moved
43		Porter	
43		Speaker Blair	
43		Terzich	
44		Speaker Blair	
44		Porter	
44		Speaker Blair	H.B. 655 passed.
44		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 659. Third Reading.
44		Speaker Blair	
44		McGrew	
44		Speaker Blair)	
44)	
44		Kempiners)	
44)	
44		McGrew)	
44)	
45		Kempiners)	
45		Speaker Blair	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
45		Tuerk)	
45		Speaker Blair)	
45		Tuerk)	
)	
45, 46		McGrew)	
46		Speaker Blair)	
46)	
46		Pappas)	
46		McGrew)	
46)	
46		Pappas)	
46		Speaker Blair)	
46)	
46		Mugalian)	
46		McGrew	
47		Mugalian)	
47)	
47		McGrew)	
47		Speaker Blair	
47		McGrew	
48		Speaker Blair	
48		Schoeberlein	
49		Speaker Blair	
49		Gibbs)	
49)	
49		McGrew)	
50		Speaker Blair)	
50)	
50		Kosinski)	
50		Fleck	Move previous question
50		Speaker Blair	Moved
50		McGrew	
51		Speaker Blair	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
51		Geo-Karis	
51		Speaker Blair	
51		Totten	
52		Speaker Blair	
52		Giorgi	
52		Speaker Blair	
52		Walters	
52		Speaker Blair	
52		Matijevich	
53		Speaker Blair	
53		Grotberg	
54		Speaker Blair	
54		Jones, J.D.	
54		Speaker Blair	
54		Jaffe	
55		Speaker Blair	
55		Rayson	
55		Speaker Blair	
55		Simms	
56		Speaker Blair	
56		Calvo	
57		Speaker Blair	
57		Tipsword	
58		Speaker Blair	
58		McGrew	
59		Speaker Blair	Take the record.
59		Bradley	'Present'



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
59		Speaker Blair	
59		Speaker	
59		Speaker Blair	
59		Speaker	
60		Speaker Blair	
60		Speaker Waldwell	'Aye'
60		Speaker Blair	
60		Speaker Telcser	'Yes'
60		Speaker Blair	66 'aye', 84 'nay', 5 'present'
60		Speaker Drew	Postponed consideration
60		Speaker Blair	
60		Speaker Babagh	
61		Speaker Blair	
61		Speaker	
61		Speaker Blair	
61		Speaker	Recess for lunch
61		Speaker Blair	House recessed until 2:00
62		Speaker Telcser)	House to order
62		Speaker)	
62		Speaker)	
62		Speaker Telcser	
62		Speaker Telcser	
62		Speaker Telcser	
62		Speaker Telcser	
62		Speaker Telcser	
62		Speaker Telcser	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
63		Ewell)	
)	
63		Speaker Telcser)	
63		Lechowicz)	
)	
63		Speaker Telcser)	
63		Clerk Selcke	Rule 21.
63		Lechowicz)	
)	
63		Speaker Telcser)	
64		Speaker Telcser	
64		Epton	
64		Speaker Telcser	
64		Ewell	
64		Speaker Telcser	
64		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 602. 2nd.
64		Speaker Telcser	
64		Clerk Selcke	Amendment #1-H.B. 602
64		Speaker Telcser	
64		Barnes	
65		Speaker Telcser	Amendment adopted. 3rd Reading.
65		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 806. 2nd. No Com. Amend.
65		Speaker Telcser	Third Reading.
65		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 768. 2nd. No Com. Amend.
65		Speaker Telcser	Floor Amendments?
65		Clerk Selcke)	Amendment #1.
)	
65		Speaker Telcser)	Am. #1-H.B. 768. adopted.
66		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 991. 2nd. No Com. Amend.
66		Speaker Telcser	Third Reading.



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
66		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1403. Amendment #1
66		Speaker Telcser	
66		Madigan	
66		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 1403-#1 adopted.
66		Clerk Selcke	Amendment #2-H.B. 1403.
66		Speaker Telcser	
66		Madigan	
66		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #2 adopted.
67		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 842.
67		Speaker Telcser	Out of record.
67		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1212. 2nd. No Com. Amend.
