

Speaker Walsh, W.: "The House will come to order. A prayer by our
Colleague, Corneal Davis."

Davis: "Let us pray. I was glad when they invited me to come into the House of the Lord. I'd rather be a doorkeeper in the House of my God, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness. Eternal God, our Father, we're thankful this morning for all of Your goodness, for all of Your loving kindness, not only to us, but to this Nation. As we come this morning, may we hear the warning of that new born babe, Mr. Colson, there in Washington. When he says to this Nation that a few of us will be perged and then we will assume that all of the Nation is saved. So true, may we recognize the fact that there is no difference in men for we all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. But may we also recognize the fact that if we will confess our sins You will be faithful to forgive us of our sins. Now, we pray, O God, for that family of God, the King. Lord, I have never had the experience of dying, none of us know how it feels to die; but, thank God, you know how it feels to die. Three days you remained in the bosom of Mother Earth and rose on the third day, laughed in the face of death, and said, 'Death where is your sting?' May they be comforted by your words. For You've said to us, 'I go to prepare a place for you; and if I go to prepare a place for you, I'll come again and receive you unto Myself'. For where I am, there ye may be also. And then we pray for the Speaker of this House, we pray for the Leadership on both sides of this aisle, we pray for his excellency, the Governor of this state, and we pray for the President of this Nation. Help them to trust in the Lord with all of their hearts. And leave not to their own understanding, in all of their ways may they acknowledge Thee for you will guide and direct our paths. We pray in the name of Jesus. Amen."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Roll Call for Attendance. Resolutions."

Clerk Selcke: "House Resolution 1117, McCormick et al."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Speaker's Table . . . On the Order of Concurrences, House Bill 220. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, I move the concurrence with



Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 220."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Is there discussion? Oh, take it out of the Record, please, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 1464, Representative Juckett. House Bill 2832, Representative Keller. I beg your pardon, 2382, Representative Keller. House Bill 2851, Representative Washburn. House Bill 2477, Representative Hart. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart."

Hart: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is what we've essentially called the Dog Bill in down our way. And this Bill passed out of the House without much opposition and the Senate accepted the House Bill, but added an Amendment which really is mostly styling as the Senate is prone to do. And so it really doesn't change the Bill in any way. The Bill now has the approval of the Department of Agriculture, and it's very much needed to get this matter completed because the Animal Control Act that we passed last year takes affect today. The Bill now will give the county an option of charging or not charging for registration of dogs. And I ask for the concurrence of the House in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2477."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2477? Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Hart, I've been trying to follow this. Does this get rid of the \$4 charge that I was complaining about in Lake County that the County Board is charging them, where the city's do all the animal control work, and the county gets the \$4, and they have to pay a city tax as well for your dog?"

Hart: "Yes, if the county . . . the county will have the option of charging or not charging the registration fee or tax on dogs, and it could be anything from \$4 to nothing."

Pierce: "Well, then it doesn't automatically get rid of it. We've got a pressure in the County Board. And I've never known one yet to take off a tax, but maybe your's will. Maybe they're more responsive down in southern Illinois than they are up our way."

Hart: "Well, I feel that local . . . the local pressure will be effective



in our area, and I think it really should be a local problem."

Pierce: "Well, thank you very much, and I just wish we'd taken it away completely, but at least we have a way of going to the County Board now and forcing them to get rid of the \$4 charge."

Hart: "That is right."

Pierce: "All right."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, will Mr. Hart yield for a question? Dick, the Amend . . . was there an Amendment put on by the Senate? I can't hear you too well over here."

Hart: "Yes, the Senate amend . . . the Senate put on an Amendment, but it's mostly styling."

Geo-Karis: "It's what?"

Hart: "Styling and drafting. I mean, you know, the Senate just can't accept any Bill in the form in which the House sends it over there. They've always got to add their little way of doing things over there. But the Amendment doesn't change the purport of the Bill as it left the House."

Geo-Karis: "And your Amendment was to allow the County Boards to charge up to \$4 . . ."

Hart: "Yes, that's optional, it's . . ."

Geo-Karis: ". . . there was no . . . it wasn't, in other words, a mandatory \$4 that we passed last year, is that right?"

Hart: ". . . That is correct."

Geo-Karis: "And what other good feature was there?"

Hart: "Well, there is a way where the county can work it out with the veterinarians to collect the . . . if they have a charge for the county, it can be collected by the veterinarians, rather than you having to take it to the courthouse and do all those other things."

Geo-Karis: "Did it improve the weaknesses we had in the other Bill, Dick?"

Hart: "I didn't hear that."

Geo-Karis: "Did it improve the weaknesses we had in that other one we passed?"



Hart: "Well, I think it's a little more flexible. At least it will give a way . . . there's been a lot of complaints in the rural areas where the veterinarian was 30 miles from the courthouse, and they had to get a rabies or vaccination, and then, yeah, and then drive into the courthouse. And this will possibly eliminate that problem."

Geo-Karis: "Okay, thank you very much."

Hart: "I think it's a very good Bill now."

Geo-Karis: "I'm for your concurrence. Thank you."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I've got a parliamentary inquiry. This Bill, in Section 3, says that this Act takes affect upon becoming law. If . . . how many votes or if this passes with a Constitutional Majority, when will this Bill become law? I've got a loud voice, Jim."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "July 1, 1975."

Shea: "In order for this Bill to become effective prior to that date, what is required?"

Speaker Walsh, W.: "107 votes."

Shea: "What is required in the body of the Act or a Bill?"

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Well, Representative Shea, I'm sure you're looking as I am at Rule 39(B), which it seems to the Chair would be applicable in this instance."

Shea: "Well, am I correct in my assumption that in order for a Bill that passes this Chamber to become effective before July 1, 1975, it must have a Section added to the Bill with an earlier effective date, and it must pass this Chamber with a three-fifths Constitutional Majority?"

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Yes."

Shea: "Thank you."

Speaker Wlsh, W.: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield to a question? Dick, I'm sure that we have been over and around this Animal Control Act. And as I understand the Bill as currently amended, it will permit the County Board to continue a rabies program, is this right?"



Hart: "That is correct. This will have no affect on the rabies program of the County Board."

McMaster: "The basic difference between the Animal Control Act under your legislation as amended and as it presently is would be that the county has the right to go into the rabies program or the right to be out of it?"

Hart: "No, they don't have any right to be out of it; . . ."

McMaster: "Okay."

Hart: ". . . but they will have the option of whether or not they will put a tax on the dog owner."

McMaster: "They will have the option of how much of a tax or whether they want to put any or not, is this right?"

Hart: "Yes, anything up to \$4 . . . pays \$4."

McMaster: "Up to \$4. Well, Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to the Bill a minute?"

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Proceed, Representative McMaster's."

McMaster: "Let me say that I think that control of rabies is a very important thing in this state. Anyone who has been exposed to rabies, and is definitely known, must go through a series of shots that is quite painful, and lasts quite some time. I think that we need to do everything that we can to maintain some sort of a rabies control program in the State of Illinois. And don't let the name of the Animal Control Act mislead you, it's actually a Rabies Control Act. And I certainly would urge that you vote for this Conference Committee Report, and that we do continue to have a rabies control program in the State of Illinois. And, hopefully, all counties will enter into it. I think that it can be done with a little inter-governmental cooperation."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Representative Hart to close."

Hart: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And this Bill as written does have the language that it takes affect upon becoming a law. So it will require 107 votes; and I'm going to ask the Body to give me those kind of votes, and then I'm going to go ask the Governor to sign the Bill. Thank you very much. I would appreciate the support of the House."



Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, the question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2477? All those in favor will vote 'aye', the opposed will vote 'no'; and this will take 107 votes. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, do you mean it will pass with 89, but to become effective before July 1st of 1975, it will receive . . . it will need 107?"

Speaker Walsh, W.: "That's precisely what I mean. All right, on this . . . have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this question there are 140 'ayes', no 'nays' and none voting 'present'; and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2477. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "I ask you to put in the Record that this Bill passed this Chamber by the Consti . . . three-fifths Constitutional Majority, although, you say that it passed by 140 votes; and it, you know, it's kind of ipso facto. I think that on all things requiring a three-fifths, the Speaker will say that it passes by a three-fifths Constitutional Majority."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Well, Representative Shea, the language used is pretty standard in declaring a measure passed, and the language that I use is the standard language that has been used. So I submit that anything further is unnecessary. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, in those instances, where a three-fifths vote is required, the Chair has always said that this passed by a three-fifths Constitutional Majority. Now, is it the intention of the Chair on every one of these Roll Calls then to indicate the number of 'yeas' and 'nays' on a proposition?"

Speaker Walsh, W.: "The Parliamentarian points out that the three-fifths vote is not necessary to its passage, but only as to its effective date. We declared that this Bill had 140 votes . . ."

Shea: "That's my . . ."

Speaker Walsh, W.: ". . . three-fifths."

Shea: ". . . that's my question. Then the Chair will indicate on each Roll Call the 'yeas' and 'nays' on that Roll Call?"



Speaker Walsh, W.: "As the Chair always has indicated the 'yeas' and 'nays'."

Shea: "There are some times the Chair doesn't."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right . . ."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, could I make one more inquiry, please? Could the Majority Membership on the House Agricultural or the Agricultural Bill, the Conference Committee on the Agricultural Bill, whoever the House Member that's in charge of the Republican Delegation, could they please tell us the time and place of a meeting for that Conference Committee?"

Speaker Walsh, W.: ". . . Well, Jerry, I would think that you would seek out the Members of that Conference Committee and find out what the time is. But if those people are here, if they'd tell the Gentleman, it would be appreciated. And now on the Speaker's Table . . ."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, last night there were many innuendos about attendance at meetings. And we find it very hard from our Colleagues on the Majority side to find out where they're at. So perhaps will just start asking from the floor."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "On the Speaker's Table is House Resolution 910. The Chair recognizes the Lady from St. Clair, Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 910 as amended simply requests the House Election's Committee to appoint a Subcommittee to study the feasibility and the practicality of allowing voters to vote in a Primary without publicly declaring their party preference. This Resolution was passed out Committee, 'do adopt'. I request the support of the House on this."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "The question is, shall the . . . shall House Resolution 910 be adopted? And is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Cis', this is just a study, isn't it?"

Stiehl: "That's right, it's just a study. I've requested this because throughout the years there've been about 18 Bills on this subject



filed. And I know it's very complex. It's a major change in State Government; and I felt that it really warrants as a Federal study."

Shea: "We'll give you your 4th of July present early this year."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, all those in favor of the adoption of House Resolution 910 will say 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk Selcke: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of the Bills of the following titles, House Bills 2163 and 2652; passed the Senate June 30, 1974. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16 to a Bill of the following title, House Bill 2359. I'm further directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate requested a Committee of Conference; action taken by the Senate June 30, 1974. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, no further messages."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "On the Order of Conference Committee Reports appears Senate Bill 84. And the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Philip."

Philip: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the House do adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 84. It's concurred in by all of the Members of the Conference Committee."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, the Gentleman has moved that Conference Committee on Senate Bill 84 be adopted. And is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Philip, who were the Democratic Members on that? I'm sorry, but we're trying to sort things out this morning?"

Philip: "House Members?"

Shea: "Yes, Sir."

Philip: "Beatty, Madigan."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill . . . the Conference Committee Report on Senate



Bill 84 be adopted? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. All right, the Lady from DuPage, Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question about this Bill in its final form. I notice it is about housing, and that Members of the General Assembly and that the governmental authorities must be notified of any project that's coming into their area. All right, does it give the local areas veto power over the housing projects? It does not. Just simply notification? Thank you."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Have all voted who wish? Walsh 'aye', W. D. Walsh 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "All right, now, Mr. Speaker, this Bill or the Amendment does not have an effective date in it from what I can determine. So is it my understanding that without an earlier effective date that no matter what number of votes this Bill receives it will not become law until July 1, 1975?"

Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, now, let's finish and rule on this if we can. The Parliamentarian advises me that there's no effective date on this Bill. So provisions of Rule 39 would apply in the . . . if in any case whether it got . . . if it got more than 89 votes, but, irrespective, of whether it has 107 votes. The Bill is automatically deemed reconsidered and the Bill subject to an Amendment striking out an earlier effective date. And I presume this to mean no effective date also or adding an effective date. So, Representative Shea, to answer your question specifically the provisions of Rule 39(B) would apply. To say that the Bill is automatically reconsidered and subject to an Amendment that would provide for an effective date. And that Amendment for . . . to be adopted would require 107 votes to become effective immediately, 89 votes to become July 1, 1975. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, we are not dealing here with the Bill, but a report of a Conference Committee. And to the best of my knowledge, a Conference Committee has never been amended from the floor of the House. And I would like to find out from the Chair if the Chair



is now ruling that the Body has an opportunity to amend Conference Committee Reports?"

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Well, Jerry, we're happy to know the direction you're taking anyway; what this is all about."

Shea: "I'm not worried about any specific Act, but we will have laws as we pass them here, some becoming effective July 1, 1975, some with earlier effective dates becoming effective then, some becoming . . . with earlier effective dates becoming law July 1, 1975, depending on what's in each and every Bill. And I would presume, because we are stapling this and making a record, that we will have to do this with each and every piece of legislation passing this House."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, I would agree wholeheartedly with the Assistant Minority Leader. I'm certain that this Bill, which has been introduced almost two years ago, have . . . we haven't had an opportunity to debate this Bill on the floor. And if I'm in order, I would like to have this Bill taken out of the Record to give us an opportunity to look at it. I think that for whatever reason we haven't had an opportunity to debate this Bill on the floor."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "I'm rising in something of a parliamentary inquiry. What happens if we amend the Bill in one . . . the Conference Committee Report in one way and the Senate amends it in another, do we then have a concurrence or nonconcurrence call on Amendments to Conference Committee Reports and maybe even non . . . failing to recede from Amendments to Conference Committee. And we end up in Conference Committees on differences in Conference Committee Reports? I think this is a very bad practice to amend a Conference Committee Report in one House, where the other House may amend it in a different way or not amend it. Then we have adoption of two different Conference Committee Reports by the two Houses; and I think the only thing you can do then is set up a concurrence call . . . Calendar on Conference Committee Reports that are in different shapes from the House and the Senate. I never could



remember a practice of amending a Conference Committee Report, although, I believe the Governor by amendatory veto could probably put an effective date on the Act or change it. Are we going to have a concurrence call on Amendments to Conference Committee Reports in case the House and the Senate amend . . ."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, in order . . . in order for the Parliamentarian to give this matter some more thought, would it be all right, Representative Philip, if this Bill were taken out of the Record for the moment? Thank you very much. Mr. Clerk, would you take this Bill out of the Record? And on the order of . . . on the Speaker's Table appears House Resolution 1088. The Chair recognizes Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 1088 is a Resolution with some substance to it in that it seeks to establish or set up a House Committee to investigate the investment practices and the statutes which govern the investment practice of the Downstate Teacher's Retirement Fund. Representative Deavers and I have done some preliminary investigating and we have discovered that the Downstate Investment Fund is not under the umbrella group, the state investment practices group and the 19 . . . the last quarterly record of earnings was . . . on \$1,000,000,000 was 5.4 percent. Which in and of itself we are making no obligations that this is bad, or it should've been higher or what not. Also we note from the latest quarterly inventory of the fund that the cost of the assets of the fund are \$1,032,000,000; and the fair cash market value at the end of the quarter was roughly \$900,000,000. And showing a net loss from cost to market of \$129,000,000. We think this is an area that has . . . deserves looking into. Perhaps the statutes are too restrictive on the investment practices of the custodian of the fund. So we do think that this is a worthy area of investigation. And on behalf of Representative Deavers and myself, we would ask that this Resolution be passed."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, the question is, shall House Resolution 1088 be adopted? And is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leon:"



Leon: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to ask the Sponsor of this Resolution a question, please."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "The Gentleman indicates he'll yield."

Leon: "Representative, the Pension Laws Commission has approp . . . has received the benefits of a \$250,000 appropriation to make a study of this. And we in the Pension Laws Commission are endeavoring to make a study and recommendations to this General Assembly. Would you think that this Resolution would be in conflict with the Pension Laws Commission Study of which we are spending a considerable amount of money to justify its existence?"

Leinenweber: "Representative Leon, both Representative Deavers, who's the Joint Cosponsor, checked with the Chairman of the Pension Laws Study Commission and he was fully in favor of this Resolution."

Leon: "Then I have no objection to it; but I wanted to be sure that you were aware that we are making this study and we have in our spending a considerable amount of state funds to do so. Thank you."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Is there further discussion? The question is, shall House Resolution 1088 be adopted? This creates a Committee; and, therefore, will require a record Roll Call of 89 votes for passage. All those in favor will vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. On this question there are 96 'ayes', 12 'nos', 4 voting 'present'; and the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 9, I beg your pardon, House Resolution 894. The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a Resolution covering the Child and Family Services Department. The Amendment that was adopted in Committee and was a recommended 'do pass' by the Whole Committee covers the same subject matter as the Groberg Resolution 729, which passed out of here a week or so ago unanimously, and I'd ask the support of the House with the same kind of a Roll Call. And answer any questions."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "The Gentleman offers Amendment #1 to House Resolution 894 and moves its adoption. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye' and opposed . . . 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it,



and the Amendment's adopted. Representative Schraeder, did you have anything further? The question is, shall House Resolution 894 be adopted? All in favor will say 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted . . . the Resolution is adopted, I beg your pardon. House Resolution 1092. And the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Quinton, Representative Harpstrite."

Harpstrite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Resolution 1092 sets up a six-man Committee to investigate the excessive dockage in grain handling here in this state. I have had many letters as the Chairman of the Agricultural Committee complaining as high as the industry taking one half of the crop of wheat this year in the way of dockage. I've talked with Representative Choate about this problem and Representative Blair, and they insisted that we do establish a Committee to investigate these irregularities. And I would ask for a favorable vote on this Resolution."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, the Gentleman moves the adoption of House Resolution 1092. Is there discussion? Then the question is, shall House Resolution 1092 be adopted? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'; and passage would require 89 votes. Have all voted who wished? On this question . . . take the Record . . . on this question there are 134 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 voting 'present'; and this Resolution is adopted. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, do I understand correctly that this House unanimously adopted H.R.894?"

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Well, they adopted it by voice vote."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, this is . . . there was no discussion on this, and I note that it requests the Governor to suspend a director, and I should like to be recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Gene, that particular thing was stricken by the Amendment."

Schlickman: "What does the Resolution provide for now?"

Schraeder: "It applies to an investigation of the Department by the



Human Resources, the same as the Grotberg Amendment does, they're identical in that respect."

Schlickman: "Oh, I'm sorry. Thank you for that explanation and please withdraw my 'no' vote."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "House Resolution 1038. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Hyde."

Hyde: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 1038, which passed out of the Veterans' Affairs, Pensions and Personnel Committee unanimously on June 26th, merely requests the State Investment Board, the State Board of Investment, which has statutory authority, to invest some of the \$450,000,000 under its jurisdiction in the mortgage investments, secured mortgage investments, veterans mortgages and banks and savings and loans. It simply requests that the State Board give consideration to the feasibility of investing some of this fund in this type of investment, inasmuch as they have been investing in corporate securities and they have been declining in value, and inasmuch as the mortgage market is in dire needs . . . need of funds. So that is part one of this Resolution; the other part requests that the Pension Laws Study Commission evaluate the feasibility of increased investment of pension funds in investments related to the construction, rehabilitation, improvement and purchase of residential units. So I would simply ask that . . . for your support on this Resolution, which requests studies by these two bodies."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, the question is, shall House Resolution 1038 be adopted? All those in favor will indicate by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. On the Speaker's Table, Senate Joint Resolution 74. And the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Take it out of the Record."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Take that out of the Record, please, Mr. Clerk. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Fred, isn't that the Space Needs? Yes, Mr. Speaker, and



Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Joint Resolution is the Legislative Information System's Commission. There an Amendment to be offered on that to include the Assistant Clerk, both in the House and in the Senate; and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, the Gentleman offers Amendment #1 to Senate Joint Resolution 74 and moves its adoption. All in favor of the adoption indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Resolution is an ongoing Commission at . . . it refers to the legislative process in reference to the computer systems. And I move for its adoption of this Membership."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, the question is, shall Senate Joint Resolution 74 be adopted? And on that question, is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

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

Lechowicz: "Yes."

Schlickman: "Doesn't this overlap the functions of the Commission on the Organization of the General Assembly?"

Lechowicz: "No, Sir, it does not. What this one does is strictly as far as the data processing applications within the General Assembly, not only as far as its Membership, but the Clerk's Office, the Legislative Reference Bureau, the Toby Barry's area downstairs. What they do is they sit down and evaluate the programs that we have on hand, make recommendations as far as new programs to take a look at the various computer printouts that are forthcoming that is available to every Member. In fact, there was a notice placed on your desks that immediately after the Session, a . . . two hours after the Session, you'll have a complete listing as far as all Bills acted upon, which will be delivered to your secretary. A Digest will be prepared within the week. And also you'll be . . . also distributed to your secretary, this is a function of this Commission, and I . . . it has nothing to do with any overlapping with any other function."

Schlickman: "Why . . . you refer to this as a Commission. The Digest



refers to it as a Committee. Why . . ."

Lechowicz: "Well . . ."

Schlickman: ". . . why isn't this Committee or Commission being created by legislative Acts, meaning by a Bill?"

Lechowicz: ". . . well, that's already been done."

Schlickman: "What's already been done?"

Lechowicz: "The . . . Bruce, do you want to answer him on that?"

Farley (?): "Mr. Speaker, that portion has already been done with the Data Information System's Commission, which is the other part . . ."

Schlickman: "Well, if it's already been done, what's the necessity for this Committee?"

Farley, (?): "Two different functions. Ours deals with all of those things also outside in the state concerning privacy, security, all of the other systems that involve industry, banking, all of the rest which has nothing to do with this particular function, which is inter-governmental right here as far as we're concerned."

Schlickman: "Well, I'd still like to know why we are not creating this Committee or Commission by the introduction, passage and approval of the Bill, which has been the customary way of handling these matters; particularly, when the Sponsor indicates that it will be a ongoing, continuing Committee extending beyond the life of the 78th General Assembly, which I think raises quite an interesting constitutional point, which I intend to raise after the answer."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Is there further discussion?"

Lechowicz: "Just in reply, Mr. Speaker, that's the way it's always been done. John Connally did it in this way. I don't know as far as the legal aspects, Gene, whether it should be in a Commission, I'm sorry, in a Bill or a Senate Joint Resolution. But that's the way it's been done, and I've never questioned it and no one has ever questioned it."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may address myself . . ."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Well, I'm sorry, I thought that Representative Lechowicz was being recognized to close. Now, you weren't, though."



Do you want to . . . go ahead speak on the Resolution."

Schlickman: "He was simply responding to my inquiries for which he yielded."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, you may speak on the Resolution."

Schlickman: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm not so much concerned about the substance of this Committee. In fact, I think it's meritorious and commendatory; although, I do have the reservation about there already being in existence the Commission on the Organization of the General Assembly within whose scope this subject matter lies. What particularly concerns me at this point and time is the representation that this will be an ongoing, continuing Committee. By necessity there will be funds appropriated. The General Assembly has not been told what the budget will be, how much will be expended. This will go on beyond the life of this General Assembly. And I would ask at this point, Mr. Speaker, if I may, can this House by Resolution . . . can the General Assembly by Resolution create a Committee, the life of which will extend beyond the term of this General Assembly and expend funds that have not been appropriated to it, specifically by Act of the General Assembly?"

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Were you directing that in the form of an inquiry of the Chair?"

Schlickman: "Yes, Sir. Don't ask me to repeat it."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "I do not think that's within the purview of the Chair to determine whether or not that should be . . . this can be done or not. The Parliamentarian is expert only in matters concerning the conduct of business, and not as to whether this is a correct or incorrect procedure. So the Chair will recognize the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz, to close."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the way it's always been done. If it's right or wrong, I really don't know. But I can tell you as far as the function, that Committee has been very productive to this General Assembly and its various agencies as far as using date processing techniques in handling Bills, Resolutions, General Committee Reports, research



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

reports and other legislative documents. It's probably one of the most effective Committees that we have. We always seek the cooperation and the exchange of ideas of the Clerk's Office, of the Reference Bureau. In fact, the new techniques as far as in Bill preparation was the recommendation of this Committee; and, in turn, the implementation of the recommendation was by this Committee. I think if you go back and you go into the various terminals that are located throughout this capital complex as far as Bill status, you will see that it is an effective Committee organization. Now, as far as the Resolution system, whether that's the proper approach, I can't answer it. That's the way it's been done. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on Senate Joint Resolution 74."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, on the question, shall Senate Joint Resolution 74 be adopted? This will take a Roll Call vote, therefore, all in favor will vote 'aye', the opposed will vote 'no'; and it requires 89 votes for passage. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. On this question there are 124 'ayes', 4 'nays', 3 voting 'present'; and Senate Joint Resolution 74 is adopted. House Resolution 1043. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster's."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 1043 requests the Federal E.P.A. to delay their requirement that the N.P.D.D.F. standards be met by, I believe, it is November of 1974. The N.P.D.D.F. is a national solution discharge elimination system. This would require livestock feedlots to come down to, I believe, practically zero discharge as far as pollution is concerned. While certainly we in the livestock industry recognize the need for this, let me point out that the livestock industry has been hit by several, very-destructive occurrences over the past year or 18 months. We have had high livestock prices causing high feeder prices to go into the feedlot. Since then we have had a sharp reduction in livestock prices with a very little reduction, I might add, in the price of meat over the counter. And as a result, those in the livestock industry



find themselves in a position of not having enough capital to borrow enough money to sell the feedlot again. This is becoming a very serious problem in the livestock industry. And is going to be a very serious problem in the food industry, which all of you, and I, all of us will meet within the next year. I, certainly, believe that the postponement of this requirement for one year will not be that harmful to our environment. And, certainly, I think we need to give the livestock industry the opportunity to get on their feet so that they may afford to pay for this very expensive waste elimination system. I urge your support of this Resolution."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, the question is, shall House Resolution 1043 be adopted? And is there discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't have much grief for the Resolution because they generally are ineffectual when they're towing it to the Congress of the United States anyhow; but all I want to suggest is that the State Agency is already in the process of dealing deliberately, and honestly and candidly at the public on feedlots and proposed regulations. And also you ought to note that this problem of the beef-raising or the meat prices doesn't stand as directly as you seem to think, Tom, to the problems of the E.P.A. And I'm reluctant to say and agree with you that we can lay the problems of the meat industry on the environmental agencies. And, therefore, I'd like a Roll Call on this and a 'no' vote, recognizing, of course, that it's going to pass. So I think we ought to be on record. Jerry Shea says vote 'aye', straight message from the deck there; but vote 'no' if you want to keep your environmental conscience clean."

McMaster: "Glenn, you misunderstood me."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster, to close."

McMaster: "Glenn, I think you misunderstood me. I did not say that the cost of the livestock or meat was due to the E.P.A. I said that it was due to a very number of occurrences that took place.



Certainly, the cost of putting in this system would be directly related to the Federal E.P.A.; and it would be almost impossible for the livestock industry to pay for it at this time. We're in a very, very tough financial position. And I, certainly, want to see the livestock feedlot filled with livestock so that we may have abundant meat; and, hopefully, at a price that the general public can afford. Believe me, we can't exist as livestock feeders if you cannot exist on buying the meat. And I, certainly, feel that you should have that opportunity. And we as livestock people want to provide it for you, Glenn."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, the question is, shall House Resolution 1043 be adopted? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider, requests a Record Roll Call. Are there four Members who join him in that request? There are. And the question is, shall it be adopted? And all in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? On this question there are . . . take the Record . . . on this question there are 112 'ayes', 26 'nos', 2 voting 'present'. And House Resolution 1043 is adopted. On the Speaker's Table appears Senate Joint Resolution 79. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to move to suspend the appropriate rule relative to referring Senate Joint Resolution 79 to Committee be suspended for the immediate consideration and adoption thereof."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, the Gentleman . . . the Gentleman asks to suspend the provisions of Rule 41 so that Senate Joint Resolution 79 may be considered immediately and offered for adoption. Does the Chair have leave to use the Attendance Roll Call? The Gentleman from Cook, there are objections to using the Senate Roll Call. So on the question of the Gentleman's motion to suspend the rules, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and a happy fiscal year. Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"



DiPrima: "Yes."

Schlickman: "What is Senate Joint Resolution 79?"

DiPrima: "Well, this is a Resolution similar to the one that Representative Hudson passed in reference to Memorial Day and Veterans Day, only this is Senate Joint Resolution to put additional pressure in the Congress and the President to recognize that there are veterans' organizations that are interested in having Memorial Day and Veterans Day reverted back to their original dates of May 30th and November the 11th."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Clerk to read the Resolution?"

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Yes, will the Clerk please read the Resolution?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Whereas . . . Senate Joint Resolution 79. 'Whereas, the Congress and the President of the United States have enacted a change in the observance of Memorial Day and Veterans Day, causing them to be observed on Mondays which fall more or less close to the original date of observance; and, whereas, the State of Illinois ever wishing to cooperate with the United States Government in its laudible undertaking follow the example and celebrated Memorial Day and Veterans Day on a movable base . . . tape blank . . . and, whereas, in their wisdom the people of the State of Illinois represented in the General Assembly by their duly elected Governor, enacted statutes from 1972 and 1973, returning the observance of Memorial Day to its traditional day, May 30th; and Veterans Day to November 11th; and, whereas, the artificial creation of long weekends annually results in unnecessary loss of lives in the nation's highways because of the convenience of travel in a three-day period; and, whereas, a great deal of confusion resides among the people of Illinois with respect to the observance of Memorial Day and Veterans Day; and, whereas, Veterans' Day and Memorial Day are holidays of great importance to all Americans; and we commemorate and recall the sacrifices of our valiant servicemen; and on Memorial Day, especially, of those who made the ultimate sacrifice in defense and liberty; therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the 78th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House concurring therein, that in a census of the General Assembly



enacted by its actions in 1972 and 1973, the holidays should be regarded in commemoration . . . as commemorations and not just as days all for it to be linked whenever possible to weekends; and be it further resolved that it is the census of the General Assembly that the celebration of holidays on such dates encourages the recognition of the citizens, the reasons and basis for the holidays; and that a celebration on a floating long weekend basis encourages the casual treatment of holidays as mere days off work; and be it further resolved that we do memorize the Congress and the President of the United States to enact legislation returning the annual observance of Memorial Day to May 30th and the observance of Veterans Day to November 30th of each year; and be it further resolved that the Secretary of State of Illinois is directed to transmit to the President of the United States, and to each Member of the Delegation of the State of Illinois to the Congress of the United States a copy of this Preamble and Resolution'."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Representative Schlickman, did you want to be heard on the Gentleman's motion to suspend the provisions of Rule 41? All right, the question is, shall Rule 41 be suspended for the purpose of considering Senate Joint Resolution 79 immediately? This will take 107 votes. And is there leave to use the Attendance Roll Call? All right, objections have been heard. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion to suspend will vote 'aye', the opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Ken Miller 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this question there are 94 'ayes', 13 'nos' and 5 voting 'present'; the Gentleman's motion to suspend the rules fails. House Resolution 1115. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Holloway."

Holloway, R.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 1115 creates a 10-Member House Committee for the purpose of studying clinical research on where human beings are used as the subject. This is a matter of some controversy; and the topic comes to mind because of some unfortunate situations that have developed across this county in the last few years.



There is a Bill on our Calendar relating to this subject; but despite the fact that this Bill is on the Calendar and the matter has been under consideration for more than one year, there are still those that contend that they have not had opportunity to make input into the question of controlling clinical research as it relates to human beings. And so it is for that reason that Resolution 1115 directs itself to the subject hoping to provide a forum of, wherein, all interested parties may come and their say in the hopes that the legislation that we hope and intend to put on the books will be adequate, we will be fair and will in no way impede what obviously is a very vital endeavor. And so for that reason, if you're . . . if you please, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I solicit your support for House Resolution 1115."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, the Calendar indicates that this Resolution has not gone to Committee. So in order for us to consider it, it will be necessary for you, Mr. Holloway, to make a motion to suspend the provisions of Rule 41 in order that we can hear it and consider adopting it immediately. So . . ."

Holloway, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Walsh, W.: ". . . Representative Holloway makes that motion. And on the question is there discussion? Is there . . . the Gentleman from Moultrie, Representative Stone. The number is correct now."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, what is the motion before the House?"

Speaker Walsh, W.: "The motion is a motion by Representative Holloway to suspend the provisions of Rule 41, that is the rule that requires that Resolution go to Committee. This Resolution has not been to Committee, and he wants to suspend that rule so that we can consider it immediately. It will require 107 votes."

Stone: "And, Mr. Speaker, I object to suspending the rules for this purpose as the Gentleman stated he has introduced or he is handling Senate Bill 1670, which mysteriously is now on Third Reading in the House. It was introduced in the Senate. It's one of the very last Bills introduced in the Senate. It was advanced to



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Second Reading without a hearing in any Committee. And was passed by the Senate. It came to the House and the same thing happened here. It was advanced to Second Reading without reference to Committee. And now lies upon the . . . rests upon the Calendar of this House on Third Reading without ever having had a hearing. Now, the same thing has happened to this Resolution. And, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a very, very important Resolution. It should have a hearing. I have no objection to the passage of this Resolution if the Gentleman will tell this House that he will leave Senate Bill 1670 where it is and that he will not attempt to pass it. However, I don't think that he should have both."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Is there further discussion on the Gentleman's motion. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, just a bit of background for Representative Stone. The Senate Bill was heard the day before yesterday, Representative Stone. There was a thorough hearing on the Bill, and the recommendation of the Committee to Mr. Holloway was that he proceed by way of a Study Committee so that he could bring in the interests of parties who would be affected by this Bill so that we could have some input between now and next January. Now, that Bill was thoroughly heard and he's proceeding now on the basis of that recommendation from the Executive Committee."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "For what reason does the Gentleman from Moultrie, Representative Stone, arise?"

Stone: "Well, to answer the last Speaker . . . all right, I . . ."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Well, I . . . why don't we just do that on explanation of votes. Is there further discussion on the Gentleman's motion to suspend the provisions of Rule 41? If not, the Gentleman . . . the Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand to support the motion to suspend the rule. This subject, although the Senate Bill on Third Reading has not been to Human Resources Committee, a similar Bill sponsored by Representative Holloway last year was in the



Human Resources Committee. He demonstrated to us at that time that there is a definite problem which this Resolution addresses itself to. Now, I don't know that I'm going to support that Senate Bill on Third Reading; but I think that Representative Holloway has demonstrated a need for this type of Study Committee, and I would urge the Members to support his motion to suspend the rules to bring this to Third Reading and that we support it on Third Reading, that's this Resolution, not necessarily the Senate Bill. I would urge your support."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Holloway, to close."

Holloway, R.: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the charge has been made that there has been no discussion, there has been no opportunity to investigate the subject involved in this Resolution. I submit to the House that Senate Bill 1670 in reality is House Bill 751, which was over in the Senate, and the Senate chose to make it a Senate Bill for reasons best known to the Senate. So the issue has been thoroughly investigated. The problem is this that the individuals subject to House Bill 1670 continually state that they have not had adequate opportunity. And the purpose of Res . . . the House Resolution 1115 is to create a Study Committee in conjunction with extending the enactment of 1670 for one year, to eliminate any shortchanging of any facet of the industry and to give all of them ample opportunity to come before a legislative Committee and give whatever input they may have. And for that reason, Ladies and Gentlemen, I urge your support of House Resolution 1115."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "For what reason does the Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Clabaugh, arise?"

