

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTY-SECOND LEGISLATIVE DAY

MAY 24, 1973

9:30 O'CLOCK A.M.

THE HONORABLE W. ROBERT BLAIR, SPEAKER

IN THE CHAIR



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

- Representative Peter C. Granata - illness;
- Representative C. L. McCormick - illness in family;
- Representative Langdon Patrick - death in family;
- Representative Bernard B. Wolfe - illness.



Speaker Blair: "I think you have to hit something in there. So if you think you have to hit something in there, he pulls that up and hits the button inside there back in the right. No? That's it. Yeah, we be . . . we can be at ease for about 15 minutes. The Appropriations's Committee is just finishing up, they ask for about 15 more minutes. So I think we'll start up about . . . ah . . . 9:30."

Telcser: "Okay, the House will come to order. Invocation by Doctor Johnson."

Doctor Johnson: ". . . We pray. Dear Father in Heaven, we thank you for your gracious and strong hands which has sustained us in the past. We thank you especially for the blessings of health, physical, mental and emotional which enable us to be about the appointed task before us and which enables us to do those tasks well. As the hours lengthen, the Calendar expands, and we grow weary of Bills and Committees and debates. We ask that you would keep us from every temptation which would in any way minimize our effectiveness as able Representatives. To that end, grant us in this Session also that calmness of spirit, charity of judgment, control of emotion and consideration in all of our dealings with one another which we would want to experience in all our colleagues. Hear us, Father, as we commend ourselves in this moment to your keeping. We are bold to ask this because you invite us to seek your hearing. Amen."

Telcser: "Roll Call for attendance."

Fredric Selcke: "We'll get him."

Telcser: "Record Representative Schneider as being here . . . oh, Representative Schneider, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Schneider: "Just a point of information on the . . . ah . . . whether or not your strained your arm yesterday when you hit the gavel?"

Telcser: "Oh, God."

Schneider: "How's your arm today, Art', is there a . . ."

Fredric Selcke: "Ah . . . Messages from the Senate."

Telcser: "Messages from the Senate."

Fredric Selcke: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandez, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of the Bill



of the following title, House Bill 1320, passed by the Senate May 23rd, 1973. Edward E. Fernandez, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles in the passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House, Senate Bills 690, 711, 724, 729, 930, passed the Senate May 23rd, 1973. Ah . . . Senate Bill 653, 654, 756, 757, passed the Senate May 23rd, 1973. Senate Bill 522, 534, 535, 554, 555, 556, 561, 563, 564, 7 . . . 579, 580, 589, 593, 594, 615, 622, 626, 641, 643, 644, 645, 660, 661, 662, 665, 667, 668, 678, 688, 689, 692, 700 and 715, passed the Senate May 23rd, 1973. Edward E. Fernandez, Secretary. Committee Reports."

Telcser: "Committee Reports."

Fredric Selcke: "Mr. Washburn from Appropriation's to which House Bill 556, 604, 771, 807, 1152, 1325, 1937 were referred . . . reported the same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation the Amendments be adopted and the Bills as amended do pass. Mr. Washburn from Appropriation's to which House Bills 1056, 1570 and 1748 were referred. Reported the same back with the recommendation the Bills do pass. Mr. Washburn from Appropriation's to which Senate Bills 341 and 349 were referred. Reported the same back with the recommendation the Bills do pass. Mr. Randolph from Revenue to which House Bill 1269 was referred. Reported the same back with the recommendation the Bill do pass. Mr. Randolph from Revenue to which House Bills 1350, 1729 were referred. Reported the same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation the Amendments be adopted and the Bills as amended do pass. Ah . . . Introduction."

Telcser: "Introduction to First Reading."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 1954, Anderson, direct the Department of Transportation to make a flood control study in Plum River in Carroll County. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1955, Borchers, amends the State Finance Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1956, Philip, an Act making the efficiency appropriation to the Comptroller for \$400,000. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1957, Borchers, appropriates \$1 . . . \$100 to William Eugene And . . . Andrews. First Reading of the Bill. Agreed Resolutions."



Telcser: "Agreed Resolutions."

Fredric Selcke: "Ah . . . House Resolution 356, Shea, et al. House Resolution . . . what was that? . . . 3, excuse me, 336. House Resolution 337, Houlihan. House Resolution 338, Hirschfeld. House Resolution 339, Gene Hoffman. House Resolution 340, R. L. Thompson. House Resolution 342, Maragos, et al. House Resolution 344, J. J. Wolf. House Resolution 345, Terzich, et al. House Resolution 346, Tipsword, et al. House Resolution 347, Leinenweber, et al. House Resolution 348, Soderstrum. House Resolution 349, Tuerk. House Joint Resolution 50, Porter, et al. House Joint Resolution 51, Porter, et al."

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

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, these are the . . . ah . . . Agreed Resolutions and the . . . ah . . . first one . . . ah . . . congratulates our colleague, Sparky Garmisa, on . . . ah . . . his 19th birthday and he is from the 60th District. House Resolution 337 by . . . ah . . . Representative Jim Houlihan . . . ah . . . recommends support for the rally for animals on May 23rd to remind people of their obligations to our animal friends. House Resolution 338 . . . ah . . . congratulates Miss Jean Waters of Tuscola in having been selected from among hundreds of entrants from the All American Cheerleading Squad; and House Resolution 339 commends Mr. . . . Mr. B. B. Bergess of Decatur who were . . . who will retire as Executive Director of the Illinois Association of School Boards; and House Resolution 340 congratulates . . . ah . . . Wendall L. Garrison in outstanding supervisory . . . ah . . . be awarded the Outstanding Supervisory Employee Award; and House Resolution 342 by Representative Maragos congratulates the Pierre Austin De Mets . . . ah . . . who was acclaimed Senior Citizen of the Year of 1973 by the Chicago Park District; and House Resolution 344 . . . ah . . . directs that we support the gains and aspirations of the people of the captive nations of which there are many, many; and House Resolution 345 by Representative Terzich . . . ah . . . commends and congratulates all the persons who contribute to the organized recreation effort . . . effort of the Clear Ridge Baseball for Boys Program; and House Resolution



346 congratulates . . . ah . . . the City of Edinburg which celebrates the centennial of its incorporation in 1873; and House Resolution 347 by Representative Leinenweber congratulates Mr. Harold J. Rasmussen, who will retire as Fire Chief of the Fire Department of the City of Joliet; and House Resolution 348 by Representative Soderstrum congratulates the Village of Benson on . . . ah . . . attaining its 100th year and its celebration is July 6 to 8 of 1973; and House Resolution 349 congratulates Doctor A. G. Haussler, Executive Secretary of Bradley University; and House Joint Resolution 50 . . . ah . . . proclaims that June 1st, 1973 is Amanda Jones Day in Illinois, and that we extend our warm congratulations on being found Miss U.S.A.; and again House Joint Resolution . . . ah . . . 51 congratulates Lloyd S. Michael of Evanston . . . ah . . . who has served as a first and only Chairman of the Illinois State Scholarship Commission since its creation by the General Assembly in June 1957; and, Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolution."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion, the Gentleman moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the Resolutions are adopted. All right, now, we'll go to General Resolutions."

Fredric Selcke: "House Resolution 321, Lundy. House Resolution 325, Studelin. House Resolution 326, Douglas. House Resolution 343, Douglas."

Telcser: "On the Speaker's table. Now, we'll take a couple of Death Resolutions."

Fredric Selcke: "Ah . . . House Resolution 324, Kenney Miller, in respect to the memory of Fay L. Dancey; House Resolution 341, Hudson, et al, . . . ah . . . in respect to the memory of H. Andy Pasquinelli."

Telcser: "Ah . . . The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh, has made the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the Resolutions are adopted."

Fredric Selcke: "Where's 1050, House Bill 1050? Is that on the Calendar?"

Telcser: "House Bills, Second Reading."

Fredric Selcke: "It's on Third Reading, that Bill you're looking for."



All right, let's go, Chockey. House Bill 684, Boyle, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Local Governmental Law Enforcement Officers Training Board. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 684, Section 1, line 21, by deleting '2100' and so forth. Boyle . . . Boyle."

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

Boyle: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment just . . . doesn't change the . . . ah . . . total of the Bill and I'd move the adoption."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman's offered to move the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 684. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Fredric Selcke: "Amendment #2, Boyle. amends House Bill 684 . . ."

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

Boyle: "Ah . . . Amendment #2 . . . ah . . . is an Amendment . . . does change the figures and this is an Amendment to . . . ah . . . add \$275,000 for the purpose of . . . ah . . . funding . . . ah . . . for the purpose of funding . . . ah . . . Public Act 77 through 833, which we passed in the last Session, and . . . ah . . . which was overlooked and was not funded and . . . ah . . . Amendment #2 funds this registration. I move its adoption."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman's offered to move the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 684. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'; the Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Fredric Selcke: "Amendment #3, Boyle, amends House Bill 684 . . ."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from Macoupoin, Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "Amendment #3 adds \$100,000 for the support of the local downstate police training and . . . ah . . . I move its adoption."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman's offered to move the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 684. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Fredric Selcke: "Ah . . . House Bill . . . did he say Third Reading,



Arthur?"

Telcser: "Third Reading."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 877, Mann, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedures of 1963. Ah . . . Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments. Any from the floor?"

Telcser: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Fredric Selcke: "Amendment #1, Mann, . . ."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from . . ."

Fredric Selcke: ". . . amends House Bill 877 on page 1 and so forth."

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

Mann: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, this amends the Bill in accordance . . . ah . . . with an understanding that was reached in the Judiciary Committee."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman's offered to move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 877. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading. House Bill 1206."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 1206, . . . ah . . . wait 'til I find it . . . ah . . . Choate, okay, a Bill for an Act to amend the Workman's Compensation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment . . . ah . . . #1 was adopted, is that right, Tobey? Ah . . . Are there any further Amendments? Okay."

Telcser: "Third Reading. House Bill 1207. One second, please."

Fredric Selcke: ". . . Chockey, when you got them, bring them up right away. Amendment #2, Barry, amends House Bill 1206, page 4, by deleting lines 9 through 21 and so forth."

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

Barry: "They're just technical Amendments putting the Bill in shape for final passage . . . ah . . . as we approach negotiation on Workman's Compensation."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman offered to move the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 1206. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Fredric Selcke: "No."





Telcser: "Third Reading. House Bill 1207."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 1207, Choate, a Bill for an Act to amend the Workman's Occupational Disease Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Ah . . . Amendment #1 was previously offered and adopted. Amendment #2, Barry, amends House Bill 1207 . . ."

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

Barry: "The same as 1206, technical Amendment, puts the Bill in shape for final passage. I move the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 1207."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman's offered to move the adoption of Amendment 2 to House Bill 1207. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 1658, Barry, is that right, a Bill for an Act to amend the Workman's Compensation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments. Any from the floor?"

Telcser: "Any Amendments from the floor? Third Reading."

Fredric Selcke: ". . . well, yeah, they've both been read at a second time before, held on Second and we adopted Amendment 2 on both . . . in the Third . . . House Bill 1659, Barry, a Bill . . . a Bill for an Act to amend the Workman's Occupational Disease Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Fredric Selcke: "878. Kozubowski? 878? Huh?"

Telcser: "Take 878 out of the Record."

Fredric Selcke: "878 out of the Record. 1442. Ah . . . House Bill 1442, Craig, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Telcser: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Fredric Selcke: "Selcke needs . . . Amendment #1 amends House Bill 1442 on page 21 and so forth. Craig."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Craig."

Craig: "I move for the adoption of Amendment #1 to change the date to . . . the effective date."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman's offered to move the



adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1442. All in favor of the adoption signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 1477, . . . ah . . . J. M. Houlihan, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Is he here? Yeah, One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 1477, page 1, by deleting lines 1 and 2 and so forth. J. M. Houlihan."

Telcser: "Ah . . . The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. M. Houlihan. Is the Gentleman on the floor? Representative Houlihan on the floor? We might as well take it out of the Record."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 1017, Lundy, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 1017 on page 1, lines 1 and 5, and so forth. Lundy."

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

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there are three Amendments in all to this Bill . . . ah . . . Amendment #3 incorporates Amendments #1 and 2 and in addition makes some additional changes . . . ah . . . requested by the insurance industry . . . ah . . . and is consistent with the first two Amendments. Therefore, I would . . . ah . . . move the adoption of Amendment #1 and then move to table it when we get on to . . . Amendment #3."

Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #1 to House Bill 1017. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion to table signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the Amendment's tabled. Are there further Amendments?"

Fredric Selcke: "Amendment #2, Lundy, amends House Bill 1017 . . ."

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

Lundy: "I would also move to table this Amendment."

Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #2 to House Bill 1017. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by . . . the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "As I understood this, these were Committee Amendments that were being tabled?"



Fredric Selcke: "Amendment #1 was a Committee Amendment."

Shea: "All right, could you explain please what the purpose of tabling the Committee Amendment was?"

Fredric Selcke: "Lundy, recognize . . ."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lundy, do you wish to respond, Sir?"

Lundy: "I'd be glad to explain it as I explained it earlier. Amendment #1, which is a Committee Amendment, and Amendment #2, which is not, . . . ah . . . are both included in Amendment #3, which was drafted by . . . ah . . . representatives of the insurance industry to include certain additional changes which are consistent with the Committee Amendment . . . ah . . . and that's why I'd like to just adopt Amendment #3, which contains all of the desired changes in the Bill."

Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #2 to House Bill 1017. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'; the Amendment is tabled. Are there further Amendments?"

Fredric Selcke: "Amendment #3, Lundy, amends House Bill 1017, page 1, by deleting line 1 and so forth."

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

Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this . . . ah . . . Amendment #3 does incorporate . . . they're both the Amendments adopted by the Committee which were my suggestions originally as well as . . . ah . . . the one additional change in . . . which was previously included in Amendment #2 and also . . . ah . . . now is in . . . puts the Bill in a form which is acceptable as I understand it to all of the representatives of the insurance industry; and I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman has moved the . . . offered to move the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 1017. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the Amendment's is adopted. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 1199, Molloy, a Bill for an Act to amend the



Credit Union Act. Second Reading of the Bill. One . . . One  
Committee Amendment amends House Bill 1199 on page 8, lines . . ."

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

Molloy: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,  
the Amendment merely allows credit unions of \$50,000 or more to have  
a C.P.A. audit in lieu of the state examination."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman has offered to move the  
adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1199. All in favor signify  
by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the Amendment's adopted. Further  
Amendments? Third Reading."

Fredric Selcke: "Ah . . . House Bill 1270, Katz, is Katz here? Ah . . .  
A Bill for an Act in relation to bicycle routes. Second Reading of  
the Bill."

Telcser: "Representative Katz, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Katz: "Ah . . . The Amendment still isn't here from the Reference Bureau,  
so continue to hold 1270."

Telcser: "Okay, take that out of the Record."

Fredric Selcke: "1242. House Bill 1242, Springer, is Doc' here? Doc'  
here? Huh? Stand at ease? Hey, what's that . . . okay . . . you  
want to go, let's go."

Telcser: "House Bills, Third Reading."

Fredric Selcke: "723, where is he? Murphy."

Telcser: "Well, . . . ah . . . hang on one second please . . . ah . . .  
let's go back to House Bills, Second Reading and try and put some  
more of those up . . . ah . . . Mr. Speaker, just asked me to do  
that."

Fredric Selcke: "1495. House Bill 1495, Mann, a Bill for an Act to amend  
Sections 3 and 4 of an Act authorizing school boards and so forth.  
Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House  
Bill 1495, page 1, line 1 and line 9 by deleting 3 and so forth."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mann. Is Representative  
Mann on the floor?"

Fredric Selcke: "It's a Committee Amendment."

Telcser: "Does someone wish to offer the Amendment from the Committee or  
should we take it out of the Record . . . is that his? Let's take it



out of the . . . take it out of the Record. Representative Shea, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Shea: "We went to Third Reading, did we come back?"

Telcser: "Yeah, we're back on Second . . . the Speaker asked me to go back to Second and I . . ."

Shea: "All right, now, we're going to stay on Second for a little while?"

Telcser: "Yes, Sir."

Shea: "All right."

Fredric Selcke: "Okay, give me 1652 . . ."



May 24, 1973. I d.

12.

F. B. Selcke: "AH.. House Bill 1652. This bill was read a second time yesterday, held on the order of Second Reading."

A. Telcser: "Are there further amendments from the floor? Third Reading. Well, let's go back on Second Reading, 1652. Okay. Now let me ask the parliamentarian if this is the time to consider it. Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

Choate: "Mr. Speaker, when this House was rapidly adjourned last evening you were in the position of verifying a roll call that was quite meaningful to a friend of mine and a colleague to everybody in this House because of the fact that it affect the full intent in import of a piece of legislation which he had offered which an amendment had been adopted on.. which amendment there was a motion made to reconsider the vote by which that amendment was adopted and on that motion.. on that motion, the House was in the process of verifying the roll call, Mr. Speaker, as I said. And the vote was not announced by you as the acting Speaker at that time. And I'm saying to you, Mr. Speaker, that this gentleman is entitled.. entitled to have action taken on that amendment which you rapidly stopped last evening."

A. Telcser: "All right. Now if the gentleman wishes to consider his motion now, we will recognize him for that purpose. And the gentleman from Fayette, Representative Brummet. "



Brummet: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, having voted on the prevailing side by which Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1652 was adopted, I now move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 1 was adopted."

A. Telcser: "Having voted on the prevailing side by which Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1652 was adopted, the Gentleman from Fayette, Representative Brummett, moves that that voted be reconsidered. Now the gentleman from Stevenson, Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Mr. Speaker? Is it my understanding of the Rules that a motion to reconsider can only be made on the same day that the motion was passed?"

A. Telcser: "Under the Rules, Representative Rigney, ah.. an oral motion like that would be.. ah.. that would be true with an oral motion. However, the gentleman has filed a written motion in accordance with the Rules ah.. on the following legislative day which would be today ah.. so that motion is proper and can be considered. Or he filed it yesterday but it's within one legislative day. Okay. Now is there any discussion relative to the gentleman's motion to reconsider which is a debatable motion? Okay. Hearing none, all those in favor of the gentleman's motion signify.. signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Stevens.. ah.. from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

W. D. Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we've debated this matter



at some length yesterday if you'll recall. And I'd just like to remind those people who feel that the word 'welfare' really belongs in here. And that a court should consider the welfare of children ah.. as well as other things in deciding whether or not to enjoin a strike. So ah.. I'd like to urge everyone to vote 'no' and I'd like to suggest to them that unless they do vote 'no' and there are more no's up there than 'yeses' then ah.. those of us who feel that welfare belongs in here will lose the day."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Stevenson, Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Well, apparently this amendment like the cat has nine lives and we're back on the same subject today that we're on yesterday and the one that we finished yesterday afternoon in the blaze of glory.. I suppose there are those who will misinterpret my intentions on this. Gentlemen, I intend to vote for a ah.. teacher bargaining law. I had that position during my campaign. I don't intend to back down on that position. I did not introduce this one-word amendment with the thought of gutting any bill. I just want to state as I did yesterday. I have a sincere belief that the court should have some rather broad, discretionary powers ah.. to look after the welfare of children ah.. in the event of a prolonged strike. I do not think this is an unreasonable position at all. I bring it forth in good conscience."





I assure you that on the day before this vote, I met with the representative of the Illinois Educational Association, one of the lobbyist who assured me that he was not disturbed by this amendment. I don't know why this has caused all the problem that it has apparently caused on the other side of the aisle. My motives were pure and I suggest that ah.. we settle this question once and for all and I solicit your 'no' vote."

A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Kane, Representative Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to say this.. that I really could care less about the IEA and their stand on this particular amendment. I'd like to point out to you because of the experience I've had in the field of negotiating. I readily realize that the word 'welfare' can be misinterpreted to mean many, many things. And this is what scares me. There are injunctive procedures in my bill. And consequently, the word welfare could be misconstrued to mean many things and I believe the word itself in there would cause a lot of problems in negotiating throughout the State of Illinois. In fact, cause more problems than the bill would do good in the long run. So consequently, I would ask you and request of you to vote 'aye' on this motion. Thank you."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Logan, Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am one of those who has been called by IEA one of the four



most anti-teacher members of this legislature. And ladies and gentlemen, I don't appreciate being called anti-teacher because this is a misnomer being a member of the profession myself, I don't hardly think that I am opposed to my own profession. However, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I plead guilty to being more pro-student than I am pro-teacher. I, like Representative Rigney, am in favor of collective bargaining for teachers. However, I do have full trust in the courts that they in their wisdom and with the sense of fairness and the sense of justice that courts enjoy in this country, that these courts are going to balance the overweening public interest. That is, the interest of the student in making its decision whether to enjoin or not to enjoin. When we do not consider the welfare of students.. when we take this out of the bill we very severely restrict the power of the courts to make an interpretive decision in its decision to enjoin or not to enjoin. I would strongly support and ask others to support a 'no' vote in order that the word 'welfare' may stay in this bill and thereby make this a good bill and one that I can vote for."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, ah.. somewhat in explaining my vote I'm very curious ah.. what time do you plan on adjourning today? It is a nice day outside and I was wondering if a motion to adjourn is in order right now. And a parliamentary



inquiry. Mr. Speaker, I asked for a parliamentary inquiry."

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

Hanahan: "That if we are successful with more green lights than red lights, are we intending on adjourning today so I could set up a golf date this afternoon?"

A. Telcser: "Can I go with you? Okay then. No, we're not. Unless a member puts a motion."

Hanahan: "All right. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a very serious issue, the word 'welfare' is an all meaning word. It was inadvertently accepted and put on by this House without the deliberative thinking that should have been taken by actions of this House. There were a very small amount of votes cast on the issue. The word 'welfare' could be construed into so many different meanings. That if.. the sponsor of the amendment is really true in concerning himself that if a strike affects the welfare of the children or affects the welfare of the people in the sense that he has described, I can assure him that there are courts in this State that will immediately enjoin if the true sense of the word 'welfare' the courts would enjoin any kind of concerted effort in affecting the true safety and welfare of people were to be affected. They have enough power, they have enough common law to effect.. effectively stop and curtail a strike that would take



place if it truly affected the word of the welfare of the people. But this word put into the bill affects the bill so adversely that it is a labor issue, it is an issue concerning working people.. the teachers of Illinois and I suggest this motion to reconsider be it that so we can get the one word out of the bill and then hopefully adopt the bill and pass it over to the Senate."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of this distinguished House. I think as all the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle know, ah.. I'm not a part of the leadership. And ah.. one of the things that is constantly perplexing ah.. of course to me and others who are not part of the leadership or and I think to the citizens general of this great State ah.. that they always hate to see us polarized into political positions. I have my dictionary in front of me. I looked up the word 'welfare'. It doesn't indicate that the word 'welfare' is a republican word or a democratic word. I think it's a word that everybody understands. I don't think either Steven A. Douglas or Abraham Lincoln coined it. It's a neutral word. Ah.. I would hope that on this subject ah.. although I'm conscious of that fact that ah.. the leadership and membership seem to be polarized. Some of those members might search their conscience and say let's look at this thing from the point



of view of what it really deals with.. the welfare of little children. The ah.. right of little boys and girls in elementary school to get an education. Let's try to look at it that way. I think when we go back to our districts whether they be the democratic area of Chicago or republican area downstate, we've got to talk to the people and say what we've got against welfare. I don't know what we can say that we've got against welfare. I'm hopeful that in this subject as well as mass transit and many others, we'll look at bills on their merits. We'll look at words as what they mean and not what ah.. a word committeemen or of the Democratic Party or the Republican Party or the leadership of this House might think the political implications are. I'm just hopeful that on this issue and many others ah.. and I hope I can reflect that in my own work and vote too, that we'll look at things on their merits and not on the basis of whether some Democratic or Republican Caucus suggest that everybody stand firm on something. I think that the people of Illinois are sick and tired of us doing that. And let's try to pull back those red lights and pull back those green lights and think about this. And then snap them back on as to what you think this means into the welfare of little children. And I urge you not to vote one way or another but to analyze this and vote whatever way your conscience directs you and not the political party."



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

Barry: "To explain my vote, Mr. Speaker, and at an appropriate time I'll be asking recognition for verification of one or another roll call or perhaps asking for recognition to make a motion to adjourn, depending upon the color of the board, but briefly to explain my vote - If you fellows and gals who are voting red think for one minute that a judge is not going to interpret the word 'health and safety' as welfare whenever they damn well choose, you've got another think coming, so I think it's much to do about nothing. Let's put this Bill into the shape the sponsor wants it. I personally think it's something we've needed for a long time. It's in good shape. It will not be in good shape if it's not in the form that the Sponsor wants it. So let's give him his Bill, let's vote it up or down on Third Reading and just remember the Courts do pretty well as they please these days, so this one word isn't that important."

A. Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. Representative LaFleur, for..... Representative LaFleur wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. Representative Hirschfeld, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

A. Telcser: "How's the gentleman recorded?"

F. B. Selcke: "The gentleman.... who?"

A. Telcser: "The gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Hirschfeld: "Vote me 'no'."

A. Telcser: "Record the gentleman as voting 'no'. Representa-



tive Peters, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Peters: "How am I recorded?"

A. Telcser: "How is the gentleman recorded?"

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

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

McAvoy: "How am I recorded?"

A. Telcser: "How's the gentleman recorded?"

F. B. Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

McAvoy: "No."

A. Telcser: "Record the gentleman as voting 'no'." Representative Schneider, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Schneider: "I did not hear how Representative LaFleur was originally voting."

A. Telcser: "He was originally not voting."

Schneider: "Not voting for it?"

A. Telcser: "And then we wanted to vote 'no'. Anyone else? Presently the roll call is 86, 86. Representative Londrigan, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Londrigan: "There's something the matter with my switch. I think maybe you ought to check and make sure I'm 'aye' on there. I can't get if off."

A. Telcser: "O'kay, how's the gentleman recorded?"

F. B. Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

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



Tipsword: "I wanted to check how I was voted. I was called off the floor."

A. Telcser: "How's the gentleman recorded?"

F. B. Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

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

Choate: "Ah... it is understood, Mr. Speaker, before final action, as far as the total vote is concerned, that the Sponsor of the Bill will be given the opportunity to ask for a verification if he desires, is it not?"

A. Telcser: "Yes, Sir."

Choate: "All right."

A. Telcser: "O'okay, any other ah... questions on the roll call? All right, the Sponsor of the Bill has requested a verification of the roll call. Does he wish the absentees polled first? O'okay, the Clerk will poll the absentees. Will the Members please be in their seats while the absentees are polled."

F. B. Selcke: "Carter. Granata. McCormick. B. B. Wolfe."

A. Telcser: "O'okay, ah... Now gentleman from Kane, Representative Hill, ah... has requested a verification of the roll call."

Hill: "Verification of the negative roll call. Yes."

A. Telcser: "We'll do the affirmative first, then the negative. We'll do the affirmative first. Will the Members please be in their seats, while the Clerk reads the names of the affirmative roll call."





F. B. Selcke: "Alsup. Arrigo. Barnes. Barry. Beatty. Beaupre. Berman. Boyle. Bradley. Brandt. Brinkmeier. Brummet. Caldwell. Calvo. Capparelli. Chapman. Choate. Craig. Davis. DiPrima. Douglas. Ewell. Farley. Fary. Fennessey. Flinn. Garmisa. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Hanahan. Hart. Hill. Jimmy Holloway. D. Houlihan. J. Houlihan. Jacobs. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Katz. Keller. Kelly. Kennedy. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Krause. Laurino. Lechowicz. Lemke. Leon. Londrigan. Lundy. Madigan. Mann. Maragos. Martin. Matijevich. McClain. McGah. McGrew. McLendon. McPartlin. Merlo. Mugalian. Nardulli. Patrick. Pierce. Rayson. Redmond. Sangmeister. Schisler. Schneider. Schraeder. Sharp. Shea. Ike Sims. Stedelin. Stone. Taylor. Terzich. Thompson. Tipsword. VonBoeckman. Washington. Williams. Yourell."

A. Telcser: "All right, are there questions of the affirmative roll call? The gentleman from Stephenson, Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Representative Boyle."

A. Telcser: "He's in his seat."

Rigney: "Bradley."

A. Telcser: "Representative Bradley on the floor? How's the gentleman recorded?"

F. B. Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

A. Telcser: "Check him off of the roll call."

F. B. Selcke: "Calvo."

A. Telcser: "Is Representative Calvo on the Floor? How's the



gentleman recorded?"

F. B. Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

A. Telcser: "Take him off of the roll call."

Rigney: "Brummet."

A. Telcser: "He's on the floor."

Rigney: "Brinkmeier."

A. Telcser: "Is Representative Brinkmeier on the Floor? Representative Brinkmeier on the Floor? How's the gentleman recorded?"

F. B. Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

A. Telcser: "Take him off of the roll call."

Rigney: "Giorgi."

A. Telcser: "He's sitting in his seat."

Rigney: "Emil Jones."

A. Telcser: "What was the last one, Representative?"

Rigney: "Emil Jones."

A. Telcser: "He's down in the center aisle."

Rigney: "Keller."

A. Telcser: "He's standing back of the Chamber."

Rigney: "Krause."

A. Telcser: "Representative Krause is not on the floor. We can take him off the roll call. However, he's on his way over from the cafeteria. Take him off for now so we can keep the Record straight."

Rigney: "Lechowicz."

A. Telcser: "Representative Lechowicz on the Floor? How's the gentleman recorded?"



F. B. Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

A. Telcser: "Take him off of the roll call."

Rigney: "Leon."

A. Telcser: "Ah.... Representative Leon is on the Floor.

Representative Brinkmeier has returned."

Rigney: "McPartlin."

A. Telcser: "He's in his seat."

Rigney: "Patrick."

F. B. Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Rigney: "Sangmeister."

A. Telcser: "He's standing by his seat."

Rigney: "Sharp."

A. Telcser: "He's in his seat."

Rigney: "Taylor."

A. Telcser: "He's sitting in his seat."

Rigney: "Garmisa."

A. Telcser: "He's in his seat."

Rigney: "VonBoeckman."

A. Telcser: "He's standing by his seat."

Rigney: "Carter."

A. Telcser: "I don't think he's voting. How's the gentleman recorded?"

F. B. Selcke: "Carter?"

A. Telcser: "Yeow."

F. B. Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Rigney: "Peggy Martin."



A. Telcser: "Representative Martin on the Floor? She's standing right up here." Now, Representative Calvo and Krause have returned to the scene. Any further questions?"

Rigney: "We're finished."

A. Telcser: "O'kay. O'kay, now before we verify the negative roll call, you are aware the Clerk has 83 'ayes'. All right, Representative Hanahan, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Hanahan: "According to my count, there's only Representative Bradley missing. Who else do you have?"

A. Telcser: "Representative Patrick. Ah...."

Hanahan: "I thought Patrick didn't vote."

F. B. Selcke: "Tommy, on the roll call, somebody helped Patrick, and he's not here and the Minority Leader came up and asked to take him off, but the machine punches him as here, so I take him off. Being taken off are Bradley, Lechowicz and Patrick."

Hanahan: "Lechowicz is here."

A. Telcser: "He just walked back in on the floor, so put Representative Lechowicz back on the roll call."

Hanahan: "That makes 84, Mr. Speaker?"

A. Telcser: "Makes 84 'ayes', 86 'nays'. Now will the Members please be in their seats. Representative Hirschfeld, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Hirschfeld: "Point of inquiry, Mr. Speaker. I'm wondering whether the Clerk had anything to do with the recent announcement that Representative Hanahan was retiring from



the General Assembly."

F. B. Selcke: "I'd like to trade jobs with him."

A. Telcser: "O'kay, will the Members please be in their seats, while the Clerk reads the negative roll call."

F. B. Selcke: "Anderson. Arnell. Bluthardt. Borchers. Campbell. Capuzi. Catania. Clabaugh. Collins. Cox. Cunningham. Day."

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

Choate: "It would probably, Mr. Speaker, make it much easier because I can see some of the Members sitting in their seats when they're called, if they would raise their hands."

A. Telcser: "O'kay, would the Members please raise their hands, ah... when your name is called?"

F. B. Selcke: "Deavers. Deuster. Duff. Ralph Dunn. R. L. Dunne. Dyer. Ebbesen. Epton. Fleck. Friedland. Geokaris. Gibbs. Griesheimer. Grotberg. Harpstrite. Hirschfeld. Gene Hoffman. Ron Hoffman. R. Holloway. Hudson. Hunsicker. Huskey. Hyde. Dave Jones. Juckett. Kempiners. Kent. Klosak. Kriegsman. Kucharski. LaFleur. Lauer. Leinenweber. McDonald. Mahar. McAuliffe. McAvoy. McCourt. McMaster. Kenny Miller. Tom Miller. Molloy. Murphy. Neff. North. Palmer. Pappas. Philip. Peters. Polk. Porter. Randolph. Rigney. Rose. Ryan. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Sevcik. Timothy Simms. Skinner. Soderstrom. Springer. Stiehl. Telcser. Totten. Tuerk.



Waddell. Wall. R. Walsh. W. Walsh. Walters. Washburn.  
J. J. Wolf. Mr. Speaker."

A. Telcser: "O'okay, questions of the negative roll call.

Gentleman from Kane, Representative Hill."

Hill: "Campbell."

A. Telcser: "He's in his seat."

Hill: "Capuzi."

A. Telcser: "He's in his seat."

Hill: "Catania."

A. Telcser: "Representative Catania on the Floor? How is  
the Lady recorded?"

F. B. Selcke: "Lady is recorded as voting 'no'."

A. Telcser: "Take her off of the roll call."

Hill: "Collins."

A. Telcser: "He's in his seat."

Hill: "Duff."

A. Telcser: "Representative Duff is back in my office. Let's  
take him off..... How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

A. Telcser: "Oh, here he is. He just came out of my office,  
so he's on the floor."

Hill: "Harpstrite."

A. Telcser: "He's in his seat."

Hill: "R. Holloway."

A. Telcser: "Ah.... he's in back of the Chamber."

Hill: "Juckett."

A. Telcser: "Representative Juckett is sitting in back of the



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Chamber. A little battered, but he's here."

Hill: "Kriegsman."

A. Telcser: "Representative Kriegsman on the Floor? How's the gentleman recorded?"

F. B. Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'. I mean 'nay'."

A. Telcser: "Take him off the roll call."

Hill: "Kucharski."

A. Telcser: "Representative Kucharski on the floor? How's the gentleman recorded?"

F. B. Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'nay'."

A. Telcser: "Take him off of the roll call."

Hill: "Mahar."

A. Telcser: "He's in his seat."

Hill: "North."

A. Telcser: "He's in his seat."

Hill: "Philip."

A. Telcser: "Representative Philip, did you say? He's in his seat."

Hill: "Rose."

A. Telcser: "He's in his seat."

Hill: "W. T. Simms."

A. Telcser: "Representative Simms on the Floor? W. T. Simms? How's the gentleman recorded?"

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

A. Telcser: "Take him off of the roll call."



Hill: "Springer."

A. Telcser: "Representative Springer on the Floor? How's the gentleman recorded?"

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

A. Telcser: "Take him off of the roll call."

Hill: "Totten."

A. Telcser: "He's in his seat."

Hill: "C. L. McCormick."

A. Telcser: "Ah...."

F. B. Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Hill: "Ah...."

A. Telcser: "Is that it? Wait a second now. Representative Kucharski has returned to the Floor. How was the gentleman recorded?"

F. B. Selcke: "The gentleman was recorded as voting 'no' and has been taken off of the roll."

A. Telcser: "J'kay, now... Representative Kucharski, do you wish to be recorded, Sir? Record the gentleman as voting 'no'. Representative Catania has returned to the Floor. Put her back on the roll call. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brian Duff, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

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

A. Telcser: "How's the gentleman recorded?"

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

Duff: "I'm recorded properly, Mr. Speaker, but I was off the Floor for a while and...."

A. Telcser: "Have you finished?"





Duff: "No, Mr. Speaker. I've been waiting for a little order. I apologize, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House for not having been on the Floor. Ah.... I would like....."

A. Telcser: "O'kay, Representative McMaster, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

McMaster: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would appreciate if we have a little bit of order around here. I'm quite sure the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle are anxious to hear the roll call, but I certainly feel that ah.... we are anxious to hear the various speakers that are saying things, so ah.... I'm quite sure that if they would calm down, give us a little bit of order, we might be more successful conducting the business of the day."

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

Pappas: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's so noisy in here, I couldn't hear if I was verified, and I just want to know how I was recorded?"

A. Telcser: "How's the gentleman recorded?"

F. B. Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no!'."

A. Telcser: "One second, Repr.... Representative Choate, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as everyone else is getting ah.... recognition for what I consider quite obvious to the press, and I would assume it is quite obvious to the press,



as for the principal reason for which I arise. Now we've had said about this Session of the General Assembly that we are slower in this stage than we have been in many years. I might point out to the media present, that it's simply by the actions that were taken last night. It's simply by the actions that were taken prior to last night. It's simply by the actions of the presiding officer that is taking place right now. There's a reason that we are a little slow, and a reason that we have a log jam of bills anxiously awaiting to be acted upon. Mr. Speaker, you're not doing yourself, your Party, your constituents and the People of the State any good by taking the course that you have chartered here this morning. I think it was quite obvious what happened last evening when you rapidly adjourned the House and ascended from the throne up there and went out the back door, when the votes were on this side to prevail. I think that this morning, it was reiterated again that the votes were here to prevail, and I don't know what the people of your area are going to say, but I know what I'm going to say, and I'm sure I know what I hope that the media will say about the actions being taken on the Floor of this House this morning."

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

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker. and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the gentleman's remarks require some response, and there have been various suggestions made over here that we



participate in some dilatory tactics, and I have refused each and everyone of them. As a matter of fact, there have been some that have been quite important. For example, Representative Totten requested that I introduce in the gallery to our right, a few minutes ago, Sherwin Schwartz, Representative Totten's Administrative Assistant. I refused to do that. Now..... can we have a little order, Mr. Speaker? I would like to call the gentleman's attention to what happened yesterday, speaking of being dilatory, when a request was made by a member over there that amendments be read in full. Now there is no provision whatever as all of us know, for amendments to be read in full. We got into a long, parliamentary debate on whether this should or should not be done. It was dilatory. The gentleman know that it was dilatory. It took a great deal of the time of this House, when we've got about 400 bills to dispose of before tomorrow afternoon, when we hope to go home. So I suggest that it's not the Membership on this side of the aisle that's being dilatory. It's the Membership on that side. Can we have some order, Mr. Speaker?"