67		Speaker Telcser	
67		Clerk Selcke	Amendment #1-H.B. 1212
67		Speaker Telcser	
67		Tipsword	
67		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #2-adopted.
67		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1535. 2nd. No Com. Amend.
68		Speaker Telcser	Floor Amendments?
68		Clerk Selcke	
68		Giglio	
68		Speaker Telcser	
68		Walsh)	
)	
68		Giglio)	
69		Speaker Telcser	
69		Lechowicz	
69		Speaker Telcser	Out of record.
69		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1536. No Com Amend. 2nd.



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
69		Speaker Telcser	Third Reading.
69		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1628. 2nd. No Com. Amend.
69		Speaker Telcser	
69		Clerk Selcke	Amendment #1.
69		Speaker Telcser	
69		Dyer	
69		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #1-H.B. 1628 adopted. Third.
69		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 609. 2nd. Amendment #1.
70		Speaker Telcser	
70		Schneider	
70		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #1 adopted. Third.
70		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 825. 2nd. No Com. Amend.
70		Speaker Telcser	Third Reading.
70		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1367. 2nd. No Com. Amend.
70		Speaker Telcser	
70		Clerk Selcke	Amendment #1-H.B. 1367.
70		Speaker Telcser)	
)	
70		Stiehl)	
70		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 1367, adopted. Third.
71		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1442.
71		Speaker Telcser	Out of record.
71		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1447.
71		Speaker Telcser	Out of record.
71		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1638.
71		Speaker Telcser	
71		Clerk Selcke	2nd. Reading. Amendment #1.
71		Speaker Telcser	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
71		Redmond	
71		Speaker Telcser	
71		Walsh	
71		Clerk Selcke	
71		Walsh	
71		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #1-1638 adopted. 3rd.
71		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1813. 2nd. No Com. Amend.
71		Speaker Telcser	Third Reading.
72		Choate)
72		Speaker Telcser)	At ease
72		Walsh	Republican conference
72		Speaker Telcser	House in recess until 4 o'clock.
<hr/>			
72		Speaker Blair	House Bills 2nd Reading.
72		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1836.
72		Speaker Blair	Out of record.
72		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1836. 2nd. No Com. Amend.
72		Speaker Blair	Third Reading.
72		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 851. 2nd. Amendment #1.
72		Speaker Blair	
73		Kucharski	
73		Speaker Blair	Amendment #1 adopted
73		Clerk Selcke	Amendment #2-H.B. 851.
73		Kurcharski	
73		Speaker Blair	Amendment #2 adopted. Third.
73		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 981. 2nd. Amendment #1.
73		Speaker Blair	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
73		Berman	
73		Speaker Blair	Amendment adopted. Third Reading.
74		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1011. 2nd. Amendment #1.
74		Speaker Blair	
74		Schlickman	
74		Speaker Blair	Amendment adopted. Third.
74		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1017. 2nd. Amendment #1.
74		Speaker Blair	
74		Lundy	
74		Speaker Blair	Out of the record
74		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1032. 2nd. Amendment #1.
74		Speaker Blair	
75		Rayson	
75		Speaker Blair	Amendment adopted. Third.
75		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1081. 2nd. Amendment #1.
75		Speaker Blair	
75		Skinner	
75		Speaker Blair	Amendment #1. Adopted.
75		Clerk Selcke	Amendment #2-H.B. 1081.
75		Speaker Blair	
75		Skinner	
75		Speaker Blair	Amendment #2, adopted. Third.
76		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1083. 2nd. No Com. Amend.
76		Speaker Blair	Third Reading.
76		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1097. 2nd. No Com. Amend.
76		Speaker Blair	
76		Shea	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
76		Clerk Selcke)	
)	
76		Shea)	
76		Speaker Blair	
76		Shea	
76		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1095. No Com. Amend.
76		Speaker Blair	Third Reading.
76		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1095-out. H.B. 1097. 2nd. Amendment #1.
76		Speaker Blair	
77		Clabaugh	
77		Speaker Blair	Amendment adopted. Third Reading.
77		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1125. 2nd. Amendment #1.
