

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTY-FIFTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

MAY 30, 1973

9:30 O'CLOCK A.M.

THE HONORABLE W. ROBERT BLAIR, SPEAKER

IN THE CHAIR



Speaker Miller: "The House will be at ease for just a short time.

Appropriations is meeting and as soon as they get up here we'll ..ah..start the work for today. All right the House will be in order and the Members will be in their seats. The Appropriations Committee is just adjourning and they'll be up here very, very shortly. The invocation this morning is by Doctor Johnson."

Doctor Johnson: "Lord of all the nations, as we in our own nation pause to remember the sacrifices of men and women who loved their country and were ready to give themselves for their country so remind us that we today here may devote ourselves to those purposes of government which You have ordained for the well being of Your people. Remember oh Gov, in Your mercy all in this Chamber who bear the burden of representing the people of our state. Remember them when they would be bent by the pressures of temptation. Remember them when they would be unduly influenced by the impact of expediency, remember them when they would be moved to withhold what should be said or to disclose that which does not the stated goals of this House and then oh Lord, above all, remember your own tender mercies which extend over all Your work and all Your children. In that mercy we take our refuge at the days end and in that mercy we pray now with confidence. Amen."

Speaker Miller: "All right, Messages from the Senate, we'll...Is the Appropriations Committee up here? We'll wait just a moment for that. All right, Roll Call for attendance. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Will the Journal show, Mr. Speaker, that Representative Granada is absent because of illness."

Speaker Miller: "The Journal will so show. The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate having the Journal indicate that Representative B. B. Wolfe is absent because of hospitalization."

Speaker Miller: "The Journal will so indicate. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk Selcke: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives



the Senate has passed a Bill of the following title, upon passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House. Senate Bill 138, 146, 192, 218, 235, 236, 238, 241, 242. Passed by the Senate, May 29, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed a Bill of the following title on passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House. Senate Bill 243, 303, 321, 326. Passed by the Senate May 29, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed a Bill of the following title on passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House. Senate Bill 124, 131, 1005, 1006, 1049, 1100, 1128, 1169, 1179 1180 and 1185. Passed the Senate May 29, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary."

Speaker Miller: "Committee Reports."

Clerk Selcke: "Mr. Randolph from Revenue to which House Bill 1821 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation the Bill do not pass. Mr. McAvoy from Banks and Savings and Loans to which House Bill 1025 was referred reported the same back pursuant to Rule 23(d). It was ordered tabled. Mr. North, from Cities and Villages, to which House Bill 833, 858, 893, 970, 974 and 1021 were referred, reported the same back in pursuant to Rule 23(d). The Bills were ordered tabled. Mr. Pappas from Motor Vehicles, to which House Bills 836, 838, 854 and 1015 were referred, reported the same back in pursuant to Rule 23(d). The Bills were ordered tabled. Mr. Wall from Registration, Regulation to which House Bills 365, 759, 934 were referred, reported the same back in pursuant to Rule 23(d). The Bills were ordered tabled. Mr. Neff from Transportation to which House Bill 777 and 953 were referred reported the same back in pursuant to Rule 23(d). The Bills were ordered tabled. Now...we got agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Miller: "Introduction and First Reading of House Bills."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1969. Barry et al. Appropriates fifty



thousand dollars to the Illinois Valley Regional Port District.  
 First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1970. Randolph et al.  
 Appropriates fifteen thousand five hundred for the expense  
 of the Commission for the Uniformity of Legislation. First Reading  
 of the Bill. House Bill 1971. Randolph et al. Makes a supplemental  
 appropriation of fifty-five hundred dollars for the Commission for  
 ...First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Miller: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Selcke: "House Resolution 364. Kelly. House Resolution 365, LaFleur  
 et al. House Resolution 366. LaFleur et al. House Resolution 367.  
 Skinner. House Resolution 368, Tuerk. House Reso....Joint Resolution  
 57. Geo-Karis et al. House Joint Resolution 58. Geo-Karis et al."

Speaker Miller: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr.  
 William Walsh, with respect to the Agreed Resolution."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. These  
 are the Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 364 congratulates  
 the Village of Midlothian for hosting the Highland  
 Games. House Resolution 365 congratulates Mr. Frank F. Scobey for  
 his unselfish efforts which have resulted in the better understanding  
 of the history of West Chicago. House Resolution 366 congratulates  
 the City...the Citizens of the City of West Chicago on their 100th  
 Anniversary. House Resolution 367 commends Mr. Thomas M. Tully upon  
 his service as Chief Deputy Assessor of Cook County. House  
 Resolution 368 congratulates Mr. Paul A. Haverkorn who was named  
 Illinois Small Businessman of the Year during the annual Association  
 of Commerce Dinner. House Joint Resolution by Representative  
 Geo-Karis congratulates the Lake County Bar Association...ah...  
 which awarded it's Liberty Bell Award to the Man of the Year,  
 Mr. Larry Leonard. Larry Leonard is the guy being congratulated.  
 House Joint Resolution 58 congratulates the basketball team of  
 the Zion-Benton Township High School and I...Mr. Speaker, I move  
 the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Miller: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman moves the adoption  
 of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed  
 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion prevails."



House Bills, Third Reading."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill..."

Speaker Miller: "We'll start right at the top of the Priority Call."

Clerk Selcke: "Kozubowski's not here..."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Clerk, if the Member is not in his seat yet just...hold...hold the...Take it out of the record."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 687. Timothy Simms. Yeah he's here."

House Bill 687. Tim, do you want this?....Yeah there is....

Yeah...I mean how ridiculous can you be?....House Bill 867.

Ewell. A Bill for an Act to amend Section 22.4 to an Act relating to Aeronautics. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. All this Bill does is increase the fees for various registration functions. There has been no increased fees for various years. It's something like from the three dollars to...ah...five dollars for pilots and instructors and aircraft from three dollars to ten dollars. The... ah...It's the Administration Bill which is requested by the Department. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

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

Hart: "Ah...Representative Ewell. What is the money used for...ah... that the pilots pay to register their liscense? That's the three dollar fee?"

Ewell: "What they give for this is they get various charts, maps, weather reports and a volume of printed matter. In other words if you ever want to fly and you're a pilot, you call in and get all of these ground charts...ah...weather charts and all the weather reports and information and I've been informed by several pilots that it's a very worthwhile thing and they have no objections to it personally."

Hart: "Well I've been informed by several pilots that they do object and as a matter of fact a whole lot of them don't even pay the three dollar fee and if there's a lot of surplus in the fund then I'd like to know, for instance...ah...what...is there a deficit in this program...ah...to determine whether or not there's



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

any need for an increase in the fee because...ah...from the inches of Aeronautics News that I've read, which are published by the Director of the Department of Aeronautics, it looks like to me that it's just a little bit of a...ah...a...ah... sand box for them to play in with this money. Does this money go through the General Revenue Fund or is it money that they have kind of like a petty cash account?"

Ewell: "No, this money goes back to the various local airports.

This is an administration measure recommended by the Department of...of...ah... Aeronautics."

Hart: "Well as you know each Department's always trying to get more money. Ah...what...what controls or guidelines does the General Assembly have over the...over the programs that are developed through the expenditures of these...ah... license or Registration Fees?"

Ewell: "Well basically they're federal controlled. It's not a matter of the...ah...of the state having so much control over aviation because aviation is a, you know, federal function."

Hart: "Well now you've got two...two things in this Bill. One is...ah...on landing fee and the other is on registration of your license. Now in other words, Illinois doesn't even issue us a pilots license. The Federal Government issues a license for pilots and in the state the...has this plan where you have to pay three dollars to register your license. There's no penalty for not registering it and the money that's used from these registration fees in my judgement is just kind of a playground for the Department of Aeronautics and I...I...unless we see some real need for increasing the fees I don't think we ought to come in here and ask in this time when we've got a program of no increases in Revenues...ah... to ask just because some Department wants it, an increase in the registration fees for Federal Licenses and I would like to know whether or not there's any real need for more money in this particular fund."

Ewell: "Well the one thing the Aeronautics Fund shows a decline



in balance which is a trend that they have to stop through the increased fees. I'm giving you the illustrations of the type of things that they do in the Department in terms of printing up the weather maps, the...ah...ground...the...ah... charts that the pilots use and in fact each month those that are registered receive a considerable amount of material because of this and it is supported by these particular fees."

Hart: "Well very briefly Mr. Speaker, I think...I think this Bill has some good and some bad in it. But the bad part of it is that...ah...because the Director of Aeronautics has come in and asked for an increase in the registration fees for pilots from three dollars to five dollars...ah... I see no justification for it. They're asking...ah... increase in registration of aircrafts from three dollars to ten dollars. Ah...if there is any need for it, I think before we ought to...we vote for this it may not be...ah... significant thing to most of you but I believe if you would survey the pilots in your area that you would find that they feel that the charging of these fees in the first place is nothing but a bonanza for the Department of Aeronautics and give them some money to play with when...ah... in fact all they are doing is to...is to make, making busy work for the Department. Because most of the benefits that are derived from the registration fees for pilots' license in airplanes are from the federal government not the state government and this is ... this is the type of middle management type of busy work that we ought to eliminate and not encourage and I would urge that this Bill be defeated."

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

Choate: "Well Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've talked to many pilots that will be effected by this. Now if we're talking about a safety program and we talk about safety every day, this Bill is designed to not only carry out the safety programs as carried...as set forth by the



Department with the cooperation of the national administration but it's set forth to improve it. Now when the first licensing came about it was only a dollar. The preponderance of this money goes for the publications and distributions of maps, aviation direction...ah...dictionary...I wish that somebody would fix this mike, it's been this way now about two or three weeks and our electricians, some of them are aware of it. Aviation Directories, Illinois Aviation Publication and all safety publications that is put out by the Department. Now on...I agree that the Gentleman is right on one hand, that some pilots do not want an increase in fees. They're being selfish because on the other hand they'll say to the Department, 'Send me all of this free literature that's available as far as safety programs is concerned. Send me all of the maps that I can coordinate my flights throughout the state is concerned. Send me the publication that such as the Aviation Directory, so that I will know where other license facilities are.' These are what it's all about. The fee was raised from one to three dollars some years ago and because of the cost of publication, because of the increase in the cost of mailing, because of the increase in the cost of hauling, this is the reason for the recommendation of from three to five dollars and from three to ten dollars. Now if you want on the one hand to say, 'Okay, we'll raise, we'll run a deficit as far as handling these safety materials is concerned and take the deficit out of the General Revenue Fund.' Fine. But if you want the ones affected to pay for the publications that come to them, then we're going to have to increase fees. I don't care, I don't care whether you have the ones affected to pay for it or whether you take it out of the General Revenue Fund. But the program will continue. It's just that simple. I think that we should pass this Bill Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Robert Dunn."





Dunn: "Well I...I...There was a lot of controversy when this Bill was heard in Committee and...ah...we heard a lot of testimony that, that the Department...ah...what the Department was doing with respect to servicing pilots and furnishing information was really of no particular value. But I'd like to speak to...ah...to the principal issue here of the...the Sponsor has indicated that this is an Administration Bill and the leader of the Administration walked the state pledging no new taxes, no new increased cost to the consumer and here we are faced with another substantial over a hundred per cent increase in a fee to one of the principal consumers in this state and I think this is totally incompatible with his commitment to the people of this state for that reason I oppose the Bill."

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

Hirschfeld: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

Very seldom in this Session have I found myself in disagreement with the distinguished minority leader but as a private pilot myself let me say this. I think the Department of Aeronautics would be better off if it just eliminated all the brochures it puts out together because none of them are worth the paper they're written on. Now I'm not going to vote for or against this Bill because I happen to be a pilot and therefore have a conflict of interest. But let me tell you a few things about the Department of Aeronautics. First of all they do not necessarily require that everybody register their license. But they are very deceitful in the way they do handle things. As soon as you finish taking a private pilots test you receive a notice that you are to register your license and unless you're told otherwise, you automatically do register your license even though it's not necessary and the cost at the present time is three dollars. The only thing that I have seen come out of the Department of Aeronautics, as far as brochures are concerned, is a monthly bulletin which is absolutely worthless because about the only thing it contains is a list of the numbers of all those who should reregister their license



that month, which is nothing more than a naked solicitation for another three dollars. In addition to that, the maps that they put out do not comply with federal standards, or a map of the State of Illinois. They are not the typical charts whatsoever that are used by pilots, they do not contain to date information as far as radio networks or where airports are concerned and are totally valueless to the pilot in the air. They put out a few other things such as radio call signals and these are no longer effective because of the fact they're constantly under change by the Federal Government. Now with regard to the distinguished Minority Leaders comments about safety programs, let me say this. The only thing that the Department of Aeronautics does as far as safety is concerned is put out some brochures encouraging you not to drink if you fly, not to take medicine if you fly and a lot of other tom foolery that we're better off without because you learn that in your course anyway. I have to agree with the distinguished Representative Hart, that this is nothing more than an attempt on the Department of Aeronautics to line it's pocket with a few additional dollars and I hope you'll give this Bill a resounding 'no'."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Sangmeister."

Sangmeister: "Mr. Speaker, I respectfully move the previous question."

Speaker Miller: "All right the previous question has been moved."

All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion prevails. All right the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell to close the debate."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd much rather spend all my time and all my tears for the motorists in Illinois who face fantastic fees and I hear a lot of weeping and nagging...from pilots etc..it seems now, but by the same token the State of Illinois and the Federal Government perform the greatest function of what you call subsidize in a welfare you've ever seen when you get around to the pilots. Now I'm suggesting here that this is just a nominal increase, it's an increase to keep



up with the cost of printing this material, it's requested by the Department and as it's been said before, I think it will come out of General Revenue or it will come out of the pockets of the people who get the benefit of the services. Now I can not see this idle mashing of teeth about three dollars or five dollars for pilots who are flying multi-thousand dollar airplanes when we don't show the same concern for motorists who are getting ready to have their taxes doubled. I think it's a good Bill. The Department is entirely right in trying to assess the cost where it belongs and I would urge support of this Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The question is, shall House Bill 867 pass? All those in favor will say...vote...will vote 'aye', and opposed 'nay'.

The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I represent an area that has an awfully lot of commercial airline pilots. Their opinion of the State Agency that regulates aviation is that it is a farce and it's completely unneeded. The Federal Aviation Administration regulates and licensed pilots and there's not...there's not anything I can think of that they can add to that and...ah...there's no reason whatsoever that the...that the...that we should increase a fee to do nothing."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Stedelin, to explain his vote."

Stedelin: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Very seldom I disagree with my personal and wonderful friend, Representative Hart. But I've ad a, I've flew airplanes since 1919 and I think that's longer than any Member of the House and I want to' tell you what the State does, the State gives out these maps that they were talking about that helped me out several times on emergency landings because they show private airfields where the other ones doesn't . I think this is just a good Bill and we ought to spend more for the safety of Aeronautics because we're going more and more to air travel. So we should have enough green lights up there so when people get in the air they can have all that they need for safe landings and safety. This is a good Bill."



Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart, to explain his vote."

Hart: "Ah...Very briefly, I think the issue here has been confused. There is nobody that's any stronger then I am for people paying their own way when they use these kind of things. But the alternative here is that if we don't increase these fees we might just have a lot of useless unnecessary middlemanagement type of busy work and this is nothing but a boondoggle for the Illinois Department of Aeronautics. The Federal Government is the one that does all the things that add any benefit to the pilots and...ah...for ...for to come in and ask for more money to just keep up publishing these unnecessary publications and doing other unnecessary things I think ought to be stopped."

Speaker Miller: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate, to explain his vote."

Choate: "I realize Mr. Speaker, that this Bill appears that it's controversial. I realize that there's more than 89 votes up there but so that the issue is clearly understood, those of those... Those of us who says that the publications are not needed, then should introduce a Bill directing the Department or changing the statutes that the publications will not be issued. But the issue here today is that you want the ones who are using the material to pay for it or do you want the money to come out of the General Revenue and again be a drain on the General Revenue Fund? I say that the Bill is directed to those who need the publications to pay for them. That's the reason I'm voting 'aye'."

Speaker Miller: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 114 'ayes', 26 'nays' and 1 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, we'll hold 9...House Bill 909 and 911. We'll keep those out of the record. All right, House Bill 687."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 687. An Act to establish a statewide Medical Examining System and so forth. Third Reading of the Bill."

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



Simms: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 687 establishes a new concept for Illinois. It establishes a statewide Medical Examiners System, it provides for a five member Medical Examiner Board, appointed by the Governor, which give him power to appoint a Chief Medical Examiner and institutes the system in Illinois. Th Chief Medical Examiner then is to appoint district Medical Examiners in geographic compact areas to the State of Illinois. It also provides that the office of Coroner shall be eliminated as of December 6, 1967. Since it has been estimated that between twenty five to thirty per cent of all deaths require expert medical legal investigation, the desperate need for a change in the system, for medical legal investigative systems is plainly evident. Why is the medical legal investigative system necessary, one might ask? Medical legal investigative system is necessary in interest of reduction of crime, public health, public safety and the protection of the personal interests of the decedent and his family. Relationship of the medical legal investigation system to crime is well known. Public health aspects are somewhat relatively unknown. However, it is not uncommon that sudden unexpected deaths come under the jurisdiction should in the area of infectious diseases significant to public health implications. The area of industrial accidents careful evaluation of circumstances of death and a careful autopsy may suggest procedures which will save the lives of others. I'd respectfully request a favorable vote of the Assembly."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

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

I rise to oppose this Bill. Within the last year the Lake County Board decided that they would look into the Medical Examiner system to see that, to see whether it would be advisable to replace our present Coroner's system. It seems to be a growing governmental fad that new inovations are always the better way to go. Since Illinois really doesn't have any



downstate medical examiner's systems in operation at the present time, they took two of our board members and had them go up to Kenoshia Wisconsin and Rayseen Wisconsin, both of whom have medical examiner systems to compare their operation with our Coroner operation. Our counties are very, very similar, we're similar in size although Lake County has a considerable greater number of deaths each year that require investigation by our Coroner. They found out that the Medical Examiner System in Wisconsin, which is a system very similar to the one that the Sponsor is proposing, cost Rayseen County two hundred and fifty thousand dollars to operate a year and the figure in Kenoshia County is approximately the same thing. Our Coroner system in Lake County handling more deaths and doing so more efficiently cost Lake County Illinois seventy five thousand dollars a year. And from that seventy five thousand dollars there are rebates which are made to our County Treasurer Office for the profit or whatever you call the amount of money that's coming in. I think It's sheerly irresponsibility to set up a financial system here which will cost all of our counties more money and will provide no benefits to the County. If Cook County wishes to continue their Medical Examiner System I say, more power to them but we shouldn't impose a Medical Examiners System on the rest of our state. Let's stay with financial responsibility and vote against this Bill."

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

Tuerk: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Miller: "Proceed Sir."

Tuerk: "Tim, explain to me what a Parenthic Pathologist is? I've heard that term...ah...around the state here in the last few months and I don't know what it is. Could you explain that?"

Simms: "Well a Parenthic Pathologist is an individual that is a licensed physician to practice medicine. He is board certified as a pathologist and also as board certification as a parenthic pathologist. A Parenthic Pathologist has special training of the legal medical aspects of death. Many times Parenthic Pathologists



have maybe a year of...ah...or two years perhaps or even a graduate of law school as well as their Medical Degree."

Tuerk: "How many of them are there in the State?"

Simms: "Ah...I believe that there are five."

Tuerk: "How many?"

Simms: "Five."

Tuerk: "Five? I see. Peoria County Coroner has handled three hundred and fifty cases in the last six months. Now how much would your system of the Medical Examiner, what would be your estimate on what the cost of handling that many cases by a Medical Examiner."

Simms: "Well my only answer would be that we've filed a Fiscal Note which was prepared by the Department...by the Department..."

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

Simms: "We have filed a...We have filed a Fiscal Note prepared by the Bureau of the Budget for five million dollars what, is somewhat less than what the present Coroner system statewide is costing."

Tuerk: "You..."

Simms: "I can't give you a breakdown as per case."

Tuerk: "You said it would be less?"

Simms: "Yes, cause' it costs for the Coroner system in the State of Illinois, fifty cents per capita. The Bureau of the Budget is estimated based on approximately thirty nine to forty cents per capita, for the Medical Examiners System."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Hunsicker."

Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this Bill. Our present Coroner system is working over these many years and the elected Coroners, I think have done an efficient job. I know that my Doctor friends are not going to be happy with what I have to say regarding this Legislation. We in our area have had both an M.D. and a non M.D. as Coroner and both have done a good job. Both were elected by the people. For many years, for many years a Coroners salary was practically nil, as we all know. A year ago the Legislature raised the Coroners salary to where it is now a rather attractive office. So now they try to upgrade the office. We also graded our court system



as you know a few years ago and today it appears to me we have a bigger problem in our Judicial system than we had under the old system before we had our so called Judicial reform. If this Bill passes, as I understand it, a non-medical individual can no longer serve as Coroner. Provided he doesn't understand in many cases the cause of death and so forth, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would remind you of this. He has the...the Coroner has the authority to investigate the same as an M.D. would and he may make a mistake once in a while and I would remind you by the same token that when an M.D. makes a mistake the Coroner covers it up and I'm going to vote 'no'."

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

Murphy: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know for that ethnics Bill yesterday and...ah...I'm getting very concerned in things about ethics and conflict of interest and things like that and I...I'd just like to ask the Sponsor if he doesn't think there's a little conflict of interest in this...ah...Bill."

Simms: "No."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Murphy."

Murphy: "I want to ask him if he doesn't think maybe that he's...ah...yielding a little necrophilism maybe or maybe a little necrolatry."

Simms: "No."

Murphy: "What are then Tim, do you know? Now I want to explain what they are. Necrophilism is a non-natural attachment to dead bodies and necrolatry is an excessive veneration for and worship of the dead and I...he seems as if he's concentrated himself on this Bill and I...ah...I think that he's got a conflict of interest. I really do."

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

Choate: "Well I'd like to just ask the Gentleman that spoke a question. Representative Murphy."

Speaker Miller: "Proceed Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Do you Representative Murphy, feel like you've got a conflict because you're sitting next to the guy you accused of having a conflict?"





Murphy: "If he wasn't furnishing my teeth and my shoes I think I'd have a conflict, yeah."

Choate: "That's the exact reason I was hoping that you would admit you had one because I know he does it."

Murphy: "But...But in seriousness, I do oppose this Bill and I think the fiscal statement that was furnished Representative Simms is completely false. Ah...Representative Griesheimer spoke about receiving Kenoshia County which add up to about a half a million dollars a year which is equivalent to the size for instance of Lake County and I believe that his Fiscal Note is about half way there. I think it will cost the State of Illinois double what the Fiscal Note says and it's like every other thing we've heard that's going to save the taxpayers money, it's going to cost the taxpayers money. No if we want to take the Coroner's Office away and put the investigative duties in the Sheriffs Office and say that he has to have a Medical Examiner for an autopsy and everything I would say fine, that's all right, maybe once we could save money but this Bill is not going to save money, this Bill creating the Medical Examiners Regional Bases is going to cost us a lot of money and is not going to do any better job than we're having done now. Consequently I think this is a bad Bill and should be defeated."

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

Miller: "Thank You ..."

Speaker Miller: "Let's keep the noise level down if we can. Please."

Miller: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As a Member of the Judiciary II Committee that heard this Bill in Committee, I'd like to narrate to you a few of the...ah... testimonies presented before the Committee. Jim Shaw, of the Illinois Coroner's Association came before our Committee and he tried to tell us that the Coroner's Act as we presently have it protects the people. He said that open hearings by Jurors for selected by the Coroner are best equipped to arrive at a legal cause of death. I submit to you that a Coroner who is not professionally trained in the cause of determining



deaths is not best equipped. We need professionalism in the Coroner's job. If we need Lawyers on our bench, don't we also need Professional People, responsible for determining the causes of death? We had one example where the Coroner came before us and told us a story about a dead body laying in a morgue and as the undertaker was preparing this body for burial they heard a little rattling on the marble table and that little rattling on the marble table happened to be an ice pick stuck in the back of the dead body. Why didn't the Coroner's Office in that case determine the actual cause of death. I'll tell you why, because he was not a professional. I respect many people here for supporting the present Coroner's system, but let's face it. People are protecting it today because of the partisan politics that associate with it. Can anyone here tell me why we need Republicans or Democrats acting as our Coroners. There is not justifiable reason to elect a Professional person to determine the cause of death and I urgently ask your support of House Bill 687."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

It occurred to me that when Cook County wanted to abolish the Coroner's system they did so by referendum. It occurs to me further than rather than go through extensive state...matters and into the Coroner's situation why not let every county do so if it finds it needs to remove the Coroner by referendum. First of all I do not think the present Coroners system is bad. Our County has had a very good Coroner's system and our costs have been much less with a comparable county to it or Rayseen or Kenoshia in Wisconsin, where the costs have been about ten times more because of the system that Mr. Simms is trying to have us adopt here. Another thing, the Coroner spot is quite investigatory, when they say that the...ah...let the Sheriff do it, let's not forget the Coroner has authority to arrest the Sheriff and investigate the Sheriff under the present statutes and I vote ah...I speak against the Bill and I say let the Counties do it by referendum like Cook County did instead of by State Bill."



Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, thank you Mr. Speaker. Ah...I would like to speak in opposition to this Bill. I think that we're taking away local government powers. We now have Coroners elected in our downstate counties. Yesterday we passed a Bill saying that if we wanted to, by referendum, we could turn the duties of the Coroner over to some other office. The office of Coroner has been since the beginning of government in the United States and in Illinois we've had Coroners. I think that now we've got the Constitution freed so that we can, if necessary or if the local governments want to, change that office such as Cook County changed theirs and I think this is a good move and I just hate to see the small counties in our district be saddled with the...doing away with the Office of Coroner and having to have Medical Examiner. It would probably be a hundred miles away. But the office of Coroner varies in expense throughout the state in Cook County I think the Coroner's Office cost about thirty cents per capita, some of our downstate counties where the Coroners Office does cost more money than fifty cents. In our County it costs as much as eighty or ninety cents from one time to another but the County adjoining where they have a Medical Doctor doesn't take near that much and I'd like to oppose this Bill and ask for your 'no' vote."

Speaker Miller: "All right, the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support Rule...House Bill 687. I would say that of all of the elected offices that this is the most arcaic, the most useless of any and unless we do update ourselves and put into practice professional medical examiners, I think that the system is indeed a hundred years behind the times. I think this is a good Bill, I think we need professionalism, not only in Cook County but across the State of Illinois where populations are more mobile and more and more we're going to have the same



problems that we have in Cook County. I think this is a good Bill and I would urge your strong support of this Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. David Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question."

Speaker Miller: "Proceed, sir."

Jones: "In this procedure, if you have a Medical Examiner, will he be the one that will go out at 2:00 in the morning if there's a crash out on I-55 and the people are pinned in the car and determine what's going on...ah..."

Simms: "Well in most of those cases, Representative Jones, people are brought to the hospitals and they're pronounced D.O.A. In fact this is what is even recommended for the present Coroners system by the Illinois Department of Public Health, the people be taken and pronounced. In the case ...to a hospital. In the case of a homicide...ah...the Medical Examiner would go to the scene. Yes."

Jones: "Well this is what the Coroner does in Sangamon County now. If he needs the service of a pathologist, he uses it in whatever facilities you need. You know he has a...the Coroner here has a slogan that says that everybody is somebody's loved one and there isn't a personal factor involved in these matters of crisis that whenever there's a problem with the...in regard to the family of the deceased it may be that he moves in and takes care of those problems that is a real service to our community and I want to say that in a talk show with the...some local Doctors they agreed that in Sangamon County the Coroner was doing a good job and doing it properly and I don't see why the counties can't resolve this and have the kind of Coroner that they think they need and not have imposed on them by this...this Legislation. I vote 'no'."

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

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

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



Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms, to close the debate."

Simms: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker, I think we've had a good discussion and debate on this this morning, I think all the facts have been brought out. I would like in closing say that the people in Cook County went to the polls at referendum last November and voted on a four to one margin to abolish the office of Coroner. Both the incumbent Coroner and the candidate for Coroner campaigned on the abolishing of it. I think for the first time we have an opportunity to change to a system that is based on education, based on experience and I would urge a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Miller: "Ah...For what purpose does the Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Rigney arise?"

Rigney: "Mr. Speaker, I was wondering...ah...Inasmuch as counties can do this act themselves by a referendum, is this looked upon as being a denial of Home Rule Power?"

Speaker Miller: "All right, the Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate." Let's keep the noise level down."

Choate: "I was only going to suggest that the previous question had been moved and the Gentleman had closed debate Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Miller: "You've raised a Point of Order sir."

Choate: "Yes I did."

Speaker Miller: "Well Mr. Rigney raised a Point of Order."

Choate: "What was his point?"

Speaker Miller: "It would appear to the Chair that...if I understood your question Mr. Rigney...Your Point of Order Mr. Rigney, that this does not effect the Home Rule unit. All right, now the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Murphy."

Murphy: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, as Speaker I think respectful dissent from your ruling and I read from the Constitution...ah...Other...Offices other than Chair of County Clerk, Treasurer, Coroner Recorder, Assessor and Alderman may be eliminated and the terms of office and manner of selection changed by County Ordinance. That's number 1. The General Assembly, then under Section six. The General Assembly by law approved by a vote of three fifths of the Members elected to each House may deny or limit the power



to tax or any other power or function of a Home Rule unit, not exercised in reform by the state. Now, under these two rulings there is no way it can take 89 votes, there is just no way."

Speaker Miller: "Is there other discussion on the point? The Gentleman from St. Claire, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "I...I don't have any discussion Mr. Speaker, but I have a Parliamentary question."

Speaker Miller: "Well let's get this one resolved first."

Flinn: "It has to do with this one Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Miller: "Well then proceed."

Flinn: "I would like to ask if your ruling stands, then suppose my county, St. Claire County at a later date decided to become a Home Rule County. Do we revert back to the Coroner's system or what happens to us?"

Speaker Miller: "Well Mr. Flinn, I don't think that's a question that the Chair need to answer today, that is a good question and I think...ah...we'll we'll have to...ah...reserve any ruling on that because I don't think it's involved today. Now the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Well Mr. Speaker, on the same question I would hope you would reconsider your decision, your ruling, that if you don't I think that I'm going to have to make a motion here. It seems to me very clear that you're, this Bill would do away with the County Office, Constitutional County Office, that of Coroner, to do so you are going to take away a power of the County of Cook, which is a Home Rule County and if that doesn't take 179...ah...107 votes, well I'll eat my hat, I think you're wrong on your ruling, I think you ought to reconsider it and I want the minutes to show that if the ruling prevails that I am going to file an exception to that ruling."

Speaker Miller: "Now the Chair is going to make a statement. Some of you are not going to agree with me but I'm going to be a lawyer up here for a moment and I'm going to change my ruling that in the Chairs opinion, the abolishment of a County Officer that



this...ah...Bill proports to do with the aviolation of the Home Rule provisions that I read into Section IV and Section VI of the new Constitution. So therefore the Chairs going to rule it takes 107 votes. All right, are there other points? All right the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms is recognized."

Simms: "Well Mr. Speaker, I dissent in that ruling because Section... under Section IV C, it specifically says offices other than Sheriff, County Clerk and Treasurer may be eliminated for the offices in a matter of collection changed by law. That specifically refers to the General Assembly and I dissent in your ruling."

Speaker Miller: "All right, that's your privilege sir. Now is there any other discussion on this point? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Mr. Speaker, Parliamentary Inquiry please."

Speaker Miller: "State your point."

Macdonald: "Ah...Once the Speaker, requests a Parliamentary decision from the Parliamentarian...ah...is he bound or is he not bound by that decision? Once he asks the Parliamentarian?"

Speaker Miller: "First let me say this. The Parliamentarian is an advisor and advisor only. It's up to the Chair to make a decision. The Chair has now made the final decision."

Macdonald: "Thank you Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Miller: "All right, the question is...For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan arise?"

Houlihan: "A Parliamentary Inquiry."

Speaker Miller: "State your point."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, was that ruling because this related to Cook County?"

Speaker Miller: "No sir, there are other counties that may become Home Rule counties."

Houlihan: "But there are no other counties that are Home Rule Counties at this time."

Speaker Miller: "At the moment that is correct to the best of the Chairs knowledge."

Houlihan: "And so this is a ruling to potential Home Rule Counties?"



Speaker Miller: "All Home Rule Counties are potential Home Rule Counties in as much as they have a right to have a local referendum. All right, the question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye' and opposed 'nay'.  
The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm voting in favor of the hard working thirteen Coroners in my district. Despite the amount of mean mouthing that they have received in the news media, I am preplated that Coroner's statewide and certainly in the 54th District are doing a very fine workable job performing a necessary government expense and government service at a minimal expense to the taxpayer. None seriously argue that the new system would effect any reduction in cost. Experience indicates quite the contrary that the cost would skyrocket. We witness in those that vote green in this, in this particular issue the same confusion that's always observed with merit selection between a Coroner candidate from the medical profession and one from nonmedical profession. The public invariably votes for the medical profession on the notion that somehow there could be a ressurection process. That is wishful thinking because in every instance the patient being worked on is deceased, so we should recognize in this situation as fair that the old system works out quite well. We should not have that fatal attraction to the proposition that change for the sake of change is invariably good. Let's stay with the system we have and give the Coroner's a pat on the back for the workmenlike job that they've done."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Day."

Day: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think there has been altogether too much partnehips and not enough pathology in connection with the debate on this Bill. It seems to me that the humane thing to do would be to call in the Coroner and pronounce it a terminal case and give it a decent burial. I vote 'no'."