A. Telcser: "Now the gentleman from Union, Representative Choate, for what purpose do you rise?"

Choate: "I only want.... as a point of order, I want to clarify one thing that the gentleman said when he was talking about the amendments being read in full, that if you will look at Representative Jacobs, in his untiring devotion to duty



in the House of Representatives, he hurt his eyes to the extent he couldn't read the amendments and we wanted him to know what was in the amendments before they were voted on."

A. Telcser: "Representative Walsh, did you wish to ah.... did you wish to respond to that?"

Walsh: "Well, I feel very bad about what happened to Representative Jacobs and I can see where that would happen from reading the amendments, but ah.... what the gentleman had hoped to do, I think, was inflict that on our poor Clerk, Fred, who is busy reading the amendments yesterday morning for a considerable period of time, and I just want to conclude by saying that ah... you People over there are holding up this House, and ah... not the People over here and I submit to you that we're going to have to settle down and get down to business before very long, and ah.... has anybody seen Doc?"

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

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to engage in any pestulant lecturing of the other side as we were subjected to from their direction, what I want to make is an inquiry of the parliamentarian, if it would not be possible in the future for verifications to be done on the honor system. The system that I contemplate, Mr. Speaker, the system that I contemplate would work as follows: When there is a very controversial issue before the floor, instead of going



through this disgraceful waste of time, the Speaker will simply announce there will be a verified roll call taken and this roll call will be taken on the honor system, comparable to the Illinois Law School. And at that point, each legislator would be honor bound to vote his switch and his switch only. Now, Mr. Speaker, is that feasible or is that an invasion of the realm of the fantasy. Have you consulted the Parliamentarian about this? I would appreciate your advise. Has it ever been tried at any time? Does it not suggest itself to each of you as being meritorious and in the future the amount of time that could be saved is incalculable. I submit it for your favorable consideration in all seriousness. It has nothing to do with the issue at hand, I recognize, but it is an issue of economy of the lives of each of us in the days that lie ahead. May I have a ruling by the Speaker?"

A. Telcser: "Well, the Parliamentarian informs me that this has never been considered in the past, but knowing the House as I do, I would say anything is feasible. Ah... gentleman from Cook, Representative Kosinski, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal information."

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

Kosinski: "How do you spell dilatory?"

A. Telcser: "I've never heard of that word. Is that a new word?"

Kosinski: "Can the Parliamentarian assist me in spelling dilatory."



A. Telcser: "I'll seek her advice, Sir? Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Philip."

Philip: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have leave for an hour caucus of the DuPage County Representatives."

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

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I was quite spellbound by the gentleman from Lawrence's suggestion, and I was just wondering if it might work out, but if those who aren't here could then report to the Clerk and let him know that they aren't here to answer the verification of roll, that's something to be considered, and I was just wondering if ah... the gentleman would care to ah... comment on that."

A. Telcser: "Well, I think that's a matter we have to take up with the Clerk's office."

Wolf: "I mean, am I clear on that. If those that are here of course, we could answer if we're here, but it's always a problem in the Clerk knowing who's not here, so if those who aren't here could report to him and let him know that they're not present on the floor, then he wouldn't have to call their names out."

A. Telcser: "I think that's a very ah... laudible suggestion, Representative Wolf. All right, now the gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House and particularly Members on the Republican side, we over here have known for years that we've operated on the honor system, way, way back, and I just wonder if you, on the other side of the



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

aisle would adopt that today, we could be proceeding with the business and pass this motion."

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

Davis: "I rise on a point of personal privilege, and I think all of you will agree. I would like to call to your attention the fact that tomorrow is a holiday weekend, and whether you're going north or whether you're driving north or whether you're driving south, or whether you're driving east or west, the highways are going to be crowded, and I say that hoping that we will be able to come to some agreement here, so that ah... when the time comes to adjourn tomorrow, you won't turn us out here in all of that holiday traffic and we'll be lined up going south almost to St. Louis and north to almost Chicago. I simply bring it to your attention on a point of personal privilege, because I'm concerned about the safety of every Member in here and I do pray for you before I go to sleep every night. Thank you very much."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ron Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Yesterday, we had no objection from this side of the aisle when it was requested by the Leadership of the other side of the aisle to read the amendments in full. I think this is a responsible approach. We are all interesting in reading the full intent of all the amendments and all the bills. And at the time it was requested, I arose and ask that the House assume a quiet posture so we



could hear all the words emanating from the Clerk's voice, so that we might fully absorb the intent of this amendment. As we sat here and we discussed the bills and the import therefore, I think every responsible legislator here was interested in following each one of these bills, and by the way, if Mr. Springer comes in, would somebody inform me, and I think we're assuming a posture, no less, at this point. I think we want to make sure that every Member on this House floor, is fully informed of the direction of these amendments, the purport of the bill, and the progress we're making. Now I think at this point, it is the responsible thing that we preclude thoughts of getting on the highways and going home. We are elected to come down here and do a job and debate the bill, and if there are questions, rise and question the sponsor in reference to them, so I feel compelled to rise at this point and say to the rest of the Membership, that as the time goes through the Bills, regardless of how many are on the calendar, that we should thoughtfully absorb all the information that is presented to us and question that which we do not understand. So at this point here, if I might, Mr. Speaker, I would request that the posture of the House be a quiet and thoughtful one and that we carefully approach the proposition. Thank you."

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





Flinn: "Point of inquiry, Mr. Speaker. What order of business are we under right now?"

A. Telcser: "Well, I would call it points of personal privilege or whatever. A number of Members are seeking recognition."

Flinn: "How much time do we have to ah... on point of personal privilege. I would like to grant my time to Representative Hoffman there. He seemed to be doing very well."

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

Boyle: "Mr. Speaker, in order to expedite matters here, I was wondering who we're waiting for. Ah... maybe we could negotiate this matter and ah... maybe we would be willing to stipulate ah... how the gentleman would vote and ah... go on with something else."

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

Stedelin: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wish you'd listen to a 70 year old man. I've got a great concern about this Nation and the Nation of tomorrow, and the future of it. And we have a group of students here and we're acting like a bunch of jackasses here, no ifs and ands about it. And we've had the most dictatorial type, that I've ever seen, and... now here, I'm going to end up as saying this: At the beginning of each Session, we have a man of God's pray for us. Why don't we now get down on our knees and pray for ourselves and ask God to make us good citizens, good Americans, good representatives of



the State and our District and then, and only then, Democrats and Republicans, we can do a good job for the State of Illinois and get this job done. Thank you."

A. Telcser: "O'kay, on this question, there are 84 'ayes', 83 'nays', and.... Representative Springer.... Representative Hill, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Hill: "I would just like to inform you, I am not finished with the verification of the roll call, and I would like to continue after ah.... "

A. Telcser: "That's fine, except that once someone has been verified that they're here, they are here."

Hill: "Yes, Sir, I understand that very thoroughly."

A. Telcser: "Representative Springer, for what purpose do you rise, Sir? Good Morning."

Springer: "Good morning, Mr. Speaker. How am I recorded?"

A. Telcser: "Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Springer: "Would you record me as 'no'."

A. Telcser: "Record the gentleman as voting 'no'." Representative Hill."

Hill: "Anderson."

A. Telcser: "He's in his seat."

Hill: "Arnell."

A. Telcser: "He's standing in the aisle."

Hill: "Bluthardt."

A. Telcser: "He's standing by his seat."

Hill: "Borchers."

Borchers: "Here."



Hill: "I don't know if I called Mr. Campbell before."

A. Telcser: "You called him first last time, and he is in the aisle anyway."

Hill: "O'kay. Clabaugh."

A. Telcser: "He's in his seat."

Hill: "Cox."

A. Telcser: "He's in his seat."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate very much if they would raise their hands."

A. Telcser: "Would the Members please raise their hands when your name is called."

Hill: "Cunningham."

A. Telcser: "He's standing by his seat, Sir?"

Hill: "Day."

A. Telcser: "He's standing up in the aisle, Representative Hill."

Hill: "Deavers."

A. Telcser: "He's in his seat."

Hill: "Deuster."

A. Telcser: "He's in his seat."

Hill: "Again, I don't...."

A. Telcser: "The gentleman raised his hand. Representative Deuster, would you raise your hand again, please?" Just raise your hand so Jack can see it."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker, I don't recognize all the faces of the new Members and it's quite difficult for me. Representative Bradley, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"



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

A. Telcser: "How's the gentleman recorded?"

F. B. Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Bradley: "Please vote me 'aye'."

A. Telcser: "Record the gentleman as voting 'aye'." Representative Hill."

Hill: "May I ask you what the count is?"

A. Telcser: "The count currently is 85 'ayes', 84 'nays'."

Hill: "Palmer."

A. Telcser: "He's right here in the aisle." Representative Hill."

Hill: "Would you announce the 'vote' now, or do you want me to continue?"

A. Telcser: "Do you have more questions? Do you have anymore Jack?"

Hill: "You can announce the vote."

A. Telcser: "On this question, there are 85.... Representative Juckett, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Juckett: "A point of parliamentary inquiry, Sir."

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

Juckett: "It seems that the verification procedure has changed much since I first came down to this General Assembly.

So that it is now a mockery, instead of the verification, as originally done. It was never done, or when they verified a roll call, when they finished on the affirmative they were finished. And the individual had to stay in his seat the entire verification, even though he might have been verified at one time. So my question, Mr. Speaker, is



it now possible for us to reverify the affirmative roll call, seeing as how they have ah.... continued and added people on the roll call?"

A. Telcser: "Well, the gentleman didn't really make it clear to the Chair that he was finished with the ah.... verification of the negative roll call, Representative. Members started to seek recognition for points of personal privilege. Representative Juckett, for what purpose do you rise?"

Juckett: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it says in the Rules, it indicates that until the result has been announced, the verification is not complete, and if this has been the ruling, and it has in the past, then I think we are entitled to continue on the verification of the affirmative."

A. Telcser: "Well, if ah... if someone wishes to question some more affirmative, they have to bear in mind, that the People who have been questioned already, and has been established that they were here, they will remain on the roll call."

Juckett: "Well, then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to question the.... have some questions, if that's not out of order."

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

Choate: "Mr. Speaker, to be quite frank about it. When the affirmative votes were questioned, the Speaker, and the tape will show, said 'is there any further questions of the



affirmative vote?' There being none, the vote was announced as far as the affirmative vote was concerned. The only difference with Representative Hill, what Representative Juckett is talking about, is as the Speaker already explained it. In the midst of his verification, there were points of personal privilege and things that took place on the other side of the aisle and interrupted his verification. That's the difference."

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

Juckett: "Well, under the reasoning then, of the Minority Leader, the affirmative roll call had been completed and thus, Mr. Bradley should not be allowed to have his name added."

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

Choate: "We all realize that that statement is not in accordance with the action that this Speaker has taken in the past, because only as late as yesterday, he announced that the Members would be put on the roll call when, if and when they arrived on the floor of the House."

A. Telcser: "O'kay, now, so the Members understand, the roll call is now 85 - 84. We're going to also have a roll call I'm sure on the question to table the amendment. So on this question, there are 85 'ayes', 84 'nays' and the gentleman's motion to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1652 was adopted, prevails. Now, the gentleman from Kane, Representative Hill."



Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I now move that Amendment No. 1, that was adopted to House Bill 1652, be Tabled."

A. Telcser: "O'okay, Representative Hill, I'm informed that technically we're back now on the question of adopting Amendment No. 1. All right. So now, we'll recognize the gentleman from Stephenson.... It will be the same issue voting yes or no. So the gentleman from Stephenson, Representative ..... Representative Choate, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

A. Telcser: "State your point."

Choate: "Ah.... what's the necessary number of votes it takes to adopt the gentleman's amendment or to Table the Amendment?"

A. Telcser: "A simple majority, the majority of those voting on the question."

Choate: "Then we're acting on his motion?"

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Stephenson, Representative Rigney, relative to the Amendment."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, again it is my pleasure to introduce an amendment that I feel is in the interest of the children of the State of Illinois. I move for the adoption of Amendment No. 1."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Kane, Representative Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've explained what welfare means in this particular piece of



legislation. I think the word would cause a lot of problems in the State of Illinois, and I would request that the Membership vote 'no'."

A. Telcser: "Is there further discussion?" Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Day."

Day: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in favor of this Amendment, and I'd like to remind the Members of this House at this time that what this Amendment does is to make it possible for a Judge who is confronted with a serious problem regarding the education of the children that come through this chamber every day, some of who are here today, and make this possible for the judge to consider the welfare of those children, when he makes his decision. Now, what's wrong with that? What could possibly be wrong with that? For over a hundred years, the Courts of this State have been charged with the responsibility and the welfare of children, and certainly this legislature should have as one of its primary objectives the welfare of the children of this State. Now we cannot sit here today and predict what the facts and issues are going to be and the issues that come along involving the various school districts throughout this State. We cannot take the position that we know what is best, what is the right answer in every one of those issues that comes along. We have to rely on the Courts. And in doing that we should give those Courts the right to consider the





welfare of the children when they arrive at a decision in an individual case. And how can we possibly go back and face our constituents and say 'we voted against giving the judge the right to consider the welfare of children when these issues come along'. This is an amendment which should be adopted."

A. Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Amendment. There is good question under the Constitution that was developed and adopted by the People of this State in 1970 that the doors to the schools of our educational institutions are common school systems, shall stay open. The Constitution states in Article X, Section 1 this: 'The State shall provide for an efficient system of high quality, public educational institutions and services. Education in the Public School through the secondary level shall be free.' Is there an efficient system of education in this State when we do not consider the welfare of the children? Isn't the welfare of the children what this thing is all about? Isn't this why we have schools? Isn't this why we appropriate and expend out of the taxpayers money of this State over one billion dollars a year? To say that a Judge can only go into questions of safety or health, certainly does not reach the situation. To say that there is an epidemic of some sort that they can close the schools for that



perhaps is understandable. But that does not contemplate strikes. That's a health welfare, yes. The schools are for the welfare of the children. The children will be our citizens tomorrow. And for this legislature to tell a judge, and I say unconstitutionally, that he cannot consider the welfare is balderdash. It's hypocrisy of the worst sort. School exist for our children. The state of tomorrow will be our children of today. What shall you do those who are voting 'aye'. Shall you cripple them? And I understand this is a Dr. Bakalis bill. And if it is, it seems to me that he should have better sense as the Superintendent of Public Instruction of this State to come in with a bill as crippled as he has which this amendment seeks to amend. I urge everyone to vote against the tabling motion."

Telcser: "The gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, this has been discussed so much in the last few days I move the previous question."

Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'."

Members: "Aye".

Telcser: "The opposed 'no'."

Members: "No."

Telcser: "Do you.. you wanna withdraw your motion, Sir?"

I'm asking the Gentleman if he wishes to withdraw his motion."



Leinenweber: "No. I don't think so. I think everybody knows how they're going to vote."

Telcser: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. Okay. The gentleman has moved the previous question. Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf. For what purpose do you rise?"

Wolf: "Well, it's a parliamentary inquiry. I just wondered what the rule number was for the suspension of rules introduced guest. We have Representative Simms with us. I'd like to introduce him if I could."

Telcser: "Representative Simms is here and Representative Grotberg had to leave for a doctor's appointment. Okay. The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. The opposed 'no'. The Gentleman from Stevenson, Representative Rigney to close. Do you wish to close the debate, Sir?"

Rigney: "Mr. Speaker, I believe I've said about all or this that I have to say. I would appreciate a favorable vote. It's a good amendment. Let's turn on the green light."

Telcser: "Gentleman's offered to move the adoption of Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1652. All those in favor of the gentleman's motion, signify by saying 'aye'. The opposed 'no'."

Members: "No."

Telcser: "The Gentleman's amendment is lost. Are there further amendments? Third Reading."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 1762. Porter. Bill for an Act to



amend the Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments. You got any on the floor? Third Reading."

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

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 989. Katz, is he here? He ain't here.

House Bill 989, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Second Reading of the Bill. We got any Committee Amendments? Ah . . . No Committee Amendments. Any from the floor? Any from the floor?"

Telcser: "Any Amendments from the floor? Third Reading."

Fredric Selcke: "Ah . . . 1060. House Bill 1060, Duff . . . House Bill 1138, whose is that? . . . Kelly, a Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Fredric Selcke: "--44, 1144. House Bill 1144, Barry, a Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Telcser: "Any . . . Amendments from . . . the Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Barry."

Barry: "I have some Amendments being drafted . . . ah . . . for that Bill and the next Bill, I believe, . . ."

Fredric Selcke: "Out of the Record."

Barry: ". . . would you please take them out of the Record?"

Telcser: "Let's take it out of the . . . let's take it out of the Record."

Fredric Selcke: "Okay. Gibbs here? House Bill 1184, Gibbs, . . . he's not here anyway . . . Webber . . . Gibbs' not here I don't think."

Telcser: "Let's take it out of the Record."

Fredric Selcke: "Ah . . . I'm trying to find one, Arthur. 1271, where the hell is that? 1282, McPartlin, 1282."

Telcser: "Do you want that out of the Record?"

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 1282 . . ."

Telcser: "Out of the Record? Take it out of the Record."

Fredric Selcke: "1387? House Bill 1387, Beaupre, a Bill for an Act to limit waiver of defense in certain retail installment contracts. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."



Telcser: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative . . . for what purpose does . . ."

Fredric Selcke: "Amendment #1, Beupre, amends House Bill 1387."

Telcser: ". . . The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Beupre."

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

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1387. All those in favor of the adoption signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading."

Fredric Selcke: "Does Blair want his Bill? Okay. House Bill 1405, Blair, does he want to move this, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Services for the Aging Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Two Committee Amendments. Committee Amendment #1 amends House Bill 1405 on page 1 by deleting lines 1 and 2 and so forth."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from Will, Speaker Blair, who's waiting for . . . there's some Committee Amendments."

Fredric Selcke: "Committee Amendment #1 . . . take it out of the Record?"

Telcser: "Well . . . here comes your Amendment."

Blair: "All right, there have . . . there have been some technical corrections in the . . . in Committee Amendment #1, which was adopted by the Committee; so in order . . . in order to take care of that, we'll have to have a floor Amendment, which will be #3. So at this time I . . . ah . . . would offer to move the adoption of Committee Amendment #1, then I would move to table . . . ah . . . that Amendment."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill . . . the Gentleman has moved to . . . do you want to table?"

Blair: "I want to . . . yeah, I offered to move and now I'm tabling."

Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved to table Amendment # . . . Committee Amendment #1 to House Bill . . . the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Could . . . could you explain why we're tabling a Committee Amendment and what's the procedure we're looking for there?"

Blair: "Well, it was necessary in the drafting of Amendment #3 to



coordinate the provisions of Amendment #1 within Amendment #3; and everything that was in 1 is in 3."

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

Blair: "All right, and 3 amends the Civil Administrative Code . . . ah . . . to make technical changes which are necessary."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, that Amendment was agreed wholeheartedly in the Executive Committee without a dissenting vote. Now, what does Amendment #3 add . . . add to the Amendment #1?"

Blair: "I just explained that . . ."

Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear you."

Blair: ". . . Civil Administrative Code with respect to some technical changes to coordinate the Department with the Civil Administrative Code."

Telcser: "Is there further discussion?"

Blair: "You have to list the Department in the Code, you have to list the Director in the Code . . ."

Lechowicz: "All right."

Blair: ". . . you have to list the fiscal salary for the Director."

Lechowicz: "Now, are there any changes from the existing salaries in the titles of the . . . ah . . . that was in the Code?"

Blair: "It's \$35,000 which is similar to . . . \$25,000 which is similar to the other Directors."

Lechowicz: "All right, thank you."

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

Choate: "Just one question . . . ah . . . Mr. Speaker, because . . . ah . . . I don't really remember what Amendment #1 and #3 did to be quite honest with you about it; . . . ah . . . but from what I understand the Speaker is saying for the edification of those who are knowledgeable about the Bill . . . ah . . . Mr. Speaker, this is just a consolidation of the two Committee Amendments #1 and #3, 1 and 2, rather, isn't that correct?"

Blair: "Well, that Amendment #3 includes everything in it that was in #1 . . . ah . . . in addition and starting on page 4 of Nu. 3 you'll find an Amendment to the Civil Administrative Code wherein that it lists the Departments of State Government that are created and we



added to that list the Department on Aging . . . ."

Telcser: "Thank you. Is there further discussion?"

Blair: "And then . . . and then we had to provide within the Civil Administrative Code the . . . ah . . . the Advisory Committee . . . ah . . . so that a . . . ah . . . that the Council on Aging and the Technical Advisory Committee is appointed as provided in the Illinois Act on the Aging. There are merely housekeeping kinds of things . . . ah . . . to . . . ah . . . make sure we are covered in all aspects of the statute."

Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved to table Committee Amendment #1 to House Bill 1405. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the Amendment is tabled. Are there further Amendments?"

Fredric Selcke: "Committee Amendment #2 amends House Bill 1405."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from Will, Speaker Blair."

Blair: "All right, this is a very simple Amendment which simply provides that 3 months after the enactment of this . . . ah . . . into law that the Department would . . . ah . . . become established and that is simply to allow the transitions that are necessary . . . ah . . . with the other agencies in departments that are involved with regards to transfers. This is a Committee Amendment and was unanimously adopted."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 1405. All those in favor of the adoption signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments? Amendment #3."

Fredric Selcke: "Amendment #3, Blair, amends House Bill 1405."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from Will, Speaker Blair."

Blair: "All right, the . . . the first part of this Amendment incorporates provisions of Amendment #1 . . . ah . . . which was a Committee Amendment which was unanimously adopted in the Department . . . or in the Committee and . . . ah . . . the second part of the Amendment directs itself to adding . . . ah . . . this Department as the Department under the Civil Administrative Code and makes other technical and housekeeping corrections in the Code . . . ah . . ."



so that we coordinate this new Department under that Code; and I would move for its adoption."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 1405. All in favor of the adoption signify by saying 'aye', oppose 'no'; the Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading."

Fredric Selcke: "Okay, what's the next Bill? Huh? House Bill 1418, Skinner, a Bill for an Act . . . Amendment's not printed yet."

Telcser: "Let's take it out of the Record."

Fredric Selcke: "Okay, you're at ease, what's the matter with you, Chockey, you ain't keeping up. House Bill 1418, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts to require primary elections in townships with a population of over 50,000. Ah . . . Wait just a minute, no Committee Amendments."

Miller, K.: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Fredric Selcke: "Amendment #1, Skinner, amends House Bill 1418 on page 1 and so forth."

Miller, K.: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment merely brings the Bill into conformity with the description in the Digest and I would move its adoption."

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

Jack O'Brien: "It was 1341, we're waiting for an Amendment to be printed."

Miller, K.: "All right, hold it out of the Record."

Jack O'Brien: "1484, we're waiting for an Amendment to be printed. House Bill 1565, Berman, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Miller, K.: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Gene Hoffman, amends House Bill 1565 on page 8 by striking line 3 and inserting in lieu, thereof, the following."

Miller, K.: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Gene Hoffman."





Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #1 to House Bill . . . or 1565 eliminates one of the provisions which is provided for in this Bill. Ah . . . One of the provisions provides for . . . ah . . . the . . . using the different rental date for figuring average daily attendance, this does not affect that. What this Amendment does it delete the part of the Bill which provides that the impaction aid will go to school districts . . . ah . . . with over 500 pupils who are state employees. Originally this section of the Act was added by Representative Clabaugh to provide for those communities which have over 5 percent of their student population . . . ah . . . as children of state employees. What this Amendment does is really adds only one school district to its consideration for all practical purposes and that is the district of Chicago. Now as all of you know, Chicago School District covers the entire City of Chicago with about a quarter of the state's total student population. With the number of students who would qualify as state employees that dispersed over 25 percent of the state's students there can hardly be a reason . . . ah . . . for saying that you've got an impaction problem. This adds . . . ah . . . or costs the state . . . ah . . . we estimate 5.8 million dollars and . . . ah . . . this is another exampe of whittling away to take care of specific areas as opposed to applying as much of our resources as possible to general state aid, therefore, I have proposed this one simple Amendment which eliminates the addition of school districts with over 500 pupils. Now, I believe it should stay at those percentage basis where you can indicate that impaction is a problem as opposed to flat numbers . . . ah . . . the adoption of Amendment #1."

Miller, K.: "All right, before we act on the Gentleman's motion, just an announcement for the benefit of the Members that it is the intention of the Chair to recess approximately 12:30 for lunch, just thought you'd like to know that. Now, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman, is recognized."

Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, . . . ah . . . House Bill 1565 as the proponent of



this Amendment stated deals with two things. The first part . . . part . . . ah . . . allows the continuation of the policy whereby school districts that have had a decrease in attendance in pupil enrollments can apply their previous years' enrollments for purpose of getting state aid; and I think there has been general agreement that this is a legitimate and a needed . . . ah . . . continuation for the State Aid Formula. Now, the second part does deal with this impaction-made problem of the substantial questions that were raised to it in the Education Committee, and the Bill, however, did pass out of that Committee with a split vote . . . ah . . . I would merely indicate that I . . . ah . . . can understand the reason for deleting this . . . ah . . . on this Amendment. I've merely voiced my technical objections to the Amendment, but I would not request a . . . ah . . . Roll Call, an oral Roll Call on the Amendment would be acceptable."

Miller, K.: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we'd get . . . ah . . . the Sponsor of the Amendment would answer a question."

Miller, K.: "Ah . . . Proceed, Sir."

Bradley: "Gene, I'm wondering if this 5 percent will apply to an area like Illinois State, Normal, or will it take care of a unified district? I think your Amendment only applies to Chicago; but this Bill is going to give a 5 percent increase?"

Berman: "Mr. Speaker, in response to Representative Bradley's inquiry, that 5 percent is there now. I did not change that, I merely eliminated the 500 figure which was added and it doesn't . . . it doesn't change anything in reference to District 5 or any of that."

Bradley: "Thank you."

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

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1575, J. J. Wolf, a Bill for an Act . . .



for an Act creating the Law Enforcement and Personnel Employment Relations Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 15 . . . 1580 there's an Amendment not printed. House Bill 1627, Kozubowski, a Bill for an Act amending the Civil Administrative Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1635, Philip, a Bill for an Act amending an Act relating to fire protection districts. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Miller, K.: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #1 . . . Philip, amends House Bill 1635 on page 1, line 10, by deleting 'death' and so forth."

Miller, K.: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Philip."

Philip: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #1 to House Bill 1635 was not a Committee Amendment, but we did discuss two Amendments and we did have the agreement of the Committee that we would admit it on Second Reading on the floor. I have checked with the Chairman of that Committee, Representative Wolf, and they are in agreement with this Amendment. This Bill deals with insurance for volunteer fire protection districts. The Amendment does two things. It takes out . . . ah . . . the word 'death' that the . . . the insurance would not be on a death of a volunteer fireman because already in the State of Illinois they get \$5,000 and we have passed the Bill that would raise it to \$10,000. So we thought another \$5,000 for a volunteer fireman would be ridiculous. Also . . . it also says that this Amendment also sets the population over 5,000. The original Bill said 1,000. So I move the Amendment #1 to House Bill 1635."

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



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

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1639, Philip, a Bill for an Act creating the Franchise Disclosure Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Ah . . . Seven Committee Amendments. Amendment #1 amends House Bill 1639 . . ."

Miller, K.: "All right, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Philip."

Philip: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you take it out of the Record, please?"

Miller, K.: "Let's take it out of the Record, Mr. Clerk." ."

Jack O'Brien: ". . . out of the Record. House Bill 1663, Washington, a Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1777, we're waiting for an Amendment on that. House Bill 1809, McCourt, a Bill for an Act to create the Abandoned Vehicle Act. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 1809 on page 2, line 27, by inserting between the words 'accepting' and 'device' the following: 'implements of . . . husbandry and . . .'"

Miller, K.: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, would you please take this out of the Record?"

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1816, J. M. Houlihan, a Bill for an Act to amend the Government Ethics Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Miller, K.: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #1, J. D. Houlihan . . ."

Miller, K.: "Just a minute, Mr. Houlihan I don't believe is on the floor. Better take it out of the Record, Mr. Clerk."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1832, McPartlin, does he want it out of the Record?"

Miller, K.: "Take it out of the Record, Mr. McPartlin? All right, take it out of the Record, Mr. Clerk."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1846, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend the Business Corporation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee



Amendments."

Miller, K.: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #1, . . . amends House Bill 1846 on page 11 immediately after line 19 . . ."

Miller, K.: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "The Amendment simply provides that the amendatory Act takes effect July 1st, 1974. I would move the Amendment for adoption."

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

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1920, Geo-Karis, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Miller, K.: "Are there Amendments from the floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Ewell, amends House Bill 1920 on page 2 and so forth."

Miller, K.: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen . . . ah . . .there's been a little discussion between myself and the Sponsor and whereas the number of people agree with the intent of what we're trying to do. We feel it will be a great impediment to the Bill. At this time I'd ask that the Amendment #1 be tabled. Leave to table Amendment #1."

Miller, K.: "The Gentleman moves that Amendment #1 be tabled. All those in favor say 'aye', oppose 'nay'; the 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #1 is tabled. Are there further Amendments? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 782, Friedland, 782, a Bill for an Act to amend the Income Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 782 on page 1, line 17, by inserting immediately after 'interest' the following . . ."

Miller, K.: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Friedland."

Friedland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Committee Amendment #1 was offered by the Department of Revenue.



It's a technical Amendment and I would move for its adoption."

Miller, K.: "Discussion? The question is, shall Committee Amendment #1 be adopted? All those in favor say 'aye', oppose 'nay'; the 'ayes' have it, Committee Amendment #1 is adopted. Are there further Amendments? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 834, Kempiners, 834, a Bill for an Act to amend the Park District Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Two Committee Amendments. Amendment #1 amends House Bill 834 on page 2 by deleting lines 2 . . ."

Miller, K.: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #1 was . . . ah . . . drafted by the Illinois Park District Association and I'm in accord with it, and I would move its adoption."

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

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #2 amends House Bill 834 on page 2 by inserting between lines . . ."

Miller, K.: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2 provides that . . . ah . . . adjoining homeowners may join together in this action; and I move its adoption."

Miller, K.: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Krause."

Krause: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would . . . ah . . . explain the difference between contracted and incurred here."

Kempiners: "Ah . . . I didn't hear the question, would you repeat it, Mr. Krause?"

Krause: "Yeah, would you explain to us . . . ah . . . why your deleting 'contracted' and inserting 'incurred' and what the difference would be here?"

Kempiners: "Ah . . . That . . . that Amendment is being offered by . . . ah . . . Representative Schlickman as Amendment #3 and I would prefer that he answer that question."



Krause: "Oh, ~~see~~ a minute, have I got the wrong Amendment?"

Miller, K.: "Is there further discussion with respect to Amendment #2?  
Mr. Krause."

Krause: "Evidently, Mr. Speaker, we've got two Amendment #2's."

Miller, K.: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Will,  
Mr. Kempfers."

Kempfers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, you probably do have two Amendment #2's. We noticed that yesterday and brought it to the Clerk's attention and the one that you're concerned with has been renumbered and circled as Amendment #3 . . . ah . . . which will be offered by Representative Schlickman."

Miller, K.: "Mr. Krause, Mr. Krause, Amendment #2 is apparently a Committee Amendment and #3 is being offered by Mr. Schlickman, does that . . ."

Krause: "Yeah, . . . okay . . ."

Miller, K.: ". . . ah . . . all right, now, is there further discussion with respect to Committee Amendment #2? All right, the question is, shall Committee Amendment #2 be adopted? All those in favor say 'aye', 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the Committee Amendment #2 is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Schlickman, amends House Bill 834 on page 2, line 31, by inserting the word 'bonded' after the word 'any' on page 2, line 31, . . ."

Miller, K.: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "The Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 834 is a disconnection Bill. Now, the usual procedure in practice with regards to disconnection Bills is that the taxpayers, the property owners, with a territory disconnected from one district and annexed to another shall continue to be subject to the bonded indebtedness outstanding in the territory or district, rather, in the district in which the territory is being disconnected; and that the taxpayers, property owners will be subject to all of the expenses of the district to which they are annexed. Under this Bill those taxpayers or property owners within a territory being disconnected will be subject only to contractual indebtedness



of the district that they're leaving and will be subject to none . . . none of the existing indebtedness of the districts which they are annexed. By this Amendment we are simply inserting in this Bill the practice and procedure that is followed with regards to all other disconnection procedures. I move for the adoption of this Amendment."

Miller, K.: "Is there discussion? All right, the question is, shall Amendment #3 be adopted? All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'; the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment #3 is adopted. Are there further Amendments? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 844, R. L. Dunn, I don't think he's here . . ."

Miller, K.: "Yeah, he's here."

Jack O'Brien: ". . . oh, there he . . . ah . . . a Bill for an Act relating to the informed consent of . . . informed consent of positions to perform abortions. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 844 on page 1 by deleting lines 7 and 8 and inserting in lieu, thereof, the following."

Miller, K.: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. R. L. Dunn."

Dunn: "Ah . . . I'm not aware of the Committee Amendment. I'd like to hold this off."

Miller, K.: "All right, take . . . ah . . . this out of the Record, Mr. Dunn, is that correct, Sir? Take it out of the Record, Mr. Clerk."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 887, Deuster, a Bill for an Act relating to local improvements. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 887 on page 1, line 14, by deleting 'service of'."

Miller, K.: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #1 . . . ah . . . was suggested by the Committee Staff and it struck two words, the words 'service' and 'of'; and simply restricts the application of the Act there slightly and it's an improvement; and I urge the adoption of Committee Amendment #1."

Miller, K.: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."





Hanahan: "I didn't get the explanation on the second part of the Amendment. What . . . what does it restrict?"

Deuster: "Ah . . . Yes, the Amendment strikes on page 1, line 14, two words . . . ah . . . 'service' and 'or', it presently says that local improvements include the provision of any service or facility . . . ah . . . service is rather broad and it was felt . . . felt by the Sponsor and by the Members of the Committee that . . . ah . . . that we ought to strike service and simply mean facility because we are talking about such facilities as sanitary sewers and walks and street lights and things like that, not really services. So we wanted to strike that to make . . . to limit those acts."

Miller, K.: "Is there further discussion? All right, the question is, shall Committee Amendment #1 be adopted? All those in favor say 'aye', oppose 'nay'; the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading. Now, we just passed over 844, we apparently have it straightened out now, so, Mr. Clerk, I believe you read it or did you?"

Jack O'Brien: "I read it."

Miller, K.: "All right, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. R. L. Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #1 to Bill 844 . . . ah . . . merely removes . . . ah . . . any reference to a minor having the consent of their parents in respect to this Bill, and the Amendment was introduced by me merely to conform with . . . ah . . . Illinois statutes; and I move its adoption."

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

Jack O'Brien: ". . . it's the only one there . . . so we won't forget it . . ."

Miller, K.: "Before we recess to a . . . there is one Bill to a Consent Calendar, Second Reading, which we'd like to call and move at this time. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."



Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1906, a Bill for an Act relating to form banking corporations. Second Reading of the Bill."

Miller, K.: "Are . . . Third Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh. For what purpose does the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan, arise?"

Hanahan: "How did that last Bill get called when my two Bills were next in order and there's no suspension of any rules?"

Miller, K.: "Well . . ."

Hanahan: "I'd like to know why House Bills 891 and 894, which were the next two on the priority call, were . . . and another Bill was called out of order."

Miller, K.: "I'm sure, Mr. Hanahan, that . . ."

Hanahan: "I'd like those Bills called, Sir, there's only a small little Amendment . . ."

Miller, K.: ". . . recognized that there are people who have 904, 942, 959, who could make the same request that you are and it's the intention of the Chair that we would recognize Mr. Walsh to recess for lunch and . . . and after which we will be back."

Hanahan: "For Second Reading when we come back?"

Miller, K.: "I'm not sure of that, Sir, but when we start on Second Reading again this is where we would start."

Hanahan: "Well, it just seems very odd that a Bill gets called out of order without a suspension of the rules of this House."

Miller, K.: "The Clerk . . . we went to the Consent Calendar, there was one Bill on there which should be moved from Second Reading."

Hanahan: "Once . . . once again it's very odd, I've got two Bills waiting, I've been waiting for weeks for them two Bills to be amended with a one word Amendment. The time I'm taking up of the House, it could adopt the both of those Bills."

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

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have our schedule or tentative schedule for the next . . . ah . . . few days and that is that when we adjourn that hopefully about 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon for our Memorial Day weekend we will return at 10 o'clock on Tuesday, May 29, and that 10 o'clock Session



will be a regular Session, however, there will be nothing controversial from 10 o'clock. There will be messages from the Senate, there will be Second Readings where there are no Amendments that . . . ah . . . have been offered and some of the housekeeping things that must be done; so it really will not be necessary for us to be back here until 12 o'clock until Tuesday, May 29 after adjourning tomorrow and now it's our intention to . . . ah . . . well it's our intention to break for lunch, but I see that the Minority Leader has a comment."

Miller, K.: "All right, the Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Only one thing . . . ah . . . Mr. Majority Leader, is . . . ah . . . that in your explanation of that . . . ah . . . impress again on the Membership's minds that at 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday we are going to really get into the . . . anything that might be controversial and this type of stuff, so they should be here no later than noon, isn't that correct?"

Walsh: "Correct, no later than noon on Tuesday."

Miller, K.: "All right, just a moment before we recess, what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Juckett, arise?"

Juckett: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the . . . based on the information which I had from the Speaker's office, the Legislative Commission to visit and examine state institutions on the educational section called a meeting for 8 a.m. on Tuesday morning in Bloomington, Normal for an investigation at the Illinois State University and we had planned that the House or we had been led to believe that the House would convene at 12 and there is normally a rule against . . . ah . . . Commissions meeting or Committees meeting while the House is in Session; and if you start at 10 it would be impossible for us to hold this meeting and we have a deadline of June . . . of May 30 that we have to hold the meeting."

Unknown: "House Committee . . ."

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

Juckett: "Well, if there's no objection to the Commission meeting, then we will meet at 8 a.m. . . . ah . . . in Normal on Tuesday morning."

Miller, K.: "Mr. Walsh."



Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm neither for or against the Commission meeting, but what the Gentleman has said refers to House Committees only and not Commissions; and now, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recess for one hour in order that we may have lunch and that we will return here in 20 minutes to 2."

Miller, K.: "All right, the House stands in recess for one hour."

Murphy: "All right, the House will be in order. House Bills on Second Reading . . . yes . . . I don't know where we're at . . . House Bill 891."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 891, Hanahan, a Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 891 on page 2, line 3, and so forth."

Murphy: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "This Amendment brings into the . . . into conformity as the Sponsor wishes by changing the word . . . one word in the Bill concerning lie detector usage in counties or cities and I move its adoption."