77		Speaker Blair	
77		Simms	
77		Speaker Blair)	
)	
77		Shea)	
77		Speaker Blair	Amendment #1 adopted.
77		Clerk Selcke	Amendment #2-H.B. 1125.
77		Speaker Blair	
78		Simms	
78		Speaker Blair	H.B. adopted. Third. Amen #2
78		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1234. 2nd. No Com. Amend.
78		Speaker Blair	Third Reading.
78		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1242. 2nd. Amendment #1.
78		Speaker Blair	
78		Springer	
78		Speaker Blair	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
78		Springer)	
)	
78, 79		Shea)	
80		Speaker Blair)	
)	
80		Deuster)	
)	
80		Speaker Blair	Amendment #1 out of record. Bill
80		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1245. 2nd. Amendment #1.
80		Speaker Blair	
80		Madigan	
80		Speaker Blair	Amendment #1 adopted.
81		Clerk Selcke	Amendment #2.
81		Speaker Miller	
81		Madigan	
81		Clerk Selcke	
81		Madigan	Table Amendment #1.
81		Speaker Miler	Amendment #1 tabled.
81		Madigan	Move to adopt Amendment #2.
81		Speaker Miller	Amendment #2 adopted. Third.
81		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1246. 2nd. Amendment #1.
81		Speaker Miller	
81		Madigan	
81		Speaker Miller	Amendment #1 adopted. Third.
82		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1253. 2nd. Amendment #1.
82		Speaker Miller	
82		Kosinski	
82		Speaker Miller	Amendment #1 adopted. Third.
82		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1268. 2nd. No Com. Amend.
82		Speaker Miller	Third Reading.



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
82		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1293. 2nd. No Com. Amend.
82		Speaker Miller	
82		Shea	
83		Speaker Miller	
83		Mann	
83		Speaker Miller)	H.B. 1293.
)	
83		Mann)	
84		Shea	
84		Speaker Miller)	
)	
84		Shea)	
85		Speaker Miller)	
)	
85		Mann)	
85		Murphy)	
)	
85, 86		Speaker Miller)	Third Reading.
86		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1332. 2nd. Amendment #1.
86		Speaker Miller	
86		Thompson	
86		Speaker Miller	
86		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1353. 2nd. No Com. Amend.
87		Speaker Miller	
87		Clerk Selcke	Amendment #1-H.B. 1353.
87		Speaker Miller	
87		Matijevich	
87		Speaker Miller	Amendment #1 adopted.
87		Clerk Selcke	Amendment #2-H.B. 1353.
87		Speaker Miller	
87		McClain	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
87		Speaker Miller	Amendment #2 adopted. Third.
87		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1357.
87		Speaker Miller	
87		Londrigan	
88		Speaker Miller	
88		Londrigan	
88		Speaker Miller)	
88		Walsh)	
88		Shea)	
88		Speaker Miller)	
89		Speaker Blair	
89		Londrigan	
89		Speaker Blair	
89		Murphy	
89		Speaker Blair)	
89		Londrigan)	
89		Walsh	
89		Speaker Blair	
89		Shea	
90		Speaker Blair)	
90		Pappas)	
90		Speaker Blair	
91		Boyle	
91		Speaker Blair	
91		Walsh	
91		Speaker Blair	
91		Londrigan	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
92		Speaker Blair	
92		Choate	
92		Speaker Blair	H.B. 1357 passed.
93		Londrigan	
93		Speaker Blair	Third Reading.
93		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 661.
93		Speaker Blair	
93		Shea	
93		Speaker Blair	
93		Telcser	
93		Speaker Blair	
93		Clerk Selcke	
93		Speaker Blair	
93		Londrigan	
93		Speaker Blair	
94		Shea	
94		Speaker Blair	
94		Shea)	
)	
94, 95		Miller)	
95		Cunningham)	Parliamentary Inquiry.
)	
95		Speaker Miller)	
95		Londrigan)	
)	
95		Speaker Miller)	
96		Telcser	
96		Speaker Miller)	
)	
96		Londrigan)	
)	
96		Clerk Selcke	Poll absentees.



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
96		Speaker Miller	Failed. Third Reading.
97		Matijeovich	
97		Speaker Miller	
97		Walsh)	
97)	