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

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm issuing an appeal now, particularly to all the Members on both sides of the aisle from Cook County to turn their green lights on. If you'll recall the last campaign for Coroner in Cook County, both Andrew Tallman and Don Mulack spent their entire campaign, long hard campaign in dicating that if elected they would abolish the Office. They very clearly annunciated the reasons for abolishing the arcaic Coroners system. I'll bet you if you went out to the Members...people in your district none of them could tell you what the Coroner does, much less what his name is. Timm Simms has an excellent Bill here and it's time to put on your green lights and vote 'aye'."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker...ah...I knew that this was coming up and so I decided to stick it on my questionnaire and found out that of those replying about eight to one are in favor of abolishing are in favor of having the Legislature abolish Coroners. Now I don't know why these people in my district answers the question the way they did because we have good Coroners, as Coroners go. It must be that they think it's time to end the system and for that reason I'm voting 'yes'."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I want to explain my 'no' vote and I want to be sure that I'm not confused with the Dunn from Cook County. But I do agree with Representative Robert Dunn that the way Cook County did it is the proper way to do it. They can vote by local referendum in the county as to whether they want a Coroner or whether they want a Medical Examiner and I think that Cook County is to be commended upon doing it the way they want to. I think that our Counties, I have seven in my district and I think at least six of those Counties would rather retain the Coroner. If they don't want to they can have a referendum, they can have a Medical Examiner and for that reason I vote 'no' and I urge everyone else to vote



red lights."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell to explain his vote."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, we do have good Coroners in my District. They do do a good job, but even beyond that the thing that disturbs me is that when you come in with a Bill like this and you find that the State of Illinois only has three parenthic pathologists then you've got something other than a Bill with meaning and I think up until that time that they do have more qualified people even on the M.D. side and they sure shouldn't come in on a case like this and expect to upset the system."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Fennessey to explain his vote."

Fennessey: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'd like to explain my 'no' vote. The reason I'm voting 'no' is that about two years ago our Coroner resigned and the County Board, before appointing the permanent Coroner made a thorough study of the Medical Examiners system. They found that it would cost probably three, at least three times as much as the present Coroners system and...ah..this is the reason I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Kriegsman."

Kriegsman: "I say let's not do away with the laymens position in our society. In the Judicial Amendment twelve, fifteen years ago, we did away with the laymen Judges and what did we get? Nothing more than more expenses and more crime. We went from three people in our Circuit Clerks Office to thirty three people. With a professional in the Coroners Office there's no reason why we couldn't possible do the same thing. It's a technical job but at the same time a layman can do it. When a man's dead, he's dead and so, I say, let's keep the layman in business."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."



Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in explaining my vote I'd like to say I'm in favor of electing a statewide school board, I'm electing...I'm in favor of electing a State Superintendent of Schools, but I'll be damned if I can understand the rationale in trying to elect a Democratic or a Republican Coroner. In two often...too often it happens on Doctors operating tables people die and we have elected Coroners who wouldn't know their insides from the outsides of a Doctors Office let alone an operating table or the causes or the reasons of death. I think that it's time that Illinois step into the twentieth century and do away with probably the least needed elected position on the whole ballot of our state so that people can then take the time to judge the qualification of the offices that are important to the people such as the Legislature and the Congress and the various other Executive and Legislative Offices. But to continue the hoax that we need to elect Coroners is pure folly when you consider that we're talking about medical examinations and medical reasoning in the cause and determination of death. It's true in Illinois we don't have enough parenthetipathologists but the...but unless we change the law, unless we step ahead, we're not going to get the type of qualified parenthetipathologists that are needed to determine the causes and the effects of death. So that we could go to bed at night and know somebody didn't die accidentally on an operating table because of somebody's willful or negligence on the part of a doctor. Now I don't know of any Coroner in McHenry County that determined or in the 33rd Legislative District that can determine that kind of trauma and that kind of parenthetideath that happens in operating of this...these hospitals. I suggest that this Bill should pass, that we should step up into the 20th century and do away with the arcaic office as we know it of Coroner."

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

Mann: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think there's one aspect of this Bill that has been overlooked. The Bill mandates that Medical Examiners to publicly express...ah...the cause of death if it will effect the public health of the community. So if there



is an individual who dies for example, from a contagious disease, it would be...ah...the Medical Examiner would be mandated to release that information to the public health officials in the community so that protective steps could be taken to protect the community. Now let's talk for a moment about the Coroner's Jury. It seems to me to have a Coroner's Jury for the purpose of establishing the cause of death is like having a Coroner's Jury to establish the need for repairs of your vehicle. In one instance you automobile, in one instance we're talking about the skills of a mechanic, in another instance we're talking about the skills of a trained medical examiner. Now Ladies and Gentlemen and Members of the House. Some of the great advances in Medical Science have come from the Medical Examiners and from the Pathologists across this country. If we trust the Pathologist to do that, why not have the Pathologist establish the cause of death and just finally let me say this. We all know that in our communities there is a very, very sensitive cases involving the cause of death. I could name a few for you but I think you know what they are. If the community is to have confidence in the expression of the cause of death, it seems to me that we need a professional in there so that he can dispassionately and objectively indicate why and what the causes of death were. I urge you to vote for this Bill."

Speaker Miller: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk."

Speaker Miller: "On this question there are 92 'ayes' and 56 'nays'.

And this Bill having failed...the Gentleman from Winnebago,  
Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to ask for postponed consideration, I am going to file a dissent to your ruling because I think that your ruling was incorrect, you did rule 89 and then...ah...not following the Constitution you made another rule that was arbitrary but I'm not going to ask for post-poned."

Speaker Miller: "That's your privilege Mr. Simms. All right, this Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby



declared lost. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Clerk has just informed me something I think you'd be interested in knowing. As we know, all know, today is Wednesday. Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday four days in order to finish by Saturday night we're going to have to take action upon one hundred and seven Bills per day to do that. We've now spent over an hour on two Bills. I thought that should be something you should think about. Call the next Bill Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Selcke: "950. House Bill 950. Maragos. A Bill for an Act to add Article 36 to and to repeal Article 35 of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Miller: "Take it out of the record. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Laurino arise?"

Laurino: "A Point of Personal Privilege. To further explain the Clerk's reasons for trying to speed up the process..."

Speaker Miller: "Just a moment, may I give you a little attention sir?"

Laurino: "On our Priority Calendar there are approximately four hundred and thirty three Bills and if we allow ten minutes per Bill it breaks down to seventy two hours of straight debate and if we work twelve hours a day through Sunday, we're an hour short. So if we can just exemplify the Clerk's prerogative to push along a little bit faster pace, maybe we can get out of here by Sunday."

Speaker Miller: "The Point is very well taken, proceed Mr. Clerk with the next Bill. 966."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 966. Telcser. Is he here? Out of the record."

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

Clerk Selcke: "Ah...871. 871. Kosinski. A Bill for an Act to amend the Highway Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I presume this is a Transportation Bill. It amends the Highway Code, authorizes employees or agents of the Department of Transportation or any county to enter upon...oh hold it. Take it out of the record."



Speaker Miller: "House Bill 892."

Clerk Selcke: "Really going to town...House Bill 892. Hanahan.

A Bill for an Act to amend Section 58.1 of an Act to revise a law in relation to Counties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. There's a series of Bills and I would ask for leave, I don't know is I need a 107 votes for the Bills that do the same thing for Senate or House Bill 891, 892, 893 and 894 wait I missed one of them, there's one that's dead. 891, 892, 894 and 895. These four Bills are companion Bills dealing with the question of use of a lie detector. I'd ask for leave to hear the Bills in one, one Roll Call or separate Roll Calls on one debate."

Speaker Miller: "Does the Gentleman have leave to consider these four Bills? Together...All right, hearing no objections, read House Bill 891 first."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 891. A Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill. 894. A Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code...Third Reading of the Bill. ..."

Speaker Miller: "Just a moment, what did you say Mr. Hanahan."

Speaker Miller: "We read 891, we read 892..."

Clerk Selcke: "894 I just read Tommy and 895. A Bill for an Act to Amend Section 13 of an Act in relation to State Police, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Miller: "All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McHenry with respect to these four Bills."

Hanahan: "All right Mr. Speaker and Members .... I could pass it around a little. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. These four Bills are a...constitute a change in the requirement of taking a lie detector for a policeman in cities and counties under five hundred thousand and for municipal officers in the count..in the various cities. It provides that a person can not be forced to take a lie detector except under certain circumstances. Those circumstances being that the test



first of all must be conducted under, by order, not by somebody just off hand suggesting that a police officer take a lie detector test. Secondly that the test be administered by somebody other than the accusers same test procedure because we've found in the past too often the same lie detector agency did not want to give out different stories for one accused and accuser...ah... in the case that is brought before them. The Bills are supported by the Fraternal Order of Police, they represent the State Police, the City Police and the County Police and the Municipal Officers such as building inspectors and the rest and zoning officers. But if we're going to have lie detectors used as a case of employment that the lie detectors case only be given when the circumstance warrant it not to act as a method to discharge municipal employer and employees such as policemen because they just refuse to take a lie detector test. It's a good series of Bills and they have corresponding rules in the Chicago Police Department, identical language of what the Chicago Police Officer now must work under in many other organizations, many cities right now have the rules of this type of...of statute by rule to prevent the misuse of lie detectors in cases of employment."

Speaker Miller: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Miller: "Proceed sir."

Lauer: "Ah...Tom, about how many cases of this sort are involved each year?"

Hanahan: "How many cases? How many lie detector cases?"

Lauer: "Yeah...How many individuals would be required to take these tests? Do you have any kind of a history on it?"

Hanahan: "I have no idea because they're numerous because we have many companies in business on this, I mean are you talking about how many State Policemen are required to take a lie detector test?"

Lauer: "Right, State Police or Deputy Sheriffs or Municipal employees..."



Hanahan: "I understand in the State Police there...there are numerous but I didn't have the exact know....knowledge of the exact amount. Just numerous is the word told me."

Lauer: "Would the...ah...Would there be sufficient cases that... that the cost could become a factor?"

Hanahan: "No...No, the cost is not a factor of the Bill. There's no real cost involved. The fact remains is that we don't want an accuser and an accused to take a lie detector test from the same polygraph examiner because if he can't come up with different stories for one or the other, somebody's lying and he can't uncover it, they generally come out with an inconclusive ...ah...test. So this way it's prohibits this type of operation. We would have the accused or the accusers taking different polygraph exam...examinations by different operators."

Lauer: "Thank you."

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

Mahar: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Miller: "Proceed sir."

Mahar: "Tom does this effect the Police and Fire Commission in any way in their hiring practices?"

Hanahan: "No, this specifically does have nothing to do with the practice of giving a lie detector test on the case of employment for hire."

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

Katz: "Is there a requirement that before the policeman or fireman is given a lie detector test that the citizen who complained of corruption or otherwise must be given a test?"

Hanahan: "Right, that's the reasin Bill, that both parties must take a test and it must be by a superior order. In other words it just can't...some...some Corporal just can't say say to a patrolman you know, you got to take a test. It must be a superior officer who commands the use of a test. And both the accused and the accuser must take the test, by different operators."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Katz."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



Katz: "Ah...I'm afraid that the effects of that provision which requires a member of the general public to take a lie detector test is going to be to...ah..drive complaints by members of the general public of corruption by policemen. The member of the general public is very hard to enlist in the aid of doing something about police corruption and if you say that regardless of the circumstances that the police officer cannot be given the test unless the citizen who really has no personal interest in it is only doing his public duty that he also must go through the test. I do have the feeling that the effect of this will be to lessen public complaints regarding corruption in the police. And so I'm afraid that I'm very concerned and would not be able to support the Bill."

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

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

Will the Sponsor yield for one additional question?"

Speaker Miller: "Proceed."

Lundy: "Tom, I'm looking at House Bill 892 but I assume a similar provision is included in all the Bills and it says that a test may not be required unless a finding of probable cause to believe the charges against the official is made. My question is, who has to make that finding of probable cause? Is it the mans superior or is it acourt or a disciplinary board or who?"

Hanahan: "Any superiors, in other words what we don't want to have happen is that some drunk come in and say, 'Well I accuse Trooper so and so or Police Officer so and so of taking a...money and use the Bill or use the law as a harassment.' So some superior officer must find probable cause that the charge made against the officer has some merit and then the issue or the order of taking a lie detector test."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Lundy."

Lundy: "One additional question Tom. There's not requirement in the Bill, as I read it, that this finding of probable cause be reduced to writing or be otherwise formalized so that...ah...again as I read the Bill...ah...this could be an entirely subjective



determination by the officers superior, isn't that correct?"

Hanahan: "I suggest in deference to you as a lawyer that you know probable cause could be used as a suit if it's misused. I...I suggest that a superior officer would then take action on...on an order...issuing an order of having a lie detector test taken. If there is not probable cause then I think the test would fail anyways and there would be no further action on the...on the accused ...ah...charges. So you know, you're looking two steps ahead. First of all, you don't want the lie detector test to be used willy nilly, you want it used in good conscience and somebody has to make a reasonable...ah...judgment on whether or not the charge has probable cause and that's why the wording of the Bill."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, just very briefly to address myself to the Bill. I...I respect the intentions of the Sponsors of the Bill, they're trying to protect police and firemen from unwarranted accusations...ah...sometimes retaliatory perhaps. But it seems to me, the way the Bill is worded with the requirement for probable cause be made by any superior and by not requiring that that finding be reduced to writing or otherwise make a permanent record that the Bills in fact do not provide very much protection for policemen and firemen. Ah...I'd like to ...if the Bill is really intended to...to protect them...ah...it seems to me that those requirements that I mentioned ought to be included in the Bill."

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

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

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

Hanahan: "Yes. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. It surprises me that those who believe firmly that the use of a lie detector first of all is generally inaccurate, will oppose this type of Legislation. First of all this Bill protects unwarranted for charges



that are phoned up to embarrass or harass good, honest, municipal police officers and municipal employees. It in no way wants to tend to cover up or reduce the amount of people that come in to make a charge. It's just that if a charge is made that it must be made within specific recommendations. One of which, is that if a superior officer address the question of whether there is cause, secondly that the charge be...the...the...accused and accuser take exams and that the results of this exam certainly cannot be used in court anyway. I just suggest that before we allow the misuse of lie detectors, we should allow the correct use of lie detectors. These Bills attempt to...ah...subject themselves towards misuse of lie detectors. It has had the support of the various Committees that the Bills went through almost unanimously in most organizations of municipal and...ah...state and county police officers support this concept of law. I suggest they're good Bills and should be adopted."

Speaker Miller: "All right, the question is, shall these four Bills pass? All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. And Mr. Clerk take four Roll Calls. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't think we should pass these...ah...all so quickly. It seems to me that the point that citizens are going to be very reluctant to make any complaint against a police officer if in making that complaint they are required to take a lie detector examination and at the same time reveal their identity to the police officer against whom they're complaining. Ah...that's one certainly bad feature of this Bill. Another is that in these Bills we exempt some one hundred or so, municipalities from the application because they're home rule municipalities. Now, if it's a good idea...ah...for one municipality, it's a good idea for others. There shouldn't be any distinction on that basis. So it seems to me Mr. Speaker, that we're kind



of doing the wrong think here in the interest of organized labor and ought to...ah...ah...consider it a little more thoroughly."

Speaker Miller: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my 'no' vote. Being a official of a village that has over a hundred policemen, one of our worst dicipline problems is within the police department. The police department is a quasi military...organization and these laws are built into the police department to protect them as well as to protect our public. They say the good honest police official and I will agree with that but what about our good honest public. So I..I..actually I oppose this Bill. I think it's a bad Bill, I think that we are doing our public a disservice to keep building immunity into our police department."

Speaker Miller: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. Four records. All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Harold Washington."

Washington: "I wanted to briefly explain my vote also, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Miller: "All right, proceed."

Washington: "I'm voting 'no'. Because I'm concerned about this issue of probable cause. If probable cause is going to be determined by the superior of the officer who is being charged with certain violations, then I'm afraid what is going to happen is that unless the citizen takes the lie test, the superior will not find probable cause. So in effect you're forcing him to take a lie test and for that reason, I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Miller: "On these questions, there are 118 'aye', and 29 'nays'. Mr. Rayson 'aye', or 'no'. Mr. Rayson 'no' on all four Bills. That make is 118 'ayes', 30 'nays' and these four Bills, having received the Constitutional Majority, are hereby declared passed. The gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Mr. Speaker, just one second to introduce a Gentleman that spent many years of distinguished service in this Legislative Body. Martin Sutter, a former Member of the House in the rear gallery."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 994. Who's handling B. B.'s stuff?"



Speaker Miller: "Is handling E. B. Wolf's Bills?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amends the Retailers Act..."

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

Clerk Selcke: "1074. House Bill 1074. Hanahan. A Bill for an Act to amend Section 3 of the Fair Employment Practices Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1074, makes shock some of the Women Libbers, it may shock some of the critics from the newspapers and news media that over the last year I have withstood their criticisms of myself concerning the Equal Rights Amendment. House Bill 1074 amends the Fair Employment Practices Act to provide that it is an unfair employment practice for a private or a public employer to discriminate not only on the basis of race, color, religion but on sex and national origin or ancestry as to wages paid his employee. House Bill 1074 will correct, if passed into law, the right of people, working people, whether male or female to have a hearing on whether or not their wages paid to them are different than somebody else's based on race, color, religion or sex. Now already the Fair Employment Practices Commission is allowed to hear complaints concerning employment. This Bill would amend that Act to provide that especially in the area of discrimination based on sex, that a female is to be paid, or a male is to be paid identical, for identical work. Except that a judgment of the Fair Employment Practice Commission could come up with. Now this would bring into scope, the law, based on all employees of Illinois. Right now under the Federal Equal Pay Opportunity Act it only goes down to fifteen or more employees. Under the Minimum Wage Amendment of House Bill 3 of last Session was passed into law, it discrimination based up to six employees with a gross business of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year would be allowed. This Bill would allow any female or male who feels that he is being agreed because of wages, that he is being paid different than in an identical type of employee doing identical work, that he would be able to lodge a complaint with the



F.E.P.C. and have a hearing commence under law on just what the complaint is. It doesn't do us any good to beat our breasts and say that we're for equal pay for equal work. This is an opportunity for this Legislature to put it into action by passing on House Bill 1074. I think it's a good Bill, it answers a much needed social question of having everyone treated every worker, male or female, treated equally when it comes to being paid for their work. I urge the support of this House."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Sponsor a question?"

Speaker Miller: "Proceed."

Skinner: "Tom, I'm not very familiar with this law and I wonder if you could tell me if the discrimination with regard to ancestry has anything to do with protecting ...ah...people from hiring their relatives?"

Hanahan: "Well, first of all, I am not amending it in, the only word I'm really amending in is sex. You know give the full scope of what the law right now, the Fair Employment Practice Commission may hear a charge that somebody has been discriminated upon employment based on ancestry, race, religion and the rest. I'm adding the word sex, down to all employes as a basis for a complaint to be lodged at the F.E.P.C."

Skinner: "Then it has nothing to do with nepotism."

Hanahan: "No."

Speaker Miller: "Is there further discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1074 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', and opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Take the record Mr. Clerk." On this question there are 148 'ayes', no 'nays' and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce in the Gallery to my right the lovely wife of our colleague, Bob Day, Martha Ann Day."

Speaker Miller: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill arise?"



Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Inadvertently my name was placed on two Bills and anyone that has heard my conversations or talk down here readily realize I would have nothing to do with tow-away Bills and I'd like my name removed from House Bill 1430 and House Bill 1558. Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "Does the Gentleman have leave? The Gentleman name will be removed from those two Bills. Call the next Bill Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1098. Who's is that? Ah...Craig. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Craig...Take the Bill out of the record."

Clerk Selcke: "That wasn't suppose to be on there. 11...House Bill 1121. Fennessey. A ..."

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

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 7...701. Katz."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Katz."

Clerk Selcke: "Do you want that? 701 Mr. Katz? A Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Miller: "Take 701 out of the record."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 763. Hart. A Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is designed to protect the Illinois Coal Industry and preserve the jobs of Illinois Coal Miners. It will delay the enforcement of Air Control Regulations by the Pollution Control Board until the customers who use Illinois Coal can comply with these regulations. These customers are primarily electric power plants and large industrial plants. They prefer to use Illinois Coal but the devices that will remove sulphur from our coal and permit them to comply with E.P.A. rules are still being developed. The purpose of House Bill 763 is to



protect, preserve and retain the Coal Industry of Illinois. Each one million tons of coal produce...produced add ten to fifteen million dollars to the economy of the state. Today coal production in 1973 is about eight per cent less than in 1972 even though there's a demand for electricity doubles about every ten years. Another purpose of the Bill is to retain as reasonable a price as possible for electricity and products produced by industrial plants and other users of coal. Meetings have been held with both Federal and State E.P.A. lawyers to discuss the Bill. The Amendment is designed to change the Bill to meet their principal objections and that was the Amendment that we adopted as Amendment #3, which is now the Bill. The Bill as amended, provides that the Pollution Control Board in Illinois shall designate a successful sulphur removing device. This device can be outside of Illinois and it can use coal other than Illinois Coal. These requirements were added to the Bill in response to E.P.A. criticism and reduced some of their objections. However, it is hoped that the task shall mate in Illinois and that Illinois Coal will be used. The new regulations, the new regulations that we're now under were a major factor in the recent closing of the Crown Mine in Montgomery County where the loss of nearly five hundred jobs and two million tons of coal production, the closing of Framond Mine #5 in Franklin where the loss of two hundred and thirty jobs and a million tons of production and the eminent closing of the Northern Illinois Mine in Will County where the loss of one hundred and sixty jobs and a million tons of production. This Bill is supported by the Illinois Coal Operators Association, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Commonwealth Edison Company, Illinois Power Company, Central Illinois Public Service Company, Central Illinois Light Company, the R.E.A. Finance Electrical Co-operatives of Illinois, The Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, the Illinois Manufacturers Association, the Illinois Municipal League and a number of Municipal Electric Systems. There are some ten thousand





five hundred Illinois Coal Miners, together with their families and the related people working in the industry, we're talking about seventy thousand Illinois jobs with a Gross Annual Product for the State of one billion dollars. The purpose of this Bill is to retain the market for Illinois Coal. I would urge the support of the House for this very important and much needed Legislation."

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

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Legislation, not from the Coal Industry viewpoint as such though, although I do support their position but from the consumer viewpoint. We have in Springfield, one of the finest municipal power, water and light facilities in the nation and with the lowest rates in the nation. This facility was developed by consumer oriented City Commissioner by the name of Willis Spalding who so faithfully served our Community that the voters sent him back for thirty two years. He developed the power plant from a little generator for street lighting into the magnificent plant that we now have and as a by product it was created, conceived by this Commissioner, Lake Springfield, which has not cost the taxpayers a dime, it's being payed for out of proceeds from the Department. Now. This plant uses some six hundred thousand tons of coal a year, which was initially supplied from the mines in this central Illinois area. Now with the energy crisis, it is converting one generator to oil power and by the E.P.A. regulations it's being forced to seek hard coal for the other generators from as far away as a thousand miles in Montana like Chicago is doing and for example, speaking of the fuel shortage, just how many thousand gallons of diesel fuel does it take for those trains to haul the coal a thousand miles from Montana to Springfield. The E.P.A. regulations say the City must install scrubbers and are similar devices in order to burn Illinois Coal.



The estimated cost somewhere in between seven million dollars or maybe twelve million dollars. For equipment which is not contested or used enough to prove it's ability to accomplish the E.P.A. requirements. House Bill 763 simply delays the requirement that the anti-sub equipment being solved until it has been manufactured and performance test for what tested for one year. We solicit your support for the consum...common sense principals contained in 763 for the benefit of the consumer and for the Illinois Coal Industry in this area."

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

Leinenweber: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'd like to speak against this Bill, although I received one heck of a lot of mail in favor of it. Now the Bill in it's present shape is...ah...is much better than it was than it was heard in our Agricultural Committee but there still is a number of things wrong with it including one very, very basic thing. Now, three years ago, when this House passed the Environmental Protection Act, it set up the procedure to protect our environment. Now with a lot of, there have been a lot of complaints but...there have been no showing in my opinion that the Act is not flexible enough to...ah...conduct...under which business can conduct itself. Now there is a procedure in the Act itself which is available to co-users in Illinois and that is the use of the variations. The variation from the rule that this Act seeks to eliminate for a period of time. That rule, which is Rule 204 does not go into effect until May 1 of 1975, which is slightly under two years away. Now, the reason that the rule does not go into effect immediately was a recognition of the fact that elimination of the use of Illinois Coal would prove of great hardship to the State of Illinois. So a period of time was given in which to permit the coal users to come up with procedures and equipment to deal with the removal of sulphur. Now there are in existence available means for removing sulphur but they not as yet been scaled up. There is certainly every reason to believe in a two year period a means will be available. Consequently, if that should prove



to be the case there would be no reason to eliminate the crewel of removal of sulphur...ah...in order to protect the environment. In other words, there's a very good likelihood that there will be adequate means for the removal of sulphur without this Legislature effecting the Environmental Protection Act. Now the Act...the Bill itself is much better than it was in Committee because it now gives a standard and a body to measure the chance of when there will be available of sulphur removal device. However, what the Act does is it removes the pressure from the coal users in the coal industry for scaling out and getting adequate machinery for the removal of the sulphur. Right now there isn't such and they must come up with it within two years. If they can't come up with it within two years, they can and they have plenty of time to do so, they can apply for a variation of the Rule 204 and if they can prove a case, fine, then it eliminates the problems. If they still deny it they have a right to appeal to the Appellate Court. If the Appellate Court agrees that they've done their best and so forth, there will be no problem. My point is we have an Environmental Protection Act that appears to be working reasonably well. There is a procedure under that Act for dealing with this problem. Let's use the Act in the way it was intended or let's repeal the Act. In short the matter is the Act is okay and let's not fool around with it by removing jurisdiction from the Pollution Control Board every time something comes up that...ah...doesn't lend itself to ready solutions. I urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Miller: "All right, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider and please make your remarks as brief as possible."

Schneider: "Thank you, I will Mr. Speaker. Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Ah...Dick knows I am in opposition to the Bill and my reasons are...ah...many and I expressed some of those in Committee, not the least of which is the assumption of the Bill in regard to employment. During the last part of the fifty's and the early part of the sixty's when the unemployment



rate really skyrocketed in Illinois because of technological advances, the coal operators didn't come rushing into the Legislature to correct that and I think also you ought to note that in their pamphlet on the energy crisis in Illinois, they not only talk about the fact that unemployment will be developed as a consequence of...ah...the agencies regulations, but they also say that it's going to be related to safety in the mines and when I pose the question 'Are you going to try to undermine the safety regulations in the mines', they indicated that not in Illinois would they do that but they're certainly going to try energetically on the Federal level and I think we're sacrificing...ah...seriously...ah...the lives of people in not only surrounding areas that are going to be effected by that in terms of safety but we're also talking about the fact that the sulphur rates in the air are going to increase considerably in the populous areas of Chicago, Peoria and East St. Louis. So I think the health question is the high priority one that we ought to direct ourselves to on this Bill. There are other things, I believe, that should be notes as well...ah...among those is that Illinois is the second largest state in terms of loss of crop production as a consequence of air pollution in the State of Illinois and if you're...if you're a farmer downstate who's going to be faced with some of the problems of air pollution as it relates to crops, I think again you ought to be seriously concerned about whether or not you can support this Bill. Only California is ahead of Illinois in crop loss as a consequence of air pollution in the country. Finally I might point out what Representative Leinenweber is emphasizing and that is simply that there are presently operations that are functioning and acceptable according to the sheet that was handed out to us in Committee. We have a number of devices that have been used throughout the world including Japan and Sweden, but also we have American Companies which are producing...ah...scrubbers and devices to clean the coal so that it is clean coal and they should be available very shortly and if we set



back the Environmental Protection Agencies efforts on this cause then we're going to be faced with a more expensive cost passed off to the person who wants to retrofit his operation. It's far more expensive to do it that way then it is to do it by new process. The Bill is probably well intended, however, I think again it's a bad Bill and I would hope that we could vote it down."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Walter."

Walters: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for one quick question?"

Speaker Miller: "Proceed."

Walters: "Representative Hart, I think we've heard about the E.P.A. and the Pollution Control Board and I'm sure they're against your Bill. I have one simple question, do you state in your explanation how many new jobs this will provide for the people of the State of Illinois?"

Hart: "Ah...New jobs, no. I'm talking about if we eliminate the coal industry in Illinois, which this will do eventually, it's already done a lot, we're talking about seventy thousand working people and families with a gross annual product of a billion dollars a year to the state. So that's what...those...those are the people and the jobs and the money and the economy that's in issue and keep retaining the Illinois Coal Market."

Walters: "We're not talking about new jobs, we're talking about retaining the one's we already have in Illinois."

Hart: "Well, I think there would be new jobs because I think you know as well as I do that there are plans for more development of Illinois Coal as the need for that fuel becomes more...more important but those plants have been forced off pending the determination of whether or not they're going to be able to sell it if they do dig and put in coal mines."

Walters: "Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Cox."

Cox: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question?"

Speaker Miller: "All right, the previous question has been moved."

All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it



and the Gentleman's motion prevails. The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart to close the debate. Mr. Hart to close the debate..."

Hart: "Ah...Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. This is a very important Bill to the Coal Industry, to the consumers of Illinois. I've got a paper here before me, I'm not going to read it, I'm just going to tell you what the conclusion is. The conclusion is that there is no way that equipment can be developed to meet the coal standards, the sulphur emission standards, by May 30, 1975. We have also...we have already seen industries, utilities going to alternate sources of fuel, such as the Illinois Power going to...ah...an oil. All this does is to take that oil away from the farmers who need to use it to plant and cultivate their crops and we have the cheapest fuel in Illinois in the most plentiful supply and that's coal. If we avoid the marketing of that coal we're just going to increase the cost of electricity to the consumer by the use of alternate fuels, we're going to decrease the economy of Illinois severely and I would appreciate the support of this House on this Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The question is, shall House Bill 763 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye' and opposed 'nay'. Now the Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate is recognized."

Choate: "Well Mr. Speaker, there's no one interested in this Legislation more than I am. I'm a co-sponsor of the Legislation and there's no one more familiar with the argument that Representative Hart is Sponsoring here this morning and I am and I might say that I happen to agree entirely with him. However, there is an argument between the Environmental Protection Agency and the Coal Industry as far as this important matter is concerned. A Member of that Environmental Protection Agency is standing right here with me at the present time and I'm one who only believes in attempting to resolve a problem between two, such as E.P.A. and such as the Coal Industry and such as the people who are dependent upon this important in our State of Illinois, for their very livelihood. I would suggest that I have just talked to E.P.A., who has been carrying on conversations, as far as this



question is concerned and at this point, not to my knowledge, has arrived at an amiable decision. But I have been assured by E.P.A., that they will, by tomorrow, give me an explicit and an absolutely answer to this question as far as they are concerned so I would suggest that tomorrow would make no difference as far as the life of this important piece of Legislation is concerned. I would suggest that we hold it until tomorrow and let me get an answer from E.P.A., if they agree and they can work out some type of amiable...amiable solution to this all important question, I would be most happy. If they can not agree with those of us who know the plight of the millions of people depending upon this industry, if they can't agree in some workable solution so that we can, adequately solve this problem, then we will do what we must do tomorrow. But as far as today is concerned, it will make no difference as far as the life of this important question is concerned and I would say to you that tomorrow we can explicitly know where we stand with the E.P.A., we can make our decision, whether it's on the behalf of E.P.A. or whether it's in behalf of the people who are dependent upon this industry. I would suggest ther that I'm going to vote 'present' until tomorrow."

Speaker Miller: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Kennedy."

Kennedy: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. At the beginning of the debate, I had intended to support Representative Hart and I heard some of the questions and I read the Bill more thoroughly and I'm going to follwo Choate's idea, but I think this is something you ought to know and I don't know whether Representative Hart knows it or not but there's been ten thousand tons of Illinois Coal, it's on the way to Scotland now to go to a private plant called the Lugge Process and they expect a answer ther within 18 months as to the availability of how they can child the high shelter content of Illinois Coal and I heard the Gentleman from Will say



that the Bill, the E.P.A. order wouldn't take effect for two more years, so I believe, if I were Representative Hart, that I believe I'd hold this Bill because everybody from Illinois has any coal mines or coal miners in his district is interested in employment. But if we get a breakthrough on Illinois Coal over in Scotland on that Luge Process, we could have an unparalleled era of employment in coal mining in Illinois and I'm not quite sure that the economic impact of this Bill if passed now, would hurt the eventual of that experiment in Scotland so I'm going to vote 'no' at this present time."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Well I...I just want to say this Mr. Speaker, I feel like somebody's trying to cut the legs out from under me and I don't appreciate it a bit. We've been...we've been sitting here with the Governor and his staff, if that's what you want to call them for...ah...several times, trying to get an agreement or an answer from him...ah...about this. We finally did have a meeting after we met in the Governor's Office with the Coal Operators and the Utility Companies and the E.P.A, both Federal and State and others and it was the...the meeting that developed Amendment #3, which is now the Bill. I'm not...I've been around here long enough that I can read what's going on here and I will consent...I will consent to postponing the Bill. But I want those who are involved in this process to know that I don't appreciate their tactics."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman moves that this Bill be placed upon postponed consideration. Place the Bill on postponed consideration take the Roll and place it on postponed consideration. The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "I'd...I'd like to have Leave of the House to take it out of the record."

Speaker Miller: "Well, I can't, it's against the Rules..."

Hart: "Well I'm asking for leave of the House..."

Speaker Miller: "Does the Gentleman have unanimous consent to take this Bill out of the record. Are there any objections."