Clabaugh: "Mr. Speaker, against the movement of the Resolution to . . ."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Would you hold that, Representative Clabaugh?"

The motion before the House is a motion to suspend the provisions of Rule 41 for the immediate consideration and adoption of this Resolution. That motion to prevail will take 107 votes. All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion to suspend the rules will



vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. And the Chair recognizes Representative Clabaugh to explain his vote."

Clabaugh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm opposed to this Resolution on the grounds that the people of the University of Illinois would be perfectly willing to go along with the Resolution if the Bill which is obnoxious to them in its present form, were not called. And, of course, I'm voting against the motion to suspend the rules simply as another protest against considering the Resolution with the possibility of it passing. I urge Members to vote 'no' on this motion."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mann."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Sponsor would listen to this. I'm committed to this Resolution, but I'm not committed to a Resolution which is going to study a problem which is embodied on a Bill that's going to pass. I had not understood that the Bill was going to pass. I understood that we were going to find out more information about it. I had understood that this was the whole idea of voting the matter out of the House Executive Committee; and that this was a substitute for the Bill. Now, to me it seems inconsistent to say that we're going to study a measure, but we're going to pass a Bill. And I would ask the House Sponsor, a very reasonable man, I would ask the House Sponsor to indicate that he's going to table Senate Bill 1670. Let's proceed with this study, and if we proceed with this study, then we'll find out if we need Senate Bill 1670 or we need some other kind of Bill. But you can't prejudge the outcome of an investigation or study. It seems to me that that was not the spirit in which this matter was passed out of the House Executive Committee. And until the matter is cleared up, I'm going to have to vote 'no', although, I'm for the Resolution."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson."

Rayson: "Well, I'd like to speak in favor of the Gentleman's motion. This matter came up in Committee, and there was kind of a demur



in Committee due to the fact that there should be more study on this Bill. But notwithstanding it got out of Committee on a 'do pass' vote. I don't know what the Sponsor would do in reference to the Bill; but even if it were to pass, it sure as hell needs a lot more study. And I say no matter what we ought to have this kind of study of an important, necessary thing that should be confronted by us all and we can't resolve it by throwing this thing down the drain and working on a Bill which is imperfect at best."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Holloway, to explain his vote."

Holloway, R.: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, most assuredly this is a matter of most serious concern; and it certainly should be looked into. And in regards to what happened in Executive Committee, I say this that any statements that I made there were made in good faith. It was my understanding that there would be conversation and that efforts would be made to make clarifying Amendments which would certainly be acceptable to the Bill. But I might say this that the only Amendments that have been proposed in regards to House Bill 670 have been directed to the point of clarifying language or in any way improving the Bill have been Amendments directed to the point of taking certain people out of it. However, I have no intention of engaging in extended combat; and if there are those who will agree that this area of human activity requires more study, I'm willing to leave House Bill, rather Senate Bill 1670 where it is. Giving an opportunity through the Study Committee of 1115 the forum whereby adequate airing of all positions may be had."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, the Gentleman has indicated a desire to take his motion to suspend the rules from the record, am I correct, Representative Holloway? No, that's not true. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker, I took Representative Holloway to say he's a man of his word and we all know that. I'm happy to vote for this Resolution if, and I gather this from his remarks, he will table.



the Senate Bill, is that right? Well, Mr. Speaker, I would ask everybody in that case to vote 'aye' because it is a good Resolution for study. But if he didn't table that Bill, I was going to vote 'present' or 'no'. So on his word, and I think we'll grant him leave, I'm sure, right after this Roll Call that he will table the Senate Bill, I will vote 'aye' on this Bill . . . on the Resolution."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "The Gentleman from Moultrie, Representative Stone, to explain his vote."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, as I said in the arguments before this was put on the board, I think there is no objection to this Resolution if the Gentleman will table Senate Bill 1670. He has promised that he will do that, and I certainly recommend that he receive 107 votes because this is a subject that needs to be study . . . studied, and I think in next January, the next Session, he can come up with a good Bill that should be passed. And I, certainly, hope that he gets 107 votes."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dee."

Dee: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I join with my Colleagues in voting 'present' here on the basis of his assurance of the Sponsor that we will study the Bill. I would like my Colleagues in the House to know that I join with them in voting 'yes'."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this question there are 121 'ayes', 4 'nos' and 6 voting 'present'; and the Gentleman's motion to suspend the rules prevails. And now House Resolution 1115. The Chair recognizes Representative Holloway, who moves that the House do adopt House Resolution 1115. It creates a Committee; it will, therefore, require 89 votes. All those in . . . we'll hold this just a second until it comes out of the . . . all those in favor will vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? On this question there are 100 . . . and take the Record . . . on this question there are 133 'ayes', no 'nays' and 1 voting 'present'; and House Resolution 1115 is adopted. House Joint Resolution 111; and the Chair recognizes the



Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Mr. Speak . . . I'd like to have that taken out of the Record; but I do have another Resolution 924 that I would like called."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, let's take that out. Did you want to table that Resolution and make it cleaner?"

Greiman: "Yes."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, the Gentleman moves to table House Joint Resolution 111. All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye' and opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the Gentleman's motion for table prevails. And now the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman, is recognized on House Resolution 924."

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've offered a Resolution to create a special Committee on inflation and the cost . . . and to study the cost of living. It's a six-Member Committee. Over all the words that I've heard in this General Assembly, the word 'inflation' has been the word most commonly used. We've considered the cost-of-living increase, we've considered how its affected us. And other states have had temporary Committees to study this and come up with proposals and come up with Committee investigations on cost of death, the cost of health care, the cost of residential rentals. And I would ask that the . . . I would ask for a record vote on the establishment of this Committee."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, this requires the appointment of a Committee? The question is, shall House Resolution 924 pass? All those in favor . . . on the question, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think it's a very excellent Resolution; and I should hope that the Committee will study the affects that Congress has had upon the national economy for the last 20 years in its relation to the inflationary spiral that we have gotten ourselves into. I think it's a study of major porportions. And I congratulate you, but I, certainly, wish that you'd get into that aspect."



Speaker Walsh, W.: "All right, the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Tim Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, although this Resolution may have a great deal of merit, I think it's rather ridiculous for the Legislature to spend time and money on this subject. The Congress of the United States has spent millions of dollars a year. The administration has looked into it. And we have seen study after study. You can pick up the Chicago Tribune today and read all about it. And I think this is just kind of efforts in futility. It's a waste at the taxpayers expense because there's nothing the Illinois General Assembly basically can do about it. And if we're trying to pass Resolutions to help somebody get some public relations that's one thing, but if we're trying to take a hard-analytical examination, something that the General Assembly does not control, then this is just probably the thing to waste some more money vote."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Now, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, rise in opposition to this particular proposal. It is . . . it addresses itself to a subject, as Representative Simms has said, that we can pick up the daily newspapers, we can read about inflation, we can go to the economists in the various universities. They all have a theory. I don't know of any subject about which so many people have so many theories and ideas and about which so much has been expressed and written as inflation. And it would seem to me that we may end up in the situation, as I heard described the other day, where vast sums of money were spent for a governmental study at one point to find out why children fell out . . . off bicycles. And they ended up with the . . . finding out they fell off of bicycles because they either lost their balance or they ran into something. And that's maybe where we'll end up with this study of inflation. So let's go with what we have and see if we can't profit by what the learned university



sages and political experts have already come out with and the journalists who have written at length on this problem and maybe save the taxpayers just a few dollars in this case."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know what we can do about inflation; but we've talked about how to keep money at home and how to fight inflation. And I think one of the actions we took here about two days ago, we passed a Bill called Senate Bill 1565 to let communities intra-sell interest re . . . revenue bonds to rebuild our communities. Now, this kind of legislation will certainly keep the money in the State of Illinois, will let people invest in revenue bonds at a lower figure. And I think this is good legislation."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Hyde."

Hyde: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I notice by the Digest that this Committee has a reporting date no later than January 8, 1974. I hope that the distinguished Sponsors of this will have a extension . . . an extension on that or they will be wasting their time. I also hope if it is deemed an appropriate avenue of inquiry, that enough funds are given of this Committee so they may travel to Japan and study inflation over there which has a rate of 20 percent, also study inflation in Italy which has a higher rate of inflation because even a grammar school student knows inflation is a world-wide problem. And to think a Committee of six State Legislators is going to listen to 'Arthur Burns, John Galbrades and Milton Friedman' or whoever and come up with anything but a very abbreviated and simplistic answer to the world-wide problems of inflation, I think is kind of silly. It's like trying to stop World War II with a water pistol; but if it will focus . . . if it will focus people's minds on the problem of inflation and the great role that government spending as controlled by the Congress has in creating inflationary pressures then however ineffectual I will support it."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman, speak to close."



Greiman: "I'm glad to see that Henry, who is about to become a Congressman, is already considering junketeering and telling us where we can go. I suspect that, you know, I've stood here for a good long . . . a good number of weeks and there are many Members of the House I'm sure who feel that the most significant anti-inflation legislation that we could've passed would have been a motion to adjourn about three weeks ago. But I notice also that most of the comments about this Committee come from the other side of the aisle. I took great care in the drafting of this so that it not be . . . have any pejorative language. So that it be expressed as a problem for Democrats, for Republicans and for people generally. And I would recommend its passage. I think it can do effective and meaningful work. And I ask that it be adopted. I ask for a Roll Call on it, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "The question is, shall House Resolution 924 be adopted. This will require 89 votes. All those in favor will vote 'aye', the opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe, to explain his vote."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly, in the past few weeks we've heard a lot about inflation, we've heard a lot about the cost of hospital care in Illinois, we've heard about the regulation of public utilities in Illinois, we've heard about loan rates in Illinois, we've heard about usury rates in the State of Illinois. I, therefore, think it would be quite a cop-out for us to not say that we can no longer deal with the problems of money and inflation in this particular state. I think that this is an excellent Resolution. I think this is a chance for this General Assembly to move forward and do something about inflation and to each problems that I've elaborated on beforehand. I think we would actually be doing a great disservice if we did not pass this Resolution and get into the field of inflation, which I think is the number one issue in the State of Illinois today."

Speaker Walsh, W.: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On



this question there are 78 'ayes', 50 'nos' and 5 voting 'present';
and this Resolution is lost."



Speaker Blair: "All right, on Conference Committee Reports, the...ah...Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2825. Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Ah...Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2825 is one that touched off some mild discussion last night and I understand that some of the Members had some difficulty in hearing what I was saying concerning the Conference Committee Report so if you'll bear with me I'll try and touch on, briefly relate to you the, the salient points of this report which I'm sure that every Member has had ample opportunity to read by now. Of course, House Bill 2825 is the Campaign Disclosure Act which would require all candidates for state...or... for public office who are required to file statements of economic interest under the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act, they would be required to, to file including anyone who would stand for any office or any committee that would be formed that would spend or receive in excess of a thousand dollars in a 12 month period. Now, it's the report for candidates for State office for the General Assembly and the Judiciary will be required this year, all local candidates will come under the Act in 1975 and the effective date for them will be January 1st. The threshold which will be required reporting for the expenditures and contributions would be in excess of \$150 All of...all contributions and expenditures including loans will be considered in the same way and will have this \$150 threshold the administration of the Act the forms will be prepared by the State Board of Elections and the candidates will file with the Secretary of State, in our case or in the case of local candidates, with their County Clerks. The...ah...the bill was originally written, carried with it penalties of a Class A Misdemeanor as changes made in a very active Conference Committee



meeting yesterday we changed the penalties provision to a Class B Misdemeanor. The law will become effective immediately upon the Governors signing it and the first requirement for filing statements of organization and requirements as to accounting for funds for us will be October 1st. And as I said before, for local candidates will be January 1st of 1975. I have touched on the...ah...the...ah...I think the more important features, there may be some questions of Members of the House and I will do my best to answer those questions. If not, I will ask for a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 2825."

Speaker Blair: "The...ah...the gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Well Mr. Speaker, If you'd give me a room that's fairly close to the House Floor, I would like to have a Democratic Conference for about 10 minutes and then we'll get back to the Floor of the House."

Speaker Blair: "All right, M5, M5, so the gentleman...ah... from Cook, Mr. Telcser moves that we recess for 15 minutes until the hour of 1:30. Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Yes, I would, Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Democratic Members to hurry down to M5 so that we can get back on the floor."

Speaker Blair: "All right, we'll be in recess for 15 minutes for a purpose of a Democrat Conference."

Speaker Blair: "The House will be in order. We're on the Conference Committee, the second Conference Committee Report with respect to House Bill 2825 and Mr. Collins was just starting his explanation at the time the Members on the Democrat side recessed. Now Mr. Collins do you want to proceed with your explanation?"

Collins: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I believe I had concluded my introductory explanation and had asked for discussion or questions of the Members."

Speaker Blair: "All right, Mr. Choate. Turn Mr. Choate on."



Choate: "Mr. Speaker, while we're waiting for the Members to get on the floor and I suppose there's going to be some questions for Representative Collins, not from me, incidentally but while I have this opportunity, I'd like to announce that the Girl Scout Troop #1605 from St. Basil's Parish in Chicago. District represented by our newlywed, Representative Kozubowski, Representative Fary and Representative John Wall. They are in the Gallery to my right, girls will you please stand?"

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Kriegsman."

Kriegsman: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Collins. May I ask a few questions? I...ah...I'm a little green on all this contribution business because anybody that sent me a check, I sent it back, I did take a hundred dollars from my neighbor because I cut his grass for 10 years. How do I...How do I put that down, for grass cutting or for political contributions?"

Collins: "If it's not in your campaign, it's not a contribution in your campaign."

Kriegsman: "But I did use it in my campaign."

Collins: "Well then you'd report the expenditure in your campaign."

Kriegsman: "How do you report that..."

Collins: "Well in the first place if you're talking about a hundred dollars you wouldn't even report it, you'd have a record of it but it's not...."

Kriegsman: "I see....now what if my...what if my business gave a thousand dollars to a campaign, who reports that... is it the business? I know they won't because they can't afford it, but if they did, do they report it or do, do you?"

Collins: "Yes, they'll report the receipt of the contribution."

Kriegsman: "And that's as simple as that? Do you have to report for expense? Dollar for dollar?"

Collins: "Pardon me?"

Kriegsman: "Do you report dollar for dollar where the



campaign money goes?"

Collins: "The aggregate of expenditures over \$150, yes."

Kriegsman: "What if a Labor Union gives me \$150 check."

Collins: "Well let's make it over \$150, that's the threshold and you'd report the receipt of that from them and they'd be reporting also that they gave it to you."

Kriegsman: "Do they have to report all contributions?"

Collins: "No, if they give it to you direct, if they give it to you direct, they would not have to report it as... ah...as an expenditure, if they spent it on your behalf, then they would, yes, they'd be operating a political committee. In either instance, you would report it as a contribution received."

Kriegsman: "Any amount up to \$150, starting from there on?..."

Collins: "Yes, then remember that any group before they qualify as a political committee must receive or expend in excess of a thousand dollars."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a few questions? Will he yield to a few questions?"

Speaker Blair: "Yeah, he says he will."

Lechowicz: "Can I ask you what a anonymous contribution is?"

Collins: "I think you'd be better to advise that to the gentleman who sits immediately in front of you, but an anonymous contribution would be one that comes to you from whence you know not."

Lechowicz: "Well, I, I just want to point out for the record, Mr. Speaker, that was one of the areas that I was going to raise in the Conference Committee that I was not invited to."

Collins: "You asked me the same question on the order of



Amendments to the Bill."

Lechowicz: "Well my problem to that and I just want to point out that it's still within this Bill and I was hoping to bring it up during the Conference Committee, that anonymous contribution and the penalties involved are as such that if I in turn take a hundred dollars out of my savings account and send a registered letter to Representative Collins, return receipt requested, and then that letter is blank except for a piece of paper, I have receipt from the Post Office that the letter was delivered and received by Representative Collins, I have a deduction from the bank of a hundred dollars or whatever the amount may be and in turn Representative Collins says he did not receive anything, did not make any disclosure as far as this money being received but I in turn can file a charge against Representative Collins and say, yes, I sent this man a hundred dollars and he did not declare it and in turn there's a jail sentence that applies, this is a very serious area of concern for, my concern for the Conference Committee's consideration. Well you can, you can charge anyone falsely with just about any crime on the books and I might call the Memberships' attention that the fact that the penalty for false complaint is the same for violation of this Act, we hammered that out in Conference Committee."

Lechowicz: "For false complaints?"

Collins: "False complaints."

Lechowicz: "Well what about the aspect of purgery?"

Collins: "I would assume the statutes on purgery would apply too."

Lechowicz: "Could you give me a definition of what exactly the contribution or expenditure in connection with the nomination, etc. as it's listed in the Bill?"

Collins: "Let's go to the Bill, it's section 914, I believe."



Lechowicz: "The definition of what exactly is the word contribution or expenditure in connection with the nomination and etc. In my personal opinion..."

Collins: "Contribution means a gift, subscription, donation, dues, loan, advance or deposit of money or anything of value knowingly received in connection with the nomination or election or elections of any persons to public office or in connection with any question of public policy. The purchase for tickets for fund raising events including but not limiting to dinners, luncheons, cocktail parties and rallies made in connection with the nomination for election or elections for any persons in public office or in connection with any question of public policy. A transfer of funds between political committees, the services of employees donated by an employer in which case the contributions shall be listed in the name of the employer except that any individual services provided voluntarily and without promise or expectation of compensation from any source shall not be deemed a contribution."

Lechowicz: "Well, what is it, do you think it's rather a clear dividing line between a campaign contribution and other kinds of contributions which a political organization may receive? And as you know there's a jail sentence that may ride on this distinction. I think it's important whether we call it a campaign contribution for a political party, for political party officers are exempt. And I'd like to separate the contributions for a state central committeeman election from those used for public office covered by this Bill. That was another one of my inputs that I was hoping would be within this piece of Legislation."

Collins: "You had ample opportunity."

Lechowicz: "No I'm sorry I didn't sir."

Collins: "...You have ample opportunity to make any suggestion and offered a number on Second Reading on all



the Bills."

Lechowicz: "Mr....ah...Mr. Representative....Representative Collins under section 926, the last para...the last paragraph, the appropriate States Attorney or Attorney General shall bring such actions in the name of the people of the State of Illinois. Now I can un...what I can't understand is why is the Attorney General, the Attorney General of the State of Illinois encompassing with these wide powers when in my personal opinion, the only people he should be able to supervise would be the various States Attorneys. I think that his power should be limited to the, to prosecution of the candidates for States Attorneys, because I can't, you know, I don't believe that the present States Attorneys can prosecute themselves. Why is that in the Bill? As it's written?"

Collins: "That has been in every Bill that we've considered. It was in the Bill that we offered for Amendment on Second Reading and I don't see how the point comes up at this time."

Lechowicz: "Well, Phil, do you follow my logic as far as the County States Attorney should be held responsible, in my personal opinion to the Attorney General, but in turn I think it's up to the respective County States Attorneys to."

Collins: "And it quite likely will be and that's why we say the appropriate States Attorney."

Lechowicz: "Well that's, it's, it doesn't say that in the Bill though. It says the appropriate States Attorney or the Attorney General shall bring such actions in the name of the people of the State of Illinois."

Collins: "Well, there was no objection to that in the Conference Committee but if you'll read on you'll see that venue does lie in the county where you, the defendant resides or where the political committee was organized."

Lechowicz: "And there was another input that I wanted to."



put in as far as the record keeping, there's a city of Mt. Carmel in California where they've adopted this type of procedure because they do have a very good ethics law in effect but in turn what they do, is they have the various political committees submit their contributions that they receive to the City Treasurer and then in turn disbursement is done by that City Treasurer on a voucher type basis. I think this protects the individual and the individual committees from the record-keeping process that are required under this Bill. I think it's almost impossible as far as keeping books and records under this Act and that's why I would like to recommend that as far as local candidates or municipal candidates, municipal committees should report to the City Treasurer for disbursement, county candidates to the County Treasurer, state candidates to the Comptroller. Has anyone given this any consideration?"

Collins: "Not to this point, evidently over the last, since last evening this in another point that's been thought up."

Lechowicz: "Well, as you know, I didn't receive this report until after..."

Collins: "Don't give me that."

Lechowicz: "Well no, it's true..."

Collins: "It's same Bill that you've considered many a time, it's the same Bill that you attempted to amend on many occasions and the language that we're talking about now was in those many Bills. Now this point could have been brought up many times and there were a series of public Conference Committee meetings, if you weren't even a Member of the Committee you could have come and offered this input. So, let's not, let's not raise the smoke screens at this late date and this is what I brand this, a smoke screen."

Lechowicz: "Well, I'll tell you this Phil, maybe you consider"



it a smoke screen but I didn't get out of here last night till 20 after 4 as I read this Bill and I put my thoughts on paper as far as what I thought were constructive items that should be included in this Bill or in future Bills so I beg to disagree with you in your comments completely and I would hope that you would address your answers to my questions and in that vein."

Collins: "The answer's no."

Lechowicz: "Well I figured as much, thank you."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question? Phil, back to the anonymous contributions. What happens to the anonymous contribution when you receive it?"

Collins: "You have to return it to the State, or give it to the State."

Mahar: "Now if you were to get a check in the mail with a registered letter which you had to sign for and you took that check with the receipt and turned it into the Secretary of State's office immediately with a notation. Wouldn't that be a proper method of handling that, would absolve you from the fact that you got, that property expedited to dispose of that..."

Collins: "Yes, I certainly think so."

Mahar: "And if somebody came along later and said, 'I gave you a check for \$150', wouldn't that be evidence that you could file a claim against that person for false..."

Collins: "Well of course it would be, I think you mean if he'd sent me cash, a check would be signed, yes."

Mahar: "I mean cash."

Collins: "Yes, yes, you're absolutely right."

Mahar: "It would solve that problem very easy in that manner."

Collins: "Pardon?"

Mahar: "It would solve that anonymous problem very easy in as far as the registered letter is concerned.."



Collins: "I would think...yes, yes, I would think so."

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

Shea: "I'm wondering if the Sponsor would yield for a question?"

Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Shea: "Phil, the Committee includes individuals."

Collins: "I can't hear you. I can't hear you talk."

Shea: "Well, Committee...Committees include individuals, is that correct?"

Collins: "Yes."

Shea: "Okay, now, and I want to be very specific about this because we are making a Legislative record here and the courts are going to look to us for what we intended by words here on the paper. Mr. A is a registered lobbyist, he solicits money from the various people he represents to make campaign donations to candidates for public office. Is he required under this Act to file?"

Collins: "Yes, if he spends that money on their behalf, not if he makes a direct contribution to, to you."

Shea: "But if he, if he makes direct contributions to you, that's an expenditure, if, if I set up."

Collins: "That, that's not covered, that would be a contribution to you...that ah...woul...that would... be in your records and reportable if it's over \$150

Shea: "I understand that but as I read this Bill and I would like it to be perfectly clear that I see it in this Bill and I think it can very cleverly be drafted to include lobbyists, or has it been drafted to exclude them? But as, as I read this Bill..."

Collins: "It includes anyone who, who spends over a thousand dollars in op....in support of or opposition to candidates or....if this is cleverly drafted I have to, I can't take all the credit for it, because the language which you refer was drafted in Washington and this was drafted from the Federal Acts....which....which our Federal



candidates are living now."

Shea: "Well...well that could be very cleverly drafted there too, Phil, but what I'm saying to you is I read the Act and the contents and the context of the way you put it together because I just can't....a lobbyist represents 1 or 2 people and gets income from them and then in turn, I say income, he gets specific donations or he gets money from them and in turn makes donations to candidates. The way I read this Act, he would have to file a statement because he is making those specific donations, if you want to call them that to candidates and it's covered under candidates, plural."

Collins: "Yes...that...that's quite possibly correct...ah... Considering that the amount expended is over a thousand dollars."

Shea: "The...if the amount collected and expended on all candidates is over a thousand dollars?"

Collins: "Yes. All candidates."

Shea: "So, that if he gave each of 10 candidates or each of 11 candidates \$100, that would be \$1,100; therefore he would have to file?"

Collins: "Quite possibly yes, he's over the threshold at any rate."

Shea: "Okay, but then it's your opinion he would have to file under this?"

Collins: "I think I'd have to see the specific incident, but you're quite possibly correct."

Shea: "Thank you."

Telcser: "Is there further discussion? If not....Representative The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "Representative Collins, the anonymous part I heard is still in the Bill, is that correct?"

Collins: "Yes, it is."

Murphy: "Very seriously, there's that portion of it could be an awful trap for everybody, because supposing... somebody deliberately wanted to hurt someone else, well



say he made the \$500 withdrawal from the bank on X date, then he mailed a letter to the candidate. Registered mail, return receipt requested, you get the letter, you sign for it, naturally, there is absolutely no money in it so you have nothing, you don't report it. At a later date, after elections he says that he sent you \$500 and that you're guilty, you didn't report it, you go into court.. His bank records show that he drew \$500 out of the bank, he says he mailed it to you, he's got a return receipt requested, I believe they've got you on circumstantial evidence and you have no prayer."

Collins: "Well, I wouldn't agree with that, of course he has to prove it and it's his word against yours."

Murphy: "No, it isn't his word, he's got a record of it, his bank transaction, he's got a record of the fact that you received the letter. He...He's got it proven."

Collins: "Well, he's trying to set you up and he has to prove it and it's just as I said to Representative Lechowicz, the penalty for false complaint is identical to the penalty for violation of this Act."

Murphy: "But how would you prove that that's a false complaint, though, that's what I'm saying?"

Collins: "Well, how, how would he prove this..."

Murphy: "Circumstantial evidence, he withdrew the money, he got a receipt that you accepted, the letter.... It's a dangerous area, that's all I'm saying."

Collins: "Perhaps, of course the State Board of Elections would have a preliminary hearing in a closed session on something like this and long before it ever got near a court it would be heard and considered by the State Board of Elections."

Murphy: "I'm ingenuous to say that, and the fact of it all, that's not the way it will work..."

Collins: "Well that's the way the law reads."

Murphy: "You'll be before the Grand Jury before you know it



because we go before the Grand Jury now on subjects we know nothing about and so you certainly will do it on this and I think it's a very bad provision of the Bill."

Telcser: "Is there further discussion? If not, Representative Collins to close."

Collins: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We've debated this at a great length and I'll be very brief. I'd just like to say that if they call this a Bill whosetime has come it would be certainly a misstatement, it's an idea that is long overdue, at least by 24 hours; but I would say long overdue by a matter of years, this Bill, this Conference Committee report was adopted last night in the Senate by a vote of 53 to nothing. I hope that we will do likewise and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Telcser: "The gentleman moves that the House do adopt Conference Committee Report with respect to House Bill 2825. All in favor of the gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye' the opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action and due to the date being July 1st it will take 107 votes. Does anyone wish to explain their vote? It'll, it's open. This will take 107 votes, 107 votes. The Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not sure as to the voter appeal of an 'aye' vote being cast on this particular proposition under the cloud of the Fleck ultimatum in regard to the pay salary yesterday. Ordinarily I would vote no on the basis of that ultimatum, but I think ethics are a good thing, everybody should have some of them. They definetly have a voter appeal. The newspapers indicate that they have and I've been thinking here as we've been sitting how we can utilize the voter appeal in the fall and I'm going to put on my campaign literature. How

ethical can a politician be? Reelect Rosco Cunningham and see. You folks, you folks may wish to use that phrase in your campaign if you're afraid to do so, it is in no way copyrighted, but of course you'll want to change the name. I wish you well in your campaigns and if any of you are in Lawrenceville this summer, stop and see us, thank you very kindly."

Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Will.

No. The Lady from Cook, Representative Martin."

Martin: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, now that we have passed House Bill 2825, which I'm very pleased about, I certainly hope that we will very soon be getting to House Resolution 932 and as, in as much as that is calling for a Committee to investigate our penal institutions. I'm sure that everyone would like to be finding them in comfortable order."

Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. One minute Rep...Lechowicz 'aye'. You're on Tim. On this question there are 156 'aye', 3 'nays', 2 answering 'present', the House adopts the Conference Committee Report with respect to House Bill 2825. On the order of Conference Committee Reports appears Senate Bill 1568 for which purpose the gentleman from...Representative Choate for what purpose do you rise sir?"

Choate: "Mr. Speaker, I first would want to announce to the House because I know that you're all interested, Representative Tipsword just called St. John's Hospital and talked to Representative Johnny Aلسup and the doctor is discharging him from the hospital today. He . . . advised him to go home and convalesce; however, John, said he thought he would walk by the House to say 'hi' to his friends on the way home."

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

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, and I'd like the Members of the House to listen to this, I want to object . . . I want to object to the hearing of the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1568. I am a Member of that Conference Committee. There is not a Democrat signature from the House . . ."

Speaker Telcser: "Turn on Shea."

Shea: ". . . there is not a Democratic signature on the back of this. I talked to Representative Krause and myself who are on that Committee. We were not offered the opportunity to look at this report or to sign this report. And I think it's a damn shame trying to protect or try to project an image of friendliness or something when you don't even give the Minority Party a chance to write his name or refuse to write his name on a Conference Committee Report. And that's what I objected to last night when at 5 to 12 somebody tried to jam a Conference Committee Report in here . . ."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative . . ."

Shea: ". . . and I'd like that noted for the record, and I think . . ."

Speaker Telcser: ". . . Representative Collins, for what purpose do you arise, Sir? Collins . . ."

Collins: "Well, I'd just like to note for the record, Mr. Speaker, that what the Assistant Minority Leader said is untrue. I offered those . . . Representative Krause right here on the floor and asked him to sign it. I did too, I put it on your desk and you told me you didn't have your orders yet. So don't give me any of that balony. It was offered to him."

Shea: "Well, it sure wasn't offered to me, Phil . . ."



Collins: "Because you told me you weren't on the Conference Committee anymore."

Shea: "I was on 1568."

Collins: "I offered it . . . I offered it to you once and you objected."

Shea: ". . . Oh, no you didn't . . . oh sure."

Collins: ". . . Yes, I did. I offered them both to you right on the floor of the House . . . Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Collins, for what purpose . . ."

Collins: "I was just going to ask you would this be proper to ask for the same Roll Call?"

Speaker Telcser: "Well, let's see, Representative . . . the Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate. By the way, the camera lights are off now to the gentleman up in the balcony. Our camera lights are now off. Representative Choate. The Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the very thing that I objected to last night was the blatant disregard, and I personally felt that it was the fault of the Senate Republican Members of the Conference Committee. Now, I'm not totally sure; but let me tell you something. This is not the only Conference Committee Report that has surfaced in here with disregard of the Democratic Conferees. I thought that the Speaker and I had an agreement, and I'm sure that it is not his fault, that no Conference Committee would be submitted until it was approved by the Conferees of both sides. And that's the reason that I'm not at this point going to inject the House Republicans in this until such time as I am positive that they have been a part. But let me make this adamantly clear that henceforth . . . henceforth on these Conference Committee Reports the Democratic Members on this side who I have appointed to that Conference Committee are going to be considered and have some input into that Conference Committee or we're going to be here one awfully long time."

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

Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to say as far as the indignation about the fact that the other side of the



7/1/74
50.

aisle didn't get a chance to sign it. There is nothing unusual about that, that's happened many times both ways. But I want to say another thing, I don't like to see a very wonderful, fine man like Representative Krause being called a liar because I served with Representative Krause a long time, and there is no finer man on the floor of this House than Representative Krause."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, so the Membership understands where we're going for the next few moments in order for everyone to calm down and not be so frisky so early in the day, I'm going to start on Conference Committee Reports, starting with Senate Bill 84. I'm going to come right down that list. We'll get back to this one as I get down so that by the time we come back to this Bill some of these internal differences might be resolved as we all reflect on what's happened these last few days. On the order of Conference Committee Reports, Senate Bill 84. Has that been called already? The Sponsor is not in his seat. On the order of Conference Committee Reports, Senate Bill 634. For which purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf, is recognized . . . scratched out up here . . . let's get Jake's now and we'll go back and . . ."

Wolf, J.: "The Conference Committee Report on this Bill is the Committee Second Report. All the conferees agreed that the report should be accepted. The Bill is aimed at closing a loophole in the Pension Code that allows employees covered under the state university part of the Code to obtain credit for years they spent in military service. This has been given to them and we had talked to 'Mr. Ed Jabala', head of the University Retirement System, who had actually misinterpreted the Code in giving this credit. This Senate 634 is aimed at closing that loophole by allowing all those who are . . . have purchased this time up until I believe the date is September 1 of '74 would be left in. And I would move for the adoption of the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Then the Gentleman offers . . . moves that the House do adopt a Conference Committee Report with respect to Senate Bill 634. All in favor of the adoption



signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. This will take 107 votes. Let's get on these Roll Calls. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, this will only take 89 votes to pass."

Speaker Telcser: "89 votes to pass. But if you want it to be effective now, it would take 107."

Shea: "Only if it has an earlier effective date clause."

Speaker Telcser: "I assumed that it did. Representative Wolf, when is the effective date clause in . . ."

Shea: "This one does, Mr. Speaker; but that's what I asked earlier at the time we were on these before. Now, the Constitution it seems to me is very clear where it says, and by the way, we talked before about I was after one Bill, that Bill is now passed, and I'm still pursuing the subject, the Constitution under Article IV, Section 10, says, 'A Bill passed after June 30th shall not become effective prior to July 1st of the next calendar year unless the General Assembly by vote of three-fifths of the Members elected to each House provides an earlier effective date'. Now, where we run into problems is we have Conference Committee Reports that are the second Conference Committee Reports that do not have an earlier effective date. And my question is, if we pass a Conference Committee Report without an earlier effective date, then that cannot become law until July 1st of 1975, is that correct?"

Speaker Telcser: "Have all voted who . . . have all voted who wish? Take the Record."

Shea: "Art' . . ."

Speaker Telcser: "Yeah."

Shea: ". . . I asked a question."

Speaker Telcser: "Oh, I'm sorry, Jerry, I didn't hear it."

Shea: "If a Bill or if we're . . . on a Conference Committee Report that doesn't have an earlier effective date, passes by 107 votes, it still cannot become law until July 1st of next year, is that correct?"

Speaker Telcser: "Your point, in my view, is that it is well taken.

Unless the Bill itself has an earlier effective date. And, of course,



itself only deals with the effective date, not necessarily passage."

Shea: "Right."

Speaker Telcser: "So I think we're in agreement."

Shea: "All right, but now my question is we have Conference Committee Reports . . ."

Speaker Telcser: "Without the Bill."

Shea: ". . . no, we've had the Bills here, but I want to find out when we've got Conference Committee Reports, the question was raised to the prior Speaker about Amendments. And he indicated that Conference Committee Reports could be amended from the floor. And this is what disturbs me because a Conference Committee has been submitted in identical forms to both Houses. And unless both Houses are acting on the same Conference Committee Report, we could have much trouble. So that's . . . and I would hope that the Chair would reconsider its ruling on amendment of Conference Committee Reports from the floor."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Shea, I wasn't here this morning when the ruling was made. And I would rule that a Conference Committee Report cannot be amended, obviously. If a Gentleman wants to change the effective date, if he's on the first Conference Committee Report, he's going to have to move it not be adopted and take care of the situation in the second Conference Committee Report. If it's the . . . on his second Conference Committee Report, he'd better take it out of the record and write a new one and distribute it. But you cannot amend the Conference Committee Report."