97		Matijeovich)	
97		Speaker Miller	H.B. 661. Third Reading.
97		Speaker Miller	
97		Hoffman	
98		Speaker Miller)	
)	
98, 99, 100		Berman)	
)	
101		Speaker Miller	
101		Brinkmeier	
102		Speaker Miller	
102		Chapman	
103		Speaker Miller	
103		Griesheimer	
104		Speaker Miller	
104		Pope	
104		Speaker Miller	
105		Cunningham	
105		Speaker Miller	
105		Boyle)	
)	
105, 106		Hoffman)	
106		Speaker Miller	
106		Arnell	
106		Speaker Miller)	
)	
106		Hoffman)	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
107		Speaker Miller	
107		Schneider.	
108		Speaker Miller	
108		Brinkmeier	
109		Speaker Miller	
109		Stone	
110		Speaker Miller	
110		Terzich	
111		Speaker Miller	
111		Boyle	
112		Speaker Miller	H.B. 661 passed
112		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 665
112		Speaker Miller	
112		Clerk Selcke	Third Reading of the Bill.
112		Speaker Miller	
112		Porter	
113		Speaker Miller	H.B. 665 passed.
113		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 672. Third.
113		Speaker Miller	
113		Schraeder	
114		Speaker Miller	
114		Skinner)	
)	
114		Schraeder)	
114		Speaker Miller	
114		Skinner	
115		Speaker Miller)	
)	
115		Jaffe)	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
115		Schraeder)	
115		Jaffe)	
115		Speaker Miller	
115		Jaffe	
116		Speaker Miller	
116		Schraeder	
117		Speaker Miller	
117		Skinner	
117		Speaker Miller	H.B. 672
117		Skinner	
118		Speaker Miller	672 lost
118		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 682. Third Reading.
118		Speaker Miller	Announcement
118		Lundy	
119		Speaker Miller	
119		Shea	
119		Lundy	
119		Shea	
119		Speaker Miller	
119		Lundy	
120		Speaker Miller)	
120		Maragos)	
120		Lundy	
120		Speaker Miller	
120		Walters	
120		Lundy	
120		Walters	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
120		Speaker Miller	
120		Huskey	
121		Speaker Miller	
121		Geo-Karis	
121		Speaker Miller)	
)	
121		Lundy)	
122		Speaker Miller	
122		Shea	
122		Speaker Miller)	
)	
122		Lundy)	Postponed consideration
122		Speaker Miller	Placed on postponed consideration
122		Walsh	
123		Shea	
123		Speaker Miller	
123		Walsh	
123		Shea	
123		Speaker Miller	
123		Maragos	
123		Speaker Miller)	
)	
123, 124		Neff)	
124		Speaker Miller)	
)	
124		Maragos)	
124		Shea	
125		Speaker Miller)	
)	
125		Garmisa)	
125		Neff	
125		Speaker Miller	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
125		Schlickman	
126		Speaker Miller)	
)	
126		Garmisa)	
)	
126		Walsh)	
)	
126		Speaker Miller)	
)	
126		Garmisa)	
)	
127		Speaker Miller)	
)	
127		Walsh)	
)	
127		Garmisa	
127		Speaker Miller)	
)	
127, 128		Maragos)	
)	
128		Walsh	
128		Speaker Miller	
128		Neff	
128		Speaker Miller)	Indefinite suspension.
)	
128, 129		Schlickman)	
)	
129		Shea	
129		Speaker Miller	
129		Schlickman)	
)	
129		Shea)	
)	
129		Speaker Miller	
130		Deuster)	
)	
130		Speaker Miller)	
130		Walsh	
130		Speaker Miller	
130		Houlihan	
130		Speaker Miller	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
130		Speaker Miller	
130		Schlickman	
130		Speaker Miller	
131		Maragos	
131		Speaker Miller	
131		Neff	
131		Speaker Miller)	
)	
131, 132		Deuster)	
132		Walsh	
132		Speaker Miller	
132		Shea	
132		Speaker Miller	
132		Deuster	
132		Speaker Miller	
133		Walsh	Death Resolution
133		Speaker Miller	
133		Washburn	Announcement
133		Speaker Miller	
133		Lechowicz	
133		Speaker Miller	
133		Clerk Selcke	House Resolution 323
134		Speaker Miller	
134		Walsh	
134		Speaker Miller	House adjourned.