Murphy: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Amendment. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', contrary 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments? Third Reading."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill . . . House Bill 894, Hanahan, a Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment: amends House Bill 894, page 4, by adding immediately after line 10 the following and so forth."

Murphy: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "This is the identical Amendment as on House Bill 892 and I move its adoption, Committee Amendment #1."

Murphy: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Committee Amendment #1. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', contrary 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Third Reading."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 904, Philip, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment . . ."

Murphy: "The Representative from DuPage, Representative Philip."

Fredric Selcke: ". . . amends House Bill 904 on page 4,



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

lines 1 and 2 and so forth."

Philip: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there is a second Amendment that I put in today on request of the Chairman of Banks, Savings and Loans. I don't think it's been printed yet . . . ah . . . Mr. Speaker, and I . . . would you pull it out of the Record until tomorrow?"

Murphy: "We do . . . we do have the Amendment printed and ready to go. Everything's ready."

Philip: "Well, excuse me, Mr. Speaker . . . ah . . ."

Murphy: "If you want it out of the Record, we can take it out of the Record . . ."

Philip: "No, no, no, no, I . . ."

Murphy: ". . . the Amendment is ready. Just move the . . . if you want to just move the adoption of Committee Amendment . . ."

Philip: ". . . yeah, yeah, I'd . . . I'd like to move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 904."

Murphy: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Leland Kennedy."

Kennedy: "Ah . . . Would the Gentleman yield to a question please?"

Murphy: "He indicates he will."

Kennedy: "What's the Amendment do, Pete."

Philip: "Amendment #1 reduces the feet for walk-in banking from 5,000 to 1,500."

Kennedy: "Well, that was . . . that's the Bill, what's the Amendment do?"

Philip: "Well, that was not the Bill, Representative, the Bill . . ."

Kennedy: "Beg your pardon?"

Philip: ". . . the Bill extended walk-in and drive-in facilities to 5,000 feet. I amended the Bill back to 1,500 for walk-in."

Kennedy: "Well, why did you do that?"

Philip: "Well, I'll tell you it's very simple, I just couldn't get the damn thing out of Committee."

Murphy: "Is there any further discussion? If not, the question is on the Amendment. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', contrary 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted."



Fredric Selcke: "Amendment #2, Philip, amends House Bill 904 on page 5, line 6, by deleting 'city of 500,000 or more' and inserting in lieu, thereof, 'county of 500,000 or less'."

Murphy: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Philip."

Philip: "Yes, Amendment #2 . . . ah . . . puts a population on it and all it says is counties under 500,000, that would be all the counties downstate excluding Cook County. So this was also a compromise and I would move the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 904."

Murphy: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Ah . . . Pete, I don't understand the Amendment. It used to be that this applied to cities of over 500,000, now it's saying in counties of 500,000. What applies and what doesn't apply if this Amendment goes on?"

Philip: "Well, this would just apply to counties under 500,000, so that would exclude Cook County. Now, this, Gerry, was not my Amendment. This came from the Chairman of Banks, Savings and Loans. I said I don't have any strong objections to it and I agreed to put the Amendment on."

Shea: "Well, as I understand, with the special census that was just conducted in two or three towns in DuPage that your official census is now over 500,000. So you're going to exclude this from DuPage County also?"

Philip: "That was not my intent at all."

Shea: "I didn't think it was your intention."

Philip: "Because let me let say this, the last time . . . you know, we had a census in 1972 and I think this . . . the census was about like 492,000 people, and this would in . . . in my judgment . . . ah . . . pertain to DuPage County until the next census would be 1980."

Shea: "Well, except, Pete, that you applied for some additional money ah . . . from the Department of Local Government Affairs citing some additional censuses that have been taken since trying to increase your dollar take and I think you'll find right now that the Department of Local and Governmental Affairs carries Dupage at



a population over 500,000."

Philip: "Ah . . . Fine, you know, Mr. Chairman, then what I would do would be move to table Amendment # . . . ah . . . 2 to House Bill 904."

Murphy: "All right, any further discussion? The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #2. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', contrary 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is tabled. Any further Amendments? Third Reading."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 942, a Bill for an Act authorizing the Department of Transportation to make a . . . make an examination study in . . . ah . . . in water shed areas of Tazewell County. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 959, . . . ah . . . a Bill for an Act to establish fair trade practices in the dairy industry in Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 960, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Miller: "Any Amendments from the floor? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 962, a Bill for an Act to amend the Finance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 987, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Miller: "Any Amendments from the floor? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 988, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Savings and Loan Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."



Miller: "Any Amendments from the floor? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Fredric Selcke: "1002, what one, 1002 has Amendments and they're not printed and we'll take it out of the Record. 1030."

Miller: "For what purpose does the Gentleman, Mr. Hart, arise, the Gentleman from Franklin?"

Hart: "Ah . . . When the Sponsor isn't on the floor, I would suggest that you don't advance the Bill. Ah . . . We're just going to have to spend a lot of time taking them back from Third to Second if they have Amendments and . . . ah . . . I think it would be better just to hold the Bill if the Sponsor isn't on the floor."

Miller: "House Bill 1002."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 1002, Porter, a Bill for an Act to amend the Game Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Ah . . . One Committee Amendment . . . Chockey, wait a minute . . . no Committee Amendments."

Miller: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Fredric Selcke: "Amendment #1, Porter, amends House Bill 1002 on page 3 . . ."

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

Porter: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, . . . ah . . . Amendment #1 replaces the original Bill and puts in the shape that the Members of the Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee requested. Ah . . . Each Member has seen a copy of it, and I move its adoption."

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

Fredric Selcke: "Amendment #2, Porter, amends House Bill 1002 as amended by . . ."

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

Porter: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 . . . ah . . . merely adds a Section forbidding the sale or importation of traps that would not meet the standards of the





Act. I move its adoption."

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

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 1030, Rayson, is he here? A Bill for an Act creating a Commission on recycling defining its powers and duties and so forth. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 1030 on page 1 by deleting lines 1, 2, 3 and so forth."

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

Rayson: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is an Amendment which changes the complement of the Commission that's outlined in this Bill to conform with the wishes of the Committee. I move the adoption of this Committee Amendment #1 to House Bill 1030."

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

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 1057, Craig, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections 1, 2, 3 and so forth of the Soil and Water Conservation District Law. Second Reading of the Bill. Ah . . . One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 1057 by deleting lines 12 through 33 and so forth."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Craig."

Fredric Selcke: "Ah . . . This is on Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Bob."

Craig: "It's a Committee Amendment, I move the adoption of Committee Amendment #1."

Miller: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Well, I'm very much interested in this Bill, and I wasn't on the Committee and I'd like to know what the Amendment did."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Craig."

Craig: "Well, one of the main things in the original Bill and the



difference was that it said 'guidelines' instead of . . . ah . . . 'set rules'. It was . . . they used to change this from . . . more or less guidelines and suggest it; and when they come to soil . . . preserving the soil and things, the Soil and Water Conservation Districts will work with the people and when they have a program, it will be presented to the area that the Soil and Water Conservation District and they will have a right to vote upon this proposition that's laid before them to help conserve the . . . runoff of the soil and into the streams, silt and things of that nature."

Miller: "Are . . . Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Ah . . . Who . . . who suggested . . . who suggested the Amendment?"

Craig: "The Water and Conservation people themselves."

Hart: "Okay, thank you very much."

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

Fredric Selcke: "Ah . . . House Bill 1058, Kosinski, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Two Committee Amendments. Committee Amendment #1 amends House Bill 1058 on page 2, line 17, and so forth."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski, with regard to Amendment #1."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Committee Amendment #1 changes technical wording in . . . within the Bill, adds the words 'barrel, slide', and instead of the word 'material', changes it to 'nonhomogeneous metal'; and I recommend its adoption."

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

Fredric Selcke: "Ah . . . Committee Amendment #2 amends House Bill 1058 on page 2 immediately after line . . ."

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

Kosinski: "Ah . . . This Amendment was adopted in Committee, it extends



the time of action on this Bill six months after the actual enactment; it's agreeable to the Committee and me; I suggest its adoption."

Miller: "Are there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson."

Rayson: "A question of the Sponsor of the Amendment . . . ah . . . Representative, does this . . . ah . . . suggest that . . . ah . . . if we ban a Saturday Night Special it . . . ah . . . the enforcement of it will not go into effect for six months and . . . ah . . . no one can sell this gun during this period of six months, is that . . ."

Kosinski: "You're correct in assuming the enforcement doesn't occur for six months, that the . . . there's the prohibition against sales. It merely permits gift or trade, gift especially in the sense of death where it is bequeathal?"

Rayson: "Could you give me good and cogent reason why we should have a six-months delay to an otherwise good Bill ban . . . gun Bill ban?"

Kosinski: "In this situation . . . ah . . . downstate group felt that there might be some wish to trade pieces of this nature one to another. Actually I think in view of that, I would suspect that none of these types of weapons are available in these collections; but rather than cause problems to the Bill, and inasmuch as the Amendment really doesn't do anything destructive, I permitted its addition."

Rayson: "Well, I take it to mean that you're not very enthusiastic about the Amendment, nor do I think . . ."

Kosinski: "Nor do I take exception to it, Sir."

Rayson: ". . . right . . . ah . . . and this downstate group is a gun . . . ah . . ."

Kosinski: "Yes, Sir, and we need their cooperation at this sort of thing."

Rayson: ". . . all right, well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak against the Amendment."

Miller: "Ah . . . Proceed, Mr. Rayson."

Rayson: "I think we have a good Bill here. I think everyone wants to ban the hideous gun Bill, the Saturday Night Special. When the



Federal Government passed the mail order ban in 1968, the further loophole was that component parts were not covered and the influx of . . . ah . . . of component part, little hand guns from Florida and Puerto Rico and elsewhere and more problems in the problem of gun control. Now the purpose of this Amendment is to try to make people not so angry with the Bill. I see no reason with it, because if we wait . . . if we pass this good Bill, but wait six months for its enforcement, we're going to have more Saturday Night . . . ah . . . Specials in Chicago and elsewhere than we've ever had before. I think it's a needless Amendment, and I would urge us all to . . . ah . . . defeat this Amendment #2."

Miller: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski, to close the debate."

Kosinski: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, . . . ah . . . this Amendment as given to us originally was further amended by a . . . ah . . . Bill Kempiners, one of the Committee Members in the Judiciary II, in a very knowledgeable manner. I think it's essentially innocuous, I think it's for the good of the Bill not to kill the Amendment . . . ah . . . it would only provide double for an otherwise good philosophy; and I would recommend very heartily prior to my completion . . . Mr. Kempiners has a comment, I think. I yield to Mr. Kempiners for a moment."

Miller: "All right, the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "I think a little explanation on this Amendment is in order. The reason the people wanted it is because they were not sure whether weapons in their possession were what we call Saturday Night Specials and I think the six-month waiting period was for them if they found out or if they were to determine they were Saturday Night Specials to get rid of them; or in the case they kept them, the other provision of the Amendment was that they could sell them or give them away. My insistence was that any weapon purchased during this six-month period should not be sold, but there shouldn't be a prohibition against these people giving them, for example, to their children or to somebody else."

Miller: "All right, the question is, . . . ah . . . Mr. Kosinski."



Kosinski: "Well, . . . I yielded, Sir, . . . ah . . . and in consequence, Mr. Kempiners deleted a portion on the basis of sale with which I was in agreement, with which the downstate group was in agreement, with which the Committee was in agreement; therefore, Mr. Chairman, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I support this Amendment to my Bill and wish it to remain on the Bill, may I put this to vote?"

Miller: "All right, the question is, shall Committee Amendment #2 be adopted? All those in favor say 'aye', oppose 'nay'; the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment #2 is adopted. Are there further Amendments? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Fredric Selcke: "House . . . House Bill 1108, Springer, a Bill for an Act to repeal an Act relating to firearms. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Miller: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Fredric Selcke: "No . . . no."

Miller: "All right, the Bill is ordered advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 1109, Tom Miller, a Bill for an Act creating little Calumet River Flood Control Coordinating Com . . . Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Miller: "Huh?"

Fredric Selcke: "No Amendments."

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

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 11, give me --22, 1122, Schlickman, a Bill for an Act in relation to land use planning and so forth. Second Reading of the Bill. I have . . . ah . . . okay, okay, thank you . . . ah . . . two Committee Amendments; Committee Amendment #1 amends House Bill 1122, page 3, and so forth."

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

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 1122 is the Local Government Land Use Planning and Management Act; and it's a codification of the existing State Enabling Zoning Act. Committee Amendment #1 was suggested by the Illinois Agricultural Association; and what it does is to restore the existing limitation on extra tor . . . extraterritorial zoning of municipalities. It does this



by reducing that authority from 2½ to 1½ miles which is present law. I move for the adoption, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1122."

Miller: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Gene, would you please just repeat what you just said?"

Schlickman: "Well, in part what I said is that Committee Amendment #1 was suggested by the Illinois Agricultural Association and the effect of the Amendment is to maintain the existing limitation on the extraterritorial zoning ability of municipalities. The existing limitation is 1½ miles, the Bill as it was introduced provided for a limitation of 2½. By this Amendment we are striking 2½ and inserting in lieu thereof 1½ which is the present law."

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

Fredric Selcke: "Ah . . . Committee Amendment #2 amends House Bill 1122, page 32, by inserting between lines 15, 16 the following."

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

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Committee Amendment #2 was suggested by a Representative of the City of Chicago, and what it does is to add a new Section to the Bill, a Section which provides that it shall be a limitation on home rule units. I move for its adoption."

Miller: "Is there discussion? The question is, shall Committee Amendment #2 be adopted? All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'; the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted."

Fredric Selcke: "Amendment #3, Schlickman, amends House Bill 1122, page 3, line 35, and so forth."

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

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a simple Amendment and it simply puts the Bill into conformance with the . . . ah . . . Township Zoning Act as it now exists. I move for its adoption."

Miller: "Is there discussion? The question is on the adoption of Amendment #3. All those in favor say 'aye', oppose 'nay'; the 'ayes'



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

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 1133, Sevcik, a Bill for an Act to amend the Savings and Loan Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Ah . . . Two . . . ah . . . One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 1133, page 4, line 18, by deleting 'coral'."

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

Sevcik: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, I move for the adoption of Committee Amendment #1."

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

Shea: "Yes, Joe, what did it do?"

Sevcik: "Well, Committee Amendment #1 is an eight-page Amendment agreed to by the . . . ah . . . Savings and Loan League and Commissioners Landigan and the . . . ah . . . by our Illinois Investigation Commission which has investigated . . . the savings. Now, this is the . . ."

Shea: "Is that the one that was down in Savings and Loan today that you and Saragusa were there?"

Sevcik: ". . . that is correct."

Shea: "Okay, thank you."

Miller: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman moves the adoption of Committee Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye', oppose 'nay'; the 'ayes' have it, Committee Amendment #1 is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Fredric Selcke: "Amendment #2, Sevcik, amends House Bill 1133 as amended."

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

Sevcik: "Now, Amendment #2 was inadvertently put into Amendment #1 and we are deleting . . . ah . . . that effective June 30, 1974, no lincensed public accountant shall be permitted to audit the books which are audited for five consecutive prior years. This Amendment would put out of business accountants who have audited books for five years prior. I move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Miller: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman moves for . . . moves the



adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'aye', oppose 'nay'; the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1148, Craig, . . ."

Miller: "Is Mr. Craig on the floor? Take it out of the Record, Mr. Clerk."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1150, Washington, . . ."

Miller: "Is Mr. Washington on the floor? Take it out of the Record."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1151, Washington . . ."

Miller: "Mr. Barnes, take care of this Amendment? All right, read the . . . read the Bill."

Jack O'Brien: "Which Bill, do you want to go back to --50 . . ."

Miller: "Is that 1151, Mr. Barnes?"

Barnes: "1151, yes."

Miller: "All right, read 1151."

Barnes: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House . . ."

Miller: "Just a minute, just a moment, the Clerk hasn't read the . . ."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1151, a Bill for an Act to amend the Beauty Culture Act. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 1151 on page . . ."

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

Barnes: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I . . . I looked down at the Amendment and I see this is Amendment to 1150 . . . 1150. So would you take 1151 out of the Record, please?"

Miller: "Well, let's . . . ah . . . let's take this . . . 1151 out of the Record unless Mr. Washington cares to call it at the present time. He's back on the floor? We're now on House Bill 1151, and the first Amendment."

Washington: "Yeah, this Amendment just changes the effective date. There's no opposition, and I move its adoption."

Miller: "All right, is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Ah . . . It seems to me that this Amendment does a good deal more than that . . . ah . . . Harold."





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

Washington: "I . . . sorry, Mr. Speaker, I came in late and I . . . I had the wrong Bill in front of me. This Amendment, Amendment #1, to House Bill 1151 simply expands the Beauty Cultural Advisory Board to 9. It has the consent of the Department of Education and Registration. I know of no opposition. There aren't any . . . any additional funds involved here, the Department can absorb it; and they have given it their clean bill of health, and I move its adoption."

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

Walsh: "Well, it seems to me that what this does it . . . it increased the number from 5 to 7 of the Beauty Culture Examining Board; but in addition to that, and that part of it I have no particular feeling on, in addition to that, it creates a new . . . ah . . . Beauty Culture Advisory Board . . . ah . . . which . . . ah . . . I do have some feeling on. Now, would that be correct?"

Washington: "That is absolutely correct, and let me reiterate, this was discussed thoroughly with the Department of Education and Registration, Dean Barringer. He had no opposition to it. He felt that it would be a good input into the Department and it would help to uplift the whole level of cosmetologists; and I can say wholeheartedly and completely that he endorses this concept. The funds involved are minimal and the Department can absorb those funds."

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

Walsh: "Well, if I may be heard, Mr. Speaker, on the Amendment, I . . . ah . . . it doesn't say what the funds will be, there is not a appropriation that I know of and perhaps the Department can absorb this cost. Whatever the cost of it is, the Department of Registration and Education ought to have their appropriation reduced if they can absorb this, because this calls for a 9-member Beauty Culture Advisory Board and I in . . . for my part can think of nothing more ridiculous than a Beauty Culture Advisory Board advising the . . . the Director of the Department of Registration on . . . ah . . ."



what to do about licensing beauty culturists. In my humble opinion, they shouldn't be licensed in the first place, but it's . . . it's absolutely absurd to add another layer on top of the Examining Board and call it a Beauty Cultural . . . Culturists Advisory Board and I respectfully submit that this is absurd and that we ought to in the interest of poor taxpayers of Illinois start acting responsibly and vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Miller: "Is there further discussion? All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington, to close the debate on the Amendment."

Washington: "The word 'absurd' rather astounds me. In the first instance, I have never heard it being suggested on this floor that because the Department is farsighted enough to want to take on additional responsibilities which involved people in an industry, that they should have their budget cut. I think the Department should be lauded for having this farsighted point of view relative to that. Secondly, I think . . . ah . . . the Majority Leader, my good friend, and distinguished and eminent person, displays an abominable ignorance to the whole field of cosmetology. It's not simply talking about licensing, we're talking about the school structure for cosmetologists, we're talking about the whole area of drugs and safety for people who submit themselves to . . . ah . . . beauty culture operations, I'm hard pressed myself to think of all the things that are involved here. This is a burgeoning industry, an industry that effects a lot of women in this state, and the cosmetologists throughout the state went to the Director, past and present, and said, 'Listen, we can make a very valid contribution to your Department, we have some things to say, we think we can help instruct you relative to what is on the market and how it should be used, we want to help you uplift the status of inspection of the various beauty departments, we want our industry to have the status and stature which we think it's entitled to, we feel that the people of the State of Illinois have a right to be protected when they send their wives and daughters to beauty culture saloons and we want to make some input', and the Director being farsighted, knowledgeable and understanding, and



realizing he doesn't know everything said 'Fine, come on it'. We've translated those wishes and desires which were mutual into this Amendment, the Director accepted it, the industry accepts it; I'm amazed to see the Majority Leader takes such a dim view and seemingly castigate a farsighted Director for what I think is a move in the direction of involving people in determination of their own lives and industry; and I move the adoption of this very fine Amendment."

Miller: "The question is, shall Committee Amendment #1 be adopted? All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'; do you want a Roll Call? Do five Members request a Roll Call? If they don't, I'll ask it once again. The Chair was uncertain. All those in favor . . . Roll Call, all right, the question is, shall Committee Amendment #1 be adopted? All those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed 'nay'; have all voted who wish? Ah . . . The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd just like to reiterate that this provides a new board in addition to expanding the present existing board which should do all of the things that the Sponsor of the Amendment . . . ah . . . claims that the board should do. This provides for a board on top of a board, and that is the thing to which I object; and I would respectfully submit that this is absolutely unnecessary and suggest that everyone vote 'no'."

Miller: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 85 'ayes', and 50 'nays, McGrew 'aye', and this . . . ah . . . the Gentleman's motion prevails; and Amendment # . . . Committee Amendment #1 is adopted. Are there further Amendments, Mr. Clerk? The Bill is . . . is advanced to the order of Third Reading; and now, Mr. Clerk, read the previous Bill, #1150."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1150, Washington, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to practice of beauty culture. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Miller: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Washington, amends House Bill 1150 on page



1 by adding after line 11 the following: 'Section 2, this Act . . .'"

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

Washington: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Amendment simply makes the effective date of the Act July 1, 1975. I know of no opposition, although I won't be surprised."

Miller: "Is there discussion? The question is, shall Amendment #1 to be adopted? All those in favor say 'aye', oppose 'nay'; the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments? The Bill is ordered advanced to the order of Third Reading. Ah . . . Mr. Clerk, . . . ah . . . read House Bill 1148, Mr. Craig is . . . is in his seat."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1148, Craig, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Swine Disease Control and Eradication Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Miller: "Are there any Amendments from the floor? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading. Read the next Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1158, Washburn, a Bill for an Act authorizing Director of Department of Transportation to make an engineering survey and study of Mason River Watershed in Livingston and Grundy Counties. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1189, Ryan, a Bill for an Act to amend the Soil and Water Conservation District Law. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1196, B. B. Wolfe, a Bill for an Act to provide the determination of pregnancies to establish penalties for violation thereof and to repeal Sections of Criminal Code of 1961. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 1196 on page 1 by deleting lines 1, 2 and 3 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Miller: "Ah . . . Who . . . Mr. Katz' handling this Bill for Mr. Walsh?"



The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Ah . . . This is the . . . ah . . . Bill amended to conform entirely to the Senate Bill that is the product of an agreement reached between the Illinois Medical Society, the Department of Public Health and the Illinois Hospital Association. It simply deals with . . . ah . . . providing satisfactory medical conditions under which surgery . . . ah . . . would be performed, the surgery would include all kinds, but it would also include abortion; but it does not deal with any of these substantive issues regarding the latter subject, it was approved in the Judiciary Committee of the House, it's for Representative Wolfe; and I would move its adoption to conform to Senate Bill."

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

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1211, Hyde, a Bill for an Act to amend the Savings and Loan Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1222, Garmisa, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill."

Miller: "Wait a minute, is Mr. Garmisa . . . Garmisa on the floor? All right, take it out of the Record, Mr. Clerk."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1237, Keller, a Bill for an Act authorizing the Director of the Department of Transportation to make engineering examination surveys and studies of the Ten Mile Creek and adjacent watershed areas in Hamilton County. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1039, Keller, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to State Forests. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."



Miller: "Any Amendments from the floor? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1243, Madigan, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to real estate brokers. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1273, Farley, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to Savings and Loans. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1305, Madigan, a Bill for an Act relating to the Chicago Metropolitan Area River Basin plans. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1313, Duff, a Bill for an Act relating to Sections to revise the law in relation to notices. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 1313 on page 1 by striking everything after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu, thereof, the following."

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

Duff: "Ah . . . Mr. Chairman, . . . ah . . . the . . . ah . . . Amendment #1 which was adopted in Committee . . . ah . . . had some technical . . . ah . . . misadventures and I will offer . . . ah . . . in succession to table Amendments #1 and 2 and adopt Amendment #3. Ah . . . I move to table Amendment #1."

Miller: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. Oh, the Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Krause."

Krause: "Brian . . . Committee Amendment #1 inserted a whole new Bill didn't it?"

Duff: "Ah . . . It didn't make a whole new Bill, there were some . . . ah . . . errors in the Reference Bureau's draft of the Bill, including the Chapter number and so forth, and it was essentially the



same Bill . . . ah . . . with some small changes in order to be sure that the concurrence provision of the Constitution was attended to. It's not substantially different. It did strike from the enacting clause, Representative Krause, you're accurate on that as far as the drafting of it is concerned."

Miller: "Is there further discussion? Mr. Krause."

Krause: "Brian, will you take it out of the Record until we can talk to you about it?"

Duff: "Well, there shouldn't be any problem on it."

Krause: "Will you . . . will you take it out of the Record?"

Duff: "Sure."

Miller: "All right, take House Bill 1313 out of the Record for the time being."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1314, Madigan, a Bill for an Act to amend the Chicago Sanitary District Act. Second Reading of the Bill. 1314. No Committee Amendments."

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

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1323, Jacobs, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Savings and Loan Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1382, Hill, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to an Act relating to wage deductions of benefits to creditors and regulating issuance of deduction orders. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Miller: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Tuerk, amends House Bill 1382 as follows: 'on line 13, deleting '5' and inserting in lieu thereof '3', and on line 14, striking 'any person' and striking all of lines 15 through 17 in lieu thereof, and insert' and so forth."

Miller: "Ah . . . The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk, with respect to Amendment #1."

Tuerk: "Oh, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a Committee Amendment in which the Sponsor of the Bill has agreed to. What it



does is reduce the number of indebtedness from 5 to 3 and it clarifies the language . . . ah . . . to make sure that the employee doesn't tax . . . ah . . . get the pay. I would move to adopt in the Committee Amendment."

Miller: "The Gentleman moves . . . ah . . . is there discussion? The Gentleman moves that Amendment #1 be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye', oppose 'nay'; the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

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

Miller: "Just a moment, Mr. Hill, is there a question?"

Hill: "Wasn't there two Amendments on this, Mr. Speaker?"

Miller: "Was there another Amendment?"

Hill: "There were supposed to be two Committee Amendments."

Miller: "Were there two Committee Amendments, Mr. Tuerk?"

Tuerk: "Ah . . . Not to my knowledge, I think we took care of both of those things in one Amendment, Jack."

Miller: "All right, the Bill has been ordered advanced to the order of Third Reading. Proceed with the next Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1383, Lemke, . . ."

Checkey: "What is it?"

Jack O'Brien: ". . . 1383, a Bill for an Act to prohibit the assignment of wages and repeal an Act named therein. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1412, Pappas, a Bill for an Act to amend the Section of the Illinois Nursing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1414, Matijevich, a Bill for an Act in relation to licensing, regulation of certain health professions. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Miller: "Are there any Amendments from the floor? The Gentleman from





Cook, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, I had a note to hold House Bill 1414, 1419 and 1474, I have some Amendments that . . . ah . . . aren't ready yet."

Miller: "Will you repeat those numbers please?"

Matijevich: "1414, 1419 and 1474."

Miller: "These Bills will be held for the time being, 1417, Mr. Clerk."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1417, Redmond, a Bill for an Act authorizing the Department of Transportation of the State of Illinois to convey certain deed of land in DuPage County. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Miller: "Any Amendments from the floor? The Bill is ordered advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1420, Dyer, a Bill for an Act in relation to renewal of licenses . . . licenses of registration of certain health care professionals. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1421, Dyer, a Bill for an Act in relation to elimination of citizenship as a condition for license in certain health care fields. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Miller: "Are there any Amendments from the floor? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading. Just a moment, the Gentleman from . . . ah . . . from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "I understood there was going to be an Amendment to eliminate . . . ah . . . one or two of the peo . . . groups from this Bill, and . . . ah . . . is the Sponsor on the floor?"

Miller: "Yes, he is, he's in the back of the room."

Hart: "Could you ask her if that . . ."

Miller: "Mrs. Dyer, Mr. Hart has asked a question."

Hart: "Ah . . . Representative Dyer, Representative Carter, do you have an . . ."

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



Carter: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, this Bill will be . . . we're accepting the advancement to Third Reading and we will be pulled back for Second for . . . for the Amendment which is not ready at this point."

Miller: "All right, the Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1427, Martin, a Bill for an Act relating to the furnishing of health care services. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1439, Martin, a Bill for an Act to amend Section 7 of the Illinois Nursing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Miller: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Martin, amends House Bill 1439 on page 1 by deleting lines 14 through 22 and inserting in lieu thereof the following . . ."

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

Martin: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, . . . ah . . . this Amendment only adds that . . . ah . . . for nursing persons . . . for nursing persons from the Educational Program to be added on or amended into the Bill; and I would move for the acceptance of this Amendment."

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

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1448, Berman, a Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 1448 on page 1 by inserting between lines 15 and 16 and immediately before line 24 the following: 'this amendatory Act of 1973 is not a limit upon any municipality which is a home rule unit'."

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

Berman: "Ah . . . Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #1 is a . . . ah . . . Amendment that was adopted in Committee, it's a home rule



Amendment; . . . ah . . . and I move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1448."

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

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #2 . . ."

Miller: "Amendment . . . it was adopted."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Berman, amends House Bill 1448 on page 1, line 22 . . ."

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

Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, . . . ah . . . this is a floor Amendment that was discussed in the Committee. It . . . ah . . . carries out the intent of the original Bill to cover annexation agreements that were entered into prior to the effective date of the original Bill that's in the . . . discussed with the Chairman of the Committee and the interested party; and I move the adoption of . . . ah . . . Amendment #2 to House Bill 1448."

Miller: "Is there discussion? The question is, shall Amendment #2 be adopted? All those in favor say 'aye', oppose 'nay'; and the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1457, Yourell, a Bill for an Act creating the Animal Care Organization Study Commission defining its powers and duties. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Miller: "Are there any Amendments from the floor? The Bill is advanced to the order of Third Reading. The Sponsor has requested that House Bill 1471 be held . . . be held for the time being and also 1474. The next Bill will be 1497."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1497, . . ."

Miller: "Ah . . . Just a moment, for what purpose does the Gentleman from Winnebago, . . . ah . . . Mr. Giorgi, arise?"

Giorgi: "You . . . ah . . . you mentioned something about House Bill 1471, the Sponsor requested . . . I'm the Sponsor."

Miller: "Well, I thought that was the number . . . ah . . . I think



Mr. Schoeberlein requested . . . said that was the Bill . . ."

Giorgi: "No."

Miller: ". . . am I on the wrong Bill?"

Giorgi: "I'm the Sponsor of 1471 . . ."

Miller: "I'm my . . . I'm sorry if I've made an error here."

Giorgi: "And there's one Committee Amendment."

Miller: "Ah . . . Mr. Giorgi, I know the problem now. There's an Amendment, it is not printed yet. It's not back from the printer, so we'll have to hold . . ."

Giorgi: "Yes, Sir, you should check with the Sponsor. The Sponsor has the Amendment ready, the Committee Amendment is ready in the proper hands of the proper proposer."

Miller: "I understand, I'm sorry. I already apologized, but I was already advised that it . . . that the Amendment was not ready. Sorry, Sir. 1497, Mr. Clerk. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, arise?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I know the rules that we serve . . . that we work under are very confusing at times, but he did call House Bill 1471, I am the principal Sponsor, the Committee Amendment is ready. He's ready to put it, so I'd like to have 1471 called."

Miller: "The Clerk's already informed me that the Bill is not . . . not printed. That's my . . ."

Giorgi: "Which Clerk? Our Clerk or Senate Clerk?"

Miller: "The House Clerk."

Giorgi: "The Amendment isn't ready?"

Miller: "It's not printed and distributed."

Giorgi: "You've had it in your hands over 24 hours and then I presented an Amendment that was ready this morning that's printed already."

Miller: "I'm sorry, Mr. Giorgi, I'm . . . the Gentleman from Shelby, Mr. Tuerk, is recognized."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think we're saying two different things. I think what Representative Giorgi is saying is . . . ah . . . being the Sponsor of the Amendment, it is ready to propose. I think what you're saying is it isn't printed and distributed. Now, I think that's the discrepancy, Zeke, I don't know



if it's printed and distributed or not . . . if that's what the Chair says, why . . ."

Miller: "Okay, the Clerk now tells me that they . . . they have been distributed, Mr. Giorgi, so it's perfectly agreeable to read . . . ah . . . House Bill 1471."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1471, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unemployment Compensation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Miller: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Tuerk, amends House Bill 1471 on page 1, line 17 . . ."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Amendment has to do with amending the Unemployment Compensation Act. At the point and time that we heard this in Committee, there was considerable discussion on it that the . . . ah . . . intended increases in unemployment compensation benefits were extraordinarily high; and the feeling and the consensus of the Committee at that point was that they should be amended to the extent to make it more reasonable . . . ah . . . than what they were presented in the original Bill. Now, the Industrial Affairs Committee . . . ah . . . listened intently and put this Bill in the Subcommittee and under Representative Schoeberlein's leadership and Representative McAuliffe and Representative Jacobs, they came up with a . . . ah . . . a proposal of which the Committee adopted in Committee, and that's the feel of the intent of the Amendment which is offered to this Bill. What was originally intended was that 25 percent increase of the cost of the Board which we felt was high. What the Subcommittee came up with and the Committee adopted was in one . . . in the lower half of the unemployment benefits proposed an increase of 20 percent and in a couple of categories 15 percent and some of the other categories lesser amounts; but . . . ah . . . it came out to be about a 16 percent weighted increase across the board and that's what the Committee adopted in Committee; and I submit that to the Membership in the form of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1471; and I



would move for its adoption."

Miller: "Is there discussion? All right, the question is, shall Amendment #1 be adopted? Mr. Palmer, the Gentleman from Cook."

Palmer: "Ah . . . If the Sponsor would yield for a question?"

Miller: "The Sponsor of the Amendment?"

Palmer: "I note that . . . ah . . . yeah, the Amendment."

Miller: "All right, Mr. Tuerk."

Palmer: "I note that . . . ah . . . in the first category that . . . ah . . . you have that there is an increase of about 20 percent, is that correct?"

Tuerk: "That's correct."

Palmer: "That would be for one individual?"

Tuerk: "That's correct."

Palmer: "And if they are married and have a dependent spouse, it's then 15 percent?"

Tuerk: "Right,"

Palmer: "It goes . . . if . . . if I may speak to that, it goes 20 percent in that first category, 15, 15, 10, 10 and 10 and weighted out it comes to about a 16 percent increase across the board. Ah . . . Is there any . . . if a man is laid off and he has a family, I . . . it . . . ah . . . his benefit would be about 10 percent, is there any reason why it should be 10 percent . . . ah . . . for a man with a family . . . ah . . . to give him 10 percent and then to give a single person then the 20 percent? What . . . what's the rationale on that?"

Tuerk: "Well, the rationale is . . . ah . . . all the input that was made in the Subcommittee hearings and so forth it was felt that we have lagged behind on the benefits paid to that single man in that lower category and actually . . . ah . . . there's well over 50 percent of all claims within that first category and it was felt that this would be . . . ah . . . more beneficial to these people, whereas, in the higher benefit areas . . . ah . . . which is . . . ah . . . only a small percentage of those people affected the smaller increase would be reasonable and therefore that's why . . . that's the rationale that went into the . . . ah . . .



deliberations."

Palmer: "Well, because if there's less people though that receive that particular benefit that is a man with a family . . . ah . . . is that any reason why his increase should be less than one man . . . ah . . . just one person? Shouldn't it be even all the way around?"

Tuerk: "No, I just explained to you why we felt that in one category it ought to be higher than another."

Palmer: "Well, I understand . . . I understand what you . . . what you stated, but . . . ah . . . it's true that a man that has a family would get less of a benefit than what a single person would get, am I right on that?"

Tuerk: "No, he's not going to get less of a benefit, he's going to get less of an increase in the benefit, but in . . . in terms of the experience factor, this was all taken into consideration."

Palmer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I have Amendment #2 which would provide a 20 percent Amendment increase across the board which I would . . . ah . . . speak on if I have the opportunity to do so, but I wonder whether or not we . . . ah . . . number 1, it seems to me that there is a . . . that there should be an evenness or a uniformity in reference to this. A man with a family is more sorely in need of . . . of money than perhaps the single person is; and . . . ah . . . the other . . . the other aspect of this thing is that the . . . ah . . . administration seeks to increase the benefits of several administrations."

Miller: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from . . . ah . . . Peoria, Mr. Tuerk, arise?"

Tuerk: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think . . . I think the Gentleman from Cook is speaking on his Amendment rather than speaking to my Amendment. I think he has one to offer, but . . . ah . . . I think we vote Amendment #1 up or down and . . . ah . . . then we go on to #2 if he gets that opportunity."

Palmer: "Well, let me just conclude by saying that there should be . . . ah . . . the man with a family should get more money. His increase should be at least equal to the man . . . the increase of the man with a . . . with a single person and for that reason I . . . I . . .



I don't believe that this Amendment to the Bill will . . . is exactly correct . . . ah . . . insofar as the benefits are concerned."

Miller: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. R. L. Dunn."

Dunn: "I have a question for either the Sponsor or the last Speaker, Representative Palmer. Do you have any idea what . . . ah . . . the increased cost might be or to employers or whoever . . . ah . . . to revise . . . revise the . . . ah . . . benefit structure along the lines of your suggestions?"

Miller: "Mr. Giorgi."

Dunn: "No, I'm not talking to the Sponsor of the Amendment or the . . . or the last Speaker, you know, whoever might be . . . to that . . ."

Miller: "Oh, I'm . . . I'm sorry. I'm sorry, Mr. Palmer, Mr. Tuerk. Mr. Palmer, care to answer?"

Palmer: "Being . . . ah . . . as I understand it, the . . . ah . . . the cost of the fund by the Tuerk Amendment would be approximately 8.3 percent. The cost of the fund with the Amendment #2 if it's passed or enacted would be about 10 percent. The cost of the employer depends upon a risk factor, that . . . ah . . . of the employment. As I understand it, . . . ah . . . your public utilities have the lowest risk factor in employment in that they pay about  $\frac{1}{2}$  of 1 percent based on the . . . up to a maximum of \$4,200. The . . . if it's a very high risk . . . ah . . . business that is the turnover of employer . . . employ . . . employees, and in that category perhaps would be your taxicab operators, et cetera, would be about . . . ah . . . about . . . ah . . .  $\frac{1}{2}$  of 1 percent to those . . . to that particular type of employer; but it's all based on the risk factor involved, the risk factors involved."

Dunn: "Thank you."