Shea: "Well, we don't have any more limits on Conference Committees, do we?"

Speaker Telcser: "You mean, are you talking about the two reports that is dead, is that what you're talking about?"

Shea: "Well, we used to have joint rules between the Senate and the House that limited the number of Conference Committees to two."

Speaker Telcser: "We don't have . . . we haven't even adopted joint rules."

Shea: "I know. So that's . . . that's what I'm getting at. Now, is it such



that we find ourselves in a position where the Senate could ask for the third Conference Committee and we under our rules could not have that?"

Speaker Telcser: "I would say, Representative Shea, that although we have no joint rules, and there probably . . . I have no idea what the Senate rules say about that matter, and I don't recall at this moment what our own rules say. While technically one of the two chambers could probably ask for a third Conference Committee, I think we'd be on very dangerous grounds in terms of tradition to try and plan for a third Conference Committee Report. I hate to have our Members thinking they can go with a third Conference Committee."

Shea: "Well, this is my question, since we do not have any joint rules, and we have, you know, where are we on the Conference Committee Reports? I . . ."

Speaker Telcser: "I would take a very conservative position on that question in order to protect every Member and their Bills on limiting ourselves to two Conference Committee Reports, as we have in the past. Although, it's obviously a tradition in the absence of joint rules or similar rules even in both cases."

Shea: ". . . I'm not so sure we can even go to the second Conference Committee or . . ."

Speaker Telcser: "Well . . ."

Shea: ". . . you know, it's either we can go to . . . if we can only go to one or can we go to 10 . . ."

Speaker Telcser: ". . . Or could we go to any?"

Shea: ". . . that's another good question; and I would hope that someplace along the line the Leadership and the presiding officers in both Houses could resolve this question."

Speaker Telcser: "I think your point is very well taken, Representative Shea. And you and I are in complete agreement. On this question there are 146 'ayes' . . . one minute, Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, if I follow what Gerald Shea is saying, I think we may have some dangerous tools in adopting Conference Committees



that don't have an early effective date. I think that's what he may be getting at, too, because we have some problems with the language of the Constitution. And if we are adopting Conference Committee Reports after June 30th, and they don't have an early effective date, we may be passing appropriations that aren't effective until July 1st of next year. So what I think Gerald Shea is saying, we had and the staff had better watch this closely. And I don't know if anybody is listening; but we had better. We're on dangerous grounds. We had better not adopt any Conference Committee until we look at that effective date."

Speaker Telcser: "All right, but as it turns out, the appropriation Bills do have an earlier effective date. We've been doing that as a matter of . . ."

Matijevich: "Well, we've passed some other things, including the Ethics Bill, and I don't know what effective date . . ."

Speaker Telcser: ". . . Well, that I couldn't tell you. Sangmeister. 'aye' on this Roll Call; Sangmeister 'aye'. On this question there are 147 'ayes', no 'nays', none answering 'present'; and the House adopts the Conference Committee Report with respect to Senate Bill 634. Pate, Representative Philip, do you want to take Senate Bill 84? On the order of Conference Committee Reports appears Senate Bill 84. For which the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Philip, is recognized."

Philip: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the House do adopt the Conference Report on Senate Bill 84. It's been signed by all 10 Members of the Conference Committee."

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

Berman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be a good pattern to set, and I thought we talked about it last night, when there's a Conference Committee Report I think that there ought to be an explanation of what the Conference Committee is and what changes it suggests. And I would suggest that of, if he would, Mr. Philip's."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Philip."



Philip: "Yes. The Conference Committee Report suggests and recommends that the House recede from House Amendment #1, which leaves the Bill in this form. It amends the Illinois Housing Development Act to require the notice of each proposed project subject to the approval of the Housing Development Authority to be given to the Members of the General Assembly in whose district the project is located. So, in other words, any time there was a Illinois Housing Development project going on in your legislative district, they would be required to notify you of that project. It's the same thing that N.I.P.C. does. When there's going to be a N.I.P.C.-approved project in your district, they have to notify."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that I was responsible for holding up this Bill originally last year, and I asked the Sponsor in the Senate to permit me to put an Amendment on in the House which would cause the Capital Development Board to be able to . . . by putting this . . . the nursing homes and the sheltered-care homes into this Act that they could then obtain money from the Capital Development Board. This thing has been hanging in limbo ever since. And I wondered if the Sponsor could answer my question in regard to the fact that would sheltered-care homes and nursing homes be involved in the Housing Act after this Amendment is adopted . . . the Committee Report is adopted."

Philip: "The answer is 'no'. I talked to the Senate Sponsor and he tells me that he cannot pass it in the Senate with your Amendment. And suggests that we go ahead and adopt this report."

Flinn: "Well, then, Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Committee Report?"

Speaker Telcser: "Proceed, Sir."

Flinn: "I would oppose this Committee Report. We have waited a long time to try to get this problem solved in our area. And we have not gotten anywhere yet, and we're over a year late. I talked to one of the Senators yesterday evening and the Senate Sponsor, and he did not object at all. I talked to Senator Partee, who was



one of the objectors, and he did not object. Originally, he objected. I think he misunderstood what the problem was. I would ask that we would vote 'no' on this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? If not, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Philip, to close."

Philip: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the Senate Sponsor of Senate Bill 84 has been extremely courteous in regards to the House Sponsor of the Amendment. We and Senator Regner bent over backwards to do everything to put this Amendment on. After the Amendment was originally put on, then we were told three months later there wasn't a necessity for it. So we then agreed to take it off. So it's been kind of utter confusion. This was not the Senate Sponsor's idea. And if the House Sponsor is interested, let him introduce his own Bill and do his own thing. So I would, certainly, ask that the House concur and adopt the Committee Conference Report on Senate Bill 84."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman moves that the House . . . the Gentleman moves the House will adopt the Conference Committee Report with respect to Senate Bill 84. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Does anyone wish to explain their votes? John?"

Alsop: "Thank you. It's good to be back. I thought of you along about midnight every night before I went to sleep and may not be able to stay very long; but I thought I'd come by and say 'hello' and see what's been going on. I listened to things that I can make out from listening to the press or reading the press what's going on. I don't think they know. I find out in reading the press, you don't get a very good idea of what's happening. So I had to come and see for myself."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay. Pate, still needs 9 more votes. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Giglio. The switches are still open."

Giglio: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. There seems to be a little hangup on this. I don't think too many of us know what this is all about, and what that Conference Committee Report said. The Sponsor of that



want to talk a little bit on it?"

Speaker Telcser: "I don't see the Sponsor in his seat. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could correct some confusion.

I think I recall voting on this same subject earlier today. Did we have a similar report or a different Bill or what was it?"

Speaker Telcser: "It was taken out of the record earlier today."

Porter: "You say you didn't take the vote on it. I see, okay."

Speaker Telcser: "The switch is still open, Jack . . . Have all voted who wish? I don't see the Sponsor out there, where is he? Where's Pate? Have all voted who wish? He's in the washroom. Is he sick in the . . . really. What? Well, if he doesn't care. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this question there are 82 'ayes', 26 'nays' . . . Representative Richard Walsh 'aye' . . . 83 'ayes', 26 'nays', 4 on answering 'present'; and the House fails to adopt the Conference Committee Report with respect to Senate Bill 84. On the order of Conference Committee Reports appears Senate Bill 641. For which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dan Houlihan, is recognized."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we do adopt Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 641. This was concurred in by all of the Members of the Conference Committee. Each of the changes embodied in this Bill and as reflected by the Conference Committee Report were considered by the Pension Laws Commission at a formal hearing. And each bear the approval of the Pension Laws Commission. And I move the adoption of the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the House adopt the Conference Committee Report with respect to Senate Bill 641. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I just have a technical inquiry of the Sponsor. On . . . it refers to House Bill 634 in the contents, oh, it has been reprinted? Okay, thank you."

Houlihan, D.: "It says 641."

Speaker Telcser: "The question is, shall the House adopt the Conference



Committee Report with respect to Senate Bill 641. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Totten 'aye'. Take the Record. On this question there are 130 'ayes', 2 'nays', 16 answering 'present'; and House adopts Conference Committee Report with respect to Senate Bill 641. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports appears Senate Bill 1265. For what purpose the Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Keller, is recognized."

Keller: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we concur with Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1265. What this does is the Senate would not go along with restoring the \$50,000 for the emergency telephone number. So this strikes it out."

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

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this was Mr. Katz's Amendment for this Bill for his 911 phone service; and perhaps . . . would you mind waiting until he gets here, Chuck, on that?"

Keller: "It's okay with me. I've talk to him about it, but it's all right."

Shea: "Did he agree to the con . . ."

Keller: "Well, he doesn't exactly agree with it, but they don't have the proper legislation yet, Jerry, to enact what he wanted to do. So I can . . . I can . . . just pull it out of the Record, and I'll hold it until Mr. Katz gets back."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay. 1291? Collins is not on the floor. Representative Juckett on the floor? Representative Juckett? No? All right, 15 . . . Phil, is not on the floor. 2543, Jerry? Oh, okay. Representative Collins, where? Where is he at, George? Phil, do you want 1291? Or do you want a Conference Committee Report for Senate Bill 1291? For which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Phil Collins, is recognized."

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would that the House adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1291."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman moves the



House adopt Conference Committee Report with respect to Senate Bill 1291. All in favor of the adoption signify by voting 'aye' . . . the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "How does the Conference Committee Report differ from the original Bill? What does it do?"

Collins: "It doesn't. It does not. The House refused to recede; and the Senate acceded to our Amendments."

Maragos: "All right."

Speaker Telcser: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman moves the House adopt the Conference Committee Report with respect to Senate Bill 1291. All in favor of the adoption signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this question there are 128 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 answering 'presert'; and the House adopts Conference Committee Report with respect to Senate Bill 1291. On the order of Concurrences . . . Leon and Sangmeister 'aye' . . . is Representative Shea on the floor? Jerry, do you want 2543? 2543? On the Order of Conference Committee Reports appears House Bill 2543. For which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea, is recognized."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I don't have the Conference Committee Report, but could the Clerk tell me, we concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 and asked the Senate to recede from Amendment 4. I'd move for the adoption of this. This is the appropriation . . . well, it's House 1243, isn't it?"

Speaker Telcser: "House Bill 2543."

Shea: "House Bill . . . I . . . this is the appropriation of the State Board of Elections. What . . . the three Senate Amendment increase the retirement, the social security and put in \$500,000 for the operation of the Campaign Disclosure Act. And the fourth Amendment was the Attorney General's Amendment. And I think the board worked it out with the Attorney General. My understanding is he has no objection to this being removed from the Bill. And I would move for the adoption of the Conference Committee Report."



Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf, J.: "Yeah, I'd like to ask a question. What is the lowest paid employee of this Board of Elections?"

Shea: "I don't know, Mr. Wolf."

Wolf, J.: "I've been informed that there isn't an employee that makes less than \$12,000 a year in that whole operation."

Shea: "I'm sure there are because there were some secretarial positions and some clerk positions that were substantially less than that in the personnel breakdown that I saw."

Speaker Telcser: "Further discussion? The Gentleman moves the House adopt the Conference Committee Report with respect to House Bill 2543. All in favor of the adoption signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Take the Roll Call. Have all voted who wish? Don . . . Getty, throw me on, would you? Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this question there are 146 'ayes', 2 'nays', 3 answering 'present'; and the House adopts the Conference Committee Report with respect to House Bill 2543. On the order of Conference Committee Reports appears House Bill 2878. For which purpose the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Philip's, is recognized. Do you want that, Pate? No? No, he doesn't it call, Mr. Clerk. All right, Juckett's not ready. Representative Juckett, are you ready for 1500? No? Okay. Okay, on the order of Concurrences . . . on the order of Concurrences appears House Bill 2851. For which purpose the Gentleman from Grundy, Representative Washburn, is recognized."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wish to concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 2851. It clarifies the Bill so that it should erase any constitutionality question."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea. Fred, do you want to change that number, 2851."

Shea: "Would you explain . . . I know there was an Amendment put on this over in the Senate. As I understand it, that this \$100 a month would only go to employees that receive less than \$1,000 a



month."

Washburn: "No, Sir, that wasn't adopted, Representative Shea. This Amendment . . . this is the only Amendment, and as I say, it . . . there was some question as to the constitutionality of the Bill if the appropriation was contained with the substantive matter in the Bill. This takes the appropriation out and will be placed in another Bill. This was the only Amendment on it. To clear up any question of constitutionality."

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

Berman: "Has this Conference Committee Report been distributed?"

Washburn: "This isn't a Conference Committee Report, this is concurrence."

Berman: "I'm sorry."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman moves the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2851. Oh, I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Excuse me, will the Gentleman yield for a question on . . .?"

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Houlihan, J.: "Bud, I know you . . . I notice you've emphasized the constitutionality question. Can you explain a little more clearly to me the history of this Bill? It went over as \$100 pay increase to everybody. Could you clear that up because I'm not sure what we're voting on."

Washburn: "No, the Bill . . . the people are covered and the amount of the coverage \$100 is still the same as the original Bill. The constitutional question came in that can the substantive part of a Bill and the appropriation part of the Bill be in one document. Some say it should be separated. Therefore, this is the Amendment that will separate it. The Bill is the same as it . . . when it left here. So far as the . . ."

Houlihan, J.: "So was there an attempt in the Senate to change . . ."

Washburn: "Yeah. Yes, there was, but . . ."

Houlihan, J.: "Can you explain that?"

Washburn: ". . . I believe there was two Amendments presented over there. One of them would've granted a certain amount of money



to those who receive \$1,200 or less a month or \$1,000 a month or \$1,200 a month or less. And the other one, I believe, would've covered all employees."

Houlihan, J.: "So that if that Amendment where employees that would receive \$1,200 a month, that would've fit better into the Governor's budget and proposed resources available and would've helped those employees that would've been most in need of some kind of pay increases, isn't that right?"

Washburn: "Well, these . . . the dollar amount was the same and would've increased each one by \$100. I believe it contains the same amount of the increase. I believe the amount of the increase was the same, \$100? I believe the amount of the increase was the same, \$100."

Houlihan, J.: "Yes, but it would've gone to fewer employees, isn't that correct?"

Washburn: "Well, yes, those making under \$1,200 a month, I don't . . ."

Houlihan, J.: "Those who were in most need of the assistance, isn't that correct?"

Washburn: ". . . Well, this . . ."

Houlihan, J.: "And this would not jeopardize the entire increase being vetoed, is that right? And so this, in fact, would be assistance if it was amended for those that most directly need it, some kind of pay increase, isn't that correct?"

Washburn: ". . . well, this Bill will cover those people now."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Chairman, just so I understand this. This Bill coming back from the Senate now is still in the form it was when it left the House with the exception of . . ."

Washburn: "It covers the same people and the same amount of money, \$100 per month increase with the same people as the original Bill."

Schraeder: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2851. All in favor of concurrence



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 125 'ayes', 3 'nays', none answering 'present'; and the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2851. Representative Walsh, Richard Walsh 'no'.

Roscoe Cunningham, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, I arise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Telcser: "State your point, Sir."

Cunningham: "I have discovered to my indescribable chagrin that S.J.R.

74 concerned the operation of the Clerk. And for some unexplainable reason, my vote was 'no'. And I ask leave of the House to change that vote to 'yes' because I am a great admirer of the Clerk of this House and would publicly . . . publicly express my appreciation for his dedicated efforts to the House through all these trying days. We find that even in the greatest of storms or calmer fight, his serene calmness is reassuring. And his efficiency is exemplary at all times. So I would ask leave that S.J.R. 74 be recorded as 'aye'. It would not change the vote."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, are there any objections? We've got objection.

Representative Stone, for what purpose do you arise?"

Stone: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, I arise to object. He has voted against every other appropriation Bill, I believe. And I think that there's no reason he should be allowed to vote for this one."

Speaker Telcser: "What do you have to say to that, Roscoe?"

Cunningham: "I would beg him to reconsider. I have voted against several appropriations, but we . . . Freddy, is indispensable."

Speaker Telcser: "Leon 'aye' on this Roll Call right now. Huskey 'aye'.

I already announced it, the House concurred. Just add him on.

Macdonald 'aye'. All right, what do you want to do next? Okay.

Phil, House Bill 220 on Concurrences? On the order of Concurrences appears House Bill 2 . . . no? . . . on the order of Concurrences,

is Representative Juckett on the floor? Juckett? Keller? Bob, do you want 1464? No? Well, let's get moving. On the order of

Concurrences appears House Bill 1464. For which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Juckett, is recognized."



Juckett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1464 and report to Conference Committee."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? Want to tell the Members what it is, Bob? Save a little time."

Juckett: "Senate Amendment #1 changes it from a legal service to those that are in mental health institutions to the Dangerous Drugs Advisory Council in the Mental Health Department."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman moves the House does not concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1464. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The House does not concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1464. Representative Keller, do you wish to have your 2382 called? He's not there. On the order of Conference Committee Reports appears Senate Bill 1265. For which purpose the Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Keller, is recognized."

Keller: "Mr. Chairman, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we do not concur with the . . . that we do not adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1265. The reason that I'm doing this is Representative Katz was on this Conference Committee and was not given a chance to state his views that he wanted to on the . . . getting the emergency telephone number spoken for. So I move . . . that we do not adopt Conference Committee Report . . ."

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

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is another illustration of what must be going on around here. Now, I was appointed by my Leadership to be a Member of the Conference Committee on this particular Bill. The subject involved was an Amendment that I'd attached to the Bill with the agreement of the Chief Sponsor of the Bill. I was never advised of any meeting of the Conference Committee. I didn't know anything about it. And Representative Keller mentions to me that he has just gotten a copy of the Conference Committee Report signed by every Member of the Conference Committee other than me. I don't even know the



Conference Committee has met. In fact, I don't think they ever did meet. I am not advised what's going on with regard to my Amendment. I am a Member of this Conference Committee, and I learned about it from another Member who tells me that he has seen it on the desks. Now, I do not object terribly strenuously to the action taken; but the manner in which it is taken offends every decent legislative prerogative. As a Member appointed by my Leadership to the Conference Committee, I had every right to be in on it, and it is embarrassing to have to learn from another Member that the Conference Committee of which you were a Member has issued a report when you did not even know they had ever met or that one was being circulated. And hence I say, that to say that something has got to change and that is a terrible way to run a railroad."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman moves the House do not adopt Conference Committee Report with respect to Senate Bill 1265. All in favor 'aye', opposed 'no'; the House does not adopt Conference Committee Report with respect to Senate Bill 1265. All right, on the Speaker's Table are . . . on the order of Resolutions appears House Resolution 1010. Representative Douglas on the floor? No, about automobiles. Representative Porter, for what purpose do you arise?"

Porter: "Mr. Chairman, Representative Douglas asked if I would handle that for him, which I will, with your permission."

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

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 1010 asks that the Legislative Investigating Commission be directed to institute investigations to determine whether certain practices of the automobile repair industry should be regulated by law or are presently controllable by law. And this follows the idea that I had in an earlier Joint Resolution concerning the repair services industry which passed the House unanimously, but somehow got lost in a Senate Committee. So I would urge the Members of the House to adopt this Resolution and allow the Legislative Investigating Commission to look into this problem.



I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Telcser: "Further discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House do adopt House Resolution 1010. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. On this question there's 72 'ayes', 17 'nays', 4 answering 'present'; and the House adopts . . . Representative Neff, for what purpose do you arise?"

Neff: "In order to explain my vote. I was going to talk on this . . ."

Speaker Telcser: "Oh, I'm sorry."

Neff: ". . . and you rolled so fast I couldn't."

Speaker Telcser: "I'm sorry, Glenn."

Neff: "Arthur, I don't think this Resolution is needed. We have the Motor Vehicles Laws' Commission set up by five Senators and five Representatives that have been doing some investigating on this and continue doing it. I think this is just a waste of money and a waste of the taxpayers' money. The automobile industry itself has taken steps to certify mechanics throughout the national institution for automobile excellency; 26,000 mechanics have been certified, which means that more common repairs are being made. And a recent franchise dealers in Cook County revealed out of 36 . . . 360,000 repair orders, only . . . there were only a total of 394 complaints. These are . . . the total repair at that time was 1,180,000 repairable items. So this has been a small complaint and I think the Motor Vehicles Laws' can do it, and I don't think we need to put this under another investigating . . . I think this Resolution should definitely be defeated."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Calvo."

Calvo: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there may be a basis or a reason to have this Resolution; but I just want to join with Mr. Neff in saying that they're going to the wrong place to do something about it. We just don't have the investigators or the funds in the Legislative Investigating Commission to take on this project. And I feel that it should be defeated in the way it's drawn and perhaps they could come back with a Resolution to do it in another way if it's so, you know, necessary



to be done. But it certainly isn't a type of thing, I don't think, that the Legislative Investigating Committee should be charged with and I would appreciate a 'no' vote."

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

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it seems to me that this is not very far different from exactly the same Resolution that passed out of here by . . . with 105 'aye' votes and no 'nay' votes about a month ago. And it seems to me that while this . . . my Resolution had called for a special Committee of both the House and the Senate, this allows the Legislative Investigating Commission to look into the same question in approximately the same way. I can't see any reason why this Resolution shouldn't pass unless there's some reason why the Legislative Investigating Commission itself shouldn't look into the problem. I would urge every Member to vote 'aye' and support this Resolution. I see no reason why it should be objectionable. The fact of the matter is that there are abuses in the automobile repair service industry. Everyone in this House knows about them, everyone in this House knows that there has been no regulation of them. And that they continue unabated. I would think this is a problem that all of us face with our constituents and we ought to be doing something about it."

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

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Members . . . Gentlemen of the House. I just want to rise to oppose this Resolution for the same reason that I've asked questions about other investigations and they tell me that they've had agencies within the Legislature and the Motor Vehicle Commission as the place to start. And this is one good Resolution that should start there. They had ample hearings in regard to the Bus Safety Act. And I think this is where it should go. And I would ask that you defeat this."

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

Craig: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the previous Speaker, and also Representative Calvo. If they don't . . . they want to put more investigation on the Illinois Investigating Commission, but they



don't want to give them anymore money. And now I understand that they hardly have the means or the way to do this. And I do feel that this should go, if they want to study this, I think the Illinois Motor Vehicle Laws' Commission should be the one to study this being they are very directly in line with the Motor Vehicles Laws' Commission; and I think that the Members to give the Motor Vehicle Laws Commission, should have a thorough investigation and make a report on this. And I think that they are . . . that is the place to put this investigation and not with the Illinois Investigating Commission, which does not have the funds to do it. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, just briefly, I think this Resolution is aimed at asking the General Assembly to license automotive mechanics and to go for mandatory vehicle inspections, and we've fought that battle before. But I'm opposed for another reason. I hate to see the Legislative Investigating Commission and their novelists start writing some stories about the automobiles, they'll be calling them bombs, and they'll be calling the wheels lethal weapons. And I think they'll be asking for criminal action to get people that drive automobiles. So I think it's a dangerous practice to give it to the legislative Investigating Commission."

Speaker Telcser: "Anyone else wish to explain their vote? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh, W.: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I disagree with those people who think that the Legislative Investigating Commission is not the place for this. First of all, the Co-chairman of the Legislative Investigating Commission, as I recall it, was consulted on this question and agreed that it was an area that they could consider. And the question of appropriation to the Commission for this purpose did not come up. So presumably there's sufficient money there to do it. Secondly, let's face it, in the area of automobile repairs, there is fraud involved. And the Legislative Investigating Commission does cover a variety of situations where crimes are committed and they



are familiar with how to handle situations where such things as fraud are involved. Now, it seems to me that in the alternative, the alternative to doing something on this level through the Legislative Investigating Commission is to consider licensing. Now, licensing, Mr. Speaker, I think is a very drastic step and a step that should not be taken without full and complete deliberation. I don't see how we can have that deliberation without some agency looking into the matter of automobile repairs. And so since there is not a Resolution before us urging the Motor Vehicle Laws' Study Commission to look into this area, then I think this House ought to be on record as having some agency do it. This Resolution is all we have before us, so let's go with this and vote 'yes' and have the Investigating Commission look into this important area."

Speaker Telcser: "Now, have all voted who wish? The switches are still open for you to vote if you wish to participate in this Roll Call. Have all voted who wish? This will take a majority of those voting on the question, a majority voting on the question. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. Yes, Sir, take the Record. On this question there are 51 'aves'. 36 'navs'. 14 answering 'present': and the Resolution is adopted. On the Speaker's Table appears House Resolution 1037. For which purpose the Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Keller, is recognized."

Keller: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 1037 resolves that the Members of the General Assembly place themselves on record as being opposed to the abandonment of various railroad lines which serve many small communities throughout the state. I move for the adoption of House Resolution 1037."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves the House do adopt House Resolution 1037. All in favor 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the Resolution is adopted. On the Order of Resolutions, House Resolution 932. For which purpose the Lady from Cook, Representative Martin, is recognized."

Martin: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

the House. House Resolution 932 calls for a Special Committee on Prison Reform. Oh, I'm sorry, there is an Amendment. And I'd like to see the Amendment adopted first. It was offered in Committee by Mr. Rayson. Perhaps Mr. Rayson will explain the Amendment."

Speaker Telcser: "Turn on Rayson."

Rayson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we discussed that this Amendment would clarify the purpose of her Resolution; and I would move the adoption of this Amendment to House Resolution 932."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman offers to move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Resolution 932. All in favor 'aye', the opposed 'no' . . . the Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, now, I don't want to take any time of the House, but I think I'm forced to. This House Resolution creates a Special Committee on Prison Reform; and we presently have funded, we've had in existence under Senator Graham as the Subcommittee Chairman with Representative James Holloway as the Subcommittee Sub-chairman. And we're duplicating services, and we're duplicating costs. Now, I'd like to say this, during our visitation in the last six months, we've visited about six or eight penitentiaries. And there has been a group, or a few people perhaps I should say, who have taken it upon themselves to visit some penitentiaries, some penal institutions and has caused somewhat of a problem to the present serving Investigating Commission. I wish Jimmy Holloway was here because he served on that Commission for eight or ten years. This is my first term; but I do know that there has been some question of responsibilities on those people who have visited penitentiaries on their own, even on the days when this regularly authorized Commission was visiting those penitentiaries. In one instance, we visited a penitentiary in the Joliet area. There was a certain person there who had brought ten members of the national television and press, and I don't know whether it was a publicity stunt or not, but I do know it played havoc with the penitentiary. They had just



undergone a two . . . prior to that two weeks ago a revolt within the penitentiary. And this absolutely played havoc with the attempts of the warden and his staff to maintain control. And I would say this is another attempt to do things that are not within the prerogative of a special Commission, it's in the prerogative of the existing Penitentiary Visitation Committee; and I would certainly ask this Resolution be defeated."

Speaker Telcser: "All right, let's first deal with the Amendment, all right? The Gentleman has offered to adopt Amendment #1 to House Resolution 932. All in favor of the adoption 'aye', opposed 'no'; the Amendment is adopted. Now, for the Resolution. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell. One minute, Representative Martin, for what purpose do you arise?"

Martin: "Please, I'd like to answer that last Gentleman."

Speaker Telcser: "All right, Representative Martin, you have a chance to close the debate . . ."

Martin: "Okay."

Speaker Telcser: ". . . when it has to do . . . you know, the positions they're taking. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I do have two questions. One of Representative Schraeder, and then one later of Representative Martin, if I may? Fred, who is the Chairman . . . here I am, Fred . . . who is the Chairman of that Visitation Commission?"

Schraeder: "Senator Graham with Representative Holloway being the Sub-chairman . . . Co-chairman."

Yourell: "Well, then in Executive Committee, unless I am terribly mistaken, Representative Martin, didn't you tell me that the Members of the Committee, that there hadn't been any effort by this Commission to visit any prisons in the past nine or ten months?"

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Martin, for what purpose do you arise?"

Martin: "To answer a question."

Speaker Telcser: "Proceed."

Martin: "Yes, that is exactly what I said. And for the Gentleman's



information, I am also a Member of that Visitation Committee, have been so for ten months and have never even been invited to a meeting . . . if you would see my name included on it."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, are you still asking questions, Representative Yourell?"

Yourell: "Yes, I am. I have one further question. Now, there seems to be some difficulty in the expression of whether this Commission has been functioning properly and fulfilling its legislative intent. Now, we have two stories here. I'm concerned about this because if there was testimony presented in Committee that is not factual, then I think the Members of the House should know about it. And if the Commission, if in fact has not been visiting and fulfilling its legislative intent, then I think there's need for this Resolution. So I would hope that the Co-chairman of this Committee . . . Commission and the Sponsor of this Resolution would debate this so we all know exactly what the facts are."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Jim Holloway."

Holloway, J.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not going to get into the merits of this Resolution pro or con; but I do want to clear up one point. And that is that the Penal Subcommittee of the Visitation and Examining Commission of which I and Representative Schraeder are Members have been visiting all the penal institutions in the State of Illinois at least on an annual basis if not more often. Representative Peggy Martin Smith is a Member of the Visitation and Examining Commission; but not the Penal Subcommittee of that Commission. So she would not have officially been with us visiting any of the penal institutions. I just wanted to clear up that point for the record."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "I've received quite a few letters upon one point that I wish this Commission would look into, and maybe Mrs. Martin has. But the point involved was the young men having to go to the . . . when they take their showers, that they have to go in groups



for their own protection against some of the older men. I think there should be some segregation thereof between the young men and the older inmates there. And I think this is something that ought to be looked into."

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

Craig: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, for the same reason that I spoke against the other Resolution that's appointing this Commission to investigate car mechanics and things that I thought it ought to go to the Motor Vehicles Laws' Commission, I feel like this should be left up to the Penal Investigating Commission of which I consider them doing a reasonable good job. And if you've got about four Commissions going around and making recommendations, I think you're going to have this General Assembly so fouled up they don't know where to go and whose ideas to take. And I think this Resolution should be defeated."

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

Rayson: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members, I want to rise in support of this Resolution. Now, we've had many Resolutions on many subjects that zero in on certain phases of that study. I know we've had two or three housing studies as to certain aspects of housing, for example. Now, this particular Resolution deals with the sensitive issues of penal reform. Now, I know we have a Penal Commission and I know they go around and they look into matters in general; but I rather doubt if they go to the kind of area that Representative Martin really thinks we should address ourselves to in penal reform. You know, in our Constitution, we're really . . . we really have the responsibility to rehabilitate prisoners. And to that end, Peggy Martin addresses herself to that kind of investigation. I'll quote, 'What is the scope of this investigation?' That this Committee would pay particular attention to lack of effective management systems, racial imbalance, the role of correctional officers, the environment, inmate development, discipline, return to the community and to any other areas which may be found to be in need of improvement. Now



these are the kinds of particular areas of penal reform that she's addressing herself to. Now, the other Commission may be addressing themselves to . . . quite properly to general correctional management and administration. But we've got to go beyond that, we've got to bring a little humanity as to what and in fact are the conditions there and how they can best be corrected so that everybody can live a human life and have dignity."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Gene Hoffman."

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

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor 'aye', opposed 'no'; the previous question has been moved. Representative Martin to close."

Martin: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. First of all, I'd like to answer a couple of questions. Number one, this Resolution does not call for a Commission, it calls for an eight-Member Legislative Committee. And as far as the Subcommittee on Visitation, I am, indeed, a Member of the Penal Subcommittee on Visitation, have been a Member for some ten months and have never once attended a meeting or been invited to a meeting. And I would certainly hope in the areas that you just heard described, the effective management system, environment, inmate development, discipline and the role of the correctional officers would be looked into. And I've felt that if anyone truly was interested in our penal institutions, are investigating to see how many empty rooms or empty beds there are, there would not be any need for this request, clipping, that was just handed out to us about we don't need another prison in the city. And, of course, this refers to the Joliet area, where our own Speaker of the House, Blair, Representative Leinenweber, Representative Sangmeister are located. And the people in that area do not want another prison in their city. And I would think that if this Visitation Committee . . . Commission was doing what it was supposed to do it would look into those areas to see if there is a need for another



institution. And I ask the support of each and every one of you on House Resolution 932. Thank you very much."

Speaker Telcser: "The Lady moves that the House do adopt House Resolution 932. All in favor of the Lady's motion signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. This will take 89 affirmative votes. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Explaining my vote, Mr. Speaker, the Legislative Committee investigating the state institutions did indeed conduct an investigation into Joliet as to whether they wanted another penal facility. And every witness save for the Department of Corrections facilities said they did not want it. So the Department decided to go ahead and do it anyway. So I don't know what use it is. They have another Committee to check these attitudes because the Department won't pay any attention anyway. So I'm voting 'no'."

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

Juckett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am on this Commission. I am a Chairman of the Subcommittee of this Commission; and without hesitation, without any reservation, I would like to explain to the Lady from Cook, if she doesn't already know it, and from her statements, it appears that she does not know it; she is not, she has not ever been a Member of the Subcommittee on Penal Institutions. She is a Member of the Educational Subcommittee; and at the organization last fall, she did not even attend the organization meeting of this Commission, which was held in Springfield during the Session. So the Lady from Cook is wrong. I'm sure she does not intend to lie to this General Assembly; but she has not been, she is not a Member of the Penal Subcommittee."

Speaker Telcser: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Martin."

Martin: "I'd like to explain my vote; but first of all, I would like to say I have no reason to lie to this Body. I am, indeed, a Member of the Visitation Committee and on the Subcommittee to visit state institutions, penal institutions at that. I have never been invited to a meeting in the ten months that I have been placed on this . . . not to any meeting. I have not even received an



invitation to any meetings. So I would beg to differ with that Gentleman; and I certainly will not stand on this floor and lower my dignity by even implying that he was telling a lie. And I would appreciate it, greatly appreciate it, if you would be kind enough to give me enough votes so that we may properly investigate the penal institutions and bring back by December of this year a report on those institutions."

Speaker Telcser: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, it grieves me to see us spending as much time as we do on the floor of this House in discussing personality, rather than in discussing issues and in voting on issues. I would like to ask that you cast a 'yes' vote on the issue; but in so doing I do want to congratulate Representative Martin on the kind of interests, the kind of work she has done where prison reform has been involved. Now, I think the Visitation Committee does a good job. I don't know what kind of misunderstanding is here; but I've had a chance over the years to learn of the kind of work that the Visitation Committee does that visits prisons. And I think they do a good job; but that does not mean that because there is one such body, that we can have no other body involved or interested in a different way in the same matter. Neither does it mean that other Legislators should not be interested. Over the years I have visited many state institutions without having been on any Committee to visit these institutions. I call the institution, and I say I'm interested in what you are doing in the area of mental health or what have you, may I visit. And I'm always told, 'Yes, I'm glad to have you come'. And this is what Representative Martin has done where prisons are concerned. I had never visited Statesville until Representative Martin sent a letter to me and to other Legislators saying, 'Come and visit Statesville'. And I was there that day, Fred, when the Visitation Committee also happened to . . . tape blank . . . very welcome. I felt that the Statesville personnel truly welcomed the attendance of all the Legislators. I learned, and one of the things I learned was a deep appreciation for what Representative Martin was doing.



I believe there is a need; and she has a special talent in this area. I think we do need to give attention beyond what the Visitation Committee is doing to this matter of prison reform. And I'm sorry to see just 45 votes. I usually don't talk this long when there's only 45 votes; but I just had to talk to tell you what a good job Representative Martin is doing . . ."

Speaker Telcser: "Well, do you want to take up more time, I don't . . . are. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? You're not being too vigorous in seeking my attention, Sir. I don't know if you're really serious, maybe you're trying to help your seatmate. Oh, have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leon."