Hart: "Thanks so much."

Speaker Miller: "Hearing no objections, then it will be taken out of the record. Call the next Bill Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 806. Stone. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I'd like leave to take this Bill back to Second Reading for a purposes of three Amendments."

Speaker Miller: "Does the Gentleman have leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading? The Bill is now on Second Reading. Read...ah...Read any Amendments Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Amends House Bill 806 on page 1 by deleting line 1 and 2 and inserting in lieu thereof, the following and so forth."

Speaker Miller; "The Gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. Amendment #1 is a very comprehensive Amendment that in effect takes House Bill 806 and makes it permissive Legislation. In other words it removes the..the...the...ah...ceiling of...ah...it had no ceiling when it went to Committee. I agreed to remove the ceiling, that is now removed so that...ah...the grants are limited to the...ah...actual tuition charge, the cost of instruction or the money that's available or whatever the student needs, whatever is lesser. In other words, it makes the...the Bill permissive and I move the adoption of Amendment #1."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Stone. Amends House Bill 806 on page 1 by deleting line 1..."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone."



Stone: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. Amendment #2 merely puts one student to serve on the...ah...scholarship commission. I move its adoption."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3. Stone. Amends House Bill 806 on page 2, line..."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. Amendment #3 removes the proprietary schools from the...the Bill. Because this is a new thing and because of the fact that there are Federal programs that pretty well cover this area, I think they should be removed from this Bill at this time and I move the adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #3. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment #3 is adopted. Are there further Amendments? The Bill is advanced to the Order of Third Reading. Do you want to call it now Mr. Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, I would...the...the Amendments have been on the desk for...for two days now but I would like for the Bill to be held one more day if I may so that we can discuss the Amendments with anyone who...who's interested."

Speaker Miller: "All right, the Bill is on Third Reading and it will not be called now. The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker...I...I...I was trying to get your attention before you announced that this was moved to Third Reading and I couldn't seem to get your attention I think it's only fair because of my great respect for the Sponsor and what he's trying to do in this Bill...ah...I agree with his intent and so on but I...I would like to ask that a Fiscal Note be gotten for this because this does...it...for the Illinois State Scholarship Commission to implement this fully with all it's repercussions. Ah...there's just no question



that...that in the years to come more money will...will be needed and I would request a Fiscal Note, with all great respect."

Speaker Miller: "Does the Gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone, care to reply?"

Stone: "Yes. I'll be glad to supply a Fiscal Note, Mr. Speaker, however, at the present time...there...I can't see...ah... what a Fiscal Note would do because...the...under the Bill, as amended, the amounts of money that would be spent would be exactly what we appropriate and whether it's implemented or not would...would not cost one cent more. I will however, be glad to try to supply a Fiscal Note. However, the...the ...that's what the note will say."

Speaker Miller: "All right, call the next Bill....Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill ...."

Speaker Miller: "Just a moment. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers arise?"

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker a matter of Personal Privilege...I'm going to ask permission of the House to do something because tomorrow afternoon I have to report in for an operation to the hospital and I've only got one Bill left on Third Reading and I'd like to have the appropriate rule applied to allow me to take in..take ...offer...have heard at this time so I can...if passed I can make arrangements in the Senate to...for someone to handle it, for House Bill 1618."

Speaker Miller: "Well this will require....The Gentleman moves that..."

Borchers: "I think I have to have 107 votes."

Speaker Miller: "Rule 18 be suspended for the purpose of hearing House Bill 1618 out of order. It will take 107 votes. All those in favor will vote 'aye', and opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 132 'ayes' and no 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Read House Bill 1618 now just a moment, the Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate is recognized."



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

I would like for the House to recognize a former Member of the House, a distinguished former Member of the Leadership in the Senate, extinguished I mean. Now the outstanding Treasurer of the Fiftieth State, our own State Treasurer, Alan Dixon. And I'm...I'm sure he's not here just because he's got a budget to be approved."

Speaker Miller: "Read House Bill 1618."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1618. Borchers. A Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, this actually, I think is a simple Bill, let me explain. Ah...it is to increase from thirty five to seventy dollars a Foster Care Home for Children. Now unfortunately we have something I didn't know about that we must correct, this Legislature must correct, but I didn't know about it, I don't think most of you know about it that we...ah... but we'll have to do it at another time. Anyway...ah...in fifty two counties, fifty five counties, in Illinois the Judges ...ah...have...take the state money and assign it for the... foster home care to care of children. Presently it's thirty-five dollars a month. Now I checked back and the best that I can find out this thirty five dollars a month is by the same amount since before 1959. Now...ah...Se...I have asked as a request of the Judges in this...in my area and the...more or less the same part of the State of Illinois, I have asked that it be increased to seventy-five dollars or seventy dollars a month, double it, subject to approval of course or a possible understanding with the Appropriations Committee. Now the total budget this last year, for these Judges was only six hundred and twenty two thousand two hundred and seventy one dollars. If the Appropriations Committee granted it, they would double it to a total, now that's the whole state of one million, forty-four thousand and something. Now what I want to report to you, what we should...ah...we should do



something about, I discovered that I want to help get more money for the children, because thirty five dollars is not enough but I also discovered that I consider these fifty five counties that and that the judges are wrong in the handling of it. I personally think the Bill should be put in that there's a Department of Family Services...ah...Family Services Children should handle the whole state, but this will have to be done at another time. Which would either be one or all, either the Judges in the state should take care of this, which I don't think they should do, personally, or the Department of Family Services should handle it, which in my opinion is the logical way to do it, now I've found this. But in the meantime, there's only thirty five dollars a month goes to these Judges for dep...forked over for dependent children. It hasn't been changed since 59' and I honestly believe that this is not sensible...ah... under the present cost of living and I ask that the...that...ah... you pass this Bill and this ...that...we will do something later on about making it uniform throughout the State of Illinois."

Speaker Miller: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Let me first point out that unless there has been an Amendment adopted to the Bill or unless there has been another Bill introduced that I'm not aware of there is no money, there is no money earmarked or indicated to support this increase as far as the State is concerned. Now let me tell you and I wish you would give me your attention briefly and exactly what this Bill does. It increases the State's contribution from one half to three quarters of the difference between what the county pays, less one half of what is received in contributions from families and relatives. The thrust of this Bill is to double the monthly maximum amount in which the Department of Children and Family Services can pay to a county for it's support of it's minor wards. It also increases the State maximum contribution per centage to seventy five per cent of the difference of what the county pays. The Department of Children



and Family Services objected to this Bill because there is no budgetary increase to them for this additional expenditure. The Department of Children and Family Services indicated that in Fiscal Year 1971 it's spendings in this area were six hundred and ninety two thousand thirty three dollars and in fiscal 72', six hundred and twenty two thousand two hundred and seventy dollars. The Department of Children and Family Services indicated that since 19 and 64 the trend has been to decrease, to decrease the courts responsibility in supporting minors in a county because this is not a judicial function but is essentially an administrative function. In 19 and 64, eighty four counties claimed reimbursement for four thousand eight hundred and eight children. In December of 72' fifty four counties claimed one thousand six hundred and one children. Of these fifty four counties, only fifteen had thirty or more children. The highest number of children claimed by one county was one hundred and fifty seven and twenty of the fifty four counties had ten or fewer children. What the Department of Children and Family Services is saying is that this is primarily a county's responsibility to care for its own wards to the extent that you can't drain all of the taxpayers for the State of Illinois to the tune of seventy five per cent of support for these unfortunate children. The Department of Children and Family Services has long been recognized, not only in the State of Illinois but in all fifty states as probably giving the most humane and the most careful of care to children of this nature and seeing that they are cared for of any agency in any state government. We must subscribe to the Departments objections here, therefore, and say that the prime responsibility does rest with the county government, it does rest with the people affected in those counties, it does rest with the relatives of these unfortunate, more so than it rests with all of the taxpayers of this state. The only thing we're attempting to do with this Bill is to say yes, taxpayers throughout the State of Illinois, we're going to saddle you with the financial



problems of all of the counties to the extent that you help in every county sustain its own problem."

Speaker Miller: "All right, is there further discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 16...Do you want to close Mr. Borchers? Fine. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House and Representative Choate. Now Representative Choate couldn't have put it better than anyone..he just couldn't of put it better, exactly my position on this too. I concur a hundred per cent with what he said but unfortunately one little fact remains. The Department of Family Services is using this at the moment as to help increase pressure to reduce the number of counties and take away from the Judges, this power. Now I do concur completely with this. But it still doesn't solve the problem that there's a certain amount of help that is deserving to the children, a certain amount of help that the state is obligated morally to do and there's been no increase since 1959 that I can find. It's been the same. Now I think the Judges are wrong, I agree with everything he said but that this should not concern us. The part is...is thirty five dollars enough for children in these fifty five counties. It is not. Now we got...we got to separate this, these two facts from each other. We should give them the more money as far as the iden...the appropriation is concerned I deliberately didn't do it for the simple reason that I wanted the...the...the...ah...well took it to the Senate to put it on appropriation or have the Appropriation Committee to make some sort of a decision of what they could or they could not do. But it is not just to leave thirty five dollars a month since 1959 without further aid and it is the responsibility of the people of the State of Illinois and it's then our responsibility to take away from the Judges and turn completely over the control of the entire state to where it rightfully belongs as Representative Choate says, to the...ah... the Department of Children and Family Services. He's absolutely right but from 1959 to date not one cent additional and ths is morally, financially wrong. I don't care what it is but even ten



is at least something. Well we're wrong if we don't give some help and remember fully that even the present last years budget to these fifty five counties is only six hundred and twenty two thousand dollars and a few hundred dollars. My Lord, we spend that on all sorts of projects and a lot more. At the very most it's only another six hundred thousand dollars. The children deserve it and I ask your support."

Speaker Miller: "The question is, shall House Bill 1618 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye' and opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, we've heard laments from advocates of county government throughout this year about the financial difficulties the county government is in as a result of the collectors fees a lot and this is another...another Bill although I'm sure it wasn't intended to be that, another Bill that will decrease the financial problems of counties and governments and for that reason alone it ought to be passed."

Speaker Miller: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 59 'ayes' and 46 'nays' and this Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Ah...Mr. Speaker a couple of introductions. In the balcony behind the Speaker are forty members of the Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs. This is a group consisting of sixty thousand women and with the group is Mrs. Robert A. Seeta of Westchester, who is the Federation Chairman. Now in addition to that, we can hold our applause, we have one of my favorite former Members, former Representative Ed Tonskelled is with us today and he's in the back."

Speaker Miller: "Call the next Bill Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 142. Rayson. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Department of Transportation. Third Reading of the Bill."





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

Rayson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would ask that this Bill be taken out of the record. It's a beautiful Bill, we're going to have to raise five million dollars and we're working on matching funds and we hope the Governor will take a good look and we want time and we...ah...I think that's the way to go..."

Speaker Miller: "Take it out of the record. Read the next Bill Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 534. Hill. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Department of Transportation, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill."

Hill: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Ah...House Bill 534 was amended on Second Reading and we've struck everything after the enacting clause. What the Bill does now is to...ah...transfer from the grade crossing Protection and Separation Fund, a hundred thousand dollars to the Commerce Commission and it's my hope that with this state money there will be federal monies plus city plus railroad monies in order to construct this viaduct in Aurora. I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Miller: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 534 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 126 'ayes' no 'nays'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Call the next Bill Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 626. Katz. A Bill for an Act to amend the Toll Highway Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 626 was heard briefly...ah...about two weeks ago when the matter was sent back to the Committee on Transportation. The Committee on Transportation has now favorably reported and recommended for



passage, House Bill 626. House Bill 626 guarantees the...ah...pledge made by the Governor of Illinois at the time of the original Toll Road that when the bonded indebtedness has been paid off on the present system and that required for the completion of the East, West, which is under construction that the Toll Roads in Illinois will be part of the free highway systems of Illinois. It precludes the mortgaging of the existing Toll Road, the Tri'State, the Northwest or the building of any new Toll Roads, this does not prevent the building of new Toll Roads but they must be financially feasible if new Toll Roads are to be constructed. In addition it provides that if the Toll Road Authority wants to build this Toll Road that they will require the approval of the Governor and of the General Assembly, it provides that people who use the Toll Road, will pay for the Toll Road unless they're on the official business of the Toll Road. The Bill is supported by the...ah... Illinois Association for Automobiles, the Illinois Unit, the Chicago Motor Club of the American Automobile Association. It points out in the testimony given by the Vice President of the Illinois Division, the Chicago Motor Club, the effect of the Toll Road is to in effect charge forty nine cents per mile for those people who happen to live near the toll road in using the toll road. It really doesn't make any sense at all that between here and Chicago one has to...ah..can...one can drive on Interstate Highways largely and we hope very soon entirely, but if you happen to live in Rockford or live along the Toll Road you will have to pay tolls the rest of your life. This is a way to do away with that, it is a way to integrate the Toll Road system into the existing free highway system. It is highly endorsed by groups of motorists, it has wide support among the newspapers in the metropolitan area, it is a fair Bill because it carries out the pledge made by the Governor of Illinois at the time the roads were constructed. I would urge for passage as the Committee on Transportation did, House Bill 626."



Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of House Bill 626. The Chief Sponsor, Representative Katz, has already told us that this proposed Legislation does and does not do. At the completion of this Countrys Interstate System of roads, there will be approximately forty two thousand five hundred miles of four lane limited access super highways for the safe use by our drivers and in Illinois we're going to have seventeen hundred and twenty nine miles as our share of this nationwide system. Fifteen per cent or two hundred and fifty six miles of these Illinois limited access roads are tow roads. They are all located of course, in the northern section of the state and one hundred and sixty two miles are a part of the federal system and a balance of ninety four miles is or will soon be non interstate toll way. Ah...Toll Road fees are kind of a way of life in northern Illinois because in the past the people needed, wanted and accepted the pay to drive procedure as necessary to finance highway improvement. In those days it was tollways or no ways. The time has arrived for adoption of Legislation which will assure all Illinois citizens, but expecially those in Northern Illinois of a Toll free system in the predictable future. I think that Illinois, being one of the five or six key states in this country geographically we are number one as it relates to the importance of vehicular traffic in a movement of people. Illinois Highways should be to the highway traveler as O'Hare field is to the air traveler all based on just our geographical location. We all know that we have the concentration of population of Illinois, which means we have the concentration of automobiles and it follows the lions share of the consumption of motor fuels in the northern section. Northern Illinois taxpayers are entitled to a toll free system like the rest of Illinois and U.S. Taxpayers. This Bill, House Bill 626 provides the necessary language in amending the Toll Highway Authority Act to accomplish this in the foreseeable



future. I encourage all Members of the House to join with me in voting for this very responsible Legislation."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Ah...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ah...

House Bill 626 was a Bill that was heard in Committee I'd say about three times, we...ah...it was held in Committee, it was finally voted out. Thee...The what we might call the third hearing. We had two different votes on it. Ah...This is the kind of a Bill that almost acts like a cat with nine lives. We had these Bills up before many times, Representative Katz continues...keeps bringing them up, I think it's kind of ridiculous to talk about doing away with any more toll roads and that's what we're doing. Now it doesn't necessarily mean that we're going to build toll roads but I think this option should be left open because many of us live in areas that have no Interstate or four lane roads whatsoever and we would like to see this open not necessarily that we want toll roads but if no other way we can get roads why the ...naturally we would take toll roads and this would close up in having any tollroads completely. They bring up about the ...ah...the people in this area entitled to have these bonds paid off and get a freeway, we want to remember that how did they get these bonds...these toll roads started in the first place. That was the people of all the State of Illinois...of guaranteeing these bonds so they'd be paid off. Now also they say, well we live in areas where a toll road won't pay out. Well I don't think we know for sure because these areas are depressed right now because we have no roads in...in these particular areas and I think the picture would change also if we take a road count on these here, sure we don't have the traffic on the...on the roads that maybe would...ah...warrant it but we want to keep in mind too that many travelers, many trucks are driving a hundred to a hundred and fifty miles out of their way...ah...not taking the shortest route, for example between Chicago and Kansas City because of toll roads or good roads



future. I encourage all Members of the House to join with me in voting for this very responsible Legislation."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Ah...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ah...

House Bill 626 was a Bill that was heard in Committee I'd say about three times, we...ah...it was held in Committee, it was finally voted out. Thee...The what we might call the third hearing. We had two different votes on it. Ah...This is the kind of a Bill that almost acts like a cat with nine lives. We had these Bills up before many times, Representative Katz continues...keeps bringing them up, I think it's kind of ridiculous to talk about doing away with any more toll roads and that's what we're doing. Now it doesn't necessarily mean that we're going to build toll roads but I think this option should be left open because many of us live in areas that have no Interstate or four lane roads whatsoever and we would like to see this open not necessarily that we want toll roads but if no other way we can get roads why the ...naturally we would take toll roads and this would close up in having any tollroads completely. They bring up about the ...ah...the people in this area entitled to have these bonds paid off and get a freeway, we want to remember that how did they get these bonds...these toll roads started in the first place. That was the people of all the State of Illinois...of guaranteeing these bonds so they'd be paid off. Now also they say, well we live in areas where a toll road won't pay out. Well I don't think we know for sure because these areas are depressed right now because we have no roads in...in these particular areas and I think the picture would change also if we take a road count on these here, sure we don't have the traffic on the...on the roads that maybe would...ah...warrant it but we want to keep in mind too that many travelers, many trucks are driving a hundred to a hundred and fifty miles out of their way...ah...not taking the shortest route, for example between Chicago and Kansas City because of toll roads or good roads



they're dodging these areas not going over. They're...so therefore it's costing somebody a lot more money to get to the places and another thing I'd hope we'd all keep in mind that if the state does take these over, the bonds are paid off, we're looking at about twenty million dollars worth of cost to the state for maintenance which we...they are financing this themselves now and we all realize in the areas that we do need roads, what this would do to the Highway Fund if we start taking out twenty million dollars out of it for maintenance and this is just what we would be doing. Also, when we're talking about these here bonds being paid off, keep in mind too that we're not talking about anything ...ah... immediately on Mr. Katz' Bill. If he's talking about something that will be twenty...probably twenty five years off...before these bonds will be paid off and I think it's ridiculous at this time to bring up a Bill and...ah...with the idea abolishing any new toll roads when we do need roads of some kind and I hope we will all oppose this Legislation."

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

Choate: "Well Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is not a roving reporter, this is a Gentleman from downstate that wants to talk to these downstaters as far as the future of their highway program is concerned. Now, what the Gentleman from ...Representative Neff just said is absolutely correct, if you're interested in the extension of highways possibly in the future in the downstate area. What Representative Katz, the Chief Sponsor said a moment ago, I take a lot of responsibility for this Bill being back on the Floor, concerning this Session of the General Assembly simply because I felt that I had taken a wee bit of advantage of Representative Katz and therefore, insisted that it be heard in Committee again and in fact help, as far as I was concerned, have it reported out of Committee. Now, you people downstate and don't raise no point because I've got an extension on this thing..."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman...just a minute. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Murphy."



Murphy: "I raise a Point of Order Mr. Speaker. The rules distinctly say that a Member must be in his seat when he's speaking."

Choate: "I'd like to advise...The Point is well taken except the only difference being is I'm standing in my seat. My seat's been in the aisle for a long time. But as far as this particular Bill is concerned, there is downstaters, there are downstaters every day that travel on the toll highway system in the Northern part of this state. There is out of staters that travel on the toll highway system in the Northern part of this state. There is out of state people that comes in this state that would only hope that they would have the opportunity, sometime in the future to travel on toll roads in the downstate portion of this state and I feel would be most happy in the future for part of the revenue that they contribute to this state, through the medium obtained in toll road tax to have an improvement in the highway system downstate, to have a toll road system downstate and if you have a statewide tollway system someway in the future, if there's nothing more equitable and fair than having all of them share together as far as the retirement of those bonds are concerned. I don't blame my neighbors from the North for being jealous, I don't blame them for wanting to retain all of these revenues up there to retire bonds. But my friends part of that revenue is from we people downstate. I don't know whether we want a toll road system today or whether we don't but what you're doing if you pass this Bill, you're precluding us from ever having the opportunity of sharing with us in building a system that we might want downstate and I would urge the defeat of House Bill 626."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Yes Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. As a Member of the Tollway Advisory Committee and former Chairman of that Committee I'd like to bring back to the minds of the Members some of the reasons why we have a toll road and some of the advantages of why we have toll roads in Illinois. You know that we handle a lot of traffic on that toll road and it don't cost one single



taxpayer's cent for police protection, police cars, for the police salary or anyone of the maintenance for the cleaning of the snow, for the painting of the stripes or for any operation on that toll road. It all comes from the user fee on the toll road. The concept of why we need toll roads is to be able to build roads immediately and not put off like what is presently being contemplated on our highway program under the Governor of putting off till tomorrow, what is needed today. The toll road teachers allow citizens to have super highway construction immediately by the bond issues that are passed in order to have a toll road. Now if at best...if at best, the toll road were to pay off it's bonded obligation under the present law that Representative Katz and I helped implement in this Legislature and that is to allow only the toll fees allowable to pay the bonds off according to the indenture rights then the best time or the soonest the toll roads would ever become free would be in the year 2007 or 2009. A good three generations away almost as far as having three toll highways in Illinois. I suggest that for the Legislature to preclude the right of the toll highway authority to determine accurately by...by studies made by engineers, traffic engineers and feasibility engineers on whether or not we need more toll highways in Illinois because we passed this type of law as we may as well abandon the toll highway authority completely because this concept that we now have under law allows the toll highway authority to have feasibility studies to undertake construction plans of new toll highways in Illinois. Only the user pays for this highway, remember that, there's nobody on the entrance ramp flagging anyone in to use them and once the people use this road, they find out that they're not only good roads to use but they're safer roads per mile. Secondly gasoline that's burned up on that toll road is not used to maintain or to operate that toll road, this money is god given almost to the State Highway Fund because all this gasoline used on the toll road is not given back, not





one cent is given back to the toll road, It's given back to your highway fund so other roads in Illinois could be built and maintained. I suggest a toll road is one of the greatest gifts that we have got in Northern Illinois because somehow it allows a lot of movement of transportation units and we generate not only the gas funds from it but also the user funds who are using the toll highway facilities at the oasis's that we generate the tax money from that we we would lose and second of all it doesn't cost us one red cent. To pass this Bill right now, in view that it will take thirty some years because...before the toll roads become free I think is foolish and the obsession that Representative Katz has on this type of approach to curtailing or...or putting down the toll road expansion I think is a bad concept under law and he should take a different approach and make sure that more people use the toll road and have less accidents and give to the people of Illinois a better chance of building more roads."

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

Walsh: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In the 50's when the toll road system was proposed and passed this Legislature and construction began and the people were faced in Northern Illinois with paying a toll for the use of a highway system that they were getting free in other parts of the state the slogan to appease them was, 'The toll roads free in 73'." Well here we are in 73' and as the last speaker just pointed out that it will be thirty years if we stop building toll roads now before the toll roads are free and I submit to you Mr. Speaker that the people of Northern Illinois are entitled to the toll roads free, they're entitled to have a free highway system just as everyone else in this state is entitled to a free highway system. There's no reason, there's no reason on earth why toll roads can't be built wherever people in this General Assembly want them to be built but the revenue's from those roads ought to pay for them and if the revenues don't pay for them then they shouldn't be built. Now the people of Northern Illinois are using these



toll roads to get to work, they're paying a dollar twenty a day and a dollar eighty a day to get to and from work using roads that people in other parts of the state are...are paying nothing for. It's grossly unfair, this is a Bill that ought to pass and I think that we ought to do it right now and to use the...the previous speaker talked about the gift of the toll road to the State of Illinois, it's a gift from the people of Northern Illinois who are forced to use the toll roads, it is a gift of the other people of Illinois and they ought to stop giving and be given something. So I urge your support for this Bill."

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

Hirschfeld: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hardly echo the words of the distinguished Majority Leader but I must say I'm somewhat shocked at the naivete of the distinguished Representative from McHenry. He gets up on the Floor of this House and proports to represent that only the users are bearing the cost of the toll roads. Now as a matter of fact that's just not true. In many instances the local government in the area of the toll roads are being forced to construct and maintain access and connecting roads to these toll roads and many of these people are certainly not the users. In some cases the cost of interchanges adjacent to the toll collection facilities are also absorbed by local government. I can't find any advantages to these toll roads. I've traveled them a few times, there's always heavy traffic jams at the toll booth which to me illustrates a total inconvenience of the facility. It is my personal belief in examining the history of the toll roads that it's the welfare of the bond holders rather than the provision of the facilities for motorists that too often plays a significant part in the policy making decision for those involved in the toll way authority. Consequently many communities along toll facilities don't even have access to it...ah...construction or improvement of highways within a



given radius of the toll ways is limited because the toll way authority is trying to avoid competition. I think what Representative Katz is doing frankly is just echoing something that was said a hundred years ago. Abraham Lincoln said this state this nation can not survive half free and half slave and what Representative Katz is saying is this state system in Illinois can not survive part free and part toll and I think this Bill should be passed, it should have been passed a long time ago and I hardly support the Bill.")

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

Fleck: "Well Mr. Speaker, the issue here is awfully clear and I move the previous question."

Speaker Miller: "The previous question has been moved. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion prevails. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, in closing I would only say to you that this is a long overdue Bill that since the time that the toll roads were constructed that this Legislature has determined to build roads in Illinois under a highway trust authority. It exists and it can be the basis for building new roads that everybody pays their fair share for. The vase of a toll road system is that those people who live along there and use it every day to go back and forth to work and they have added charges that they have to pay. That's quite unfair, these toll road boot plazas impede the police free flow of traffic let us stand behind the solemn pledge made by the Governor of Illinois when these roads were put up, let us pay off those bonds and integrate the toll road system into a system of free highways in Illinois and join with the Chicago Motor Club in giving the workers and the people of this state that to which they are entitled a free highway system that everybody shares equally in the cost of. I would urge support for House Bill 626."

Speaker Miller: "The question is, shall House Bill 626 pass? All those



in favor will vote 'aye' and opposed 'nay'. All right now the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

Everyone should recognize that the county highway superintendent who are responsible for financing our highway improvements in this state oppose this Bill and they are urging you to put a red light up there and why? The Illinois State Toll Highway System is the only self sustaining and financially sound mass transit network in Illinois. If we...We are at a time when the commuter railroads are down here pleading for support, the bus companies are pleading for support, the Chicago Transit Authority need money and we're struggling with mass transit and this is not time to take a highway system that's supporting itself entirely and dismantle it or destroy it. Now politically it's very easy for you to go and say everything in life ought to be free but if you put a green light on you better be prepared to go back and talk to your highway superintendent and your transportation and say where are you going to find the twenty five million dollars that these tolls sustain to maintain these roads. Are you going to take it out of the motor fuel tax funds? Are you going to take it out of your streets and roads, are you going to take it out of general revenue for education? Where are you going to get the twenty five million From the financial responsibility point of view, you better have that answer it seems to me if you're voting green. Now even progressive Atlanta, Georgia is developing a system of urban toll roads because they know that in this day and age we've got to have some way to finance transportation improvement. Even some of the western states realize the interstate system needs to be maintained and they can't even pile ...they're lucky to pile one lane in their interstate system because they don't even have the local funds. Now I urge you not to take away the flexibility that we have in this state. If we want to develop and



maintain a toll highway system we ought to have that flexibility and just cause we built these roads in Northern Illinois is no sign we have to cut off Southern Illinois. I urge you to vote 'no' against this Bill because at a time when we're pressed for transportation fund we have one system that's paying for itself maintaining itself, providing police protection and don't dismantel something that from a businesslike point of view is working."

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

Hudson: "Mr...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

In explaining my vote I would like to suggest that if Representative Katz has given birth to a cat with nine lives here I commend him for it and I hope he has another litter. This is a...this is a good Bill, I supported it the last time, I think it's all important and I know that it's corny and I know that it sounds square to talk about moral obligations and to talk about keeping faith with the people. But I remember when these bonds were issued and I remember what the people of Illinois were told at the time they were issued and they were made a promise and they were told that when these bonds were paid off, this toll way would become a toll free system. That is why they voted for the issuance of these bonds, one reason, at least that's the understaining they had and I think nothing is more important at this time, at this point in time for the Illinois Legislature, for people in general in public office than to keep faith with the people, to keep their word with the people and do the things that they promised they would do. I think this is important, all we're doing here is perpetuating this Illinois Toll Authority be extending it, extending it's authority, building more and more toll ways with these revenues, it's not what we told the people we would do. Let's keep our promise. If they can lower their toll gates fee here from thirty five to thirty cents, they're making money, they're making more than they know what to do with, let's use the money to do what we told the people we would do and that is to pay off the bonds and revert them to a toll



free system."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. J. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to suggest that we must find revenues if we're going to seriously talk about regional mass transit. It's been pointed out in discussion that these toll ways are in the Northern part of Illinois, that these toll ways do raise revenues. I would suggest that because we're going to do some special Legislating for the Northern region of Illinois, that region which needs and must have the valuable mass transit system, that we ought to consider those funds being directed toward the regional mass transit system. I think we've all found out that highways are not the answer when we get a large number of people located in the same area that have to commute to work. We must work for regional mass transit and not for additional highways in the Northern region of Illinois."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote I would like to answer the previous speaker. How many toll booths do you find within the city limits of the City of Chicago? The answer is zero and why? I think that you've got your answers yourself. I think this charade has gone on long enough in taxing the people who live along the toll roads and who continue to tax them when they should have freeways, instead of that we also have people getting up here and saying that well it paid it's own way. It has but what you're talking about is double taxation, nothing else. I fear that this is not equitable, not equitable with the people and certainly not with the rest of the State of Illinois where they are getting freeways."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote I want to point out to the previous Gentleman from Lake, who spoke and spent so much time on the shores of the Patomic he should remember that when Governor Stratten supported the toll road Bill and Representative Jack Bartsol from Lake County fought that Bill



and Jack Barstol said that if we wait one year we'd get the Federal ninety per cent Interstate Funds for our toll road. But we couldn't wait at that time, we went ahead and built roads which we're still paying for that would have been built free one year later. All you have to do is follow the Northwest Toll Way past Rockford and to where it reaches Wisconsin and you'll see it's free in Wisconsin. All you have to do is follow the Tri State Toll Way to Wisconsin and you'll see it's a beautiful free road once you reach Wisconsin, there's not a toll road in Wisconsin, there's not a toll road in Michigan, Michigan has wonderful highways built on the Interstate program. But we were so, in such a hurry back in 1953 to help the bond holders and the banks and some road builders that we went ahead with the toll roads that would have been free to us forever had we gone ahead and waited the year that Jack Barstol suggested and he only failed by one vote of beating the Toll Road Bill back in 53'. Now all Representative Katz is asking is that the funds from the Northern Illinois Toll Roads be used to maintain those toll roads and not be taken off to build uneconomic roads in other parts of our state. Many commuters from Crystal Lake and other places use that toll road every day to get to and from work, it's not an out of state luxury for them, it's a daily getting to and from work. The toll roads were a monstrosity when they were built, the Toll Road Commission is unresponsive, they've got a few spokesmen on the Toll Road Advisory Commission, they give free passes to speak for them down here in the Legislature, they don't care about the rest of us, they don't listen to us, they don't answer our letters and I say let's do anything to lower the toll road fee. We passed a Bill under which they should have lowered the fee to twenty five cents, they refused to lower the fee to twenty five cents even though they're making money..."

Speaker Miller: "Your time is up Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "And I vote 'aye' on this Bill."

Speaker Miller; "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Murphy."



Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the distinguished Gentleman, Representative Katz for introducing this Bill and giving us Republicans a chance to keep our word and vote 'yes' to take the toll off of the freeways because we promised that."

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

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The Illustrious Sponsor of this Bill speaks always or often of bicycle pass, very commendable. If he'll come down to our district we'll show him lots of bicycle pass, only we call them highways. Now in this particular situation we witness here today all of you are voting green, are letting a group cop out in their responsibility to help the rest of us. Don't leave us stuck in the mud. The phoney argument is painful that you're keeping the word of some former politician about when and if the road will be free. We had a Governor that promised our district a hundred and fifty miles of freeway construction immediately, the present Governor has announced within the last three weeks that we do not get a mile of that during the next five years. So if it works one way, it must work the other. It's immoral we agree that a politician can back out on a prior administrations commitments, but it's one of the realities of the life. We ask you to reconsider this... in this matter because the money that you take away from the total highway situation here will condemn us all in Southern Illinois to remain in the mud. Don't tire in your well doing. If the responsibility of the strong to carry for the weak. Be glad that you have the financial muscle to do so. Change."

Speaker Miller: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 107 'aye', and 45 'nay' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Call the next Bill Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 730. Schraeder. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the State Employees Retirement System. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."





Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is an Appropriation Bill for...I've been asked to take it out of the record. Hold it for a little while."

Speaker Miller: "All right, take it out of the record and call the next Bill Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 882...."

Speaker Miller: "Take this Bill out of the record."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 884. Collins. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Phil Collins."

Collins: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask leave to return House Bill 884 to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Miller: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, the Bill is now on Second Reading. Read the Amendment Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2...Is this Amendment 2 Or 1. Amendment #1. Amends House Bill 884 on page 1 by deleting line 16 through 32..."

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

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 is an agreed Amendment worked out between my...myself, the Police Organizations and the Assistant Minority Leader, Representative Shea...ah...Before I proceed on the Amendment however, Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the Clerk to make a correction on the face of the Amendment on line 16 page 1, there is a typing error. Ah...This part..... This portion of the Amendment restates the law as it is presently the figure of 1/16 should properly be 1/6 and I would ask the Clerk to make that correction on the face Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Miller: "Leave is granted. Can you make the correction Mr. Clerk. All right, it's been take care of Mr. Collins, proceed."