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

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I also rise in opposition to this Amendment because of the inequality and the number of





. . . the benefits given to the number of children of . . . the more children you have, the less percentage increase that are given to the family; and the person who needs it most at that stage of the game is the one who has the large family; and, therefore, just because he has more than one or two children does not mean he should have less percentage for each child that he has to support. In fact, on a national scale even the President himself has asked that we increase the . . . these supports and these benefits and I think that the Amendment that is going to be put in if given him opportunity by Representative Palmer will be a more equitable one and, therefore, I rise in opposition to this particular Amendment."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Schoeberlein."

Schoeberlein: "Ah . . . Mr. Chairman, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it looks like I'm the middleman on this. When we adjourned due to the death of Ben Blades, I worked all day Thursday, I worked all day Friday, and I was here Saturday morning. I made many phone calls to get information so the Subcommittee would have information when we met on Monday. I was not going to keep these Gentlemen who have children and who have a wife at home . . . ah . . . just sit around with me on this, but I did explain it to the Subcommittee when they returned on Monday. Now, the information we had for the benefit of every Member of this House, we like to keep a fund solvent and . . . Mr. Speaker, and for the information of the Members of this House, this fund was at \$500,000,000 in 1967. The fund right now is \$236,000,000, which is less than half of what . . . of the \$500,000,000. The safety point . . . could I have a little quiet please? . . . I'm just wasting myself . . ."

Miller: "Let's have a little quiet, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Schoeberlein: ". . . the safety point of this fund is \$400,000,000, and as I say, it's \$236,000,000 at the present time, as of two weeks ago. Now, what we have done on this is the . . . the Bill itself, Bill 1471, made a 25 percent figure on there which means one fund, one category from \$51 to \$64, another \$74 and \$93, another \$80 to \$100, another \$87 . . . ah . . . \$109, another \$90 . . . \$113,



another \$90 . . . \$121 . . . all right, the way we have this worked out at the present time, the percent of participants and unemployment . . . and unemployment compensation and this is something that surprised me very much, if you'll listen. In number 1 category, it is over 52 percent that claim unemployment compensation, because they are the first ones that are layed off, because they perhaps have a new man, they are the single men or perhaps the husband or the wife that is working. The next one, number 2, is 8.6; number 3, is 12.4; number 4 is 11.4 . . . 11.5; number 5 is down to 7.3; and number 6 is only 7.9, this is the person with four children or more. That's only 7.9 percent of those that are claiming unemployment compensation. Now on the Bill, #1 . . . ah . . . #1, the Amendment that we presented, we have gone to . . . ah . . . from \$51 in 1971-'73 we have gone to \$60; and number 2, we've gone from \$74, we've gone to \$82; number 3, we've gone to \$88 from \$80; number 4, we've gone to \$95 today from \$87; number 5, we've gone from \$90 to \$98; and number 6, we've gone to \$105 from \$97. Now, we thought we worked out a pretty good formula here in order to keep this solvent, and . . . ah . . . with the understanding I did not want to set the top figure as what it should be . . . by . . . by striking the present figure in the Bill which amounted to . . . ah . . . \$2,000, I believe, \$600 to . . . ah . . . \$2,704, we did not touch that formula hoping that somewhere between here and the Senate we could gather information and I now have it that I could use at a later date, I've been waiting for it all morning from Scarga, and . . . ah . . . we could use this particular information; and I was hoping that this could move over to the Senate where this . . . ah . . . amount could be shown what was necessary to keep this fund solvent. The other day I read of the four people down in . . . the teachers in other . . . that are under Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund down in . . . ah . . . in East St. Louis where the fund is short \$1,000,000 in the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund and nobody is doing a damn thing about it. Now, how are these people going to get the money that isn't in the fund? I've been paying in the



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Illinois Municipal Retirement since 1935, but here it is . . . one people, one section of the . . . of those who are members, I.M.R.S., that are \$1,000,000 short in the Illinois Municipal Retirement. So if every school district or every municipality should get short, where is this fund going to be? So I agree with Representative Tuerk, I believe that he's come up with a good formula, if it can be changed between here and the other side instead of being killed, I would say that we should adopt this particular . . . ah . . . this particular Amendment #1 in the House at this time. Thank you."

Miller: "Is there further discussion? All right, the question is, shall Amendment #1 be adopted? All those in favor will say 'aye', opposed 'nay'; do five Members request a Roll Call? All right, all those in favor of Amendment #1 . . . adoption of Amendment #1 will vote 'aye', and opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. R. L. Dunn. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk . . . 'aye' . . . on this question there are 109 'ayes' and 19 'nays'; and the Amendment is adopted . . . Amendment #1 is adopted . . . other Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Palmer, amends House Bill 1471 on page 5, line 25, by striking . . ."

Miller: "All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer, is recognized with . . . in regard to Amendment #2."

Palmer: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 would increase the benefits to the . . . all right . . . the various persons who are unemployed . . ."

Miller: "Just a moment . . . just a moment, Mr. Palmer, I have several men. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk, arise?"

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think I raised a point of order, Amendment #1 has been adopted. Amendment #2 speaks of the very same issue. I think if you check it, you'd find Amendment #2 in conflict with Amendment #1."

Miller: "It appears . . . the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Ah . . . Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,



I would object to unauthorized lobbyists using the side of the halls for lobbying on Bills, and I would ask the . . . ah . . . Sergeant of Arms that this hall be cleared please."

Miller: "The Sergeant at Arms will please clear the aisles on either side . . . side of the . . ."

Collins: "The Gentleman representing the currency exchanges, right back there, Mr. Spillberg . . . I would ask that he be removed from the Chambers."

Miller: "Representative is correct, your point is well taken, Mr. Collins. Will the Sergeant at Arms please carry out what is necessary to clear the side aisles that are lobbying for Bills. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, arise?"

Shea: "Ah . . . Mr. Chairman, I voted on the prevailing side on Amendment #1 and I would at this point like to make a motion to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #1 was adopted."

Miller: "Right at the moment, Mr. Shea, we're involved in trying to decide whether or not the . . . ah . . . the motion before the House is with respect to Amendment #2 whether or not that is in conflict with Amendment #1."

Shea: "All right, I would just like to make that motion. I'll file the written motion and ask that the Sponsor keep the Bill on Second Reading please."

Miller: "Mr. Palmer, it appears to the Chair that in certain instances . . . ah . . . Amendment #2 is in conflict with Amendment #1 because it is attempting to . . . ah . . . refer to language that is al . . . which has already been stricken by Amendment #1. So it does appear to the Chair to be in conflict. Hold it just a moment, please, for what purpose does the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan, arise?"

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, I voted 'no' on Amendment #1, I didn't want to get into this debate because I was going to rise in support of Romie Palmer's Amendment #2. Now, during the debate, Mr. Palmer said to you that he has an Amendment addressing himself to the same question. I suggest that you said to him and to this House that we will take up his Amendment. Now, because of some technicality which this House has been faced with in the past because it pertains



to the same thing we're not being given an opportunity to judge whether Romie Palmer's Amendment is better than Representative Tuerk's Amendment just by the quirk of one being a Committee Amendment and one being an Amendment from the floor. I suggest to you that Representative Shea's motion should be in order so that we at least have the opportunity to vote on which Amendment should be adopted to this Bill."

Miller: "Well, right at the moment, Mr. Hanahan, we are considering Amendment #2, and that has as yet has not been disposed of. So if you'll abide with us for just a moment. Does Mr. Palmer care to be recognized with respect to the Chair's feeling and belief in ruling that there is a conflict."

Palmer: "Mr. . . . Mr. Speaker, will you take this out of . . . out of the Record right now . . ."

Miller: "Ah . . . The Chair . . ."

Palmer: ". . . so we can make a determination . . ."

Miller: ". . . take what out of the Record, Mr. . . ."

Palmer: ". . . take the consideration of the question that's put to the Speaker . . . ah . . . on the parliamentary point as to whether or not it is in conflict."

Miller: "Ah . . . Do you want to withdraw the Amendment, Mr. Palmer?"

Palmer: "I didn't ask for that, but just to . . . ah . . . on the parliamentary point of conflict put to the Speaker if he'll hold it, or if he'll take . . . if he'll take . . ."

Miller: "The Chair is having difficulty in abiding by your request, Sir, because the Chair has already ruled . . ."

Palmer: "All right . . . take it out of the Record if you . . ."

Miller: "Do you withdraw the Amendment?"

Palmer: ". . . take the Amendment . . ."

Miller: "All right, does the Gentleman have leave to withdraw Amendment #2? All right, leave is . . . hearing no objection, leave is granted. Now, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "If my motion to reconsider the vote by which House . . . er . . . Amendment #1 to House Bill 1471 were successful and that Amendment were defeated, would Amendment #2 then be in a posture to amend the



Bill? Oh, come on, what's the matter?"

Miller: "Ah . . . Mr. Shea, that's a rhetorical question at the moment, and the Chair . . ."

Shea: "All right, then I would like to proceed with my motion having voted on the prevailing side of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1471, I would like to reconsider the vote by which that Amendment was adopted. It was a Roll Call vote."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, on that Roll Call . . . on the motion and the adoption of it, there was a Roll Call, and I would ask the Speaker how many persons voted on the prevailing side and suggest that that many people will have to vote to support this Gentleman's motion? Will the Clerk tell me how many? . . . I hope so."

Miller: "The count was 108, 108, 108 'ayes' and 8 . . . 19 'nays'."

Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Miller: "All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, has moved that . . . that he has voted on the prevailing side he moves to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #1 was adopted. Now, all those in favor of the Gentleman's motion to reconsider, all right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Now, do I understand, Mr. Speaker, that in order for this Gentleman's motion to prevail he must get 108 votes?"

Miller: "Ah . . . In answer to the Gentleman's inquiry, it appears to the Chair that as long as it took a majority of those voting in the last . . . on the last Roll Call to which you refer, he would also now just take a majority of those voting."

Walsh: "It would take a simple majority of those voting, Mr. Speaker?"

Miller: "No, those voting on the question. This is adoption of an Amendment."

Walsh: "And for this Gentleman's motion to prevail, it would take a simple majority of those voting?"

Miller: "Well, in the Chair's opinion, it would be a simple majority."

Walsh: "Ah . . . May . . . May I suggest then, Mr. Speaker, that the Members vote 'no' on the Gentleman's motion in order to keep the Amendment on."



Miller: "All right, now the question is on the motion by Mr. Shea that the vote by which . . . ah . . . Amendment #1 to House Bill 1471 was passed be reconsidered. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk, arise?"

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in explanation of my 'no' vote it seems that apparently that we've come to that time in the Session when we adopt Amendments on the floor and we get an overwhelming support for an Amendment, which in my estimation was a good Amendment, that somebody votes on the prevailing side and then all of a sudden had second thoughts and . . . ah . . . moves to reconsider which is certainly their prerogative, but let me say this as you persist in this motion and adopt Amendment #2, what I'm saying to this Body and what I've said to the Committee and I've said to all those who propose the higher increases, that you're running the risk again as you did in 1971 of jeopardizing the entire people throughout the State of Illinois in getting no increases in unemployment comp' because if you recall this House did vote out increases in 1971, they were high increases. The Bill went to the Senate, the Senate killed the Bill and I'm fearful that's what's going to happen again this time. Now, if that's the wishes of this House, you go ahead and adopt Amendment #2, but what I'm saying to you is, and I've said to the union people, I've said to the Industrial Affairs Committee, I've said to the Sponsor of this Bill that this is a responsible position, it gives people a reasonable increase in unemployment comp', and I would think that that's what this House would want to do is adopt Amendment #1 and defeat Amendment #2."

Miller: "All right, the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "I'd like to explain my vote."

Miller: "You may proceed."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that last explanation is exactly what is wrong. The explanation that we should somehow kowtow and bend over backwards for somebody's position that possibly never even knew what it was like, the unemployed or the degradation



of being out of a job. Well, let me tell that Gentleman, there's a lot of people in Illinois that's out of work, not because they don't want to work, but for reasons not of their own choosing, and we're talking about helping those people, and it is a political issue that is the State Senate does not adopt a good increase in unemployment compensation that they're going to stand a test of election next year, and let them be elected or defeated according how they treat people who are unemployed. I'm sick and tired of saying that we should kowtow to the manufacturers in the Chamber of Commerce and compromise for them. We're talking about working people, people who want to go to work, and I say to you, Representative Tuerk, that you should vote for the best increases in the judgment of what's good for working people, not for the best interest of the industrials of Peoria."

Miller: "All right, the Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Schoeberlein. I'd recognize Representative Schoeberlein if he'd care to talk now."

Schoeberlein: ". . . other voices and I'm not going to talk . . ."

Miller: "All right, if you'd like to wait, Mr. Schoeberlein, I'll recognize the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise on a point of personal privilege. I don't think the Gentleman from McHenry was listening to what I had to say. I'm saying Amendment #1 went through the Industrial Affairs Committee, the consensus was that these raises in unemployment comp' benefit were too high. We put it in the Subcommittee, we worked it out, we've given what we consider and most of the people throughout the State consider this to be a reasonable increase, and what I'm saying is that it would appear to me that the adoption of Amendment #1 would give the people across the state who are unemployed increases, needed increases in unemployment comp'. Now, what he's suggesting is that we should adopt higher increases, and I suggest to him and to this Body that Amendment #1 addressed itself to a problem, came up with a responsible position and I think it should be adopted as opposed to higher, higher, higher increases, which are apt to get defeated, which then the people of the State of Illinois who are unemployed



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



would get no increases and unemployment comp' benefits. Now, you take the choice."

Miller: "All right, the Gentleman . . . ah . . . we're on explanation of votes, Mr. . . . we have a Roll Call on the board. I asked the Clerk to take the Record, and I've been allowing an explanation of votes. You may ask a rhetorical question, yes, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "In explaining my 'yes' vote to reconsider, I . . . ah . . . this matter, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to ask the Sponsor of this Amendment what assurance does he have from the opposite side of the rotunda from the (boggled off) Senate that they'll pass any . . . any increases? Has he got a verbal assurance that's going to go through that Committee or not, or does it have to go back in the Conference Committee again like we have in the past on many of these issues?"

Miller: "All right, out of order, but . . . ah . . . Mr. Tuerk has already explained his vote. The only way I can answer . . . have him answer your question if he wants to, the Chair will recognize him, otherwise I . . . the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. . . . Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Gentleman from Cook asked a question. I can't give him any assurance of what the Senate is going to do with anything. I'm just saying to you that if you look back and you were two years ago and you know precisely what happened. I'm just suggesting to this Body that the same thing might happen and is apt to happen and I want to protect the people of the state rather than hurt them."

Miller: "All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dunn, R. L. Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I . . . I'd like to reiterate what Representative Tuerk has said, the Chairman of the Industrial Affairs Committee. We made an attempt in the Industrial Affairs Committee, the Subcommittee Report, very capably handled by Ralph Schoeberlein, and he explained how hard he worked to get us the proper facts so we could evaluate this matter. We came up with a Bill that we thought would have the best chance of passing both Houses and getting signed into law so people could get . . . ah . . . a justifiably needed increase in unemployment benefits. We haven't



had an increase in over three years, and I would like to remind some of the Members of that Committee that are now supporting . . . the opposition of the Bill to the agreement they made in that with me personally in that Committee meeting, and I was very, very surprised at the attitude that some of them are taking right now; and this . . . to turn this into as Representative Hanahan suggested, a political issue for the next election rather than getting some meaningful benefits passed is a mistake for the working man in this state."

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

Shea: "I wonder if Mr. Tuerk would yield to a question? Fred, I've asked Zeke to pull this out of the Record, and I suggest that maybe we get together and talk about it and we could settle it a lot quicker than by taking up all the time of the House. Would that be agreeable with you?"

Tuerk: "Well, Representative Shea, actually we've done considerable talking about this already and it seemed to me that the Sponsor of this Bill . . . it seemed to me, let me emphasize that, it seemed to me that the Sponsor of this Bill had agreed that this Amendment was in order, and if we take it out of the Record, we have more conferences and so on. I think what it would do, Gerry, is just take more time of the House because it'd come back again on Second Reading and we'd have Amendments . . . ah . . . I think we've given this considerable thought and discussion and I think . . . ah . . . now it's up to you people to vote it up or down, one way or the other."

Shea: "All right, thank you."

Miller: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, as principal Sponsor of this Bill, could I pull it out of the Record temporarily?"

Miller: "If the House grants leave, yes, Sir. We're on a Roll Call right at the moment."

Giorgi: "I'd like to . . . I'd like leave of the House to pull this Bill out of the Record for a few moments. Mr. Speaker, where are we at in parliamentary procedures?"

Miller: "We're on a Roll Call right now, and there are 82 'ayes' and 68



'nay's on the Gentleman's motion to reconsider."

Giorgi: "Well, I think . . . I should say from the mood of the Committee, the day I appeared before them with this Bill, I did agree with the Chairman of that Committee to do the best that I could about raising unemployment compensation rates. Everything that's been said by Mr. Tuerk and Mr. Dunn are . . . is correct. Now, I'd like to . . . ah . . . insure that what we've talked about gets into the Bill and that's why I'd like to pull it out of the Record before you make a parliamentary decision."

Miller: "Is there leave to withdraw this Bill from the Record at the present time? All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "After we get the Roll Call . . . at . . . at that point there's just a motion to reconsider, is that correct?"

Miller: "That is correct."

Shea: "Then it would be in a position where Amendment #1 could be voted up or down?"

Miller: "We would be back on consideration."

Shea: "All right."

Miller: "On this question, the Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Jacobs."

Jacobs: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I served on the Industrial Affairs Committee, the Sponsor of the Bill, Representative Giorgi, did make . . . did say in our Committee that he would not put an . . . another Amendment or have one put on. I believe that Representative Giorgi did not have the present Amendment put on, none of the Members of the Committee that I know of made any reference to that we would not support any other Amendments. We agreed with Giorgi on his promise not to have someone put it on. Now, if Zeke . . . if you had this Amendment put on, I could not vote for it, and I know that you did not or you wouldn't have asked to have it taken from the Record. So I was never happy with the total outcome and I don't think that we should be accused, any of this side of the aisle, for making any promises we didn't fulfill. I think we did go along with Zeke, with Representative Giorgi, I should say, but we did not promise that we wouldn't support any Amendment or fight any other . . . other Amendment. Thank you."



Miller: "The Chair will recognize the Gentleman from Kane, Mr.

Schoeberlein, and we must go on to other business after that."

Schoeberlein: "Ah . . ."

Miller: "Mr. Schoeberlein."

Schoeberlein: ". . . Mr. Speaker, . . . Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, Mr. Giorgi . . . Representative Giorgi and I went down to Mr. Bobbitt's office together, arm in arm you might say, and we were in agreement on many things here. Ah . . . One thing I would like to say in explaining my vote as I wanted to say before was that there was an increase of 10 percent in living costs when the price . . . when the . . . ah . . . when this . . . when the weekly . . . when the monthly increase was increased at 15.2, the living cost increase was 10.2. This time the living cost increase is 6.6 and we have increased it 16 percent. Now, I think this should be taken into consideration and if there is a meeting, I spent a lot of time on this, as a Gentleman as I've tried to be here on the floor, I would just like to be able to sit and listen to others."

Miller: "On this . . . on this question, there are 84 'ayes' and 67 'nays', and the Gentleman's motion to reconsider prevails. Now, the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, has requested that this Bill be taken out of the Record. Leave? All right, take it out of the Record. House Bills, Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, will you start with the priority of call on the Calendar."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 723, Murphy, a Bill for an Act to amend Section 1 and to add Sections to an Act relating to compensation of Sheriffs, Coroners, County Treasurers, County Clerks and Clerks of certain courts. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, . . . ah . . . this is a Bill that will rectify the situation which for a long time has been very unfair. It deals with the salaries of our County Sheriffs throughout the State of Illinois, except in Cook County. At present, our Sheriffs' salaries are fixed in the same manner and under the same limits as our other county officers; and



yet our Sheriffs are called upon to serve in a manner quite different from other county officers. The County Treasurer, Auditor, Recorder of Deeds, the Clerk, all of them for the most part work a routine 8 hours a day. The Sheriff, on the other hand, is required to be on call 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. This includes Christmas, New Year's, Easter and all of the holidays. Only two other county officers, the Coroner and State's Attorney, are based on separate . . . ah . . . provisions as different from the other routine officers. I'd like to point out that our Sheriffs are subject to serious hazards, everytime one of these men go out on a call at nighttime and around the jail, he's in a potentially dangerous situation. Ah . . . I'd like to point out that the last legislative raise for these men was in 1967. This Bill will not take effect until December of 1974. Over this seven-year period, the cost-of-living index will have increased by 40 some per . . . 40 percent. The increase in the minimums are merely picking up 34 percent of the rise of the cost-of-living over these many years. If you are interested in good quality law enforcement, I urge your support of this Bill."

Speaker Blair: "Discussion? All right, the question is, shall House Bill 723 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. Waddell 'aye', Hunsicker 'aye', Hunsicker 'no'. What . . . do you want to do, do you want to talk? All right, at this point there are 117 'ayes' and 10 'nays'; and the Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Hunsicker, to explain his vote."

Hunsicker: "The reason that I'm voting 'no' on the . . . gentleman . . . is that I don't know how the other counties operate, but the Sheriff in our county, the sheriff gets his living quarters furnished, he gets his groceries . . . he's got his car, he got . . . I can't believe it doesn't cost him anything except the clothes on his back, and he gets his raise as the cost of living goes up and therefore I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Blair: "On this question there are 117 'ayes' and 10 'nays'; and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, de-



clared passed."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 620, Philip, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Philips."

Philips: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 6 . . . House Bill 620 does two things. It reduces the age for antique cars from 30 to 20 years old, and secondly it reduces the license fee from \$20 to \$10 per year. There's no opposition from the Secon . . . from the Secretary of State's office, and I ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Blair: "Discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there are 110 'ayes', 7 'nays', and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 669, Keller, a Bill for an Act relating to State Parks. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Keller."

Keller: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, . . . ah . . . this Bill is the naming of a . . . district in . . . my . . . I'd appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Blair: "Discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there are 142 'ayes', no 'nays'; this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 518, McMasters, a Bill for an Act to amend the Inheritance Tax Act. Third Reading . . ."

Speaker Blair: "Take it out of the Record, he's not here. Wait a minute, . . . ah . . . Mr. . . . okay, Mr. Skinner is handling that, go ahead."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 518 was taken out of the Record the last time we were on Third Reading at the . . . the Minority Leader's request. Sets in a . . . in the Attorney General's opinion from



. . . dated June 23, 1972, and has been circulated, and I presume there is no longer any question about the intent of the Bill. It will give a \$50 service fee for each inheritance tax estate handled by the County Treasurer. The county is mandated to collect inheritance taxes but receives no remunerations. Ah . . . I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on this Bill."

Speaker Blair: "Discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there are 129 'ayes', 10 'nays'; this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 637, Kozubowski . . . wanted that out of the Record."

Speaker Blair: "All right, take . . . take it out? Take it out."

Jack O'Brien: "687, . . ."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman says take it out."

Jack O'Brien: "709, Washington, a Bill for an Act to provide for the location of low and moderate income housing within certain communities of this state. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Washington: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'll try to be brief . . . ah . . . we have in the State of Illinois an extremely serious economic problem and I think House Bill 709 as the Chicago Today in its editorial supports stated represents a modern, sensible, partial solution to the problem. May I have some order, Mr. Speaker? As we all well know, industry has been building up the suburbs over the past 10 years, the suburbs are burgeoning, the taxation is increasing in the suburbs, the demand for employment is increasing, but yet still the housing facilities for those in the suburbs on the lower and modern income level are practically nil. Conversely in the inner city, industry has been leaving, new industry has not been built up, the tax base has been eroding, unemployment has been increasing and the lack of mass transportation to get to labor pool in the inner city to suburb job market, I . . . I left the fact that there are no readily available housing facilities



anywhere near proportionate to the problem in the suburbs as creates a tremendous crises. Superimposed on that, Mr. Speaker, I do want some order on this Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Blair: "All right, . . . ah . . . the Gentleman would like some order."

Washington: "Superimposed on that, Mr. Speaker, or in orderly stringent zoning housing and building laws in certain suburban areas and some of our major counties was preventing the building of low and moderate income housing notwithstanding that that housing would meet some of the same requirements. We must do to . . . we must relieve the unemployment ratio in higher cities and we must supply the labor pool to the burgeoning suburbs which needs this labor in order to keep them . . . as a viable economic unity . . . a unit rather within the . . . within this country. House Bill 709 is a meager, moderate, sensible proposal to that. It simply says by way of a very uncomplicated formula that if you have within a given community a given amount of increase in commercial and industrial properties, which calls for . . . you were reaching for it, I wish you'd hit it again, Mr. Speaker . . . which calls for a certain amount of skill and semi-skilled labor, than that community must not through this zoning and building or housing laws preclude the building of a minimal amount of low and medium income housing. It does not mandate that the community should build anything. It simply opens the door to building the sensible, near-side low and modern income housing for workers throughout our state who want to get to the job market to make their economic contribution to the state. I have confined this jurisdiction of the Bill to counties of over 250,000. I have reason to be certain here that everyone here understands the problem, I don't want to belabor it. I could go on for days and so could you. I think you also understand that we've got to have a solution to that problem. Hopefully, you have read the Bill and have paid particular attention to Amendment #2 which we have drawn on this Bill as concisely and tightly as we possibly can. It is supported by the League of Women Voters, the Chicago . . . supported by Chicago Today, it's supported by the U. S. Steel Workers,





N.A.A.C.P., and many other organizations. As I said before, it is a moderate, sensible solution . . . I hope this House . . . I hope this House will accept House Bill 709 as being a partial solution to a seriously . . . very serious economic and housing problem in the state; and I urge your endorsement of House Bill 709."

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

Juckett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, first . . . ah . . . a parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Blair: "State your point."

Juckett: "Because this does affect units of government of 250,000 or more, would this Bill require 107 votes to be effective?"

Speaker Blair: "All right, while we're . . . ah . . . looking at that point, do you want to address yourself to the merits?"

Juckett: "Yes, . . . ah . . . would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Blair: "He indicates he will."

Juckett: "Ah . . . From what you indicated, does this . . . ah . . . Bill then make obsolete or ineffective the local building requirements of the communities of the cities . . . of Illinois?"

Washington: "No, it does not. I am not aware of any local building or housing standards which excel those of the Federal and State Government. This Bill mandates that any housing or Bill pursuant to this Act must rigidly comply with the Federal Housing Standards and the State Housing Standards and the Environmental Control Rules as laid down by the State of Illinois. No, I say that this Bill in many, many instances will uplift the building housing standards of a given locale."

Juckett: "Okay, why did you not include Local Governmental Standards?"

Washington: "A certain degree of uniformity is obviously necessary. You know as well as I do, Representative Juckett, that many Local Housing Standards are ridiculous and they scream requirements. There are certain communities in this state which require plumbing to last for a 100 years when the building can't last for 50. What we have done . . . what we have attempted to do is simply lay out very . . . standards, not . . . or health or safety requirements of any given operation and I define one here . . . State, Federal Housing



Standards do not comport with health and safety. What we have done in most instances by adhering to those three requirements is to uplift the standards."

Juckett: "Well, let me read to everybody in this Assembly Section 8 of this Act enforcement 'Any person injured under this Act including the landowner and developer of a proposed site for a qualified mixed income housing development and the potential occupance of such housing may sue a community in the Circuit Court on the ground that the community's refusal to issue a zoning or other permit as required by this Act or on the ground on the nonconformance of the community's low and moderate income housing plan with the requirements of this Act. Such persons if they are successful in the action shall recover all court costs and attorneys fees incurred in bringing and prosecuting the action. The community shall bear the burden of proving that it has met the minimum housing needs of low and moderate income workers or its low and moderate housing plan meets the requirements of this Act and is reasonably calculated to meet the minimum housing needs of low and moderate income workers'. Now, how can you say that this doesn't affect local communities? How can you say that this meets the standards of the State of Illinois, and how can you stand there and tell me that you are not trying to override the decisions of local people who for their knowledge is far superior to yours or mine of their community and you're not only saying that their standards don't apply, but the community and every member in that community is guilty before they have a right to trial? Mr. Washington, I'm surprised. I'm astounded that you would try to get a piece of legislation like this without admitting what it contains. My, my, God. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that Section right there if no other Section first would mandate that we have 107 votes, but it would mandate that how could we look to people in our own communities when we meet them on the streets saying that they have no knowledge and no idea of how to run their communities, but that our distinguished colleague from Cook knows all and sees all and in this Bill tells all. I would certainly recommend a 'no' vote on this Bill of our distinguished colleague."



Speaker Blair: "Ah . . . Do you want to answer that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington . . ."

Washington: "I'm certain, Representative Juckett, that we are charmed by the levities displaced in your voice, but I don't think we should let levity or that type of subtle sarcasm remove for one solitary minute the fact that you have taken something very serious out of context. You're referring to only the enforcement powers, but if you had read the whole Bill, which evidently you did not, you would've found that the community is not mandated to do anything, but it did meet the minimum . . . minimum housing requirements as set forth in this Act, then if they are taken into court, they have an affirmative defense. I repeat, the community is not mandated to do anything. The community is simply precluded to its zoning building or housing laws which in most instances are far inferior to the federal or state standards from precluding a minimal amount, the minimum amount of low and modern income housing. Let me give you an example, it has been discovered that in the Chicago Metropolitan area 15 percent of all the jobs created since 1967, they're low and moderate income jobs under \$6,000. All this Bill says . . . what this Bill says is that no community can prevent in a scattered size situation the building of a minimum of 15 percent low and moderate income housing. The purpose being that the burgeoning and commercial goings on in the suburbs need a labor pool, they can't get a labor pool. They are busing, if you will, busing workers to the suburbs and in many instances they can't get there. The absentee rate is skyrocketing. The efficiency rate in industry in the suburb is horribly low. Management in industry in the suburbs wants to do something about it. This is a moderate attempt to accommodate them and accommodate the people in the State of Illinois and also those people throughout the world who depend upon our market. I do not think it befits you, Representative Juckett, to reduce such an urgent, sincere and I think viable solution to this serious problem to reduce that level of levity, chicanery, buffoonery and all those things that you are very good at."

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

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a



question or two?"

Speaker Blair: "Ah . . . Yes, he indicates he will."

Bluthardt: "Harold, I'm not particularly concerned about . . . ah . . . lower housing in my community because most of the housing in . . . ah . . . my community is low or moderate . . . ah . . . type housing. Ah . . . I am concerned though with the provisions of your Act that refers to state standards and the standards of a county low cost housing plan. I'm concerned with the fact that you would have . . . ah . . . a county supersede the . . . of a . . . of a municipality, especially Cook County; but getting to the question, what if a community is essentially built, is there a requirement here that an area may be designated for low . . . low or moderate cost housing, even though it has federal structures on it that those structures would be raised and low cost housing constructed there?"

Washington: "We . . . no, there are no such provisions here . . . ah . . . there is no attempt nor do I read into this Act and I . . . simply can't see where you could read into the Act the requirement that there be a raising of property for the building of low income housing. There is no such requirement here. It is implied throughout the Act that you're talking primarily about vacant land . . . about vacant land."

Bluthardt: "Well, there's a requirement here that says Section 4, permits and approval, 'the community shall not be denied any zoning, building or other permits or approval necessary for the construction of a qualified, mixed income housing development which meets the state standard specified in Section 5. Now, say that the . . . ah . . . the . . . ah . . . Housing Authority wants to build a low or moderate cost housing development in a particular area or the village or . . . or a city in the suburbs of Cook County. Could they not designate that area and . . . ah . . . require the . . . ah . . . the municipality to issue permits and to allow the . . . ah . . . property be raised and a project . . . lower housing project developed there . . . ah . . ."

Washington: "No, that . . . no . . ."

Bluthardt: ". . . merely because that community does not have a mixed



income group residing in that area?"

Washington: ". . . let us see what we're talking . . . when we say mixed, pardon me, when we say community, what we're talking about . . . ah . . . by definition under this Act a community is so extensive with the jurisdiction of the zoning, building and housing loan. That's what we mean by community. This Act does not mandate that they raise . . . raise property, nor does it mandate that they be given a particular piece of property, they have to negotiate for that sort of thing."

Bluthardt: "However, it gives the authority to . . . to acquire that property and . . . ah . . . it seems that that authority supersedes the authority of Local Government. So if they decide . . . ah . . . that they want to purchase that square block and build low cost housing, I guess that they would have the authority under your Act."

Washington: "No, no, no where in this Act do we say that? In the first place, don't use authority, we're talking about limited dividends, not for profit or that sort of organization, not authority."

Bluthardt: "Well, it's an authority or an entity, call it what you want . . ."

Washington: "Well, it may be a governmental entity, but don't emphasize authority. The emphasis here is on not for profit. The city or the community does not have to give up a particular piece of land if that land is not available. All that they ask is that the community cannot prevent them from building low and moderate income housing on a given site that is available because of zoning, building, and housing on; and I want to keep repeating that because that's the essence of this Act, you don't have to give up a given piece of property if that property is not available to negotiation on a part of the builders and the owners, then there's no available property."

Bluthardt: "Well, then I'd like to speak against the Bill. I think that it's a mistake to proceed in this manner to . . . to acquire low and moderate cost housing. It's . . . ah . . . something . . . but the old idea of forced housing, that's not going to stop the problem that exists, and I . . . I admit there is a problem that exists and the problem mainly is the lack of proper transportation



to and from the City of Chicago to these jobs. If you will support the mass transportation setup that would give adequate transportation to the suburban communities and the City of Chicago, you would no longer need this type of legislation. In fact, I don't think you need it now, I think you're going the wrong direction; and I oppose the Bill."

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

Huskey: "Mr. . . . Mr. Speaker, . . . ah . . . I would like to ask the Sponsor a question."

Washington: "All right."

Huskey: "Representative Washington, on the existing zoning laws of the suburban communities . . . ah . . . will your Bill overrule their local zoning ordinances?"

Washington: "If by virtue the particular zoning law which might require so much land funded or so much room space in a given locale, if by virtue of those zoning laws the community is precluding the zoning of a modest minimum amount of low income and moderate income housing, yes, that . . . this Bill maintains that the local zoning law must fail, and it did fail, and it did fail. Why should a suburban community let an industry into that community, receive the benefit of the top executive jobs for that community, build fine . . . management for that community, take the advantage of all the taxes so they can improve their schools in that community to the detriment of the inner city and then tell the workers who work in the plant who are not executives, 'You can't live here'. It makes no sense to me, and the thing is to me that this will override, completely override, any test zoning or in any given community in the state."

Huskey: "Okay . . . Representative Washington, you will override the zoning laws regardless of the Health and Welfare . . . in that community."

Washington: "The Bill sets out their share . . . the standards are clear . . . enunciated . . . the Federal Housing Standards, State Housing Standards, local health laws."

Speaker Blair: "All right, now, the Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Kempiners."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Speaker Blair: "He indicates he will."

Kempiners: "I think that my question may have already been answered in your answer to a previous question. Are you concerned about . . . are you saying in this Bill that the people in the community have no say, nor do their elected officials have any say as to whether or not that low or moderate income housing is located within the community, is that basically . . . ah . . ."

Washington: "No, I'm not saying that. They do have a voice. The local community which has been the recipient of industry in a given locale can own his own initiative if he desires . . . if he desires, the low or moderate income housing pursuant and if it meets the standards of this Act, they don't have to do anything. If they have . . . the zoning and health and building laws to preclude the housing then they must bow to the will of the state and the will of the Constitution of the state and the will of industry and the will of the working class. It seems to me that if they confront that consistently they're bound to lose. Why get into that confrontation . . . why don't . . . why not the state take the first step which is moderate and minimal to resolve the problem."

Kempiners: "The way you're saying it is that in effect the people of the community really have no say as to whether or not they do want this type of housing?"

Washington: "The people in this community do have a say as I said before. You and I know that if laws are onerous according to the state Constitution and state statutes notwithstanding the will of the people in the given community those laws are overridden. That's what we're doing everyday is setting down standards for human conduct, and if that human conduct doesn't comport with morality and common sense, then you and I and all of us here have drawn up laws to strike it down."

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

Leinenweber: "Will the Gentleman yield for a couple of questions? I'm . . . ah . . . yeah."

Washington: "For Mr. Leinenweber, any day."



Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Washington, it's my understanding that low and moderate income housing is defined in your Bill as government accepted housing, is that right?"

Speaker Blair: "Oh, okay, get of the way . . . the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson, has a point of order."

Rayson: "Ah . . . I thought we had a rule around here when people speak you go to one side of the aisle and then the other. Now, is this . . . is that right?"

Speaker Blair: "No, there's not a rule, it's just a custom of the Chair . . ."

Rayson: "Oh . . ."

Speaker Blair: ". . . and the Chair didn't do it . . ."

Rayson: ". . . well, I . . ."

Speaker Blair: ". . . and the Chair apologizes to you for that, Mr.

Leinenweber withdraws and you may have the floor."

Rayson: ". . . oh, I . . ."

Speaker Blair: "Proceed."

Rayson: ". . . I appreciate the apology and I waived, I wanted to speak to this matter and talk to the Gentleman, but please continue with the great dialogue over there, that's all right, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Blair: "Are you finished? Oh, he yielded to Leinenweber? All right, Leinenweber is up."

Leinenweber: "I am of course, very appreciative. Representative Washington, my question was under your Bill as I read it, low and moderate income housing is defined as government subsidized housing either on federal, state or local needs, is that correct?"

Washington: "No . . . low and moderate income housing will be built, one, by governmental agencies and, two, by not-for-profit organizations and limited dividend corporations."

Leinenweber: "Would it be a defense to an action under Section 8 of this Bill for a municipality, let's say, to show that there was in the community a certain percentage of housing available . . . ah . . . within say rental purchase means for persons who would qualify for low and moderate income workers even though they were not low and moderate income housing that's defined under this Bill?"

Washington: "It would be a perfect defense if one could show that the





housing needs in a given community for low or moderate income workers was fulfilled by the community. That was be an absolute . . . of Section 8."

Leinenweber: "Where does it say that?"

Washington: "It doesn't say it there, but if you read the rest of the Act which makes an exemption for those communities which are . . . and then when you superimpose Section 8 on that you have your answer."

Leinenweber: "I'm talking about housing that would not be under your definition of low and moderate income housing under Section 4, subparagraph 2."

Washington: "Well, the answer still is 'yes'."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Ray . . . Mr. Rayson. Mr. Stone, the Gentleman from Moultrie."