Leon: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of this General Assembly, I'm a little bit disturbed when I look at the Calendar and see that this House Resolution 932 was recommended by the Executive Committee to 'do adopt', and then see that Members of that Executive Committee have not voted on it. I am wondering whether or not the Committee is just passing them out with a recommendation to 'do adopt' and then do it with the tongue in their cheeks. If they're sincere in doing their job in the Executive Committee, I think they should at least support the motion that they put on the board. Please record me as 'aye'."

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

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I will try not take too much time. I would like to say that in the course of holding hearings on probation and parole at the Illinois prisons this past year, I got the distinct impression that the Department is trying to make improvements; however, they have monumental problems. I also got the impression that Legislators by and large don't care a lot about the problems of the prisons. Prisoners don't vote. I think that they begin to feel very demoralized. I think they have a lot of problems. I think that if we're going to be able to talk about rehabilitation with a straight face, we have to do something to try to solve the problems in the prison systems. I think that any Legislator who's willing to try to solve



those problems should receive all of the encouragement that he or she needs, not that many of us want to do that kind of work. And I think that if Peggy is willing to do it, we should all give her a green light and let her go ahead and do it."

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

Rayson: "Well, Mr. Chairman, we're addressing ourselves to a problem here, and we get hung up on procedure and wrangling on the Executive Committee, and whether or not there's duplication of study; but it seems like she wants to zero in on really what is the legislative function, penal reform. You know, 'Lenny Bruce' used to tell the story about the Egyptian masters that used to whip the Jewish slaves; and when one got out of line, the Jewish . . . the Egyptian master said we have the pyramids to build and that's where it's at. So I suggest that we should drop all this obfuscation and address ourselves to the sensitivity of human dignity, and that's what Peggy Martin wants."

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

Hyde: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm voting for this Resolution, not in derogation of the Commission that visits our institutions, I think they do a fine job. I think they have a big job to do. I think it involves visiting mental institutions and many other institutions in our state; but my personal philosophy is the more Legislators that visit, more state institutions, that spend state money to see how they're doing it and how the administration is going, I think it's all to the good. Now, visiting prisons is not a pleasant task. Anybody willing to take their time to go do it seems to me ought to be encouraged. And I would say, even though the Lady's philosophy and mine may differ radically in many areas, I would say that this Commission zeroing in on prisons could do a very great service to the people of Illinois because we have learned that some prisons are being invaded by people who radicalize the prisoners, the Symbionese Army was an outgrowth of courses that were taught in some of the prisons. And it would seem to me if we get some very good sensitive people on this Commission that a very fine service



could be done for the taxpayers and for the Legislature. Anybody who wants to go visit prisons to see how our money is spent seems to me ought to be encouraged. The Lady has taken a special interest in this field; and I think she ought to be encouraged. And, therefore, I'm voting 'aye'."

Speaker Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. On this question there are 57 'ayes', 64 'nays', 8 answering 'present' . . . Representative Martin, for what purpose do you arise?"

Martin: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to place this House Resolution 932 on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, it'll be on Postponed Consideration. On the order of . . . on the Speaker's Table appears House Resolution 937. Bernie, do you want that now? Postponed, yeah. For which pur . . . yeah, do you want me to call it now? . . . For which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Epton, is called."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Resolution has been on this Speaker's Table since June 20th. It's a Resolution that I've spent many hours on, and I resent very much the fact that anybody sitting in the Chair, and I, of course, exclude the present occupant, would wait until we were long since gone and not in a . . . any mood to listen to some Resolutions of this nature. This will undoubtedly tie up the House because there are some lawyers on the floor who have aspirations to become judges; and, God forbid, they should antagonize the Chicago Bar and the Illinois State Bar. But I have spoken a total of 33 minutes. I have spoken a total of 33 minutes. I have waited to have these Bills called. And to those of you who take issue with the Speaker and have him thoroughly screwed by having your Bills called, I want you to know that he's very fair. He does it to his friends as well as to his enemies. I resent very much having to wait until July 1st at 10 to 4 to call the Bill which to me is very important, much more important than some of you may realize. However, I intend to call it, and I intend to take your time. And those of you who care to respond, certainly that's your privilege. I would like to go home, too.



And if our Leaders on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the rotunda get through playing poker, I'll be very happy to sit down and hear what they have to say and send us in what direction they care to. But I, for one, think this Bill could've been called many, many times when we sat here doing absolutely nothing as we're presently doing at the moment. And if I have leave, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take these two Resolutions together."

Speaker Telcser: "All right, are there . . . Representative Berman is objecting, Representative Epton."

Epton: "Well, I can understand Representative Berman's objection; but I want you to know, Ladies and Gentlemen, if we're here longer it's because the Gentleman who is newly elected to the Chicago Bar Association thinks that his association shouldn't be aligned with the Illinois Bar. I think he's making a dreadful mistake because my indictment of the Chicago Bar will get a lot more votes than my indictment of the Illinois State Bar. I think he blew that one. In any event, I'll take them individually; and I'll repeat the offer I made before to all of the lawyers in this House. And I appeal to the lawyers now, not to those of you who have an intense dislike of the real profession. I appeal to the lawyers who feel very keenly about the dignity of our profession. And I'll make this offer now as I have before. If I make one misstatement on any one item, on any one paragraph, I'll be very happy to withdraw these Resolutions and apologize to both of these associations. But speaking on the Chicago . . . this is the Illinois State Bar Resolution. Let me read to you, and it may save some time, because it's a statement made by 'Howard Clement'. 'Howard Clement' is a distinguished member of the Illinois and Chicago Bars. Howard sat with me on the Admissions' Committee of the Chicago Bar when the Chicago Bar Association still had a big red 'N' for all Negroes who would like to join the Chicago Bar Association. It wasn't too long before that that the Jews finally got past it; but now it was their turn. And 'Howard Clement', and I and 'Keith Parsons' sat on that Committee of the distinguished,



nonpartisan philanthropic organization and told the secretary that if we saw a red 'N' on another application we would not admit a single member into the Chicago Bar. And to those of you who suggest that the Chicago Bar voluntarily saw the light, I suggest that you're not sticking with the truth. Now, let me get back to 'Howard Clement'. 'Howard Clement' very concisely states in an article in the Illinois State Bar Journal, it's rather appropriate since they apparently don't read all the stuff they put in, unless it comes from me, 'Recent events appear to illustrate that if the practice of law is to remain a true profession, then more of us must make a great effort . . . a greater effort to maintain high standards of conduct by force of organization or conservative opinion among the members of the Bar. The improvement of disciplinary procedures is only one measure among several that should be strongly pursued'. I won't go into this four-page article; but Howard, who certainly stands for all of that that is good, says very convincingly that the Illinois State Bar Association, which is a Commission which is delegated or was delegated as a Commission of the Illinois Supreme Court, charged with the duty of disbaring unethical lawyers, including those lawyers who were charged with unethical conduct . . . but who were not guilty, has failed miserably, failed miserably. And to you Members of the Illinois State Bar, which includes me, if you care to get up on the floor and state the number of lawyers that they have suggested for disbarment in the last ten years, I suggest to you that you're better off leaving the number unquoted. It doesn't run into two figures. And let me go further, I'll bring you up to date, recently in the communication I had with the member of the . . . the secretary of the Illinois State Bar, in response to a letter which went out over their stationery and over their mailing lists, a gentleman by the name of 'Mr. Burstrum', an attorney as some of you may know who was quite interested in cumulative voting or rather the elimination, he stated in his letter that went out to all of the members of the Illinois Bar that on Friday evening, March 29th, the Board of Governors of the



Illinois State Bar Association by resolution approved the proposition that the legislative reform amendments should be on the ballot. When I questioned the Illinois State Bar asking who gave them the right to make that decision, who sat in the committee, and when it was determined, I got a very nice letter from 'Mr. Dickenson' saying that the question of placing the legislative reform amendments was first heard by a legislation Committee and then placed before the board with the subsequent recommendation that the Bar Association refer this to the assembly of the association at its June meeting. As we heard earlier, somebody is lying; either the secretary doesn't recognize the truth or 'Mr. Burstrom' using their official mailing lists doesn't know the truth. I don't want to take up a lot of time on the Illinois State Bar; as you will notice, my censure of them is no where remotely connected to my indictment of the Chicago Bar. It may be because I haven't been quite as active in the Illinois State Bar and don't know all of the crooked maneuvers that they have con . . . operated. But I'm asking all of you, especially the lawyers, to recognize that I am proud to be a lawyer, I recognize the dignity of our profession. But I suggest that a body that has failed to discipline the profession, that has failed to live up to the standards for which we . . . for which it was formed has no right to be in existence. And by voting on this Resolution, we are simply placing the Illinois Bar Association on notice. But the Illinois House would like to see them get down to business or else attend to only having barbecues, picnics and press releases. And I solicit a vote in favor of House Resolution 937."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman moves the House do adopt House Resolution 937. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Representative Epton, does the Digest adequately describe the Resolution part . . . Resolution? As it states, it urges the Illinois State Bar Association be relieved of the statutory responsibility to police the professional conduct of lawyers because of its negligence in fulfilling its statutory constitutional



and professional responsibilities."

Epton: "Yes, it does; but I should respond to that by saying, as you know, this has no real significance and it simply suggests to the Illinois State Bar that this could be a serious Bill if . . . as a matter of fact, it could have no standing anyhow because Justice Underwood has clearly stated that they will retain the function of deciding who or who is not a lawyer, who disciplines the lawyer or who does not. What the Illinois State Bar does however, even today, it's an integral part of the disciplinary action; and today, despite the rules of the Supreme Court, and those of you who are not aware of it, the Illinois Association . . . State Bar Association is still part of that disciplinary action. So you're correct, it does ask that they be removed from that capacity."

Leinenweber: "Is that statutory or is that by rule of the Supreme Court?"

Epton: "By rule of the Supreme Court."

Leinenweber: "Then there wouldn't be a statutory responsibility then."

Epton: "That's correct."

Leinenweber: "So shouldn't this be directed to the Supreme Court?"

Epton: "Well, actually, I'd like to take them one at a time. I find that I have a little better luck with the Bar Association than I do with the Supreme Court."

Leinenweber: "Well, I . . . my only point is that by the fact we're urging this Legislature to do something that it has no power to do."

Epton: "Well, it has no power at the present time; but if we could get hot enough, we might be able to put the Supreme Court to the test. There are some rules or some statutory law which says that although the regulation of the law is left to the Supreme Court, the Legislature has certain duties that it can pursue, certain avenues. At the moment I'm reluctant to do that because we'd run into a head-on confrontation with the Supreme Court. But you're correct, we could eventually lead to a statutory clash with the Supreme Court."



Leinenweber: "If I might address myself very briefly to the Resolution.

I think this poses the problem now. I don't have any objection, other than I would have my own vote whether I would wish to urge the Supreme Court to do something or other. But the legal profession is an arm of the judiciary, and we are, of course, sitting here today as an arm of the legislative branch of government. So I do not think that the way, at least the way I understand the Resolution is, that is in proper form. So for that reason, I'm going to vote 'no'."

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

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

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Epton: "Yes."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Epton, does the Illinois State Bar Association presently have any responsibility in this area of professional conduct?"

Epton: "Yes, they do."

Griesheimer: "And would you tell me what it is?"

Epton: "They retain pretty much the responsibility they had previously.

They have a committee, a disciplinary committee, similar to the Grievance and Inquiry Committee, which screens complaints and makes recommendations to the Illinois Supreme Court who acts. Today, the Illinois Supreme Court, as in the past, it could act in initiated complaints itself. But it still uses the committee of the Illinois State Bar Association to study, evaluate and recommend."

Griesheimer: "I'd like to speak very briefly to this. I was not aware of this Resolution; and since it does involve my profession, I was very concerned about this matter. I regret that we are having this held for the very last, as Mr. Epton has indicated, because there are some 45 lawyers in this Body that could be interested. So I just called the State Bar Association and spoke with the Executive Director and he advises me that the Bar Association has not exercised any form of disciplinary power since February 1, 1973, with the creation of the Attorney's Registry and Disciplinary Body,



which is a direct arm of the Supreme Court. Now, although, I'm sure that there are some reasons that we would like to . . . I would say we, that there may be some reason for taking this blow at the Bar Association. I don't see that it really accomplishes anything at the present time; and I would feel that we would better spend our time on important matters and let this fall by the wayside and urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart."

Hart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've been giving this Resolution a lot of thought since it was introduced; and the timing of it is to me a matter that ought to be at least discussed a little bit. I've been practicing law for 20 years and when I started practicing in Denton, my home town, we had some problems with grievance procedures against local attorneys there, which were taken up with the Illinois State Bar Association. And at that time, I felt that the Illinois State Bar Association did nothing but give lip service to the question of whether or not there was any discipline on a State Bar Association-wide basis. Their basic attitude at that time was, 'Well, you appoint a committee down there in Franklin County and take care of it'. And I was very disappointed because I hold the legal profession in the highest regard. My father was a lawyer, my grandfather was a lawyer, my uncle. I practiced with my cousin. It's kind of been a way of life for the Hart Family ever since I was born. And I had many, many disillusionments about it after I got into it. I, however, have to say that I feel that the Illinois State Bar Association during the 20 years that I've practiced law has actually come a long, long way in cleaning up its procedures, in broadening its base. We have recently adopted an assembly, which is similar to the General Assembly of the Illinois State Legislature, whereby, we elect persons from the Circuit in the state and they go and make the policy for the Bar Association. For many, many years I've felt that policy-making was kind of a closed corporation as far as the Illinois State Bar Association was concerned. I happened to have been a charter member of a title insurance company



that was formed by lawyers of this state, called Attorney Title 'Guarantee' Fund. And we for years attempted to get recognition from the Illinois State Bar Association as a bar-related title insurance group. An idea which was generally accepted in many areas of the United States; but through the efforts of the Chicago Title and Trust Company and the other big banks and trust companies in Chicago, and their influence on the Illinois State Bar Association, we were not able to get to first base. But through continued efforts, and which I think this is the way to get at the problem is by organizing your efforts and trying to meet the situation, through continued efforts we were finally able to convince the Board of Governors of the State Bar Association that this was in the best interests of the lawyers. And we are now recognized as an arm or a board, recognized lawyer, title insurance company. The whole point of what I have to say here is that I feel that this new arm of the Bar Association, which deals with grievance procedures, should be given an opportunity to prove itself. And for that reason, although I generally join with my windmill tilting friend on the other side of the aisle and probably tilt as many as he does in this kind of a thing; and I certainly feel puritanical about my approach to this profession. I feel that at this time we should give the Illinois State Bar Association and its new disciplinary groups a chance to prove itself. And for that reason, I'm going to vote against this Resolution."

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

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

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor 'aye', opposed 'no'; the previous question has been moved. Representative Epton to close."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you for this opportunity and your patience. As I said earlier, that if there was any statement I made that was in error, I would sit down and withdraw. Let me submit to you that Representative Griesheimer got some erroneous or perhaps some carefully worded information



from the Illinois State Bar. When he suggested to having taken advantage of it since 1971, he's right in that regard if he means they've done nothing. But let me read to you what the existing rule is, 'Number two, the joint petitions presented and adopted by the Chicago and the Illinois State Bar and the Supreme Court. The Inquiry Committee of the Chicago Bar Association and the Illinois State Bar Association will screen petitions to determine whether a complaint would be filed against an attorney. If a complaint is filed, the' . . . I know it by heart . . . 'the Grievance Committee of the Illinois State Bar and the Chicago Bar would hear the matter and then make recommendations for discipline to the Illinois Supreme Court'. So I agree with part of that statement. They have not done anything since 1971. Forgive me, they have done something; but as a matter of fact, I wrote to them on their last seminar in Spain. And I asked them why it was the usual course of conduct to go to Spain, to Granada, to Madrid to have a seminar on closed corporations; and they thought everybody went to Spain for a study on closed corporations. But to those of you who find some value in the Illinois State Bar, I submit you may be right; but I conclude by saying, nobody in the legal profession, and I appeal, not to the 51 lawyers here, but to the 54 lawyers, some of them practicing, most of them not, some of them inadequate, some of them are not; but the fact remains, I appeal to you as members of the Bar, who respect it as I do, vote in favor of this Resolution to help lift up and maintain our standards as they should be. Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved the House do adopt House Resolution 937. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' . . . do you want a Roll Call or don't you, I don't care . . . Bernie, do you want a Roll Call? No? . . . all in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', the opposed . . . the 'ayes' have it . . . if you want a Roll Call, give me five hands . . . all in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Now, the Lady . . . take two minutes of explanations . . . the Gentleman from Tazewell, Representative Kriegsman,

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



was up first."

Kriegsman: "I would, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to stand up and thank Bernie Epton for standing up with his profession and trying to improve it. I don't know what else to say, except that he's on the right track. And I've heard 'Justice Burger' say the same identical type of reasoning, that we've got to do something to overhaul the legal profession. I'm sorry, that I didn't have more time, I'd like to compare the legal profession with the truck driving, but I don't have enough time."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman . . . okay, now wait a second . . . the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I vote in favor of this motion; and I want to point out to you that the Bar Association probably has more fees per 100 than any other trade in the business. And I say to you that we are critical of every other organization. We sit here and talk about, and the Bar Association says, that we ought to review the police, we ought to review everybody else in the business, but nobody . . . and nobody ought to review us. I say it's wrong and it's in error. Nobody has attacked the thesis that Representative Epton has laid out, no one has brought forth a single iota of evidence to show that they have done anything. To the contrary, he's pointed out clearly, logically and concisely what they haven't done. There has been no defense to this. All we hear are vague mutterings about the timing, the fact that we might hurt the feelings of some other judges; and after all, fellows, this is our social club and we ought not rap ourselves. I say that we're wrong; and if we want to talk about sin and correcting the society, we ought to start with ourselves. And the first place for the lawyers to start is by taking care of themselves and quit babbling in everybody else's business. And I urge everybody in this Body to vote 'aye'."

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

Geo-Karis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we've spent enough time going pro and con; but I think what we're doing in this Resolution is attacking the State Bar;



and I can honestly tell you our Lake County Bar does discipline its members and we do have a Grievance Committee that does work. And, therefore, I do think that the . . . they should be allowed to proceed further under the new arm of the Supreme Court and give 'em this chance. And, therefore, I'm going to vote 'present' and I believe the policing of my profession just as well as every other."

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

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if you think you've heard anything, wait until he gets going on the Chicago Bar Association. But because I think that that seminar should've been held Portugal, I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Telcser: "Does everyone else really want to explain their vote? Now, I don't want to shut anybody off, I don't want to shut . . . now, Representative Duff, wants to explain his vote. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I did not participate on the debate on this Resolution because I did not think we were going to see what we're seeing. The simple fact is, and I'll make one statement, I think it's wrong to take away what the lawyer thinks more than anything else right now in spite of the fact that they're not doing a good job, the very little thing that they've got left, to discipline themselves."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, is it safe to assume that we can go home until five minutes to 12 tonight?"

Speaker Telcser: "I really . . . I wouldn't make that assumption. The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I just merely want to congratulate Representative Epton. I think he's doing a wonderful thing. I count every member of my family . . . have been in the legal profession; and I guess I'm the only exception. But I do know something about lawyers, and I observe them and contact them all the time, every day, have for years. And I think that this is the right thing to do."

Speaker Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 56 'ayes',



35 'nays', 19 answering 'present'; the House adopts House Resolution 937. On the Speaker's Table appears House Resolution 938. For which the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Epton, is recognized. Representative Tipsword, for what purpose do you arise?"

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of inquiry if I might, please."

Speaker Telcser: "State your point, Sir."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, about 24 hours ago, maybe a little more, maybe slightly less, I found that I was appointed on two Conference Committees, on House Bills 2367 and 23 . . . 3 and Representative Beaupre on this side of the aisle. And I have inquired around among my fellows here and found that most of them were in the same condition with regards to Conference Committees upon which they've been appointed. I have never heard from the Conference Committee, either one of them, I have never been notified if there's any meetings. It seems to me like 24 hours is far long enough on these very important budget Conference Committees that we should be having some report; and I would like to indicate to anyone else who may be on that . . . these Committees that I have been here all the time. I'm ready to receive any requests from them that we need if they'll tell us where we're going to meet. I would very much like to get the business of this House completed so that I could go home and all of the other Members of this Body could go home. May I please know where those Conferences are and when we're going to have a report?"

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "I certainly . . ."

Speaker Telcser: "Oh, wait a minute, Representative Barry, for what purpose do you arise?"

Barry: "Just to ask to be recorded 'no' on 937, please."

Speaker Telcser: "Record Representative Barry 'no' on 937."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I appreciate your patience and, hopefully, this will not take longer because if those of you have the courage and the foresight to indict the Illinois State Bar, you have no choice but to indict probably the greatest phony in the entire United States. There is no Bar Association that



I know of, and I have been a member of several of them, I've travelled throughout the country, that has quite the halo that the Chicago Bar Association has and deserves it least. I have been active on committees in the Chicago Bar Association since I got out of law school. I have seen them treat the rich completely different from the poor. I have seen them treat the lawyers in the large law firms completely different from the poor. And bear in mind if anybody here can say to the contrary, I'll sit down. And just so there can be no doubt, I want you to know that I have no vendetta with any of the members, the present officers and members of the board who are some of our distinguished colleagues and who are decent men. But somehow, someway, somewhere when you become a member of the Chicago Bar Association, Board of Governors and their officers you seem to lose a little bit of your integrity. That's almost a prerequisite of assuming office. I say to you that the Chicago Bar Association has constantly, I can give you an incident depending on how far back you want to go, and, Mr. Speaker, assuming you have something important, I'll sit down . . . not that quick . . . but the fact remains, I can tell you when the Chicago Bar Association had a committee meeting on what we call ethics. It's something that the attorneys vaguely hear about, they even have canons about that. As a matter of fact, we have canons . . . which canons . . . and we have one that says that the names of the deceased partners will not be given association names. As a matter of fact, under the law you file under an assumed name. 'Icen, Lincoln and Beele', if you will, and they're a pretty good outfit. And so is that great law firm that does all our bond work, 'Chapman-Cutler'. They're in violation of the law, unless they filed under the assumed-name statute. But if they do file under the assumed-name statute, they're in violation of Canon VI that says, 'You cannot have or operate under an assumed name'. I don't care whether you do or you don't. Let's change one canon or the other. As a matter of fact, this very small committee, the Bar Association, which attempted to be ethical, suggested that change to the Board of Managers. And suddenly we



heard from the Board of Managers. The president, Harold Smith, came rushing down to my committee and said, 'Is this all you've got to worry about? With Communism running rampant through the world, you worry about this?' And I suggest that if you have been in some problems on Communism, we'll try and handle that, too. But the fact remains, the reason he came rushing down was because the night before 33 large firms in the City of Chicago had held a meeting at my association headquarters, if you will, that's rubbing it in, using our transcript and said that if the Bar Association passed that, they would resign in 'May'. Guess how long our committee stayed in office? Then again we have a situation where the Bar Association, this applies to all of them, all you members of the Judiciary, who've sat there year after year. And we've heard these wonderful men come from the Chicago Bar Association with their wonderful Bills. They worked on them for hours, and hours, and weeks and months with the greatest talent possible, come down . . . Judiciary Committee. And some lawyer who hasn't practiced for 15 years and really doesn't understand too much about the law, looks at the Bill and says to this distinguished Member, 'Didn't you leave out two paragraphs?' And the distinguished leader of the Bar Association spent hours, and hours and writes that brochure 'Sam Matiyets Cositoes' said, 'Well, yeah, I guess you're right'. And then when we asked him to make a change, they can't because they're not authorized to do so. I'm trying to keep this on a pretty decent level. I'm trying to suggest and somebody mentioned about getting our Supreme Court to write some disciplinary action. We do have, as you know, today an assessment of \$20 a lawyer, which incidently didn't come out of the goodness of anybody's heart either. That came out of some discussions on my previous Bills attempting to revoke the charter of the Chicago Bar Association. So that they do have . . . if they were to have these as a matter of law, which they are not, Ladies and Gentlemen, but if we were to eliminate the Chicago Bar and the Illinois Bar, we still have the Supreme Court of Illinois with a separate disciplinary body



to entertain complaints. But for those of you who are worried about taking away any possibility of the lawyers handling themselves, I submit there is still one alternative. And finally let me conclude with this one little situation to show the speed in which they operate. I was on the Ambulance Chasing Committee, and I was not one of the ambulance chasers, I was on the Committee, investigating the ambulance chasing the City of Chicago. And at that time we asked the Chief Justice of the Circuit Court, Justice John S. Boyle to give us a list of 300 . . . to give us a list of lawyers who had more than their share of litigation pending in the courts. The Chief Justice was good enough to give us the names of 300 lawyers or law firms, which incidently included my law firm, as well as 'Cochran and Ellis' and some others. The whole purpose of that as we asked 'Frank Greenburg', the president at that time; what have you done with that list of 300 law firms or lawyers who have more than their share? How do they explain it? And 'Mr. Greenburg' said, 'Well, we can't do that job, we don't have sufficient money'. He was testifying just after 'Paul Boone', of the National Association of Independent Insurers, had advised the Committee that they gave the Chicago Bar Association \$200,000 to get rid of ambulance chasers. As a matter of fact, I suggested that 'Boone' hire our firm to get the \$200,000 back. But the fact remains to this day, despite inquiries of the members of the various Committees, to this day they have a list of 300 lawyers or law firms. And not one of us have been asked where our cases come from. There are perhaps 100 or 200 of us who can explain that they came from insurance companies or the unions or what have you. But in that group I know chasers. Before that Committee, we had police captains testify. . . And, Art', I do hope you'll be gentle with me because I would hate to tell you the names of the police captains who testified that they gave the names of the lawyers who traced cases to the Chicago Bar Association. And to this day, I have repeatedly asked the Chicago . . . year in and year out, Ladies and Gentlemen, there's not a thing I have uttered on this floor that I have not talked about within the chambers of the



Association itself. I have been offered the Presidency. I have been offered the Board of Managers. I have been offered . . . I've been given a plaque, but it ticked when they gave it to me; but the fact is, I say this to you, if the Bar Association . . . incidently, one final word, and this is final, I showed both Associations the courtesy of telling them about this Resolution, I showed them the courtesy of telling them when it would be called. And in their great wisdom, and in their supreme arrogance and indifference, they didn't even bother to appear. And to you Gentleman who chose to rise on this floor and defend them, that's your privilege; but I don't think it does you credit. I ask for a favorable vote on the . . . I hope the elimination, unfortunately, or just short of that of the Chicago Bar Association."

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

Berman: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. And first I want to apologize, if that's the proper word, to my esteemed colleague, Representative Epton. I think, Bernie, it's a discredit to you if you say that one of us that stands in opposition to your point of view is being a discredit to ourselves. Sometimes I have cringed when you've taken off on people who have differed with your point of view. But I shall not step away from what I think is the fair response to this preposterous Resolution just because I . . . you and I differ. And our difference of opinion does not detract from my regard for you as a Legislator or as a lawyer. But . . . that's right . . . but it disturbs me greatly as a Member of this Legislature when we are asked to be a party and a vehicle for your personal vendetta against the Bar Association. We have been here for six years, and I think that's . . . for each of those years we have seen some type of Bill or some type of Resolution relating to the same kind of approach so far as . . ."

Speaker Telcser: "One minute, Representative Epton, for what purpose do you arise?"

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, a point of . . . I do think that, certainly, Representative Berman was very kind in listening to me. And I'm electing to stand at rise. But I think he is making an unintentional



misquote. I stated earlier, I'm going to keep this on a higher level, I suggest he do so. I have no personal vendetta. And if anyone wants to suggest that, then be prepared to respond as soon as it's my turn to speak."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Berman."

Berman: "May I continue, Mr. Epton? Thank you. First I'd like to take you up on you offer that you'll withdraw the Resolution if we find anything wrong in it. And I refer you to paragraph 5, 'It does not properly treat firm names with some of the partners that are deceased'. And I would refer to the A.B.A., the American Bar Association, code of professional responsibility under ethical considerations, paragraph 2-11, that specifically allows for the inclusion of the 'deceased partner's name and firm name'. Now, that's number one, and if you follow through with your commitment, I can stop there. You can either say . . . wave your head 'yes' or 'no'. You're charging in the Resolution that they are not properly, and I think that if to a lawyer, the word 'properly' is a very vague term to use in a Resolution where you are, in fact, not asking this Legislature or this House of Representatives to merely censure the Chicago Bar, I would call to the attention of my colleagues here that you are asking this House of Representatives to ask . . . you are calling upon the Secretary of State to revoke the charter of the Chicago Bar Association. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think that's a rather . . . very, very important type of request that's been put before us today."

Speaker Telcser: "Counsel are you asking the other Counsel here a direct question?"

Berman: "No."

Speaker Telcser: "Oh, okay."

Berman: "When I'm done, he can withdraw the Resolution if that is what he wishes to do. That's what he committed himself to do. Now, I have in front of me a three-page letter which responds, and I think quite adequately, to every one of the counts that Representative Epton says to us in his Resolution. I think it's an imposition by me to read this whole letter; but I think it's even a more



greater imposition upon us for Representative Epton to bring this up on the . . . what I would hope would be the last day of the Legislature and take up all our time on his nuances and his peaks of fitness with the Chicago Bar Association. I would merely point out some of the positive things that we have done in the Chicago Bar Association, and, yes, as recently as ten days ago, I was elected to the Board of Managers of the Chicago Bar Association and I want my colleagues in the House to know one of the reasons, I believe, why I was elected to the membership of the Board of Managers of the Chicago Board Association. Because I came to the nominating committee and I said that I think that it's important to the Chicago Bar Association to have legislative input, not only for them to come down here and suggest to us legislative solutions to problems, but for us as Legislators to try to upgrade and improve the Chicago Bar. And I think that that appeal was recognized, not because of Art Berman as an individual, but more so because Art Berman is a Member of this General Assembly and this House of Representatives. Now, let's talk about some of the positive things that the Bar Association is involved in because I think that that is what has to be weighed when a Resolution is presented to us calling upon us to recommend the revocation of the charter of the Chicago Bar Association. Number one, the Matrimonial Law Committee at the request of the presiding Judge in the Divorce Division handled many divorce cases without charge for indigence. The hours spent on such cases are computed and form the basis for substantial contribution in Federal funds toward the legal aid programs in Chicago each year. Number two, the Chicago Bar Association has arranged for a contribution to the Legal Aid Program in Chicago from its members and serves as a collection agency for such funds. Number three, the young young lawyer section has a program whereby its members act in a virtually no-fee capacity to represent purchasers of homes financed under government-secured mortgages. This program was set up at the request of Federal offices and has proven a great help to the low-income people purchasing homes under such programs.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Four, the young lawyer section has a program where its members act as volunteer parole officers where specific prisoners were released under parole. The young lawyer section has arranged for the writing, publication and distribution of a handbook explaining to citizens how they may proceed without a lawyer in prosaic courts. The Chicago Bar Association has a program which costs it thousands of dollars each year to provide a lawyer referral service for low income people who need a lawyer. The Chicago Bar Association Committee for the defense of indigent prisoners each year contributes many hours devoted to the defense of indigents charged with crimes on a basis where they generally receive barely enough money to cover their out-of-pocket expenses. Without this committee the criminal court would frequently be hampered because when conflicts of interests occur, the public defender cannot represent co-defendants. The Association has a speaker's guild which provides lawyers to speak before civic groups at no cost throughout the country . . . the county upon a great variety of law or civic oriented subjects. The Board has had a special committee, which for the past three years have studied and negotiated endlessly seeking to improve police procedures in the City of Chicago. I can go on and on, Ladies and Gentlemen; but let me merely indicate this. This is a very serious Resolution that's calling upon this General Assembly to recommend the revocation of the Chicago Bar Association. And I think that it's a sorry day when one of our Members who tries to champion, and most times I agree with him wholeheartedly, champion the cause of the legal profession in this House has to stand and ask us to lend ourselves to this kind of a . . . of an action. I think it's totally uncalled for and I solicit your 'no' vote on this Resolution."

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

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this proposition has been argued very, very ably by one proponent and one opponent. I have checked the Calendar and we do have several other motions and many Senate Bills on Third Reading. I hope we can go with that business."



And I move the previous question."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the previous question has been moved. Representative Epton to close."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen, I, certainly, agree with your comments. As a matter of fact, too much time has been given. We'd have been better off with just my side of the argument. I should say that my offer still stands; and Representative Berman who was going to keep this on a high plane explained . . . wanted to know if I would withdraw my Resolution. What he forgot to tell you was what he was reading were the canons of the American Bar Association. I said that the canons of the Chicago Bar Association are in conflict. And I think I should know because I served on the committee that formed them. I served on the . . . as a matter of fact, I think I have more hours on the committee in the Chicago Bar Association than Mr. Berman has on his head. I certainly think that applies to my head. But in any event, I want you to know that what he forgot to say when he talked about the wonderful deeds of the Chicago Bar, he forgot to mention they were a wonderful theatrical organization. They also had a wonderful restaurant and they maintain a good library. So I concede all of their virtues. But the fact remains to this day they have responded to the 300 lawyers whose names are in the crowd. To this day they haven't responded to the two lawyers who were found by police captains, not lieutenants, sergeants, corporals, or whatever they are, even privates, whose cars were found and who admitted soliciting. But the Chicago Bar Association had neither the time nor the money to do it. I might add that Representative Berman in his sincerity didn't have a chance to talk to all the past presidents as I have. Without failure each and every year I have been wined and dined, I've been taken to lunch and to dinner, sometimes I haven't eaten food until they tasted it; but the fact is that all of them have conceded, all of them, the only exception has been one gentlemen here, who may well believe what he says, they have all conceded that they are



derelect. And they've all asked for additional time. This started when I was young fellow. I'm an old tired man now; and I don't really . . . I'd like to see my grandchildren live to the time when lawyers are an honest, decent, respected profession. I will let this go to a Roll Call; but again I would submit to you that in this pile of papers I have, I have situations where the Chicago Bar Association deliberately killed the complaints, failed to act on a complaint or lied, if you will, and that latest is as recently as two weeks ago when my request to submit an article, it was agreed to by the Board of Managers by 'Mr. Kissle'; and then when they got my reply for that record, they decided that it was too expensive. I said I would pay for the additional \$225, and they decided then it really wasn't . . . they didn't have the room or the time. I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved the House do adopt House Resolution 938. All in favor of the adoption signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Okay, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am not a member of the Chicago Bar Association. Now, in considering House Resolution 937 and the one presently under consideration, House Resolution 938, I do see a relationship. House Resolution 937 dealt with unprofessional conduct of an attorney. In House Resolution 938, we have a Resolution drafted by an attorney calling upon the Secretary of State to revoke a certificate of incorporation knowing full well that the Secretary of State has no statutory authority to revoke a certificate of a corporation for the reasons cited in House Resolution 938. Therefore, as an attorney, as a Member of this House, he has drafted or caused to be drafted a Resolution calling upon the Secretary of State to perform an act for which he does not have statutory responsibility or authority. I, therefore, suggest that there lies in this Resolution, its drafting and its offering unprofessional conduct. And I call upon the Illinois State Bar Association to conduct the investigation that he so desires. And I suggest that he be the first subject of an investigation."