Collins: "Now Mr. Speaker, Amendment #1 to House Bill 884, as I said is an agreed Amendment. This is the Bill that would permit Policemen with twenty three years of service at age 53 to retire and...an annuity rate of fifty per cent of their average salary



for the last four consecutive years...ah...of higher salary within the last ten years. Ah...I would ask for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 884."

Speaker Miller: "Is there discussion? The question is, shall Amendment #1 be adopted? All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments? No further Amendmets? The Bill is advanced to the Order of Third Reading. Okay, does the Gentleman desire to have it called on Third Reading. It has been read a third time. All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House...ah...It...The Bill does exactly what I said in explaining the Amendment. This is something that will bring the Chicago Policeman in line with the...ah...benefits derived by the Chicago Firemen for the past fourteen years. It would provide an alternate method for computing their time and annuity and would allow a Policeman at age 53 who has achieved twenty three years of service to retire at the annuity rate that I stated in the Amendment. As I said this has been a Bill that has been worked out in accord with the Assistant Minority Leader and I would move for the passage of House Bill 884."

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

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

Speaker Miller: "Proceed."

Lundy: "Can you tell us whether this Bill has received the approval of the Pension Laws Commission?"

Collins: "This Bill presently has not. However, a similar Bill in the last Session did. There were objections to this Bill on behalf of the Pension Laws Commission because this particular Bill had not been submitted for consideration to the Pension Laws Commission. This Bill as a concept has in previous years been approved."

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

Capuzi: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentelmen of the House. I



can attest to what Phil Collins just stated here today that this Bill was not heard before the Pension Laws Commission. Although, a similar Bill last Session was heard and was approved."

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

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support this Bill. It's a long overdue thing that the Policemen need to put them up to par with the Firemen. In many ways these people serve the public, this is not a big thing really but it does give the Policemen the same Pension right as a Fireman and I urge a 'no' vote."

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

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I also rise in support of this Bill. Ah...I have about twenty seven hundred Policemen that live in my district in Chicago, I've talked to many of them. I've talked to leaders of their organizations and they all are in agreement that this is a necessary Bill. Chicago Firemen now enjoy the same advantage and all we're asking is that the Policemen receive the same treatment that the Firemen are receiving now."

Speaker Miller: "All right. Have all...That all the discussion? Mr. Beatty desires recognition again."

Beatty: "I...I'm sorry Gentlemen but in my concluded remarks I urged a 'no' vote. I am supporting this Bill, I wish you would all vote 'yes'."

Speaker Miller: "All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins to close the debate."

Collins: "No, Mr. Speaker with apologies to the House, the technical Amendment that I asked the Clerk to make was on the advice of the staff. I am now advised that is wrong, the figure should have been 1/16 and so I have to ask the indulgence of the House to once again return to Second Reading to correct the...ah...well it was



correct in the first place, to correct my error."

Speaker Miller: "All right, the Gentleman asks leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment. Is there objection? All right, the Bill is on Second Reading."

Collins: "Now Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Clerk to make the correction on the face that I erroneously asked him to delete from the previous...previously. Ah...and now if the correction has been made I would ask to return to Third Reading for the passage of this Bill."

Speaker Miller: "Has the correction been made Mr. Clerk? All right, the Bill is now advanced to the Order of Third Reading. It's been read a Third time, do you care to make any further statement Mr. Collins?"

Collins: "Briefly in closing Mr. Speaker, I think that the proponents of the Bill have been heard on this, on this Bill. This is the most important of Legislation as far as the Chicago Policemen are concerned to come before you this Session. It brings...it brings the Policemen in line with benefits that the Chicago Firemen have had for some time. I think it only fair and just that this Bill be passed and I would ask the support of the House."

Speaker Miller: "All right, the question is, shall House Bill 884 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye' and opposed 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bludthardt is recognized to explain his vote."

Bludthardt: "Well I was going to ask the Sponsor a question but I'll do it rhetorically. I was going to ask Phil if this is the yo yo Bill or have you been sipping on Chateau neu de pas Phil?"

Speaker Miller: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 136 'ayes' and 4 'nays'...ah...Record Mr. Duff as 'aye'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Call the next Bill Mr. Clerk."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 885. Collins. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask leave to return House Bill 885 to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Miller: "Does the Gentleman have leave? All right, the Bill is returned to the Order of Second Reading."

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

Speaker Miller: "Just a moment..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Collins. Amends House Bill 885 on page 1 by deleting line 25 and 26 and inserting in lieu thereof..."

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

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 885...ah...is the Bill that increases the multiplier to provide the...ah...the tax rate and contributions necessary to fund the...House Bill 884. Ah...the Bill as originally written would have increased the multiplier by a greater amount. House...Well the Amendment #1 will decrease the amount required in House Bill 885. This is another Amendment worked out with the Assistant Minority Leader Mr. Shea and I would ask for it's adoption."

Speaker Miller: "All right, is there discussion? The Gentleman moves the adopt...The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Question. How much will the exchange of multiplier cost the taxpayers? The estimate."

Collins: "The estimated cost is approximately one million eight hundred thousand dollars spread over three years."

Speaker Miller: "All right, the Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Are there further Amendments? The Bill is advanced to the Order of Third Reading. All right, this Bill, having been read a third time. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, with respect to House Bill 885."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I would move for the passage of House Bill 885."



the multiplier in the original Bill called for step increases over 1974, 75, 76 and 77 from two dollars to four dollars and forty five cents. The Amendment that you just adopted would increase the multiplier in 1974 by 1.9...ah...1.90 and in 1975 by 1.97...ah...Representative Ewell asked me the cost, I think I'm well within line on my answers to him and I would ask for passage of House Bill 885."

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

Ewell: "Well Mr. Collins, wouldn't this necessitate increasing the taxes in the...ah...city?"

Collins: "Ah...I believe it would by a million aid over the next period."

Ewell: "Ah...If we have a tax freeze, how can we do this? In other words, how can we consistently vote to freeze taxes and by the same token constantly come in for Bills that will mandate the taxes be increased."

Collins: "Ah...I believe Pension Funds are exempt under the tax free Legislation."

Ewell: "They're exempt but however, money must necessarily come from the tax fund. This means other funds must be reduced"

Collins: "I don't think that necessarily follows."

Speaker Miller: "Is there further discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 885 pass? All those in favor....Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Record me as 'present' please."

Speaker Miller: "Record Mr. Choate as 'present'. Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 121 'ayes', no 'nays' and 1 'present'. Mr. McGrew 'present'. Two 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Record Mr. Ebbesen as 'aye'. Ebbesen. Read the next Bill Mr. Clerk."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 928. Leon. A Bill for an Act to..."

Speaker Miller: "Take the Bill out of the record."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 998. J. D. Jones. A Bill for an Act."



Clerk O'Brien: "...To make an appropriation for the cost of living increase and compensation of certain State Employees. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Dave Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Now hear this. House Bill 998 is the cost of living adjustment for the State Employees to equate the cost of living, which according to the Department of Labor index has increased 6.6 per cent in the last 12 months, in Illinois. House Bill 998 provides for a thirty five dollar per month increase to each of the some sixty five thousand employees under the jurisdiction of the Governor for a ten month period, starting September 1. The thirty five dollar per month scales at 9.2 for those in the lowest paid bracket of three hundred and ninety dollars per month, to one point four of those in the highest income bracket. As recommended in the Appropriations, this formula does do more for the little guy at the bottom of the pay ladder than an original five per cent concept across the board. This plan and this Legislation has been approved by all the employees associations and by the Appropriations Committee, 23 to 0. We now solicit the same...approval of this much needed Legislation by all the Members of this House."

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

Choate: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Far be it from me to ever take opposition to a Bill that would bring about an increase as far as the State Employees are concerned. But I would like to set the record straight here this morning and say that there is a Bill in Committee. That I think is more equitable in the House Appropriations Committee that is more equitable as far as the lower paid employees is concerned than is the Bill that we're discussing at the present time, House Bill 998. There is a Motion on the Speaker's Table to discharge that Committee which I assume will be called in the near future because of the tie vote in the Appropriations Committee on the Bill in question. The difference between the Bills is,



as far as I'm concerned in the first place, House Bill 998 is out of the budget...it is out of range of the budgetary allocation, out of the General Revenue Fund except for by the administration and especially the Chief Executive of this State, the Governor. The second all important reason that I favor the Bill, which I hope that we get to consider in the near future is because that I'm convinced after the appropriate Amendments are adopted that it will pay attention to the lower, the lower salaried people in the State of Illinois rather than the higher salaried as it does in this particular piece of Legislation. It will pay and bring about a greater increase for the Secretarial help that are low paid it will bring about a higher increase for the Janitorial help which are underpaid, it will bring about a better increase for all of the lower paid people under state employment. It will also, it will also include as a companion measure the appropriate increases for the university personnel. As soon as the Amendments and the appropriate measures are adopted. Therefore Mr. Speaker, I would hope that House Bill 998 does not, at this time receive the adequate number of votes for passage until such time as the Membership will have an opportunity, an opportunity to compare the two pieces of Legislation and then make up their minds, then make up their minds which is the most adequate Legislation for all of the State Employees of this State. I would therefore ask that this Bill, at this time, not receive the necessary number of votes until such time as we do have a choice as far as the two pieces of Legislation are concerned."

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

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Speaker, I stand here just absolutely amazed that the last Gentleman's comments. He knows full well that this General Assembly in the past has set a course of action to provide, provide cost of living increases for our State Employees and for him to stand on this Floor and suggest, yes suggest that we not provide the votes for these cost of living increases is absolutely amazing. Now let's look at the facts.





The facts are that this Bill actually provides more money in the lower ranges than the Bill to which he refers. Actually, his Bill the one that's in Committee only provides an increase of about thirty dollars a person in the lower ranges and this Bill provides thirty five dollars. So we're making a better provision than his Bill makes and as far as the cost of this program compared to the cost of his program the difference is between seventeen million and eighteen million dollars a year. A million dollars and he has to go no further than his Governor to see that just yesterday he is priding himself on the fact that he is cutting back employment, he says he's cutting back employment some fifteen hundred employees are going to be layed off and he's going to save some fifteen million dollars. So certainly, certainly there's enough money available in the State's General Revenue to provide this increase that is higher than his at these lower paid employees. So, I'm just amazed and I would hope that when the time comes to throw that switch that he will not go back on his pledge to the state employees of this state that we had a General Assembly program that would provide yearly cost of living increases."

Speaker Miller: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Sangamon to close the debate. Mr. Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I just want to say to you that this, formerly this Bill was worked out by the Appropriations Committee to take care of the needs of the little guys had been said and comparing the two Bills that the former speaker on the other side of the aisle refers to and ... and the Bill that he has proposed to the Appropriations Committee would only provide thirty dollars per month to the guy in the low scale but ninety eight dollars to the guy in the top bracket. Whereas in 998 it's thirty five dollars for everyone across the board. Thirty five dollars a month, to help meet that grocery Bill which is the biggest consumer in the cost of living index and that in this ...in 998 is the fair way of doing it and it has met all the discussion and Amendments that were recommended by the Appropriations Committee from those in the employer associated groups. I urge



your vote at this time because this is the Bill to do it and it's a fair plan and it's needed and I think that the sixty five thousand employees in the State of Illinois will be very grateful for this. Not a pay raise, nothing to do with the pay raise in the pay plan. This is a cost of living adjustment. I solicit your green votes."

Speaker Miller: "The question is, shall House Bill 998 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye' and opposed 'nay'. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate to explain his vote."

Choate: "Well Mr. Speaker, I'm amazed at the Gentleman from Will. Took my remarks out of context in the manner in which he did because if he was listening clearly he heard me say that if the majority would let us get that Bill out of Committee or amended in Committee that there was certain Amendments that was going to be adopted and one of the major differences is the fact that this Bill does not cover all state employees. 998 doesn't. It does not cover the University Employees, it doesn't cover some other employees such as I just suggested a moment ago. There's no one on this side that's opposed to a cost of living increase to the State Employees of this State. The only thing I said, that if the majority would let us get the other Bill out of Committee and I think it should come out of Committee then give this House the opportunity to compare the two plans. Give this House the opportunity if they want to pass both plans, pass both plans. But I suggested that we hold this one until such time as we have an opportunity to compare the two plans. I suggested that the other Bill in it's amended stages would pay more or bring about a higher cost, a higher increase rather in the cost of living plan than the present one does. I would suggest that at no time, at no time did I or anyone on this side, contrary to the remarks from the Gentleman from will indicate any opposition to an increase as far as the State Employees are concerned. We indicated that we wanted to give them the best plan possible and the only way you can do that is have them there and let 89 of these Members composed of both Members from bot...Members from both side of the aisle make up their minds which plan is the most



adequate, which plan is the best, which plan is the most feasible as far as bringing about a cost of living increase for all of the employees of the state, not just a few. I vote 'present'."

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

Walsh: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. That board sure indicates to me that there is some opposition to this Bill and opposition to giving the State Employees a cost of living increase. I don't know what you can call it when people are withholding their voted. We've got to have 89 votes to get this passed. If they're not given to us by the people on the other side of the aisle then there's no way you can interpret it other than they're opposed to it. Now these are the people, the people effected by this Bill, who are the people most in need of a pay raise. This is a mere five per cent cost of living pay increase, the people covered by it deserve it very much if there are others who are not included they can be included in the Gentleman's Bill later on or in some other Bill coming over from the Senate. It just seems to me that simple justice indicates that we ought to pass this Bill and that if we don't pass this Bill those who don't support it have got to be opposed to the State Employees getting a pay increase. It's as simple as that. I urge your support for this Bill."

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

Shea: "Well Mr Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this House. I think Mr. Walsh just put his finger on the pulse of the Bill. All we're asking is to let another Bill of a similar vien out, let us get the Bill in shape where it covers all State Employees and then let this House decide if they want either one or both."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan to explain his vote."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As you can see on the board I'm voting for this Bill. The reason that I'm voting for it I think is very apparent. We're dealing with working men and women pay cost of living pay increase and it's not lightly taken that a Democrat or a Republican should somehow take the glory or the fame because the Sponsor of the Bill is for State Employees. I



think the State Employees to just the necessity of buying bread, medicine and meats deserve this type of consideration and a favorable vote, which tends to make me think that we should also then vote for another Bill of this nature when it's brought before this House. But to play a game and to hold back from this particular Bill because another Bill is not in front of us, I will say what will happen to the State Employee if this Bill fails and the other Bill fails to get out of Committee? We're dealing with around seventy some thousand persons that work for the State of Illinois that will not get any cost of living increase and I'm voting 'aye'."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer to explain his vote."

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

It seems to me that we are not paying attention to the relative merits of this Bill. I've heard the other Bill, it's a good Bill but this is a better Bill Ladies and Gentlemen because for one thing we are dealing directly with cost of living. A cost of living, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, has nothing to do with whether you make twenty thousand dollars a year or five thousand dollars a year. If you have three children and your wife and yourself obviously it's how much you have to spend at the grocery store that's going to determine your cost of living. It would seem to me that by not using this flat dollar amount approach you are by inferency that the cost of living for a twenty thousand dollar a year man goes up more rapidly than it does for a five thousand dollar a year man assuming that both have children or a family of five. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it seems to me that you're being terribly unfair to the people of the state who are State Employees, who can least afford unfair treatment. You are holding off on a very good Bill here that addresses itself specifically to the problem of cost of living. We're not talking about a pay increase here, if we want to give a pay increase, then fine, let's introduce a pay increase Bill as such. What we're doing here, Ladies and



Gentlemen of the House, is addressing ourselves specifically to one of the most pervasive problems which is facing the people of this state and the people of this nation as a whole. Inflation. What it costs when you go to the grocery store and try to buy the daily substance by which your family is fed. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones to explain his vote."

Jones: "In explaining my vote, I just want to call to the attention of those on the other side of the aisle that not too long ago we had a Bill on the Sales Tax Relief, or food and medicine and there were other Bills that had been preceeding and that were employed to give our support to happen to give it a chance and there were votes on this side of this side of the aisle that did come up and help that Bill pass. Now I think the same consideration ought to be given on House Bill 998."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff to explain his vote."

Duff: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I guess I'm a little befuddled about the...ah...charges of how we should treat all these Bills or these two Bills but as far as I'm concerned having the one before us is significant in itself and I would suggest to the many persons who have not yet decided to put a green light on that none of us know whether any particular Bill is going to get out of Committee or what form it's going to get out of Committee or what form it's going to take on the Floor and what's going to happen to it in the maelstrom of activity that will surround us over the next several weeks. This Bill is before us on Third Reading in a form of which you can make a decision. I would say to those of you who have not yet put on a green light that it's very, very possible that this is the only Bill that you will have an opportunity to have a record vote when you go back to your constituency and when you file your petitions next December. This is a record vote available to you for sure. This is a very significant and important aid to the employees of the State of Illinois for which we have a direct responsibility. If they can't look to us in



this House, who else can they look to for what they need? Many, many people have indicated they are interested and in this idea and they want to vote 'aye' on this and on another Bill. I would say to you, do vote 'aye' on this Bill. Do make sure that you are on record and if you get an opportunity to vote on the other Bill then do so but don't miss the chance to be on record on an important vote that you've got to go back to your constituents with. I would think that it would be irresponsible not to be sure that we are going to pass some Bill to take care of the employees of the state."

Speaker Miller: "The Speaker...ah...the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Will, Speaker Blair to explain his vote."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Speaker, I think it's important that we set the record straight on the differences between the Bill that we're that's still in Committee and the one that's here on the Floor. Now one of the main reasons why we put this Bill in was simply because the Executive Branch of Government did not make provision for any cost of living increase in his budget for State Employees under the Executive Branch. The universities and all these other categories that you're talking about that are in the other Bill have come in in their Appropriation Bill. In other words, they have taken care of their employees as far as cost of living is concerned and there's no necessity at all...ah...to address ourselves to that in a duplicate form and that's exactly what the distinguished Minority Leader is suggesting that you do. Now nobody's going to be left out because they vote for this Bill in comparison to the other Bill because the other employees are all taken care of in their own department appropriations for the universities and so forth. I raise once again the question because I happen to have taken a look at the board up there and I can tell you right now that if this Bill goes down it's because of lack of votes on the other side of the aisle. The votes over there are just simply not coming on. This is the first time I've ever seen partisan politics raise it's ugly head when you get into the question of increasing cost of living for State Employees when, when...when believe it or not, when, believe it or not the



Governor is from your side of the aisle. Now, I don't see any reason at all why you can't provide enough votes to give these people a cost of living increase. It's just that simple and when the Minority Leaders Bill comes up for consideration we certainly will consider it on it's merits."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen I should like to be recorded as 'present'. In explaining my vote, I think this is a partisan issue. I think it is a political issue but I don't think that the voters of this state or the voters of any district are going to look at this simple vote in making their decisions. The Democratic Party has consistently in the past, throughout the years always endorsed the program of the working man. We are suggesting at this time that there is a Bill that does not cover all of the people properly, that there is a better way and we intend to take that better way. I am sure that the people of this state will for forbear and stick with the Democratic Party because of our record over the years as having supported the working man and laborer. I should like to be recorded as 'present'."

Speaker Miller: "Record the Gentleman as 'present'. Mr...The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Previous Sessions I have Sponsored Resolutions for increases in State Employees wages. I was shut out in Committee, I was shut out on the Floor receiving not a Republican vote. I too, along with every Democrat over here as is well known, support the employees increase. What we are doing here is withholding our votes so that you let out, a Democratic measure out of Committee. The Speaker consistently in Committee shut out every Democratic proposal for a pay increase, for my Bill on Sales Tax Relief, every Bill Sponsored by the Democrats is voted down in Committee. The Speaker insists that his name be on every Bill of any importance in this House. The only way we have of making ourselves felt is to withhold our votes in this manner until you give us



a fair vote in these Committees. That is all we're seeking here for you to do today and until you do so we are withholding our support. When the time comes we will be on record as to favoring cost of living and salary raises for the State Employees. The Majority Leader just land blasted me the other day when I supported a State Employee measure. Now he's on the other side of the issue. We're asking that we withhold our vote now and later we will be on record."

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

Hirschfeld: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to set the record straight on my own vote if for nothing else. Let's presume there is partisanship involved in this particular measure, it wouldn't be the first time this House has seen partisanship, at least in the three years I've been down here. But I must say that I agree with the distinguished Speaker of the House and I too am shocked at the action taken by the Minority Leader today because for the first time in my three years anyway that the distinguished Gentleman who's the Minority Leader on the other side of the aisle has decided that pride of authorship is more important than pride in content and I've examined both Bills and I've tried to vote very fairly in this Session on Bill content and not on Sponsorship, sometimes to my own disadvantage I might add and it seems to me that of the two Bills the only Bill that is in proper shape today for passage and very likely the only Bill that will be in proper shape for passage is the Bill that's before us and I would like to ask my fellow Members from the other side of the aisle to forget pride of authorship. It's not important who Sponsors a Bill or which party Sponsors a Bill. What's important is the content of the Bill and Speaker Blair has pointed out, the content of his Bill far exceeds the content of the Bill Sponsored by the other side of the aisle and I would like to see just a few more green lights so that we can do something for the people who are working for the State of Illinois."

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

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





at the board up there and seeing the votes I'm...I'm just appaled and I think it's a deplorable situation when we start talking partisan politics when we're talking about a cost of living increase for State Employees, the people that we control. Now you have a Bill over there and I'm going to support it to get it out of Committee or discharge or whatever it is. But we're dealing with the lives of sixty five thousand people. These people are entitled to cost of living index...or increase. The same as we increased our pay. Now I think it's deplorable that you withhold your votes on such a vital issue at this time. You know and we know that we supported your Bills for Sales Tax Relief and other Bills based on the merits of the Bill and not looking at it as a Democrat or Republican issue and I look at the board at this time and I'm sure that there are ten or fifteen more that should get on this Bill because I'm going to be one that gets on the other Bill and certainly it shouldn't be a partisan issue."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Merely because this Bill isn't receiving the 89 votes that it needs to pass doesn't mean that it's necessarily dead today. It seems to me that the Employees of the State of Illinois certainly realize what's going on here. It seems to me that we should have both Bills and come to a conclusion of what is best for those State Employees. I have never voted against a increase either in the cost of living or raises for the Employees of the State of Illinois and you can feel well assured that I won't in this Session of the Legislature. But it seems to me that we should approach all avenues of approach and come to a conclusion that would better serve the citizens of the State of Illinois and the workers of the State of Illinois and I appreciate very much if this Bill wouldn't get 89 votes at this particular time."

Speaker Miller: "Have all voted who wished? McLendon 'present'. Have voted...all voted who wished? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question...For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell arise?"



Ewell: "To request a verification of the Roll Call."

Speaker Miller: "The question...On this question there are 91 'ayes' and no 'nays' and 4 'present'. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Will, Speaker Blair."

Speaker Blair: "If the Speaker would please, could we poll the absentees first, we want to get a record on that."

Speaker Miller: "Yes sir. Mr. Clerk, will you poll...call the absentees and ask every Member to please be in his or her seat."

Clerk Selcke: "Arrigo, Barnes, George Barnes 'present', Barry, Beatty."

Speaker Miller: "Just a minute. Barry 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Yeah, well it's not poll...punched out here. We got you on the sheet Toby. Beatty, Beaupre, Berman, Boyle, Bradley, Brandt, Brinkmeier, Brummet, Caldwell, Caldwell 'present'. Calvo."

Speaker Miller: "Record the Gentleman as 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Capparelli, Carter."

Speaker Miller: "'Present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Chapman, Choate 'present'. Craig, Davis, DiPrima, Douglas, Ewell, Ewell 'present'. Farley, Fary, Fennessey."

Speaker Miller: "Record Mr. Fennessey 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Flinn, Garmisa, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Granata, Hart."

Speaker Miller: "Record Mr. Hart 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Hill, Hill 'present'."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Hill 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "D. Houlihan, J. Houlihan, Jaffe 'present'. Emil Jones, ..."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Jones 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Katz, Keller, Kelly, Kennedy."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Kennedy 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Kosinski, Kozubowski, Krause, Laurino, Lechowicz, Lemke, Leon, Lundy."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Lundy 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Madigan, Mann, Maragos."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Maragos 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Martin, Martin 'present'. Matijevich, McClain."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. McClain 'present'."



Clerk Selcke: "McCormick, McGah, McGrew."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. McGrew 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "McLendon, McLendon 'present'."

Speaker Miller: "McLendon 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "McPartlin, Merlo."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Merlo 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Merlo 'present'. Mugalian, Nardulli, Patrick, Pierce."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Pierce 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Rayson, Redmond, Sangmeister."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Sangmeister 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Schisler, Schneider 'present'. Schraeder, Sharp,  
Shea."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Sharp 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Ike Simms, Stedelin, Stone, Taylor, Terzich, Thompson,  
Tipword..."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Tipword 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "VonBoeckman, Washington."

Speaker Miller: "VonBoeckman 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Washington 'present'."

Speaker Miller: "Washington 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Williams."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Williams 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "B. B. Wolfe, Yourell."

Speaker Miller: "Record Mr. Boyle 'present'. Mr. Boyle 'present'."

All right the..."

Clerk Selcke: "Wait a minute, where in the hell is he?"

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

has requested a verification of the affirmative Roll. Now will the  
Members please be in their seats as the affirmative Roll is read,  
please be in their...in your seats and raise your hand as your  
name is called. Mr. Clerk call the affirmative record."

Clerk Selcke: "Alsup, Anderson, Arnell, Bluthardt, Borchers, Campbell,  
Capuzi, Catania, Clabaugh, Collins, Cox, Cunningham, Day, Deavers,  
Deuster, Duff, Ralph Dunn, R. L. Dunne, Dyer, Ebbesen, Epton,  
Fleck, Friedland, Geo-Karis, Gibbs, Griesheimer, Grotberg,



Hanahan, Harpstrite, Hirschfeld, Gene Hoffman, Ron Hoffman, J. Holloway, R. Holloway, Hudson, Hunsicker, Huskey, Hyde, Jacobs, Dave Jones, Juckett, Kempiners, Kent, Klosak, Kriegsman, Kucharski, LaFleur, Lauer, Leinenweber, Londrigan, Macdonald, Mahar, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McCourt, McMaster, Kenny Miller, Tom Miller, Molloy, Murphy, Neff, North, Palmer, Pappas, Philip, Petrovich, 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."

Speaker Miller: "All right, are there questions of the affirmative roll? For what purpose does Mr. Springer arise, the Gentleman from Randolph?"

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

Speaker Miller: "How is Mr. Springer recorded?"

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

Springer: "That's right."

Speaker Miller: "Are...Mr. Ewell are there questions of the affirmative Roll?"

Ewell: "Soderstrom."

Speaker Miller: "Was that Mr. Soderstrom? Mr. Soderstrom not in his seat, is he on the Floor? How is he recorded Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentlmean is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Miller: "Take him off the Roll."

Ewell: "Sevcik."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Sevcik? He's back there in his seat."

Ewell: "Mr. Rayson. I mean, no...no. Mr. Pandolph."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Randolph is not in his seat. Is Mr. Randolph on the Floor? How is he recorded Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentlmean is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Miller: "Take him off the Roll."

Ewell: "Ah...Mr. Philip."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Philip is in his seat."

Ewell: "All right, Mr. Murphy."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Murphy, he's not in his seat. Mr. Murphy on the



Floor? How is he recorded Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Miller: "Take him off the Roll."

Ewell: "Mr. Londrigan."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Londrigan, the Gentleman is not in his seat.

Is Mr. Londrigan on the Floor? How is he recorded Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Miller: "Take...take him off the Roll."

Ewell: "Mr. LaFleur."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. LaFleur? He's in his seat."

Ewell: "Mr. Fleck."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Fleck? He's right down here near the front."

Ewell: "Mr. Alsup."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Alsup. I don't see Mr. Alsup in his seat. Is

the Gentleman on the Floor? How is he recorded Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Miller: "Take him off the Roll."

Ewell: "Mr. Deuster."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Deuster is in his seat."

Ewell: "Mr. Klosak."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Klosak? He's in his seat."

Ewell: "Mr. Juckett."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Juckett, he's in the back waving his crutch."

Ewell: "Mr. Jacobs."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Jacobs? Is Mr. Jacobs on the Floor? How  
is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Miller: "Take him off the Roll."

Ewell: "Mr. Holloway, J. D. Holloway."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Jim Holloway. I can't see whether or not he's  
in his seat. Mr. James Holloway on the Floor? How is he recorded  
Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Miller: "Take him off the Roll."



Ewell: "Mr. R. K. Hoffman."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Ron Hoffman's right down in front."

Ewell: "All right. Hanahan."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Hanahan is in his seat."

Ewell: "Mr. Totten."

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Totten is in his seat. All right, Mr. Murphy is back on the Floor. Put Mr. Murphy back on the 'aye' Roll."

Ewell: "Mr C. L. McCormick."

Speaker Miller: "Is Mr. C. L. McCormick recorded Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Miller: "Are there further questions of the affirmative?"

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I've been busy calling, can you tell me the count from the Clerk."

Clerk Selcke: "What was that?"

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman would like to know the present count Mr. Clerk. Is Mr. Londrigan on the Floor? Mr. Londrigan is back on the Floor. Mr. Londrigan, you were taken off the Roll so put him back on the...as an 'aye' vote. Mr. Jacobs is back on the Floor. Put him on as an 'aye' vote. Can you give me a count Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Selcke: "Okay."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker can we have a Roll Call sir?"

Speaker Miller: "Just a moment we've got to count the 'present' up here, you want a record. All right, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh. There's 87 'ayes' right at the moment."

Walsh: "Well Mr. Speaker, I notice that some of the 'aye' votes were coming back on the Floor and we've got it pretty doggone close. Now maybe Representative Alsup can be found, Representative Holloway you can't tell. If they're around maybe they can come in and I certainly don't want to be dilatory, that's one thing about me, I don't want to be dilatory but I...I would appreciate it Mr. Speaker if you would verify the 'present' vote."

Speaker Miller: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell arise?"

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker Point of Order, I mean we verify votes but clearly



a 'present' has never been indicated to be a vote and I think that the Majority Leader is getting into bad taste here because this becomes dilatory and we of our side do not approve of that when we have over a hundred Bills today to go and the best we've ever done is about thirty some."

Speaker Miller: "Well 'present' is a vote Mr. Ewell. The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "I'm sure glad to see my good friend and colleague the Majority Leader not be dilatory. I don't ever remember really a 'present' vote being verified and I suppose he can do it if he wants to but I agree with him, it's not too dilatory, T-0-0."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman desire that the 'present' vote be called? Mr. Clerk call those voting 'present'. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ron Hoffman arise?"

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, the question just arised, could we verify the Gallery please?"

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Clerk, will you read those voting 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Barry, Barnes, Berman, Choate, Ewell, McLendon."

Speaker Miller: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman arise?"

Berman: "On a Point of Order Mr. Speaker. I am referring to Rule 50 B and there is provided for the verification and I would like the Chair to inform me as to where the authority rests for a verification of a 'present' vote."

Speaker Miller: "In answer to your inquiry it appears that the Rule to which you referred permits the verification of those 'present' only when it's a question of a majority of those voting on the issue so it would appear to the Chair that your point is well taken. On this question there are 87 'ayes', no 'nays' and 29 'present'. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to put this on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Miller: "All right, Leave is granted, this Bill is now placed on Postponed Consideration. Call the next Bill Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Selcke: "Hold it? Out of the record. What the hell number is



that? 998. House Bill 14...where in the hell is it? 1403 Madigan. An Act to provide for planning of Illinois Health Facility Services. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask for leave to take the Bill back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Miller: "Does the Gentleman have leave to return this Bill to Second Reading? All right, hearing no objection, this Bill is returned to the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #3. Madigan. Amend House Bill 1403 as amended in the third and last paragraph."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #3 would provide that before the State Board could implement the purposes of the act that it would have to adopt a state plan for the implementation thereof. I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Miller: "Is there discussion? The question is, shall Amendment #3 be adopted? All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #3 is adopted. Are there further Amendments? The Bill is ordered...advanced to the Order of Third Reading. Now this Bill, having been read a Third time the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1403 would create the Health Facilities and Services Planning Board. This Board would be composed of thirteen voting members, six of these members being representatives of the various aspects of the health care delivery system and seven of the members being consumers. The function of the Board would be to grant permits to Health Care Facilities for the construction of new facilities for the extension or expansion of already existing facilities. A Health Care Facility is defined as a place, building or agency subject to licensure or approval of the Department of Public Health. There are certain criteria set out in the Bill as to when the Bill is operative. The purpose of the Bill is to provide for planning and the development of Health Care Facilities throughout





the State of Illinois. Those of us from the Chicago area and especially the suburban area are well aware of the current proliferation of applications for permits for the construction of Health Care Facilities. House Bill 1403, if enacted into law, would provide for a comprehensive health care planning in this regard. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Miller: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield for a several questions?"

Speaker Miller: "Proceed sir."

Kempiners: "Mike, this question or at least the first question I'm going to ask is relative to a letter I sent you on this Bill regarding the inner action between the State Agency and Local Comprehensive Health Planning Agency. In that letter I stated my concern that the State Agency or the State Board would not have to follow the recommendations or really pay much attention to what the local Comprehensive Health Planning Agency recommended in making it's decision. In conversations which I have had with the staff man from the, from the Human Resources Committee regarding this Bill...ah...I indicated that I would like to see some Amendment added that would require the State Agency to follow the Local Agency's decision unless there was a conflict between the state plan and the local paying plan, a conflict between the local plan and one of the surrounding areas or new information became available. He indicated to me in our discussions that there would be no other reason that the A Agency would make a decision contrary to the B Agency's. Now would you go along with that estimation that he made to me?"