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

Speaker Blair: "All those in favor say 'aye', oppose 'nay'; the 'ayes' have it, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington, to close . . . Mr. Juckett request . . . ah . . . it appears . . . ah . . . that . . . ah . . . that this Bill would fall under the provisions of Section 6 . . . inasmuch as it would . . . an Amendment . . . a power . . . as a home rule unit . . . not exercised . . . United States and for that . . . require 107 votes. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington, to close."

Washington: "Ah . . . I gather that decision disappoints you, Mr. Chair . . . Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Blair: "Ah . . . No, I don't know where that . . . ah . . . that cackling came from . . . it . . . ah . . . the only thing is the . . . the Chair is not aware that the . . . ah . . . state exercises or performs . . . ah . . . would be . . . override . . ."

Washington: ". . . not override . . . in the community . . ."

Speaker Blair: ". . . but it denies . . . limits the power . . . ah . . . and . . . in which the state does not . . . exercising or performing . . . and that comes under G."

Washington: "But, Mr. Speaker, you're presuming. I'm not presuming anything of the sort. It might well be . . . it might well be or



. . . eventually from this Act that the zoning and building laws of a given community will be brought into compliance and there's no confrontation between this Act and those laws."

Speaker Blair: "Is . . . There's a requirement that it has to be done under the Act."

Washington: "Very well, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Blair: "Ah . . . That . . . that was the interpretation given to me by the Parliamentarian . . . made a brief visit to the podium."

Washington: "Very well then. This Bill has had a thorough discussion and I . . . point. I think the issue is fairly . . . I think what we have delineated for you the serious problem and we've offered what I think is a moderate solution. The opposition if I can interpret opp . . . his opposition and through the interrogation, I think it has no real solid economic base upon which to stand. The questions were would this deny a given community certain rights? Certainly not. Any community which has had the benefit of a decreased tax base through this . . . through the introduction of additional industries seems to me have to . . . has to bear the requirement of providing reasonable, healthful living facilities for anyone who works there. Anything less than that seems to me to be extremely selfish on the part of local communities. I do not think that mass transportation can even begin to resolve this problem. As a matter of fact, I would defy anybody here to tell me today what status . . . is in this state . . . legislation. I think we have to come up with a resounding zero. The only solid answer is that the problem should be approached in two ways. One, partly through mass transportation which would take care of those people who do not want to live in the suburbs which would probably be the most of them; but, two, for those who want to live on the side of their jobs; and I think this is an answer to the problem. I ask your support of House Bill 709."

Speaker Blair: "Ah . . . The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', the oppose 'no'; this requires 107 votes. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it seems to me that in . . .



of the Speakers that has been questioning . . . this piece of legislation . . . would like to have in their communities . . . it seems to me that . . . in many communities . . . housing programs that are set out by F.H.A. . . . the sound basis that these communities are built on is built on F.H.A. and to emerge into that housing program. Along with that . . . lessen that tax impact on the . . . on the people that . . . in the area by coming in and lowering industry out of the inner city out to these areas. Now it seems to me that if you're gonna' use . . . industries to benefit your taxes you ought to have the responsibility then on . . . in the other direction. What we're saying is a minimal step to be . . . to take for communities where these industries have now . . . and the industrial workers cannot live in the communities that they are serving. Many of these people on the busing program that was proposed recently have to pay up to \$60 a month simply to reach these areas and I submit to many of the opponents of this measure these are the same people that cry about welfare, yet when these people cannot afford to go out to the job market to get these intermediary jobs, I would hear the same hue and cry from the same bunch howling about the increased welfare in our . . . in our state. Well, Gentlemen, you cannot have the best of both . . . you got to have it one way or the other. If we can't get passed on a housing program, eventually mass transit is going to come along and I believe that the same Gentlemen are going to cry about spending money for those poor people in the inner city going out in mass transit to these jobs. You can't have it both ways, it's coming, it's a matter of time. I solicit your support on a minimal first step to get housing for industrial workers in the plants that you have lured out of the inner city to broaden your tax base to give you a better base . . . which is the only thing we're asking for here. I solicit your support."

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

Rayson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain my vote. The Gentleman pointed out a problem. Ah . . . There's been some dilemma with other kinds of things such as home rule and other kinds of aspects



of our community life. I think we haven't really dug down to the full extent of this problem, but if I understand the Gentleman as the Bill won't do a heck of a lot to resolve the problem, at least it's in the right direction of recognizing the problem and if we've got good faith, we ought to give enough votes for this Bill to pass. I don't really think it will help, but if there are these kinds of jobs and we all know this, and if the minority people are really denied jobs in suburbs and elsewhere due to transportation problems, I think we've got a duty to have people displaced in jobs to follow the marketplace. We have a duty to save our environment in all of its aspects and one of the aspects is the economic aspect. For example, if . . . if a steel company didn't meet pollution standards and decided to close their old plants to go out and right the suburbs and this displaced many jobs, I'd say the state has the duty and other local units of government has the duty to try and replace these jobs by the same people. If we want to raise the society with . . . ah . . . the Kerner Commission Report and Professor Kornby and others have . . . the case . . . ah . . . total or part-sided America or do we want to meet the problems head-on so that Americans can be enriched no matter where they are in equal opportunities for work? I suggest the Bill is a modest attempt, it's not a feeble attempt, but we should encourage it and pass it and get these votes. Thank you."

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

Holloway: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise from my sick bed to be in support of Representative Washington's Bill 709. Ah . . . As I listened to the debate . . . ah . . . prior to the . . . ah . . . voting, I'm afraid some of us are attempting to make a lot more out of this than . . . ah . . . is really involved through . . . a rather simple proposition many of our areas advertise and they create industrial parks and they entice industry into their area and . . . ah . . . this makes it necessary for people to . . . ah . . . go through great lengths to . . . to get out to work. Now, we're . . . we often see or have seen in the past that when someone who is . . . shall we say a little strange to the neighborhood wanted



to build a house, all of a sudden the appropriate board would meet and . . . and that site would . . . would suddenly be zoned for a park or a library or a forest preserve or some . . . ah . . . public purpose such as that. Now, Representative Washington's Bill simply says that in the event an individual who wants to build a house . . . ah . . . out close to his job finds a place where it can be built that these same people don't meet in a hurry and decide that they're going to have another park. That's all this is about. Now, there are people who say they're opposed to the cross-town and the billion dollar expense of cross town. Well, now . . . ah . . . if you don't want to spend a billion dollars for cross town, then let people . . . ah . . . live where they can afford to live. They're just people, they're not . . . from anybody else. If I make \$20,000 a year, I . . . I have the same tastes and the same standards that anyone in this \$20,000 a year and the same applies to a man who makes \$6,000, or \$5,000 or \$7,000. That's all this Bill is about, it isn't to take any of the rights of citizens in those communities from them; and Ladies and Gentlemen, I vote 'aye', and in the interest of American justice and public policy of Illinois, let's pass this Bill and get this little issue out of the way."

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

Davis: "Mr. . . . Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I did want to speak on this Bill but I knew there'd be a lot of questions and I knew that my learned friend and colleague, Harold Washington, would be willing and ready to answer those questions. In the meantime, the previous question was moved. I'm going to do this as fast as I possibly can. I don't want anyone to get angry if I quote a couple of Proverbs because it's written here in this Bible. One of them says 'The wicked flee when no man pursue it', and the other proverb, I'm not saying this, this is what my Bible says, the Wise King Solomon, and the other proverb says, 'An ungodly man speaketh of evil'. There's no evil in this Bill, there's nothing to run from. You know what, the Bill only affects those counties where 250,000 or more people live. It only really affects about 7 counties, and . . . my figures get it in this state . . . just



about seven counties in this state and what is it trying to do? It's trying to bring jobs and people together, that's all it's trying to do. There's nothing more pathetic in the morning when there is no . . . bumper to bumper trying to get to the suburbs to get to their jobs and then you look on the other side and you see the suburbanites, those who live in luxury, coming in the opposite direction trying to get to the inner cities so they can go to their office. All the Bill says is give 'em a chance, you see, give 'em a chance and when you think about zoning, I would like for you to do this, I remember Dean Lee talking about a . . . and how property is cheap . . . Well, let me tell you something so you'll hand it down, you'll hand it down to your children and your children will hand it down to their children, their children and their children's children, but one day, let me remind you, it will all stop and one day you are going to realize what . . . meant when he said 'I brought nothing into this world and it is certain I'll carry nothing out'. Remember that, that day is gonna' come just as sure as you stand here. I'm asking you now to put people and jobs together. Make it easy so the rich suburbanites to get to the inner cities and make it easy for poor people . . . for poor people to get to the suburbs. This is the way you can make it easy by giving them a chance to own a home in the suburbs. It certainly won't hurt you. Mr. . . . Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly, I'm going to read this to you and I'm going to sit down. I'm reading this to you because you are . . . I reported to you but you'll say I've read it. Listen to this if you'll bear with me, 'If a man say he loves God and hated his brother, he's a liar, for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath not need, how can he love a God whom he hath not seen; if he says that, he's a liar and his truth isn't any . . .'"

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this Bill does address itself to a real problem in Illinois. My own community, Evanston, has recently adopted a very comprehensive, scattered set, low income housing plan, and I doubt that the Bill would effect many of the other communities in my particular district; but I



think it's significant that this Bill does take away from local communities powers that they have traditionally enjoyed to regulate for the benefit of a community's welfare and safety and health at their own standards. I think that it subjects those local plans to state standards, and overcomes the local ordinances if the low income housing plan would be uneconomical. That's what ... the Bill as I read it. I think that I have to respect my own promise to my constituents to come down here and to oppose legislation that unreasonably takes local governmental powers, because I think local government is that closest to the people and thus able to represent their interest. I doubt frankly that a proposal like this if it were adopted would work without local support; and I don't think it can work unless it has that local support; and I, therefore, very reluctantly vote 'no'."

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

Thompson: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've listened to the various discussions here and . . . contradicting itself and the problem. I heard another Speaker say that it takes away the . . . unity . . . Speaker, and this building has not been brought out by any Speaker on the floor exactly what the whole bill is. I say to you, and my mind goes back to the time that was served in the army, that if it hadn't not been for like-minded people like myself, we probably wouldn't have communities just to argue about. When I was called into the army, I had no excuse. I offered and then I wasn't a deserter, I didn't come out looking for amnesty, but I went because this was the kind of country that I loved, the only country that I know and the issue in this Bill here is being kept back by those who have been on this floor to speak and at . . . there will come a time when you will have to be outspoken on the issue and the . . . the housing to these poor and working people . . . ah . . . seeking, you will not have to worry about them. I think every man here is loyal to his . . . thank you. You have 107 votes."

Speaker Blair: "The Clerk will take the Record. Ah . . . Mr. Washington, . . . I'm sorry, go ahead. Mr. Washington."



Washington: "I didn't get a chance to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Blair: "Go . . . go right ahead."

Washington: "And in explaining my vote, I'll be very brief, I simply want to read a statement from Gilbert A. Cornfield of the . . . ah . . . United States Steel Workers Union; he says, 'There is hardly an industrial labor organization that has not lost employment for its members to suburban and newly developed farmland. At the same time, new industry coming into the state is likely to avoid the city and build in newly incorporated areas in the countryside. This life from the city has had an unfortunate impact upon the work force in the general resid . . . in general residing in the center of the city. They give their wholehearted endorsement.' When Roll Call is taken, Mr. Speaker, I will ask for a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Blair: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania."

Catania: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to briefly explain my vote. A little while ago we were talking about unemployment compensation, we were lamenting the fact that the people on unemployment compensation need an increase. What we're talking about here is lowering the unemployment compensation weight, and when you lower the unemployment compensation rate you also lower the crime rate. This is 1973, wouldn't it be nice if by 1976, 200 years after we all pledged ourselves in this country to equal opportunities for everybody, we had really come a little bit closer to achieving it. I hope everybody will join me in voting green."

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

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of the previous . . . ah . . . Speakers suggested that Christian love was somehow involved in this or the lack of it or that the wicked flee when no man pursue it and I'd like to suggest that the Bible also says 'It's inequity to practice hypocrisy'; and I think a lot of the green lights on there are hypocrites. I happen to live in the southwest neighborhood in Washington, D. C., where we had a super redevelopment land agency that said it sold everybody what kind of a house they had to have and whether they were rich and poor and they put some \$70,000 townhouses next to a public housing project and it was just





a catastrophe. Now, we lived in this community, it was integrated, it was peaceful, but they did some foolish things because big brother was saying exactly what kind of houses had to be where and who had to live next to each other. We can live together as Christians and love, but we don't have to have the State of Illinois coming out to every little part of the State of Illinois and telling you what kind of houses you got to build and where they are; and I think that many of those green lights up there ought to . . . ah . . . ought to reconsider what you've done. I think . . . ah . . . we have a House full of hypocrites."

Speaker Bliar: "I agree. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis."

Davis: "I rise to a point of personal privilege. Who is this hypocrite?"

Who is the hypocrite the man in the suburbs who has loaned in industry and loaned out poor people, who is this hypocrite? I leave it to God, Almighty, to answer you, and you hear me, He will answer you."

Speaker Blair: "The . . . ah . . . Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. Since I was one of the ones that had a green light on that board, I would suggest to one of the previous Speakers when he started talking about being hypocrites that it seems to me that some interest that that Speaker represents that tend to come into this General Assembly and want to take tax dollars out for his particular interest in the transportation field same tax dollars from these poor people, he's not defying to give them the opportunity to live in an industrial area I suggest I don't know what his definition of a hypocrite is; but it seems to me that he who is without friend cast the first stone."

Speaker Blair: "The . . . ah . . . the Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Kennedy."

Kennedy: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my green vote. The Gentleman from Lake who is a freshman Legislator and who has subject this House to lots of talk, used the word hypocrite. I don't know whether a Caucasian ever explained his vote on this Bill or not, but I would say to him that if I was a hypocrite by voting green, then the Caucasian race is just . . . as guilty of hypocrisy when they called it slavery. Now,



let's remember that the Caucasian race itself in three or four centuries ago practiced hypocrisy when they brought the black man to America and then refused to give them a decent place and living; and I'm proud that I voted green and I want the Gentleman from Lake to realize that . . . that he might be a hypocrite himself. He ought to keep his mouth shut once in a while."

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

Borchers: "Mr. . . . Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the House, just . . . predict it now, and I just want to say that in my community in Decatur, Illinois, there was a housing unit built called the . . . ah . . . Greenwood, let's see, Greenwood Housing Unit, and . . . ah . . . people came and moved into that area. It's partly wrecked at the moment. The crime has increased incredibly and in this area of town where you can once walk on the streets in safety, you can no longer walk at night. Ah . . . Three little girls about two years ago were surrounded by about 14 or 15, 14-15 year olds, these three little girls were 7 or 8 and they practically were stripped of their clothing, that's just one instance of many of the things that have happened in this particular area. I think it's very dangerous to take all sorts of groups of different people and automatically force them into areas where it changes the complete housing . . . ah . . . situation of an area where . . . ah . . . it changes the com . . . the rich and poor complexion perhaps of schools, perhaps it's wrong that some . . . some people are poor and some are rich, that's true, it's unfortunate, but the simple fact is these things do happen and when it causes turmoil and trouble, I don't think it's for the best interest of the people of this state and will only lead to one thing, and perhaps in other nations in the past to serious internal conflict, and I don't think we should try to go in this direction."

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

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to seriously address this question for just a moment because I think that some of the Members on both sides of the aisle who have either not voted or voted red are not taking into account the effect that



this is going to have on the City of Chicago. Now, do you want the City of Chicago to become a vast wasteland where only the poor-rich and the poor-black live together competing for a limited number of jobs? Do you want the declining tax base that this is going to produce out of the City of Chicago which we here in the state benefit from? Do you want to erect an economic lawn around the city which insulates people with similar problems and drives them further and further into poverty; and then do you want the . . . welfare Bill that you have to pay and welfare that . . . does nothing but perpetuate poverty? This is . . . Bill. If you talk to the people in your communities, you'd realize that it's a free enterprise Bill, and it's also a way of loosening up the present enormities both white and black in inner cities who if they're not . . . are going to explode. This is a modest Bill, it's a Bill that pushes for employment, it's a Bill which everybody in this House has to be able to favor. Let's not becloud the issue by talking about the technical aspects of the Bill, that's not what's really at heart here. What's really at heart is the future of the 5 or 6 counties . . . around Chicago, 7 or 8 million people. Do we bring jobs and people together or do we continue to isolate and imprison the poor whites and the poor blacks in the inner cities? It's your choice. This Bill gives us a chance."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from . . . ah . . . Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in explaining my vote, let me say that the question to me is not a matter of integration, not a matter of poor housing, but a matter of local government, local government controls. Do you want . . . do you want some nonelective agency far removed from the people to be dictating your policy? Do you want some nonelective agency to start running your local government? Well, if you do, why in the world did you adopt a Constitution giving home rule powers to local government. If you have no confidence in that, then, of course, we should do away with all local governments and have one supreme agency in this state or this federal nation of ours operating this government, not the people, let the elected officials run their local governments,



not some supreme agency, not some nonelected agency. Now, in explaining my vote, I voted red. I had become sick and disgusted from the presentation of the opposition to this Bill. I think it was insulting, I think it was in bad taste, and, Mr. Speaker, because of that, I ask that my vote be changed from red to 'present'."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from . . . Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I've had the privilege and pleasure of serving down here for a few years and I come from an all white, an all-white district in northern Illinois. I've represented many different counties over the years to reapportionment. I'd like to suggest to the Members that may be fearful that a vote for a Bill of this nature may have some political consequence. I'd like to remind them, I put in an open occupancy, fair housing, fair employment and every other socially needed Bill that the people of Illinois has needed, and I have increased my political vote each and every election until now I'm going up to retire. I suggest to those Members that have any question about political significance that the underdog is always appreciated. This is the reason why working people today enjoy some dignity, to get up enough full dignity that working people should enjoy . . . it . . . it provides with a Bill of this nature so that working people would have housing credit to their industrial centers. I suggest those who are a little fearful of voting for political repercussions should examine their conscience, vote for what working men and women need and vote green on this Bill."

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

Hirschfeld: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think a little bit for some reason are . . . ah . . . worried about the home rule preemption here. Now, the home rule . . . ah . . . concept was developed in the Constitutional Convention and it was done for a purpose; but it does not . . . it's not a be-all and end-all, it's not a sacred cow that can't be gored. Frankly, if you'll remember just two weeks ago Representative Yourell, and Ewell and myself . . . Representative Yourell was the principal Sponsor, and I think an excellent Bill, which took away some home rule



. . . dealing with policemen and firemen, and the basic reason was we did not trust all the mayors, present company accepted, and some of the city managers to properly . . . ah . . . handle hiring, firing promotion and demotion; and I think what the distinguished gentleman . . . Gentleman from Cook has done with this Bill is that there is some areas where there's on overriding public interest that the Legislature sees fit to pass legislation that is more important than home rule powers. I think this is a good Bill, and I think we ought to give it the few more votes it needs to pass."

Speaker Blair: ". . . The Clerk will give me the Roll Call now. 94 'ayes', . . . 32 'nays', 4 'present'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Harold Washington, for what purpose do you arise?"

Washington: "I respectfully request a poll of the absentees, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the Clerk will poll the absentees."

Fredric Selcke: "Anderson. Arnell. Beatty. Day. Duff. Ralph Dunn. R. L. Dunn. Ebbesen. Fleck. Giorgi. Granata. Grotberg. Harpstrite. Gene Hoffman. Ron Hoffman. Hyde. J. Jones. Kent. Kriegsman. Kriegsman's present?"

Speaker Blair: "Yeah, Kriegsman present."

Fredric Selcke: "Kucharski. LaFluer. Laurino. Madigan. McAvoy. McCormick. McCourt. McGrew. McMaster. Kenny Miller. Kenny Miller 'present'. Molloy. Murphy. Neff. Pappas. Patrick. Re . . . Schlickman."

Speaker Blair: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, arise?"

Schlickman: "If I may, Mr. Speaker, I should like to briefly explain my vote."

Speaker Blair: "All right."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm in sympathy with the object of this Bill. It is true that suburban communities are/ have been attracting industry from the inner city for the sole purpose of broadening their tax base, increasing revenue, reducing taxes, and essent . . . it's true unfortunately that too many suburbs aren't living up to their responsibility to house the workers who are employed by this newly-attracted industry; but unfortunately I haven't seen



anywhere in the country where legislation of this nature will succeed. Massachusetts tried it, it failed miserably; and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I should like to be recorded as voting 'present'."

Speaker Blair: "Record the Gentleman 'present'; and McGrew now is 'aye'."

Fredric Selcke: "Schoeberlein. Sevcik. Springer. Stiehl. Terzich. Tuerk. Wall. Walters. B. B. Wolfe."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Harold Washington."

Washington: "I think the Members will understand that the closeness of the vote warrants . . . ah . . . my asking leave to put this on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman have leave? All right. Will you read the next Bill? Please read the next Bill."

Fredric Selcke: "725. House Bill 725, W. D. Walsh, an Act in relation to the prevention of development disabilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 725 is a recommendation of the House Developmental Disability Study Committee, and it directs . . . it's directed at the prevention of developmental disabilities which are mental retardation, cerebral palsy, or epilepsy and other similar . . . related conditions. The Bill provides that by very . . . the Department of Public Health shall develop standards for hospitals to be designated as regional . . . studies to provide care to the expectant mothers . . . whose life is in jeopardy of delivering a handicapped infant. The Department of Mental . . . the Department of Health would be mandated in House Bill 725 to establish criteria for the identification of mothers likely to deliver a handicapped child. The Department of Health would be required to circulate annually this list of criteria for identifying high risk mothers. Every physician in the state would be notified by the Department of Health as to facilities designated as regional . . . natal centers and would be encouraged to . . . these centers not appropriate. This Bill . . . ah . . . has the endorsement of the Illinois Hospital Association, and . . . ah . . . the Illinois Community for Prenatal planning; and I know of no



serious objection and . . . ah . . . ask for your support."

Speaker Blair: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'; have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. Geo-Karis 'aye'. On this question there are 141 'ayes', no 'nays'; this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. Come up to the Clerk's podium and give him your name, let's go. Come up here and give him the name, we've got to keep the House moving and if I stand here and keep recording names of people who didn't push their switch while the . . . was going off and on."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 751, an Act relating to medical experiments performed on human beings. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Randolph, Mr. Holloway, oh, I'm sorry, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Robert Holloway."

Holloway: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, . . . ah . . . this is a Bill requiring the volunteers for medical research be given a full counting of the possible sex and the risks involved . . . ah . . . in regards to . . . ah . . . medical research. Now, the Bill would require . . . ah . . . those persons qualified to engage in . . . ah . . . medical experimentation on humans . . . ah . . . to fully explain to the . . . to the person in layman's terms and in writing the effect of such treatment or the lack of treatment and . . . ah . . . that he be given an answer to any inquiries concerning the research or the treatment procedures. Ah . . . They must present a written explanation and . . . in layman's terms . . . ah . . . and also . . . ah . . . a consent must be obtained from the proposed volunteer and the volunteer is given the opportunity to withdraw at any time. Ah . . . The purpose of this Bill is not to in any way inhibit this kind of activity, but to make sure that there is a public disclosure of the project and the procedures . . . ah . . . a . . . ah . . . a report is required to be filed with the Department of Public Health. It's simply a measure to see to it that . . . ah . . . the type of thing that happened at Tuskegee forty years ago will never happen in Illinois; and I urge the adoption of this measure. Thank you."



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

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill received a very thorough going over by the Human Resources Committee. It was back and forth a number of times. I'd like to compliment the Sponsor of the Bill for the fine job he did and encourage your favorable response to it."

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

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

Speaker Blair: "All in favor say 'aye', oppose 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holloway, care to close?"

Holloway: "I'm closed."

Speaker Blair: "All right, now, all those in favor vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there are 143 'ayes', no 'nays'; and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 754, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Houlihan. D. L. Houlihan."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. D. L. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 754 seeks to add a new Section to Article 26 of the School Code . . . ah . . . which Section is designed to tighten the reporting procedures under the Article for those pupils subject to the compulsory attendance law. The synopsis on this Bill is misleading referring as it does to pupils no longer in attendance. This Bill is specifically designed to reach the situation of the expelled, suspended or withdrawn pupils who is no longer enrolled in the particular school. As distinct from the truant or mere absentee who is simply not in regular attendance, that latter situation is presently covered in the School Code under Section 26.3 and 26.6 of the Code. This Bill requires quarterly reports by the school board for the regional superintendent of those pupils excluding transferees who have been expelled, withdrawn or who have left school and have been removed from the enrollment rolls during the period of time school was





in regular session from the time of the previous quarterly report. The purpose of this Bill is to determine the number of pupils who have been removed from the enrollment rolls of the schools because of expulsions, suspensions or withdrawal and to further determine if such pupils are being provided with an alternative education program by the schools. Secondly, but very importantly, . . . ah . . . a purpose of the Bill is to attempt to come to grips with the fact that large numbers of juveniles come into police contact as a result of delinquent acts. The reporting burden involved here, I feel, is minimal. It is neither onerous nor unreasonable. Ah . . . The Bill represents an attempt to determine the extent of the problem so that we'll . . . we'll be in a position to subsequently divide meaningful alternative education programs to meet the needs of such pupils. The Bill is supported by among others the Commission on Children; and I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Blair: "Discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', the opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there are 126 'ayes', 4 'nays'; this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. McAvoy 'aye'. Wall 'aye'. Duff 'aye'. Here we go again . . . ah . . . you know, let's get on these Roll Calls because it just takes up time for me to have to do that."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 775, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Mahar. Mahar."

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

Fredric Selcke: "Over here."

Mahar: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 775 amends Election Code to provide for the rotation on the ballot within a Legislative District. This Bill is somewhat similar to House Bill 581 as amended which passed out of the House a couple of weeks ago. There's one basic difference between this Bill and that one, and that is that this Bill rotates all Members on the ballot. Now, there was some confusion as to how this thing was handled and let me quickly summarize what we're doing as far as House Bill 775 is concerned.



First of all, it deals only with the House of Representatives.

Secondly, it deals only with the Primary Election. Third, it applies only to precincts in which voting machines are used; and last, it applies to all those on the ballot. I urge your favorable vote."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Mahar, could you ex . . . ah . . . define by what you mean by voting machine, does that include electronic voting machines as well?"

Mahar: "No, it does not."

Skinner: "Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "Questions? Discussion? The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill."

Hill: "Ah . . . I'd like a further clarification of that. I think it does cover the vot-o-matic . . . ah . . . precincts."

Mahar: "On . . . ah . . . page 2, line 14, it says specifically precincts in which voting machines are to be used, which doesn't imply to me vot-o-matic. Voting are not vot-o-matic."

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

Shea: "Well, Mr. Mahar, as I remember . . . ah . . . we've got to have either voting . . . automatic voting devices, either machine or vot-o-matic in all counties of over 40,000 in the next General Election; and it's my understanding that this Bill was going to cover all those situations. Now, you're telling me it only covers those situations where they're machines and not those situations, it's your opinion that this does not cover device commonly known as a vot-o-matic, although it is a machine?"

Mahar: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Blair: "Any further discussion? Yes, Sir. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Just one quick question of the Sponsor. Ah . . . Did I understand you to say that covers every one not . . . that's not just those who file on the first day, but if . . . ah . . . if somebody files . . . ah . . . four or five days later that they would also be rotated?"

Mahar: "Yes, Sir, it covers all . . . rotates all candidates on the



ballot."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentle . . . the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, I . . . I'd like to ask . . . ah . . . Representative Mahar a question by way . . . by way of a comment. If . . . if this only refers to voting machines, we sure wasted a lot of time on debate on Second Reading because much of the . . . much of the debate on Second Reading was relative to the . . . ah . . . vot-o-matic devices. As I recall, Representative Peters and many others were up on the floor of the House, wherein, they talked about . . . ah . . . the effect of this Bill would have on the vot-o-matic; and in spite of your interpretation, I really think that it . . . it does involve the vot-o-matic, too. I . . . I can't buy . . . ah . . . strictly on your answer to this question because . . . because the courts . . . like to determine what it means strictly by, you know, answering the question as it relates to machines only. Ah . . . I think it relates to the vot-o-matic too. Now, how do you answer that?"

Mahar: "I think what you're referring to, as I mentioned earlier . . . ah . . . Representative Rayson had House Bill 581. It's initially . . . different than this Bill. There was considerable debate on 581 on this floor, an Amendment was adopted, which I have in front of me, which brought House Bill 581 into almost complete coincidence with this Bill with one exception. The House Bill 581 which passed out of here a couple weeks ago was 105 votes, rotated everybody more than two names on the ballot. This particular Bill rotates everyone on the ballot, including the first two names in the Primary Election only."

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

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak briefly on this. In view of the fact that I . . . I'm not confident in my mind that it doesn't relate to vot-o-matic, and I really think that in spite of the fact we . . . we have tried to come to some system which is fair to everybody, it's virtually impossible. Now, I think this type of . . . ah . . . legislation . . . ah . . . re . . . really obviates the . . . what we do in the election. For example, if you're third



on the ballot, you go around telling people all over the district, I'm third on the ballot. It's very difficult sometimes to know where you're at and you can't tell someone in one part of your district I'm third on the ballot, when you may be second on the ballot. I think you cause some real practical problems . . . ah . . . for somebody who is trying to campaign in his or her district. Ah . . . I realize that we ought to come to some fair means in placement on the ballot, but I don't think this answers the problem. Also to those of us who have vot-o-matic devices, we know that there's such things as specimen ballots, and it's very difficult to . . . to even print a specimen ballot where in one part of a district you're going to be first on a ballot, another part of a district you're going to be second, third or fourth. So I think in spite of the Sponsor's . . . ah . . . heroic effort to come to some fairness, I think we all will have some practical problems with this type of Bill; and I would urge to . . . you to vote against it."

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

Borchers: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, in our area are the voting machines. Now, we've got on . . . we have our number . . . bill . . . but we have . . . number . . . ah . . . 69 and everything in the Legislature will be fine and all that sort of stuff, and . . . now . . . I . . . I've been like this since we are . . . beginning . . . this . . . to more and more to vote for 69 and 54 or make up little lines in one thing or another. Lately it's rather . . . I'm rather unconvinced that this may be a good step because we're going not so much by position on the ballot, but by our number."

Speaker Blair: "All right, have all voted . . . the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Juckett."

Juckett: "Well, Mr. Chairman, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just briefly I'd rise in support of this Bill. Ah . . . We've previously passed a very similar Bill . . . ah . . . to this, the only difference I believe is that in the other Bill they required rotation only if there were more than two candidates. I think that this provides for all elections . . . ah . . . whether there are two or



more candidates and I think that this becomes an important feature especially in districts where only one of one party is likely to be elected and . . . ah . . . the . . . ah . . . candidate in the second position is at a . . . a distinct disadvantage. I . . . I know because I was in that position myself. Well, I . . . I think that this Bill . . . ah . . . more . . . ah . . . more reasonable in that it would rotate the . . . the names of . . . ah . . . of all candidates even if there are only two and would give upon . . . as candidates who are in the minority position in a district an equal chance on all the elections; and I . . . I would urge the support of . . . ah . . . of the . . ."

Speaker Blair: "Ah . . . The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar, care to close?"

Mahar: "Yes, just briefly . . . by saying that we come to you . . . the House, we talked to you about the Primary, we're talking about voting machines only, we're talking about rotating all candidates on the Primary . . . provide equal opportunities to everybody that's running for election, we're talking . . . equal opportunity and I urge your support."

Speaker Blair: "Ah . . . The question is, shall House Bill 775 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we passed a Bill a couple of weeks ago that was substantially the same as this in applying just to voting machines and in the suburban area of Cook County and in the City of Chicago there are voting machines; and the very nature of these machines placed a second person on the ballot as well as all those under him in a . . . at a great disadvantage. Now, we passed that Bill a couple of weeks ago, but with 105 votes. Ah . . . This goes a step further and really removes that disadvantage as Representative Collins pointed out for those situations where there . . . there are just two running; and I think that the second person on the ballot there in a minority district certainly should not be discriminated against and he's entitled to the same consideration as everyone else. So I would urge everyone to give this



an 'aye' vote. It applies only in the Cook County area and in areas where there are voting machines. I see no objection to it."

Speaker Blair: "All voted who wish?"

Fredric Selcke: "George, Londrigan 'no'."

Speaker Blair: "Will . . . the County Clerk will take the Record. The Clerk will take the Record."

Fredric Selcke: "County Clerk? Londrigan . . ."

Speaker Blair: "All right. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Mr. Speaker, I request this be placed on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Blair: "All right, does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, it will be placed on the order of Postponed Consideration. Proceed, Mr. Clerk. Oh, wait . . ."

Walsh: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Speaker would like me to let you know what our plans were for tonight. Ah . . . He hopes to . . . we will be able to adjourn by 7:30 or 8 o'clock. So you can make your dinner plans accordingly. We should be out of here . . . ah . . . at 7:30 or 8."

Speaker Blair: "Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 802, Choate, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Secretary of State. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Choate: "That's my Bill? What does it do? Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a \$20,000 . . . \$150,000 appropriation to the Secretary of State for . . . ah . . . renovations of the House Chamber. One of the things that will be involved is the installation of new Roll Call systems. The boards will be larger, the names more leg . . . legible, and it's been said that this one is in bad need of repair; and as we all know, it's been breaking down on certain occasions. I think we all realize that the . . . no puns intended . . . ah . . . we all realize that the carpet in much of the interior of the Chambers are in dire need of repair and I would appreciate the vote of the Membership as towards helping clean up the House."

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



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

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

Walsh: "Clyde, it's my understanding on this Bill that it is just for refurbishing. It is . . . ah . . . possibly chairs, carpeting and the . . . ah . . . and the tote system, is that correct? There's no installations of any kind?"

Choate: "And . . . ah . . . the lighting is with them also, but basically you're correct."

Walsh: "All right, there's nothing in here about . . . ah . . . readjusting the . . . ah . . . press row or the Gallery or the telephones on our desks or anything such as this?"

Choate: "No. New bathroom also."

Speaker Blair: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 802 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record."

Fredric Selcke: "Giglio 'aye' . . ."

Speaker Blair: "134 'ayes' and 4 'nays'; and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 820, whose is this . . . an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Londrigan. Out . . . out of the Record . . . out of the Record."

Speaker Blair: "Out of the Record."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill . . . ah . . . 823, Yourell, a Bill for an Act to amend Section 7 of Article 7 of an Act to revise the law in relation to township organizations. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 823 is a . . . really a simple Bill that would amend the Township Act to provide that judges of election . . . ah . . . be selected as nearly as practical as the same as provided in the Election Code. What that means is that in order to conduct a good election we should strive at all times to have the same judges of election that appear in the voting places of all elections so that they know how to properly con . . . conduct the elections . . . ah . . . and I would solicit your support. This Bill came out of



Committee unanimously and if there are any questions, I'd be delighted to try to answer them."

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

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

Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Palmer: "I have one . . . one question and one circumstance that . . . ah . . . which I'd you to respond to, and that is in the township law it is provided that where no more than one slate of officers to be elected appears on the ballot. Then there is a mandatory requirement that the town board . . . ah . . . redistrict the township for voting purposes and they obviously don't save money. How will this Bill affect that?"

Yourell: "You and I both know what you're talking about, Representative Palmer, and in no way will this . . . ah . . . this statute or the Amendment to this statute affect this situation by . . . in Chapter 139 that you speak to."

Palmer: "Well, does that mean that you'll have a three and two or two and two and three division; or shall if they are chosen or if this circumstance does arise, it means that the . . . the Clerk, I believe, can only pick those people who are certified by the County Board? That is . . ."

Yourell: "No, that is not . . . Town Board of Auditors as contained in the statutory language in Chapter 139. You're speak . . . speaking specifically to the point where this is only one slate of candidates or one individual on the ballot when in the . . . ah . . . in the . . . ah . . . course of saving funds for the township that they don't have to use all of the precinct polling place, but rather the Town Board of Auditors can . . . ah . . . consolidate precincts but using the same judges and the judges then would be selected by the auditor to serve in those election precincts."

Palmer: "But those judges have to be . . . ah . . . approved by the . . . from the list . . . ah . . . made up by the County . . . ah . . ."

Yourell: "That's right, that's what they're doing now."

Palmer: "Okay, all right."





Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Tom Miller."

Miller: "Representative Yourell, it's impossible to read the Bill in the book . . . in the Bill Book, but are there any penalty provisions . . . ah . . . for noncompliance?"

Yourell: "Ah . . . No, there is not, except those that are provided in the Election Code itself."

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

Murphy: "Ah . . . One question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Telcser: "He indicates he'll yield."

Murphy: "Ah . . . Representative Yourell, does this . . . ah . . . depending on a township election we vote, we'll say, at the Town Hall, just in one place on a small township. Would this mean that you'd have to vote in your regular precinct voting places using the same judges?"

Yourell: "No, no. Ah . . . Representative Murphy, that has nothing to do, and this is similar to the question asked by Representative Palmer, it is up to the . . . ah . . . Town Board of Auditors to determine if there is only one slate of candidates or an individual appearing on the ballot in that one election to consolidate precinct polling places and the Town Board of Auditors shall name the judges of election."

Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Does the Gentleman wish to close the debate?"

Yourell: "I ask for a favorable response."

Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 823 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish?"

Fredric Selcke: "Take the Record."

Telcser: "Take the Record. Representative Totten, do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Totten: "Yes, to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker, and . . . and remind some of those with a green light that this takes the responsibility away from the Township Clerk for appointing judges for a Township Election; and they . . . the responsibility of the County Clerk; and when we're



looking for more local control . . . ah . . . there is no monopoly on wisdom and our County Clerks are down here to do it, and for this reason this Bill should get a red vote."

Fredric Selcke: "Hi, Doc'."

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

Duff: "Mr . . ."

Telcser: ". . . to explain his vote."

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

Telcser: "How is Representative Duff recorded?"

Fredric Selcke: "Who's that?"

Telcser: "Duff."

Fredric Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Duff: "Thank you."

Telcser: "Okay, the Gentle . . . there's some other Members who wish to . . . ah . . . the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

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

Telcser: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Deuster: "Record me as 'no'."

Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Representative Collins, for what . . . for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Fredric Selcke: "The Gentleman . . ."

Telcser: "How's the Gentlem . . ."

Fredric Selcke: ". . . is recorded as not voting."

Deuster: "No."

Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Representative Jones, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Jones: "How am I recorded, please?"

Telcser: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Fredric Selcke: "He is recorded as voting 'yes'."

Telcser: "Now, there are a number of changes to make, please, now there are a number of Members seeking recognition . . . ah . . . I think we'd save time if we'd take a new Roll Call. Okay?"