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Duff: "Well, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I really did lay off that further . . . that earlier Resolution on purpose because this is a pretty serious one. I don't want to comment on the opinion of others as to who should be investigated by whom; but I hope everybody in this House listened carefully to what Representative Berman said. And I don't care whether he's on the Board of Managers or not. Now, I'm not in a big law firm. In fact, I've a two-person law firm. And I don't feel discriminated against by this operation that has big firms. You know today the lawyers are in terrible disrepute. They're probably held in less regard by the public than anybody but Legislators and used car dealers. And I think deservedly so. I, myself, am sick of some of the things I hear so-called lawyers doing in Washington, and in Chicago and even in Springfield and even in this Chamber. And I'm not happy about the negative people in the legal profession. But I'll tell you something, there are a lot of fine people in it. Now, this big organization in Chicago, which is supposedly helps only big firms has allowed people like me to be part of . . . act in committees as a two-man law firm. We have tried to do a lot of good things. Most of the charity work that I do comes from people in the Bar Association who have committees that want indigents to be helped. I think it's important to listen to what Representative Berman said on this thing. There is no other organization in Chicago which is adequately organized to help the poor and the undefended and to come up with opinions as to how these things may be accomplished. Of course, it's a poor organization in many ways. It's run by lawyers. But that's not the point. The point is it's the only existing organization in the entire County of Cook that can do the job. If you eliminated, and you eliminated services, then you must believe that there's never any kind of politics within the profession or within the court system; and this is the only vehicle that we have which gives the profession an adequate good relationship on a day-to-day basis with the legal society and all of its parts, including



probation, the courts and all other systems."

Speaker Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. On this question there are 53 'ayes', 38 'nays', 18 answering 'present'; the House adopts House Resolution 938. On the Speaker's Table appears House Resolution 976, for which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Caldwell, is recognized."

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

Speaker Telcser: "Lewis, hang on. Representative Giorgi, for what purpose do you arise?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering . . . I know that all of our debate is being transcribed verbatim, could I put an order in for the last debate . . . the debate on the last Resolution?"

Speaker Telcser: "Sure . . ."

Giorgi: "So I can . . . give around my district."

Speaker Telcser: ". . . sure, come up to the Clerk . . . Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 976 merely asks to have enlarged by two Members a Committee that is currently studying the policy numbers game. We find that there's much to be done; and we hope to have a report by the end of the year, which will perhaps give us the knowledge to shape some legislation. I move its adoption."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? What does this do? Does it create a new Committee or something? It expands it on an existing Committee?"

Caldwell: "Extends an existing Committee by two Members."

Speaker Telcser: "Well, let's get 89 and be sure. The Gentleman moves the House adopt House Resolution 976. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. Put me on, Telcser 'aye'. On this question there are 107 'ayes', no 'nays', 6 answering 'present'; the House adopts House Resolution 976. On the Speaker's Table appears House Resolution 988, for which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kelly, is recognized."



Kelly: "Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd appreciate your support for House Resolution 988. It's a particular Resolution which calls on the Governor of the State of Illinois to proclaim a week during the fall as Respect Life Week. This particular Resolution received the unanimous approval of the Executive Committee. And this is part of a National Respect Life Program which considers and concerns itself with every . . . with all forms of life from the unborn to the elderly, including the mentally and physically disabled. I'd appreciate your support on the adoption of this Resolution."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman moves to ~~adopt~~ House Resolution 988. All in favor 'aye', opposed 'no' . . . the 'opposed 'no'; the Resolution is adopted. On the Order of Resolutions appears House Resolution 1069. For which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Taylor, is recognized."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, could I have leave of the House to have Amendment #1 to House Resolution 1069 adopted? The Amendment is just a typographical error in the reporting from January 7, 1974 to January 7, 1975. And that is the existing of . . ."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'; and the 'ayes' have it; and the Amendment's adopted. Now, proceed, Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 1069 is giving the Legislative Investigation Commission the right to investigate the 'A. F. McKinley' Community Service Organization. Now, I'm one that is not very fond of ever forming any type of Investigating Commission; but over the past four years, I have continually gotten calls and reports about problems that exist in that area. And all last . . . the last Saturday I'd spent at home, I've gotten three calls on that day about activities that I think that needs investigating at that . . . of the facilities in the city. 'A. F. McKinley' is an organization that was formed some years ago. And one that I have always was doing a fair and fine job. But something is going wrong



thought that if the Legislative Investigating Commission looked into it we might resolve these problems. But since this Resolution has been introduced, I have gotten a call from the Director himself and a number of his members willing to sit down and talk with the people about the problem which they had refused to do in the past. I do not know at this time if that Resolution would be needed or the Investigating Commission would need to be involved. But since the Resolution has been introduced I thought that it would behoove me to try to get it passed. And with that I'll solicit your support for House Bill, I mean, House Resolution 1069."

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

Juckett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question or two?"

Taylor: "Mr. Juckett, ever since I've been on this floor and every Bill that I've had, I've always been glad to yield to you and I would gladly do so again today, Sir."

Juckett: "Thank you for your kind remarks. And remember I was one of your supporters."

Taylor: "Thank you."

Juckett: "Could you give us any idea as to what kind of problems these are?"

Taylor: "Well, there is a problem in one case where I know that this House has appropriated money to the Department of Mental Health that it's being used there. And I've found that some of their monies has not been used in the areas that they were supposed to be used in. I'm not certain of this. I'm certain it is true of the allegations that have been made to me."

Juckett: "Okay, we have . . . I have worked with this organization and they have testified before the Mental Health Fund Advisory Committee. And I'm wondering whether you have contacted the Department of Mental Health and their community grant program section to determine whether that section has any information for you. Because this organization, as all organizations, who do refuse community grants are thoroughly reviewed beforehand, and are given thorough reviews



after the money is spent before they are paid. I'm just wondering whether you have checked with that section and whether it has given you any information."

Taylor: "I have not checked with the Department of Mental Health at all. As I've said, this happened on a Saturday afternoon, and the calls that I've gotten, and I got three calls that day, from different individuals that was involved. And we had to be back here on Sunday. And, as you know, I've been working pretty extensively trying to watch a couple of Bills. So I have not had the opportunity really to dig into it as I think it should be. But it may not be that deeply involved. I just hope to get these . . . both sides together and maybe we can come out with a workable solution. And that was the only reason that I proposed the Resolution."

Juckett: "Well, could I make a suggestion? Could you hold this, and contact the Department of Mental Health, the Community Grant Section, and get them and the 'A. F. McKinley' group together, and go to them together, present what you, or what has been given to you and see if you can work it out?"

Taylor: "Mr. Juckett, I . . . I have talked to Director 'Burlingham' myself. And have an agreement with him because I am a Member of the Investigating Commission. And I feel that we would not need it, then I would gladly tell them that I didn't think they would have to spend money in that area. But at this time, I think it's too late because the Session is ending; and I, certainly, want to get this problem resolved."

Juckett: "Well, now as a Member of that Commission, would you think it proper if the House directed them to do this . . . that they did not do it?"

Taylor: "Well . . . well . . ."

Juckett: "And remember, you know, that when the House is out of Session, if you cannot get your problem resolved, that the Commission does have the power to initiate its own investigation as long as we're not in Session. So that you would not be losing anything."

Taylor: ". . . Well, the problem that exists is that the Investigating



Commission would have to have the approval of the House if we were not in Session. Therefore, I would suggest that we have the . . . we will have to direct them in order to go into this agency in order to investigate them."

Juckett: "Well, now, if we are not in Session . . . if we are in Session, the Commission does need the approval of the House or the General Assembly. But if we are not in Session, there is a procedure whereby the Investigating Commission can initiate its own investigation. And I say to you, Sir, that if you . . . if the Mental Health Department and the Community Grant Section could not resolve the question for you, that you as a Member of the Investigating Commission can request the Commission to investigate. And if you get the requisite majority, I think it's an extraordinary majority, you can on your own volition do what you want to do. But I think you're a little premature in this request not having gone through the Mental Health Department and having them check it out."

Taylor: "Well, Mr. Juckett, I think that's a matter of opinion. But at any rate, I would like to move ahead with my motion at this time, Sir."

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

Giorgi: "Well, Mr. Speaker, didn't you rule in the last couple of days that this dialogue is incorrect and improper and . . ."

Speaker Miller: "Well, I understand Mr. Juckett is finished. Is there further discussion? Mr. Taylor like to close?"

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, thank you very much; and I would like to say is that I would appreciate your favorable vote on this motion."

Speaker Miller: "Well, inasmuch as . . . it involves the expenditure of funds. This will take 89 votes. And all those in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed 'nay'. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, arise?"

Matijevich: "Well, my point is if he doesn't reach 89, my point of order is . . . well, he's got more than enough anyway. I don't think it takes 89 because it's an existing Commission, Investigating



Commission, not a new Committee. But that's all right, he's got enough votes."

Speaker Miller: "Have all voted who wished? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk.

On this question there are 107 'ayes', 1 'nay' and 4 answering 'present'; and the House does adopt House Resolution 1069. Mr. Nardulli 'aye'. On the Speaker's Table appears House Resolution 1086. The Chair will recognize the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. This is a Resolution which thanks Doctor Leo Cohen, who is the . . . who at least was until July 1st, the Chief of the Office of Financial Affairs in the Department of Local Government Affairs, for his extraordinary service in defense of the indefensible during the last year. It thanks Doctor Cohen for his efforts to bring the assessment equalization process out of the quagmire of politics in which it apparently has been mired for decades. And we hope that Doctor Cohen's efforts to straighten out the mess will not cease with his departure from the Department. The good gentleman is returning to Southern Illinois University. And it seems to me that we ought to praise people who have done good jobs."

Speaker Miller: "Is there discussion? All right, the question is, shall the House adopt House Resolution 1086? All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'; and the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution's adopted. Under . . . on the Speaker's Table appears House Resolution 1111. On this . . . the Chair will recognize the Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to suspend Rule 41, House Rule 41, to take House Resolution 1111 off the Table for immediate consideration."

Speaker Miller: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted to . . . for the immediate consideration, Mr. Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, what the Resolution calls for is an investigation by the Illinois Legislative Investigating Commission of the Kane County Jail. Twice, and the most recent time was a couple of weeks ago, the Kane County Jail has been



investigated by a Grand Jury. And, consequently, they have come up with severe criticisms of this particular jail. It criticized the general administration of the jail, made a detailed list of the observations about the jail. It criticized the cleanliness in medical services and inspections. It says there's a lack of programs. The Grand Jury said the jail was understaffed and that the jail administration is virtually nonexistent. And, consequently, I would like to have this Resolution adopted."

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

Grotberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to speak to the Resolution because I think it's a fine Resolution, Mr. Hill, but it's very untimely in that before the snow falls the Kane County Jail will have a new jail and probably one of the most modern jails in the State of Illinois. It's in the process of being built. I've checked with that county board. And I really believe, although the investigations that have been done have been, you know, fantastic. And the thing has been brought to a point to involve the Illinois Investigation . . . Legislative Investigation Committee into something that is in the process of solving itself in the very near future is an exercise in futility. And I would like to speak against the motion."

Speaker Miller: "Is there further discussion? All right, the question is, shall the House adopt House Resolution 1111? All those in favor say 'aye', opposed . . . all right, we'll have a Roll Call. All right, all those in favor of the adoption . . . all right, the Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Schoeberlein, is recognized."

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Chairman, this happens to be my county, I mean, the county I'm from. In 1962, I was Chairman of the County Board; and we overhauled that jail, and got bars, and doors and everything in there that was soundproof. And did a lot of work. Now, what has happened in the meantime, all I know is what I read in the paper. And it isn't good. But as John Grotberg said, there is a new jail in the offing; and I would like this particular Commission or Committee to invite the Members of the Legislature who reside in



Kane County to be with them when they make this investigation.

And I'm for it 100 percent."

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

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Miller: "He indicates he will, Sir."

Juckett: "Would you be willing to accept an Amendment to add an investigation of the Cook County Jail?"

Hill: "I believe that you could put your own in if you so desired. I'm doing the best with my piece of legislation. This is my county. I'm vitally concerned with it; and, consequently, you could've put one in the same way I did, Representative Juckett."

Juckett: "You don't want to investigate similar type of conditions that you've described in Cook County?"

Hill: "I don't think I said anything like that. I said that as far as I'm concerned you can put in your own Resolution."

Juckett: "Well, then you're unwilling to accept an Amendment to investigate similar conditions in Cook County?"

Hill: "At this late date, of course not."

Juckett: "You're not willing to accept it? Would you take it out of the Record so I could draw an Amendment?"

Hill: "I am not willing to accept it at this late date I said."

Juckett: "Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "All right, is there further discussion? All right, the question is, shall the House adopt House Resolution 1111? And we'll have an oral Roll Call. All those in . . . I mean, a record Roll Call . . . all those in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 100 'ayes', 13 'nays' and none answering 'present'; and the House does adopt Resolution 1111. On the Speaker's Table appears House Resolution 1116. And the Chair will recognize the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would ask suspension of the appropriate section of Rule 41 for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 1116."

Speaker Miller: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections,



the rule is suspended. And Mr. Mann may proceed. Just a moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Juckett."

Juckett: "Now, can I correct an understanding that he's asking for a suspension of the rule for the immediate consideration? Well, before giving leave, may I ask when was it introduced?"

Mann: "Representative Juckett, it was introduced yesterday; and, therefore, we didn't have time to go to the Executive Committee with it. It's just a Study Commission, a Committee rather."

Juckett: "How much money is involved?"

Mann: "No money. If there's any money involved, it will come from the Speaker's Discretionary Fund; but I'm hopeful that we won't have to expend any money."

Juckett: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think at this point I would object because I think it's sort of late; and I don't think that this is the proper way to conduct business."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker . . . Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Miller: "Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Yes, I appreciate the Gentleman's concern. All I'm asking for here is the suspension of the rules so that we can consider this Resolution. It calls for a Study Committee, it does not call for any substantive action by this House at this time. If he'll give me leave to consider it, I will try to explain succinctly and briefly."

Speaker Miller: "Does Mr. Juckett persist in his objection? All right, the Gentleman persists, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Well, let's have a Record Call then . . . Roll Call."

Speaker Miller: "All right, Mr. Mann moves that the rules be suspended for the purpose of immediate hearing and consideration on House Resolution 1116. All . . . this will take 89 votes. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, to suspend a rule it takes 107 votes, doesn't it?"

Speaker Miller: "My Parliamentarian is in the rear of the Chambers, and I need her guidance. The advice I received says 107. So the Chair will so rule. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted



who wished? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. Record Mr. Totten as 'aye'. On this question there are 105 'ayes' . . . Mr. Merlo."

Merlo: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I do not believe that Representative Mann's request for immediate consideration is unreasonable. I'm sure that all of us as each day passes . . ."

Speaker Miller: "Just a moment. Record Kenny Miller as 'aye' on this Roll Call. Dave Jones as 'aye'. Mr. DiPrima as 'aye'. Mr. Ike Sims as 'aye'. Mr. Robert Holloway as 'aye'. Mr. Collins as 'aye'. Mr. Ryan as 'aye'. Mr. North as 'aye'. Mr. Porter as 'aye'. Give me the count, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 114 'ayes', 3 'nays' and 4 answering 'present'; and the Gentleman's motion to suspend the rules for immediate consideration is carried. Now, the Chair will recognize the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, with respect to the Resolution."

Mann: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker; and thank all of you for that resounding vote. I think the vote does evince a concern on the part of the Members of this House for a problem that we find in all of our constituency, namely, a need for child day-care centers. I don't know why we're having this crisis. I know one reason why we're short of them, and that is, that there's increasingly large numbers of women who are seeking employment in order to provide sustenance for their families. As you may know, under our present statutory regulations, women on public assistance must now work. There are other women, middle-class women, who are victimized either by divorce or by a death perhaps in the family, who now must be the breadwinners. We do need more facilities. And rather than involve ourselves here in extended debate; and I would ask you for an affirmative vote. I want to emphasize now that we're not proposing any substantive legislation here. I'm really asking for a six-man . . . Member House Committee to be appointed to report back no later than December 31, 1964."

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

Mann: "'74, excuse me."

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm



not sure whether the nonmembers of the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission are aware that the Commission is about to complete and release a study on day-care licensing. And I would hope, if this Committee is approved, that the Members who are appointed to this Committee will coordinate their efforts very closely with the extensive fieldwork and backup data that our Commission will release in the very near future."

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

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

Speaker Miller: "Proceed."

Houlihan, J.: "Bob, there's a lot of questions about how we use Commissions and how they should be worked into the Committee structure. Would this work with any one of the Committees, and how would this relate to, I think 'Gene Barnes has a \$15,000 Commission on day care?"

Mann: "No, I think Representative Barnes' Commission deals with child care. And concerns itself with the care of children from out of state; and child care involves child abuse. We're not concerned here with child abuse. Although, I would say that the absence of day-care centers may very well invite it. What we want to do is find out . . . we want to document the need, if it exists, for day-care centers. Find out how much it would cost, see whether we could get some private and federal funds and see if we can get the state government actively involved if the need, in fact, exists. I have no preconceived notions. If the need exists to try to document that need, and then try to get legislation going."

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have no opposition. And I think there is, in fact, a need; and I think this is a good thing. I would make a recommendation that in future Resolutions we might direct a Subcommittee of a particular Standing Committee to do that work so that we would not . . . but not bypass all the Committees which we have established. And I think it would be legislatively a lot more efficient; but because of my respect for the Sponsor and the need that this area has, I



think we ought to vote 'aye' for this Bill."

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

Holloway, R.: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Miller: "Proceed, Sir."

Holloway, R.: "Representative Mann, you indicated that the House Committee on Child Care was established for the purpose of studying instances of child abuse. Where did you get that idea?"

Mann: "I'm sorry, I got that idea from the media. If I'm mistaken, I retract it."

Holloway, R.: "Are you a Member of the House Committee on Child Care?"

Mann: "I said I got it from the media. No, now you know I'm not a Member. Aren't you a Member?"

Holloway, R.: "Yes, I'm Vice-Chairman. I wasn't certain. I just wanted to . . ."

Mann: "No, that was an impression; if it's incorrect, I withdraw it."

Holloway, R.: "I see. May I direct myself to the Resolution, Mr. Speaker? I just simply want to say that we have a Committee on Child Care established earlier this year by the House. And the Committee actually is in formation from the standpoint of ascertaining points of emphasis. And as I understand our mission here is it cuts across all areas of . . . relating to children, whether it be child abuse or any other factor that would have an affect on children. And it seems to me that at this point in time before the Committee on Child Care has had an opportunity to define the areas of most need in regard to children that it might be well to hold this situation in abeyance. And I would urge a vote against it."

Speaker Miller: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan, arise."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, it couldn't happen that a member of the press is carrying beer in . . . a female member of the press happen to have any beer over there, could it? And the . . . huh? . . . that wouldn't be a camouflaged can, would it?"

Speaker Miller: "The Chair will ignore the comment, Mr. Hanahan. The



Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Kriegsman, is recognized."

Kriegsman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say that I agree with Representative Holloway. I'm sure there must be any number of a dozen Committees or organizations around this town, that nowhere else, that can handle this thing. And when the Speaker . . . Representative Mann speaks of Federal funds and state funds, it just scares the living daylight out of me that this can go into a \$1,000,000 proposition just for starters. And I, certainly, hope that we turn it down, not because of finding out the information, but I've got about 17 Kriegsman transfer cartons in my room of findings that have been found. And I'm sure that the people that . . . having found that the things that they were finding have nothing else to do. And I'd like for them to go after this one."

Speaker Miller: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, to close the debate. I'm sorry, Mr. Merlo. The Chair will recognize the Gentleman from Cook."

Merlo: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I feel that there is a need of an immediate study of day-care problems in the State of Illinois. There's no question that there's a growing recognition of the advisability of child care funding for low and moderate income families. And the status of day-care as both an economic stimulant and an intensive social need has been documented. And that is why I rise in support of this Resolution. I happen to live and represent an area that has a large segment of low and moderate income families; in fact, families that are very poor indeed. And you find it very difficult, and in fact, impossible to exist unless they have two sources of income to sustain their families. And I'd like a little order, Mr. Speaker. These people are decent people looking for a lifestyle to live with dignity and respect. And we as Legislators must be realistic. We must realize that the ever increasing number of working mothers in our society have placed stress on the current structure of child day-care centers throughout the state. And I feel that this Resolution to study all phases and aspects of the current problem in the child care program in the State of Illinois is timely. And I hope, not only



for my community, for many communities throughout the state that you will all support Bob Mann's Resolution. It is something that should be determined now, and not to wait much further into the future for resolve."

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

Juckett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It appears from all the speakers who have spoken in favor of this special Committee that there seems to be some sort of a problem. And they are concerned with people. My concern is for this House of Representatives. If there has been, and if there is in fact a concern, why was this Resolution . . . why was this Resolution introduced last night? Why did they wait until the last day of the Regular Session in order to introduce it? Was it, in fact, to bypass the Committee system? The Committee on Human Resources this year has set up many special Subcommittees to look into the field of their expertise. We have already set up a special Child care Committee. Why another one? I would hope that the people that feel that there is a concern, and that there are many women that would like to work, but don't know where to put their children, that they should address their remarks, not to government, but they should address their remarks to private industry. Because if it is such a problem to hire people, then I'm sure that private industry would be in favor of setting up their own programs in order to get the best qualified worker. And if it were necessary to set up a program, I'm sure they would've done it long ago. And it is not an answer to say that it's the government's responsibility. Because if, in fact, a problem exists, it is not government's responsibility, it's private industry. And you should not take private industry off the hook. They should pay for it. If they want the employee, and this is the benefit that they have to give, then private industry should pay for it. And we could save an awful lot of money and a lot of studies that are going to go into transfer cases, and packing cases, and storage cases and round cases; and nobody is going to look at them. Now, we've already got a Standing Committee of this House that is capable



of doing it. But the Sponsor chose for this overwhelming problem, this problem that people have said has been eating away at industry; but he puts it in on the last day of the Session. It couldn't have been that great of problem when we've been down here for three months that it could've been put into one of the other Committees. And I'm sure it would've been voted out, and it would've been handled properly. Or a Special Subcommittee of the Standing Committee, which is what we are all aiming for, could've been established to handle it. I think that this is a very bad practice to put such a motion before the House on the last day of its Regular Session so that they could say the Committee is not meeting again, and please help the poor children, the poor mothers, the poor industry, the poor employers. So I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Lechowicz: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Miller: "All right, the Gentleman moves the previous question.

All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'; the 'ayes' have it; and the previous question is moved. The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis, on a point."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, may I direct this one query that I was trying to direct earlier to Bob?"

Speaker Miller: "Well, we . . . no, we called . . . the debate is closed . . ."

Geo-Karis: "Oh, all right, all I'm asking at this time is that perhaps he would like to refer this to the Human Resources Committee. That's all."

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

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, after 12 years in this General Assembly, I'm a little surprised that the Gentleman from Cook would suggest that I would try to circumvent a Committee. I don't conduct myself that way as a Legislator. There are some Committees trying to address themselves to this problem throughout the state. They're having difficulty. They need help. I have supported his various . . ."



investigations of nursing homes and of mental health institutions because I thought that we ought to know more about them. I'm not in favor of letting industry off the hook. I'm in favor of getting the facts, and perhaps eliciting some cooperative inquiry from industry. So I want to assure the Gentleman that while I would've liked to have introduced this Resolution earlier, surely the purpose was not to circumvent any Committee. And the purpose was to respond to what I consider to be a very contemporary need. I just want to quote this to the Members of the House, 'the number of working mothers in this country is soaring, more than 57 percent of all women with children, aged 16 to 17, worked during 1972'. Now, I think we're all concerned about our children. I think we're concerned about adequate day-care centers. I have no preconceived notions about what this Committee will recommend for the General Assembly. This is strictly a study Committee, a House Committee to report back no later than December 31, 1974. I don't know why this should provoke such concern. I think that we've talked on many occasions about the need to encourage welfare mothers to work, we've talked about the needs to provide decent day-care, and health care and educational facilities for children. All we want to do is get a feel for the dimensions of the problems and come back and tell you what they are. I think this is a legitimate legislative purpose; and I would appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Miller: "All right, the question is, shall the House adopt House Resolution 1116? Now, inasmuch as this creates a special Committee, it will take 89 votes. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 90 'ayes', 11 'nays' and 6 answering 'present'; and the House does adopt House Resolution 1116. Mr. McCormick on the floor? Yes. On the Speaker's Table appears House Resolution 1117. In this connection the Chair will recognize the Gentleman from Johnson, Mr. McCormick."

McCormick: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen, I would appreciate it



if we could have unanimous consent to suspend the Section of Rule 41 that would allow immediate consideration of this Resolution."

Speaker Miller: "Does the Gentleman have leave? All right, leave has been granted hearing no objections."

McCormick: "Now, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House . . . explain the . . ."

Speaker Miller: "Just a moment, for what purpose does the . . . just a moment, for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Juckett, arise?"

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, I'll raise an objection."

Speaker Miller: "All right, objections have been heard, Mr. McCormick."

McCormick: "All right, I'll make the necessary motion to ask the House to . . ."

Speaker Miller: "All right, the Gentleman moves that the . . . rules be suspended for the immediate consideration of . . . in adoption of House Resolution 1117. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed 'nay'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Could I have one sentence that could tell us what it does, C. L.?"

McCormick: "Mr. Speaker, if it's agreeable with the Speaker. In explanation of this Resolution, this is a Resolution by myself, Speaker Blair and Minority Leader Choate. And the purpose of the Resolution, and there's certainly no controversy that I know of about it. It has the agreement of the Department of Personnel. As you know, the Senate conducted hearings and worked on Senate Bill 1475 last year. When that Bill came over here . . . when that Bill came over here, I was the House Sponsor; and we immediately started to work on trying to work out what we considered things that needed to be done to the Bill. Now, when we got the staff on both sides of this aisle working on it, we come to the conclusion that it needed more input. And it is true that the Department of Personnel's Advisory Board hadn't completed any input. And we wanted to take this time, and had held the Bill in the Executive Committee so that we can make this study and report back and have the Committee hearings in the fall. I would appreciate the necessary votes to



suspend the rules."

Speaker Miller: "All right, this will take 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 118 'ayes', 1 'nay' and none answering 'present'; and the rules are suspended for the purpose of immediate consideration of House Resolution 1117. In that connection, the Chair will recognize Mr. McCormick."

McCormick: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, everyone in the House knows that we've gone several years without any serious changes in the Personnel Code. And everyone knows there's been court decisions that affects the Secretary of State, the Governor, everybody in the state. Now, the purpose of this is to try to bring together information from every section of the Executive Department all of the elected state offices, the Advisory Commission, the Department of Personnel, and try to bring together a composite agreement between both of the parties in Illinois to come up with a Bill to complete 1475 that will be good for all of the state employees, all of the people of Illinois and fair to everybody concerned. And this is the best method that I know of to do it; and I would appreciate very much your support on this Bill . . . on this motion."

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

Juckett: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, again we're setting up a special Committee when we have a Committee of this House on Personnel and Pensions. I see no reason for a special Committee when this regularly constituted Committee can conduct whatever is necessary to be conducted. I'm sure that Mr. McCormick will probably have the necessary votes to pass it. And when his special Committee is set up, I would certainly like the Gentleman from Johnson to investigate the practice of this Executive Department and of this Governor for people when they take their civil service exam that if they are of the minority race, and I don't know what that definition is, but they are given five points extra because they are a 'minority race'. So if you can assure me



that they will go into that practice because it is going on now and people are not being given a fair shake by this current administration. Then maybe this special Committee won't be too bad; but I still renew the objection. We do have Standing Committees. They are capable. They are staffed. And they are the proper ones to do these investigations. Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "Is there further discussion? Mr. McCormick care to close?"

McCormick: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't believe there's any better Republican on this side of the aisle than I am; but I'm not naive enough to say that this administration has probably done any worse by the Personnel Code than probably we have in the past. And you know as well as I know that in the movement to let the certi . . . Secretary of State people be certified, and you know that the courts have made rulings on that. You know that the Secretary of State himself now, he wants some sort of a Personnel Code. You know the other departments do. And you know that we can't work it out by letting everybody come in with a special Bill. And you know you can't work it out by making it an all Republican Bill or an all Democrat Bill. And what I'm trying to do here is simply bring the House together, the people together, the departments together and forget about who's a Democrat or a Republican and try to work out a Personnel Code that is in conformity with what people all over the United States that are experienced in that field can bring to us. And I think that we should forget about the petty politics in this and simply give us an opportunity to present to you what we think is a good Bill this fall."

Speaker Miller: "The question is, shall the House adopt House Resolution 1117? Inasmuch as this creates a special Committee, it will require a Roll Call vote of 89. All those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson, to explain his vote."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, I would simply like to suggest that what I think we have



been witnessing here for the past half hour, perhaps 40 minutes, is more or less a one-man fight with maybe one or two entering in against the growth of Commissions where perhaps no Commissions were necessary, inasmuch as some other Committee or Commission could do the work. We've been watching the duplication perhaps of efforts or at least the possibility thereof. And I will suggest that out of this, this is the stuff out of which bureaucracy springs. And as bureaucracy grows so does the cost of government; and this, in turn, becomes the stuff out of which, at least in part, inflation grows. So I think there has been an effort here made to hold these extra and special Committees and Commissions in line in the interests of economy perhaps. And it's a worthy effort; and I feel that the . . . I feel that Representative Juckett should be commended in his efforts for so doing. And I am voting red. This isn't going to change the vote on the board. But I did feel that I would just like to express these sentiments to my esteemed and distinguished colleagues here in these closing days."

Speaker Miller: "Have all voted who wished? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk.

On this question there are 127 'ayes', 4 'nays' and 4 answering 'present'; and the House adopts House Resolution 1117. Is Mr. Douglas on the floor? Or Mr. Barnes? This has to do with S.J.R. 65 on the Speaker's Table. Can someone handle that? Mr. Washington."

Washington: "Yes, Representative Barnes asked me to handle this for him, he'd be gone a short while. S.J.R. 65, which passed the Senate without a dissenting vote, in a sense is comparable to House Bill 2757, which is now in a Subcommittee of the Higher Education Committee by agreement. The key to the Resolution simply provides on page 2 that . . . it is urged that the institutions of higher learning in the state, as well as their private counterparts, formerly the program for the selective admission of medical school applicants who agreed to serve in areas of physical need . . . physician needs within Illinois metropolitan areas, and that city institutions report to the Illinois General Assembly their findings at their earliest convenience. It's simply a recognition of the fact that we are short of physicians, a recognition of the fact that we do need



some methods or means to stimulate more of young individuals going into medical schools and urge that these institutions of medical practice . . . hearing to direct their best efforts to this study and to give us the benefit of that study. And I urge your adoption."

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

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, unless this Resolution was amended in Committee, I think all of us ought to take a look at it. It urges the University of Illinois, and S.I.U. and other public agencies concerned with the problem, as well as their private counterparts, to formulate a program for the selective admission, selective admission, of medical school applicants who agree to serve in areas of physician need within Illinois metropolitan areas, not within the State of Illinois, but within Illinois metropolitan areas. And that said institutions, both public and private, report to the General Assembly by January 1 of '75. Now, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it has been repeated, and repeated and repeated that the problem of physician need is not the metropolitan areas. That it is in the need of the country towns . . ."

Speaker Miller: "Just a moment. For what purpose does Mr. Washington arise?"

Washington: "I had been led to believe this was noncontroversial. I'd like to take it out of the Record."

Speaker Miller: "All right, the Gentleman asks leave to take it out of the Record. Leave is granted. Mr. Washington, do you wish to proceed with H.R. 1087? All right. On the Speaker's Table appears House Resolution 1087. And the Chair will recognize the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington."

Washington: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have an Amendment on the Speaker's Table. This Resolution was passed out of the Executive Committee without a dissenting vote with the understanding that it would be amended to strike reference to minorities because it was felt that the need for a study group in the area of jury selection was



important, but it should be expanded to include the whole gambit of problems. And I'm . . . this Amendment simply expands it to do that. And I move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Resolution 1087."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1. Is there discussion? All those in favor say 'aye', oppose 'nay'; the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. All right, proceed, Mr. Washington."

Washington: "The Resolution simply addresses itself to the serious question of jury selection because without criticism necessary of that process . . . the Sun Times recently ran a very incisive, and analytical nondiscriminatory series of articles dealing with selection system by which we get our jurors. And it was found in that study, which was quite incisive, that the system, which is somewhat dated, needed incisive and intensive study and perhaps revision. This Resolution simply calls for a six-man Committee appointed by the House to study that in full and report back to this Assembly by December 31, 1974. I might add that no money is expected to be expended here. The facilities for studying this are already out there. But it is a needed Committee. It will be addressing itself to something which I think is vitally . . . the Gentleman, please, I can't conduct this . . . is vitally important. And it sits in line, of course, with what we've been trying to do in terms of the whole area of the administration of criminal justice. For example, we are . . . we have passed legislation which compensates the victim's crime. We have passed legislation which attempts to safeguard those who are witnesses in criminal matters. We have passed legislation which is designed to compensate witnesses who testify in court. And this is in line with that in attempting to expand the whole selective process of jurors so that we do get a true cross-section of individuals within our community who should be made to serve upon these juries. And this House Resolution 1087 addresses itself to that; and I urge your adoption."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? Does this create a Committee, Harold?"



Okay, the Gentleman moves the House do adopt House Resolution 1087. All in favor of the adoption . . . oh, he says a special Committee now . . . all in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Okay, let's get on the Roll Call for the Gentleman. Getty, do you want to put me on here? Have all voted who wish? Kenny Miller 'aye'. Take the . . . Kempiners 'aye'. Catania 'aye'. The switch is still open, Bob, do you want on here? Have all voted who wish? Collins and Dee 'aye'. Take the Record. On this question there's 116 'ayes', 4 'nays', none answering 'present'; the House adopts House Resolution 1087. Okay, back on the order of Conference Committee Reports . . . oh, okay, we'll get yours next, Pate. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports appears Senate Bill 1568, for which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins, is recognized."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask for the adoption of the Conference Committee Report on House . . . on Senate Bill 1568. This Bill is identical in every word and in every respect to House Bill 2825, which this House has passed earlier. And I would appreciate the same Roll Call. Mr. Speaker, if it's in order, I would ask leave for the same Roll Call; if not, I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Berman: "Mr. Speaker, I think Representative Shea had some comments on this Bill. I was wondering if we might just hold it for a minute or two. He's not on the floor."

Collins: "I thought he cleared that with the Speaker, and he cleared that; but if not, I'd be happy to hold it to wait for Jerry to come back."

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

Collins: "Huh?"

Berman: "I didn't hear you."

Collins: "I said I thought that the Speaker, and Representative Shea and Representative Choate has had some conversation on this Bill; and it was all right to call it. I have no objection to holding



it at all."

Berman: "If you'll hold it just one second, I'll find out for you."

Collins: "Sure."

Speaker Telcser: "I'll tell you what. Phil, let me get to Pate Philip.

Okay? We'll come back to yours. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports appears House Bill 2878, for which purpose the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Philip, is recognized."

Philip: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the House do adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2878, which would in effect remove Senate Amendment #1. Which in effect takes out all the local candidates and officials from the Ethic's Act. So, Mr. Speaker, I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Redmond: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I concur in the recommendation of my colleague from DuPage County. This Bill is a matter of extreme importance to all of the downstate counties in Illinois. I have reason to think that the Second Conference Committee Report is acceptable to the Senate in its present form. And I ask for the adoption. Thank you."

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

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just came back from the Senate, where they're discussing this proposition over there now. I'm wondering if you want to hold it until they get through with it, Pate?"

Philip: "Jerry, I suppose that's agreeable . . . my information was that the problem had been solved and worked out. Obviously, perhaps I have been misinformed."