Madigan: "Bill it would appear to me that rather than dealing with the specifics of your proposal that we should deal with it on a philosophical plane and decide each for ourselves whether we want the actual decision making powers direct with the A Agency at the state level or the B Agency at the local level. For my



own purposes I find it difficult to understand how we can have effective comprehensive statewide Health Care Planning if the local B Agency is going to be reposed with all of the decision making power. To site one example. What if there is a...a conflict concerning a construction of a Health Care Facility on the peripheral edge of one of the areas represented by one local C.H.P. Someone must resolve this. Now certainly the local people can't resolve it, necessarily it will have to be resolved at the state level. Additionally you are proposing that the actual authority in regard to this Bill be placed in the hands of the B Agency. The Bill as structured, I feel, can not provide for that, for one reason and that is the certain case decisions which have been handed down within the State of Illinois which have held the delegation of Legislative authority for voluntary or private groups is prohibited. These cases are Relph V. Thompson, 228 Illinois, 522 and People X. L. Dyer versus the City of Chicago, 413 Illinois, 315."

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question? It is regarding the number of votes it would require to pass this Bill."

Speaker Miller: "Are you raising that as a point of inquiry?"

Kempiners: "Parliamentary Inquiry."

Speaker Miller: "Well just a moment. Ladies and Gentlemen, on the Point of Order raised this is to whether or not this takes 89 votes or 107 votes we've had considerable discussion up here in checking this matter and it appears that this Bill does not grant to the state, it doesn't any new rights other than what they are now exercising at the present time. In other words, the State of Illinois is not, by this Bill, preempting any right from Home Rule Units. So it would be the Chairs ruling that this Bill will take 89 votes. Now is the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, completed with his question?"

Kempiners: "I'm completed with my questions Mr. Speaker but I'd like to address myself to the response I received."

Speaker Miller: "Proceed sir."

Kempiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Miller: "We have a Point of Order. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, you ruled that this Bill takes 89 votes, yet in a Home Rule City, such as Chicago, if I wanted to build an addition to my hospital or build a hospital, would this Bill circumvent the building department's authority of the City of Chicago?"

Speaker Miller: "No more than it does right now, in the Chair's opinion. In other words, it's not preempting.."

Hanahan: "This Bill would not...If the City of Chicago issues me a Building Permit to build an addition to my hospital that this Board would not have the power to deny that permit?"

Speaker Miller: "All right, let's refer this to Mr. Madigan the Gentleman from Cook, because we just had a discussion on it. Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Tom the building departments throughout the state are concerned with construction aspects of the building itself. This Bill is concerned with the question, is there a need in the local for another hospital. It does not relate to the type of building you're going to put up, the type of construction materials that are going to be use, the type of beam structures..."

Hanahan: "I beg your pardon, you don't know too much about building a hospital then because when you talk about lead shields for X-ray rooms you're not talking about whether or not the building department has a desire on the construction aspect but on whether or not you have radiation shields and I suggest this Bill would prohibit a build...a Building Permit be issued by the City of Chicago if this Board denied the application and I think this Bill on reflection you ought to reconsider your ruling of earlier because this definitely prohibits a Home Rule City from issuing permits of a construction of a hospital such as an X-ray room unless this Board approves it and it certainly interferes with Home Rule Authority, under my judgement. I don't see how you could rule any other way upon reflecting that one question."

Speaker Miller: "Does the Gentleman from Will desire to continue?"

Kempiners: "Well I'd like to follow through with what the Gentleman



from McHenry was saying that there certainly are provisions which have to be met now if this Bill becomes law that are not presently met by a Home Rule Unit or otherwise. I'm not quite sure how to proceed with this but regarding the question I asked the Sponsor. I'm not opposed to this Bill. I come from an area where we need health planning and I had intended to vote for this Bill. However, I am concerned with the philosophical question which I asked and which Mr. Madigan recognized as a philosophical question as to the input that local comprehensive Health Planning Agencies shall have in the decision making. My feeling is that they ought to be able to make a decision and unless the three criteria I mentioned in my question are met the State Agency should follow their suggestions. This Bill does not allow that to happen. There's the B Agency, which is composed of local people, consumers as well as health providers...ah...they can have review and finding and they can make their comments but that's about all and I disagree with that particular philosophy. I think that they ought to hold hearings, they ought to make their decisions and unless there is new information that becomes available after the decision is made or there is a...ah...conflict between the state plan or the local plan or a conflict between the local plan in a surrounding area, that decision ought to be ratified. So at the present time, Mr. Speaker, when the Roll Call is held, I would wish to be vote... recorded as voting 'present' on this Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Ogle, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question or two?"

Speaker Miller: "Proceed sir."

Brinkmeier: "Mike, number one and I'm a little bit confused, wouldn't this be duplicating that's presently being done by the Comprehensive Health Planning Agency? They do this sort of thing, do they not?"

Madigan: "Ah...Bob, the Comprehensive Health Planning Agency is a planning agency, yes, but it does not have the statutory authority to determine if there is a need for a new facility and then to determine whether that facility will go up or whether it will stay



on the ground."

Brinkmeier: "Okay, thank you."

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

Petrowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I might suggest that we take a close look at this Bill. It does apply to all hospitals, nursing homes, clinics and included are all governmental facilities and among these, the Cook County Hospital, the Chicago Board of Education Health Clinic, all County nursing homes, T. B. Sanitariums, Township Hospitals, City Hospitals, private, non-profit and proprietary health facilities are also included. Only the V.A. Hospitals are exempt. This Bill would also prohibit any such facility from constructing or expanding and they could not establish any new service without first obtaining a state permit from this board and in order to obtain this permit certain requirements would have to be met and unspecified fees would have to be paid. I also refer you to a report of a Chicago Home Rule Commission. In their report, in which they specifically recommended that Home Rule Units, especially the City of Chicago should have the power to control their own health services and facilities within the city. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I dissent from your ruling in terms of the required 89 votes on this and suggest it does need 107 and also suggest that it does infringe upon the rights of various local units, various Townships Hospitals and Community Agencies in many of the downstate areas that may not as yet be prepared for this kind of Legislation and I will have to vote in opposition."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. First might I say that when we talk about building Health Care Facilities they ought to be based upon the need as to whether they are needed for the health care of the people of the State of Illinois. We shouldn't build Health Care Facilities on whether we need jobs, whether we need construction jobs, this Bill is a vital Bill, I think in the future of health care in the State of



Illinois. And I think we ought to do it on a common sense basis and that's what Representative Madigan tries to do. This is similar to Legislation that we had two distinguished Sponsors on the other side of the aisle, Representative Epton and I believe Representative Shapiro handled last Session. Now since my work with the Health Care Licenses Study Commission, I had some problems with this Bill last Session but since my work with the Health Care Licenses Commission I am totally in favor of this Bill because I think in the future we are going to see that we are going away from the matter of in patient health care for the ambulatory health care system whereby we treat persons as out patients. We try to prevent...ah...people from getting illnesses and so forth and I think this is a great step forward in that regard. Now one thing we've got to remember, that when we talk about local people making decisions very often they make them on a political basis and if you build hospitals they're going to try to fill the beds. Whether people are needed to be in those beds or not they've got to fill the beds. This is the reason why we're having such a rising cost in health care. We've got to try to reduce that cost. Another thing we've got to remember that when we build hospitals what we do so much of that equipment is so costly and you have hospitals competing...ah...against each other on the use of some equipment that may not be used for six months. We ought to do it on a common sense basis and this is the first step forward in doing that and I would commend this House in not only providing 89 votes but going well beyond 107 votes to make sure that we as a Legislative Body go forward in the area of health care delivery in Illinois."

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

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have been a provider of health care for more than twenty five years and wish as strongly as I can at this point to tell the people of Illinois that we are presently in this country and in the State of Illinois with a health care delivery system which is oriented



towards my fellow Doctors and not towards the patients. The orientation of that system has been towards the system itself, towards that Doctors, as I said, towards the providers in general and towards the vested interest which builds and benefits from the hospitals and the other facilities to which health care is provided. The time has come once and for all in the history of this country and it's not just Illinois, for us to recognize that the consumer of health care is where the interest should lie. We're here to represent the people of the State of Illinois who at this time are in serious danger of receiving the worst health care in the world, not as we often say the best because of the inadequacies of the planning and the structure of the system which provides the care for them. We are blessed with a system that is overladen with waste, with duplication and with overlapping facilities which lead both to unnecessarily increased costs and also to unnecessarily inadequate and low quality care. Most of us don't know that because we know the way into the system, we have the contacts and the resources to get decent care. People in general, because this system is so inadequate, suffer as a result of it. This Bill is not just a small step in the right direction, it's the step in the right direction. It sets up a basis where there can once and for all on a statewide basis be planning which will make it possible to eliminate the waste and begin to move in the direction of upgrading the quality of healthcare in the State of Illinois for all the people of Illinois. I urge everyone on this Floor to recognize that the purpose of this Bill is strongly to protect the consumer, it's to eliminate the waste which presently leads us in this country to an extraordinarily over priced health care system. It's a necessary move, the Bill is a very important step in that direction and I agree with those who are speaking out strongly in it's behalf and I urge you to vote 'aye'."

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

Hudson: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Miller: "Proceed."



Hudson: "Mike, something you said earlier seemed to indicate to me that your Bill would not effect...ah..changes in existing facilities...ah...additions or is that, was my understanding correct on that?"

Madigan: "Ray, there are criteria set out in the Bill as to what the Bill will become operative so that if a Health Care Facility proposes to expand and the total capital expenditure for that expansion is over one hundred thousand dollars or if that proposed expansion substantially changes the scope or the type of service on the functional operation of the facility for the bed capacity in a substantial manner then it will be necessary to apply for a permit before the expansion can be begun."

Hudson: "Thank you. Do you have...Mike, another question. Do you have any idea what the overall cost or a rough estimate of the cost...sh...of this would be if...if the Bill passes and the system is set up, to the taxpayer?"

Madigan: "Ray, we anticipate the Bill be no expense to the taxpayer because of the permit fees which will be charged to the applicant. I have requested the Comprehensive Health Planning Agency to develop a fiscal note which is not yet prepared, it is in the process of preparation right now."

Hudson: "One final question. Getting into the area, not of publicly owned institutions but...ah...private facilities. If for example a group of individuals thought after making the study that might be independent of any state influence, that a Health Care Facility was not needed in a given area, they were ready to back it, they had the financing and all...all of that. They would then have to appeal to this, apply to this state agency and if the state agency said, no you're wrong then they would be barred from going ahead, even though in their judgement...ah...it was needed."

Madigan: "Well Ray, there are substantial review procedures provided in the Bill. The first hearing is conducted at the B level. In other words, the local Comprehensive Health Planning Agency





will conduct public hearings. That agency will then certify it's findings to the A Agency, which is the State Comprehensive Health Planning Agency. If in the opinion of the State C.H.P. it intends to render a negative decision relative to the application, it then notifies the applicant who is then given another opportunity for a hearing before the State C.H.P. Assuming that the applicant is denied by the State C.H.P. the applicant has available the provisions of the administrative review act of the State of Illinois. In other words, he can take his appeal into the courts for a judicial review of the decisions of the administrative body."

Hudson: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question."

All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion prevails. All right, Mr. McHen...  
The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Question..."

Speaker Miller: "You may rise on a Point of Order."

Hanahan: "Question of the Sponsor. This is a 14 page Bill that effects the people of very...it's not a meaningless Bill, it's a very complicated Bill and he has an Amendment on the Bill and I'd like to know if he took out Nursing Care Homes? Did he take out Intermediate Care Homes from the provisions of this Act?"

Speaker Miller: "Well now just a minute Mr. Hanahan. You rose on a Point of Order. State your point."

Hanahan: "I rose on the point on whether there's two thirds vote in favor of closing debate on an important Bill like this."

Speaker Miller: "It takes a majority vote by 'ayes' and 'nays'."

Hanahan: "Two thirds sir."

Speaker Miller: "If you want a Roll Call..."

Hanahan: "Well if that's what you want to request. You can't judge a vote on a open and close debate I want..."

Speaker Miller: "The 'ayes' were predominant ....The 'ayes' were very



predominant Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Well it was the other way to me."

Speaker Miller; "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, to close the debate. All right, the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi is recognized on a Point of Order."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, you are taking notes on this to who wanted the Floor. Couldn't you have notified the motioner that he was out of order because you had made prior commitments as a Parliamentary decision."

Speaker Miller: "I made...The Chair makes no commitments, the Chair writes down names if he sees people that desire to be recognized."

Giorgi: "I asked for the Floor and you indicated to me that you were taking a note of my name and you were going to call on me later."

Speaker Miller: "I..."

Giorgi: "Shouldn't you have notified the motioner that his motion was out of order?"

Speaker Miller: "No sir, that's the Chair's prerogative. When somebody gets up he doesn't know all the time what the Gentleman is arising for."

Giorgi: "Couldn't you have politely told him I have a few people that requested the Floor, hold your motion? We haven't all lost our minds have we?"

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman moved and the House concurred in the Gentleman's motion. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan to close the debate."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Certain objections to the Bill raised this afternoon are identical to objections or proposals which have been suggested by the Illinois State Medical Society. For your ratification, I wish to set out for chronologically the history of this Bill since it was introduced. The Medical Society has approached me with three major requests. Number 1. They requested that the Doctors Offices be excluded from the provisions of the Bill. Lines 5 through 9 page 1 of Amendment 2, so provide. Number 2. They requested that there be notice and public hearings at the Local B



level. Pages 2 through 4 of Amendment 2 so provide. Number 3. They requested the state plan be adopted before the implementation of the Act. Amendment #3 so provides. The issue is simple. In the area of Health Care Services and Facilities, do we wish to allow the current proliferation of Health Care Facilities all throughout the State of Illinois or do we wish to provide for intelligent comprehensive planning which is in the interest of the people, the consumer and not the provider. I request a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Miller: "The question is, shall House Bill 1403 pass? All those in favor will please vote 'aye' and opposed 'nay'. Now the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan is recognized to explain his vote."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, this is a very bad Bill in many areas and I'm not speaking in behalf of or for the Medical Society. I'm speaking of that if this Bill becomes law, it's a bureaucracy. You're creating another agency to check on other people. If the State of Illinois wanted to put on an addition on a Mental Institution they'd have to get a permit from another governmental agency to put that addition on and that's what this Bill calls for. Section 15 specifically permits only this agency to allow a construction in Home Rule cities and I think your judgement on Home Rule issue is in error and you should resent it and I hope it's descended upon. This Bill not only pertains to Hospital Care it pertains to Intermediate care, it pertains to Mental Health Care, it pertains to Nursing care. If the Union Health Service, which is owned and operated by my union, wanted to put a Health Care Facility up on it's land in the Medical Center Commission such as a Nursing Care Home that we would not only have to get permission from the City of Chicago for a building permit but then we go before some other bureaucracy to ask them permission. All I think this Bill does is keep the big fat cats big and fat and keeps down those of us who want to provide good, comprehensive Health Care that aren't as big as some as the major hospitals of this state and want to provide some good health care being provided with a Bill to prohibit this. This



is a bad Bill. It should have been debated a lot more thoroughly and because some Commission recommended it does not put any imprimatur on by the Pope. The Bill is still bad, no matter how much it's not going to prohibit any bad construction in the field. All it's going to do is put another level of agency of bureaucracy in between the citizens and the big fat cat hospitals."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "There are a few other reasons why this General Assembly should take a good hard look at this Bill and I'm one of the Co-sponsors of it and that is when we talk about the welfare recipients the guy that's running away with the swag, everyone says they want work, they want to go on relief they want to milk the taxpayer out of our biggest three hundred million dollar budget almost seven hundred million finds it's hands... finds it's way into the pockets of the Doctors, the Dentists, the Pharmacist, the Nursing Care Centers, the Hospitals. So this is that we've got a real stake at this Bill. We should watch as to what's happening in hospital development. I'm supporting this Bill and realize that half a year, twelve for a dollars, half is going to the pockets of the Medicare care people."

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

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen I only take the moment to tell you that I had this Bill in the last Session. It was a good Bill then. House Bill 2653. Representative Madigan profited by mistakes, by my mistakes and this is a much better Bill now and I encourage those who have failed to vote green to add your name to an already illustrious Roll Call."

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

Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Bill. I see we have the votes. I don't want to take much time but the one place we're all going to go is to the hospital and I speak with first hand information along with many others. For God sake, let's get it organized. It's just about time. I thank you for your green votes."



Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Thank you. It's interesting that everybody that just talked in support of this Bill is from a large metropolitan area. But, if this Bill passes and becomes law it's the end of any improvements in Health Care Facilities for small rural areas. This is very reactionary approach and if somebody wants to come in and provide better care for people to hospital in a small area, in a rural area, why in the world would anybody be...want to stand in the way and if you...if you expect some bureacuracy up here in Springfield to say that yes we recognize that the facilities are inadequate in the small counties and yes we recognize that they need better health care and say yes you can come in and build a hospital and provide that then you're just imagining things. Because what's going to happen is that they're going to say. Well you got a hospital down there and the county is thirty five thousand you don't need anymore hospitals. But they don't realize that the fact that we've got a hospital doesn't insure that we have any good medical care and this could provide private enterprise coming in and filling the need to provide the kind of medical care that we're entitled to in the small counties in small areas and rural areas just as much as those of you who already have them because of your high populated areas and it's rationed at that brain. So this... this Bill, if passed is going to be the end of any possible health care imporvements in rural areas and I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Juckett: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. This Bill assumes that all of the rising costs of medical care are due to the construction of facilities and of course that's a very invalid assumption. The rise in cost of medical services came about when the Federal Government got into the medical practice and of course we have prime examples of government inefficiency and all you have to do is look at transportation systems look at you Post Office system and that's where Government



is controlled and now we're handing over the control of the construction and the basically the operation of all medical practice to the government. I live in an area where we have a lot of airplanes. O'Hare Field. I assume that probably if this Board had been in effect only Lutheran Generals. correct me, only Ressurrection Hospital would be able to be there. Lutheran General and Holy Family and Northwest Suburban wouldn't be there and Gentlemen and Ladies, what would happen if we have a disaster at O'Hare Field? Ressurrection couldn't handle it. But then we would be doing it before the almighty dollar and saying we did it for economy. It's like having a fire department and not wanting to pay for it because it's expensive. But what happens when a disaster strikes and the whole trouble is we're relying on Government to tell us what is right and wrong and Government is in no position to tell us what is right or wrong. We've had several tornados come through this state this last week. Of course the board couldn't plan a tornado could it? It just would help to protect those that were already in existence. This is one of the worst pieces of Legislation to come through and I just hope that you aren't in need of hospitalization because they're going to say, I'm sorry, we don't have the room and we can't take care of you. You might go to Blue Cross and Blue Shield and some of these others and say let it be taken on an outpatient care basis we don't need to be hospitalized to have it cared for and you'd probably knock down half of the cost. This is a wrong way to do it. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners to explain his vote."

Kempiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll try to make this brief.

I asked a question of the Sponsor earlier and if he had answered in the affirmative I would have been pleased to stand up and vote for this Bill and to explain a good reason why it should pass. I am in favor of what he is trying to do because I think good planning will cut down the cost of hospital care. However, at



the same time, when the Bill addresses itself to local comprehensive Health Planning Agencies which are staffed on a voluntary basis or not staffed but at least manned on a voluntary basis by sincere dedicated individuals and then cuts the ground from underneath these people and says, well you can have input but we're not going to let make...let you make any decisions, I really worry what's going to happen to the effectiveness of these people and whether they're going to continue their interests in good health care planning at the local level. Because of the contradictions that I have voiced, I would like to be recorded as voting 'present' on this Bill."

Speaker Miller: "Vote the Gentleman 'present'. The Gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone."

Stone: "Parliamentary Inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Someone said this morning that we had well over a hundred Bills to pass each day if we were to get out of here by Sunday. We're on our about twenty second Bill today, that...that board up there has been well over 107 votes for about twelve minutes and I would...My Point of Inquiry is just this, if you explain your vote after a Bill has quite obviously passed, does it count more than if you don't explain your vote?"

Speaker Miller: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 123 'ayes', 30 'nays' and 3 'present' and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1430. Skinner. Deuster. A Bill for an Act to amend the Toll Highway Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This will be very fast. Representative Skinner has an Amendment he'd like to offer. This is agreeable to me and I think improves the Bill and I would ask that the Bill be taken back for such purpose of an Amendment..."

Speaker Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none. House Bill 1430 shall be brought to the Order of Second Reading. Will the Clerk



please read the Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Skinner. Amends..."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #1 requires Environmental Impact Statement accompany the bid for the Fox Valley Expressway and I move the adoption of it."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman has offered the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1430. All in favor of the adoption say 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading. 1430 has been read a Third time, the Gentleman wish to have it read. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have the Bill taken out of the record because there is a companion Bill involving a small appropriation. I'd like to have that considered first so we can take these two Bills up at the same time for maximum efficiency and I ask it to be taken out of the record or kept on Third Reading."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 842. Calvo. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Cannibas Control Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman's not on the Floor. Take it out of the record."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 843. Calvo...House Bill 877. 877. Mann A Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Did you say Mann? Is the Gentleman on the Floor? Take it out of the record. Is Representative Mann on the Floor? He wants it out of the record."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1029. Rayson. A Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson. Is he on the Floor? Take it out of the record."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1206. Choate. A Bill for an Act to amend the Workman's Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."





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

Barry: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. May we consider 1206 and 1207 together on that?"

Speaker Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none would the Clerk please read House Bill 1207."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1207. A Bill for an Act to amend the Workman's Occupational Disease Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Barry: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a rather comprehensive pair of Bills that the improvement rather annual or biannual improvement as it stemmed in recent years over the Workmen's Compensation Act and the Occupational Diseases Act and I might tell you that the history of these Bills was that the employers, the insurance companies generally and the laboring forces in Illinois tried to determine by an agreed Bill process what these improvements should be from time to time. I'm going to try not to take a lot of time of the House but I think that you ought to...ah...ah...view these Bills in the light of a man who works in the factory for an average weekly wage of perhaps a hundred and sixty, seventy dollars a week at the same time, if you will, try to view these Bills, what I'm about to say and why a guy like you or like me that perhaps makes three four or five hundred dollars a week and remember that what I'm about to say applies to you and reduces your income if you were hurt working for your employer or your corporation if you're a...ah...a practicing attorney in a corporation or whatever. So we're talking about a broad span of earned incomes for everybody concerned. I think I can summarize...ah...one area of the improvements and incidentally there are Bills that are somewhat diametrically opposed to these over in the Senate that we'll be toying with in due course and hopefully these Bills will go over there and ultimately I suppose it will wind up in Conference Committee. Now with that for background, let me suggest that...ah...the increases that we suggest by these two Bills for both Workmen's Comp. and Occupational Diseases are now going to be based, we suggest by



Bills on the State's average manufacturing weekly wage and that is...has been determined to be a gross of about a hundred and eighty two dollars and fifty cents. Last year it was about a hundred and sixty eight dollars, next year we anticipate it to be up to a hundred and eighty five dollars. So for the purpose of these Bills we've rounded off that average manufacturing weekly wage to a hundred and eighty two dollars and fifty cents. Now, the increased amounts of this. In the first period through June 30th of 1960, pardon me, 75, we've retained that rate as a balance and the amount paid for temporary total injury...ah... while a man is off by these Bills after he has been off at least three days...ah...will be two thirds of that wage. That two thirds over the period of the next eight years will be increased to a point where it will be about two hundred per cent of the average factory wage, whatever that will be eight years from now. So there'll be no reason to come back to the Legislature if we pass these Bills year after year after year making increases because the increases, if any, will be built into the law. By these Bills there is some small increase in death benefits and it follows the National Commission recommendations. Incidentally the National people have suggested to us in effect that if we don't do something about our inadequacies in Workmen's Comp. and Occupational Diseases Act in Illinois they will take over for us probably in two or four years. Another area in which there is change here is with regard permanent total disability and death changes. Ah...You can imagine that anyone who was permanently injured ten or fifteen years ago by our law is woefully underpaid to exist today so therefore these Bills suggest that there shall be...ah...a primary fund that is directly paid by the company responsible and then a second injury fund that is created by these improvements that allows for supplemental payment in future years if the amounts paid to the injured or the family of a deceased employee is not sufficient to exist. I might tell you that the minimum rate suggested are somewhat, somewhat under what we pay Public Aid



recipients even by these Bills that we tried not to be too ambitious. Another area where there is a change and I think a significant change, many states pay for a man as a whole when he is unable to recede with any kind of employment for which he was educated or uneducated as the case may be. This Act finally recognizes this improvement, man as a whole as opposed as to what we've been living with for many years. Another...ah...area that these Bills cover is to suggest that an occupational disease along with the recommendations of the National Committee on Occupational Disease is any disease that may be incurred because of employment. Ah...The last item that I think is of some significance is the fact that any abuses...ah...that have been prompted by the inadequacies of our laws, these laws in the past are now going to be avoided because the little, the goodies tossed in suggesting that a company is harassing that perhaps they ought to pay the attorneys fee for correcting that harassment. Nothing that is unreasonable let me assure you, I'll go into detail if you please. If there are any questions I'd be pleased to try to respond."

Speaker Telcser: Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1206 and 1207 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. The Clerk will take two Roll Calls. Ebbesen 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Merlo 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On these question s there are 100 'ayes'. Representative Skinner for what purpose do you rise?"

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, being totally confused may I vote 'present'."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'present'. Simms 'no'. Representative Dunn, for what purpose do you rise?"

Dunn: "I believe I'm recorded as 'aye'. I'd like to be recorded as 'present'."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'present'. Campbell 'no'. McMaster 'present'. Hart. Representative Hart for what purpose do you rise sir?"

Hart: "Ah...I was recorded as 'aye'. I meant to pull my switch 'no'. Would you please change it to 'no' please."



Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Brandt 'aye'.

On these questions there are 98 'ayes', 23 'nays'. Bluthardt 'present'. McCourt 'no' and these Bills, having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1258. Kent. A Bill for and Act to amend an Act relating to investments in Federal Savings and Loan Associations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Lady from Adams, Representative Kent."

Kent: "House Bill 1258 is one that will correct the Constitution to read 'individual' so that the married woman is left out and is considered an individual. It changes the law in no way. It just changes the wording to 'individual'."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1258 pass? 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 136 'aye', Merlo 'aye'. 2 'nay'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Gibbs and McAuliffe 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1272. R. A. Walsh. A Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Richard Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1272 does just as the Digest describes. It would provide that for anyone domicile in the State of Illinois to execute a will outside the state that such a will must be executed in accordance with the law of Illinois. Now for example...ah...the Lawyers in the House and maybe most of the other Members know that a hand written will without witnesses it not admissable to probate in the State of Illinois. Under the present law if an Illinois resident, a person domicile in Illinois would execute such a will in Kentucky while visiting there that will would be admissable in Illinois. Now I'm just conforming the law for...ah...wills execute outside of the state for the law of wills inside the state. Ah...I think this is a good Bill and I would urge your support."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."



Pierce: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, I'm rising in oppose...in opposition to this Bill. The laws always been that will is valid under the law of the jurisdiction where executed and the place where executed is valid. If someone lives in Maryland and draws up a valid will according to the laws of that state, that may only take one signature of a witness or whatever their law may be and moves to Illinois and dies five years later his will should be recognized by the Illinois courts even though he dies a resident of Illinois. Because he...our...our assumption should always be to carry out the intention of a testator and if he draws up a will, valid where executed that's in no way against the public policy of our state it shouldn't be thrown out because the procedure of that state or the number of witnesses or the type of testation clause is different than it is in our state. This has always been the rule that the will is valid if valid where executed. Under the laws of the nation we'll recognize a will drawn up in Italy, a will drawn up in England, a will drawn up in Australia if it's valid under the laws of that country when it's drawn up and the same goes for wills in Arizona and elsewhere. The purpose of this Bill is to make people who move to Illinois go to Illinois Lawyers and have their wills drawn up to produce more business for Illinois Lawyers and I'm for that because I'm an Illinois Lawyer and I do some will work as well as chasing ambulances but... let me, let me say this. Many people won't know they need a new will. They'll move to Illinois, they'll rely on the will that was good in Indiana or the will that was good in England when they drew it up or in Ireland or in Massachusetts and they'll come to Illinois and the will will not be valid under Illinois law. That's why we've always had the rule that the will will be recognized if it was valid when executed in the state or place where executed and this completely changes that. It may produce a business for Illinois Lawyers but it's going to cause many deceased people to have what they want done with their estate destroyed and have their state go by the laws of intestacy as if they have no will and therefore I oppose this Bill."



Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Hyde."

Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. My regards for the Chief Sponsor of this Bill is in inverse ratio to my regard for this Bill. Ah...This Bill...ah...would frustrate the desires of a testator who writes a will in Missouri...ah...or some other state and then his assets are in Illinois, he moves to Illinois and lo and behold the will doesn't comply with the Illinois regulations and statutes on execution and it is invalid. Now what happens when a...a will is declared invalid is the law writes a will for the testator and it's called a statute of dissent and distribution...ah...and it is generally quite different from what the deceased would have wished the disposition of his property to follow and so we ought to be striving to find ways to admit wills to probate which after all are the solemn expressions of the person who owns the property and acquired it during his lifetime as to how and to whom he wishes disposition of his assets to be made. Ah... I know that the distinguished Sponsor of this Bill has a unique situation which seems to him to be unjust but we Legislate for all of the people and I think we should be searching for ways to validate wills rather than to invalidate them and to impose on the distribution scheme the artificial and often times contrary to the wishes of the deceased a statute of dissent and distribution and so I agree with the distinguished from Lake, I think this Bill ought to be defeated but again I reiterate my high regard for the Chief Sponsor."

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

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill was thoroughly discussed in Judiciary I and it did not get a unanimous vote because it has one saving clause if you want to use the term but the Sponsor of the Bill does state to us. That is only those who are domiciled in Illinois who go out of state to more or less evade the laws of the State of Illinois. However, I've had the question myself, when do we mean domicile. The fact that you have to show intent. The testator at the time that the



will is to be probated is no longer around so we do not know what his intent of domicile may be and we raise more questions at that time as what we mean by domicile than we do as in solving to have the will knocked out. I feel that I had a similar situation myself in my practice just recently. Fortunately, there was an older will that had complied with the laws of the State of Illinois. This woman had gone to Michigan and prepared a whole graphic will and was trying to bring it back. There was a question whether she was domiciled in Michigan or not and this Bill will make it more confusing. I therefore will have to vote 'present' on this Bill and I would also ask those to feel likewise because it can open a bigger kettle of fish than it's trying to solve."

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

Lechowicz: "Move the previous question Mr. Speaker."

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

All in favor signify by voting saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'.

The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Richard Walsh to close."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is, it has been phrased a Lawyers Bill and I guess it's difficult to pass a Lawyers Bill without first getting the imprimatur of the Chicago Bar Association and the Illinois Bar Association. I'm a little disappointed with both organizations because they apparently oppose the Bill yet neither saw fit to appear to testify in Committee yet they had a full month to do so between the time the Bill was introduced and the time it was acted upon in Committee. As a matter of fact it was about six weeks. Ah... I would like to make reference to the two Gentlemen who spoke against this Bill. I think they misunderstand it. The Gentleman who lives in Maryland who executes a will in Maryland and moves to Illinois executes the will in accordance with the law in the state of his domicile at the time. Namely the State of Maryland. That will would be admitted to probate in Illinois. There wouldn't be any problem. The same thing with the Gentleman to whom



Representative Hyde referred, the Gentleman who lives in Missouri who happens to own property in Illinois, that will would be admitted to probate in Illinois. We're only talking about Illinois domicile people, that is people who are domicile in Illinois. We in the Legislature have decreed that such wills be executed in accordance with Illinois law. That there be two witnesses to that will. Now that's for the protection of Illinois Citizens. It seems to me that we shouldn't have a loophole in that public policy it's for the protection of legacies under a will that is properly executed or for the heirs of that person in order to prevent fraud, in order to insure the wills are executed without duress or undue influence and also that the mental capacity of the person executing the will is present. Now the Illinois Bar Association has said, this Bill is contrary to the general rule that an instrument valid where executed is valid anywhere. That is not the law insofar as the execution of wills is concerned and this Bill of mine, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I say, is merely to clarify what I consider to be an ambiguity. The law as to the execution of wills is the law of the domicile of the person and...and not where it is executed and so held in...in the State of Ohio and the State of Massachusetts. I apologize to the Bar Associations for not submitting the Bill to them first. I thought that it would be their obligation to come to our Committees and express themselves. I believe it's a good Bill, I urge your support."

Speaker Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 1272 pass? Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Jim Houlihan 'no'. On this question there are 19 'ayes', 65 'nays' and this Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1538. Matijevich. A Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."





Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1538 has been introduced to alleviate the situation wherein delinquent taxpayer's have had to pay excessive penalties and interest to redeem their own property. It provides that either registered or certified notice be sent to delinquent property owners before the tax fails and the Bill as amended insures that the cost of such mailing shall attach as a lien against the real property so that none of the cost is born by the taxpayer. It passed out of Committee unanimously. I would solicit your favorable support in behalf of House Bill 1538."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1538 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 125 'ayes', no 'nays' and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1658. Barry. A Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Barry."

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

Barry: "May I hear 1659 with it?"

Speaker Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none will the Clerk please read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1659. A Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Occupational Disease Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Barry: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a much softer version of what you voted favorably for a few minutes ago. This being an Amendment to Workmen's Comp. Act and 59 being an Amendment to the Occupational Diseases Act suggesting that the Statute of Limitations should be extended from one year to two years and impartial hearings should be added to the Act. Nothing else."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1658 and 59 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish?"