Fredric Selcke: "Yeah."

Telcser: "Okay, we're going to take a new Roll Call. The question is,



shall House Bill 823 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 97 'ayes', 47 'nays'; and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed."

Fredric Selcke: "Give me Mike's Bill . . . House Bill 831, Juckett, a Bill for an Act to amend the Mental Health Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Juckett: "Thank . . . ah . . . I'll take the last unanimous Roll Call . . . thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, . . . ah . . . House Bill 831 applies to the Mental Health Code. It was prepared . . . ah . . . at the suggestion of the Illinois Association of Mental Health, and it in . . . largely in part places language now found in Section 15 of the powers and duties statutes into the Mental Health Code itself where they actually belong. We define temporary relief which is in the Code but not defined. We state that the state . . . ah . . . that the Superintendent of State Institutions is to determine if a released or discharged person is in need of after-care and if so that that should be put into his record. Also that every person or every patient shall be provided . . . ah . . . now it's only that he's entitled to it, but that he should be provided with adequate and humane care and treatment pursuant to an individualized treatment plan. I would urge the adoption House Bill 831."

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

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to just give one instance why this Bill is a good Bill. Ah . . . One year ago there was picked up a man in a tavern indicated by our priest . . . ah . . . who had been permitted to be . . . ah . . . released by one of the zone centers and about three months before that this . . . and he'd been put into the zone center by order of the county . . . of one of our circuit judges . . . this man had butchered his baby with an ax and he was out three months later and picked up by our police; and I feel that this is an excellent Bill and it will help protect not



only the man, but the public."

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

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Catania: "Ah . . . Representative Juckett, was this Bill amended to get rid of the discriminatory language that it had when it was in the Human Resources Committee?"

Juckett: "The Bill was amended . . . ah . . . in Committee to eliminate the discrimination that was evident against husbands so that it is nondiscriminatory now, and it treats husbands and wives the same as far as liability for support."

Catania: "Was it amended after we discussed it, you and I, on . . . on Second Reading?"

Juckett: "It was not amended . . . ah . . . further than what it was amended in the Committee."

Catania: "Well, then I suggest that it is in defiance of the Illinois Constitution. It does deal in the same way with men and women."

Juckett: "No, I don't think it's in violation of the Constitution at all. If anything, the present Act . . . ah . . . refers only to a wife . . . ah . . . not supporting a husband or not domiciling the husband and . . . ah . . . we inserted that the husband is not liable under certain circumstances and under the state law and under the present Federal Constitution there are distinctions that derive in sex and we recognize those distinctions. We've written it into the law."

Catania: "So, Representative Juckett, it appears to me that you are assuming that wives are obligated to live with the husbands and husbands are obligated to support their wives; and I don't think that that's an assumption that you can make."

Juckett: "We don't assume that at all. We just indicate that if the wife does not live with the husband or if the husband does not support the wife, then there are . . . ah . . . certain conditions that are met."

Catania: "Well, it appears to me to be a clear discrimination on the basis of sex."



Juckett: "There is absolutely no discrimination intended as far as sex."

Catania: "Well, whether it's intended or not, it appears to have turned out that way in the Bill."

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

Walters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Walters: "Representative Juckett, on the second page of the Digest, it says 'provides no parent is liable for the same expenses for a child who has reached majority'. . . what is the rule now?"

Juckett: "Ah . . . That's currently in the statute and we spell out what the liability would be . . . would not be."

Walters: "There is a liability now?"

Juckett: "Ah . . . Let me . . . let me find it. It says, 'no' . . . presently it says, 'no parent is liable under this Act . . . ah . . . for a child . . . after such child reaches the age of majority'; and we've indicated that we've added the words 'clothing, transportation or other incidental expenses'."

Walters: "Thank you. Second question, in the beginning of the Bill, you say it states the Superintendent of Hospital shall in writing give the release and so on and so forth. What's the procedure now by the Superintendent of the State Hospitals when they release a . . . a patient?"

Juckett: "There is no requirement whatsoever for them to . . ."

Walters: "What do they do though ordinarily, do you know?"

Juckett: ". . . the . . . ah . . . discharge the team that treats the individual . . . ah . . . just determines whether they shall or shall not be discharged and there's no requirement that anything be put into the record."

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

Duff: "Will the Sponsor answer a question?"

Telcser: "Indicates he will."

Duff: "I'd just like to understand one thing here . . . ah . . . if a spouse was mentally ill and in . . . during that period of time under



obviously . . . under emotional . . . ah . . . disability refuse to domicile the other spouse and then went into a mental institution, does this say becau . . . that because that individual made a decision under an emotionally . . . some capacitated frame of mind that that person would be penalized by not having the other spouse have an obligation financially?"

Juckett: "To them . . . this does not go into the mental capacity of the individual making any type of decision."

Duff: "Well . . ."

Juckett: "It just equalizes to the husband what was previously granted to the wife."

Duff: "Well, now, I'm not talking about husbands and wives right now. I'm talking about the situation . . . what I'm trying to get clear in my mind is that if an individual is mentally incapacitated to the extent that they have got to be entered into a mental institution and that person during that period of mental incapacity makes a decision that they will not, he or she, will not domicile the spouse and does that then say that the person who makes that emotionally disturbed decision will be penalized in terms of future support?"

Juckett: "Well, if the individual went into a mental hospital and there was not a five-year period preceding that in which the wife did not domicile the husband, the husband would be liable for the expenses of the wife."

Duff: "Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the Bill."

Telcser: "Proceed, Sir."

Duff: "I understand the . . . ah . . . degree of ability that the Sponsor has in this field and I understand he is very knowledgeable in the Bill he proposes in this area; but this seems to me to be a totally unfair punishment . . . ah . . . relative to the decision that an emotionally disturbed person might make relative to living with their spouse. Ah . . . A decision that is clearly shown possibly to be that . . . that character by the very effect that they then have to go into a mental institution. Ah . . . It seems to me to be an undue penalty."

Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Does the Gentleman wish to close



the debate?"

Juckett: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and Mr. Speaker, if any wife or any husband is under any kind of a mis . . . mental disability and would be incompetent to make a decision, I am sure upon any petition to any court this provision would not be applicable because the court would protect the rights of the individual and . . . ah . . . for the benefit of all those that are in need of mental treatment and . . . ah . . . need help and on behalf of the Illinois Mental Association, I would certainly urge your vote for this good Bill."

Telcser: "The question is, shall House 831 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. The Lady from DuPage, Representative Dyer, to explain her vote."

Dyer: "Ah . . . in explaining my vote, I . . . I read the Amendment very, very carefully, and I, too, respect Representative Juckett's expertise in the field of mental health and I know your Bills in this area are very good. However, I was one of those who did vote yes to get this out of Committee with the understanding that the language would be between the responsibilities of husbands and wives would be clarified to be in . . . ah . . . constitutional under the new Illinois Constitution. Ah . . . I checked this out with Ann Lusine and she suggested language that would . . . that would meet the criteria and . . . as far as I can see, Representative Juckett, it . . . it has not been added. Ah . . . Is that correct? Therefore, I . . . I just have to vote 'no', and I urge many others to vote 'no' until this language change can be made."

Telcser: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania, to explain her vote."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, when this Bill was voted out of the Human Resources Committee, several Members made it very clear that they were voting it out only with the understanding that the Sponsor would get rid of the discriminatory language before it got to Third Reading. Now, if this Bill will go back to Second Reading and be amended so that it does conform to the directive of the Illinois Constitution, I would be happy to support it because



I think that the intention of the Sponsor is good and he certainly is an expert in this area; but I . . . I find it hard to believe that the Sponsor, who I believe says that he's in favor of equal treatment of men and women, really wants to persist in what is clearly discriminatory language. Now, Representative Dyer and I have cooperated . . . ah . . . as much as we possibly can. We've done everything that the Sponsor asked us to do, yet he has not adopted the Amendment which he, I think, promised the Human Resources Committee that he would adopt."

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

Douglas: "Ah . . . In explaining my continuing 'aye' vote, I . . . I feel it's terribly important with all due respect to the significant issue that is now being raised that we don't lose sight of the fact that this is still a good Bill, and the matter that's being raised I think is one that can be remedied and I'm going to continue to vote 'aye', and I hope somehow or other Representative Juckett can reassure those who are raising what is essentially a peripheral issue on this Bill and . . . and work out the details. It's got to go through the Senate, and I would like that assurance, but I still will continue to vote 'aye' because this is still a good Bill."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was one of the Members of the Human Resources Committee before which this Bill came. I feel it is a very humane Bill and I also feel that Representative Juckett being aware of any possible discrimination has certainly sent his recommendation on to the Senate. I do not think that such a good human should fail and I cast my vote 'yes'."

Telcser: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Ah . . . For those who believe as I do that . . . ah . . . in many respects this is a good Bill, I should like to point out to you that I really don't think that the Sponsor is going to permit this Bill to die if it doesn't have enough votes; but rather that he will bring it back to Second Reading and do what he assured us in the Human Resources Committee he would do. It was pointed out to





the Sponsor of this Bill that the language was clearly in a violation of . . . ah . . . the Illinois State Constitution and he assured us that if voted 'aye', as you can see by the Digest all of us did, he would put an Amendment on . . . on the floor of the House to bring it into compliance with the Illinois State Constitution. I'm voting 'aye' in the hopes that the . . . ah . . . Sponsor of this Bill will do what he assured a number of us he would do."

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

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I . . . I can understand the concern of those who speak to the . . . ah . . . equal rights problem, but frankly I think that . . . ah . . . that's taking away from this consideration the attention that should be drawn to the fact that this Bill punishes the person who made a decision while they were in . . . mentally ill."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, can I ask the Sponsor a question?"

Telcser: "You can ask him a rhetorical question which he'll answer."

Giorgi: "Has . . . ah . . . the Mental Health Commission approved to this Bill, could Mr. Juckett inform us?"

Juckett: "This Bill was not submitted to the Mental Health Commission. It is not one of their Bills. It was suggested by the Illinois Mental Health Association who deals every day with the problems that are answered by this Bill."

Giorgi: "And then on the matter on licensing, you mentioned here that you want to license family homes. Is that the intent of the Bill? What do you mean by licensing family homes? In what page . . . ah . . . page 1, Section . . . parenthesis C . . . lines 23, 4, 5 and 26, family homes, on line 23 . . . on line 23 it says 'arrangements have been made with a suitable family home', then you drop down to line 26 and you say, 'all facilities in which placements are made shall be licensed by the State of Illinois'. It is al . . . Is this also a licensing Bill, and who's going to license?"

Juckett: "Now, wait is that new language?"

Giorgi: "No, that's in the Bill."



Juckett: "Well, if it . . . we probably restated what was in the law."

Giorgi: "It's new language . . . new language. It's on the first page of your Bill . . . ah . . . Mr. Juckett. I think you ought to take the Bill out of the Record because I think you're . . . ah . . . you're not acting with the, you know, with the knowledge of the Mental Health Commission and you're licensing with this Act."

Telcser: "Representative Giorgi, now, we've suspended the rules of this so you could ask a couple of questions, have you concluded now? You have? All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."

Katz: "Yes, I have another question to ask the Gentleman and everybody seems to be talking around. Would the Sponsor tell us whether . . . ah . . . he consciously decided to . . . ah . . . make the change that would have provided so called equality or was it simply inadvertent if he consciously made it, why did he made it; if it was inadvertent, is he planning to add the Amendment in the Senate?"

Juckett: "At the Committee, I did not state that I would accept what Mrs. Catania wanted. I said that I would work with her or with anybody else on the problem, and I did work with . . . ah . . . Representative Dyer. There was some language which was suggested to me, and I made the decision that I felt that the language as in the Bill was as good or better than the language which was suggested. There was no inadvertence on my part to . . . to not to keep my word to work on the problem."

Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this question there are 117 'ayes', 10 'nays'; and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. Representative Barnes, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, . . . ah . . . this is one of two times that I will do this, but a friend of mine came by and I wanted to let everybody know that from the south side of Chicago and . . . ah . . . great Chicago and friends that Wilbur Wood won his eleventh game today, 4 to 1."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 847, North, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



Telcser: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative North."

North: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill provides for two specific changes in the existing statute. One is to reduce from 10 to 5 years for qualification and increases the benefits from 50 to 55 percent."

Fredric Selcke: "Oh."

North: "The reason on the increase of 55 percent . . ."

Fredric Selcke: "Oh, I thought he wanted to vote."

North: ". . . is to differentiate between the occupational and ordinary disability. This Bill amends the downstate fire pension law. It passed out of Committee 11 to 1; and I know of no opposition to this Bill."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 847 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 127 'ayes', 3 'nays'; this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 867, Ewell, . . ."

Telcser: "Is Representative Ewell on the floor? Take it out of the Record."

Fredric Selcke: "875, Chockey. House Bill 875, Merlo, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Board of Trustees General Assembly Retire . . . Retirement System. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Merlo: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 875 is the appropriation Bill for the General Assembly Retirement . . ."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Have you completed, Representative Merlo?"

Merlo: "Number . . . 875 . . ."

Fredric Selcke: "Yeah . . . yeah, it needs three hands."

Merlo: "I request a favorable Roll Call."

Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 875 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Lemke 'aye'. Take the Record."

Fredric Selcke: "Hey, look at that."



Telcser: "On this question there are 146 'ayes', no 'nays'; this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. Geo-Karis 'aye'."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 909, Blair, is he gonna' . . . what's he gonna' do? Huh?"

Telcser: "Who's he? Take it out of the Record. I . . . I was sure . . ."

Fredric Selcke: "D. L. ain't here either. 913. House Bill 913, Polk, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 913 amends the Illinois Municipal Code. It requires a classified set of fingerprints of all full-time members of all municipal police and fire departments to be furnished to the Illinois Department of Law Enforcement and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This Bill was amended . . . ah . . . and the Amendment simply stated that to the date that it would take effect. Ah . . . The support that it received throughout the state was from the Fire Chief Association, the Association of Fire Fighters of Illinois, the Boards of Fire and Policemen's Association and the . . . ah . . . I'd appreciate your support."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 913 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'."

Unknown: "I say warn the natives."

Fredric Selcke: "Why?"

Unknown: "You don't need identification."

Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. Lemke 'aye'. Geo-Karis 'aye'. On this question there are 140 'ayes', no 'nays'; and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 963, whose is this, Matijevich, a Bill for an Act to add 15.1 and so forth of an Act codifying the powers and duties of the Department of Mental Health. Third Reading of the Bill."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."



Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 963 amends the powers and duties of the Department of Mental Health with regards to after-care services for discharged mental health patients. Ah . . . Well, yes, this issue hasn't been beclouded with any Equal Rights Amendment's implications so I'll ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 963 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 152 'ayes', 1 'nay'; and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 969, Juckett, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Juckett: "Ah . . . Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 969 has to do with the Special Education Program of the State of Illinois. Ah . . . About 1965 we mandated that all school districts shall have special education programs. We provided for partial funding and we have found that with the partial funding it has not been sufficient for the school districts to adequately establish special education programs. There are some 30 to 40 percent of the school districts in the state that do not now have special education programs, and many of those that do are using the funds of the regular kids for the special education programs. This Bill would in most instances . . . ah . . . put the funding at two-thirds of the cost of the program. There are limitations of . . . ah . . . in some instances where they are high-priced individuals, the superintendent, there we limit the exemption to \$7,000 per year. The Digest in its explanation is wrong in that it says that it has recommended do not pass, the April 27th date is correct, the May 11th date is wrong, the May 15th and the tabled is wrong, and the May 16th is correct. It . . . yeah . . . it came out of the Committee 16 'aye', 5 'nay'; and I would urge your adoption of this Bill, not only for the special education kids, but also for the regular education kids, who in many cases now are being



shortchanged in order to finance the special education program."

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

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield to a question, please?"

Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Brinkmeier: "Bob, . . . ah . . . do you know approximately how much money, additional money, this is going to cost the State of Illinois?"

Juckett: "I've had several indications and it depends on how many new programs are put in . . . ah . . . but they range from about \$17 to \$19,000,000."

Brinkmeier: "Okay, thank you."

Telcser: "Okay, the Gentleman from Cook . . . from DuPage, Representative Hoffman, Gene Hoffman."

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

I would like to make a comment on this Bill, particularly in reference to the last Speaker that was solicited. Now, I know that we pay for these types of categorical programs . . . ah . . . after the fact. I also know that special education kids are counted in A.D.A. just the same as anyone else, and so they are being supported on the basis of the regular program as any other child is at the present time. If we're talking building into our categorical program additional sums of money . . . ah . . . such as this, all we're really saying is that we are going to reduce the amount of resources that are available . . . ah . . . for general distribution to all school districts for all purposes for all kids; and, therefore, I must rise in opposition to this Bill."

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

Schneider: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Schneider: "Bob, I can't recall offhand, we had a series of Bills on this topic in Committee, but is this inducement that we talked about for teachers to enter into the field of special education?"

Juckett: "No, I don't consider this an inducement to enter in the field, but it's rather an inducement to be able to teach kids to be useful citizens and not be hidden away in closets and for people to have to be ashamed of when the kids have a great potential; and without



their teachings of the kids, they wouldn't be able to meet that potential."

Schneider: "Well, I'm not against that, I know it's probably in the Bill, too; but . . . ah . . . could you tell me then what is in the Bill? I'm sorry, I don't have enough information on my end."

Juckett: "Yeah, basically what the Bill does is it changes the limitation on . . . on reimbursement from a 50 percent or \$5,000 limitation per teacher in the field . . . ah . . . in the program of the local school districts to two-thirds of their salary . . ."

Schneider: "All right . . ."

Juckett: ". . . and that we have mandated that they have it, while we haven't given them the sources to pay for the funds . . . to pay for the program."

Schneider: "All right, that does sound to me like what I did think it was and I suggest that really the money is improperly directed. I would think we should probably spend money in that area more effectively on different kinds of equipment and classroom materials, rather than directing it toward what I consider an incentive program . . . ah . . . and I think I raised that question in Committee and was the reason I opposed it at that time; and I think I would ask the Members to look carefully at it and also oppose it."

Juckett: "Well, in answer to that, the equipment charges, and the material charges and the building charges come out of a special two-cent . . . ah . . . levy which are paid for by the local districts."

Schneider: "I understand that as well. Thank you."

Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Well, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Telcser: "He indicates he will."

McClain: "Ah . . . Bob, to follow through with what Glenn is saying . . . ah . . . does this money . . . is this money earmarked for the teacher or does it go into . . . ah . . . school district's general revenue fund?"

Juckett: "It goes into the school district education fund and replaces what is, you know, coming out of that fund for regular kids to try



to be spent by the mandate on special education."

McClain: "Okay, so in other words, it doesn't necessarily have to be spent for special education?"

Juckett: "It is a reimbursement, if a school district does not spend the money, . . . reimbursed, and if the plan is not approved by the O.S.P.I., they don't get reimbursed."

McClain: "Okay, thank you."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Tuerk...tape unclear."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for years . . . complained that we here in Springfield, the General Assembly, have mandated special education services and then not reimbursing for their additional costs to those services. Now, here comes the Gentleman from Cook with this Bill . . . have to reimburse the local school districts in special education . . . districts for the extra cost of educating handicapped children that we have mandated upon them. I think Representative Juckett is to be congratulated, not criticized, for bringing this forward and the fact that I'm a Cosponsor in this Bill isn't going to hurt it either; but . . . but let me say this, I think it's unfair policy . . . to say we're getting A.D.A. for . . . ah . . . handicapped children, of course, they're getting A.D.A., but he knows very well that it costs more to educate a handicapped child than it does a nonhandicapped child, which is the reason for the extra reimbursement that we have been paying for years. All this Bill does is increase that reimbursement by . . . ah . . . \$2,000 per teacher or . . . to . . . cover the cost, the extra cost of special education. It's a good Bill and I ask that we all support it, because we mandated back in 1965 that starting in 1969 each district have special education. We failed to provide the funds. Now, in this Bill we're helping to provide those funds from the state to the local school districts and local special education joint agreement districts."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Tom Miller."

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

Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the Gentleman from Cook,





Representative Juckett, to close."

Juckett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a vote for the kids, an 'aye' vote please."

Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 969 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. Telcser 'aye'."

Fredric Selcke: "Where's George. Campbell 'aye'."

Telcser: "Okay, Campbell 'aye'."

Fredric Selcke: "On this question . . ."

Telcser: "On this question 130 'ayes', no 'nays'; and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed."

Fredric Selcke: "Blair. Telcser. Campbell. I think it's Blair, Telcser, Campbell. House Bill 999, Skinner, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue of 1939. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 999 apportions the tax levy according to market value instead of according to assessed value for tax districts that cross in and out of Cook County. It's an implementation of Article 9, Section 7, of the 1970 Constitution. This is what the Bill does. With passage, people living on both sides of the county line in overlapping tax districts will finally be taxed fairly. At the present time, bond issues are failing in both Barrington and Elgin because of the gross discrepancy. In addition, tax protest are being . . . tax protests are resulting. The Bill came out of Committee 17 to 1; I would ask for a favorable vote."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 999 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? All right. On this question there are 1 . . . J. J. Wolf 'aye' . . . 140 'ayes', no 'nays'; and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 1040, Schneider, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill is



a result of a number of requests from . . . school board policy regarding jury duty. It presently . . . deductions so . . . in the event they are assigned to jury duty, so what occurs is that the jury duty then is . . . ah . . . deducted from their salaries . . . ah . . . in order to equalize the salary. Therefore, they can maintain their salary, however, there is a deduction . . . ah . . . of the jury monies that are paid to them. So what this does is clarify that and also authorize for some expenses to be deducted from that in the event they are eating there or travelling to and from . . . ah . . . the service . . . ah . . . jury service. So I introduced the Bill . . . ah . . . for the purpose of clarifying . . . ah . . . that policy."

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

Shea: "I don't follow what we're doing here . . . ah . . . a teacher gets paid while they're on jury duty now, as I understand it, is that correct?"

Schneider: "That . . . except if they were . . . made enough money that day, . . . be compensation from jury duty . . ."

Shea: "Well, that . . . that makes sense, but what are we trying to do here now?"

Schneider: "Well, tell me why that makes sense? I don't know that there are professions that would deduct jury monies from . . . ah . . . the salary that they get . . . ah . . . for their normal performance when they're in jury duty."

Shea: "Well, I think that many of the independent companies, like Illinois Bell, in that . . . ah . . . end up, you know, they'll pay the employee while they're on jury duty, and I have no problem about paying the school teacher while he's on jury duty, but to pay the school teacher while he's on jury duty adds another \$50 or \$60 a week as his compensation for jury duty, . . . ah . . . it just seems . . . to me."

Schneider: ". . . jury duty money. They deduct that portion of the . . . ah . . . monies from jury duty that are not expenses . . . ah . . . under this Bill, which I propose, and . . . ah . . . equalizes the salary, because you get \$100 a week and then he, let's say, he gets



\$10 for jury performance, the school could deduct . . . ah . . .  
 would pay \$90 . . . keep their \$10 from jury duty, would be \$100.  
 That's . . . that's the . . ."

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

Totten: "Where are we at? Would the . . . ah . . . would the . . .  
 Sponsor yield for a question?"

Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Schneider: "Are you . . . are you saying that the . . . ah . . . that  
 the teachers then would get their expenses paid?"

Schneider: "That's right."

Totten: "Now, then . . . then someone in . . . in private industry or  
 other . . . they have to serve on jury duty . . . ah . . . does not  
 get their expenses . . . duty . . ."

Schneider: ". . . jury duty . . . ah . . . salaries in private profession  
 . . . exempting teachers from jury duty . . . legal professions,  
 doctors, physicians, editorial . . . and coronary personnel in that  
 profession, it seems to me to be equitable to authorize . . . ah . . .  
 would be equitable to allow teachers to serve without penalty."

Totten: "Well, if I may, Mr. Speaker, speak to the Bill for a moment. I  
 . . . I just think that this is an exemption to a general rule that  
 is unwarranted . . . ah . . . and that we . . . ah . . . we should  
 not have a green light on that."

Telcser: "Okay, the Gentleman . . . ah . . . from Cook, Representative  
 Beatty."

Beatty: "I'd like to ask a question of the Sponsor of this Bill."

Telcser: "He indicates he'll yield."

Beatty: "Are you saying that you wish to give the school teacher something  
 in addition to his normal salary overall for his serving on a jury?  
 I'm asking can you tell me if there are private professionals who  
 are reduced in their salary because of service under the jury duty?  
 Can you tell me that?"

Schneider: "That's not the issue, I just answered your question."

Beatty: "That is the issue. I . . . might as well . . . do you want to  
 hold . . ."



Schneider: "Wait a second . . . the issue is clear and that is if you are in a private profession and you're a salaried person, can you serve on jury duty, you are not penalized by having a reduction in your salary."

Beatty: "Are the . . . ah . . ."

Schneider: "I . . ."

Beatty: ". . . aren't the teachers compensated between getting the money from the jury service and their salary, aren't they getting compensated what they normally would get for work . . ."

Schneider: ". . . no, they would deduct the equivalent of what they receive on jury duty and they would receive . . . ah . . . just their salary as a teacher, they would receive nothing in addition as a jury . . . a person who serves on a jury."

Beatty: "Between the two, however, they get as much as they would get if they're just teaching, is that correct?"

Schneider: "That's correct."

Beatty: "Well, I . . . I'd like to speak to the Bill for a moment."

Telcser: "Proceed."

Beatty: "I think that . . . ah . . . teachers wish to do good for the students. We always care about their worries about the needs of the students. I think we should conserve for the needs of the students and let the teachers do as anyone else. They're . . . they're always worried about the . . . the good things in life, let them serve here, get their salary and not be overly compensated with public funds. I urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

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

Hudson: "Would the . . ."

Telcser: "Don't you seek recognition?"

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

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

Schneider: "Just to ask a favorable Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 1040 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 28 'ayes', . . . do you wish to poll the absentees . . . 53 'nays'; and this Bill having failed to . . . Representative Douglas, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make an observation. That's the first time I've ever seen the Sponsor of the Bill on Third Reading vote against his own Bill. I think it's an interesting observation."

Telcser: "And this . . . and this Bill having failed to receive a constitutional majority is, hereby, declared lost."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 1053, Brinkmeier, a Bill for an Act providing for State Board of Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Brinkmeier: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 1053 calls for an all elected, I shouldn't say an all elected, a majority of elected members of a State Board of Education. Now, this Bill is the result of approximately two years of discussion with educators in northwestern Illinois and I presume their attitude to be some of those around the rest of the state. As you know, Article . . . Section 2, Article 10, on our new State Constitution states that we must create a State Board of Education to be elected or selected on a regional basis. Now, in conformity with that requirement . . . House Bill 1053 would have 12 members elected to a State Board of Education. The state would be divided into 12 educational districts, 2 congressional districts would comprise one educational district. The Governor would appoint the 13th member felt by many people that there should be somebody on that board that is in direct communication with the Governor. So this is done for that purpose. Now, the election of these members of the board would be on a non-partisan basis, twice the number that would be certified and . . . thank you, Mr. Speaker, . . . twice the number that would be certified in the Primary would be on the ballot then on the Fall and again it would be a non-partisan election. Now, I know this is a very delicate situation. I know that you have received many letters from various organizations around the state, but very frankly I would hope that you would take a good, hard look at some



of the recommendations that you have received. For example, I submitted a questionnaire which was distributed on your desk a few days ago, a questionnaire that went to every school board member in the 35th Legislative District and also went to every administrator, principal and superintendent. Results of that questionnaire when they got back were that only 19 of the 138 that responded, only 19 of those administrators and board members referred an all-appointed board, 58 of them preferred an all-elected board, 51 preferred a combination with some elected and some of them appointed. I . . . ah . . . would be glad to answer any questions of you; but at this time, I think I would just like to urge a green light and put both of these Bills, both, I mean, an elected and an appointed board across the way; and we take our chances from there and see what the Senate and the Governor have to say."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when House Bill 1053 was originally introduced it looked much different than it does today. I want to compliment the Sponsor of the Bill and . . . ah . . . I think one of the outstanding men who worked with the Legislature, Jim Jepson, for putting this Bill in such a shape that the issue before us today is a question of whether we want to stand on our record that we made the other day for an all-appointed board or if in fact we want to pass a Bill . . . ah . . . which provides for an elected board. The issue is very clear. We made our decision of when we voted overwhelmingly 103 to 48, if my memory serves me correctly, in support of House Bill 661. We have before us today a clear-cut issue. The issue is, do we want to stand on the position that we took the other evening in B; and B, in fact, a decision m-making body where the decision is made or do we in fact want to pass the buck and give it to someone else to decide? I'm confident . . . I'm confident that this body will stand on their decision that they made earlier and I encourage you to vote 'no' on House Bill 1053."

Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Lawrence,



Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wish that one or both of the prior Speakers would indicate if there was a third Bill that would be coming along here soon. It would be also worthy of your attention; but I, for one, am very proud to endorse Representative Brinkmeier's Bill. It is a tribute to the strength of this nation and to the education that's been the ruin to all of the youth of the land so long that we have an electorate who are educated, intelligent, discriminating and have the capacity . . . proper selection. It is wrong as wrong can be that all at once a group of elite decide that the mass of mankind are not smart enough to elect those who will preside over the school system. It is the pernicious practice, it's one that we should disassociate ourselves from. Now is the time to start that disassociation. Do not let the . . . the prior Speaker kid you when he said that you have made your decision. Your decision is what we made here in the next few minutes, and that decision is, do you believe that all wisdom is incorporated in 661 or do you believe that you have a great many people in your district who still cherish the right to express at the polls their free choice in the land of the free and the home of the brave. Let's all vote for Brinkmeier's Bill. Proceed."

Telcser: "Is there further discussion? If not, the Gentleman from Ogle, Representative Brinkmeier, to close. Did you want . . . ah . . . one second, Representative. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I feel pretty much like . . . ah . . . the other Representative from DuPage as well that we can't continue to move Bills along that are . . . ah . . . good solutions because one's elective and one's appointed. We do that it seems in some cases in a Committee when we say, 'Well, we have two good Bills, let's vote 'em both out on the floor to make a decision'. I don't think today we ought to say that 'We've now voted out one, let's vote out two and let the Senate decide, because then eventually we're going to do it to the Senate and also to the Governor. Well, it seems to me



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

if we're deliberative and questioning, that we ought to raise by pertinent issue as to whether or not an elected board is superior in its intent . . . ah . . . as the Sponsor indicates or if we . . . ah . . . facing a better choice than the other Bill. It seems to me that we have enough safeguards in the elective procedure, some of the memos that have crossed my desk and some of the ideas that come to mind are that in almost every situation we do have elective checks on the . . . ah . . . appointed school board for example. We still do elect our local school boards in most cases. Ah . . . We still do elect the regional superintendent of instruction . . . ah . . . because they are individuals who for the most part who are involved in the dispensing of funds for educational purposes then perhaps it should be directly accountable, but if you recall neither the appointed board nor the elected board will be involved in that procedure; but rather that will be a legislative and a gubernatorial function, then it seems to me that we are also an added check along with the Governor as elected officials of the people to be responsible for the expenditure of funds. So I think . . . ah . . . we have elective safeguards in relationship to the school boards and I don't feel that . . . ah . . . an elected statewide school board is feasible, I don't believe it's functionable, and I think we've a good choice on 661. I think we ought to abide by that. I think we ought to defeat this measure."

Telcser: "The Gentleman . . . the Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

Choate: "Mr. Speaker, may we have just a wee bit of order? Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're considering a piece of legislation here today that's going to have far reaching effects as far as the future of education is concerned in the State of Illinois. How many times have I heard the Members on this side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle talk about the present judiciary system and talk about various other peoples in appointed offices and say 'why haven't they run for office like I run for office'? How many times have I heard Members of this Legislature say, That if we had it to do over again the conscience of this state would





not run on a retention basis'. That they would take their chance running against an opponent the same as I do? How many times have I heard Members of this General Assembly talk about responsibility, responsibility to the educational system of this state; and how more responsible could you be than if you had to answer to the people, the elected of a district of this state? I'm saying to you that if you answered to the people, you're going to be more responsible in the field of education than you are than if someone appoints you to that office because if you're responsible to the people, you're responsible to the people who desire high-class education for the use of this state. If you're responsible to a person who appoints him, you're going to be at his whim and desires as far as the educational opportunities are concerned. I'm saying that if you're interested in quality education, if you're interested in people comprising this board in the state that will further the quality of education of this state, then put it on the elected basis. I think that we should give Representative Brinkmeier . . . we . . . I only wish that I was a Cosponsor. I wish to give this Bill a resounding vote of approval and show the people that we are interested in furthering the educational quality system that we have and must continue to have in the State of Illinois."

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

Leon: "Pass me for a minute, please."

Telcser: "Pass you . . ."

Leon: "For one minute."

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

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I respectfully disagree with the distinguished Minority Leader. I think he presumes that the people have nothing better to do with their time than to wonder about who's going to run for what and what . . . ah . . . where their position is going to be on the ballot, et cetera. I would defy any Member of this House to name for me two of the trustees of the University of Illinois. Now, we have a number of trustees of the University of Illinois. They run every time we have a general election, and I bet there are very few of us who know who they are."



These people are running state-wide and as we politicians know the way we determine how an election went in a particular precinct disregarding personalities is by looking at the vote of the University of Illinois. That has . . . is and has been for many years the way to find out. Now, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that anyone who runs from a congressional district as the members of this Gentleman's proposed school board would do would have to get themselves involved in politics. They cannot run and win in a congressional district which consists of approximately a half a million people without becoming involved with the township committeemen, the county chairman, the precinct committeemen and other politicians. So they're going to be answerable to the politicians and not to the people. Now, I submit to you too that the one who is really answerable to the people in matters of education is the Governor of this state. He is the one to . . . to whom we look and who is responsible for education and it is he who will be appointing the members of these school boards as we passed in House Bill 661. I suggest to you that 661 pass this House resoundingly. We indicated what we want. This Bill is in direct contradiction to it, and if we both vote for this Bill, then we are doing exactly the opposite of what we did a few days ago and looking ridiculous. Let's defeat this Bill resoundingly. We're already on record as favoring an appointed school board and let's stay with that."

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

Wolf: "I just want to ask the Majority Leader what the bet, Han . . . and Livingston are too?"

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

Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, . . . ah . . . in answer the challenge thrown out by the . . . ah . . . distinguished Majority Leader, I too would inquire and name two more, Forsythe and Neil, and Jane Leader from Adam."

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

Berman: "Ah . . . Thank you, Mr. Speaker, also in response to the remarks of the Majority Leader, I don't think that this Body or any Legislative Body ever looked ridiculous when we come forth and say we have



confidence in the selection process whereby the people chose the people that will sell policy for education. I think it's a red herring and a very bad example when we talk about the University of Illinois Trustees in relation to House Bill 1053. I think all of us and many of our constituents are aware of their congress . . . their Congressman. This is the sim . . . similarities between the congressional election and the proposal in House Bill 1053, and I submit to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the only way that you're going to be able to get a state board that is responsive to the people and not responsible to a single individual is an elected state board and I urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from . . . ah . . . Cook, Representative Giglio."

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

Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the Gentleman from Ogle, Representative Brinkmeier, to close."

Brinkmeier: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in my opinion, this board of education would become one of the most powerful bodies in the entire state. They'll be making recommendations for massive educational appropriations. Now, we're talking about billions of dollars. For example, I went over this the other day, but I'd like to emphasize that in 1970 the 102 counties in the State of Illinois collected over \$2,788,000,000 of local taxes. Approximately 60 percent of that or roughly \$1,673,000 went for local education. In addition to that, of course, to spend, the state will spend about \$1,000,000,000 a year. So we're talking over about 2 3/4 billions of dollars each year that this board is going to have a lot to say on how this money is spent. Now, we all know that in the future that education will probably cost more than it's costing today. So very likely in the very near future it's going to cost \$3,000,000,000. Now, I'd like to point too to the Majority Leader when he talked about the people who have paid in membership here not recognizing the names of the . . . of the trustess. I'd like to point out too that the members of the Junior College Board, the Board of Regents, the members of the Board of Higher Education, these people are appointed,



and I wonder how many of you can tell me the names of all those people? So I think that's a very weak argument. I feel that we should have an elected board of education that's directly responsible to the people that are taking up the path. I don't like being pragmatic as the school teacher, but I think we have a responsibility to those people that are paying this tremendous amount of money for education; and I would urge a green light."

Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 1053 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate, to explain his vote."

Choate: "Mr. Speaker, only one short statement I want to make in explaining my vote because I think this is a clear-cut issue and I think that every Member on the floor of this House knows what they're doing, with the exception that I want to point out to the Majority Leader when he says he wonders who would be looking on ballots and et cetera and who would be interested in going to an election if you have this many kinds of election. I wonder how he voted on my election consolidation Bills in the last Session of the General Assembly to have only two elections a year to get more voter participation and still save the taxpayers of this state between \$8 and \$12,000,000."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am in the opinion that we should vote both the elected and the appointed, and, therefore, please mark me 'present'."

Telcser: "Record the Lady as voting 'present'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I join in support in elected school board and I also voted to have the Governor appointed; but I'd like to point out that we can't always wait on this inspired Leadership from the second floor. We're still waiting on the C.T.A., we're still waiting on the budget recommendation and we're still waiting on recommendations for education. We're left in this quagmire by ourselves. We're left here to fight it out; and I suggest



if you want to see something done, you'd better start delegating the responsibilities to people who are going to be responsible to the people; and I say that this is a second alternative. I say that we ought to pass this out, give it both . . . give it to the Senate and give it to the Governor, and if the Governor says I want to appoint the board of education, then let's let the blame or the credit fall where it may; but I suggest that this Bill deserves to have a chance before the Governor, and if he says 'I want the responsibility, I'm going to run education', then we can look for him whether it be good or bad."

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

Boyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and briefly explaining my vote, I believe that Webster defines politics as the science in order of government. The science dealing with the administration of state, and he defined the politician is one first in the science in order of government; and I certainly don't find anything disreputable about that. Thank you. I vote 'aye'."

Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Ogle, Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Well, very . . . Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, very briefly . . . I'd like to call attention to the fact that I don't believe you are representing your constituents when you're going for an appointed school board. As I pointed out to you a moment ago, the people in our area, downstate Illinois . . . who should know . . . most about education, about the problem . . . 14 percent of these people answered the questionnaire indicating that they would prefer to have all-appointed board, and I would say this too if you would take the time to question your constituents other than so-called educators, the man in the street, I'll guarantee you that it's going to be even greater than that. My returns indicate that only 10 percent of the so-called lay people want an appointed board. The remainder want either an all-elected or a combination of the two. So once more I would urge a green light on that board."