Shea: "I just left Senator Rock. Well, here, he's behind me. We were together over there."

Philip: "Well, I'll be happy to postpone it."

Shea: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, since Representative Shea has returned. The order of Conference Committee Reports, Senate Bill 1568. Phil, 1568."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was indicated that Representative



Shea had something further on this one. He's shaking his head 'no', so then I would ask for a favorable Roll Call . . . the same Roll Call as 2825, whichever is easier for you."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman moves the House adopt the Conference Committee Report. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman."

Berman: "I had one question on this. There's a Section that talks about the Committee reporting July 1st for the previous year's activities."

Collins: "Yes, Art'."

Berman: "I presume legislatively that you're talking about next July 1st of '75 for the . . . for the first reporting date. Am I correct, Sir?"

Collins: "Yes, you are correct."

Berman: "Thank you."

Collins: "And I believe it is the . . . unless . . . well, I want to check our own language; but I believe it says during the month of July, not July 1st. Yes, during the month of the July."

Berman: "All right, and that would be July . . . during July of '75 . . ."

Collins: "1975, yes . . ."

Berman: "You want it to report for the past year?"

Collins: ". . . yes, the Bill states clearly that the first obligation on any of us is October of this year."

Berman: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman moves the House adopt Conference Committee Report with respect to Senate Bill 1568. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? This is an important Roll Call, Ladies and Gentlemen. I want to be sure that everybody is on that wishes to be on. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. On this question there are 146 'ayes', 2 'nays', 5 answering 'present'; and the House adopts the Conference Committee Report with respect to Senate Bill 1568. Representative Juckett, are you ready on 1500? On Conference Committee Reports appears Senate Bill 1500, for which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Juckett."



Juckett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would urge the adoption of the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1500. We clarified some technical changes; and we allow the Department of Mental Health to hire physicians unlimited license until July 1 of next year. We provide for two extensions or renewals of those permits; and upon the renewal or the issuance of a new permit, they would take clinical exams. And the Department has agreed to this and the Senate has agreed; and I urge the adoption of the First Conference Committee on Senate Bill 1500."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Telcser: "Yes."

McClain: "Bob, how does this reflect to the Comprehensive Health Planning Act that we just passed? Is there any conflict between the two?"

Juckett: "Not that I know of."

McClain: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman moves the House adopt Conference Committee Report with respect to Senate Bill 1500. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Leon 'aye'. Take the Record. On this question there are 133 'ayes', 3 'nays', 2 answering 'present'; and the House adopts the Conference Committee Report with respect . . . Hart? Record Hart 'aye' instead of . . . oh, 'no' instead of 'aye', from 'aye' to 'no' . . . the House adopts Conference Committee Report with respect to Senate Bill 1500. Chuck Keller on the floor for 2382? No? What about Phil Collins? Phil, do you want House Bill 220? House Bill 220? Okay, on the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 220, for which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins, is recognized."

Collins: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 220 is a Bill that passed this House last year. And Senate Amendment #1 to the Bill merely inserts a passage that deals with the use of interpreters. It was inadvertently



left out of the House Bill. And I would move for concurrence with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 220."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Art, does this permit the interpreters to go into voting booths now to interpret?"

Collins: "No, no, it permits the use of the interpreter to instruct on the model machine."

McClain: "On the ballot sheet outside the voting booths?"

Collins: "On the model outside the booth, yes."

McClain: "It does not . . . it specifically states it does not permit the interpreter to go inside the voting booths?"

Collins: "Yes, the language is that they may use an interpreter in instructing a voter on the model machine. Any such interpreter shall execute the interpreter's affidavit English language disability as set out in the Session, Sir."

McClain: "If a judge went into the voting booth with the interpreter, would that be permissible?"

Collins: "No. No, it's strictly an instruction on the machine, Mike."

McClain: "Okay, and thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "What's the matter, Art? Oh, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Art, ask Berman, please."

Speaker Telcser: "Ask Berman? Art', what's up, 'baby'?"

Berman: "We are being asked to vote to concur on what? A Senate Amendment?"

Collins: "Yes, that's right."

Berman: "Senate Amendment # what?"

Collins: "It's the only Senate Amendment."

Speaker Telcser: "Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 220."

Berman: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Further discussion? The Gentleman moves the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 220. All in favor of the concurrence signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. Oh, I'm sorry, I'm sorry. Representative Molloy, for what purpose do you arise?"



How did you want to vote, Vince? Did you want to vote, Vince, or . . ."

Molloy: "Yes, 'aye'."

Speaker Telcser: ". . . Okay, record Representative Molloy as voting 'aye'. Want me to open the switches again? Is your key turned by mistake, Vince? The switches are open. Try turning your key, Vince. Got a bad switch? Representative Giorgi, for what purpose do you arise?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, does this prevent, you know, a person from either party from bringing into the polling booth with the person that wants help?"

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Collins, can you answer Mr. Giorgi's question? Would you repeat the question, Representative Giorgi?"

Giorgi: "Does this prevent a Democratic clerk, a Democratic judge or Republican judge from bringing into the polling booth with the person who wants help in voting? Does this prevent that?"

Collins: "Yes."

Giorgi: "Well, I've been in the polling place. I don't think that's abused, especially in downstate communities. We have people that can't read or write. And they'd like help; and we send in a member from each political party to help the person with these vote-o-matic machines which are so . . . which are supposed to have been a real improvement in the election process. And I think that with the sophistication of those machines, elections are so much quicker than the old method of counting ballots. So I think this is a very bad . . . I think you fellows ought to reconsider because in downstate communities both parties allow a clerk of the Republican Party and a clerk of the Democratic Party to go into the polling booth with the person in helping them vote. We've not . . . no abuses on this at all in downstate Illinois. In fact, we're concerned because of the computer-type counting and because of the vote-o-matic machines that they're so sophisticated they can steal elections from us because we don't have the expertise to fight them. I think it's a very bad Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Maragos."



Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I feel it's . . . I will withhold unless it goes above 89 again, then I want to speak against it; but . . . because if this . . . affects my poor mother who's been voting for some 50 some years."

Speaker Telcser: "Phil."

Collins: "Well, I wouldn't pick on Sam or his mother, Mr. Speaker. However . . ."

Speaker Telcser: "Mrs. Maragos."

Collins: ". . . the fact does remain that this Bill has passed this House once before by a substantial majority. What we're being asked to do today is act on the Amendment, which strengthens up our . . . strengthens our weakness in the Bill in that the use of interpreters is writtin into the Bill. So rather than handicap Sam's mother, we would put an interpreter there so there would be no chance of abuse. I think the Senate Amendment is a good Amendment to a Bill that was good to begin with. It makes it very clear that nobody's trying to get into that booth to violate your right to the privacy of the polling place. And if you do need instruction because of language difficulty, then you will be instructed outside the polling place. Of course, this doesn't deal with physical incapacities at all. It's strictly language difficulties. The Bill specifically states that a model machine will be in the polling place and that you will receive instruction on the machine. And while I would ask . . . I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Telcser: "Anyone else wish to explain their vote?"

Collins: "Well, at this time, Mr. Speaker, I'll ask to postpone the consideration of this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, the Gentleman has asked to put this . . . first or what? . . . this is a concurrence motion, not a Conference Committee. Okay? All right, the Gentleman wishes to put on the Order of Postponed Consideration the concurrence motion with respect to House Bill 220. Representative Giorgi, for what purpose do you arise?"

Giorgi: "I know from the way we're conducting ourselves, we're going to be



. . . might be here all summer; but shouldn't the first Concurrence Committee be allowed to go down and strike another . . ."

Speaker Telcser: "Well, Representative Giorgi, there are no such things as Concurrence Committees. This is not a Conference Committee Report, this is a concurrence motion. I want to talk to you, Zeke, by the way. Zeke, this is a concurrence motion. It was not a Conference Committee Report. Zeke, do you get what I mean? Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, what we've been doing when the motion to concur fails, that it automatically, and the Speaker's ruled, that it automatically go to nonconcur. And I know you're going to say, 'Well, he's asked to postponed'; but the Speaker had once said, rather than allowing that . . . that it be an automatic nonconcurrence. And they go to a Conference Committee. And I think Phil would even admit to that. I say even Phil. That's the way we've been doing it."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman has the right to put it on Postponed Consideration, Representative Matijevich. Well, we'll clear it up. Put it on Postponed Consideration. Repre . . . okay, Representative Philip on the floor? No? All right, let's go back to Senate Bills, Third Reading. I hear you, Roscoe. Senate Bills, Third Reading. Senate Bill 1397. Is Representative Gene Hoffman on the floor? He's not on the floor? Senate Bill 328. Ron Hoffman on the floor? Ron Hoffman? Now, John, I hope that you and some of your seatmates back there tell Ron and Gene that I've tried to call their Bills, and if they come back in two or three hours . . . would you remind them? Okay. Jack, do you want to take another run? Senate Bill 1240."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1240, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to compensations of sheriff, coroners, county treasurers, county clerks, clerks of the Supreme Court, recorders and auditors with their necessary clerk hire. Third Reading of the Bill."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, we've been down this path quite a number of times. And I think everybody understands what the Bill is. It raises the



minimum for county officials in 101 downstate counties. I've talked to people on both sides of the aisle. And I would seriously solicit a favorable Roll Call. Mr. Speaker, if that's an indication how this Bill is going to do, that's bad news."

Speaker Blair: "All right, is there discussion? Mr. Fennessey."

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

Speaker Blair: "Yeah, he says he will."

Fennessey: "What's the minimum . . ."

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

Fennessey: ". . . what's the minimum in counties of 100,000, 110,000? What's the minimum? 100,000?"

Lauer: "100,000 or a little over, '16.5'."

Speaker Blair: "Timeout. All right, he's gonna proceed."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, this thing has been in and out of the record so many times, let's go ahead and take a vote on it just to find out how the wind is blowing."

Speaker Blair: "All right. Mr. Hart."

Hart: "When would this take effect? If this passed, when would it take effect?"

Lauer: "It would take effect this year. It would be the 1975 salary."

Hart: "Well, there really isn't any hurry about it then is there?"

Lauer: "Yes, there is because if it isn't passed before the November election, those three county officers that are being elected in the November election will not be able to get a pay raise until '78."

Hart: "Well, but, I mean, we could do it tomorrow, couldn't we?"

Lauer: "Good God, Dick, I hope we're not going to be here tomorrow."

Hart: "I've always admired an optimist."

Speaker Blair: "All right. Mr. Juckett."

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Blair: "Indicates he will."

Juckett: "As I recall the other day, I asked some questions as to how many of the counties were at maximum and what those maximums were. Do you have those answers?"



Lauer: "They have not furnished me with the information. There are very few at the maximum."

Juckett: "Very few at the maximum. So if we . . ."

Lauer: ". . . I'll have to admit that, Bob."

Juckett: ". . . so if we were to pass this Bill, raising the minimums; and I think you indicated that there were quite a few at the minimum . . ."

Lauer: "Yes."

Juckett: ". . . that we here in the General Assembly then would, in effect, be affecting this pay raise or a pay raise and very probably a tax increase for many of our local counties and county officials."

Lauer: "Not necessarily, Mr. Juckett. I think now that the treasurers, for example, have the power to invest funds pretty much at discretion. Many of them are making enough on their tax money investments to pay for this increase in total."

Juckett: "Well, now, if they're making investments, wouldn't they utilize that money for the general business of the county? And that would . . ."

Lauer: "I'm quite sure they would."

Juckett: ". . . that would be able to help the taxpayer to present large increases, they'd only have smaller increases in their tax rates."

Lauer: "Quite conceivably. Although, it's a revolutionary idea. Some of them might not even have to increase at all. In fact, I suspect they would not."

Juckett: "Unless they paid their county officials more money and . . ."

Lauer: "No, even with the increase."

Juckett: ". . . Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think it's a bad practice for the General Assembly to be continually asked to raise the minimum when the county people themselves will not even raise their own salaries. And I think that if they don't have the intestinal fortitude to face the taxpayers after they've raised their salaries, I don't see why we should either. And I urge a 'no' vote."



Speaker Blair: "Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Lauer, I'm trying to recall your position on previous pay raises for the Legislators. Do you think that we ought to get a raise?"

Lauer: "I voted 'no'."

Ewell: "You voted 'no'. But somehow or another you find it in your heart to raise the taxes of the people to pay for all of these multiple of employees. Do you have any idea of how many people will benefit by this raise that you're asking to be at the taxpayers expense?"

Lauer: "Since there are six officers affected in each county, and there are 101 counties, I would assume 660 people."

Ewell: "Well, that's a lot more than Legislators. And I would say to the Members of the Body, I think that our concern for the taxpaying public ought to begin here at home; and I think that we ought to be consistent with Mr. Lauer's position and help him maintain a record of consistency in saving the taxpayer's money. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Murphy."

Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, I agree very much with the Representative who just spoke about the fact that it seems a little inconsistent not to vote for a Bill for the Legislature, but do it for a Bill for the people. But on the other hand, why should the people in the county be punished for something like that. They're all going to take office this coming December. And if a raise isn't put through for them now, that means they're going to sit there for four years without a raise. And the system is such that we do set their salaries. And so, consequently, I think it would be very narrow-minded and very poor judgment on our part if we didn't grant them the raise that I think they're due for in this day of rising costs and high . . . and the increased cost of living. So I think that in all fairness, we should certainly give a vote to give them this money at this time because if they don't get now, they'll not get for four years. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Cunningham."



Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as usual

I agree with the prior speaker, the distinguished Gentleman from Antioch. And I hope it's a forgivable digression to say that when that good man leaves this House in the next Session for a temporary absence, it will be quite a loss. I hope you heard that, Murphy. And about this particular Bill, I urge you to vote for it. And I hope that you recognize that that's the opposite position that I've taken on every pay raise that was presented. But the present situation is entirely intolerable. In the downstate counties, quite often we have the situation of an elected official who draws a lower salary than the top highway maintenance employee in that same county. That isn't the way things should be. I ask you to recognize that the county boards, God bless them, but sometimes they're a little bit timid; and they feel the necessity for a sustaining, encouraging hand to raise the figure to a livable wage. They will not object to us preempting their authority to fix the salary by pushing the bottom up a little ways. It comes under the heading of 'passing the buck'. And we must recognize together that the buck stops here with the Legislature. And if they're unable or unwilling to raise these salaries to where they should be, it is our duty and responsibility to do so. I would have you believe and recognize that in some downstate counties the situation is so bad, and county clerks, and sheriffs and treasurers, that if they're dependent entirely upon the salary of the office that's fixed by the county board, some of them would need to take in washing, or their wives would, to make the ends meet. Now is the opportunity to do justly in regard to dedicated public officials, who have been neglected in this era of raising prices. I urge you to give Jack Lauer and this very good Bill a green vote."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, let me make one observation on this Bill. In the 46th District, which encompasses three counties, I note here in start, a county board can go \$5,500 additional in salaries before they reach the maximum. In Knox they



they can go about \$6,500 or \$7,500 more a year. And in Peoria County they can go \$6,000 more before they reach the maximum. I think we should ask all the county boards to exercise their prerogatives; and rather than us mandating a definite salary level, in fact, a raise for these officials, I think we ought to give it to the county board to make that decision. I would urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Friedland."

Friedland: "Would the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Blair: "Yes."

Friedland: "Representative Lauer, do you recall from Committee testimony . . . was it indicated that if this Bill passed state-wide from all the counties it might cost between \$70,000 and \$80,000 state-wide for all the counties? Is that about right?"

Lauer: "No, my understanding was that, including all officers, it might cost \$400,000."

Friedland: "\$400,000."

Lauer: "That's for the 101 counties."

Friedland: "I see. Was it also brought out in the Committee testimony that in certain counties some officials are already at the maximum. It seems sometimes those that favor with a county board and perhaps some that do not are kept at the minimum. Was that . . ."

Lauer: "That's quite true."

Friedland: "Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Lauer to close."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, the county officials have not had an increase in the minimum since 1967. This, of course, took effect in 19 . . . at the end of 1967 with the . . . or in 1968. And it is a case . . . there would be a ten-year period where this maximum would not be changed. We do, unfortunately, sometimes have a situation where, exactly as Representative Friedland pointed out, some county officials do not meet with the approval of their county board. Sometimes it's on a partisan issue, sometimes if the county board does not approve of the people's choice. It's also a case, Mr. Speaker, that many of these county officials are



at or very near the minimum. But by no means are all of them at the minimum. In fact, some are at the maximum. The total cost to the 101 counties in the state is estimated to be in the neighborhood of \$400,000. Obviously, this would figure out to \$4,000 per county so that I don't really think that we are running the risk of virtually imposing a tax increase on any of these counties. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I solicit your favorable vote."

Speaker Blair: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1240 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? LaFleur. Mr. LaFleur."

LaFleur: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen, I've sat here in the same posture as many of you wondering what to do in this; but in reflecting in what Ray Ewell said, I voted 'no' on the legislative pay increases, the officers pay increases and the judges pay increases. And yet I'm voting 'yes' for this. And the reasoning that I see on this is the Legislature has taken upon itself the obligation of setting the maximum salary that can be paid to county officers and the minimum salaries. If we do not act, then they cannot act. I only see this as something that should be done and needs to be done to help the counties in the next four years. I do not see any harm in this. In fact, I would join and put this burden back on the counties so they could determine what salaries they should pay all their officers themselves. I would urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Boyle."

Boyle: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Bill. These folks have not had a raise in the minimum since 1967. And we sit here in this House and voted pay increases for ourselves, we voted pay increases for the state employees, we voted pay increases for the members of the judiciary. And it's always been my belief on these pay raises that they all should go or none should go. And I think that we are doing a disservice to the hundreds of county officials throughout the State of Illinois to be in the Legislature and vote ourselves, and judges



and other state employees increases, when the same arguments that apply to our own increase, certainly, applies to these county officials. And I think that if . . . what's good for the goose is good for the gander. And if we need a pay raise, and if the judges need a pay raise, and if the state employees need a pay raise, then, certainly, the hundreds of county officials throughout the State of Illinois that dedicate themselves to the service to the public also are entitled a pay raise. And I'd appreciate a green light."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I can't tell who's voting which way because my eyes are so bloodshot from the last couple of nights. But I would like to address my remarks to the newer Members of the General Assmbley. Now, this is really not a very far-reaching Bill, and it's nothing new. We passed this same Bill out of here two years ago because we felt that the county officials were entitled to a pay raise. But, unfortunately, at that same time we were caught in the throes of trying to implement the new 1970 Constitution. And when we finally implemented the Constitution, we, inadvertently, found out that we had put the wrong effective date on the Bill for the pay raise for the county officials. So we had to go to the Attorney General and ask for an opinion to see whether or not we could give them a pay raise anyway. The Attorney General correctly, I think, stated that we could not give the county officials a pay raise because we had the wrong effective date on it. Now, they've waited two long years, and they're going to have to wait another year, even if this Bill passes. And I really think that they're entitled to the pay raise. I realize that if the pay raise passes the heat will be on the Legislators and not on the county officials. But I think we've promised them this two years ago. We voted and gave it to them. They did not get it because of a mistake we made in the Legislature. And I would hope we would give him enough votes to pass it this time again."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. McMaster:"



McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think you all know that probably I was the one that verified a Roll Call a year ago on a pay raise for elected county officials. And I think you also know that I have not voted for a pay raise during my time down here for anybody. But let me say that in this case I think that the elected county officials do deserve an increase in the minimum. I've got the list here, I can go down the line with you, Ray Ewell or anybody else and show you what the percentage of increase would be. Ray, I don't know how you're voting. I don't know how you voted on the pay raise. But I, certainly, do not think that you should take out what a Senate Sponsor is voting on a legislative pay raise and show your vindictiveness on a Pay Raise Bill for elected county officials. I don't think that's the right approach to take to legislation. I think each piece should be considered on its merit. And I, certainly, feel that the elected county officials, in this case, do deserve an increase of the minimum. And while I might catch hell when I go home from a lot of different sources, and if this is the only Pay Raise Bill that I voted for, it's the only one I'll catch the devil for. And I'm going to vote for it."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Dee."

Dee: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, now, I'm from a big city. And I'm not much concerned with these problems of downstate as it affects me. But I, certainly, can understand the problems of the county officials. Now, it's not going to cost . . . the counties can afford to pay these raises. The counties want to make these raises. But because of the nature of the voters, because of the situation that the county boards find themselves in, it becomes impossible for them to vote themselves raises. Now, the downstate people have helped us. I'm talking to you people, my people, from the big city. Come on now, let's help them, and let's get on this Bill and give these poor county officers a little raise. I suggest a 'green'."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've heard



of a lot of flaky arguments, but the last four arguments have to be it. Number one, you're not talking about a maximum, which they haven't got the guts to put on themselves. You're talking about a minimum. They want you to do their dirty work. And I say to you, that if this is the way that the local county people feel, that's the way it ought to go. You, yourself, have put yourself on the line here for those pay raises here and in this state; and I suggest you leave this to the people right where they're running. And no way should we do their dirty work for them. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we do an awful lot of talking about law enforcement and stopping crime. And one of the officers included here is the county sheriff. Now, if we have to do some dirty work and go out to your counties and say, 'Yes, we'd like you to pay your share of the decent wage', or 'We'd like to increase the minimum'. That's one of the finest things we can do to improve the quality of the law enforcement. If you want to get a good man or a good woman to serve as sheriff, you've got to provide an adequate compensation. And all the . . . if you're talking about county treasurers, and county clerks and all these other things; if you want to strengthen county government, I don't think there's anything wrong with us doing the dirty work or biting the bullet. Somebody has got to do it. We increase our own pay, that's a hard job. I think that we ought to vote 'yes' and increase this minimum if we're interested in strengthening county government as well as state government."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Jenison."

Jenison: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I still have great faith in the abiding fairness of this distinguished Body in spite of the experiences we all suffer mutually in the last days of the Session. But I would plead with some of you who are voting 'present' for any of a number of reasons to give this matter just a little thought; and join with us who really seek to raise by a very small amount of money the salaries that



counties can pay to their county officials. In a county as small as mine, and I represent some smaller, we're talking about a minimum of as low as \$9,000 for full-time county officials. They aren't making as much as many of their associates in all the other fields of governmental activity. And when the state engages in the fact that . . . of setting minimum and maximum, all you are doing is permitting a county, yes, to have the courage to at least pay the minimum. These people are deserving of that much. And I would plead with you to give them that support. Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. Mr. Molloy. Molloy 'aye'. No? Molloy 'no'. Do you want to talk? Mr. Molloy votes 'aye'. The Gentleman from Logan . . ."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, would you put this on Postponed Consideration, please?"

Speaker Blair: ". . . Yes, he asks that the matter be placed on Postponed Consideration. And that's where it will be."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1272, Madigan. Not here. Senate Bill 1382, D. Houlihan."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Houlihan."

Clerk Selcke: "A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Capital Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Houlihan, D.: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment."

Unknown: "That's going to be tabled and then we're going on . . ."

Speaker Blair: "Okay, Frank."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment # . . . did we go back to Second? . . ."

Speaker Blair: "Yeah, leave to take it back to Second."

Clerk Selcke: ". . . Amendment #9, Lechowicz, amends Senate Bill 1382 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Houlihan."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the Amendment #9 be



adopted and tabled."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman offers to move the adoption of Amendment #9 and asks leave to table. No objections, tabled."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment . . ."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the Gentleman offers . . . who? Mr. Lechowicz? . . . Giorgi offers to move the adoption of 10 and asks leave to table, right?"

Giorgi: "#10."

Speaker Blair: "Okay, no objections? Asks leave to table, tabled. #11, are you going to consider it?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #11, Giorgi, amends Senate Bill . . ."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #11 takes \$66,711 provided for the Attorney General's Office and returns it to the Personnel Service in line with the Capital Development Bonding Authority budget. And I move for its adoption. I move for its adoption, Sir."

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

Walsh, W.: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Amendment that we've heard much about before. The efforts to remove the payment from this agency to the Attorney General. We've heard before that the Attorney General is the constitutional officer for the . . . Attorney for the state officers. And I would urge you to vote 'no' on the Gentleman's Amendment."

Speaker Blair: "The . . . any further discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, to close."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, we agreed that the Attorney General is the constitutional officer . . . Attorney for the State of Illinois; but we also feel that the Director of the Capital Development Bonding Authority should have his own lawyer, his own confidant. And that's the reason why we want this changed."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "I'm not going to speak, Mr. Speaker. I think we can take a Roll Call on the Amendment."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the question is, shall Amendment . . . Mr. Pierce, do you want to be heard? Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Where are we? What was your motion? Okay. All I wanted to



say was there's no question here the Attorney General represents this agency in court, on appeal and so on. The only question is, is the agency entitled to have some technical consultants who happen to be attorneys as inside advisors to it. And I think there's no doubt that they can. They had it under the previous administration. And I think we should vote for this Amendment. The Attorney General represents the agency in court, on appeal, the Supreme Court; but the agency, the Capital Development Bond, is entitled to have their own inside advisors if they out of their own budget. And, therefore, I favor the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the question is, shall Amendment #11 be adopted? All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Hyde."

Hyde: "Well, thank you . . . thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a very important Amendment. And I think if it's adopted, we may end up goofing up the entire appropriation because I am confident there will be litigation. The Attorney General is the Attorney for this agency by Constitution, and by case law and it has been well established. And if this Amendment goes on, we are merely saying to these people who run this agency, 'Go on out and get some patronage lawyers and they'll tell us what policy to adopt'. Actually, this agency should serve the people of Illinois, and all of the people, regardless of their party. The Attorney General was elected, and his staff, by Constitution and by case law should be the attorneys for this agency. So I think it's a serious mistake to support this Amendment. It is a political move. And one of several we have seen and will continue to see. I think it should be nipped in the bud now or we're going to be faced with a long arduous evening trying to beat back illegal, improper and very unwise Amendments such as this. I strongly urge a 'no' vote if the Constitution means anything to you."

Speaker Blair: "Have all . . . Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh, W.: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think it's been adequately said what this does. And I'd just



like to take a little bit more time in explaining my vote so that maybe Republicans can come out of the woodwork and vote 'no' on this Amendment. Well, perhaps we don't need anymore Republicans to come out of the woodwork. If only this tie will hold up, we will have defeated it."

Speaker Blair: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I haven't explained my vote. Now, we all agree that the Attorney General, the Attorney of Records of the State of Illinois; but we've also agreed in the past in the time honored in this House that the Department has to have an Attorney to take in counsel so that they can trust, they can delegate duties to and be sure that these duties are performed. In this case, they're taking the Attorney General's Office, who wouldn't really be subservient to the Director of this Department. And I think that he needs an Attorney, he needs someone that he can counsel with and he needs someone that he can confide in. And I don't think this is the proper thing to do to the Director of the Department. And at the proper time, I'd like a poll of the absentees and a verification of the Roll Call and a negative vote."

Speaker Blair: "Have all . . . let's see, what is . . . we're 79 'nays' and 77 'yeas'; and Mr. Giorgi wants to poll the absentees."

Clerk Selcke: "Alsop, Berman, Capuzi, Carter, Catania, Fary, Fleck, Ron Hoffman, Hunsicker, Klosak, Lechowicz, Murphy, Pappas, Randolph, Sharp, Soderstrom, Wall, Richard Walsh."

Speaker Blair: "Murphy 'no'."

Speaker Murphy: "Okay, the absentees have been polled. Do you want a verification, did he say? The Clerk will proceed with a verification, please. At the start of the verification, there are 77 'ayes' and 80 'nays'. The Clerk will proceed with the verification. Yes, we'll verify the affirmative first, yes. Who's taking care of the affirmative vote? Peters, Representative Peters, all right. We're going to verify the affirmative first."

Clerk Selcke: "Barnes, Barry, Beatty, Beaupre, Boyle, Bradley, Brandt, Brinkmeier, Brummet, Caldwell, . . ."



Speaker Murphy: "Would the Members please be in their seats so that we can have an orderly verification. Please be in your seats. Proceed, Clerk . . . Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Selcke: "Calvo, Capparelli, Chapman, Choate, Craig, DiArco, Davis . . ."

Speaker Murphy: "We're verifying that Representative Choate is here right now."

Clerk Selcke: ". . . DiPrima, Douglas . . ."

Speaker Murphy: "Clerk, the man is not in his chair, and please proceed."

Clerk Selcke: ". . . Farley, Fennessey, Flinn, Garmisa, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman, Hart, Hill, Jimmy Holloway, D. Houlihan, J. Houlihan, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Katz, Kelly, Kennedy, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Krause, Laurino, Leon, Londrigan, Lundy, Madigan, Mann, Maragos, Martin, Matijevich, McClain, McGah, McGrew, McLendon, McPartlin, Merlo, Mugalian, Nardulli, Patrick, Pierce, Rayson, Redmond, Sangmeister, Schisler, Schneider, Schraeder, Shea, Ike Sims, Stedelin, Stone, Terzich, Thompson, Tip sword, Von Boeckman, Washington, Williams, Yourell."

Speaker Murphy: "All right, Representative Peters, any questions of the affirmative vote? Representative Peters."

Peters: "Representative Yourell?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Yourell is in his seat."

Peters: "Fennessey?"

Speaker Murphy: "He's doubly in his seat. Who was your next one?"

Peters: "Williams?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Williams? Is Representative Williams on the floor? How is he recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

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

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the Record."

Peters: "Von Boeckman?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Von Boeckman on the floor? He's there standing up waving his hand."

Peters: "Terzich?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Terzich? Is Representative Terzich on the floor? How is he recorded, Mr. Speaker?"



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

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the record."

Peters: "Stedelin?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Stedelin? Is Representative Stedelin on the floor? How is he recorded, Mr. Speaker? . . . Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the record."

Peters: "Schraeder?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Schraeder? Representative Schraeder is standing in the aisle."

Peters: "Rayson?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Rayson? How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the record."

Peters: "Shea?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Shea is standing in the aisle."

Peters: "Laurino?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Laurino? How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Selcke: "'Aye'."

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the record. Representative Terzich is back. Put him back on the Record."

Peters: "Londrigan?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Londrigan? How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the Record."

Peters: "Mann?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Mann? Representative Mann is relaxing down in front here."

Peters: "McClain?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative McClain."

Peters: "All right, I see him, I see him."

Speaker Murphy: "He's in his chair."

Peters: "McGrew?"



Speaker Murphy: "Representative McGrew? Representative McGrew on the floor? How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Selcke: "'Aye'."

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the record."

Peters: "McLendon?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative McLendon is in his seat."

Peters: "McPartlin?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative McPartlin? How is he recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "'Aye'."

Speaker Murphy: "He's recorded 'aye'; take him off the record."

Peters: "Krause?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Krause is in his seat."

Peters: "I see him; I see him. Kennedy?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Leland Kennedy is in his seat."

Peters: "Emil Jones?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Emil Jones? Is Representative Jones on the floor? How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Selcke: "'Aye'."

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the record."

Peters: "Representative Jaffe?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Jaffe? He's standing over on the right-hand side here."

Peters: "Jacobs?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Jacobs is in his seat."

Peters: "J. M. Houlihan?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative J. M. Houlihan is standing in the aisle."

Peters: "J. D. Holloway?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Jimmy Holloway? Representative Holloway on the floor? He's standing at the back."

Peters: "Representative Hart?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Hart? Representative Hart? He's sound asleep in his chair."

Peters: "Representative Carmisa?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Carmisa? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "'Aye'."



Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the record."

Peters: "Representative Fennessey?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Fennessey? He's standing right there."

Peters: "Barnes?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Barnes? Is Representative Barnes
on the floor? How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Selcke: "'Aye'."

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the record."

Peters: "Barry?"

Speaker Murphy: "Who?"

Peters: "Barry?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Barry? Is Representative Barry on the
floor?"

Peters: "No, Barry, B-A, not Fary, Barry."

Speaker Murphy: "Fary is sitting there . . ."

Peters: "Barry?"

Speaker Murphy: ". . . Fary is sitting every bit of the nice man
is sitting right there." {

Peters: "Toby Barry?"

Speaker Murphy: "Toby Barry? Representative Toby Barry, is he on
the floor? How is he recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "'Aye'."

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the record."

Peters: "Beaupre?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Beaupre is in his seat."

Peters: "Bradley?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Bradley? Is Representative Bradley
on the floor? How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Selcke: "'Aye'."

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the record."

Peters: "Brinkmeier?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Brinkmeier? How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?
Oh, Representative Brinkmeier is on the phone back there. I see him."

Peters: "Brummet?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Brummet? He's in his seat."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Peters: "Calvo?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Calvo? He's back there, he's back in his seat."

Peters: "Ms. Chapman?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Williams came back on the floor. Put him back on the Roll. Representative Chapman? She's in her seat."

Peters: "DiPrima? I see him. Douglas?"

Speaker Murphy: "Who was your next one?"

Peters: "Douglas?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Douglas? Is he on the floor? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "'Aye'."

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the record."

Peters: "Representative Bruce Farley?"

Speaker Murphy: "He's right there in the middle."

Peters: "Representative Keller?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Keller? Representative Keller has joined the press. He's right over there."

Peters: "Leon?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Leon? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the record."

Peters: "Lechowicz?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Lechowicz? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Representative is recorded as being absent."

Speaker Murphy: "He's still absent."

Peters: "Absent? Brandt?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Brandt? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "'Aye'."

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the Record."

Peters: "Did I get Representative Yourell, Bus Yourell?"

Speaker Murphy: "Yes, you did; yes, you did. Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, I know some of us get a little older and sometimes

our eyesight gets bad; but the Gentleman that is sitting in Mr.

Yourell's seat is not Mr. Yourell when you announced it. - So I . . ."



Speaker Murphy: "I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Thank you very much . . . my eyes . . . I'm getting old. Is Buz' on the floor? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the record. What . . . no, he wasn't there when he was verified. I had the wrong man, I had Ray instead."

Peters: "Representative Sangmeister?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Brummet? Representative Brummet? For what reason do you arise? Boyle, I'm sorry. Representative Kenny Boyle."

Boyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the photographer's light is on; but I'd like to direct the attention of the House . . . there's a young lady in the gallery right behind the Speaker's podium that's taking some pictures. So if some of you folks who are trying to get some sleep and you got your feet up on the desks, and so forth, you'd better wake up or you may be on the front page of your newspaper tomorrow morning."

Speaker Murphy: "Well, whether the light is on or not, the guests have no right taking pictures. That light is only for the press. So we'll have her cease and desist and I'll ask the Doorkeeper to watch if she does. Proceed."

Peters: "Representative Madigan?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Madigan? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "'Aye'."

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the record."

Peters: "Giglio?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Giglio? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the record. Oh, where is he? Oh, he's right there talking to the press."

Peters: "Giglio here?"

Speaker Murphy: "Yes, he's here."

Peters: "Representative Nardulli?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Nardulli? He's back in the back."

Peters: "Okay. Have we called Sangmeister? Yeah, he's there."



Speaker Murphy: "Record Representative John Fary as voting 'aye'. Representative Londrigan is back on the floor voting 'aye'. Are there any others?"

Peters: "I think that's it, Mr. Speaker. If we might get the count, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Murphy: "All right, we'll give you a count before we proceed with the negative votes. Representative Giorgi, for what reason do you arise?"

Giorgi: "How many were taken off?"

Speaker Murphy: "We're going to give you a count. I told you, just a minute. Okay, we put one on, and took off 15, you have a total of 63 'ayes' and 80 'nays' as we start the verification of the negative. Representative Jimmy Houlihan is back on the floor."