Take the record. On these questions there are 100 and....

Washington 'aye'. 131 'ayes', 1 'nay' and these Bills, having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 890. Duff. A Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Duff: "Ah...Ladies and Gentlemen of the House...ah...I'd like permission to bring this Bill back to Second Reading for the purposes of Amendment. As some of you know the Bill has had some public note in controversy and we've been able to work it out."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any objection? Hearing none House Bill 890 is put on the order of Second Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Duff."

Duff: "Ah...Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like leave to Table Amendments 3 and 4 for purposes of allowing Representative Getty to offer Amendment #5."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved to Table Amendments 3 and 4 to House Bill 890. All in favor of the Gentleman's Motion, signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The Amendments are Tabled. Will the Clerk please read Amendment #5."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5. Getty. Amends House Bill 890 ..."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The effect of the Amendment is to provide the State's Attorney of any County with an option to precede either by information or by indictment as he may now. Previously in form as it was constituted the State's Attorney would have been prohibited from proceeding by indictment except under very restricted circumstances. My... Amendment is supported by the State's Attorney's Association and the State's Attorney of Cook County and I certainly do move for it's adoption."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment #5 to House Bill 890. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', the opposed



'no'. The Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments?  
Third Reading. Now, Representative Duff, the Bill is on Third  
Reading, it has been read a Third time. Do you wish to act on  
it now sir?"

Duff: "Could we hold it one moment now while we get the file ready.  
I was off the Floor when the Bill was called."

Speaker Telcser: "All right. We'll pick up one Bill Representative Duff  
then go back to yours. Okay?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 816. Blair. Out of the record. House  
Bill 855. Stone. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Junior  
College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Stone: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen this Legislation only  
provides technical corrections to the Public Junior College Act  
that are necessary for the administration of the Legislation. I  
move it's adoption."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall  
House Bill 855 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 114 'ayes', 2 'nays'. Shea  
and Lemke 'aye'. This Bill having recieved the Constitutional  
Majority is hereby declared passed. Now we'll go back to House  
Bill 890. It has been read a Third time. The Gentleman from Cook,  
Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 890  
now is in effect Amendment #5 which was just offered and adopted  
by Representative Getty. Ah...I'm frankly pleased that Representative  
Getty and some of the others have worked to take a subject that is  
undoubtedly difficult and a Bill which perhaps initially bit off  
more than it could chew and work it into a now a Bill which I  
know of no opposition. Essentially this Bill will save the counties  
money. It will improve the legal process. It will allow the  
State's Attorney's to have an option as to whether to proceed  
by grand jury or by information...ah... There are many challenges  
it has been commented earlier by Representative Matijevich, or



yesterday on the whole subject of whether the grand jury is a totally pertinent device in our Justice system today. This Bill represents a consensus in general. There could be some particulars that could be explained and I will be glad to answer questions but this Bill in general now answers a consensus of what may be done at this time to improve a system that needs improvement and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fleck."

Fleck: "Will the Sponsor yield for a few questions?"

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Fleck did you seek recognition?"

Fleck: "A few questions. Will the Sponsor yield for a few questions?"

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates he will, yes."

Fleck: "Brian, I remember this Bill in it's original form provided for a person called before a grand jury to have the right of a cross examination and council. Now I...Is it my understanding that this is out of the Bill now?"

Duff: "That's correct."

Fleck: "Ah...Now in what way does the grand jury proceedings differ under this Bill than they presently are? I haven't read the Amendment and I..."

Duff: "Well it allows the prosecution to proceed on information or indictment at his option instead of requiring a grand jury indictment in all felonies where it's not weighed. The prosecution may now proceed on the information...ah...Simply a State's Attorney statement of the charges unless there's a preliminary hearing at which probable cause is actually found. What we're saying is that we're giving...ah...an option to the State's Attorney's Office which will probably result as in the case in California in a reduction of the use of grand jury by some seventy per cent."

Fleck: "Did the Amendment knock out the requirement for a preliminary hearing, for prosecution pursued by information?"

Duff: "No."

Fleck: "I have no further questions."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Sangmeister."

Sangmeister: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. When this Bill was first introduced it looked like it would be one of the most



controversial before this House. Representative Getty's Amendment now puts this in good shape, as he stated, it is now supported by the State's Attorney's Association and what it really does now is give the option of either going by grand jury or information and the other one item, as I recall it does, is it now mandates that there be a transcript of the grand jury proceeding which will be available to the defendant at a later date. I support this Bill and urge others to do likewise."

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

Houlihan: "I have a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates he'll yield."

Houlihan: "You say that the, what the Bill will do will be to allow prosecution of a felony by either information or indictment and I don't know that you've made it clear that presently the State's Attorney has the right to bring a felony prosecution by an information now but only in the situation where the defendant weighs the right to have his case presented to a grand jury. Isn't that correct?"

Duff: "The Defendant has to waive grand jury proceedings now."

Houlihan: "So that right now a prosecution for a felony can be brought by information but only in the instance that it, that the defendant waives that right to have his case presented to a grand jury."

Duff: "That's right."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion?"

Duff: "This does however require a preliminary hearing at which probable cause is found before the information is..."

Speaker Telcser: "Have you concluded sir? Okay is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Simms."

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

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Simms: "Representative Duff, as the Bill is amended now, does this Legislation have the support of the State's Attorney's Association?"

Duff: "Well yes it does. It has, as indicated by Representative Getty."



Duff: "Actually there was a great deal of conversation as to about how far one should or could go at this time with moderating or modifying the grand jury system and frankly Representative Getty has done a fine job. I might also add that Representative Telcser got involved as a mediator here and we are all now completely satisfied that we are taking a step forward to improve a system that needs it."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To remove any doubts this Bill as it presently stands before you has the endorsement of the State's Attorney's Association and the State's Attorney of Cook County. Basically what it does is it provides the State's Attorney with a straight option to either proceed by way of having a preliminary hearing and then proceed by information or to proceed by the indictment process. It does not require that he go through a preliminary hearing and then the usual rubber stamp of having an indictment and then proceed to trial. I want to point out that this will save quite a bit of money and it will save quite a bit of time. This is a very positive step towards a speedy trial. I think this is something that we all are interested in that we have speedy and just form of justice and I certainly do solicit the support of both sides of the aisle for this Bill as it presently is constituted. There is one other very important safeguard which is incorporated into this Amendment. That is that each transcript of the testimony of witnesses must be supplied when prosecution is by way of indictment. This is a very forward step, now you have it if there's a preliminary hearing but not mandated if there is an indictment."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr....Mr. Getty does this take away any rights of a defendant in...ah...before the state...before the court?"

Getty: "No it doesn't take any rights of the defendant before the court. He still has the right to a preliminary hearing. Ah... if the defendant is going to be prosecuted by way of information."



If there...the proceedings are by indictment the law is now, today..."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Fleck....One moment. Representative Fleck, for what purpose do you rise sir?"

Fleck: "Well Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know who's Bill this is? Representative Duff's or Representative Getty's?"

Speaker Telcser: "It's Representative Duff's Bill."

Fleck: "The questions should be directed towards the Sponsor, not someone who's speaking in behalf of the Bill."

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

Duff: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As in true...as would be true in any piece of Legislation which might be progressive or which might take a forward step, it is inevitably necessary to talk to all the parties of interest. In this instance we are trying to take a step to improve a system which has become somewhat archaic. There are differences of opinion as to what specific steps might be taken. Initially this Bill was not in the shape which was acceptable and the only oppositon that came to it was from the State's Attorney. However, they have a daily constant interest in the subject and consequently we have worked very closely with them in order to try to be sure that we affect a constructive a step as we can. The grand jury is not today totally a protective device despite it's public image. It does not and can not protect the defendant most of the time and sometimes it's subject to great abuse. In this instance we have found a consensus around the area which will lead to speedy trials, we have found a consensus in the area which was originally proposed in the Bill to allow the prosecutor initially to mandate...ah...the use of the information. We are now using an option, we have not, we have maintained as originally intended to seek a grand jury that will be someday, I believe, further steps which will be made in improving the grand jury system. As of this point we have



consensus and I would appreciate your favorable vote on it."

Speaker Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 890 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fleck to explain his vote."

Fleck: "Well Mr. Speaker, I'm going to vote for this Bill but I'm going to say something and I think every Member on this Floor and in the Senate should say. This Bill has made a tremendous metamorphose from the way it was originally introduced which provided, I think, very, very decent safeguards to a person who's called before a grand jury. As every Member of this body knows and most the newspaper people know, a person who is called before a grand jury isn't necessarily guilty of anything and an indictment doesn't necessarily mean they're guilty of anything. In England, which invented the grand jury had the brains and intelligence to abolish it but I see a very, very bad direction with the grand jury system in this country. It appears that grand jury's are used more now days for political vendetta than they are to curve the more serious crimes such as drug and syndicated crimes. The grand jury's are suppose to be secret but unfortunately time and time again we find leaks to the crest where so called secret testimony is suppose to be, which is suppose to be secret is on the front page of newspapers. I think that if we're going to have this Bill dealing with the grand jury we should permit safeguards for people who are called before grand jury's to have their rights protected as they should be protected under the fifth Amendment or any other Amendment. Especially the due process part. Too many times innocent people lives have been victimized and destroyed by an indictment and then later finding them not guilty because of the malicious abuse of the grand jury proceedings and I wish that we would take directions in reforming grand jury's and not changing a motion and watering down Bills which would have had those initial protections."

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

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





Marijevich: "Mr. Speaker only in explaining that my vote doesn't at all reduce my feeling that the grand jury system Bills should be investigated as many of you agreed with me on my Bill yesterday I would hope that if this Bill does become law that that doesn't reduce the necessary and necessity for ...ah... investigating the whole system."

Speaker Telcser: "On this question there are 139 'ayes', 2 'nays' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 856. Stone. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Junior College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen this Bill was asked for by the Illinois Junior College Board. The purpose of the Amendment is to allow the Junior College District to establish variable tuition rates so that your tuition could depend upon the courses you take and you're taking and the cost of those courses on to the district."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 856 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Palmer 'aye'. Take the record. The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain, for what purpose do you rise sir?"

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, I was going to explain my vote. Real quickly if I may I believe this Bill is not tight enough. It subjects local boards to latent abuse...abusing of their rights and I just can't support this piece of Legislation."

Speaker Telcser: "On this question there are 117 'aye', 5 'nays' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 899. Mann. A Bill for an Act concerning pay toilets in public places, accommodations of amusement. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Mann: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is really a



Bill for the relief of the little guy and I'd also like to say to you that it is a gut issue. Now having disposed of the frivolity I would like to speak seriously to the need for this Bill. I see that our leader has a sign that says 'Let's wipe out pay toilets'. But seriously Mr. Speaker and Members of the House to the disabled person, to the pregnant woman, to the aged person, to the infirm individual to any of us who are struck by a sudden urge that do not have the necessary tokens with us the imposition on people is terrible, it can be medically burdensome. I would ask that you would support this Bill Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think you'll find that your constituents will behind, will be behind you all the way, once more, no pun intended. But really...ah...the City of Chicago has passed an ordinance banning pay toilets. I put a Committee Amendment on saying that no more than fifty per cent of any place of open accommodations could contain pay toilets so I have made something of a compromise. Now there are many arguments which are advanced against this kind of Bill. Ah...First it is said that the pay toilets are cleaner and yet you and I know from experience...ah...that pay toilets can be just as dirty as free toilets. As a matter of fact when Judge Epstein held this Bill to be Constitutional in the cross examination of the Greyhound Corporation who was complaining about the dirty condition of their toilets it was brought out that these were pay toilets. Now another argument that is made against the Bill is that it invites burglars and it invites...ah...people to burglarize the facility. Well if someone is bent upon doing that a dime is not going to deter them. So what I would say to you Ladies and Gentlemen is that here we have a Bill which makes good common sense. In places of public accommodations at least...no more than fifty per cent of these places should the toi...pay toilets exist and I would ask for your support on this Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Madison Representative....the Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

Choate: "One question of the Sponsor. Bob, if this Bill is passed and



enacted into law will it be know as the 'Wall Bank Act'?"

Mann: "Wall Mann Act."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Calvo."

Calvo: "Well as usual Choate kind of stole my thunderbut I just wondered if this was the Eddie Wall Bank Bill or if we've got the new Bob Mann or if it's the Bob Eddie Wall Bank Mann?"

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 899 pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Hill 'aye'. On this question there are 104 'ayes' 20 'nays' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Cox 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 917. Beaupre. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill put in by the Junior Colleges for the purpose of allowing them to contract with local school districts for tuition rates. Under the present law by opinion of the Attorney General's Office it is required, the current law requires any high school student who is matriculating at their institution...a...the total tuition per capita rate, regardless of how many hours they take. For that reason the Junior College have asked that this Bill be passed so that they can make a more equitable arrangement for the students. I would ask your favorable support."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Ah...Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates he will."

McClain: "Ah...Jack, just one question. Ah...This contractual agreement does the high schools, do they have to pay the full price or is this just a half price or what's the contractual agreement?"

Beaupre: "Under the current law, if a high school student is taking but two hours of vocational training at a local junior college the local school district is billed for the entire per capita cost of educating a student. In other words as though they were taking



a full load. This will allow the Junior Colleges to make an agreement on a prorated basis as for tuition."

Speaker Telcser: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 917 pass? Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Hirschfeld, to explain his vote."

Hirschfeld: "Mr. Speaker, a Point of Information. I wonder if we might have the House Electrician check Representative Walter's and Kennedy's light. They always seem to go red on the Public Junior College Bills."

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

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

Kennedy: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. That's the chance I've been waiting for since December the 8th, 1972. Will I be allowed to answer the Gentleman?"

Speaker Telcser: "I think you should have that right sir. Will the Members please be in their seats and let's listen to Representative Kennedy."

Kennedy: "I, it's kind of hard to control my emotions lately. I hope that I do not offend anyone but...ah...around the first of December of last year a number of students from North DeKalb Junior College contacted Representative Walters and I about some trouble they were having out there and we responded to their complaints and had a meeting in Representative Walter's Office. It was brought to our attention that several people had been dismissed out there. Now the next statement I'm going to make... obviously by my name, Kennedy, that I'm a Catholic. There was a nun dismissed from that school and I feel like she was dismissed because she was a Catholic. That's just my opinion, I'm not sure that it's Bob Walter's opinion or not. But Bob Walter's and I, Representative Walter's, he's a very honorable gentleman, he's the father of nine children and the only thing I can find wrong with him is that he's a Republican but he's a good Republican. He and I went out to see the President of this Junior College, a Doctor Burkheimer and present at that meeting was Representative



Walters and myself and Doctor Burkheimer and a man by the name of Ware a black man. He's recently been appointed the President of the Junior College of East St. Louis. He conducted himself like a Gentleman but I want you to listen to this next statement. Doctor Burkheimer was a little irritated at Bob Walters and I and he doesn't know me too well, he evidently know Bob better. He threatened Bob with political oblivion he said that, told him that, 'I'll never support you again Representative Walter's, I supported you before I went to a party you had but I'll never do that again.'. Now that brings us up to December the 11th. There was a huge ice storm through out the Southern part of the state and the board had a meeting that night and everybody went to it, a great number of people went to it, students and faculty members and interested citizens and the press was there. I'm not too sure the press covered it like they should have but then they're entitled to a few mistakes in their life but the President of the Junior College Board a Mr. Hanks, Doctor Hanks, I believe, or Mr. Hanks, I think he's an honorable man but he was very disrespectful to Representative Walters more so to me I believe but I can take those things, I've taken them for all my political life, a politician gets in trouble sometimes and he doesn't always rational but that's the reason why a jilty red light, my red light against any Junior College Bill and I would hope that Bob Walters continues to vote red because I feel like that Sister Virginia was dismissed of rolls at this Junior College, it was in my district, because she was a nun. Now mind you she's not without fault, she's a pretty hard nosed nun but I'm sure in my own mind that's why she got fired. Bob Walters was threatened of political oblivion because he and I had the audacity to challenge the Boards decison, Doctor Burkheimer's decision. They were angered at us because we attended the meetings, we attended several subsequent meetings not because we were citizens, because we were Legislators. I think the Attorney General's Office contacted me on this matter and they didn't care to get involved and the people involved were told to go before the S.E.C.C. and they



didn't care to go to the S.E.C.C. and I think they would have generally disagreed with what Bob and I had on it he didn't feel like maybe they should either but I just wanted to answer the Honorable John Hirschfeld's question. I think maybe that he was acting sassy but that's why Representative Walters and Representative Kennedy have been voting red on Junior Colleges and that's why we'll continue to vote red."

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

On this question there are 138 'ayes', 7 'nays' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 921. Arrigo. An Act authorizing and furnishing secretarial services to the Members of the Governing Board of State supported Institutions of Higher Learning.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Arrigo."

Arrigo: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and to you Mr. Kennedy. I hope that I'm, since I'm going to mention the Illinois Junior College board you will not hold that against me and vote 'no' on this Bill. This is a very simple Bill that authorizes any governing board, the Board of Higher Education, the Illinois Junior College Board, the University of Illinois Trustees, Southern Illinois University Trustees, the Board of Regents and the Board of Governor's to furnish each Board member with secretarial services or a private secretary to be paid from the regular appropriations to the board. This is permissive Legislation which would allow the governing board to provide secretarial services to the members if they wish to do so. Since governing board members serve without compensation, secretarial work, secretarial work that their position requires could become burdensome. This Bill would allow the Boards to hire secretaries for each member or for groups of members if they felt that the work load required it and the requirement that payment be made from the regular appropriations to the board should act as a control as the boards would be required



to find the money within their already pinched appropriations.

This is a good Bill and I urge it's passage."

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

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Sponsor a question?"

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates he'll yield."

McCourt: "Ah...Is it now prohibited that the various governing boards can not render members this service?"

Arrigo: "I don't know who's asking the question."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative McCourt, all the way in the back on the other side."

Arrigo: "No, it's not prohibited but somehow or other it has never been done. The board members must request this and this Bill was put in at the behalf of several of the board members at the University of Illinois Trustees because the secretarial services that they have to pay to their own girl has become somewhat burdensome and I think if we passed it into law they would not hesitate to take advantage of it."

McCourt: "I'm sure of that. In other words, this Bill as I see it is just one more increase in the already over burden...ah...expenses that we seem to be proliferating here."

Arrigo: "No, if you have listened to me. This must come out of the budget and the appropriations as they are now. That in itself will act as a control. As you know the trustees and board members are not paid for their services."

McCourt: "Well I'm...I'm now down here Mr. Representative but I thought educational money was to be used for education for the kids and not to be used for secretaries for board members and I hope that this Bill is defeated."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As a member of the Higher Education Committee and one who voted against this Bill, I'd like to just briefly explain my opposition to it. Ah...First of all the...the board members can now obtain the necessary secretarial service and be reimbursed by the, by the



for any expenditure they make. This Bill would provide and I think we can all understand that if we do enact it into law that the governing board would so do that is provide for a private secretary for board members. Now, even the witness at the Committee did not state that he needed a private secretary. He indicated that a...ah...I think up to...ah...maybe twenty five per cent of his personal secretary time was devoted to board activity. As a matter of fact I think he said it was more like fifteen per cent. But at any rate, the time that she does expend just as time that we employ people is reimbursed by the board or can be if the board member so requests. It seems to me that for us to pass a law which would authorize boards to hire private secretaries for board members is just an imitation to expend more public funds in an unnecessary manner. The budgets that we're going to consider were prepared by the various boards without private secretaries in mind. If we pass this Bill we can expect additional expenditures and I'm sure that we all know that they will have private secretaries. It's an unnecessary thing Mr. Speaker and I urge the defeat of this Bill."

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

Arrigo: "In reply to Representative Walsh...ah...I know he was one of the Members who voted against this but that's not an unusual thing for Representative Walsh. He has a habit of voting against many of my Bills in the Higher Education Committee. I want to read Section 2 of the Bill. Any governing board may furnish to each of it's board members secretarial services or a private secretary and provide compensation therefore from the money appropriated. And I think the board member who appeared as a witness indicated that they would not take advantage of it, he was only using his private secretary for about one third of her time. This is a good Bill, this is a tendency in a trend and I urge it's passage."

Speaker Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 921 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'."





Have all voted who wish? Take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to briefly explain my vote. Now one of the people that talked to me about this was Mr. Earl Neal who's a Trustee at the U of I. Now I'm sure that the Universities with the amount that they have in their budget could have found some place to find enough people to assign them to their Trustees and it would have never come to the Floor of this House. But here are some people that wanted to say, 'This is what we need for elected public officials, we need some secretaries'. No more than any Member of this House has gotten lately from this General Assembly and they're forthright honest enough to come to this Assembly and say 'This is what we need, give us the authority by law, you the General Assembly that run the Universities'. I think this is a good Bill and I think it should pass."

Speaker Telcser: "Skinner 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mann."

Mann: "May I explain my vote...ah...Mr. Speaker."

Speakr Telcser: "Proceed sir."

Mann: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, maybe I'm missing some...something in the hidden agenda of this Bill which has prompted the 'no' votes. But really I can not understand why we would not give people who are willing to serve in a responsible position that requires a lot of time and a lot of effort and a lot of concentration, why we would not supply them secretaries. It just doesn't make sense. Then when matters that come to our Universities come before us and our Trustees are perhaps handicapped by a lack of help we're the first to criticize the kinds of Legislation they recommend. Now it's absolutely ridiculous Mr. Speaker and Members of the House for us not to accord these people who are serving without pay this minimal ministerial form of help. I urge you please reconsider your vote on this matter and give them the minimum kind of help which they need."

Speaker Telcser: "All right, you want to take another? No...Okay, there are 67 votes on the board right now. The Gentleman from Cook,



Representative Arrigo to explain his vote."

Arrigo: "Mr. Speaker, I think the absentees in the Assembly hall now I think the number of absentees is responsible for the low vote on the 'aye' column and I'm certain that if this hall was filled with the people that are suppose to be here this Bill would pass and I urge that this Bill be postponed temporarily."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, the Gentleman has asked for Postponed Consideration. He has that right under the Rules. It will be on Postponed Consideration. Let's get the next one."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 923. DiPrima. An Act to May 30th Memorial Day. Third Day...Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Since we returned over the Holiday many of the Members of the House have come up to me and said to me that they attended the commorative service for the departed comrade at the various cemeteries and in the various communities which I was happy to hear and I'm sure the Veteran's Organizations were happy to see the Members of this House attending functions. Now what this Bill intends to do is have Memorial Day reversed back to May 30th. Now in 1968 General Johnny Logan proclaimed May 30th of each year as Declaration Day which was later changed to Memorial Day. A day of mourning and reverence to the memory to the honored dead of our nations wars and May 30th has been observed as the day of mourning until recently when it was indiscriminately changed to the last Monday in May. Much to the consternation of Veteran's of all wars and as a matter of fact our nations youth already shows an amazing lack of Americanism and patriotism. If this change of the date persists the true observance of Memorial Day will cease to exist and out of deepest respect to our deceased Veteran's of all wars I urge you to support this Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 923 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Kempiners 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. I'm sorry, the Gentleman



from Cook, Representative Robert Dunn."

Dunn: "Well very briefly to explain my vote. I have the highest regard for the Sponsor of this Bill and I see he's got it passed but I wonder if the Members realize what they're doing to our own Legislative Sessions in future years when May 30th falls in the middle of the week. Ah...We're going to have to go home and come back and I don't see how we have any less respect for the deceased Veteran's by celebrating Memorial Day on Monday I wish we could change some votes here and kill this Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Anyone want to change their vote. I tried for you Bob. On this question there are 114 'aye', 13 'nays' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority...

Bluthardt 'aye'...is hereby declared passed."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1107. Chapman. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Chapman: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Yes Mr. Speaker, House Bill 1107 will make part time students, if they are attending college at least half time eligible under the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. At the present time only full time students can qualify to receive tuition help from the State of Illinois. This is very important I believe because statistics show that part time students often financially needier than full time students. I urge you to vote 'yes' on this measure."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1107 pass? All those...I'm sorry, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman."

Berman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Telcser: "She indicates she will."

Berman: "Ah...If this Bill passes does this in effect take away the availability of...ah...of scholarships from full time students? Because we're increasing the amounts of people that could apply?"

Chapman: "It would depend on what the appropriation eventually is for the Scholarship Commission. It seems to me that we should make



funds available to our needy students and that to separate them part time and full time is an arbitrary kind of a discrimination."

Berman: "Well if I may address myself to this Bill. I think the idea is a good one but I don't think the time has come yet and I know people in my district who are...ah...in need, have full time students for scholarship help and yet because of the limitations of appropriations they can't get help and I think that we ought to take care of the full time students before we expand the...ah... coverage of the...ah...scholarship program for part time students. Presumably, the reason they're part time students is because they're able to go out and get a job and help themselves along...ah...there might be reasons why a person needs to be full time and...ah...I think that those people are entitled to our first consideration. I can understand the purpose of the Bill but I think that because of the limitations of funds and the monies that we give to scholarships, I don't think I can support this at this time."

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

Brinkmeier: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As a triple dropout I can attest to the needs of this type of Legislation. That had it existed when I had been in school probably I wouldn't have had to miss year in grade school and high school and another year between high school and college. I think these people that are working part time probably because they have to they need this kind of help more than many full time students do and I would urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I too rise in support of this Legislation in deference to the last Gentleman who spoke against it. It would seem to me that a good number of students who are attending part time are attending it part time students because they just can't afford to go full time and must seek employment in order to finance their education. So it would seem to me that this would be a very good Bill and I hope everyone supports it."



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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Briefly in opposition I would like to point out to the Membership that a full time student carries only twelve semester hours a week. A part time student would be one who carries something less than that. As the Gentleman from Cook, on the other side of the aisle pointed out we do not have enough funds now to...ah... provide money for the needy full time students. So I do not believe that we should provide funds for needy part time students since really because by definition there are those who are in most cases if not all people who have part time jobs and if they do carry twelve hours which is certainly a minimum class load they would be eligible for scholarship aid and I would urge a 'no' vote at this time."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, is there further discussion? The Lady from DuPage, Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. With all due deference to the last speaker, I would like to support this Bill very strongly. I would like to point out that it was voted do pass out of Higher Education Committee on a vote of 10 'yes' and only 1 'no'. The discussion in Committee brought out the point that this helps the working person, the student who needs it the most, the person who has to have a part time job. It also makes it possible for the young wives who need to drop out of school and help earn family income and wants to come back and finish her education. So it is designed to help the people who need it most and I do urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? If not the Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman to close."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker. I hope that everyone will vote to support giving tuition help to our neediest students. Our neediest students are our part time students. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 1107 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'."



Speaker Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Maragos 'present'. On this question there are 126 'ayes', 9 'nays' 1 answering 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1156. An Act creating the Human Rights and Liberties Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, may I ask an inquiry. Am I correct where it varies an enabling Act and Appropriation Bill pending in the Appropriations Committee...ah...does the time toll on the Bill if it waits for the Appropriation Bill to come out?"

Speaker Telcser: "That's a good question?"

Washington: "I thought you answered it this morning but I wasn't certain."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay the Parliamentarian informs me Representative Washington that the substantive Bills, which are companion through Appropriation...Representative Washington is your problem the Thirty Day Rule or is it the May 25th Rule which we ..."

Washington: "11...1156 will expire on the 16th of June. I was going to try to get the Appropriation Bill out within the next week or so and bring them out together rather than take the time of the House with two different Bills."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay the Parliamentarian informs me Representative Washington the companion Bill to an Appropriation Bill which still may be in Appropriations Committee has the same rule applying to it as if it weren't an Appropriation Bill. So therefore, your substantive Bill is exempt from the deadline at which time House Bills have to be out of the House."

Washington: "Then I ask leave to take 1156 out of the record Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "All right, now well of course that does not...ah... fall true on the Thirty Day Rule which is of no concern to you anyway."

Washington: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, take it out of the record."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1173. Lundy. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



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

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

House Bill 1173 relates to that old favorite subject, General Assembly Scholarships. What this Bill attempts to do is to strike a compromise between the present system where we are mandated to award the scholarships really with no standard provided in the Act and one alternative that was rejected earlier this year by the House and that is total abolition. What this Bill does and I emphasize that it is permissive is to allow a Member of the General Assembly to delegate to the State Scholarship Commission the responsibility for awarding the Scholarship or simply ask the State Scholarship Commission to evaluate candidates based on criteria specified by the Member and then make recommendations to the Member for the award of the scholarships. Again I emphasize it is permissive, no Member is required to do this. The Scholarship Commission is in favor of the Bill. It came out of the Higher Education Committee unanimously, I'd be happy to respond to any questions."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1173 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...McGah 'aye', Merlo 'aye'. On this question there are 99 'ayes', 3 'nays' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1176. Ron Hoffman. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ron Hoffman."

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

House Bill 1176 amends the School Code to provide that a referendum authorizing school boards to issue bonds if defeated will not be resubmitted to the voters within the same calendar year. Now as we consider many of the propositions one of the first questions you'll hear in any Committee is does the Legislation provide for referendum. At that time certainly we're cognizant to the fact that people should have an expression of their views on the proposition.



But at the same time all of us very much realize that many of these referendums that are run are defeated and run again. Many times we see the Editorials in the paper. Here we go again. Referendum number 4 or referendum number 5. The only thing that indicates to us is that number one, the School Board is not cognizant of the fact that the people have expressed their views. They want their views adhered to and secondly the School Board is not portraying the cause properly and supplying th information to the constituents. This Bill here seeks to provide somewhat of an assurance to the people that when they do go the polls and they do cast their ballots on a referendum proposal that it will not be run again thirty or sixty days later. I solicit your support."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Clabaugh."

Clabaugh: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I know there is a popular appeal to this kind of a Bill. I know there's a general feeling that people don't like to have the expense of two or three elections but I think this Bill is all too rigid. The people in a Community can be wrong just as often as the school board is wrong and I think have a great deal more likelihood of being. Now if a building burns or if something there's a condemnation of a building or any number of things like this or there's a sudden expansion of the community and particularly when new people move into the community such as when a new factory or a new plant comes in many times they're resented by the people that live there and they're much needed if not an absolutely necessary bond issue is lost purpose of which to build a building. I think it's tragic if they're not allowed to call back until a year that means another school year go by. At least one school year and it could well be that two school years or two school terms would be affected. Now there must be some way to arrive at what Representative Hoffman wants to do and of course this is not the first time that this Bill has been in but I don't think this is the way to do it. I think we're thinking just a little bit too little of boys and girls and a little bit too much





about the costs of an election. I think this is a bad Bill, I think it's an unnecessary Bill and I think it should be defeated."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Mahar: "According to the Digest it says that it shall not be resubmitted within the one, in the same calendar year. Would it be possible to have a referendum say in November and come back in February and have another one?"

Hoffman: "That's correct Representative and it was left that way because we did not want to make it as rigid as Representative Clabough has indicated that it is."

Mahar: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? If not the Gentleman From Cook, Representative Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I have the highest respect for Representative Clabough and in his field of endeavor I'm sure he appreciates the fact that we realize there are circumstances that go above and beyond but I think we're all faced with the point here that we have had continual abuses with school boards do not fully inform the people of the areas concerned of their real needs. It's not a matter that the school boards should come to us or come to anyone and say we know what's better than you do and we should resubmit these bonds time after time for referendum purposes. It's a matter where if their cause is just and it is portrayed properly and this is evident in many of the referendums that I have observed, in many that I have on record that if they are properly portrayed the people get behind them to fully support them and vote them in. This Bill here is geared toward the irresponsible approach of submitting and resubmitting bond issues without comprehensive programming and proper information. Now I think this is a travesty and I think this circumvents the faith that we would want our constituents to have in the legislative process. They want to know that if they in their minds have an



opinion yeah or nay on an issue and they vote that way that I got to simply respect it. I certainly would appreciate a favorable vote on this proposition. Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 1176 pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from McHenry Representative Skinner to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I've found in discussion with groups in my constituency about various subjects that the only subject that really makes people excited is consolidation of elections. Now this is going to require consolidation of elections because it's going to say you don't have three chances to pass a bond issue, you've only got one chance per year. Now there's only one thing wrong with this and that is that it doesn't go far enough. The bond issue and rate increase referendum should be, should be forced to be held on the same day school board members have to be elected. Let them stand or fall on their own, on their own proposals. I think that this Bill absolutely must be passed or else the proliferation of elections will continue."

Speaker Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ron Hoffman to explain his vote."

Hoffman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would appeal for a little more enthusiastic support here because I think we're all faced with a similar proposition, it's not just my district. I think you'll find the people very much aware of what is going on in individual municipalities and many of these propositions that are put forth are good, are worthy and they have a lot of public opinion behind them to pass them. I'm putting this proposition forth to safeguard the people's opinion that when they are going out to vote and they are getting interested and they are getting behind these proposals that they are going to pass them on their own initiative. And that the emphasis here is that the school boards are a little more responsive instead of running these things at the cost of the taxpayer of three or four thousand dollars a referendum and run these things time and time again and continually spend the tax



dollar not to the...ah...progress of the proposition but at the toll expense of the taxpayer and I would urge the...solicit your reconsideration on this proposition."

Speaker Telcser: "All right, Simms 'aye', Garmisa 'aye', Kozubowski 'aye', Brinkmeier 'aye'. Craig 'aye'. Do you want another Roll Call? The question is shall House Bill 1176 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf. On this question there are 95 'aye', 31 'nays'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Gibbs 'no'."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1212. Tipword. A Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill does not proport to take away any of the powers that have been heretofor granted to the Environmental Protection Act. All that this Bill does is clarify the use of Bonds in variance applications and in applications for permits. The Bill was supported in the Committee by the E.P.A. and the Amendment that was placed on it in the Kouse was suggested by the Representative of the E.P.A. In clarification of use of these bonds. I request the support of the House in passage of this Bill. It will make it better for the E.P.A. and for those applicants."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1212 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 134 'ayes', 1 'nay' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Thompson 'aye'. We got to wait for the click to get back. Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise sir?"