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



Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in pointing . . . in explaining my green light up there, I'd like to state that the main cause of this particular . . . ah . . . basis of this particular board is gonna' be elected as a nonpartisan board. I . . . we've had experiences where even we had May candidates running for the various constitutional conventions . . . ah . . . seats last time and it was successful manuever and at the same time these are going to be the best people who will be on the nonpartisan basis and will be able to be elected for the communities and reflect the spirit of their communities, and we'll have a cross-section of the whole state this way without just having one or two people from all . . . one part of the state without having the other part represented. I think this is a more equitable way of choosing our electoral board and I ask for your consent."

Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this question there are 77 'ayes', 71 'nays'; and Representative Brinkmeier, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Brinkmeier: "I feel this is a very important issue, and I'm sorry to take the time of the House, but I'd like to have the absentees polled please."

Telcser: "Okay, will the Members be in their seats and the Clerk will read the names of the absentees."

Fredric Selcke: "Bradley."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker . . . Mr. Speaker, I'd think you'd better put it on Postponed Consideration . . . Postponed Consideration."

Telcser: "Okay, the Gentleman has asked for Postponed Consideration. House Bill 1053 be put on the order of Postponed Consideration."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 545, Mugalian, a Bill for an Act to amend Probate Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Fredric Selcke: "We destroyed . . .but I'll get you one."

Mugalian: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the . . . tape blurry . . . increased probate . . . I . . . urge a green light."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 545



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 126 'ayes', 3 'nays'; and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 602 . . . what do you want, Representative Maragos?"

Maragos: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor of House Bill 545 if that was his first Bill that they passed? He's a veteran now, okay."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 6 . . . 602, Barnes, a Bill for an Act to amend the Fair Employment Practices Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Barnes: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 602 is a Bill that is similar in scope to a Bill that we passed out earlier this year, House Bill 353. What we're asking for in House Bill . . . ah . . . 602 is that returning veterans with less than honorable discharges that they would not be precluded from applications for employment for job opportunities . . . ah . . . here in this state. I think this is only fair and proper. We have each month, each year, a number of young men returning to our state with less than honorable discharges but not dishonorable discharges are now being precluded from application for employment. I would ask your favorable vote, I think this is only fair and proper so these young men can adapt to civilian life and have an instructive life to offer our society."

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

Walters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address myself to the Bill, earlier this Session . . . about this particular Bill and there . . . objections to what the . . . tape blurred . . . but anyway I'll get back to the Bill, this Bill . . . Fair Employment Practices Act to . . . dishonorable discharge from . . . service. Now, I'd like to remind everyone in the Legislature the series of conduct discharged from military service reflects conduct and these are controllable by the individual. Even under Federal requirements they do not require an employee to reinstate a former employee who has received less than an honorable discharge. The Veteran's Admin-



istration requires inquiries into discharges when their benefits are requested. Though a veteran receives an unfavorable discharge, he is still eligible for benefits provided his discharge was not a result of willful misconduct. A person discharged is no different than one's employment, is a test of his ability. An unfavorable may be for bad conduct or it may be classified as a general discharge which includes categories such an undesirable or medical or hardship. A person's medical background, therefore, is generally recognized as an important tool in determining proper job classifications. If an employer inquires among other things into the discharge and the . . . this Bill helps to destroy incentive, eliminates the valuable judgment too for employers and in no . . . is "pores standards that have long been standing in Federal law. I urge you to vote 'no'. Thank you very much."

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

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

Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Kosinski: "Mr. Sponsor, at this time if a man receives an unfavorable discharge, is he absorbed into his employment somewhere along the line or isn't he?"

Barnes: "I'm very sorry, I didn't get the question, Roman."

Kosinski: "If a man presently receives an unfavorable discharge from the United States Army, what happens to him in terms of employment, do you know?"

Barnes: "Well, like . . . the only thing that happens to him is he comes back into the job market and tries . . . ah . . . to receive occupation as you and I did; but the problem is that many, many occupations and many industries preclude the young man from even application for . . . for employment based upon the fact that he left on dishonorable discharge. The only thing that . . . is the same thing that this House . . . tape blurred . . . that they would not be preaching this unemployment . . . that's all we're saying here."

Kosinski: "Ah . . . Mr. Sponsor, then the only . . . that this will possibly . . . some of the people will get out of it . . . the United





States Army with unfavorable discharges . . . state permit them to at least to compete . . . market?"

Barnes: "The only thing that this will do is permit them to compete in the labor market as anyone else. This is all it does . . ."

Kosinski: "Well, that sounds rea . . . that sounds reasonable . . . reasonable to me, thank you."

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

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe that this is a matter that goes much deeper than it appears on it . . . on its surface. I have informed my members and people who work in the Veteran's Commission in the State of Illinois that there are a number of situations . . . ah . . . in what the veterans today come in contact with and deal with . . . ah . . . that have brought about a desire by the people in that Commission to see this Bill passed; and what I'm referring to are situations in which a member of the Armed Forces has for one reason or another incurred what we're . . . we would consider a misdemeanor in civil life, being absent without leave for a day or . . . or some sort of effect that is contrary to the rule of military justice, and it looks like in civil court police bargaining goes on. That is to say that often times the officer who 's . . . the soldier explains to him and tells to them . . . it's suggested to him that if he will accept something other than an honorable discharge, that charges will be dropped, that he does not receive a dishonorable discharge, and, therefore, it's not detrimental to his record, only to find out that when he's discharged with something less than the extended honorable discharge, that he faces . . . in seeking employment later on. This Bill really addresses itself to that problem. No one is trying to erase the . . . attached to a dishonorable discharge . . . for people who have committed minor offenses and for that reason have not received the standard honorable discharge. I think that this is something that we ought to consider. I don't doubt that because . . . commit so minor offense . . . that he should be penalized for the rest of his life and be unable to get employment, and I would ask that . . . support for this Bill."



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

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, more than likely if we polled all of the Ladies and Gentlemen in this room we'd probably be amazed at the number of us that have served on active military duty, and I think that we can all be . . . of the fact that most of us advertised that fact when we run for office. We always keep favorable discharges, in fact, I think we can even look to the Leadership from the other side of the aisle and find out that special consideration given in certain congressional awards has been used to catapult people into successful areas and careers; it is therefore amazing for me to think that anyone would go down to this level to try to exonerate some people who are nothing more than bare criminals. I think that has . . . what has been shown by this Bill is that the Sponsor, although I'm sure he's knowledgeable and well meaning here, does not understand the military justice system at all. A bad conduct discharge which would be one of the things with which would be excluded as an unfair business practice can be obtained for theft, can be obtained for all forms of thievery in the military and they are certainly more than just a mere misdemeanor. The last Speaker referred to the fact that the one-day A.W.O.L. immediately seeking a dishonorable discharge through a court-martial should not be stigmatized. Well, I served as a military prosecutor in the Judge Adjutant General Department of the Air Force for three years, and I was a prosecutor, and I'll guarantee you there was no way that you got a dishonorable discharge or a fair conduct discharge for one-day A.W.O.L. I'm still in the Judge Adjutant Reserve and they're still not giving them. I think the practical matter here is that we have to realize what you are doing. We're looking to the man's business career when he was in the service, and we're allowing the new employer to use that as a judgment determination as to whether he is going to be a good employee for him . . . if a man was a misfit in the service and he were kicked down as an undesirable, you'd certainly want to consider that when you're ready to hire him. If you received a bad conduct discharge for bear harping, you sure don't want to hire him. So I



urge all of you to vote against this very bad Bill."

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

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when I was a . . . as a former military officer and serving in the Judge Adjutant General's . . . Bill had some of the remarks that have been made . . . the . . . of the discharge does not reflect the character of the conduct that a person receives. I say from personal experience that what it reflects is the administrative convenience of the military. I have seen discharges under other than honorable conditions, general discharges, used for no other reason than to solve an administrative problem of the military. Now, it seems to me that what this Bill does is not to say you have to employ people who have bad conduct discharges or other less than honorable discharges, it simply says that can't be the sole reason for not hiring them and that seems to be an entirely reasonable position in light of the fact that these discharges are very often used in my personal experience not to reflect the conduct of the discharges as to . . . ah . . . simply . . . ah . . . simplify the administration of the . . . of the military sys . . . personnel system; and I urge a favorable vote on the Bill."

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

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have personally discussed this Bill with the top leaders of the Legion, the V.F.W., the Auvets and the disabled American Veterans and on one voice they are definitely against this piece of legislation. Now, there is a couple of Bills in the . . . that will review these cases once these cases pass the . . . ah . . . cases . . . and I would advise you all to vote against these Bills."

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

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

Telcser: "The Gentleman has moves the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes, to close."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to



to answer a couple of the remarks that was made here especially by one of the previous Speakers . . . I happened to have served in the military service for some four years and . . . military justice that . . . 90 percent of that time with headquarters in the United States Air Force in Europe, so I do have some type of knowledge of what I'm speaking about here, but contrary to what that Speaker said I did not . . . 'cause I don't want . . . my pocket, I don't feel that is necessary. I served my country and I think that that was the only commitment I had to make to patriotism as far as I'm concerned personally. I think what's involved here without beclouding the issue is one thing, we have in this state laws on our books that says that if a man has served his time in prison for com . . . committing a felony that he has paid his debt to society and he should be accepted back into society thusly. The only thing that this Bill says and it says nothing more, is that if a man comes back from the military service with a less than honorable discharge but not dishonorable he cannot be precluded from employed . . . employment soley on that fact. This is all this Bill says, and I feel I will end my request to you by one thing . . . to submit one thing to this Body, when these men come back, they have three alternatives. They can either/or go to school to further their education and hopefully they will be able to do that in House Bill 353 that we passed, they can either/or get a job to be a productive citizen in our society, or they can go on the welfare road. I think those are the choices that we are making here today. Either these will be productive citizens in our society or they'll go on the welfare rolls; or if they can't make it to welfare, they will be statistics in our criminal . . . ever increasing criminal statistics. That's what's involved here. I ask for a favorable vote of this House on this particular Bill."

Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 602 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Caldwell, to explain his vote."

Caldwell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think that we ought to . . . ah . . . stop and reflect momentarily . . . ah . . ."



Representative Barnes has thoroughly researched this matter. He has interviewed veterans organizations and they are in favor of these men who have less than honorable discharges . . . ah . . . coming back into society and being allowed to apply for work in industry. I think we're being shortsighted. Those of us who have had anything to do with law enforcement know that modern day army a lot of these young men in all . . . ah . . . ethnic groups were given their choice when misdemeanors and other violations of the law occurred to go into the service or go into prisons. Many of them accepted this service. I would suggest to you that modern day . . . ah . . . service . . . ah . . . requirement. Someone has pointed out here that the military is not the mili . . . the military of 1900 and the late '60's and the early '70's is not the military of some 20 years before, and where you do not have access to an honorable discharge, they get these less than honorable discharges through ignorance and through the laziness of the military personnel, and I would suggest to you that we are doing a great disservice if we did not allow these people with less than honorable discharges to apply for work . . . ah . . . I want to also point out to you that the . . . the . . . the late war and the war that's still going on gave thousands of young men access to . . ."

Telcser: "Will you conclude your remarks, please, Sir? Your two minutes are up."

Caldwell: ". . . I will, Sir . . . and these . . . this is all a new era in which young men can run afoul of the law, and I would suggest to you that we take this into consideration. Nobody is going to . . ."

Telcser: "Will you please conclude your remarks, Sir, your two minutes is long overdue, Sir."

Caldwell: ". . . I would suggest that we all take cognizance of this matter . . . ah . . . and let's put some green lights on that board and do our society a service."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from . . . ah . . . Sangamon, Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise only because I consider this a very



important issue. I was in Committee and I heard testimony from these young men. Many of them were only 18 and 19 year olds who because possibly they could not stand army discipline got into trouble. Now, what are we going to do with these young men the rest of their lives, they and their families, they have families. They have to support themselves and their families. Are we going to starve them or are we going to give them a shotgun and go out and say get your own. The only thing I think we ought to do here is show a little compassion. Give them a second chance . . . against them all the rest of their lives, 40, 60 years. Give them and their family a chance and let's vote 'aye'."

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

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't want to belabor the point, but I . . . I would like to rise because I believe that some of our remarks . . . those of us who are speaking for this Bill have misinterpreted. I don't think that there's a person on this House floor who would advocate eliminating the dishonorable discharge or felonious conduct by a soldier, and that I think that that record ought to go along with him through life; but the fact of the matter is that there are a number of categories of discharges, many of which . . . ah . . . mean very little as far as what kind of conduct was performed in the service. None of us are advocating eliminating or . . . or abolishing from the law or putting into the law requirement that you can't . . . refuse to hire someone who has a dishonorable discharge. All we're asking is that you give a man a chance who has made one mistake normally during the young years of his life and to come back and to be a productive member of this society. I encourage that green vote."

Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? The . . . the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Chairman, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I also don't like to take a lot of time on a given Bill, but I do agree with the people who think that this is an important Bill. I was . . . on court-marital, I was member, I was a defense counsel, I was a



prosecutor, and it's the most miserable kind of justice that the United States of America has ever figured out how to perpetrate. Ah . . . But this Bill doesn't pertain only to court-martial. Since the Korean War, increasingly every year the largest number of discharges which are not . . . ah . . . honorable discharges are discharges at the convenience of the service. These are administrative discharges. There may be some people who will benefit by this Bill that shouldn't, but the largest majority of young men who have made a simple mistake, who have a social disorientation within a barrack, who might've got drunk once when they were 17 and come back and busted a shore patrolman or . . . or an M.P. . . . ah . . . are they going pay for it the rest of their lives? These young men are living in the urban areas desperately looking for employment and we're telling them go out and pull yourself up by the boot straps and then we're taking away the boot strap. This is a fair Bill, this is a Bill where we have already given to felons an advantage that we won't give to young 18 year old boy that comes home from the service with a less than honorable discharge. It's got nothing to do with dishonorable discharges."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, in all fairness, again we repeat you're not talking about dishonorable discharges, people who have been tried and convicted. Basically, you're talking about young, men had they been but one year younger, we couldn't even mention their names in the newspaper, we couldn't even do anything to them simply because they're juveniles. Now, there's some people out there who's shootin' and killin' people at 15 years of age. I say that you've got a lot of bad people, but here you're talking about people who have essentially made it all the way to the military; and if you know anything about it, you can't go into the military with a felony hanging around your neck. You're talking about some boys who are bascially decent boys, but kids who have made a mistake. Yet, at this time we ask for mercy for them, we ask for a little consideration for them because they are behind, they have made a mistake, but they have paid for their mistake, but the question of it is how



long will you allow them to continue to pay for the simple mistake? If it's a bad mistake, give them a dishonorable discharge and I agree with you there's no contention in this area whatsoever, but what we talk about is that the Secretary of State of this state can say that people who have been convicted of certain types of crimes are entitled to another chance, then I'm surely not going to be a party to where boys go in the service, and basically these boys are volunteers, and they just cannot adjust to it. I suggest we owe this opportunity to them and we ask for these particular boys mercy above all."

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

Thompson: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I said I wasn't going to say anything on this issue, but there's some things that have been said that especially . . . stand up and speak out. I just wonder now if all the people on this floor would ask to step to the center aisle that hadn't had a second chance in life, how many could step out there truthfully and say they hadn't asked it?"

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly, in the 77th General Assembly, I voted for a whole series of Bills to permit ex-convicts, convicted criminals to have another chance at the labor market. I can't do less for these boys who may have gone wrong one time. We have a decision, shall we put them on the dole or shall we give 'em another chance at the labor market and let the labor market weed out the bad ones? I vote 'yes'."

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

Borchers: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, actually, in my opinion, Representative Barnes has a very good point in this, and the thing that stops me on this is that a man that gets an dis . . . honorable discharge, he can be out of the army which he wants to be and immediately get a job if this Bill passes. He receives really no punishment. Ah . . . He . . . ah . . . may take the very job that another man who has been an





honorable discharge . . . ah . . . may be competing with him for. I think that this . . . ah . . . House merit . . . but unfortunately it should be a time involved. I don't think we should punish them forever, I agree with him. I agree with him on this, but it's just something that I . . . ah . . . the Bill is a little too broad. Now, there is legislation and it has been stated as legislation in progress now . . . ah . . . on the Review Board, on the same issues now . . . you can get a Review Board and change . . . by your own initiative discharge, but I think we should . . . ah . . . just wait a little while, let the government take its census on this, get it through the House and . . . ah . . . make certain that we're not aiding and giving no punishment whatsoever to a boy that deserves at least some."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, am a service woman and I have had a struggle with my conscience. However, rather the public know I think inasmuch as this legislation has gone on record explaining felons for jobs, I'm going to vote 'yes'."

Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this question there are 96 'ayes', 37 'nays'; this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 645, Lemke, a Bill for an Act to amend Section A of the Workmen's Occupational and Disease Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Lemke: "Mr. Speaker, can we have 645 and 646 . . . ah . . ."

Telcser: "Are there objections to hearing 646 which I assume is a companion Bill?"

Lemke: "It's . . . one . . . one to is amend the Workmen's Comp . . . Occupational Disease and the other is to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act."

Telcser: "They're . . . are they companion Bills?"

Lemke: "Yeah, they're similar Bills, it's the same . . . same provision"



that we're changing."

Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, will the Clerk read House Bill 646?"

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 646, a Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Lemke: "Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, I ask you to . . . vote favorably for 645 and 646, the . . . this is a provision in the Workmen's Compensation Act to allow for partial loss of hearing. It's the only member of the bod . . . body in the Compensation Act that has not . . . there's no allowance for partial loss of hearing. If a worker suffers an injury at work, and has a 99 percent loss of hearing, he recovers nothing for this injury under the present Act. It's been neglected for many years and I ask for a favorable vote."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall . . . the Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

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

Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Tuerk: "Will you please explain to the House how you determine when and how and where, et cetera, that this person lost his hearing?"

Lemke: "Well, I'll look at the Illinois Chamber of Commerce Springfield Scene paper in their proposed model Bill they talk of technical details in allowance for prior injuries. There are measureable terms for partial loss of hearing. I talked to the fellow from the Illinois Bell Telephone Company, and this is company and . . . that gives a test for loss of hearing, they can determine it and they have no problem with it; and I think it's the same provision and how do you determine when a man's loss of vision is? This is something for the arbitrator to decide, not for the Legislators. I don't think that in the Act we should allow for partial loss of hearing or, I mean, we shouldn't allow for partial loss of hearing of any other member if we're not going to allow for partial loss of hearing in the Act, and I ask this . . . I don't know . . . ah . . . I'm not a doctor, but I can tell you this that the way cases go at



the Industrial Commission, both sides have an opportunity to put forth their evidence and the arbitrator decides and you have your right to review it off to the Supreme Court."

Tuerk: "Well, I understand what you're saying and I understand, too, that there are technological advancements to . . . ah . . . test the person for the loss of hearing and loss of sight, et cetera. All I'm asking is, Sir, is who makes the determination as to whether that person lost their hearing, whether it's systematic, whether it's . . . ah . . . something that was caused by a . . . ah . . . situation that is work environment, or just how that is determined?"

Lemke: "It's the same thing as to who determines what the injuries to his . . . to his eyes are or what the injury to his lungs are. This is up to the . . . up to a fair trial before the Industrial Commission. Both sides have an opportunity to present their evidence and I'm sure that the arbitrators are unbiased and they give their decision pro or con for either the petition or the respondent."

Tuerk: "In other words, you're convinced that the arbitrator will be able to determine just exactly how he lost his hearing?"

Lemke: "This is a matter of evidence, procedure, there's no other provisions in the Act to allow for evidence. I think this is the . . . the Act, the Workmen's Compensation Act and the Occupational Disease Act leaves this up to the evidence put into the case and it is determined by the arbitrator; and if . . . if . . . if either side is not happy with the arbitrator's decision, he can appeal that case up to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court will determine. At the present time, there has been cases remanded back to the Industrial Commission to write a percentage loss of hearing. Now, I think it's . . . it's the initiative upon the Legislature to amend the Act before the courts do, and I think this is our job and this is why I introduced the Bill."

Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 645 and 646 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'; the Clerk will take two Roll Calls. Fleck 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record."



Take two Records. On this question there are 138 'ayes', 4 'nays'; and these Bills having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 649, Hart, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart."

Hart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is similar to a Bill that was already passed regarding the salary of state's attorneys. It provides that where two or more counties join together to hire the same supervisor of assessments, the state shall pay an additional \$5,000 towards the salary. This has the support of the Department of Local Governmental Affairs. It came out of Executive Committee without a dissenting vote. Plus save the state some money. I think it's a good Bill for at least the small counties like I represent; and I would appreciate the support of the House."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 649 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this question there are 127 'ayes', no 'nays'; and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed."

Fredric Selcke: "Yeah, give it to me. House Bill 743, who is it, Waddell, a Act creating the Data Information System Commission defining its powers. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like this to be called back to Second Reading for purpose of an Amendment, which the Clerk has."

Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, the House Bill 743 will be placed on the order of Second Reading. Are there any Amendments?"

Fredric Selcke: "Amendment . . . what number is it? . . . Amendment #2, Waddell, amends House Bill 743 on page 1, line 30, and so forth."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Waddell. Repre-



sentative Waddell, on your Amendment, Sir."

Waddell: "I move the adoption of the Amendment . . . we can't do it now . . . it's too late . . ."

Telcser: "The Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment #2 to . . . to House Bill 743. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman, relative to the Gentleman's motion."

Berman: "Would he explain the Amendment, please?"

Telcser: "Do you wish to explain the Amendment, Sir?"

Waddell: "In this particular Amendment, what it does it changes the language as it was originally in the Bill and recommends the procedures to make available the flexibility of secured computer utilities of the services of a cost recovery basis; and that cost recovery basis is also is related to the recommendation of the establishment of state-wide policies and standards for information systems. For your information in the State of Illinois we have five systems unto themselves. We also are concerned with the interrelationship of these systems. For example, the state police in the present condition whereby these . . . ah . . . utilization of this equipment that we have in the police cars and you have in your locality, those that are on isperm and the rest of those systems. It means they have availability to some 53,000,000 entities. We in che Data Information System have made an attempt not only here but in the area of the universities and the junior colleges . . . to try and perform a service to the General Assembly. That being in trying to unify and to get a standard procedure to be used in many of . . . appropriations . . . the university . . . different types of systems and they are on different accounting systems . . . many times when you can't make it a sale out of it. What we concern ourself with here is to try and unify those to try and save money for the people of the State of Illinois and this in turn is partially what is being done here."

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

Shea: "Ah . . . Representative Waddell, I have an Amendment right after this . . . ah . . . that incorporates all of your changes with . . . and other changes I made in Item 4. I'm wondering if, would



it be possible to accept the one . . . ah . . . and you table yours?"

Waddell: "Yes, Sir, that would be possible."

Shea: "All right, thank you."

Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman has offered to move . . . are you going to table this Amendment? All right, the Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #1 to House Bill 743. That's #1 the Clerk informs me. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion to table signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the Amendment's tabled. Are there further Amendments?"

Fredric Selcke: "Amendment #2, Shea, amends . . ."

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

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

ah . . . this is an Amendment that is agreed with the Sponsor.

It's got exactly all the provisions that he had in there, accept in line 4 or Item 4 . . . ah . . . I add the words 'recommend procedures and legislation to help coordinate state and local management information and data processing systems'. Ah . . . I believe it's agreeable with the Sponsor, and, therefore, I'd move for the adoption of the Amendment."

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

Waddell: "I recommend its passage."

Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman has asked to move action on Amendment #2 to House Bill 743. All in favor of the adoption signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'; the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments? Third Reading. Do you wish to consider your Bill on Third Reading, Sir? Having been heard a third time, the Gentleman from Kane, Representative Waddell, with reference to House Bill 743."

Waddell: "I solicit your favorable vote."

Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 743 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 148 'ayes', no 'nays'; this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared . . . ah . . ."

Waddell: "Thank you, you rascal."



Telcser: ". . . House Bill 761 . . . I'm sorry, 760."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 76 . . . 760, Yourell, a Bill for an Act to add Section 3.1 to Act to revise the law in relation to notices. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to consider House Bill 761 with House Bill 760 as they are companion Bills and . . ."

Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, the Clerk will please read House Bill 761."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 761, a Bill for an Act to add Section 2 of an Act concerning publication of legal notices. Third Reading of the Bill."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, . . . ah . . . House Bill 760 and 761 amends the Act relating to notices and the publications of the notices to re . . . and the total circulation . . . now these . . . printed on that date of the publication. Simply what they do is preclude any . . . the total . . . the reason for that they do that either by con . . . or . . . number of phases involved . . . distribution problems . . . affect only a porcion of the circulation area . . . ah . . . an individual business entity. It should be interested in or be on the look out for or should be made aware of the particular notice and he certainly should be able to find it another copy of that day's publica . . . publication . . . that will . . . this will not cost any individual . . . or governmental body any additional expenditure . . . Chapter 1 . . . Section 4 provides additional cost in . . . and so forth. It's gone . . . Metro . . . such notices as the . . . Chicago's budget statement and the Cook County annual appropriation Bills and the Chicago Daily News and the . . . edition which only appears in a few thousand copies. Now, this legislation is . . . is supported and endorsed by the Illinois . . . Association and by Mr. Davidson with the Courier, Mr. Dave Sagin from the Chicago . . . and many other researchers throughout the State of Illinois; and I would request a favorable Roll Call."



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

Bluthardt: "I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a question."

Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Bluthardt: "Ah . . . this . . . would this cover a situation like a kingdom . . . under different names . . . different names . . . in the Senate . . . would that mean a publication made a . . . will have to be published in each one of those circulations?"

Yourell: "No, no, Representative Bluthardt, it would not. All . . . of the single newspaper is that single newspaper or publication have . . . edition run in that single day."

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

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

Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Mugalian: "It seems to me . . . ah . . . that . . . publications of governmental . . . ah . . . tape blurred . . ."

Yourell: ". . . Representative Mugalian, this would not cost any individual force or governmental body any additional expenditure . . . that the . . . copy of the statute here if you'd care to look at it."

Telcser: "Okay, the Lady from Adams, Representative Kent."

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

Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Kent: "Would you tell me who will become . . . for the extra edition? Will it be the newspaper?"

Yourell: "That is correct."

Kent: "Is that all?"

Yourell: "Well, I'm not . . . I'm really not concerned in looking after the interests of the newspapers, I'm looking after the interests of the people who write their own . . ."

Kent: "Well, don't . . . well, don't you think that those . . . advertise in something . . . will have to pick up the cost of this?"

Kent: "No, that is not true. According to the statutes, I read it again, Chapter 100, Section 4, takes care of that and there's a dis . . . in the statutes."





Kent: "I'm afraid if you don't . . . something . . . they should . . . it."

Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman wish to close the debate?"

Yourell: "Ah . . . Just briefly here, Mr. Speaker, all of the papers that have contacted me including the Illinois Press, all the weekly papers, the bi-weekly papers . . . ah . . . there's dozens and dozens . . . and throughout the State of Illinois that are supporting this . . . ah . . . this measure and I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 760 and 761 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', oppose by voting 'no'; The Clerk will take two Roll Calls. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record . . . 'aye' . . . and Krause 'aye' . . . on these questions there are 150 'ayes', 5 'nays'; and these Bills having received the constitutional majority are, hereby, declared passed."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 770, . . . ah . . . Waddell, an Act to regulate weather modification in this state and amending certain Acts therein named. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 770 concerns itself with setting up regulations of the Illinois . . . industries on weather modification they . . . At the present time, the State of Illinois has no such agencies. Likewise the provisions of the Bill state that the State of Illinois can . . . on the basis of controlling the highly scientific method whereby we can . . . unintelligible . . . this way under the Bill and with the Registration and Education that we set up a board to control . . . I suggest that . . . favorable . . ."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 770 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 144 'ayes', no 'nays'; and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed."

Fredric Selcke: ". . . unintelligible . . . House Bill 819, B. B. Wolfe,



..."

Telcser: "... passed for now ... let's take it out of the Record until Representative ... unintelligible ..."

Fredric Selcke: "Ah ... House Bill 819, a Bill for an Act to amend the Professional Service Corporation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Berman: "... unintelligible ..."

Telcser: "If Representative Epton is ... you can help him ... unintelligible ... or do you want to take it out of the Record ..."

Berman: "All right, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ... ah ..."

Telcser: "Ah ... unintelligible ..."

Berman: "... unintelligible ..."

Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The quest ... shall House Bill 819 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? ... unintelligible ..."

Unknown: "... ah ... unintelligible ..."

Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Juckett. On this question there are 150 'ayes', no 'nays'; and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. Representative ..."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 830, Juckett, a Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Juckett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 830 will give to those who are physically handicapped, ... in certain instances not subject to ... unintelligible ... this also ... manufacturing about 34 states ... and I would urge the adoption of House Bill 830."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ron Hoffman."

Hoffman: "... unintelligible ..."

Telcser: "... is there further discussion? The question is, shall



House Bill 830 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record."

Fredric Selcke: ". . . unintelligible . . ."

Telcser: "On this question there are 151 'ayes', and 1 'nay' . . . this Bill . . ."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 849, Fennessey, a Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Telcser: "Okay, Representative Fennessey."

Fennessey: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 849 is a . . . 1974 . . . more than 20 feet long and . . . unintelligible . . . by the Department of Transportation . . . the language . . . This passed by the Committee 16 to nothing and supported by the State Police, Department of Transportation, Secretary of State's office."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 849 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish?"

Unknown: "No, no, no."

Telcser: "Take the Record. On this question there are 144 'ayes', no nays'; and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 850, Walters, a Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Walters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 850 is the same . . . Motor Vehicle Law Commission's Bill. It was recognized by the Illinois . . . the reason for this Bill is very simple, . . . unintelligible . . . they are serving a very dangerous situation."

Telcser: ". . . The question is, shall House Bill 850 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', 1 'nay'; and this . . . constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed."



Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 857, Stone, a Bill for Act to amend the General Not For Profit Corporation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Moultrie, Representative Stone. Is Representative Stone on the floor? Yes, he is.".. "

P. Stone: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah.. this ah.. this Bill merely enables a Not For Profit Corporation to buy insurance to indemnify the Members of the Board of Directors if the are sued in ah.. doing any of their official acts. It's allowed by ah.. most other Corporations and... and people. And, I think, it's a good Bill."

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

H. A. Katz: "But, does it enable a Director, who is proven to have embezzled funds, for example, to be secure from having to....."

P. Stone: "No.... No, Sir. It does not. It only allows the Corporation to buy insurance to protect Directors in the ah.. official acts of the Corporation. And, that would not be an official act of the Corporation. And, I'm sure that it would not be ah.. covered by insurance that the Corporation would buy."

H. A. Katz: "Well, I believe, the way it's worded, that it would cover all forms of personal liability and would serve to protect a Director from his own wrongful activities as a Director of the Corporation. That's the only objection I



have that the Directors employ themselves, purchase the insurance, ah.. take the funds and somebody sues them and...."

P. Stone: "No, certainly this would cover it. No.. The... This is meant to.. to protect a Director of a Non Profit Corporation in pursuing his lawful duties as Director of the Corporation and in the performance of his duty. And, it would not correct ah... ah... would not protect him in any wrongful acts."

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

R. A. Mugalian: "Ah.. I don't want to belabor the point. But, if his acts are lawful, he doesn't need any insurance and wouldn't need any indemnification."

P. Stone: "What's the question?"

R. A. Mugalian: "Is it negligence or does it include willful?"

P. Stone: "Will you please repeat the question?"

R. A. Mugalian: "Can you tell me, Sir, if it includes ah.. willful acts as well as negligent acts on the part of... on the part of the Directors?"

P. Stone: "Well, I suppose any act that ah... that a Director does is willful. Ah.. if you mean any wrongful willful act, I don't think, it would... would correct it. The Bill would merely add Illinois to the role of forty-eight other States which have enacted ah.. some type of identification ah... Legislation such as this. Now presently, there is considerable doubt whether Corporations can legally idemnify their Officers and Directors against the expenses that they



incur in.. in the defense of lawsuits brought against them when they're acting as Officers and Directors. And, even if they are successful in the defense of such lawsuits. Now, if the insurance provisions of this Bill would merely enable the Corporations to spread the risk of such lawsuits, and thereby, substantially reduce these ah.. potential impact of the lawsuits. Now, this is.... This Bill is only for Not For Profit Corporations, like the Electric Cooperatives and others who have no way now to... to provide ah.. compensation for their.. their Directors. And, their Directors do not want it."

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

A. L. Berman: "Well, I'd point out to Representative Mugalian and Katz, that asked the question, that on Page 2, Lines 31 onto the next Page, it accepts... it exempts wilfull misconduct acts by these ah... Directors. And, I think, that that answers their questions. I think, it's a good Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten."

D. Totten: "Would the Section.... Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Yes, he indicates he will."

D. Totten: "Would the Section of the Not For Profit Corporation Act, that you are referring to, would that apply to Political Organizations which can be incorporated as Not For Profit Organizations?"



P. Stone: "Well, I.. I don't think, it intends to refer to those. These are... are the general Not For Corporation ah... Not For Profit Corporation Acts. And, I think, that... that ah.. Political Organizations are not included in that Act."

D. Totten: "I think, they can be and I would like to have that cleared up."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative..... Do you wish to respond, Representative Stone? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Maragos."

S. C. Maragos: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this was re... ah... ah... discussed fully in the Judiciary Committee and came out thirteen to nothing. But, the point is, yes ah..., if a Political Organization wants to buy insurance and indemnify any of its Members for any wrongful acts, like getting involved in an automobile accident or having something like that, fine. But, I'm sure that they're not going to get any insurance of indemnity for any ah... remarks they may make on the... on the field of battle in the political battle as far as ah.. ah... lawsuits ah... in case they ah... ah.... for ah..., the term that I want to use, to slander liable. But, I think, that in any other case, they would be ah.. probably insured for."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The gentleman from Moultrie, Representative Stone, to close."

P. Stone: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm sure there.. there isn't anything wrong with this Bill. It was given to me by the Electric Cooperatives. And, they've had a few



problems in... in getting good Board Members to serve because of the fact they were afraid that they would be sued for something ah.. without any cause and ah... and they would then have to ah.. pay out of their own pocket for money to defend these lawsuits. Ah.. I would appreciate your favorable vote."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The question is, 'shall House Bill 857 pass?'. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Jones.. 'aye'. Take the record. On this question, there are 132 'Ayes', 4 'Nays' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Washington.. 'aye'.





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

Borchers: "Ah . . . When is the period of . . . ah . . . is this too much extension, is it a time of the young birds, the young rabbits are out or not, because . . . because if it is, those dogs can kill those young birds or young rabbits. I'd like to know."

Dunn: "It doesn't extend the season for hunting except in the season for training . . ."

Borchers: "Well, okay, for training?"

Dunn: ". . . and . . . ah . . . dogs that are trained are under control of the . . ."

Borchers: "I've had dogs that are on land that are supposedly trained and they've destroyed the game, I'd still like to know what . . . what months it is that you extend this to."

Dunn: "April and May. It extends it to April and May."

Borchers: "I still can't hear it, I'd like to know."

Dunn: "April and May are the two months."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what months . . ."

Telcser: "The Gentleman say . . . the Gentleman says April and May. It extends it through April and May."

Borchers: "That is the very time when all the young are out, and I think we should voice 'no' on this. I hate to say it because I like for . . . I'm a sportsman myself, but this is a period of time when all the young birds and all the young rabbits or squirrels are out running around . . . to get around, and I have seen . . . I've seen what's happened by the so-called training . . . trained dogs."

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

LaFleur: "I . . . Mr. Speaker, fellow Members, I hate to disagree with my good friend Webber, but having run bird dogs for a good many years, we find . . . we find that the nesting season is not disturbed a bit by this. That you can run the dogs out in the field through May, through April . . . ah . . . and into June. Right now the birds are just pairing off and this Bill would really be a help and a boom to the sportsman."

Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 880 pass? All those . . . the Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Boyle."



Boyle: "Ralph, Ralph, I had my attention called on something here that I didn't notice before. Apparently, in your Bill, last Section, stops them from running the dogs at night, is that right? It . . . it repeals that Section?"

Dunn: "Right, it repeals the restriction, I guess it . . . it allows them to train at night."

Boyle: "Okay, okay."

Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 880 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 120 'ayes', 7 'nays'; this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 1077."



Telcser: "House Bill 1077."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 1077. Hanahan. Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the bill."

Telcser: "Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This bill amends the Vehicle Code for the transit-mixed vehicles. It raises their licenses fees up to \$1,492 from \$1,296 in the 5-axle truck. It's a permissive bill. It only allows cities, counties and states to issue permits to allow the transit-mixers for increased weight limitations. I can suggest to the Members of the House that it is a good bill. It's sponsored by and recommended by the former ah.. Motor Vehicles Commission. It has been discussed by them. It is a bill that is needed in the construction industry. It does provide for lower speed limit and it's strictly a permissive bill not similar to other bills that we've had in the past."

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

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker this is one of the worst-built bills that I've ever seen come out of Committee. This is a cement truck that is actually a monster. There's only 40% of the bridges in the State of Illinois.. now get this.. there's only 40% of the bridges in the State of Illinois that will be able to handle this cement truck of 72,000 pounds. The bill is camouflaged. It looks like a special lightening fee to make it look worthwhile



to make money for the State. But it's a bill that if you'll search your mail, you have a letter from the Chicago Motor Club and many other letters opposing this bill. It is absolutely.. we're crying about roads. This.. this big truck will be nothing but a road crusher, 72,000 pounds and only 40% of the bridges in the State of Illinois will be able to handle this. 60% of the bridges cannot take this truck. I urge your 'no' vote."

Telcser: "Gentleman from one.. Whiteside, Representative Ken Miller."

Ken Miller: "Point of information."

Telcser: "State your point, Sir."

Ken Miller: "How many votes does it take this bill to pass? It seems that involves home rule units."

Telcser: "Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Yes there is a home rule amendment on there adopted on Second Reading."

Telcser: "Well it will take 89 votes then, Representative. It will not affect the home rule unit. Is there further discussion? Does the Gentleman wish to close the debate? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Representative Hanahan, if I can inquire."

"Now, you've got a larger truck here that's going to haul cement. How many men will be displaced as a result of this gargantuan motor vehicle running through the state and tearing up our roads?"

Hanahan: "Well, first of all you're a typical lawyer. It's



like asking me.. You're like asking me when did I quit beating my wife last. There's no way to answer your question except to state the facts. First of all, this bill only allows a city, a county or state to issue a permit, if in their mind the truck will not tear up any bridges or any roads. That's number one to your question about what this big, monstrous truck will do. Number two, the bill has got a home rule provision which will allow the cities that are home rule units not to issue permits if they so desire. Number three, you're other question I didn't remember because being a good lawyer, you've got me confused."