Unknown: "He wasn't off."

Speaker Murphy: "Oh, wasn't he? I thought he was. Okay, who's doing the negative. Representative Giorgi is? Proceed with the negative, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Selcke: "Anderson, Arnell, Bluthardt, Borchers, Campbell, Clabaugh, Collins, Cunningham, Day, Deavers, Dee, Deuster, Duff, Ralph Dunn, R. L. Dunne, Dyer, Ebbesen, Epton, Ewell, Friedland, Geo-Karis, Gibbs, Griesheimer, Grotberg, Hanahan, Harpstrite, Hirschfeld, Gene Hoffman, Robert Holloway, Hudson, Huskey, Hyde, Jenison, Dave Jones, Juckett, Kempiners, Kent, Kriegsmann, Kucharski, LaFleur, Lauer, Leinenweber, Macdonald, Mahar, McAuliffe, McCormick, McCourt, McMaster, Kenny Miller, Tom Miller, Molloy, Murphy, Neff, North, Palmer, Peters, Philip, Polk, Porter, Rigney, Rose, Ryan, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Sevcik, Shurtz, Timothy Simms, Skinner, Springer, Stiehl, Taylor, Telcser, Totten, Tuerk, Waddell, William Walsh, Walters, Washburn, J. J. Wolf; and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Yourell is back on the floor, and wishes to be put back on as 'aye'. Representative Toby Barry is back on the floor and wishes to be put back on as 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "Now, wait a minute, wait a minute. Who was the first one?"

Speaker Murphy: "Yourell, Buz' Yourell; and Toby Barry. Okay? All right, any questions of the negative, Representative Giorgi?"



Giorgi: "Anderson?"

Speaker Murphy: "Just hold it for a minute. Okay, Representative Merle Anderson, is he on the floor? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "'Nay'."

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the record."

Giorgi: "Bluthardt?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Bluthardt? Is he on the floor? Yeah, he looks a lot like him. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "'Nay'."

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the record. Pate, you don't look like him."

Giorgi: "Kucharski?"

Speaker Murphy: "Who?"

Giorgi: "Kucharski?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Kucharski? He's in his seat."

Giorgi: "Kempiners?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Kempiners? He's right here on my right."

Giorgi: "Friedland?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Friedland is sitting in the seat by the wall."

Giorgi: "Ron Hoffman?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Ron Hoffman, is he on the floor? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as being absent."

Giorgi: "Gene Hoffman?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Gene Hoffman? How is he recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Clerk Selcke: "'No'."

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the record."

Giorgi: "Schlickman?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Schlickman? Is the Gentleman on the floor? How is he recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Clerk Selcke: "'Nay'."

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the the record."

Giorgi: "Sevcik?"



Speaker Murphy: "Representative Sevcik? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "'Nay'."

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the record."

Giorgi: "Randolph?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Randolph?"

Clerk Selcke: "Absent."

Speaker Murphy: "He's recorded as absent."

Giorgi: "Polk?"

Speaker Murphy: "Who was that?"

Clerk Selcke: "Polk."

Speaker Murphy: "Is Representative Ben Polk on the floor? Oh, he's standing back there, yes."

Giorgi: "Walters?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Walters? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "'No'."

Speaker Murphy: "Take him off the record."

Giorgi: "Washburn?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Washburn is right here on my left."

Giorgi: "Representative Mahar?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Mahar? Oh, he's back here, right back here talking to the boys back there."

Giorgi: "Fleck?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Charles Fleck?"

Clerk Selcke: "Absent. He's recorded as absent."

Speaker Murphy: "He's recorded as absent."

Giorgi: "Richard Walsh?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Richard Walsh? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Absent."

Speaker Murphy: "He's recorded as absent."

Giorgi: "Waddell?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Waddell is in his seat. Is that all?

Representative Lemke wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Berman 'aye'. All right, Mr. Clerk, what is the record? Representative Garmisa is back, 'aye'. Representative Pat North,



for what reason do you arise?"

North: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker. Once the permanent Roll Call has been verified, and we move on to the negative, can I be added to that verified Roll Call . . ."

Speaker Murphy: "As long as you're verifying the Roll Call, anybody has the right to change their vote, having their name added, or taken off the Roll Call until the total verification which is coming right now. On this question there are 68 'ayes' and 78 'ayes' . . . and 74 'nays'; and this Amendment is, hereby, declared lost. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #12, Schraeder, amends Senate Bill 1382 and so forth."

Speaker Murphy: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, anybody that's been through this particular Amendment about 15 times . . . it's been on about 15 Bills . . . on the original . . ."

Speaker Murphy: "Turn Representative Schraeder back on."

Schraeder: ". . . it's non-controversial. The Appropriations Committee on both sides of the Leadership, the House, the Senate, and everybody else agreed to this; but it's been shoved from pillar to post to make everybody happy with their own Amendments. And so I just ask to reaffirm that this would be adopted. And it's Amendment #12. It's the Peoria Land Use Study Commission appropriation for \$50,000. I ask your consideration."

Speaker Murphy: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall this Amendment be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed by saying 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments? Third Reading. It's been read a third time. Do you want that one called, Mr. Houlihan? All right, Representative Houlihan is recognized."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1382 is the appropriation for the operating costs of the Capital Development Board. As amended, the appropriation is 6.8 million dollars. And in the form that the Bill is presently, it's my understanding it is agreed to between the Minority Spokesman



and the Majority Spokesman of the House Appropriation Committee.

And I move the adoption of this Bill."

Speaker Murphy: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Molloy 'aye'. His switch is not working. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 140 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1326, Totten . . . does he want that? . . ."

Speaker Murphy: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative . . . has that been read a third time?"

Clerk Selcke: ". . . an Act to amend the Regional Transportation Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Murphy: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, is recognized."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1326 was amended in the Senate to provide for an increase in the R.T.A. Board . . . we've debated this many times, and I would appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Murphy: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Garmisa, is recognized."

Garmisa: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if we wanted to dismantle the R.T.A., this is the way to do it. Well, we're going to go ahead and pass 1326 out of this House, we're going to tear the heck out of the R.T.A. before it was even a 'board'. Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, if they want to put the R.T.A. in the Federal court for the next two to three years, the way to do that is to pass the R.T.A. 1326. Mr. Speaker, do I get up on the floor of this House and speak that often where I have to have the cat calls from that side of the aisle?"

Speaker Murphy: "All right, let's have some order and give the Gentleman his right to say what he has to say and let's move on to the business of the House."

Garmisa: "I have never at any time . . ."



Speaker Murphy: "We know that, Ben, proceed."

Garmisa: "Whenever anybody on that side of the House has something to say where they haven't had my undivided attention. And I would appreciate the same from that side. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when we go to pass Senate Bill 1326, what we're virtually doing is tearing the guts out of the R.T.A. Bill. We're going to tear the heck out of the one-man one-vote provision of the R.T.A. Bill. We're going to bring it back into the federal courts for the next two to three years. We will never have an R.T.A. if this Bill is passed. I would ask every Member of this House to vote a red light on this very fast Bill."

Speaker Murphy: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman, is recognized."

Berman: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Bill. I've spoken to a number of people who have been appointed to the existing R.T.A. Board, both sides of the political spectrum; and they've indicated to me, several have, that they could not operate, they would not serve on a board of this size. I think it's unmanageable. I think that each of the people that have been appointed to the existing board have received high recommendations both from the Legislators, who know them, and from the media. And I think that would be undermining everything that the R.T.A. is trying to do in a strong bipartisan manner. I urge a 'no' vote on 1326."

Speaker Murphy: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Juckett, is recognized."

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, starting last fall and through this Spring Session, I said and I have continued to support legitimate changes to the R.T.A. Board; but I adhere to what the previous speakers have said, that this is a ridiculous Bill. It would totally violate the one-man one vote Bill; and I urge a 'no' vote on this . . ."

Speaker Murphy: "All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, to close the debate."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, in response to the Representative from



Cook on the other side of the aisle, I didn't know my Bill did all that and would put it in the courts. And I think that may be another reason to vote for it. And let me remind those Members who think that an appointed board of this nature need be on a one-man one-vote basis. There is not an appointed mass transit board in the country that would stand up to that test because none of them are on a one-man one-vote. And I would, certainly, appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Murphy: "The question is, shall House Bill 1326 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 52 'ayes', 75 'nays', 5 voting 'present'; this Bill having failed to get the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared lost."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1492, Arnell . . ."

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Arnell. Oh, just a minute, I'm sorry."

Clerk Selcke: ". . . a Bill for an Act to amend the Regional Transportation Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Murphy: "Proceed, Representative Arnell."

Arnell: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1492 increases from two-thirds to 100 percent the part of the tax proceeds from any area required to be spent for service in that area. This matter has been amply debated. I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Murphy: "Is there any discussion? If not, the Representative from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield a minute? Would you read the precise language? What's the preposition?"

Arnell: "It changes it 'to', not 'within to'."

Skinner: "'To'?"

Arnell: "'To'. Enough said."

Speaker Murphy: "All right, the question is, shall this Bill pass?"

All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."



Skinner: "You know, I'm often extremely confused sitting here watching everything happening. Last night we sent out a meaningful earmarking Bill that had the preposition 'within'. We got 140 votes in favor of it and none against. This is a totally meaningless earmarking Bill. And we can only get under 60 votes. And I don't understand the difference. When it says that the money is going to be earmarked for services 'to', you can spend all the money in the world you want on the commuter services. You don't have to spend a dime in the county."

Speaker Murphy: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there are 56 'ayes', 68 'nays', 6 voting 'present'. This Bill having failed to receive the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared lost."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1669, Ryan, out of the Record."

Speaker Murphy: "Out of the Record."

Speaker Blair: "All right, Mr. Kozubowski with respect to the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1267."

Kozubowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House do . . . the House do adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1267. The substantial change in this Bill is that it reduces the appropriation for the computerized criminal history system by \$700,000. And I move that the House do adopt the Conference Report."

Speaker Blair: "All right, Ms. Catania."

Catania: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Blair: "He says he will."

Catania: "Now, is that the system that we said could have \$1,000,000 a couple of days ago?"

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

Catania: "Is that computerized system that you just mentioned the one that we appropriated \$1,000,000 to the other day?"

Kozubowski: "That's correct. That's correct. \$1,029,000."

Catania: "And now it's down . . ."

Kozubowski: "\$300,000."

Catania: "To a total amount of \$300,000?"



Kozubowski: "That's correct."

Catania: "And is that the only substantial change in it?"

Kozubowski: "That is the only change."

Catania: "Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the . . . Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan, .: "Sorry, Wait', I was off . . . well, could you explain this to me just very briefly?"

Kozubowski: "Yes, I would recommend that the House do adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1267. The only change in the Bill is a reduction in the computerized criminal history file by an amount \$700,000. The file now stands at \$300,000."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Juckett."

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, are we on the first or second Conference Committee Report?"

Speaker Blair: "First."

Juckett: "Well, according to the Bill that I've got or the Committee Report, the Senate is going to concur in our House Amendment, the House is going to recede from Amendment #5, and then the \$300,000 for the computerization. What is House Amendment #5 that we're receding from?"

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Representative Juckett, Amendment #5 was the \$1,029,000 for the computerized history record file. I move we do adopt it, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the question is, shall the House adopt the Conference Committee Report with respect to Senate Bill 1267. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Molloy 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 137 'ayes', no 'nays', 5 'present'; and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. And what? . . . and the Conference Committee Report is adopted. Well, is Mr. Keller ready on 1265? A Conference Committee Report. Well, he refuses to adopt? Well . . ."

Speaker Murphy: "Is Representative Shea on the floor? No, he's not on the floor. Representative Schneider. Second Bills, Second Reading."



Representative Schneider, do you want to go with Senate Bills, Second Reading . . . on Second Reading? Representative Schneider, you don't want it?"

Clerk Selcke: "1538, Lechowicz."

Speaker Murphy: "Do you want that one, Representative Lechowicz? Representative . . . Senate Bill 1538, proceed."

Clerk Selcke: "We got any Amendments?"

Speaker Murphy: "Any Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "This Bill has been read a second time. No Committee Amendments. We got any Floor Amendments?"

Speaker Murphy: "Any Amendments from the floor? Any Amendments from the floor? Third Reading."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1538 . . . wait a minute . . . an Act creating a Model School for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Study Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1538 says exactly what the Clerk just read. It creates a Commission to promote an effective Model School for the Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Study Commission. Now, the Commission will consist of five Members of the Senate, three appointed by the President and two appointed by the Minority Leader; and also five Members of the House, three appointed by the Speaker and two appointed by the Minority Leader. This is Senator Berning's Bill to show his concern as far as, not only in his section of the state, but throughout the rest of the state to create a model school for the deaf and hard-of-hearing. And I would ask for your favorable consideration of Senate Bill 1538. This is the substance . . ."

Speaker Murphy: "Is there any discussion? Oh, pardon me."

Lechowicz: ". . . this is a substance Bill."

Speaker Murphy: "Is there any discussion? Representative Grotberg, the Gentleman from Kane."

Grotberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ted, Ted, is there any way . . . it says there's a problem with the deaf-blind that surfaced in a couple of Committee meetings back here that had . . . concerns and



another Bill in Mental Health or something to get at that problem. Would there be . . . would they be receptive in this Commission to dealing with that problem. It's too late for Amendments and all that."

Lechowicz: "I'm sure they would."

Grotberg: "But to test blind is not to me a separate subject from what you're talking about."

Lechowicz: "No, I'm sure they would. It's Senator Berning's Bill; and I'm sure that he'd be more than agreeable to work in as . . . as well."

Grotberg: "And we can get through next Session on it?"

Lechowicz: "Yes."

Grotberg: "Okay, thank you."

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 wished? Oh, Representative Molloy 'aye'. Take the record. On this question there are 142 'ayes', no 'nays'; this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1566, Lechowicz. This Bill has been read a second time. No Amendments. Third Reading. An Act . . . Senate Bill 1566, an Act codifying the powers and duties of Department of Mental Health and so forth. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1566, the primary purpose of this legislation is to clarify the responsibilities of Department of Mental Health planning and to promote the greater accountability to public over state mental health programs. This Bill requires a comprehensive long-length plan to be adopted and to be consistently maintained and updated based . . . to reflect current state posture in the mental health area. This was Senator Carroll's Bill in the Senate. It passed overwhelmingly in the Senate. And I would ask you favorable consideration."

Speaker Murphy: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Repre-



sentative Giorgi."

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

Speaker Murphy: "Proceed, he indicates he will."

Giorgi: "Is this a five-year plan for bricks and mortar or a five-year plan for how we treat our mentally ill?"

Lechowicz: "Well, really it's a combination of both, Representative Giorgi"

Giorgi: "Well, will you give me a . . . why the basis for the Bill . . . then, in other words, we didn't have a good five-year program of bricks and mortar in the past five years, is that it?"

Lechowicz: "We're not talking about bricks and mortars, we're talking recent disputes and recent years over the direction that mental health has taken."

Giorgi: "Yes, but . . ."

Lechowicz: "This Bill will take long-length plans in writing and out to the public for its scrutiny and comment and for legislative action. It will require the department to announce years ahead of time what they intend . . .when they intend to close an institution, phase out a program of service, or develop new programs within that institution. In fact, I think this is probably one of the most meaningful Bills in this kind of Assembly in this area."

Giorgi: ". . . Well, Mr. Lechowicz, five years ago . . . we're not using the same tactics as we're using today that we used five years ago. So this might be a thought from the Dark Ages. I think you might pull this out of the record and . . . has this been approved by Mr. Levitt in the Department of Mental Health?"

Lechowicz: "Pardon me?"

Giorgi: "Has this been approved . . . has this been perused by Mr. Levitt in the Department of Mental Health? Mr. Levitt, the Director of Mental Health, was this Bill perused by him?"

Lechowicz: "This is legislative initiative."

Giorgi: "How is that, Sir?"

Lechowicz: "Legislative initiative. And, Zeke, I don't think I have to tell you there's also an . . ."



Giorgi: "Well, that's what I'm questioning. This is really legislative initiative; but not really the attitudes of people in mental health feel. Is that correct? Mr. Speaker, I'll just speak to the Bill because it seems like the Sponsor isn't well versed in it."

Speaker Murphy: "Proceed."

Lechowicz: "Well, point of order, Mr. Speaker. I'll give you a complete breakdown on the Bill and its responsibilities, Zeke. If you've got a specific question, I'll be more than happy to respond."

Giorgi: "Well, Mr. . . . can you tell me what the in-net total was five years ago in those institutions? You're giving me a five-year plan, and tell me what the total is today. You're talking about a brand new approach to mental health problems. And we don't even know the proper approach to mental health problems."

Lechowicz: "Well, I think this Bill will correct that situation. This is exactly why this Bill is needed, Zeke. Please read the Bill."

Giorgi: "I'm reading the Bill. Five years ago, you aren't treating the mentally ill like you are today. Five years ago, it was primarily residential care. Today, you're using your zone centers and putting the people back into the community and you're using the community facilities to keep the people on the streets and contributing taxpayers. So I think you're a little confused in what you have in mind."

Lechowicz: "No, I think you are, my Sir, unfortunately."

Giorgi: "I haven't lost a . . . in my life . . ."

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Giorgi, if you want to speak on the Bill, speak on the Bill. You've had enough interrogation."

Giorgi: "I did, Sir. I did speak my peace."

Speaker Murphy: "All right, the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's not too often I disagree with my labor friends; but let me say that this is a good Bill because, to tell you the truth, Zeke is saying that what we believed in five years passed, we don't believe in today. But this is the purpose of the Bill. You're looking forward



in the future and making plans five years hence on what we may do in this very important department. I would suggest that Representative Lechowicz is on the right trail. And Senators Carroll and Saperstein do have a good Bill in the best interests of the Department of Mental Health. I'm not sure how they stand on the Bill; but I think it is a very good Bill."

Speaker Murphy: "The Representative from Cook, Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the House Sponsor of this Bill is absolutely right, that there is probably no more important piece of legislation for the future of mental health programs in Illinois than this Bill because the problems that the Representative from Winnebago has pointed out, many of them could've been avoided if we had forced the department five years ago to begin planning for the kind of depopulation of its mental health institutions that we've seen over the last five years. Perhaps many of the crisis in mental health that we've seen in the last two years could've been avoided if we as a General Assembly had required the department to tell us and to tell the people of this state what their plans were. This isn't an unwarranted invasion of the Legislature into the Executive Branch. This is something that's entirely in order. It's perhaps long overdue and it seems to me that it's a very small first step in beginning to require the Department of Mental Health to tell the Legislature that appropriates money to that department and to tell the people of this state what their plans are in terms of the way they're going to run the department. In fact, I would go so far as to say that, not only do we need this kind of advance planning for the Department of Mental Health, we need it for Corrections, we need it for Public Health, and we need it for Children and Family Services. And if the House Sponsor of this Bill doesn't share that view with me, then I'll be offering those Bills next year. I hope I can persuade him to join me."

Speaker Murphy: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Giglio, is recognized."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, I don't know. It seems like my counterpart from



Rockford is having a little trouble. Maybe I can talk to him a little bit in my native tongue if he doesn't understand. Representative Giorgi, 'foreign language, Italian, can't interpret'."

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Giorgi, can you answer that?"

Giorgi: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I had trouble understanding him. I'm the only Roman in the House. 'Foreign reply, Italian, can't interpret'."

Unknown: "Mr. Speaker . . ."

Speaker Murphy: "No, we didn't ask you for a speech, we just wanted you to answer that in Pisano, you know."

Giorgi: ". . . see if he understands . . ."

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Houlihan, you're recognized."

Unknown: ". . . still speaking in foreign tongue . . . Frank . . ."

Speaker Murphy: "For what purpose does Representative Walters stand? Representative Walters."

Walters: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I'd remind the Representatives on the other side of the aisle there are ladies in the audience."

Speaker Murphy: "All right, the Gentleman from Cook may close the debate."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think this is really an excellent piece of legislation. And I concur with what Representative Lundy has stated as far as maybe we should also include this type of planning in other agencies. This piece of legislation was introduced with the best motives in mind. The director of the department does not oppose this piece of legislation. In fact, he testified in this behalf. And I'd ask for your favorable vote and consideration on Senate Bill 1566."

Speaker Murphy: "All right, the question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed . . . by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Jacobs, is recognized."

Jacobs: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think this 'no' vote that I have up there is because my concerns for the mental institutions that we have today. Now, if we're going to go into a five-year plan, there won't be an institution in the State of Illinois. They're phasing them out so fast now."



that a Bill was just presented and passed out of the House and Senate, where we're recodifying the Mental Health Department to stop the phasing out. We're sending these patients into the nursing homes, giving them a handful of tranquilizers, and a rocking chair, and say, 'Go rock yourself to death'. This is a bad Bill. We ought to look at it real closely because what we were arguing about the other day with the mental . . . with our patients going into these nursing homes that do not meet the standards of the state, I think it's a crime for us to take and say to the Mental Health Department, 'We'll give you five years and we'll see if we can't straighten it out'. There won't be anything left at the end of five years. And I vote 'no'."

Speaker Murphy: "Have all voted who wished? The Representative from Cook, Representative Houlihan, did you want to . . . there's 127 votes up there, you know."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I intended to ask the Gentleman from Cook a question. As I understand it, this Bill consolidates about four or five other boards and we're really . . . well . . . different Bill? . . . well, then let's just go on record and say that the solution to people's problems are not going to be by boards or by good, and honest and sincere people working those agencies. This will be a help and . . . Ted, you can explain to me the other Bill that I was referring to. I would appreciate that."

Speaker Murphy: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 131 'ayes', 8 'nays', 9 voting 'present'; this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1462, Keller, this Bill has been read a second time. There are no Amendments. Third Reading. Senate Bill 1462, an Act to repeal an Act relating to certain revenue bonds. Third Reading of the Bill."

Keller: "Mr. Chairman . . ."

Speaker Murphy: "The Representative from Effingham, Representative Keller."

Keller: ". . . Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this



Bill repeals an Act requiring information concerning revenue bonds to be filed with the State Treasurer. I move for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Murphy: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea, is recognized."

Shea: "I don't know how important this Bill is to the Gentleman; but unless it's brought back and amended to have an earlier effective date, this Bill will not become effective until July 1, 1975."

Speaker Murphy: "Is that suitable to the Sponsor?"

Keller: "That's okay."

Speaker Murphy: "Okay, any further discussion? The Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Murphy: "A real quick one."

Geo-Karis: "Charlie, what are you trying to do with your Bill? In other words, am I correct that you say under this Bill that whoever owns revenue bonds or whoever issues them does not have to report them to the county treasurer?"

Keller: "No, this is with the State Treasurer, Adeline. What it does, the way I interpret it, it's an Act just requiring less paperwork. Wherein, now if the municipality wants to, you know, file industrial revenue bonds, they have to go ahead and file an application in here with the State Treasurer's Office also."

Geo-Karis: "In other words, you're not removing . . ."

Keller: "Just eliminating part of the paperwork."

Geo-Karis: ". . . in other words, you're not removing any requirement that they file with the county treasurer or anything like that?"

Keller: "No."

Geo-Karis: "Okay, thank you."

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'. R. Dunne 'aye'? Oh, Molloy 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wall. Do you want to vote 'aye'? Representative Wall 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question



there's 121 'ayes', 1 'nay'; this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. 1554, yes."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1554, Shea; this Bill has been read a second time."

Speaker Murphy: "Any Committee Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Just a minute, we've got an Amendment, I think."

Shea: "With leave of the House, I think I . . . this has got an Amendment, an effective date Amendment. Has it not, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Selcke: "Yes, it's got an Amendment. 1554."

Speaker Murphy: "It's on Second Reading. It's been read a second time."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, can I ask this before I take this Bill back? This is a Bill . . ."

Speaker Murphy: "This is on Second Reading, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Pardon?"

Speaker Murphy: "This is on Second Reading."

Shea: "Oh. Would . . . all right, do you want to read the Amendment?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #1, Shea, amends Senate Bill 1554 in the House on page 23 by adding after line 16 the following: 'Section 3. This Act takes effect upon its becoming a law'."

Shea: "I move for the adoption of the Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Murphy: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh."

Walsh, W.: "Representative Shea, this is the Bill that you said you were going to hold, that you were not going to call."

Shea: "Well, if you'll give me chance, I was going to say something; and I moved it back to Second to put on an earlier effective date. Once they get that on, I'm going to move it to Third. And then before I proceed to have it called, I'm going to see if Mr. Philip, Mr. Schlickman, Mr. Duff, or the Majority Leader have any objections. If they do, I will not call it."

Walsh, W.: "All right."

Speaker Murphy: "All right, the question is on the Amendment. All those in favor of the adoption signify by saying 'aye', those opposed by saying 'no'; and the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments? Third Reading. And we want to leave it on Third Reading a moment."



Shea: "All right, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill that amends the Financial Disclosure Act . . . Franchise Disclosure Act administered . . ."

Speaker Murphy: "Are you calling this now? I thought you said you were going to hold this."

Shea: ". . . No, what I said, Mr. Speaker, I was . . . when I got it to Third Reading, I gave Mr. Walsh and Mr. Schlickman my files on this. Mr. Schlickman returned the file to me and said it was all right with him if I called it. I also made that same commitment to Mr. Pate Philips, Mr. Brian Duff and the Majority Leader. And if they have no objection, I'll proceed to call it. If they do, I will leave it . . . all right, then I will not call it."

Speaker Murphy: "Hold it on Third Reading. 1555? Senate Bill 1555, Second Reading."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1555, it's been read a second time, held on Second. Amendment #1, Shea, amends Senate Bill 1555 in the House on page 12, by adding after line 27 the following: 'Section 2, this Act takes effect upon its becoming a law'."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment amends the effective date and has this Act becoming effective upon it becoming a law. And I'd move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Murphy: "Any discussion? The question is on the adoption of . . . all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed by saying 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. And further Amendments? Third Reading. Do you want to read it a third time now? Yes, read it, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1555, an Act to amend the Illinois Housing Development Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill was put in at the request of the Illinois Housing Development Act. What it does is increase what the rate percentage that the authority can sell their bonds at. It increases it from 7 to 8 percent. It raises to 10 percent what they can borrow short-term money at. And I would move . . . I know of no objection to this; and I would



ask for the support of the House."

Speaker Murphy: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh."

Walsh, W.: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all I have is the Digest on this . . . and I wonder if the Gentleman would hold it because some question has been raised on this side. If we could look at it for a few minutes and then come back to it."

Speaker Murphy: "I guess he seems agreeable."

Shea: "What the Majority Leader wants succumb to his wishes."

Speaker Murphy: "You two Gentlemen ought to get together and have a visit."

Clerk Selcke: "Hold it on Third?"

Speaker Murphy: "Hold it on Third Reading. Is Representative Collins on the floor? No, he isn't. 1651, how about that?"

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1651 . . . Senate Bill 1667 . . ."

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Matijevich, do you want that? No? Take it out of the record."

Clerk Selcke: "1670, Robert Holloway . . ."

Speaker Murphy: "No, he doesn't want that. Hold it."

Clerk Selcke: "All right."

Speaker Murphy: "1673."

Clerk Selcke: "1673, out? Hold it."

Speaker Murphy: "Okay, messages from the Senate."

Clerk Selcke: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the House Amendment to Senate Bills 358, 408, 1128, 1318 . . . 1318, 1319, 1676, concurred in by the Senate, June 30, 1974. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred in the House in the adoption of House Amendment to Senate Bills 166, 1290, 1424 and 1494, concurred in by the Senate, June 29, 1974. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. No further messages."

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Shea, do you want 1541? When we called that you were not on the floor? All right, under the Conference



Committee Report, House Bill 2362. Yes, the Lady from Cook, Representative Martin. Conference Committee Report 2362. It's on the Supplemental Calendar, but I understand it is not distributed as yet. It's just coming up from downstairs."

Martin: "Mr. Speaker, could you hold this for a moment, please?"

Speaker Murphy: "Representative Martin, the Calendar hasn't been distributed yet. So we're going to hold it for a little bit."

Martin: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Blair: "Senate Bills, Second Reading, Senate Bill 1345."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bills, Second Reading, Senate Bill 1345. This Bill . . . this Bill was read the other day, and we were on . . . we stopped on Amendment #19. So I will start on Amendment #19."

Speaker Blair: "Who's the Sponsor?"

Clerk Selcke: "C. L. McCormick."

Speaker Blair: "Wait a minute, Mr. Choate. Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to yield to my good friend, Representative C. L. McCormick, on Amendment 19."

Speaker Blair: "Oh, all right. Where's Mr. McCormick. Do you have 19? Do you want to read 19?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #19, McCormick, amends Senate Bill 1345 on page 45 by inserting between lines 3 and 4 the following: 'Section 53. The sum of \$20,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary to appropriate the Department of Transportation for the placement of a location one mile north of Stonefort, Illinois, on U. S. 45 of a traffic control device for a mosquito crossing'."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. McCormick."

McCormick: "Now, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I appreciate Representative Choate because . . . you . . . and I'm sure Representative Hart knows the situation in Stonefort, Illinois. And I'm sorry I didn't get to really get over and consult you on this Amendment thoroughly before I . . . what was one of the fella's outside said that 'sneaker' that you put on. But I don't want this to be a 'sneaker', Mr. Choate. I want to fully inform you of it. But I . . . somebody is interrupting us over here."



Speaker Blair: "Mr. Jones, for what purpose do you arise?"

Jones, D.: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege because I have some input into what Representative McCormick is talking about. You know we have had a lot of news about the Watergate tapes and whatever. But I want to say to you that's nothing new. But I was C..L.'s seatmate in my first Session; and I was so impressed with his mosquito abatement speech that I taped the next one. And so now if you listen carefully, I've got the tape of his 1967 speech seven years ago almost to this day. 'Speaker Unknown: "Representative McCormick." McCormick: "Mr. Speaker, I . . . Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're late in the Session and this Bill, I think, everybody knows is a worthwhile Bill, and I can even verify that by Representative Shaw. And I'd, certainly, appreciate your vote on this Bill." Speaker Unknown: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Murphy." Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, I just don't think this is fair at all because, in the first place, he's already got \$10,000 appropriation, and he got a good speech, now he's getting a \$20,000 appropriation and we get no speech. And I think you'd better put your red lights up there and make him talk." Speaker Unknown: "Make him explain his vote, you mean? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Simmons." Simmons: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I for many years have wanted to go to Southern Illinois with my friends to hunt Canadian Geese. And that . . . a Representative from down that way, if he'd rent up a place, and he said he would. So I plan to go down there in November. But what's got me bothered is how to distinguish the difference between a Canadian Goose and all these southernmosquitoes and I wish he'd give me a little enlightenment." Speaker Unknown: "C. L. will go almost to any lengths to get a vote on the Bill, won't he. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shaw." Shaw: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know when my name was mentioned simply because I've been in Vienna, Illinois, on several occasions. And every time I got there, I expected him to be . . . unclear . . . that is operated by the distinguished Representative from the other side. Now, he spoke to me out there for



one hour, and 16 minutes and 13 seconds about mosquitoes. Now, the reason why he was telling me this is because he said he had a hard time putting over an appropriation for \$20,000. But if I helped him and I listened. So he pointed out to a pasture and he said, 'There's the last carcass, this carcass from that pasture that was raised for several months, because of the mosquitoes that we have on the southern part of Illinois have killed somewhere of about 155 head of cattle. And then he kept brushing my shoulder, and I was wondering why he did that. And he said, 'You have some mosquito eggs on your shoulder'. And he had a little equipment in his hands and he squished it on the floor and he said, 'I'm killing those mosquitoes because they really multiply out here, Ed. And I need your help. Well, as far as the eggs were concerned, I was all right. But then I told him I . . . we also have mosquitoes in Chicago. And he said, 'Now, listen you help me put this Bill over, and I'll give you half for Chicago'. And I hope he consents to it. So I recommend that you vote for this Bill so Chicago gets \$10,000 because we have a situation in Chicago, too." Speaker Unknown: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative . . ." Unknown: "I have already informed the Gentleman from Johnson. And this is in cooperation with the Gentlemen from Will and Co . . . and Kankakee, who don't want the product. That Superintendent 'Vincent Bradley' has a product which will get rid of the water down there that causes these mosquitoes to breed to rapidly. But we're willing to help in the Chicago area here, unless he'd rather have it the other way." Speaker Unknown: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Is there any Member that desires to explain his vote? The Gentleman from Johnson, Representative McCormick." McCormick: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I voted for gas tax diversion, and I voted for some awful election Bills for you people up in Chicago to keep you honest and I've done just about everything but I never have got your green votes in all of my life in this House. And I've had some Bills that's even worse than



those. Now, if I have to get into this mosquito thing, I was trying to save some time for the Speaker; but if I have to get into this mosquito thing, I want to try to convince you that we must have this money. There's no question about the mosquito situation in southern Illinois. I want you to know that the reason that I'm here before this Legislature is not just because of the mosquito, like some of the places up and down the river that claim to have mosquitoes, we have a mosquito of a very special kind. This is a mosquito that is nowhere else in all of the State of Illinois or in the Midwest. This is a mosquito of the New Orleans's time. We have a salt-water mosquito that's adapted itself to the area around Stonefort, and Ozark in Johnson, Williamson and Saline Counties. This mosquito I see in the Chicago Sun Times they act like it's a big one; but this is a baby mosquito, Ladies and Gentlemen. . . . the mosquitoes that you have in southern Illinois. We had the University of Illinois to take a little dab of that \$10,000 that Governor Kerner gave us four years ago and they went out there and marked the land about a foot square, picked it up and take it in, there was 2,500 eggs in every foot of ground that they dug up. Now, last . . . vital I think to this. And the reason that we ask for the money. If you remember Governor Kerner vetoed the \$10,000 two years ago. He said he had contacted the Department of Health. And they said . . . thank you . . . it would take four billion dollars to kill those mosquitoes. I firmly intended to put in a Bill for four million dollars this Session, Mr. Speaker; but then you appointed a very concerned Gentleman in the Appropriations Committee. And I was afraid that it would take quite a cut. So I decided to go up \$10,000 at a time. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, if you lived in the Stonefort area, you'd see the older men that are getting social security that can't afford to buy all of this off . . . business that you spray all over you; and they love to sit out in the sun in the evening as the sun goes down in the evening, they love very much to talk in tune of tobacco and whittle and sit on the walk. They can't even sit out there, Ladies and Gentlemen, in the evening with



any peace. And when these mosquitoes bite, they don't just bite you like Chicago mosquitoes bite; they make a welt nearly as big as your fist. And if you scratch it, it gets to be a sore. We can't even keep the cattle in the fields at night. You can take a 1,000 pound cow and leave her out and in a week's time you'll think it's a calf again. I wish I had you look at my children that were here today, bless their little hearts, they already ~~are~~ impatient and to play out a little bit this summer. And they can't even wear short pants. They didn't even have any until they came to Springfield and their mother went to the dollar store and got them a pair a piece so they could wear them up here. When they get home, they got to get back to the longs because they can't stand the mosquito bites. Ladies and Gentlemen, here's one other thing, and I can verify this by the Secretary of State, and you Democrats listen to this, we had a large profitable youth camp in Ozark, Illinois, that's probably the nicest in all of the State of Illinois. Now, I can't remember the father's name, but he called the Secretary of State, being a good Protestant, but very friendly to the Catholics where they . . . you know. They called him, and they said, 'Mr. Secretary, was there anything in the world that you could do to get part of the money that McCormick appropriated last Session?'. He didn't know the Governor had vetoed it see. He said, 'I had 500 Catholic youths at the Ozark Camp last week', and he said, 'they were swimming and having a wonderful time; the next day we went out for the same sort of recreation', and he said, 'all of a sudden the sky got dark', and I'm not talking for C. L. McCormick, this is your father that's talking, 'He said all of a sudden the sky got dark and we thought we was going to have a storm, and the children started to disperse; but before they did all these things descended upon them and we had to get two new nurses in addition to the ones we had at the camp. The children's eyes turned blue, their lips were thick', and he said, 'I think the State of Illinois should assume part of the responsibility for eliminating this menace in this particular area'. And Ladies and Gentlemen, I would appreciate this \$20,000



if you see fit to give it to me.'