Shea: "George looks like a fine Clerk."

Speaker Telcser: "We declared the last Bill passed. Read the next one."



Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1250. Brummet. An Act to add Section 5.1 and so forth to an Act in relation to the suppression, eradication and control of Bovine Brucellosis. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Fayette, Representative Brummet."

Brummet: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is probably the least controversial Bill of the, as it's been introduced this Session. There's nothing political about it, it doesn't deal with equal rights or civil rights and it even endeavors to stop unwanted abortions. It's a Brucellosis Bill and it deals with animals. The object of this Bill is to amend several sections of an Illinois Act to clarify the language and update references to federal regulatory agencies and public stockyards. It provides for excessive change in the quarantine provision, authorizes indemnity payments for unregistered and crossbred bulls and steers and further defines health certificates pertaining to the implication of dairy and breeding cattle."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1250 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Somebody's putting quarters in the machine I didn't punch mine. Have all voted who wished? Getty 'aye'. Palmer 'aye'. I didn't touch it. Take the record. J. J. Wolf 'aye'. On this question there are 146 'ayes', no 'nays'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Leon 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1259. Dyer. A Bill for an Act to amend the University Civil Service Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is another noncontroversial Bill. It is the first in the series of a Sex Repeal Bill simply conforming the Illinois Statutes to the 1970 Illinois Constitution and what this does is simply add the word 'sex and national origin' to the things in which you can not discriminate in the University Civil Service System. I'd appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1259 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye',



the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Leon and Getty 'aye'. Hirschfeld 'aye'. On this question there are 136 'ayes', 1 'nay' Waddell 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1260. Stiehl. A Bill for an Act to amend Section 1 of the Title of an Act to abolish discrimination between sexes in payment of wages and so forth. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Stiehl: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is another Bill in a series of Legislative proposals designed to end all forms of discrimination. It simply changes the word 'female' to 'persons'."

Speaker Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 1260 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Did my seatmate vote me 'no'. I have a lot of trouble with that guy. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 150 'ayes', 1 'nay'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1261. Geo-Karis. A Bill for an Act to amend to amend Section 2 of an Act to require compensation of causing death by wrongful act, neglect, default. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a sex appeal Bill. It relates...it relates to the men being able to collect when their wives get struck and killed in an accident. Because the law before only allows the women so you see we have no discrimination and I move for it's passage."

Speaker Telcser: "The question...The question is, shall House Bill 1261 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 154 'aye's, 2 'nays'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1262. Macdonald. A Bill for an Act to revise



the law in relation to divorce. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1262 amends the Divorce Act and simply brings into conformity allows the person who in good faith has married a bigamist to have the same rights in alimony as in other divorce cases and I urge your 'yes' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1262 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? What's he doing now? Holy...Hey Tom...Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 139 'ayes', 6 'nays' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1264. Catania. A Bill for an Act to amend Section 3 of an Act relating to Unemployment Offices and Agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania. Is the Lady on the Floor? She's out there? Take it out of the record. Is that you Representative Geo-Karis? Do you want to handle that Representative Geo-Karis?"

Geo-Karis: "Is that Representative Catania's Bill? No thank you that's her Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, take it out of the record."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1265. Chapman. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the Mechanics Liens. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman. Representative Chapman, do you wish to have your Bill heard?"

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, the present law permits a husband to create a Mechanics Lien against his wives property but does not permit a wife to create a Mechanics Lien against her husbands property. This Bill neutralizes the statutes by changing 'married woman' to 'married person'. I ask for your support."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."



Hanahan: "I just wondered if the Lady would answer a question."

Speaker Telcser: "She indicates she will."

Hanahan: "If I have work done at your house, I'm a Carpenter and I did some work at your house and you contracted with me for the work to be performed and you refused to pay me. Are you saying that I can not place a workman's lien upon your property?"

Chapman: "No, I'm not."

Hanahan: "What are you saying?"

Chapman: "Actually this extends, if you're helping to create liens Tommy, this just extends this so that a...where at the present time a man can create a lien against the property owned by his wife. It now would also extend the right to a wife to create a lien against property owned by her husband."

Hanahan: "You mean if...if I...If my wife and I own a piece of property and my wife contracts to have some work done, right now you say that that house can't be liened?"

Chapman: "No, this applies to property that is held in the name of the one spouse only."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Is there further discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1265 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Kozubowski 'no'. On this question there are 100 'ayes', 9 'nays'. Macdonald 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Shea and Brinkmeier 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1266. Martin. A Bill for an Act to amend the State Housing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Martin."

Martin: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1266 amends the State Housing Act to forbid discrimination on the basis of sex or national origin in hiring by housing corporations or their contractors. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1266 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 140 'ayes', no 'nays' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1264. Catania. An Act to amend Section 3 of an Act relating to the Employment Offices and Agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Catania: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1264 amends the Public Employment Offices and Agencies Act. It eliminates the present requirement that separate rooms have to be maintained for the use of women registering for situations with the Illinois Department of Labor in it's free Public Employment Offices. This practice is not now observed by the Department of Labor. This Bill received a do pass Amend...recommendation with 20 'ayes', no 'nays' and no 'present' votes in the Judiciary I Committee. I solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1264 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Grotberg 'aye'. Take the record. On this question there are 136 'ayes', J. J. Wolf 'aye'. 5 'nays' and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Hoffman, 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1267. Martin. An Act to amend Section 1 in a title of an Act prohibiting discrimination and intimidation on account of race or color in the forming of contracts of public buildings or public works. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Martin."

Martin: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1267 amends an Act prohibiting discrimination and employment under contracts for public buildings and public works and adds to the list of illegal discrimination based on sex, creed or national origin. I solicit a favorable vote."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from McHenry. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Could you illustrate...ah...Ms. Martin, could you illustrate





an example of why this Bill is necessary?"

Martin: "It is necessary because women and other minorities have been left out illegally in the, in the work of public building and public work. The law originally only applied to race and color and it did not at all permit females or other minorities was not included and now we are conforming with the 1970 Constitution."

Hanahan: "Could you illustrate an example? Are you talking about if the...if a public employer wants a Plumber that this in essence because of the United Brotherhood of Plumbers...ah...there would be no females allowed or what's the...what's the discrimination. What's the actual, establish an actual case that this Bill would rectify."

Martin: "If...If a women were a Janitor..."

Hanahan: "I can't hear you."

Martin: "Or if a woman were a Plumber and who qualified to do the work, was a member of your union, she should not be discriminated against simply because she is a woman."

Hanahan: "Well you know I just want to take issue with your Bill because the Bill that I'm reading the synopsis is anywhere right, what I would suggest then is a public employer such as the City Colleges of the City of Chicago that is just presently putting out a contract now for the cleaning services for City Junior Colleges and in their contract they specify how many female employees they want and how many male employees so that the female washrooms are cleaned by female sex Janitresses and if the male washrooms are cleaned by male sex Janitors that this Bill would outlaw that kind of contract being left by the City Junior Colleges. Am I correct in that, what this Bill does?"

Martin: "We...We...We need then to find out what that law is all so that we can rectify it. What we're trying to do now is rectify House Bill 1267 which states ...ah... in the Act that it only refers to race or color. The only thing that we're adding here is 'sex, creed and national origin'."

Hanahan: "Well then Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak against the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Proceed sir."



Hanahan: "This Bill is a bad Bill in the area of certain types of employment. One of which as I illustrated just today I talked to Oscar Shavits the Chancellor of the Junior City Colleges pertaining to a contract for the City Junior Colleges. Where in the contract he must specify how many female Janitoresses are necessary for the female washrooms and how many male Janitors are needed to clean the male washrooms. Now this is a matter of fact, not a fantasy that we have to have the distinguishing differences in employment in that kind of case. I suggest the Bill is, might be lofty and ideal but impracticality is silly. Since when would women want to work cleaning male washrooms while school is open any more than males wanting to clean female washrooms and therefore I suggest that the Bill would be a bad Bill if passed into law."

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

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

I'm afraid I have to take issue at the last speaker. I think the purpose of this Bill is to outlaw sex discrimination public work projects when sex is not a relevant consideration to the job to be done. Now in the example that the Gentleman just gave...ah... being of the female sex in order to clean a female washroom is clearly a bonafide job qualification. In that kind of a situation the statute would not apply and it's not intended to. All that the Bill is suppose to do is to outlaw sex discrimination when sex is not relevant to the job that has to be done by the prospective employee. I think it's a good Bill and I think we ought to pass it as we passed the other sex discrimination Bills today. Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Washington."

Washington: "Yes Mr. Speaker, Representative Lundy is absolutely correct. This particular statute has been on the books of the state since 1932. 1932 and all it provides is that no one who has a contract with the state can discriminate in the hiring practices against race...or based on race, creed and color and all she is doing is adding sex and I think the examples listed by the Gentleman from McHenry are irrelevant. I think it's an excellent Bill and it's long overdue."



Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would take issue with Representative Hoffman and I would state that I would like to have him read Section 17 of the anti-discrimination section of the new Constitution and that is all that Representative Martin is trying to do is to update through her Bill and conform with the new Constitution and I see absolutely no reason to oppose this Bill and I ask for your green lights."

Speaker Miller: "Is there any further discussion? Representative from Cook, Representative Martin may close the debate."

Martin: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just like to add to all that has been said is that women have been cleaning mens washrooms all of our lives and I...To this I would ask for a favorable vote. Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? House Bill 1267? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 101 'ayes' and 10 'nays' and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1279. Leinenweber. A Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Leinenweber: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1279 amends the Environmental Protection Act in regards to procedure in pollution enforcement cases. Currently under the Environmental Protection Act the procedure is as follows. The Pollution Control Board assigns the case to a hearing examiner who so quali...statutory qualification is that he must be an Attorney. The hearing examiner presides at the hearings and take testimony before a court reporter. The record's taken, transcribed and sent to Chicago to be review by the Pollution Control Board. The Pollution Control Board may then consider the transcript plus any other testimony, oral or written and with leave of the Board



hear all arguments. The Pollution Control Board then makes a decision which can be either cease and assist and or imposition of monetary penalties, revocation of permit, the imposition of a performance bond. House Bill 1279 changes this procedure by first upgrading the office of hearing examiners requiring them to have the same qualifications as the Pollution Control Board, that is they must be technically qualified. The hearing examiners may also under House Bill 1279 be a Pollution Control Board Member or the hearing examiner and a member of the Pollution Control Board may hear the case together. The hearing examiners hears the testimony, has the opportunity to observe the witnesses and he makes the decisions, the final decisions as to law and facts. Then the conclusions as to facts and law which becomes final if the same is not appealed. The decision is fully reviewable by the Pollution Control Board either on application of the Environmental Protection Agency or the...the respondent. It can be reviewed either by agreed statement of facts on the transcripts or with leave of the Pollution Control Board by a trial they no vote. In review of the ... can definitely be at the request of the agency or the respondent and the review of the Pollution Control Board is to the Appellate Court the same as the statute now reads. The reasons for the Bill...Mr. Speaker, could I have a little order?"

Speaker Miller: "Let's give the Gentleman some attention now, there's a Bill he's explaining and it will save time if he can make the proper explanation and we can move on."

Leinenweber: "The purposes for House Bill 1279, the most important purpose is it gives the power to the hearing examiner who is the person who hears the testimony and observes the witnesses and their demeanor. He has the initial right and the power to make conclusions as to law and facts. These conclusions are fully reviewable by the Pollution Control Board. I might add that the Pollution Control Board recognizes that this is a problem and now requires the hearing examiner to file along with the report a close statement of credibility. Now I suggest to you, particularly those who are Lawyers that a statement of credibility does not equal



or approach in desirability the ability of the person who makes the findings to hear the testimony and witness personally the demeanor of the witnesses. It also cuts down one step for the party in the event they are satisfied with the initial decision of the hearing examiner. They no longer as the cases now must have the case heard before a hearing examiner and then trudge it to Chicago to have the case heard a second time before the Pollution Control Board. I might add this is customary and in every instance I'm aware of under the statutes that every administrative agency operates at the present time. This will save time for the Pollution Control Board. When we argued House Bill 291 which extended the deadline for the board to pass on variations from ninety to a hundred and twenty days that the necessity was because of the burden on the board brought about by not enough time in getting variation petitions heard is extremely important. I would suggest to you that alleviating the burden of Pollution Control Board to sit on every violation case will certainly give us more time to do this important job. I gave the Bill to the Pollution Control Board and the Environmental Protection Agency for input. I adopted most of their suggestions. The Pollution Control Board wants to have the authority to decide if the question's a fact. However they do not time to hear the witnesses. I would suggest that this is a fatal defect in the E.P.A. as it presently reads and 1279 will remedy this. I urge the adoption of 1279."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder is recognized."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, would the Gent...Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Miller: "He indicates he will."

Schraeder: "Does this Bill now provide for the hearing officer to be an Attorney. Is that right?"

Leinenweber: "Yes."

Schraeder: "Is this a change from the old law?"

Leinenweber: "This is the same as the old law. The only addition to the qualification of a hearing examiner is they now must be technically qualified if, in the area of which they are going to



be dealing, the same as the Members of the Pollution Control Board. However, they must be Attorneys because of the fact that they preside in a courtroom type of procedure they must rule on questions of facts of law in the admissibility of evidence."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers is recognized."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Speaker a question if I may."

Speaker Miller: "Proceed."

Borchers: "Ah...Now this does give the hearing officer the right to make a decision in the county or the city where the hearing is held in relation to people involved and the event involved at... wherever it may be. He can make a decision that will be reviewed by the Pollution Control Board in Chicago if the...ah...people in front of his so called court wish to do...are not satisfied with his decision. He has the power, is it a combination? He's got the power, is that correct?"

Leinenweber: "That's right, now there's one additional thing that 1279 has that the Act does not have. It requires that the hearing examiner hear the case in the county in which the violation occurred and you're absolutely right, it's on either the petition of the agency or by the respondent, the alleged violator, the decision of the hearing examiner is fully reviewable by the Pollution Control Board and then by the Appellate Court as it currently is the law."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to speak to this Bill a minute. I want to tell you that two years ago I had a Bill quite similar to this in the...ah...in the House. The Pollution Control Board... ah...the Pollution Control Board, the Environmental Agency fought the Bill and it was defeated in Committee but this is truly and I tell you from all the material I have at all sorts, all over the State of Illinois, this is a step in the right direction and I'm glad to see the Pollution Control Board has changed their mind over two years ago. This is the way it should begin to be and I certainly support this Bill."



Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Ah...

During the discussion in the Committee on this particular piece of Legislation some of the pertinent questions that I think are relevant for our consideration at this time is the individuals who are going to be called in to be making ...ah... decisions on questions of pollution are going to be individuals operating by themselves contrary to the notion of having regulations that are applicable statewide. For example, we may have these we have a hundred and thirty one lawyers who are being used as hearing officers, we may very well get one hundred and thirty different opinions on a particular problem that may vary from the deep Southern part of the State to the Northern part and I think part of the criticism leveled at the P.C.B. has been ...ah...some inconsistencies or problems of not dealing with the problem fairly. What this is going to do is expand that possibility for people to say 'Well you treat one person differently downstate than you do in other areas of the state'. So I think one of our concerns at this point ought to be whether we want some kind of consistent ruling that relates to the problem of regulating the environment. So I think although again it's an effort to try to relax the pressures on the Pollution Control Board the fact is we have five members which you have to persuade three that...that the decision is correct and that you'd have a better chance going to the Pollution Control Board than you would on trying to depend on one person. I think it's going to result in a...ah...diversity of opinions that are going to cause more problems and I think the Bill once again, although well intended, is a poor Bill and I ask for it's defeat."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentle...The Gentleman from Union, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Will the Sponsor answer a question?"

Speaker Miller: "He indicates he will."

Pierce: "You didn't mean to indicate did you that the Pollution Control Board had supported or endorsed this particular Bill?"



Leinenweber: "No I...I definitely did not indicate, I...I think Representative Borchers if he so indicated was in error."

Speaker Miller: "Just one second. For what reason do you rise Representative McGrew?"

McGrew: "I rise for a Point of Parliamentary Inquiry Mr. Speaker. I had read somewhere in the Rules that a Member was to speak from his seat. Is that the correct procedure?"

Speaker Miller: "That is the normal procedure however, there's a great likeness between Representative Pierce and Representative Choate and so I didn't notice the difference. Thanks for calling my attention to it. Proceed sir."

Leinenweber: "What I said was that I meant to indicate that this Bill was reviewed before I filed it, by the Pollution Control Board and as far as I can remember I...I think we asked every suggestion that was made come in writing from the Pollution Control Board. It was also reviewed by a former member of the Pollution Control Board who happens to be a friend of mine who...who did approve it. So if the Pollution Control Board opposes the Bill, although I, in my own defense I would say not overly strenuously, basically on the grounds Representative Schneider indicated that they felt that there would be a lack of consistency. Ah...I could speak to that but I will do that in the final..."

Pierce: "No, thank you. I just wanted to make it clear that the Board was in opposition to the Bill not in support of the Bill even though you had tried your best to accommodate their suggestions. Because I think Representative Borchers had indicated the Board was supporting the Bill and we want to make it clear the Board is opposing the Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for some questions?"

Speaker Miller: "A question and a quick answer. Yes sir."

Lundy: "Well I had a couple. Number one, is it entirely up to the Board whether it appoints a hearing officer in a given case or not or may the...ah...petitioner or the applicant apply for a Board..."





apply for an exam...a hearing officer, is the Board required to appoint it?"

Leinenweber: "It's up to the Board to appoint a hearing examiner, in fact the Board member may hear the case in the first instance in lieu of a hearing examiner or along with a hearing examiner. But it's up to the Board. They can either, they can actually they can change the procedure, they can do that now. The only procedural change is the upgrade of the members and the extension of the authority as in all other administrative set ups to make conclusions of that in law which becomes final if not appealed."

Lundy: "The Point of my question was, can the Board be forced to have a matter heard by a hearing examiner when it doesn't want to?"

Leinenweber: "No, it can not."

Lundy: "All right one other short question and that is does the Board review hearing officers decisions at it's own initiative? Could it ever be prevented from reviewing the decision of a hearing officer?"

Leinenweber: "Well the...ah...I would say that it probably could not. I did not, the, only on the application of the petitioner or the Environmental Protection Agency or the...the...ah...the respondent."

Lundy: "So the Board can not review a hearing officers decision on it's own initiative?"

Leinenweber: "That's right."

Lundy: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Will may close the debate."

Leinenweber: "In closing, the...the basic criticism which bothers the Pollution Control Board was the possibility of inconsistency in decisions. Well this is true in every area of law where you have different Judges. You have Circuit Courts in every county of the state, we have five Appellate Court Districts, we have a Supreme Court. Eventually either if the...the Pollu...Advis... the Environmental Protection Agency felt there was an inconsistency they could certainly attain review by the Pollution Control Board in an attempt to provide a consistent pattern of decisions throughout the state. In the event that this did not take place they



could always go to the Appellate Court and get a finding of consistency. I don't feel that this is, that this warrants the retention of the present system which is cumbersome, time consuming and requires a second step for...ah...someone who may be very well satisfied with the Pollution, with the hearing examiners report. Finally the most important reason I feel that this Bill is a good Bill is because the person who hears the evidence, sees the demeanor of the witnesses is the one that makes the decision. Ah...Unlike the case now where the record is bundled and wrapped rather hurriedly probably by the Pollution Control Board who then makes the decision, removed from the atmosphere of the hearing. I feel it's a good Bill, I think it's ..it improves the procedure, it brings it in line with other administrative agencies and I move it's adoption."

Speaker Miller: "The question is, shall House Bill 1279 pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 48 'ayes' and 22 'nays' and this Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Ah...Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise on a point of personal privilege. At this time Mr. Speaker, I've been waiting all afternoon for you to take a stand because I am the Chairman of an Interim Study Committee of the Human Resources Committee. You can hardly get any more important than that and I would like suspension of the appropriate rule of this House to bring back to Second Reading sir, a Bill that you left in Human Resources. Mr. Speaker, it is called Murphy's Law of random perversity. Do I have such permission?"

Speaker Murphy: "Leave, leave, leave, certainly leave."

Grotberg: "Number one. Left to themselves all things go from bad to worse. Number two. Anything that can go wrong, will go wrong. Number three. If there is a possibility of several things going wrong the one that will go wrong is the one which will do the most damage. Number four. If you play with the thing long enough, you'll



surely break it. Number five. If everything appears to be going well you've obviously overlooked something and Number six. Nature always sides the hidden flaw and Number seven. Mother Nature is a bitch and with that I present to you Mr. Speaker, Murphy's Law of Random Perversity. Thank you."

Speaker Murphy: "I accept it with due humility although I thought you were talking about the Federal Prosecuting Attorney."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1295. Mann. A Bill for an Act to amend the Harness Racing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Murphy: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mann."

Clerk Selcke: "Ah...No, out of the record, he's not here."

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

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1434. Skinner. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Junior College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, about, after the comments about Local Junior College Administration previously this afternoon, I almost fear to bring this Bill up. But with the passage of House Bill..."

Speaker Murphy: "Why don't you table it then?"

Skinner: "But with the passage of House Bill 464 which requires all Junior Colleges in all parts of the state to be in some type of Junior College District in the very near future I think this Bill is more necessary than ever. It provides for a way for people to get out of Junior Colleges once they've gotten into them. The need for this is because there may be two population centers in an area, one population center wanted to go to one Junior College and the other population center not really knowing what happens until after they get annexed. This gives them a way to get out. If they want to go to another Junior College and I would ask for a favorable vote."

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

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

Speaker Murphy: "He indicates he will."

Walters: "Representative does this also provide for those who want



to get out period?"

Skinner: "This will...this will not have a...there's no way that this is going to contradict 464 and I presume that's the thrust of your question. It doesn't go to that."

Walters: "Thank you."

Speaker Murphy: "Is there any further discussion? If not the question is, shall House Bill 1434 pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record.) Oh...Hold it one minute. What's the matter have you got it? Representative Hart, for what reason do you rise?"

Hart: "Well I wanted to explain my vote. If you'd put your glasses on maybe you could see some of us out here."

Speaker Murphy: "I was afraid you did, that's why I didn't look that way."

Hart: "I see. Well...Maybe I could explain it by saying it just needs a couple more votes and maybe we can get some help."

Speaker Murphy: "Hart votes 'aye'. Representative Schisler's 'aye', Representative Borchers 'aye', Representative Simms 'aye'. Representative Dick Walsh 'aye', Representative Clabaugh 'aye'. Representative Hudson 'aye'. Representative Martin 'aye'. Representative McLendon 'aye'. Representative Terzich 'aye'. On this question there are 91 'ayes' and 1 'nay'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1435. Skinner. Amends the Public Junior College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Murphy: "The Gentleman from McHenry."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, at the present time once again in the Junior College District you assume the depths of that Junior College District and so if you decided to get...to get annexed and go into another Junior College District you could very, very conceivably end up with two Junior College Bond taxes to pay. This gives an area that wants to disconnect and annex to another district thirty days in which to initiate that disannexation proceeding and would prevent double taxation which it doesn't seem



to me there's any reason for."

Speaker Murphy: "Any further discussion? If not the question is, will the House...House Bill 1435 pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. 100...The vote on this question is 100 'ayes' and 6 'nays' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1449. Porter. An Act creating the Energy Crisis Study Commission, defining it's powers and duties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Murphy: "For what reason does Representative Houlihan arise?"

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I wanted to question a Parliamentary Inquiry. Are we going to go to Second Reading at all today?"

Speaker Murphy: "It is the plan of the Speaker that we should adjourn at approximately 5:30. So I question that we, we will."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1617. Douglas. He's not here."

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Douglas is off the Floor?"

Clerk Selcke: "1628. House Bill 1628. Dyer. An Act to provide for nonvoting student representation on various governing boards of Public Junior Colleges and so forth. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Murphy: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1628 very simply provides that if each one of the governing boards of Trustees of a Public Colleges and Universities in Illinois, there shall be one student who is sitting as a nonvoting member. This is obviously simply for purposes of communications and responsiveness between the student, the consumers of the educational process and the administration. The producers of the educational process. Thirty five states now have this system. Three hundred and seven Colleges and Universities have it. It has found, been found to work beautifully wherever it works. I'll be glad to answer questions. I solicit your favorable vote."

Speaker Murphy: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Blair is recognized."

Blair: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 1628 gives statutory recognition to



a need which we have been too long in recognizing. The governing boards of our Public Universities and Colleges are composed of dedicated men and women. They dedicate enormous amounts of their time and energy to provide policy directives which will enhance the educational experiences for those seeking a higher education. Their goal is a learning environment that serves and is responsive to the needs of the school students. Board members can not do this without a direct and causative means of contact with representatives of the student body. This Legislation recognizes not only the need of governing boards to hear and listen to the concerns and opinions of the students it governs but it provides for student representation in a logical place in which to fully participate in the boards decision making processes. That is, and I emphasize as nonvoting membership on the board. The majority of todays college students are persuing a Iniversity education to satisfy personal needs and ambitions. They are evidencing a strong and sincere orientation toward participation in and service to their community. The keystone of the present community is their campus. Their interests, strive and commitment are the best indicators we have of their potential contributions to our society. I think we should do everything we can to foster such an attitude. It is in our own interest. I urge your support for House Bill 1628."

Speaker Murphy: "The Gentleman from Ogle, Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'd like to add my support to this particular Bill. Several years ago I served on a Campus Disorder Study Commisson and we held hearings around the state and one of the things that came up in these hearings with these college students was their biggest gripe or complaint was the lack of communication. We know subsequently that they have served in various Commissions, Committees around the state, they've done an admirable job and I would urge you support for this Bill."

Speaker Murphy: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Simms."

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



Speaker Murphy: "The previous question has been moved. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the previous question has been moved...adopted. The Lady from DuPage may close the debate."

Dyer: "Once again I would just urgently solicit your favorable vote."

Speaker Murphy: "The question is, shall House Bill 1628 pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 142 'ayes' and 6 'nays' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Hanahan 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 447. Shea. An Act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Legislative Reference Bureau. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Shea: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Legislative Reference Bureau. It was reduced some thirty eight thousand dollars in the Appropriations Committee and I'd appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Murphy: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 447 pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 154 'ayes', no 'nays'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1449. Porter. An Act creating the Energy Crisis Study Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Murphy: "The Geneltman from Cook, Representative Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House...ah... House Bill 1449 creates an Energy Crisis Study Commission composed of four Members of the House, four Members of the Senate and four public members appointed by the Governor. I ask your favorable vote."

Speaker Murphy: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall



House Bill 1449 pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 140 'ayes' and no 'nays'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 495. Juckett. An Act to make an appropriation for purposes of reimbursing certain Mass Transit operations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Juckett on the Floor? No that's not Representative Juckett in his seat, no."

Clerk Selcke: "Out of the record. House Bill 609. Schneider. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Pollution Control Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Murphy: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This represents the ordinary and contingent expenses request. It reduced considerably from last year over a hundred thousand dollars. It further reduced by the Committee twenty seven thousand dollars I solicit your support for the Bill."

Speaker Murphy: "Any further discussion? If not the question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 142 'ayes' and no 'nays' and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 614. Calvo. An Act to make private, ordinary and contingent expenses for environmental quality. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Murphy: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Calvo. Take it out of the record. Is Representative Calvo on the Floor?"

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 683. Who's is that? Schraeder. Appropriation to Elwood C. Sparks, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Murphy: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder is recognized."





Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a Veteran's Commission Bill that would pay to a Veteran who failed to file within the proper time for a hundred and thirty two dollars and ninety seven cents. It passed the Appropriations it passed Veteran's. No dissenting votes, I ask your support."

Speaker Murphy: "Any further discussion? If not the question is, shall House Bill 683 pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 139 'ayes' and 1 'nay' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 945. Gene Hoffman. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 954. Shea. Appropriations for the expenses of the Secretary of State. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the ordinary and contingent expense for the Secretary of State's Office. It was reduced two hundred thousand dollars in the Appropriations Committee. I believe that as a State Office this is the first time that every expense for the Secretary of State's Office has been put in one Bill so that it could be scrutinized by this General Assembly and I would appreciate the support of the House."

Speaker Miller: "Is there any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 954 pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', contrary by voting 'no'." Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 154 'ayes', 1 'nays'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. For what reason does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walters arise?"

Walters: "Mr. Speaker, just in case someone asks me how much I voted, how much is in that appropriation?"

Shea: "About eighty two million."



Walters: "That's fine, thank you."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1003. Giorgi. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Murphy: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi is recognized."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this is the Bill that allows School Boards to run, to have their members run from geographic districts and school districts like Rockford, Peoria, Springfield and Decatur."

Speaker Murphy: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, will House Bill 1003 pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Hold it, hold it. The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Clabaugh."

Clabaugh: "Mr. Speaker, this isn't the first time we've had this Bill before us many many times...ah...The way of teacher...teaching... teacher training for a certain number of years of teaching and I would simply say that if we pass this Bill that immediately pass a Bill and remove all teacher training courses from our teacher training institutions. Because if a few years of teaching is as good as training for teachers in our teacher training institution then we're wasting a lot of money. All too often five years or ten years or twenty years of so called successful teaching simply means that they taught in such a fashion that they weren't fired and that's what successful teaching means and it doesn't usually mean a strap number of years it simply means one year repeated five or ten or twenty times the same errors being repeated at the end as was at the first. Now this is I think a bad Bill. I think it's lowering standards lower than almost any state in the union has and Illinois does not have and does not deserve to have that kind of a reputation."

Speaker Murphy: "How about going back to the Gentleman from Winnebago and let him...ah...finish his opening remarks because I think I shorted him."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I apologize. That wasn't the Bill that I thought it was. This is a Bill that passed through Teacher Certification and as I understand it, last year was the last year



they're going to issue Teacher Certificates. But the Teacher Certificates have an automatic renewal to them so that they're valid for six years. All this Bill does is says that at the end of those six years, those Teacher Certificates that were issued last year won't be honored and I agree with Mr. Clabaugh, there won't be anymore Teacher Certificates after this, this series of Teacher Certificates have been issued. He's perfectly right. But this is a good Bill and I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Murphy: "The Gentleman from Ogle, Representative Brinkmeier is recognized."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'd like to add my support to this Bill. I couldn't agree more that it's something that we really need and just I'd like to illustrate very briefly an example of what happened in the School District where I taught. There's a young lady that got married, she taught for several years, got married. She had three youngsters that were old enough finally to get back into school, she went back to teaching and after she had kept home, she was at home...a Teacher in Home Economics but after she had had these three youngsters long enough to get them into school, she had to take off a summer and go live at a college campus in order to qualify for the Teacher Certificate. I contend that experience is the best Teacher and if they've had five years teaching experience, I don't think we should force them to go back and get some more additional training for it."

Speaker Murphy: "Is there any further discussion? If not the Gentleman from Winnebago may close."

Giorgi: "I'd appreciate your vote on this Bill."

Speaker Murphy: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, there might be some confusion on this Bill. What Mr. Clabaugh said is right. Last year is the last year they're going to issue certificates, or Provisional Certificates. But the certificates are good on an automatic renewal basis for six years."



All the law says is that we recognize their certificates at the end of those six years, that's all. He's confused the issue somewhat."

Speaker Murphy: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Sharp."

Sharp: "Yes, I would like to rise in support of this measure. We're talking about provisional Teaching Certificates and at the present time or up until last year the state had seen fit to issue provisional Certificates which are good for periods of two years which can be renewed twice, which means six years to complete the requirements...ah...to provide or to earn your Teaching Certificate. Now when a provisional Certificate is issued an individual who goes into the classroom does not have to have Student Teaching. He does not have to meet this requirement the way it is now. After a six year period he has to spend some time as a Student Teacher. No it seems to me that it's just not practical to ask an individual after being in the classroom for six years to spend a summer practice teaching. It just doesn't make any sense. If we feel that we need Teachers so bad that we provide a provisional Certificate then we should have required the Student Teaching before they entered the classroom and not six years later. So for this reason I feel that asking someone to go pick up Student Teaching after they've taught six years just doesn't make any sense and I wish that more would support this."

Speaker Murphy: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Clabaugh is recognized."

Clabaugh: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I didn't know this Bill is as bad, was as bad as it is when I spoke a moment ago. Now this extends the life of a provisional Certificate. And provisional is the lowest class of Certificates that we have. This simply says that they...ah...if they get that kind of Certificate then you're waiving completely any teacher training at all."

Speaker Miller: "Any further discussion? Has everybody voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there



are 88 'ayes' and 44 'nays'. Caldwell 'aye'. Perry 'aye'. DiPrima 'aye'. On this question there are 91 'ayes' and 44 'nays' and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1051. Washington. Wait a minute. Excuse me. Matijevich. House Bill 1051. Matijevich. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Murphy: "That's quite a compliment you had John. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1051 is an attempt to provide a more equitable transportation for those citizens of the State of Illinois who attend nonpublic elementary and secondary schools. Under our present law that we had passed recently...ah...transportation is supported to students in nonpublic schools if they reside within extreme elementary or secondary public school district. What this Bill is intended to do is in those areas where the student must cross public school boundaries to attend a nonpublic school the...ah...transportation will be afforded by the state. The Amendment offered in Committee is a fifteen mile restriction on the Bill. I might say that at least six other states, Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and New York have similar...ah...law wherein you may cross public school boundaries to provide transportation for nonpublic schools. I would plead with those who are in the City of Chicago who are one public school districts that they would give us some help in other areas of the state where we have this very difficult problem of crossing school boundaries and I would solicit your support for House Bill 1051."