Palmer: "Well, how many men will it displace from the labor forces?"

Hanahan: "I believe it would not because if you really want to be honest with yourself, you know and I know that the weights that we're asking for that the permission be granted are right now being carried around the State and don't kid yourself and don't try and kid me that they're not. No men will be displaced in fact if we could sell a little more concrete a little bit cheaper it might put more people to work not only hauling it but building buildings and improving the economy of the State."

Palmer: "Tom, do the Teamsters endorse this bill?"

Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Is there further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, somebody just mentioned the fact that these



trucks are so big that they're already home rule units."

Telcser: "Question is shall House Bill.. Lady from DuPage,  
Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Representative Han.. Could I ask the sponsor a question."

Telcser: "He indicates he'll yield."

Dyer: "Mr. Hanahan did.. never did answer the key question  
which he asked himself. Representative Hanahan, when  
did you stop beating your wife?"

Hanahan: "I didn't know this was an ERA question."

Telcser: "Question is shall House Bill 1077 pass? All those  
in favor signify by voting 'aye' and the opposed by  
voting 'no'. Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative  
Pappas."

Pappas: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the  
House. I think we've had a little frivolity and ah..  
this type of thing this evening. What this bill does  
if I can reiterate what the sponsor said, it allows..  
it's permissive.. it allows the cities and counties  
and the state to issue permits if in their eyes that  
they want to issue permits. As far as the bridge thing  
is concerned is no municipality or the state will issue  
a permit to allow one of these vehicles to go over a  
bridge if it is not posted. The other thing is that  
I'd like to bring out is in this bill the weight limitations  
on these bills on the axles is less than what is now  
authorized on many other vehicles. So that you are not  
allowing any more weight than what we have already allowed  
for other vehicles."



Telcser: "Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Craig."

Craig: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is not asking for any more than the garbage truck people when the garbage began to pile up in the City of Chicago and around over the country and they came in and they got an injunction and they went to court with the Department of Transportation, Division of Highways and they won their case. And they're not asking for any more weight load than the garbage truck already has. Now here is also I'd like to remind you people that on these trucks when they're loaded to their maximum weight, going to point A to B and their speed limit you must remember is 45 miles and hour is top limit for speed. These trucks it is proven here by Professor Raymond J. Krisick, the University of Northwestern, Associate Professor of Engineering, which proves that the roads were not damaged anymore by a truck running from A to B with a maximum load on it when it came back empty than a truck running at the normal speed loaded both ways. Now, when they talk about the bridges in Illinois, they're talking about all the trucks that weigh that maximum load and as many as they can get on that bridge and plus there's another 50% bearing. There's very few bridges in Illinois that's fallen down from that cause of an overload. Plus the fact that the man who's talking about these bridges in Illinois that wouldn't permit this kind of weight, they could not travel on those roads or those



bridges anyway; and I'm saying that this equipment is special type equipment. The same as the garbage people have on their trucks; and I think this Bill does deserve your vote."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Hunsicker."

Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, rather interesting to hear that they would be allowed only a 45-mile-an-hour speed limit. I ask you how many semis on the truck today stay within the limit they're supposed to stay in? Just travel up and down 66 and you'll soon learn that they're exceeding the speed limit anywhere from 10, 15 to 20 an hour. I see that everytime I go to Springfield and back; and this 45-mile-an-hour limit is for the birds. Now, I think our highways are breaking up at too rapid a rate; and there's only one way that you're going to keep the manufacturers from making heavier automobiles and that is put a limit on and keep it on instead of letting . . . ah . . . permits go out so they can haul bigger ones every once in a while. I think this Bill should be defeated."

Telcser: "Okay, Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the Record. On this question there are 62 'ayes', 73 'nays'. Representative Hanahan, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Hanahan: "Postponed Consideration."

Telcser: "Gentleman's requested Postponed Consideration. He has that right. We'll be putting it on Postponed Consideration. Okay, Senate Bills, Third Reading."





Telcser: ". . . and we've got four Senate Bills, which were killed, that we have to pass . . . ah . . . as soon as possible and relative to . . . ah . . . Senate Bill 457, the Gentleman from Madison, Representative Calvo, is recognized."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would appreciate the suspension of Rule 35A in order that we can call Senate Bill 457 out of order and . . . ah . . . for passage today."

Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved to suspend the provisions of Rule 37 . . . ah . . . for the purpose of hearing 457 out of its numerical order. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no', 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this question 129 'ayes', no 'nays'; and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Appearing on Senate Bills, Third Reading, Senate Bill 457."

Fredric Selcke: "Senate Bill 457, an Act to provide the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Personnel. Third Reading of the Bill."

Telcser: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Calvo."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill for certain transfers amounting to \$265,000 in the Department of Personnel for the payment of present awards that have been granted in Workmen's Compensation Claims cases. They're short in this fund, and I'd appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Telcser: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 457 pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this question there are 151 'ayes', no 'nays'; and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. Relative to a motion in regards to a Senate Bill 1139, the Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Holloway, is he on the floor? . . . is recognized. Is Representative Holloway here? Representative . . . the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to have my . . . "

Telcser: "Wait . . . here he is . . . here is Representative Holloway."



Representative Lechowicz, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to have my name removed as the Cosponsor of House Bill 1077."

Telcser: "All right, does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing none, it will be journalized. Now, the Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Holloway, relative to Senate Bill 1139."

Holloway: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1139 is an emergency Bill. It appropriates \$300,000 to the Superintendent of Public Instruction to cover the cost of flood damage to the schools up and down the Mississippi."

Telcser: "The question is . . . the question is, shall Senate Bill 1139 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'."

Fredric Selcke: "Senate Bill 1139, an Act making a sup . . . an appropriation to the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote . . . ah . . . I'm voting in favor of this, but I have a feeling this small business administration has a . . . ah . . . an extremely liberal loan program. In fact, it may even be a grant program for public facilities, and I wonder . . . pertains for twice."

Telcser: "Ah . . . Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this question 146 'ayes', 1 'nay'; and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. Now, the Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Holloway, moves that the provisions of Rule 37 be suspended so that Senate Bill 1140 can be heard out of . . . its numerical sequence. All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'; 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this question there are 140 'ayes', no 'nays'; and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Mann 'aye'. Senate Bill 1140."

Fredric Selcke: "Senate Bill 1140, an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



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

Holloway: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill validates the days missed because of the high waters so that their state aid will not be jeopardized."

Telcser: "The ques . . . the question is, shall Senate Bill 1140 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'."

Fredric Selcke: "There is the suspension of the rules."

Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. Katz 'aye'. Grotberg 'aye'. On this question there are 149 'ayes', no 'nays'; and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Campbell, moves the provisions of Rule 37 be suspended so that Senate Bill 1141 can be heard out of its numerical sequence. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no', 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this question there are 137 'ayes', no 'nays'. Kozubowski and Davis 'aye'. The Gentleman's motion to suspend the rules prevails. Senate Bill 1141."

Fredric Selcke: "Senate Bill 1141, an Act to amend an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent distributed expenses of the Department of Public Aid. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a request for a transfer of \$15,000,000 from A.D.C. to General Assistance in the Department . . . within the Department of Public Aid. There's no new money involved and they are out of money at the present time. I'd certainly appreciate your favorable support."

Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1141 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. Record Representative Skinner as voting 'present'. On this question there are 145 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 answering 'present'; and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared



passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, with reference to an announcement . . . do you want to announce the Subcommittee meeting? Is your Subcommittee meeting tonight, Don?"

Totten: "Yeah, there'll be a meeting of the . . . ah . . . Subcommittee on . . . ah . . . on Mr. . . . ah . . . Representative Neff's Bill one hour after adjournment in Room M5 for those Members in the Subcommittee."

Fredric Selcke: "We got any . . . we got any Re . . . no, we read those this morning."

Telcser: "Re . . . Representative Barnes, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, in reference to the Subcommittee, . . . ah . . . I would appreciate it if we could have that meeting in the morning. I have some people down here and . . . ah . . . we've been here all day already."

Telcser: "The Chairman announces the meeting? He indicates . . . ah . . . that the time which he will call it. House Resolutions."

Fredric Selcke: "House Resolution 355, Jaffe et al. House Resolution 360, LaFleur et al."

Telcser: "Speaker's table."

Fredric Selcke: "Ah . . . Death Resolutions."

Telcser: "Representative Tipsword, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what order of business we're on, but might I ask unanimous consent of the House to have leave to withdraw as Cosponsor of House Bill 1486. I've spoken to the Chief Sponsor."

Telcser: "Well, you have leave, Sir, but we have forms up here, if you'd just sign it, then the Clerk will do it and we'll save floor time."

Tipsword: "Okay."

Fredric Selcke: "Ah . . . Death Resolutions."

Telcser: "Death Resolutions."

Fredric Selcke: "Ah . . . House Joint Resolution is that 51 or 57? . . . House Joint Resolution 51, Geo-Karis, in respect to the memory of Mrs. Luthy . . . Lucy Jane Bales. House Resolution 358, Lemke,



in respect to the memory of Francis T. McCurrie."

Telcser: "Okay, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh, has moved that the . . . ah . . . House do adopt . . . ah . . . the Death Resolutions. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the Resolutions are adopted. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn until 9:30 tomorrow morning for a regular Session."

Telcser: "All in those in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the House stands adjourned until the hour of 9:30 a.m. regular Session."



INDEX  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
MAY 24, 1973

NOTE: ". . ." indicates sound system is working improperly and conversation is unintelligible towards end of the day. Check big tapes for verification.



Speaker Blair	At ease for 15 minutes House come to Order
Dr. Johnson	Invocation
Speaker Blair	Roll Call for Attendance
Schneider	Point of information
Speaker Blair	
Clerk Selcke	Messages from the Senate
Speaker Blair	
Clerk Selcke	Committee Reports
Speaker Blair	
Clerk Selcke	Introduction-First Reading
Speaker Blair	
Clerk Selcke	Agreed Resolutions
Speaker Blair	
W. Walsh	Explains Agreed Resolutions



Walsh	List of House Joint Resolutions
Telcser	Resolutions adopted
Fredric Selcke	House Resolutions
Telcser	Death Resolutions
Fredric Selcke	Death Resolutions
Telcser	Death Resolutions adopted
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 684, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
Telcser	
Boyle	Amendment #1
Telcser	Amendment #1 adopted
Fredric Selcke	Amendment #2
Telcser	
Boyle	Amendment #2
Telcser	Amendment #2 adopted
Fredric Selcke	Amendment #3
Telcser	
Boyle	Amendment #3
Telcser	Amendment #3 adopted
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 877, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
	Amendment #1
Telcser	
Mann	Amendment #1
Telcser	Amendment #1 adopted
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1206, Second Reading
Telcser	House Bill 1207





Fredric Selcke	Amendment #2
Telcser	
Barry	Amendment #2
Telcser	Amendment #2 adopted
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1207, Second Reading, Amendment #2
Telcser	
Barry	Amendment #2
Telcser	Amendment #2 adopted
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1658, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Telcser	Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1659, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Telcser	Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1442, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Telcser	Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	Amendment #1
Telcser	
Craig	Amendment #1
Telcser	Amendment #1 adopted
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1477, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
Telcser	Taken out of the Record
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1017, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
Telcser	
Lundy	Three Amendments in all



Telcser	Table Amendment #1
Fredric Selcke	Amendment #2
Telcser	
Lundy	Table Amendment #2
Telcser	Amendment #2 tabled
Shea	
Fredric Selcke	
Telcser	Explain ?
Lundy	Purpose if tabled
Telcser	Amendment #2 tabled
Fredric Selcke	Amendment #3
Telcser	
Lundy	Amendment #3
Telcser	Amendment #3 adopted
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1199, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
Molloy	Amendment #1
Telcser	Amendment #1 adopted, Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	Third Reading
Telcser	
Katz	Hold
Telcser	Take out
Fredric Selcke	
Telcser	House Bills, Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	
Telcser	Take out
Shea	Question



Special Request

Telcser

Fredric Selcke                      House Bill 1652, held on Second Reading yesterday

Telcser

Choate

Telcser

Brummet                              Amendment #1, move to reconsider vote

Telcser

Rigney                                Question

Telcser

Walsh                                 Urge no

Telcser

Rigney                                Urge no

Telcser

Hill

Telcser

Lauer

Telcser )

          )

Hanahan )

Telcser

Deuster

Telcser

Barry

Telcser

Hirschfeld                          How am I recorded?

Telcser

Fredric Selcke



Hirschfeld No

Telcser

Peters

Telcser

Fredric Selcke

McAvoy

Telcser

Schneider

Telcser

Londrigan

Telcser

Tipsword

Fredric Selcke

Telcser

Choate

Telcser

Fredric Selcke

Polls absentees

Telcser

Hill

Verification of Negative Roll Call

Telcser

Affirmative Roll Call

Fredric Selcke

Telcser

Rigney )

Questions of affirmative Roll Call

)  
Telcser )

Hanahan

Fredric Selcke



Telcser  
 Hanahan  
 Telcser  
 Hirschfeld                      Point of order  
 Fredric Selcke                   Trade jobs, et cetera  
 Telcser  
 Fredric Selcke                   Reads negative Roll Call  
 Telcser )  
           )  
 Choate    )  
 Fredric Selcke  
 Telcser )  
           )  
 Hill      )                      Questions of negative Roll Call  
 Telcser  
 Duff                              How am I recorded?  
 Telcser                    ) )  
                                   )  
 Fredric Selcke            )  
                                   )  
 Duff                            )  
                                   )  
 Telcser  
 McMasters  
 Telcser  
 Pappas                            How am I recorded?  
 Fredric Selcke  
 Telcser  
 Choate  
 Telcser  
 Walsh  
 Telcser



Choate

Telcser

Walsh

Telcser

Cunningham

Telcser )

Kosinski )

Point of personal information

Telcser

Philip

Leave for hour Caucus

Telcser

Wolf )

Telcser )

Schraeder

Telcser

Davis

Point of personal privilege

Telcser

Hoffman, R

Telcser

Flinn

Telcser

Boyle

Telcser

Stedelin

Telcser

Hill

Telcser



Springer )	Record as no
)	
Telcser )	
Hill	Continues verification of negative Roll Call
Telcser	
Bradley	Vote me 'aye'
Telcser )	
)	
Hill )	What's the count?
Telcser )	
)	
Juckett )	Parliamentary inquiry
Telcser	
Choate	
Telcser )	
)	
Juckett )	
)	
Choate )	
Telcser	Motion to reconsider vote prevails
Hill	Move Amendment #1 to House Bill 1652 be tabled.
Telcser	
Choate	Parliamentary inquiry
Telcser	
Rigny	Move for adoption of Amendment #1
Telcser	
Hill	
Telcser	
Day	In favor of Amendment
Telcser	



Palmer	Support
Telcser	
Leinenweber )	Move previous question
)	
Telcser )	
?	
Telcser	'Ayes' have it
Rigney	
Telcser	Amendment #1 to House Bill 1652 lost. Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1762, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Telcser	Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 989, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Telcser	Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1138, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Telcser	Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	
Telcser	
Barry	Amendment being drafted
Telcser	Take out
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1387, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Telcser	
Fredric Selcke	Amendment #1
Beaupre	Amendment #1
Telcser	Amendment adopted, Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1405, Second Reading, Two





## Committee Amendments

Telcser	
Blair	Amendment #1, move for adoption and then table
Telcser	
Blair	
Telcser	Amendment #1
Shea )	Question
)	
Blair )	
Telcser	
Lechowicz )	Question
)	
Blair )	
Telcser	
Choate )	
)	
Blair )	
Telcser	Amendment #1 tabled
Fredric Selcke	Amendment #2
Telcser	
Blair	
Telcser	Amendment adopted
Fredric Selcke	Amendment #3
Blair	
Telcser	Amendment adopted, Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	
Telcser	Out
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1418, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments



Miller	
Skinner	Amendment #1
Miller	Amendment adopted, Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1565, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	
Jack O'Brien	Amendment #1
Miller	
Hoffman, G.	
Miller	
Berman	
Miller	
Bradley )	Question
)	
Hoffman )	
Miller	Amendment adopted, Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1575, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1627, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1635, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	
Jack O'Brien	Amendment #1
Miller	
Philip	
Miller	Amendment #1 adopted, Third Reading



Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1639, Second Reading, Seven Committee Amendments
Miller	
Philip	Take out of Record
Miller	
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1663, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1777, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
Miller	
McCourt	Take out of Record
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1816, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	
Jack O'Brien	Amendment #1
Miller	Take out
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1846, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	
Jack O'Brien	Amendment #1
Miller	
Katz	
Miller	Amendment adopted, Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1920, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	
Jack O'Brien	Amendment #1
Miller	



Ewell	Amendment #1 tabled
Miller	Amendment #1 tabled, Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 782, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
Miller	
Friedland	Amendment #1
Miller	Amendment #1 adopted, Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 834, Second Reading, Two Committee Amendments
Miller	
Kempiners	Amendment #1
Miller	Amendment #1 adopted
Jack O'Brien	Amendment #2
Miller	
Kempiners	
Blair	
Krause )	Yield?
)	
Kempiners )	
Miller	
Krause	We've got two Amendments, #2
Miller	
Kempiners	Amendment's been renumbered as #2
Miller	
Krause	Okay
Miller	Amendment #2 adopted
Jack O'Brien	Floor Amendment #3
Miller	



Schlickman	Amendment #3
Miller	Amendment #3 adopted, Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 844, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
Miller	
Dunn, R. L.	Amendment #1, not aware, hold it
Miller	Take it out
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 887, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
Miller	
Deuster	Amendment #1
Miller	
Hanahan )	Question
)	
Deuster )	
Miller	Amendment #1 adopted, Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	I read it, House Bill 844
Miller	
Dunn, R. L.	Amendment #1
Miller	Amendment #1 adopted, Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1906, Second Reading
Miller	Third Reading
Hanahan )	
)	
Miller )	
Walsh	Schedule for next few days
Miller	
Choate )	
)	
Walsh )	



Miller	
Juckett	)
	)
Miller	)
Walsh	Moves House recess for one hour
Miller	House stands in recess
Murphy (In Chair)	House will be in order
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 891, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
Murphy	
Hanahan	Amendment #1
Murphy	Amendment #1 adopted, Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 894, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
Murphy	
Hanahan	Amendment #1
Murphy	Amendment #1 adopted, Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 904, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
Murphy	
Philip	Amendment #1
Murphy	
Philip	Move adoption of Amendment #1
Murphy	
Kennedy )	Question
)	
Philip )	
Murphy	Amendment #1 adopted
Fredric Selcke	Amendment #2
Murphy	



Philip	
Murphy	
Shea	Question
Philip	Move to table Amendment #2
Murphy	Tabled, Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 942, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 959, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 960, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 962, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 987, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 988, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	
Miller	
Hart	
Miller	
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1002, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	



Fredric Selcke	Amendment #1
Porter	
Miller	Amendment #1 adopted
Fredric Selcke	Amendment #2
Miller	
Porter	
Miller	Amendment #2 adopted, Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1030, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
Miller	
Rayson	Amendment #1
Miller	Amendment #1 adopted, Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1057, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
Miller	
Craig )	Amendment #1
Fredric Selcke )	
Miller	
Hart )	Question
Craig )	
Miller	
Hart )	Question
Craig )	
Miller	Amendment #1 adopted, Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1058, Second Reading, Two Committee Amendments
Miller	
Kosinski	Amendment #1





Miller	Amendment #1 adopted
Fredric Selcke	Amendment #2
Miller	
Kosinski	
Miller	
Rayson )	Question
)	
Kosinski )	
Rayson	Speaks against Amendment
Miller	
Kosinski	To close
Miller	
Kempiners	
Miller	
Kosinski	
Miller	Amendment #2 adopted, Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1108, Second Reading, No Committee Amendment
Miller	Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1109, Second Reading, No Committee Amendment
Miller	Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1122, Second Reading, Two Committee Amendments
Miller	
Schlickman	Amendment #1
Miller	
Skinner )	Would you repeat?
)	
Schlickman )	



Miller	Amendment #1 adopted
Fredric Selcke	Amendment #2
Miller	
Schlickman	
Miller	Amendment #2 adopted
Fredric Selcke	Amendment #3
Miller	
Schlickman	
Miller	Amendment #3 adopted, Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1133, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
Miller	
Sevcik	Amendment #1
Miller	
Shea )	Question
)	
Sevcik )	
Miller	Amendment #1 adopted
Fredric Selcke	Amendment #2
Sevcik	
Miller	Amendment #2 adopted, Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1148, Second Reading
Miller	Take out
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1151
Barnes	
Miller	
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1151, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Miller	
Barnes	Take out
Miller	Washington want it?
Washington	Amendment #1
Miller	
Walsh	
Miller	
Washington	Amendment #1
Miller	
Walsh )	Question
)	
Washington )	
Miller	
Walsh	Speaks against
Miller	
Washington	To close
Miller	Amendment #1
Walsh	
Miller	Amendment #1 adopted, Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1150, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	
Jack O'Brien	Amendment #1, floor
Miller	
Washington	
Miller	Amendment #1 adopted, Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1148, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments



Miller	Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1158, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1189, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1196, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
Miller	
Katz	Amendment #1
Miller	Amendment #1 adopted, Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1211, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1122, Second Reading
Miller	Out
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1237, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1039, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1243, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1273, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1305, Second Reading, No



	Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1313, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
Miller	
Duff	Amendment #1, move to table
Miller	
Krause )	Question
)	
Duff )	
Miller	
Krause )	Will you take out of the Record?
)	
Duff )	Sure
Miller	Out of the Record
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1314, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1323, Second Reading, No Committee Amendment
Miller	Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1382, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	
Jack O'Brien	Floor Amendment #1
Miller	
Tuerk	Amendment #1
Miller	Amendment #1 adopted, Third Reading
Hill )	Question, Second Amendment?
)	
Miller )	



Tuerk	
Miller	
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1383, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1412, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1414, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	
Matijevich	Vote to hold 1414, 1419 and 1474
Miller	They'll be held
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1417, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1420, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1421, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Hart	
Miller	Question of Dyer
Hart	
Carter	Advance to Third, will pull back to Second later
Miller	Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1427, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Miller	Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1439, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	
Jack O'Brien	Amendment #1, floor
Miller	
Martin	Amendment #1
Miller	Amendment #1 adopted, Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1448, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
Miller	
Berman	Amendment #1
Miller	Amendment #1 adopted
Jack O'Brien	Amendment #2
Miller	
Berman	Amendment #2
Miller	Amendment #2 adopted, Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1457, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
Miller	Third Reading
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1497
Miller	
Giorgi )	I'm Sponsor of 1471
)	
Miller )	
Giorgi )	Like to have 1471 called
)	
Miller )	Bill not printed
Tuerk	
Miller	



Jack O'Brien

House Bill 1471, Second Reading, No  
Committee Amendments

Miller

Jack O'Brien

Amendment #1

Miller

Tuerk

Miller

Palmer )

Yield?

Miller )

Tuerk )

Miller

Tuerk )

Point of order

Palmer )

Let me conclude

Miller

Dunn, R. L. )

Question

Miller )

Palmer )

Miller

Maragos

Oppose

Miller

Schoeberlein

Miller

Little quiet, Ladies and Gentlemen . . .

Schoeberlein

Miller

Amendment #1 adopted

Jack O'Brien

Amendment #2

Miller

Palmer





Miller	
Tuerk	Amendment #2 in conflict
Miller	
Collins	Object to unauthorized lobbyists
Miller	Sergeant at Arms, et cetera
Collins	Ask Stillberg be removed
Miller	
Shea )	Reconsider vote by which Amendment #1 adopted
)	
Miller )	
Shea	Will file written motion
Miller	Amendment #2 appears in conflict
Palmer	Hold it a moment
Miller	
Hanahan	
Miller	
Palmer )	Take it out of the Record
)	
Miller )	Amendment #2 withdrawn
Shea )	Question
)	
Miller )	
Shea	Move to reconsider vote
Miller	
Walsh )	108 is the count
)	
Miller )	
Walsh )	Question
)	
Miller )	Would take simple majority
Walsh	



Miller	
Tuerk	Explains vote, 'no'
Miller	
Hanahan	Explains vote
Miller	
Schoeberlein	
Miller	
Tuerk	Point of personal privilege
Miller	
Maragos	Explain vote, question
Miller )	
)	
Tuerk )	Answers
Miller	
Dunn, R. L.	Explains vote
Miller	
Shea )	
)	
Tuerk )	Question
Miller	
Giorgi )	
)	
Miller )	Ask leave to pull it out of the Record
Shea )	
)	
Miller )	Question
Jacobs	
Miller	
Schoeberlein	
Miller	Motion to reconsider . . . take out



	of the Record
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 723, Third Reading
Miller	
Murphy	
Speaker Blair	House Bill 723
Hunsicker	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	House Bill 723 passed
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 620, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	
Philip	
Speaker Blair	House Bill 620 passed
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 669, Third Reading
	House Bill 669
Speaker Blair	
Keller	
Speaker Blair	House Bill 669 passed
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 518, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	
Skinner	
Speaker Blair	House Bill 518 passed
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 709, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	
Washington	
Speaker Blair	
Juckett )	Parliamentary inquiry
)	
Speaker Blair )	



Juckett )	Question
)	
Washington )	
Speaker Blair	
Huskey )	Question
)	
Speaker Blair )	All right
)	
Washington )	
Speaker Blair	
Kempiners )	Yield?
)	
Washington )	
Speaker Blair	
Leinenweber )	Yield?
)	
Washington )	Any day
Speaker Blair	
Rayson )	Point of order
)	
Speaker Blair )	
Rayson	Yield to Leinenweber
Speaker Blair	
Leinenweber )	Continues
)	
Washington )	
Speaker Blair	
Stone	Move previous question
Speaker Blair )	'Ayes' have it
)	
Washington )	To close
Speaker Blair )	
)	
Washington )	To close
Speaker Blair	House Bills
Barnes	



Speaker Blair	
Rayson	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	
Holloway	Support 709
Speaker Blair	
Davis	Support
Speaker Blair	
Porter	Votes 'no'
Speaker Blair	
Thompson	
Speaker Blair	House Bills --
Washington	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	
Catania	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	
Deuster	
Speaker Blair	
Davis	Point of personal privilege
Speaker Blair	
Barnes	Point of personal privilege
Speaker Blair	
Kennedy	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	
Borchers	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	
Mann	Explains vote



Speaker Blair	
Bluthardt	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	
Hanahan	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	
Hirschfeld	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	House Bill 709
Washington	Request poll of absentees
Speaker Blair	
Fredric Selcke	Polls absentees
Speaker Blair	
Schlickman	Explains vote, 'present'
Speaker Blair	
Fredric Selcke	Continues
Speaker Blair	
Washington	Leave to put on Postponed Consideration
Speaker Blair	Leave go
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 725, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	
Walsh	
Speaker Blair	House Bill 725 passed
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 751, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	
Holloway, R.	
Speaker Blair	
Douglas	



Speaker Blair	
Friedland	Move previous question
Speaker Blair	'Ayes' have it
Holloway	I'm closed
Speaker Blair	House Bill 751 passed
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 754, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	
Houlihan, D. L.	
Speaker Blair	House Bill 754 passed
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 775, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	
Mahar	
Speaker Blair	
Skinner )	Question
)	
Mahar )	
Speaker Blair	
Hill )	Question
)	
Mahar )	
Speaker Blair	
Shea )	Question
)	
Mahar )	
Speaker Blair	
Wolf )	Question
)	
Mahar )	
Speaker Blair	
Matijevich )	Question



Mahar )	
Matijevich	Urge 'no' vote
Speaker Blair	
Borchers	
Speaker Blair	
Juckett	Urge support
Speaker Blair	
Mahar	To close
Speaker Blair	House Bill 775
Walsh	
Speaker Blair	House Bills --
Mahar	Postponed Consideration
Speaker Blair	All right
Walsh	Plans for tonight
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 802, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	
Choate	
Speaker Blair	
Walsh, R. )	Question
)	
Choate )	
Speaker Blair	House Bill 802 passed
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 820, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	Taken out of the Record
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 823, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	
Yourrell	House Bill 823





Speaker Blair	
Palmer	Yield?
Speaker Blair	
Palmer )	Question
)	
Yourell )	
Speaker Blair	
Miller	Question
Yourell	
Speaker Blair	
Murphy	Yield?
Speaker Blair	
Murphy	Question
Yourell	
Speaker Blair	
Yourell	Ask for a favorable response
Speaker Blair	Vote
Totten	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	
Duff	
Fredric Selcke	Voting 'no'
Duff	Thank you
Speaker Blair	
Deuster	How am I recorded?
Speaker Blair	
Fredric Selcke	'No'
Speaker Blair	



Fredric Selcke	
Speaker Blair	
Jones	
Fredric Selcke	Yes
Jones	Change to 'nay'
Speaker Blair	Take new Roll Call. House Bill 823 passed
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 831, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	
Juckett	House Bill 831
Speaker Blair	
Borchers	Good Bill
Speaker Blair	
Catania	Yield?
Speaker Blair	
Catania )	Question
)	
Juckett )	Anended in Committee
Speaker Blair	
Walters	Yield?
Speaker Blair	
Walters )	Second page of Digest
)	
Juckett )	Currently in statutes
Speaker Blair	
Duff	Yield?
Speaker Blair	
Duff )	Question
)	
Juckett )	



Speaker Blair	Proceed, Sir
Duff	
Speaker Blair	
Juckett	To close
Telcser (In Chair)	
Dyer	Explains vote
Telcser	
Catania	Explains vote
Telcser	
Douglas	Explains vote
Telcser	
Geo-Karis	Explains vote
Telcser	
Chapman	Explains vote
Telcser	
Duff	Explains vote
Telcser	
Giorgi	Asks a question
Telcser	
Giorgi )	
)	
Juckett )	Not submitted to Mental Health
Telcser	
Katz	Question
Juckett	At the Committee . . .
Telcser	Vote--House Bill 831 passed
Barnes	Wilbur Wood won game



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Fredric Selcke	House Bill 847, Third Reading
Telcser	
North	House Bill 847
Telcser	Vote--House Bill 847 passed
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 875, Third Reading
Telcser	
Merlo	House Bill 875
Telcser	Vote--House Bill 875 passed
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 913, Third Reading
Telcser	
Polk	House Bill 913
Telcser	Vote--House Bill 913 passed
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 963, Third Reading
Telcser	
Matijevich	House Bill 963
Telcser	Vote--House Bill 963 passed
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 969, Third Reading
Telcser	
Juckett	House Bill 969
Telcser	
Brinkmeier	Yield?
Telcser	
Brinkmeier	Cost?
Juckett	
Brinkmeier	Thank you
Telcser	



Hoffman, G.	Oppose
Telcser	
Schneider	Yield?
Telcser	
Schneider )	
)	
Juckett )	
Telcser	
McClain	Yield?
Telcser	
McClain )	Question
)	
Juckett )	
Telcser	
?	Comments on Bill
Telcser	
Miller, T.	Moves previous question
Telcser	
Juckett	To close
Telcser	Vote--House Bill 969 passed
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 999, Third Reading
Telcser	
Skinner	House Bill 999
Telcser	House Bill 999 passed
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1040, Third Reading
Telcser	
Schneider	House Bill 1040
Telcser	



Shea )	Don't follow
)	
Schneider )	
Telcser	
Totten	Yield?
Telcser	
Totten )	Question
)	
Schneider )	
Totten	Should not have a green light
Telcser	
Beatty	Yield?
Telcser	
Beatty	
Schneider )	
)	
Beatty )	Speak to Bill
Telcser	Proceed
Beatty	
Telcser	
Hudson	Moves previous question
Telcser	
Schneider	To close
Telcser	Vote--House Bill 1040 failed
Douglas	Observation
Telcser	Declared lost
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1053, Third Reading
Telcser	
Brinkmeier	House Bill 1053



Telcser	
Hoffman	House Bill 1053, opposed
Telcser	
Cunningham	Support
Telcser	
Schneider	Oppose
Telcser	
Choate	Support
Telcser	
Walsh	Oppose
Telcser	
Wolf, J. J.	What was bet?
Telcser	
Yourell	
Telcser	
Berman	Support
Telcser	
Giglio	Move previous question
Telcser	
Brinkmeier	To close
Telcser	
Choate	Explains vote
Telcser	
Geo-Karis	Present
Telcser	
Ewell	
Teleser	



Boyle	Explains vote
Telcser	
Brinkmeier	
Telcser	
Maragos	Green light
Telcser	Vote
Brinkmeier	Absentees polled
Fredric Selcke	
Telcser	Postponed Consideration
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 545, Third Reading
Telcser	
Mugalian	House Bill 545
Telcser	Vote--House Bill 545 passed
Maragos	Sponsor of House Bill 545 . . .
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 602
Telcser	
Barnes	House Bill 602
Telcser	
Walters	Address myself to the Bill
Telcser	
Kosinski	Yield?
Telcser	
Kosinski )	Question
)	
Barnes )	
Telcser	
Beaupre	Comments on Bill





Telcser	
Griesheimer	Oppose
Telcser	
Lundy	Support
Telcser	
DiPrima	Oppose
Telcser	
? Fleck	Move previous question
Telcser	
Barnes	To close
Telcser	
Caldwell	Explains vote
Telcser	Conclude your remarks
Caldwell	Continues
Telcser	Your two minutes is overdue
Caldwell	Continues
LoDrigan	Rise because this is an important issue
Telcser	
Beaupre	Don't want to belabor point
Telcser	
Duff	
Telcser	
Ewell	Dishonorable discharges
Telcser	
Thompson	
Telcser	



Kosinski	Votes yes
Telcser	
Borchers	
Telcser	
Geo-Karis	Votes yes
Telcser	Votes--House Bill 602 passes
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 645, Third Reading
Telcser	
Lemke	645 and 646 ?
Telcser	Any objections
Lemke	
Telcser	Companion Bills?
Lemke	
Telcser	Yes
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 646
Telcser	
Lemke	House Bill 645 and 646
Telcser	
Tuerk	Yield?
Telcser	
Tuerk	Explain
Lemke	
Tuerk )	Who makes determination?
)	
Lemke )	
)	
Telcser )	Two Roll Calls; House Bill 645 and 646 passed
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 649, Third Reading



Telcser	
Hart	House Bill 649
Telcser	Vote--House Bill 649 passed
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 743, Third Reading
Telcser	
Waddell	House Bill 743, Second Reading
Telcser	House Bill 743 to Second Reading
Fredric Selcke	Amendment #2
Telcser	
Waddell	Amendment #2 moves adoption
Telcser	
Berman	Explain
Telcser	
Waddell	Changes language
Telcser	
Choate	
Waddell	Yes it would be possible
Telcser	Table Amendment #1
Fredric Selcke	Amendment #2
Telcser	
Shea	Amendment #2
Telcser	
Waddell	
Telcser	Amendment #2 adopted
Waddell	To close
Telcser	House Bill 743 passed



Fredric Selcke	House Bill 760, Third Reading
Telcser	
Yourell	House Bill 760 and 761 ?
Telcser	
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 761, Third Reading
Yourell	House Bill 760 and 761
Telcser	
Bluthardt	Chain of newspapers
Yourell	No
Telcser	
Mugalian	Yield?
Telcser	
Mugalian	
? <i>Kent</i>	Yield?
Telcser	
? <i>Kent</i>	
Yourell	
Telcser	
Yourell	To close
Telcser	Vote--Two Roll Calls; House Bill 760 and 761 passed
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 770, Third Reading
Telcser	
Waddell	House Bill 770
Telcser	Vote--House Bill 770 passed
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 819, Third Reading
Telcser	



Berman	House Bill 819
Telcser	House Bill 819 passed
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 830, Third Reading
Telcser	
Juckett	House Bill 830
Telcser	
Hoffman, R.	
Telcser	House Bill 830 passed
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 849, Third Reading
Telcser	
? <i>Fennell</i>	House Bill 849
Telcser	House Bill 849 passed
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 850, Third Reading
Telcser	
Walters	House Bill 850
Telcser	Vote--House Bill 850 passed
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 857, Third Reading
Telcser	
Stone	House Bill 857
Telcser	
? )	Question
)	
Stone )	
Telcser	
Mugalian )	
)	
Stone )	
Telcser	

Special Request



Berman	Question
Telcser	
Totten	Yield?
Telcser	
Stone	Answer
Telcser	
Merlo	
Telcser	
Stone	To close
Telcser	Vote--House Bill 857 passed
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 879, Third Reading
Telcser	
Matijevich	House Bill 879
Telcser	Vote--House Bill 879 passed
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 880, Third Reading
Telcser	
Dunn, Ralph	House Bill 880
Telcser	
Borchers )	
)	
Dunn )	
Telcser	
LaFleur	Hate to disagree . . .
Telcser	
Boyle	Question
Dunn	
Telcser	Vote--House Bill 880 passed



Special Request

Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1077, Third Reading
Telcser	
Hanahan	House Bill 1077
Telcser	
Huskey	
Telcser	
Miller, K	
Telcser )	
)	
Hanahan )	
Telcser	
Palmer )	Question
)	
Hanahan )	
Telcser	
Yourell	
Telcser	
Dyer	
Telcser	
Pappas	
Telcser	
Craig	
Telcser	
Hunsicker	
Telcser	
Hanahan	Postponed Consideration
Telcser	Okay
Calvo	Suspend Rule 35A to hear Senate Bill 457



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Telcser	Motion prevails
Fredric Selcke	Senate Bill 457, Third Reading
Telcser	
Calvo	
Telcser )	Senate Bill 457 passed
)	
Lechowicz )	Leave to have name removed from 1077
Telcser	
Holloway	Senate Bill 1139
Telcser	
Fredric Selcke	Senate Bill 1139, Third Reading
Telcser	
Skinner	Explain vote
Telcser	Senate Bill 1139 passed. Suspend rules to hear Senate Bill 1140 out of sequence
Fredric Selcke	Senate Bill 1140, Third Reading
Telcser	
Holloway	
Telcser	Senate Bill 1140 passed. Senate Bill 1141
Fredric Selcke	Senate Bill 1141
Telcser	
Campbell	Senate Bill 1141
Telcser	Senate Bill 1141 passed
Totten	Announcements
Telcser	
Barnes	Have meeting in morning?
Telcser	





Fredric Selcke	House Resolutions
Telcser	
Tipsword	Leave to withdraw?
Telcser	
Fredric Selcke	Death Resolutions
Telcser	
Walsh, W.	Move to adjourn
Telcser	House is adjourned until 9:30 a.m.