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Jones."

Jones, D.: "Continues with tape . . . 'Unknown Speaker: "The Gentleman

from Cook, Representative C. L. Smith." Smith: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd like to ask the Representative from downstate a question. McCormick." McCormick: "Yes, Sir."

C. L. Smith: "You know, you southern gentlemen gave us a trip down there and it was free. And I was riding from Callatin County over to Clyde Choate's territory, my host told me that there was a gentleman down there, he had to put his overcoat, his earmuffs, and gloves and a net over his head when he went out to cut his lawn. Is that correct? Do you concur in that?" McCormick:

"That is absolutely true. He had to put one of these beehive nets over his head. And when he worked on his tractor, he has to put screenwire in front of it to keep it from plugging his tractor and destroying it. That is to allow . . . that is now." Unknown

Speaker: "Right now. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Krause." Krause: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just want you to know that southern Illinois is down in McCormick place and you just saw it on fire." Unknown Speaker: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shaw." Shaw: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain my vote. He convinced me so well to be confused I'm going to vote 'no'."

Unknown Speaker: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question? What happened to my Amendment, C. L.? I had one concerned in the fly away for ducks. Have you done anything about the ducks?" McCormick: "Yes, Sir. Representative Anderson, I seriously considered your Amendment. And it certainly has merit. But I thought that in order to get it adopted, it would be necessary to attach a copy of your picture. And I didn't know whether that would be appropriate or not." Unknown Speaker: "Have all voted who wished? Take the Record.'" End of tape.

Unknown: "Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take up very much time of the House . . ."



Speaker Blair: "Mr. Yourell, what's your purpose?"

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for those Members who had never heard the true-to-life story that C. L. tells relating to his friendship; and, of course, you could only say this about a friend, Clyde Choate, about the time down there, C. L., you know, when you come across Clyde and told us all about it. Would you tell us about that now."

McCormick: "Oh, you mean, the time about . . ."

Yourell: "You remember."

McCormick: ". . . the time his family forgot about his birthday?"

Yourell: "That's right, yeah."

McCormick: "Oh, I should have told that the other day. I've told it; but maybe some of you haven't heard it. You want me to interrupt this to do it?"

Speaker Blair: "Go ahead."

McCormick: "I'm going to have some Democrat votes to get this \$20,000 here after a while. Well, you know, I hate to embarrass you, Clyde, you know; but I know you don't mind, you've been embarrassed before."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Choate."

Choate: "I just want to remind the Gentleman from Johnson one thing, I'm the Master of Ceremonies at your thing down there on October the 5th. So now take your choice."

McCormick: "Well, you know, the only difference is right here we're not having a gospel thing and down there we'll be singing the gospel and we may have to preach a little bit, Clyde, instead of telling stories like this. But anyway Clyde Choate had a birthday. And I know some of you heard it; but since he had a birthday the other day, I'll tell it before we get back on the real important business of the House. He had a birthday, and he got up that morning and he went in for his coffee and whatever his wife fixed for him and nobody said 'Happy Birthday, Daddy' or Happy Birthday, Pop' or anything, you know, they just kind of ignored it. And, you know, he kind of left blue, and he went down into the office and nobody says too much about it. But finally his secretary says something



about Clyde. Said, you know, this is your birthday, let's do a little celebrating. And so that, you know, he's been kind of down and thought, well, the family didn't give a darn about him and nobody cared about his birthday and this was the best opportunity he had, you know. And she said, 'I'll tell you what, I've got a little something planned'. She said, 'Let's go, you know, up to my apartment'. Well, you know, Clyde hadn't been used to doing that; but anyway, you know, how do you feel when your family kind of lets you down? You know how you kind of feel? I don't give a hoot. So they went up to her apartment and they go in and, you know, things are in pretty good shape. And she says, 'Now, Clyde, you go ahead and make yourself comfortable, you know, and get you a drink and do whatever please, and I'm going to go in here and make myself comfortable'. Well, of course, you know, like most of us would think that she was going to make herself comfortable. So Clyde he goes on over and he gets him a drink and he starts to make himself comfortable, see. And he finally gets out of his clothes, where he don't have to be tied down on anything; and then here she comes out from the bedroom and he's standing there with anticipation. And she says, 'Surprise'. And she steps aside and there's Clyde's wife and two daughters. So that goes to tell you that there's always surprises at birthdays, you know."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Well, I've got to now tell the reason that C. L. knows about that story. His wife worked for me then. You know, there's nothing like common knowledge, is there."

McCormick: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to tell you, sincerely, that the mosquito situation is just as bad at Stonefort as it ever was. Now, Governor 'Horner', Governor 'Horner', he recognized it many years ago when he built a road right through that area; but he thought that by doing that that the 'fills' would fill up all of those things, you know. Then all of you people that wanted to get rich real fast, invested in the coal mines and in the coal-strip mining, and they come back down and they dug the hole. Now, we've got the mine holes and



we've got them full of water; and we've got the mosquitoes and they are an unusual kind of mosquito that nobody in this room has ever seen, unless you've been to Stonefort. Now, I've already told you . . . Dave Jones told you what kind of mosquitoes, and I'm not going to go over that again. And I could even tell you lots more of the things that they do. But now what has happened over the years like the deer makes patterns across the woods, they started going across one highway north of Stonefort just one mile, right in front of 'Speck Brackman's' house. Now, they don't just go one mosquito at a time, but they go across their in groves like bees, changing them from the hives and following the old queen bee. When they do that, it doesn't make any difference what's on that road, it's a dead duck. What we've got down there is three or four terribly bad wrecks that come up, and they don't, you know, they don't recognize a car sits, they just go in front of it and it knocks them together and it's caused a tremendous amount of accidents. And it just isn't right for the Department of Transportation not to invest \$20,000 in a lighting system that will protect the people that drive on the highways in Stonefort. And I'll tell you now, I talked to Clyde Choate, and I didn't get to go over this very much; but we got down there deciding a little bit about this the other day before I ever got the Amendment drawn. And we went out and we tested what kind of light would be necessary to either stop the cars or stop the mosquitoes. And we took first a regular electric light and it didn't do a thing except draw more bugs. We took the green light, and they stopped, it didn't make any difference. We took a red light, and they didn't pay any attention to it. Then Clyde said, 'Let's get a lantern'. We tried the lantern. Now, the only thing, Clyde, that I've been able to come up with is this, when the mosquitoes do cross, and they cross in such droves, it causes the light to get dark in the area. And I thought we might get R.E.A. to put a timer on the thing, where you dim her, so when the sun went down, it would tell the cars to stop, and when the sun went up, you know, and it was light, why they let them go. And if you people



think that that's an emergency enough to put this on this Bill, I want you to know that I sure appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Choate."

Choate: "C. L.?"

McCormick: "Yes, Sir?"

Choate: "Do you think that we might meet in conference?"

McCormick: "Well, you know, I . . ."

Choate: "All these Conference Committees are being affected."

McCormick: ". . . Well, you know . . ."

Choate: "It might be that we could meet in a Conference Committee and . . ."

McCormick: "I tell you what let's do. Just in order to show the Conference Committee, and no Roll Call, you know, that's a lot of waste of time and money. We don't want to do that here."

Choate: ". . . No, I want to talk about the kind of light we might come up . . ."

McCormick: "Oh, I thought maybe, you know, I thought you might need a little support in the Conference Committee and the House Members . . ."

Choate: ". . . Well, we'll get to that after you've finished. But I was going to suggest that maybe, instead inasmuch as you told me, I did not know about the scientific result that you . . . as far as the testing of the lights are concerned. I knew it was being carried on; but I had not been appraised of the results. In your often misguided wisdom, do you think it might be appropriate to change the appropriation to the department to the effect that instead of erecting a light, maybe that we could buy enough flash lights so these mosquitoes could carry them along with them forewarning their . . . forewarning the general public that, you know they're crossing the highway."

McCormick: "Well, you know, I had never thought of that; but you make sense, Clyde. The only thing I would like for that appropriation not to be effective until about January 10th so that I could sell the flash lights."

Choate: "You know, C. L., you just second guess me because I was going



to invite the director to come to your dollar store and price them."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, we've heard about the number of the mosquitoes; but I'd be fascinated to know, are they really big, C. L.? Just how big are they?"

McCormick: "Well, they can carry a flash light."

Mann: "How big are they?"

McCormick: "I wouldn't have agreed to Choate's proposition if they couldn't have been big enough to carry a flash light. And the thing that's bad about it, see, you know, people laugh about this and they make jokes about it. When in reality it isn't a joke. It's dead serious. It's, you know, if somebody would come and tell you that your child had pneumonia and he's in the hospital, it would worry you to death. But you ought to see your child after about 10 of these mosquitoes bites him on the rear. And that's the thing. And, Clyde, you know, you see a child, or you see a women, they can't even wear miniskirts down there in Stonefort. Yeah, you can't wear miniskirts, of course, your boys can't wear shorts. You know, you have to wear long, hot underwear in the summertime, and it's hotter than hell down there."

Choate: "If you think C. L.'s kidding about the women can't wear miniskirts, they mostly wear jeans now because one poor old gal got brave enough to wear a miniskirt. Remember, C. L.?"

McCormick: "I know what happened to her."

Choate: "She walked head-on into a mosquito and he bit her on both front legs. Everybody that saw her from there on didn't know whether we was walking forward or backward. They swelled up so much."

McCormick: "That's the truth. And you know what? You know, if you remember when 'Lilian Viochoski' was there. And, you now, the late Lilian was here. And you know we tried our best to work Lilian's problem out. And, you know, she's one of the finest people that ever come down from Cook County. And she was always remiss in her duty remember. She didn't do this . . . and Lilian was a little bit heavy at that time for her height and everything. And



they was talking about all the cattle having . . . losing weight and how it was ruining the farm situation down there. And she wondered about what should happen to her, if you remember."

Choate: "I remember."

McCormick: "And I told her, I said, 'Lil', we've been studying your situation down there. The only thing we can't do is to find out how to make them bite you in the right places'. And if we could ever find . . . get that done we could take care of . . ."

Choate: "Can I relate . . . can I now relate the two happenings of a fellow member of this House?"

McCormick: "Yes, Sir, I'd be happy for you to."

Choate: "About three years ago, Tom Hanahan flew to Anna, Illinois, with me to my daughter's graduation exercises. About 11 o'clock that night we started back and we were driving up Interstate 57. And you know how the fire flies are in abundance at that time of the year with the Spring Session, the fire flies are flying all over the beautiful fields down there. And Hanahan looked out the window. He said, 'What are all of those little lights out there?' I said, 'That's those mosquitoes that McCormick's been talking about.' He said, 'I'm going to vote for that next Session'."

Speaker Blair: "Okay, Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "On behalf of the Body, would the Gentleman mind taking just a little more of our time and a little less of our money?"

Speaker Blair: "Okay. That Amendment probably doesn't apply to that. No, I just think we ought to take it out of the record. Thank you. Now, Mr. Hoffman, do you want that 3997? Gene Hoffman back there? I saw a minute ago. On Third Reading. Supple . . . Calendar #2, Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1348. Mr. Williams."

Williams: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to concur in the Conference Committee Report. And I'm pleased to announce that all of the House Amendments remain in tact. And then this will be final action, I guess, wouldn't it?"

Speaker Blair: "Oh, you want to adopt it?"

Williams: "Yes, I adopt the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Blair: "All right, is there discussion? The Gentleman has moved



that the House adopt Conference Committee Report with respect to Senate Bill 1348. All those in favor will vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Shea 'aye'. The Clerk will . . . Molloy 'aye' . . . The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there are 120 . . . how many? . . . 125 'ayes', 1 'nay' . . . and Choate 'aye' . . . and this . . . and the House adopts the Conference Committee Report with respect to Senate Bill 1348. Mr. William Walsh. Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh, W.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there are about 35 or 40 Conference Committee Reports that must be dealt with before we finally adjourn. These will be worked on overnight, hopefully, and probably part of tomorrow. And we hope very much that we'll be able to adjourn tomorrow this Spring Session. But for now we will adjourn now if my motion carries to the hour of 9:30 a.m. tomorrow. And I, Mr. Speaker, move that this House stand adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow."

Speaker Blair: "All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye' and opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. Have a good dinner. All right, we're in the First Special. Leave to use the Attendance Roll Call from the Regular Session as the Attendance Roll Call for the Special Session. No objections. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh, moves that the First Special Session be adjourned until immediately after the Regular Session adjourns tomorrow. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, and the First Special Session is adjourned."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1		Speaker Walsh	House in order
		Davis	Prayer
		Speaker Walsh	Roll call for attendance
		Clerk Selcke	Reads Resolutions
		Speaker Walsh	Concurrences HB 220
2		Collins	Moves adoption
		Speaker Walsh	TOOR HB 110
		Hart	Moves adoption of SA to HB 1477
		Speaker Walsh	
		Pierce	
3		Hart	Discussion
		Speaker Walsh	
4		Geo-Karis	Yield
		Hart	
		Speaker, Walsh	
		Shea	Parliamentary inquiry
		Speaker Walsh	
		McMaster	Yield
5		Hart	
		Speaker Walsh	
		Hart	To close
6		Speaker Walsh	
		Shea	Inquiry
		Speaker Walsh	Concurs with SA #2 to HB 2477
7		Shea	
		Speaker Walsh	Discussion
		Striehl	Explains HB 910



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	2.
		Speaker Walsh		
8		Shea		
		Stiehl	Discussion	
		Speaker Walsh	HR 910 is adopted	
		Clerk Selcke	Messages from Senate	
		Speaker Walsh		
		Philips	Moves adoption of CCR on SB 84	
		Speaker Walsh		
		Shea		
		Philip	Discussion	
9		Speaker Walsh		
		Dyer	Yield	
		Philip		
10		Speaker Walsh		
		Shea		
		Speaker Walsh		
		Caldwell		
		Speaker Walsh		
11		Pierce	Parimentary inquiry	
		Speaker Walsh	TOOR SB 84	
		Leinenweber	Explains HR 1088	
		Speaker Walsh		
12		Leon	Yield	
		Leinenweber		
		Speaker Walsh	HR 1088 is adopted.	
		Schraeder	Explains HR 894	
13		Speaker Walsh	Amendment #1 is adopted	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
			3.
		Speaker Walsh	HR 894 is adopted
		Harpstrite	Explains HR 1092
		Speaker Walsh	HR 1092 is adopted
		Schlickman	Inquiry
		Speaker Walsh	
		Schraeder	
14		Schlickman	Discussion
		Speaker Walsh	
		Hyde	Explains HR 1038
		Speaker Walsh	HR 1038 is adopted
15		Lechowicz	TOOR SJR #84 and amend
		Speaker Walsh	Amendment #1 is adopted
		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Walsh	
		Schlickman	Yield
		Lechowicz	Discussion
		Speaker Walsh	
		Lechowicz	
17-18		Schlickman	
		Speaker Walsh	SJR # 74 is adopted
19		McMaster	Explains HR 1043
		Speaker Walsh	
		Schneider	Opposes
		Speaker Walsh	
20		McMaster	To close
		Speaker Walsh	HR 1043 is adopted
		DiPrima	Suspend rules



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	4.
		Speaker Walsh		
21		Schlickman	Yield	
		DiPrima		
		Speaker Walsh		
22		Clerk O'Brien	Readd SJR #79	
		Speaker Walsh	DiPrima's motion to suspend	fail.
23		Holloway	Explains HR 1115	
		Speaker Walsh	Motion to suspend	
24		Stone	Inquiry objects	
		Speaker Walsh		
		Washington		
		Speaker Walsh		
		Stone		
		Speaker Walsh		
25		Kempiners Supports		
		Speaker Walsh		
		Holloway	To close	
		Speaker Walsh		
		Clabaugh	Opposes	
26		Speaker Walsh		
		Mann	Votes 'no'	
		Speaker Walsh		
27		Rayson	Opposes	
		Speaker Walsh		
		Holloway	Explains vote	
		Speaker Walsh		
28		Matijevich	'aye'	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	5.
		Speaker Walsh		
		Stone	Explains vote	
		Speaker Walsh		
		Dee	Explains vote	
29		Speaker Walsh	Motion to suspend prevails	
		Speaker Walsh	HR 1115 is adopted	
		Greiman	HJR 111 TOOR	
		Speaker Walsh	HJR 111 is tabled	
		Greiman	Explains HR 924	
		Speaker Walsh		
30		Palmer	Supports	
		Speaker Walsh		
		Simms	Opposes	
		Speaker Walsh		
31		Hudson	Opposes	
		Speaker Walsh		
		Shea	Supports	
		Speaker Walsh		
		Hyde	Supports	
		Speaker Walsh		
32		Greiman	To close	
		Speaker Walsh		
		Jaffee	Explains 'aye' vote	
33		Speaker Walsh	HJR 111 is lost	
		Speaker Blair		
		Collins	Moves CCR #2 to HB 2825	
		Speaker Blair		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	6.
		Choate	Wants Democratic Conference	
		Speaker Blair	Recess for 15 minutes	
		Speaker Blair	House in order	
		Collins		
		Speaker Blair		
36		Choate	Introduction	
		Speaker Blair		
		Kriegsman	Yield	
37		Collins		
		Speaker Blair		
38-39		Lechowicz	Yield	
40-41		Collins	Discussion	
		Speaker Blair		
42		Mahar		
43		Collins	Discussion	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Shea	Yield	
44		Collins	Discussion	
		Speaker Telcser		
45-46		Murphy	Yield	
		Collins		
		Speaker Telcser		
		Collins	To close	
		Speaker Telcser		
47		Cunningham		
		Speaker Telcser		
		Martin	Wants HB 932 heard	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
			7.
		Speaker Telcser	CCR #2 to HB 2825 is adopted
48		Choate	Alsup discharged from hospital
		Speaker Telcser	
		Shea	Objects to hearing on SB 1568
		Speaker Telcser	
		Collins	Shea's lying!
49		Speaker Telcser	
		Choate	
		Speaker Telcser	
50		Murphy	
		Speaker Telcser	Get back to SB 1568
		Wolf, J.J.	asks for adoption CCR to SB 634
51		Speaker Telcser	
52-53		Shea	Discussion
		Speaker Telcser	
54		Matijevich	
		Speaker Telcser	CCR to SB 634 is passed
		Philip	Asks adoption CCR to SB 84
		Speaker Telcser	
		Berman	What's it do?
		Speaker Telcser	
55		Philip	Explains CCR to SB 84
		Speaker Telcser	
56		Flinn	
		Philip	Discussion
		Speaker Telcser	
		Philip	To close



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	8.
		Speaker Telcser		
		Alsup		
		Speaker Telcser		
57		Giglio		
		Speaker Telcser		
		Porter		
		Speaker Telcser	CCR to SB 84 fails	
		Houlihan, D.	Adoption of CCR to SB 641	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Schlickman		
58		Houlihan, D.		
		Speaker Telcser	CCR to SB 641 is adopted	
		Keller	Adoption of CCR to SB 1265	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Shea	Wait for Katz	
		Keller	TOOR CCR to SB 1265	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Collins	Adoption of CCR to SB 1291	
59		Speaker Telcser		
		Maragos		
		Collins		
		Speaker Telcser	CCR to SB 1291 is adopted	
		Shea	Adoption of CCR to HB 2543	
60		Speaker Telcser		
		Wolf, J.J.	Question	
		Shea	Discussion	
		Speaker Telcser	CCR to HB 2543 is adopted	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	9.
		Washburn	Asks adoption of CCR to HB	2851
		Speaker Telcser		
61		Shea		
		Washburn	Discussion	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Berman		
		Speaker Telcser		
		Houlihan, J.		
62		Washburn	Discussion	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Schraeder		
		Washburn		
63		Speaker Telcser	House concurs	
		Cunningham	Personal Privilege	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Stone	Objection	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Cunningham	Asks Stone to reconsider	
		Speaker Telcser		
64		Juckett	Non concur to SA #1 to HB	1464
		Speaker Telcser	House does not concur	
		Keller	Moves not to adopt CCR to SB	1265
		Speaker Telcser		
65		Katz		
		Speaker Telcser	House not adopt	
66		Porter	Explains HR 1010	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	10.
		Speaker Telcser	HR 1010	
		Neff	Explains 'no' vote	
		Speaker Telcser		
67		Calvo	Opposes	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Porter	Explains vote	
		Spekaer Telcser		
		Giglio	Opposes	
		Speaker Telcser		
68		Craig	Opposes	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Giorgi	Opposes	
		Speaker Telcser		
69		Walsh, W.	Supports	
		Speaker Telcser	HR 1010 is adopted	
		Keller	Explains HR 1037	
		Speaker Telcser	HR 1037 is adopted	
70		Martin	Explains HR 932	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Rayson	Explains Amendment #1	
		Speaker Telcser		
71		Schraeder	Against Resolution	
		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #1 is adopted	
		Martin		
		Speaker Telcser		
		Yourell	Questions Schraeder	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	11.
		Schraeder	Discussion	
		Yourell		
72		Martin	Discussion	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Holloway, J.		
		Speaker Telcser		
73		Borchers		
		Speaker Telcser		
		Craig	Opposes	
		Speaker Telcser		
74		Rayson	Supports	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Hoffman, G.	Moves previous question	
		Speaker Telcser		
75		Martin	To close	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Leinenweber	Explains vote	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Juckett		
		Speaker Telcser		
76		Martin	Explains vote	
		Speaker Telcser		
77		Chapman	Explains 'aye' vote	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Leon	'Aye'	
		Speaker Telcser		
78		Catania	'Aye'	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	12.
		Speaker Telcser		
		Rayson		
		Speaker Telcser		
79		Hyde	'Aye'	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Martin	Postponed consideration	
		Speaker Telcser		
80-81		Epton	Explains HB 937	
82		Speaker Telcser		
83-84		Leinenweber		
		Epton	Discussion	
		Speaker Telcser		
85		Griesheimer	Yield	
		Epton	Discussion	
		Speaker Telcser		
86		Hart	Opposes	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Kempiners	Moves previous question	
		Speaker Telcser	Previous question moved	
87		Epton	To close	
88		Speaker Telcser		
		Kriegsman	Explains vote	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Ewell	'Aye'	
		Speaker Telcser		
89		Geo-Karis		
		Speaker Telcser		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
			13.
		Mann	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Duff	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Houlihan, J.	Inquiry
		Speaker Telcser	
		Borchers	Congratulates Epton
90		Speaker Telcser	HR 937 is adopted
		Tipsword	Inquiry
		Speaker Telcser	
		Epton	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Barry	'N' on 937
		Speaker Telcser	
91-92		Epton	Explains vote
93-94		Speaker Telcser	
		Berman	
		Speaker Telcser	
95		Epton	Point of order
		Speaker Telcser	
96-97		Berman	Continues
		Speaker Telcser	
98		Stone	Moves previous question
		Speaker Telcser	Previous question is moved
99		Epton	To close
		Speaker Telcser	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
			14.
100-101		Schlickman	Explains vote
		Speaker Telcser	
		Duff	Explains vote
		Speaker Telcser	HR 938 is adopted
		Caldwell	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Giorgi	Inquiry
		Speaker Telcser	
102		Caldwell	Explains HR 976
		Speaker Telcser	HR 976 is adopted
102		Kelly	Explains HR 988
		Speaker Telcser	HR 988 is adopted
		Taylor	Explains HR 1069
		Speaker Miller	Amendment #1 is adopted
103		Taylor	Continues explanation
		Speaker Miller	
		Juckett	Yield
104-105		Taylor Discussion	
		Speaker Miller	
		Giorgi	Inquiry
		Speaker Miller	
		Taylor	To close
		Speaker Miller	
106		Matijevich	Point of order
		Speaker Miller	HR 1069 is adopted
		Skinner	Explains HR 1086



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	15.
		Speaker Miller	HR 1086 is adopted	
		Hill	Suspend rules	
		Speaker Miller	Leave granted	
107		Hill	Explains HR 1111	
		Speaker Miller		
		Grotberg	Untimely	
		Speaker Miller		
108		Schoeberlein		
		Speaker Miller		
		Juckett	Yield	
		Hill	Discussion	
		Speaker Miller	HR 111 is adopted	
		Mann	Suspend rules HR 1116	
109		Speaker Miller	Leave granted	
		Juckett	Inquiry objects	
		Mann		
		Speaker Miller	Roll call vote on suspension	
		Duff	Inquiry	
110		Speaker Miller		
		Merlo	Motion for suspension prevails	
		Mann	Explains HB 1116	
		Speaker Miller		
111		Skinner		
		Speaker Miller		
		Houlihan, J.	Yield supports	
112		Mann	Discussion	
		Speaker Miller		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	16.
		Holloway, R.	Yield opposes	
		Mann	Discussion	
		Speaker Miller		
		Hanahan		
113		Speaker Miller		
		Kriegsman	Opposes	
		Speaker Miller		
114		Merlo	Supports	
		Speaker Miller		
115		Juckett	Opposes	
		Speaker Miller		
		Lechowicz	Moves previous question	
		Speaker Miller	Previous question moved	
		Geo-Karis	Inquiry	
		Speaker Miller		
116		Mann	To Close	
		Speaker Miller	HR 1116 is adopted	
117		McCormick	Suspend rules HR 1117	
		Speaker Miller		
		Juckett	Objects to motion	
		Speaker Miller		
118-119		McCormick		
		Speaker Miller		
		McCormick	Explains HR 1117	
		Speaker Miller	Motion to suspend prevails	
		McCormick	Continues explanation	
		Speaker Miller		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
			17.
		Juckett	Objects opposes
		Speaker Miller	
		McCormick	To close
		Speaker Miller	
120		Hudson	Explains vote 'no'
		Spekaer Miller	HR 1117 is adopted
121		Washington	Explains SJR #65
		Speaker Miller	
		Juckett	Opposes
		Speaker Miller	
		Washington	HJB #65 TOOR
		Speaker Miller	Leave granted HJR #65 TOOR
122		Washington	HR 1087 Amendment #1
		Speaker Miller	Amendment #1 adopted
123		Washington	Continues explanation
		Speaker Telcser	HR 1087 adopted
		Collins	Asks adoption of CCR to SB 1568
		Speaker Telcser	
124		Berman	
		Collins	
		Speaker Telcser	TOOR SB 1568, temp.
		Philip	Asks adoption of CCR to HB 2878
		Speaker Telcser	
		Redmond	Supports
		Speaker Telcser	
		Shea	
		Philip	Postpone HR 2878



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	17.
		Speaker Telcser		
125		Colling	Asks favorable roll	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Berman		
		Collins		
126		Speaker Telcser	CCR to SB 1568 is adopted	
		Juckett	Asks adoption of CCR to SB	1500
		Speaker Telcser		
		McClain		
		Juckett		
		Speaker Telcser	CCR to SB 1500 is adopted	
127		Collins	Asks concurrence on HB 220	
		Speaker Telcser		
		McClain	Yield	
		Collins		
		Speaker Telcser		
		Shea		
128		Berman		
		Collins		
		Speaker Telcser		
		Molloy	'Aye'	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Giorgi	Opposes	
		Collins		
129		Speaker Telcser		
		Maragos	Opposes	
		Collins		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	18.
		Speaker Telcser		
		Collins	Postpone consideration	
		Speaker		
130		Giorgi		
		Speaker Belcser		
		Matijevich		
		Speaker Telcser	Senate Bills, 3rd	
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads SB 1240	
131		Lauer	Explains SB 1240	
		Speaker Blair		
		Fennessey	Yield	
		Lauer		
		Spekaer Blair		
		Lauer		
		Speaker Blair		
		Hart		
		Lauer	Discussion	
		Speaker Blair		
132		Juckett	Yield opposes	
133		Lauer	Discussion	
		Speaker Blair		
		Ewell	Opposes	
		Lauer	Discussion	
		Speaker Blair		
		Murphy	'Aye'	
134		Speaker Blair		
		Cunningham	'Aye'	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
			19.
		Speaker Blair	
135		Tuerk	'No'
		Speaker Blair	
		Friedland	Yield
		Lauer	
		Speaekr Blair	
136		Lauer	To close
		Speaker Blair	
		LaFleur	Explains vote
		Speaker Blair	
137		Boyle	Explains vote
		Speaker Blair	
138		Hirschfeld	Explains vote
		Speaker Bliar	
		McMaster	Explains vote
		Spekaer Blair	
		Dee	Explains vote
		Speaker Blair	
139		Waddell	Explains vote
		Speaker Blair	
		Deuster	Explains vote
		Speaker Blair	
140		Jenison	Explains vote
		Speaker Blair	
		Lauer	Postponed consideration
		Speaker Blair	
		Clerk Selcke	Reads SB 1382



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
			20.
		Houlihan	Back to 2nd
		Speaker Blair	Leave is granted
		Clerk Selcke	Reads Aemdment #9
		Speaker Blair	
141		Lechowicz	Table Amendment #9
		Speaker Blair	Amendment #9 tabled
		Clerk Selcke	Reads Amendment #10
		Speaker Blair	Amendment#10 tabled
		Clerk Selcke	Reads Admendment #11
		Speaker Blair	
		Giorgi	Explains Amendment #11
		Speaker Blair	
		Walsh, W.	Opposes
		Speaker Blair	
		Giorgi	To close
		Speaker Blair	
		Houlihan, D.	
		Speaker Blair	
142		Pierce	Supports
		Spekaer Blair	
		Hyde	Opposes
		Speaker Blair	
143		Walsh, W.	Explains vote
		Speaker Blair	
		Giorgi	Explains vote poll and verify
		Speaker Blair	
		Clerk Selcke	Reads absentees



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	21.
		Speaker Murphy		
144		Clerk Selcke	Reads Affirmative roll	
		Speaker Murphy		
145-146		Peters	Verifies affirmative roll call	
147-148		Speaker Murphy		
		Huskey		
149		Speaker Murphy		
150		Peters Continues		
		Speaker Murphy		
		Boyle, K.	No pictures!	
		Speaker Murphy		
		Peters	Continues	
		Speaker Murphy		
		Giorgi		
		Speaker Murphy		
151		Clerk Selcke	Reads Negative roll call	
		Speaker Murphy		
152		Giorgi	Verifies negative roll	
		Speaker Murphy		
153		North	Point of order	
		Speaker Murphy	Amendment #11 is lost	
		Clerk Selcke	Reads Amendment #12	
		Speaker Murphy		
		Schraeder	Explains Amendment #12	
		Speaker Murphy	Amendment #12 is adopted	
		Speaker Murphy	3rd reading	
154		Houlihan	Explains SB 1382	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	22.
		Speaker Murphy	SB 1382 is passed	
		Clerk Selcke	Reads SB 1326	
		Speaker Murphy		
		Totten	Explains SB 1326	
		Speaker Murphy		
155		Garmisa	Opposes	
		Speaker Murphy		
		Berman	Opposes	
		Speaker Murphy		
		Juckett	Opposes	
		Speaker Murphy		
156		Totten	To close	
		Speaker Murphy	SB 1326 is lost	
		Clerk Selcke	Reads SB 1492	
		Speaker Murphy		
		Arnell	Explains SB 1492	
		Speaker Murhpy		
		Skinner	Yield	
		Arnell		
		Speaker Murphy		
157		Skinner	Opposes	
		Speaekr Murphy	SB 1492 is lost	
		Spekaer Blair		
		Kozubowski.	Do adopt CCR to SB 1267	
		Speaker Blair		
		Catania	Yield	
158		Kozubowski		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
			23.
		Speaker Blair	
		Houlihan	
		Kozubowski	
		Speaker Blair	
		Juckett	Inquiry
		Speaker Blair	
		Kozubowski	
		Speaker Blair	House adopts CCR to SB 1267
159		Speaker Murphy	
		Clerk Selcke	SB 1528, 2nd
		Speaker Murphy	3rd reading
		Clerk Selcke	Reads SB 1538, 3rd
		Lechowicz	Explains SB 1538
		Speaker Murphy	
160		Grotberg	
		Lechowicz	Discussion
		Speaker Murphy	SB 1538 is passed
		Clerk Selcke	Reads SB 1566, 2nd
		Clerk Selcker	3rd Reading
		Speaker Murphy	
		Lechowicz	Explains SB 1566
161		Speaker Murphy	
		Giorgi	Yield opposes
162		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Murphy	
		Lechowicz	Point of order
		Giorgi	Question



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	24.
		Speaker Murphy		
163		Matijevich	Supports	
		Speaker Murphy		
		Lundy	Supports	
		Speaker Murphy		
164		Giglio	Support	
		Speaker Murphy		
		Walters	Point of order	
		Speaker Murphy		
		Lechowicz	To close	
		Speaker Murphy		
165		Jacobs	Explains no vote	
		Speaker Murphy		
		Houlihan		
		Speaker Murphy	SB 1566 is passed	
		Clerk Selcke	Reads SB 1462, 3rd	
		Speaker Murphy		
166		Keller	Explains SB 1462	
		Speaker Murphy		
		Shea	Should take back to 2nd	
		Speaker Murphy		
		Geo-Karis	Yield	
167		Keller		
		Speaker Murphy	SB 1462 is passed	
		Clerk Selcke	Reads SB 1554, 2nd	
		Shea	Moves Amendment #1	
		Speaker Murphy		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	25.
168		Walsh		
		Shea	Discussion	
		Speaker Murphy	Amendment #1 is adopted	
		Speaker Murphy	3rd reading	
		Shea	Explains SB 1554	
		Speaker Murphy	TOOR	
		Clerk Selcke	SB 1555, 2nd	
169		Shea	Explains Aemdneamt #1	
		Speaker Murphy	Amendment #1 adopted, 3rd	
		Clerk Selcke	Reads SB 1555, 3rd	
		Shea	Explains SB 1555	
		Speaker Murphy		
		Walsh	Please hold	
		Shea	Agrees	
		Speaker Murphy	Held on 3rd SB 1555	
		Clerk Selcke	Messages from Senate	
170		Speaker Murphy		
		Martin	Please hold CCR to 2362	
		Speaker Murphy		
		Speaker Blair		
		Clerk Selcke	Reads SB 1345	
		Speaker Blair		
		Choate	Yields to McCormick	
		Speaker Blair		
		Clerk Selcke	Reads Amendment #19	
		Speaker Blair		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	26.
171		McCormick	Explains Amendment #19	
		Speaker Blair		
172-173		Jones, D.	Personal privilege	
174-175-176		Speaker Blair		
		Yourell		
		McCormick		
		Speaker Blair		
		Choate		
177-178-179		McCormick		
		Choate		
		Speaker Blair		
180		Mann		
181		McCormick		
		Chaote		
		Speaker Blair		
		Ewell		
		Speaker Blair	Amendment #19 TOOR	
182		Williams	Moves to concur in CCR #2 to SB 1348	
		Speaker Blair	House concurs	
		Walsh, W.	Moves house stands adjourned	
		Speaker Blair	House stands adjourned	
		Speaker Blair	1st special session	
		Speaker Blair	1st special is adjourned	