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

Skinner: "If I may ask a question? John, how will this work? If someone wants to get from the Crystal Lake School District to Marion Central High School in Woodstock, would they have to, how will they get from one school bus to the other school bus?"

Matijevich: "Well what will happen Cal, from talking to Father Fergus for example of Carmel High School and I know that in Woodstock



they have, they do have the same problem. There will be a bus route established for the nonpublic schools. What this Bill will do will provide that the State of Illinois will reimburse the public school district for such transportation. In our area, for example, in Lake County, the local school district would entirely support this particular Legislation. They're glad to have it as long as the Legislature would statutorily give that authority. In fact I think when you talk about the...the school buses and so forth and the upkeep and so forth the public school districts might even come out a little bit ahead. I guess publicly they wouldn't say that but I understand they're for it, the nonpublic schools are for it, all we have to do is find the money and I'm trying to do that in another Bill. But this Bill, I think is very much needed, it's entirely Constitutional under the Supreme Court decision of many years ago and I would hope that we throughout the State of Illinois would support it. There is a way it can be done."

Skinner: "Can I also ask how...you know, what school ditrict does it? How do they decide that?"

Matijevich: "Ah...In...In our particular area it would be the local school district where the nonpublic school district is located."

Speaker Murphy: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Polk is recognized."

Polk: "Will the Sponsor yield a question?"

Speaker Murphy: "Yes."

Polk: "Now, let me understand this. Are you saying that the school buses then will go to the homes of the individual people and children that are participating, going to school in a private school. Is that correct?"

Matijevich: "Well, what I'm saying is that the transportation will be afforded for nonpublic school students if they live within the fifteen mile boundaries. The practical effect of it will be that there will still be established routes but there, at least there will be some transportation afforded. I don't think what will happen will be that buses will be coming right up to peoples homes. That



isn't done now under the public school situation and it won't be done under this. But we, it was very difficult to write specific Legislation in this regard when you do cross school boundaries. So this was the best that we could do under the circumstances."

Speaker Murphy: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This certainly is a far reaching Bill. It gets the state into the business or properts to get the state into the business of transporting nonpublic students and not just those that live along the line to the public school but taking them up to fifteen miles from where they reside or from where the district line is and that could be any number of miles away from where they reside. I submit to you that this is going to be extremely costly, I haven't seen any figures, I don't know whether the Gentleman provided a Fiscal Note. Now in addition to that there seems to be some confusion about whether the state pays the cost or whether it's paid by the local district. The Gentleman seems in the Bill to indicate that he would like the state to but there's some conflict with the Bill and with another section of the School Code which indicates that the districts shall pay according to a formula. So either way, whether it's the state or the district, the cost is fantastic and it it's the district I suggest to you that schools are financed in public school transportation and now private school transportation is financed largely from the property tax levy and those of you who are so interested in a tax raise might consider this a vote in favor of implementing the tax freeze and vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "A question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Blair: "Okay."

Beaupre: "John, what is the rational behind providing full subsidy in this situation...ah...as opposed to the eighty per cent that we have in the general school formula?"



Matijevich: "I guess...I guess Representative Beaupre this may be ...ah...ah...may have been also the problem of coming to with specific Legislation to try to get at a specific problem. I think probably the reason for it was that the local public school districts would rather have it that way. I think that's the rationale for it. I think that they feel that if they get full funding for it they want to be in it and maybe if not they're a little more hesitant. But this was drafted after some consultation with not only the nonpublic schools, but also public schools and actually we're using a, the same criteria that is used in Special Education Districts. But I...I would just like to respond, if I may in addition to Representative Beaupre and I never take personal issue on any Member of the House because I think we all have...we all have our right to our own opinion. But I want to say right now that the Majority Leader is usually one of the first to try to help the people in the higher levels of education with nonpublic colleges and universities and he has that right and I think I've joined him on many occasions. But my first inclination is to try to help those youngsters in the Elementary and Secondary Schools and this is entirely Constitutional and I think before we help those in Higher Education we have to help all of the students in Secondary in Elementary Education whether they be in public or not public schools."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It seems to me that if this Bill passes we are making a blanket obligation to the state and to the taxpayers of the State of Illinois wherein this obligation hitherto has been on a district by district basis and I think on a district by district basis a great deal more discretion and a great deal more care has been exercised in expending funds in this way and if it goes statewide by virtue of a blanket obligation under the provisions of this Bill I'm afraid that the cost will escalate the taxpayers will suffer and I think the Bill really should be





defeated and would urge a red light."

Speaker Blair: "All right. Does the Gentleman care to close?"

The question is, shall House Bill 1051 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished?

Turn this thing on once there so I can see it.... The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 93 'aye' and 33 'nays' and this Bill having...The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "I request a verification."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker I need a few more people who are interested in helping out the young people of the State of Illinois. So I'd like to Poll the absentees."

Speaker Blair: "All right, Poll the absentees."

Clerk Selcke: "Barnes, Bluthardt, Caldwell, Chapman, Choate, Day, Deavers, Douglas, Duff, R. L. Dunn, Fleck, Gibbs, Giglio, Granata, Hart, Hirschfeld, Gene Hoffman, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Dave Jones, Katz, Klosak, LaFleur, Lauer, Leon, Lundy, McCormick, McGah, McMaster, Kenny Miller, Malloy, Neff, Palmer, Pappas."

Speaker Blair: "Put Pappas 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "Peters, Porter, Leon."

Speaker Blair: "Porter 'aye'. Leon 'aye'....Huskey....Huskey."

Huskey: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Blair: "How's..."

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

Huskey: "I'd like to change my vote to 'no'."

Speaker Blair: "Change his vote to 'no'."

Speaker Blair: "Caldwell, how is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Blair: "Vote him 'aye'." Mr. Duff 'no'. Harpstrite, how is he recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Harpstrite 'no'."

Speaker Blair: "He says change it to 'aye'. Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "What is the number of 'aye' votes Mr. Clerk?"

Speaker Blair: "What's the..."

Clerk Selcke: "97 'ayes'."



Walsh: "I withdraw my request for a verification."

Speaker Blair: "All right, on this question there are 97 'ayes', 34 'nays'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of Consideration Postponed appears House Bill 452. It has been read a Third time previously on which the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt. For what purpose does the Gentleman Mr. Shea rise?"

Shea: "I might ask you, would you hold this for a few minutes?"

Speaker Blair: "We're ready to proceed with this Bill."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill has been up before, it's been debated. I think it's fully understood by all of those who have been interested in the...ah...matter. It's a Bill that will provide a method for filling vacancies in both the House and the Senate when a vacancy occurs by reason of death, resignation or for any other purpose. I think we have debated it and I think there is an urgent need for this Legislation and I'm asking for your support."

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

Shea: "Well Mr. Speaker, I certainly think that this Bill needs some more work on it and at the time you take the Roll Call would you record me 'present' please?"

Speaker Blair: "All right, the question is, shall House Bill 452 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Mr. Barry, 'present'. Ah...Mr. Farley, 'present'. Mr. Kozubowski 'present'. Mr. Pierce 'present'. Mr. Getty 'present'. Mr. Brinkmeier 'present'. Mr. Krause 'present'. Ah...Mr. McLendon 'present'. Mr. Lemke 'present'. Mr. Fennessey 'present'. Mr. Craig 'present'. Mr. VonBoeckman 'present'. Mr. Brinkmeier 'present'. Mr. Bradley 'present'. Mr. Tipsword 'present'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk...Clerk will take the record. Simms 'aye'. Madigan 'aye'. Madigan 'aye'? Are you on the Roll Cal. Madigan is recorded as voting 'aye'. Madigan wants to go from 'aye' to 'no' and Simms goes to 'aye'. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea rise?"

Shea: "I'd like to verify the Roll Call."



Speaker Blair: "Well it's got 89 votes."

Shea: "It starts off at that position."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the Members be in their seats. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Poll of the absentees first."

Speaker Blair: "All right, Poll the absentees."

Clerk Selcke: "Alsup, Arrigo, Barnes, Barry."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Arrigo."

Arrigo: "I want to be recorded as 'present'."

Speaker Blair: "Record the Gentleman as 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Beatty."

Speaker Blair: "Beatty 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Beaupre, Berman."

Speaker Blair: "Wait a minute. Beaupre is 'present' and Barnes is 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Boyle, Bradley, Brandt."

Speaker Blair: "Brandt. Some of those names were 'present'. I mean I called them off earlier, like Bradley and...Oh all right. It doesn't show on the official Roll Call, they're over here so... Now. Mr. Brandt is 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Brinkmeier, Brummet."

Speaker Blair: "Brummet 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Caldwell, Calvo, Capparelli, Carter."

Speaker Blair: "Carter 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Chapman, Choate, Craig, Davis.."

Speaker Blair: "Davis 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "DiPrima, Douglas, Ewell, Farley, Fary, Fennessey, Flinn, Garmisa, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Granata, Hart, Hill, Gene Hoffman, Jimmy Holloway, D. Houlihan."

Speaker Blair: "D. Houlihan 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "J. Houlihan. Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Katz, Keller Kelly, Kennedy, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Krause, Laurino, Lechowicz, Lemke, Leon, Londrigan, Lundy, Mann, Maragos, Matijevich, McCormick, McGah, McGrew, McLendon, McPartlin, Merlo, Mugalian, Nardulli, Patrick, Pierce, Rayson, Sangmeister, Schisler, Schneider, Schraeder,



Speaker: "Yes."  
 Speaker: "He is in their hands, the  
 Gentleman."  
 Speaker: "Yes."  
 Speaker: "Buffy."  
 Speaker: "Basset."  
 Speaker: "as 'present'."  
 Speaker: "as 'present'."  
 Speaker: "as 'present'."  
 Speaker: "as 'present' and another is  
 'present'."  
 Speaker: "Some of the names were 'present', I mean  
 like Bradley and... Oh all right, it  
 does not matter, they're over here now."  
 Speaker: "as 'present'."  
 Speaker: "as 'present'."  
 Speaker: "Calvo, Capwell, Carter."  
 Speaker: "as 'present'."  
 Speaker: "Cooks, Cruz, Davis."  
 Speaker: "as 'present'."  
 Speaker: "Douglas, Ebel, Farley, Fary, Finnerman,  
 Gligo, Gzigi, Granata, Hart, Hill, Kane  
 Laway, D. Houlihan."  
 Speaker: "as 'present'."  
 Speaker: "as 'present'."  
 Speaker: "Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Katz, Ketter  
 Kinski, Kuzborski, Krause, Laurin, Ludwick,  
 Man, Mandy, Mann, Maragos, Matijevich, Matuszewski,  
 Minton, Muzarza, Nardo, Mugalian, Nardone,  
 Nason, Spangraber, Schisler, Schuchter, Schroeder,  
 ...



Sharp, Shea, Ike Simms, Stedelin, Stone, Taylor, Terzich, Thompson, Tipsword, VonBoeckman, Washington, Williams, B. B. Wolfe, Yourell."

Speaker Blair: "All right, on this question there are 89 'aye', at least, no 'nays'...1 'nay'. What do Choate and Shea want?"

Shea: "We're still waiting of the verification of the affirmative vote."

Speaker Blair: "I thought that's what we did."

Shea: "No, I think that was the absentees."

Speaker Blair: "All right, proceed to verify the affirmative."

Clerk Selcke: "Anderson, Arnell, Bluthardt, Borchers, Campbell, Capuzi, Catania, Clabaugh, Collins, Cox, Cunningham, Day, Deavers, Deuster, Duff, Ralph Dunn, R. L. Dunn, Dyer, Ebbesen, Epton, Fleck, Friedland, Geo-Karis, Gibbs, Griesheimer, Grotberg, Hanahan, Harpstrite, Hirschfeld, Ron Hoffman, R. Holloway, Hudson, Hunsicker, Huskey, Hyde, Dave Jones, Juckett, Kempiners, Kent, Klosak, Kriegsman, Kucharski, LaFleur, Lauer, Leinenweber, Macdonald, Mahar, Martin, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McClain, McCourt, McMaster, Kenny Miller, Tom Miller, Molloy, Murphy, Neff, North, Palmer, Pappas, Philip, Peters, Polk, Porter, Randolph, Redmond, 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 and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Blair: "All right. No questions of the affirmative. Questions of the affirmative, Mr. Shea?"

Shea: "Mr. Anderson."

Speaker Blair: "He's there."

Shea: "Mr. Arnell."

Speaker Blair: "He's there."

Shea: "Where?"

Speaker Blair: "Sitting in his seat."

Shea: "All right, Mr. Cunningham."

Speaker Blair: "How is he recorded? Rosco?"

Clerk Selcke: "Roscoe is recorded as voting 'aye'."



Speaker Blair: "He isn't out in his seat, is he on the Floor?"

Take him off the record."

Shea: "Mr. Day."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Day. Is Mr. Day there? All right, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Blair: "Take him off the record."

Shea: "All right, now you've taken Mr. Day and Mr. Cunningham off, is that correct?"

Speaker Blair: "Right."

Shea: "Mr. Campbell."

Speaker Blair: "He's there."

Shea: "Mr. Ebbesen."

Speaker Blair: "Ebbesen's there."

Shea: "Mr. Harpstrite."

Speaker Blair: "He's there."

Shea: "Mr. R. K. Hoffman."

Speaker Blair: "He's there."

Shea: "Mr. Gene Hoffman."

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman's recorded as not voting."

Shea: "Mr. Hyde."

Speaker Blair: "He's there."

Shea: "Mr. Juckett."

Speaker Blair: "He's in the back."

Shea: "Mr. Kucharski."

Speaker Blair: "He's there."

Shea: "Mr. LaFleur."

Speaker Blair: "He's there, put Mr. Day back on the Roll Call."

Shea: "Mrs. Macdonald."

Speaker Blair: "Mrs. who?"

Shea: "Mrs. Macdonald, but I see her there now. Mrs. Martin."

Speaker Blair: "How was she, how was she recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "She was recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Blair: "Well where is she? Put her back Jerry. Take her off momentarily."



Shea: "How's Mr. McClain?"

Speaker Blair: "He looks all right to me. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Blair: "Just take him off of 'aye'? Vote him 'present'."

Shea: "Mr. McMaster."

Speaker Blair: "He's back there."

Shea: "Mr. Pappas. I see him over there."

Speaker Blair: "He's here."

Shea: "Mr. Redmond."

Speaker Blair: "How is he recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Mr...Wait till I find him. The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Shea: "I have no further questions....Hold it...Pardon me. Let him. I'm sorry, I didn't hear what you said."

Speaker Blair: "He said the Gentleman was recorded as voting 'aye' Is he on the Floor? All right take him off."

Shea: "Mr. Gibbs."

Speaker Blair: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman, Mr. Gibbs, is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Blair: "I don't see him on the Floor. Take him off, yeah. Mr. Day, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

Speaker Blair: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Day: "Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Holloway, for what purpose do you rise? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Holloway, the Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Holloway: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Blair: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. All right, Gibbs is back put him back on. We're trying to keep order. For what...what. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins rise?"

Collins: "Well Mr. Speaker, briefly to explain my vote, I...ah...

I've been over on the other side of the aisle for few minutes talking



to a number of my friends over there who I feel would like to vote for this Bill but I think there's...ah...appear to be some misconceptions to it. Concerning this piece of Legislation, this is not something that has come before, has not come before us in the past, as a matter of fact I was the Sponsor of this Bill once before when we passed it in earlier Session and it was only for technical reasons, as I remember that the...the...ah...the Governor vetoed the Bill at that time and I know that the Minority Leader has expressed himself as being in favor of this type of Legislation in the past...ah...Mr. Speaker, I...Could I have a little order, I don't feel that everyone can hear me. Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Blair: "Yes, could we have a little order please?"

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that noone could hear me, could I start over again? At any rate as I was saying. Mr. Lauer said that he didn't hear a word I said, may I start over again Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Blair: "Well I didn't hear for what purpose you got up, what was that?"

Collins: "Well I got up to explain my vote."

Speaker Blair: "Okay, go ahead. Just a moment. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea rise?"

Shea: "I tink we're past the point of explaining our votes and I can remember when I..."

Speaker Blair: "Well I don't want to be arbitrary..."

Shea: "I can remember when I stood on the Floor of this House and begged, begged for votes from your side of the aisle to pass this Legislation last year and as you said you made a mistake then but that doesn't mean, all we asked was just to hold it for a while."

Speaker Blair: "Two wrongs don't make a right. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt, for what purpose do you rise?"

Bluthardt: "Well I think the last retort by the Assistant Majority Leader ought to have a reply because a Bill was passed that would fill the need of, of this Bill, that this Bill would fill and that Bill did go to the Governor. The Governor vetoed it on the





grounds that it didn't provide a way for an independent candidate to be replaced. This Bill does and I'm surprised that the other side, knowing the urgency of this Bill and knowing...Let me read briefly from an Editorial in the Springfield Journal that appeared yesterday. This is a Bill...that...ah...would permit the House to be restored to full strength for the current Session but would provide an orderly process for the future. The long range interest of both political parties would be served. The question of filling vacancies, vacancies should not be shelved indefinitely. Rerely is their a Session which death does not take a toll. With Illinois so closely divided politically it makes good sense to provide for an orderly and effecient method of sustaining the two party system and thereby assuring more productive Legislative process. And...I...I say to you over on that side you ought to listen and you ought to join with me in this good Bill. There's a need for it, it's good government, you ought to support it is."

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

Collins: "Well Mr. Speaker, I refrained from rising while my good friend the Sponsor of this Bill was speaking just now. But I should have raised a point of order I believe because I think that half the time the Assistant Mincrity Leader rose I have the Floor and was attempting to explain my vote and then he rose on a point and then the distinguished Sponsor of the Chairman of the House Elections Committee my good and dear friend Edward E. Bluthardt rose and I didn't want to interrupt him or show him any discourtesy but I would call the attention of the Chair that I do believe that at the time of these...ah...interruptions that I have been recognized to explain my vote and did have the Floor at that time Mr. Speaker and then of course the Assistant Minority Leader raised a point of order as to whether I should be allowed to explain my vote at this time and I was, so I was interrupted or cut off at that time. So Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a ruling on the Assistant Minority Leader's point. Do I have the right to explain my vote or do I not Mr. Speaker and if I do I would like to proceed on that explanation at this time and



again I'd ask Mr. Chairman if I could have a little order because obviously everyone is having a little difficulty hearing at this time. Ah..."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, the Gentleman from Henry, Representative McGrew sought recognition, did you want to speak to Representative Collins point sir?"

McGrew: "No."

Speaker Telcser: "I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman."

Berman: "Mr. Speaker, my memory is not a long one, I just want to know if you have your track shoes on today?"

Speaker Telcser: "No, but do you want to make a motion on it. Representative Collins to explain his vote."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker the furthest thing from my mind was to put a motion I certainly would wait for the distinguished Majority Leader to do that. Well as I was saying Mr. Speaker, previously, I just can't imagine anyone not supporting this Legislation as I think that most everyone of us in the House is on record at one point or another as supporting this Bill or similar Legislation. I was the principal Sponsor of this type of Legislation I think a year or two ago at which time, at which time the Governor for the reasons that Representative Bluthardt pointed out sought to veto the Bill and then of course the distinguished Minority Leader had a Bill that was similar and I think did pass this House and the Assistant Minority, I never had to be begged to vote for this type of Legislation because I have persistently and continually supported this type of Legislation and it looks like I'm going to have to do it again in the next Session if I'm fortunate enough to be reelected. And...ah...Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker, I would move that we adjourn until 9:30 tomorrow morning."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved that the House do stand adjourned until 9:30 tomorrow morning. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The House stands adjourned."



*Speaker Blain ? DeLoach probably.*

INDEX

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 30, 1973



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 Bernard B. Wolfe - illness.



Speaker Blair	At ease--House be in order
Doctor Johnson	Invocation
Speaker Blair	Roll Call for attendance
Walsh, W.	Absentees, Republicans
Speaker Blair	
Choate	Absentees, Democrats
Speaker Blair	
Fredric Selcke	Messages from the Senate
Speaker Blair	
Fredric Selcke	Committee Reports
Speaker Blair	
Fredric Selcke	Introduction and First Reading
Speaker Blair	
Fredric Selcke	Agreed Resolutions
Speaker Blair	
Walsh, W.	Explains Agreed Resolutions
Speaker Blair	Resolutions adopted. House Bills, Third Reading
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 687, Third Reading, taken out of the Record. House Bill 867, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	
Ewell	Explains the Bill, Sponsor
Speaker Blair	
Hart	Question of Sponsor
Ewell	Response and discussion
Hart	Doesn't agree
Ewell	Discussion



Hart	
Ewell	
Hart	
Ewell	Declining balance
Hart	Speaks to the Bill
Speaker Blair	The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate
Choate	Speaks to the Bill--supports
Speaker Blair	
Dunn, R.	Discussion on Bill--oppose
Speaker Blair-	
Hirschfeld	Speaks on Bill
Speaker Blair	
Sangmeister	Moves previous question
Speaker Blair	So moved
Ewell	To close
Speaker Blair	Vote
Skinner	Explains vote--no
Speaker Blair	
Stedelin	Explains vote--yes
Speaker Blair	
Hart	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	
Choate	Explains vote--yes
Speaker Blair	Bill passed
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 687, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	



Simms	Explains the Bill, Sponsor
Speaker Blair	
Griesheimer	Speaks on the Bill
Speaker Blair	
Tuerk	Will Sponsor yield?
Speaker Blair	Proceed, Sir
Tuerk	Question put
Simms	Response
Tuerk	Discussion
Simms	
Speaker Blair	
Hunsicker	Rise in opposition to this Bill
Speaker Blair	
Murphy	
Simms	
Speaker Blair	
Murphy	Question to Sponsor
Speaker Blair	
Choate	Question of Representative Murphy
Murphy	
Choate	
Murphy	Opposes the Bill
Speaker Blair	Keep noise level down
Miller, T.	Testimonies presented before Committee
Speaker Blair	
Geo-Karis	Opposes the Bill



Speaker Blair	
X Dunn, R. <sup>atp</sup>	Speaks in opposition to Bill
Speaker Blair	
Macdonald	Rise to support the Bill
Speaker Blair	
Jones, D.	Ask Sponsor a question
Speaker Blair	
Jones, D.	Question put
Simms	Response
Jones, D.	Discussion, oppose Bill
Speaker Blair	
Friedland	Moves previous question
Speaker Blair	So moved
Simms	To close
Speaker Blair	
Rigney	Denial of Home Rule?
Speaker Blair	
Choate	Raised a point of order
Rigney	Yes, I did
Choate	
Speaker Blair	Not a home rule unit.
Murphy	Disagrees with Chair's ruling
Speaker Blair	
Flinn	
Speaker Blair	
Flinn	Question of Chair





Speaker Blair	
Bluthardt	
Speaker Blair	Changes Chair's ruling, takes 107 votes
Simms	Dissents on Chair's ruling
Speaker Blair	
Macdonald	Parliamentary inquiry
Speaker Blair	State your point
Macdonald	Inquiry asked
Speaker Blair	
Macdonald	Thank you
Speaker Blair	
Houlihan	Parliamentary inquiry
Speaker Blair	State your point
Houlihan	
Speaker Blair	Discussion on parliamentary inquiry
Houlihan	
Speaker Blair	Vote
Cunningham	Explains vote--aye
Speaker Blair	
Day	Explains vote--no
Speaker Blair	
Dunne, R. L.	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	
Skinner	Explains vote--aye
Speaker Blair	
Dunn, Ralph	Explains vote--no



Speaker Blair	
Waddell	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	
Fennessey	Explains vote--no
Speaker Blair	
Kriegsman	Explains vote--no
Speaker Blair	
Hanahan	Explains vote--aye
Speaker Blair	
Mann	Explains vote--aye
Speaker Blair	Take the Record
Simms	Files dissent to ruling
Speaker Blair	Bill lost, didn't get 107 votes
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 950, Third Reading of Bill
Speaker Blair	Take it out of the Record
Laurino	Point of personal privilege
Speaker Blair	Attention please
Laurino	
Speaker Blair	Point well taken
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 966
Speaker Blair	Take it out of the Record
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 871, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	
Kosinski	Explains the Bill, Sponsor
Speaker Blair	Take it out of the Record
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 892, Third Reading



Speaker Blair	
Hanahan	Asks leave to hear series--891, '892 984, and 895
Speaker Blair	Leave granted
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 891, 894, and 895, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	
Hanahan	House Bills 892, 893, 894 and 895-- explains all four Bills, Sponsor
Speaker Blair	
Lauer	
Speaker Blair	
Lauer )	Discussion
)	
Hanahan )	
Speaker Blair	
Mahar	
Speaker Blair	
Mahar	
Hanahan	
Speaker Blair	
Katz	Question of Sponsor
Hanahan	Response
Speaker Blair	
Katz	
Speaker Blair	
Lundy	Will Sponsor yield?
Speaker Blair	Proceed
Lundy	Question put



Hanahan	Response
Speaker Blair	'Mr. Lundy . . .'
Lundy	Another question
Hanahan	Response to question
Speaker Blair	
Lundy	Addresses himself to the Bill
Speaker Blair	
Grotberg	Moves previous question
Speaker Blair	So moved
Hanahan	To close
Speaker Blair	Vote--four Roll Calls
Walsh	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	
Huskey	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	
Washington	Explains vote--no
Speaker Blair	The Bills pass
Choate	Introduction of Martin Seuter
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 994
Speaker Blair	
Fredric Selcke	
Speaker Blair	Take it out of the Record
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1074, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	
Hanahan	Explains the Bill, Sponsor
Speaker Blair	



Skinner	May I ask the Sponsor a question?
Speaker Blair	Proceed
Skinner	Question asked
Hanahan	Response and discussion
Skinner	Discussion
Hanahan	
Speaker Blair	Vote--Bill passed
Walsh, W.	Introduction of Martha Day
Speaker Blair	
Hill	Leave to have name removed, 1430 and 1558
Speaker Blair	Leave granted
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1098, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	Take it out of the Record
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 1121
Speaker Blair	Take it out of the Record
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 701
Speaker Blair	
Fredric Selcke	Third Reading
Speaker Blair	Take it out of the Record
Fredric Selcke	House Bill 763, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	
Hart	Explains the Bill (coal),-Sponsor
Speaker Blair	
Jones	
Speaker Blair	
Leinenweber	Speaks against the Bill



Speaker Blair	
Schneider	
Speaker Blair	Mr. Walters
Walters	Question of Sponsor
Speaker Blair	Proceed
Walters	
Hart	
Walters	
Hart	
Speaker Blair	
Cox	Moves previous question
Speaker Blair	So moved
Hart	To close
Speaker Blair	Vote
Choate	Explains vote--aye
Speaker Blair	
Kennedy	Explains vote--no
Speaker Blair	
Hart	Explains vote--aye
Speaker Blair	Postponed Consideration
Hart	Leave
Speaker Blair	Against rules
Hart	
Speaker Blair	Take it out of the Record
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 806, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	



Stone	Leave to take back to Second, three Amendments
Speaker Blair	Leave granted
Jack O'Brien	Amendment #1 read
Speaker Blair	
Stone	Explains Amendment #1
Speaker Blair	Amendment #1 adopted
Jack O'Brien	Amendment #2 read
Speaker Blair	
Stone	Explains Amendment #2
Speaker Blair	Amendment #2 adopted
Jack O'Brien	Amendment #3 read
Speaker Blair	
Stone	Explains Amendment #3
Speaker Blair	Amendment #3 adopted. Third Reading
Stone	Held for one day
Speaker Blair	Third
Dyer	Fiscal note requested
Speaker Blair	
Stone	Be glad to
Speaker Blair	
Borchers	Personal privilege
Speaker Blair	Vote to suspend rules
Choate	Introduction
Speaker Blair	
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 1618, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	



Borchers	Explains the Bill, Sponsor
Speaker Blair	
Choate	Speaks on the Bill
Speaker Blair	
Borchers	To close
Speaker Blair	Vote
Skinner	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	Take the Record, Bill lost
Walsh, W.	Introductions
Speaker Blair	
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 142, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	
Rayson	Take it out of the Record
Speaker Blair	Take it out of the Record
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 534, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	
Hill	Explains the Bill, Sponsor
Speaker Blair	Vote--Bill passed
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 626, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	
Katz	Explains the Bill, Sponsor
Speaker Blair	
Ebbesen	Rise in support of Bill
Speaker Blair	
Neff	Speaks on the Bill
Speaker Blair	





Choate	Speaks on the Bill
Speaker Blair	
Murphy	Point of order
Choate	
Speaker Blair	Point is well taken
Choate	Continues speaking on the Bill, oppose
Speaker Blair	
Hanahan	Speak on the Bill
Speaker Blair	
Walsh, W.	Speaks on the Bill
Speaker Blair	
Hirschfeld	Speaks on the Bill, support
Speaker Blair	
Fleck	Moves previous question
Speaker Blair	So moved
Katz	To close
Speaker Blair	Vote
Deuster	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	
Hudson	Explains vote--aye
Speaker Blair	
Houlihan, J.	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	
Waddell	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	
Pierce	Explains vote



Speaker Blair	
Murphy	
Speaker Blair	
Cunningham	
Speaker Blair	Bill passed
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 730, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	
Schraeder	Take it out of the Record
Speaker Blair	
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 882
Speaker Blair	Take it out of the Record
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 884, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	recognizes . . .
Collins	Leave to return to Second for Amendment
Speaker Blair	Leave granted
Jack O'Brien	Amendment #1 read
Speaker Blair	
Collins	Explains Amendment #1, Sponsor
Speaker Blair	Leave granted
Collins	Amendment #1, Agreed Amendment
Speaker Blair	Amendment #1 adopted, Third Reading
Collins	Explains the Bill on Third, Sponsor
Speaker Blair	
Lundy	Will Gentleman yield for a question?
Speaker Blair	Proceed
Lundy	Question asked



Collins	Response
Speaker Blair	
Capuzi	
Speaker Blair	
Beatty	Rise to support Bill
Speaker Blair	
McAuliffe	Rise in support
Speaker Blair	
Beatty	Urge 'yes' vote
Speaker Blair	
Collins	To close, return to Second
Speaker Blair	
Collins	Make correction
Speaker Blair	Bill back to Third
Collins	In closing
Speaker Blair	Vote
Bluthardt	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	Take the Record, passed
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 885, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	
Collins	Leave to return to Second
Speaker Blair	
Jack O'Brien	Amendment #1 read
Speaker Blair	
Collins	Explains Amendment #1 to House Bill 885
Speaker Blair	



Ewell	How much?
Collins	\$1,800,000 over three years
Speaker Blair	Amendment #1 adopted, Third
Collins	
Speaker Blair	
Ewell	Raise in taxes
Collins	
Ewell	Tax freeze
Collins	
Ewell	
Collins	
Speaker Blair	Vote
Chaote	Vote me 'present'
Speaker Blair	Bill passed
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 928
Speaker Blair	Take it out of the Record
Jack O'Brien	House Bill 998, Third Reading
Speaker Blair	
Jones, D.	Explains the Bill
Speaker Blair	
Choate	Speaks on the Bill
Speaker Blair	
Blair	Speaks on the Bill
Speaker Blair	
Jones, J. D.	To close
Speaker Blair	Vote
Choate	Explains vote



Speaker Blair	
Walsh, W.	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	
Shea	Explains vote--aye
Speaker Blair	
Hanahan	Explains vote--aye
Speaker Blair	
Lauer	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	
Jones, J. D.	Explains vote--aye
Speaker Blair	
Duff	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	
Blair	Explains vote
Speaker Blair	
Ewell	Record me as 'present' and explains
Speaker Blair	
Londrigan	Explains his vote--present
Speaker Blair	
Hirschfeld	Explains vote--aye
Speaker Blair	
Gibbs	Explains vote--aye
Speaker Blair	
Hill	Explains vote--no
Speaker Blair	Take the Record
Ewell	Verification



Speaker Blair	91 'ayes', 0 'nays', 4 'present'
Blair	Polls absentees
Speaker	
Fredric Selcke	Polls the absentees
Speaker	Barry 'present'
Fredric Selcke )	Continues poll of absentees
)	
Speaker            )	Records various Representatives
	'present'
Fredric Selcke	Verifies the affirmative
Speaker	
Springer	
Speaker	
Fredric Selcke	
Springer	
Speaker            )	Questions of the affirmative
)	
Eweel             )	
Fredric Selcke	
Speaker	
Walsh	
Speaker	
Ewell	
Speaker	
Choate	
Speaker	
?	
Speaker	
Fredric Selcke	Reads 'present'



Speaker	
Maragos	
Speaker	
Jones	Postponed Consideration
Speaker	Leave granted
Speaker	House Bill 1403
Fredric Selcke	Second Reading
Madigan	Return to Second Reading
Fredric Selcke	
Madigan	Take to Third Reading
Speaker	Amendment #3 adopted
Madigan	House Bill 1403, Health Care Facilities
Speaker	
Kempiners	Conflicts present
Madigan	
Speaker	Vote
Kempiners	
Speaker	
Hanahan	
Brinkmeier	
Matijeovich	
Douglas	
Hudson	
Skinner	Moves previous question
Hanahan	
Giorgi	Point of order



Speaker House Bill 1403 pass?

Hanahan Expalins vote

Giorgi

Speaker

Juckett

Kempiners

Speaker Vote--passed. House Bill 814

Fredric Selcke Third Reading

Speaker House Bill 843, Third Reading; House Bill 877, Third Reading; House Bill 779, Third Reading; House Bill 1206, Third Reading; House Bill 1207, Third Reading

