

Speaker Redmond: "House will come to order, will you please make the announcements, Mr. Doorkeeper."

Mr. John Painter: "All those not entitled to the floor, please go to the Gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "We will be led in prayer Reverend Krueger, House Chaplain."

Reverend Krueger: "I have with me this morning my grandson, Terry James Krueger. He's going to join us in prayer. In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, Amen. Oh Lord, Bless this House this day. A contemporary C. S. Lewis said, 'Aim at Heaven, and you will get Earth thrown in; aim at Earth, and you will get neither'. In thirter...379 A.D., Saint Basil wrote this prayer for Divine direction: 'Oh Lord, our God, teach us, who beseech Thee, to ask Thee a right, for Thy right blessing. Steer those, the vessel of our life, towards thyself; Thou tranquil haven of all storm-tossed souls. Show us the course, wherein, we should go. Renew a willing spirit within us. Let Thy Spirit curve our wayward senses and guide and enable us onto that which is our true good to keep Thy law and in all our work, evermore to rejoice in Thy glorious and gladdening presence, for Thine is the glory and the praise from all Thy saints forever and ever, Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Messages from the Senate."

O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary: Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles and the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit, Senate Bill 8, 23, 27, 28, 169, 259, 261, 262, 294, and 389, passed by the Senate, March 25, 1975, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary; Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of



Representatives that the Senate has concurred in the House in the passage of bills with the following titles, to wit, House Bill 37, House Bill 295 passed by the Senate, March 25, 1975, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary; Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the following Preamble and Joint Resolution, to wit, House... Joint Resolution 27 concurred in by the Senate, March 25, 1975, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. (ah...Introduction to First Reading)"

Speaker Redmond: "Introduction First Reading."

O'Brien: " House Bill 995, Getty, a Bill for and Act to amend sections of and Act, codifying the powers and duties of the Department of Mental Health. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 998, Hart, a Bill for and Act to amend sections of an Act in regard to limitations. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 999, Skinner, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1000, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Social Workers Registration Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1001, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections to the Illinois Structural Engineering Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1002, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act to license and regulate tree experts. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1003, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1004, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Civil Administrative Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1005, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Water well and Pump Installation Contractors License Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1006, Katz, a Bill for an Act to add public members to the Weather Modification Board. First Reading of the



Bill. House Bill 1007, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act for the regulation of business of horseshoeing. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1008, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Illinois Land Surveyors Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1009, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Illinois Nursing Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1010, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Illinois Optometric Practice Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1011, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act to create a State Board of Pharmacy. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1012, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act in relation to physical therapy. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1013, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act to gra...regulate the practice of Public Accounting. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1014, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Civil Administrative Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1015, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act to provide for the license fees of architects. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1016, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act in relation to the practice of barbering. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1017, Katz....."

Unknown: "You want a committee meeting today...today?"

O'Brien: "...a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act relating to the practice of beauty culture. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1018, Katz, A Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act to license and regulate shorthand reporters. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1019, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act to provide for the licensing, regulation of....ah.... detection of....ah....deception examiners. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1020, Katz, a Bill for an



Act to amend sections of an Act in Relation to licensing and regulation of plumbers. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1021, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act to regulate the practice of . . . podometric . . . podiatry. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1022, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the . . . ah . . . Psychologist Registration Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1023, Katz, A Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Sanitation Registration Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1024, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Illinois Professional Engineering Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1025, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act to regulate the practice of dental surgery and dentistry. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1026, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act in relation to regulation of persons engaged in the practice of funeral directing and embalming. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1027, Katz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act to provide for the licensing and regulation of detectives and detective agencies. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1027, Hart, Choate, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to Department of Conservation. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1029, Kempiners, a Bill for an Act in relation to the merit for sheriff's personnel. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1030, Mudd, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Public Building Commission Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1032, Greiman, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act in relation to the compensation of members of the General Assembly. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1033, Greiman, a Bill for an Act for making appropriation of the Illinois Community College Board. First Reading of the Bill.



House Bill 1034, Caldwell, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1035, Yourell, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act to create sanitary districts. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1036, Pierce, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1037, Capparelli, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act to create sanitary districts. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1038, Lechowicz, a Bill for an Act to appropriate balances of Public Act 78-1046 and 78-1047, close of business June 30, 1975, the payment of interest and retirement of state bonded indebtedness. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1039, Lechowicz, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Treasurer. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1040, Lechowicz, a Bill for an act to provide for the ordinary contingent expense of the Office of State Treasurer. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1041, Lechowicz, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act in relation to state finance. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1042, Lechowicz, a Bill for an Act making appropriation of the Department of Matured Bonds and Interest Coupons. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1043, Lemke, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation and certification of Farm Labor Contractors. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1044, Lemke, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act relating to employment offices and agencies. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1045, Lemke, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act to revise a Law in relation to private employment agencies. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1046, E. M. Barnes, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act making appropriations for the ordinary contingent expense of certain agencies. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1047, E. M. Barnes, a Bill for an



making appropriation of the Metropolitan Fair and Exhibition Authority. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1048, E. M. Barnes, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary contingent . . . contingent expense to the Illinois Commission on Human Relations. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1049, Jaffe, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an act concerning Public Utilities. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1050, Totten, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Motor Fuel Tax Law. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1051, Terzich, a Bill for an Act creating a Law Revision Commission. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1052, LaFleur, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act in relation to the rate of interest and other charges in connections with sales on credit and lending of money. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1053, D'Arco, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act to establish a Joint Legislative Reference Bureau. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1054, Schisler, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Civil Administrative Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1055, LaFleur, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1056, Hill, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary contingent expense of the Illinois Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1057, McClain, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1058, Rayson, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Environmental Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1059, Rayson, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Civil Practice Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1060, Rayson, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1061, Kelly, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Criminal Code. First



Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1062, Garmisa, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act in relation to state finance. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1063, Giglio, a Bill for an act to amend sections of the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1064, Choate, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1065, Beau . . . Beaupre, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1066, Satterthwaite, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1067, Yourell, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1068, Yourell, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1069, Calvo, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1070, Berman, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act to create sanitary districts. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1071, Keller, a Bill for an Act making appropriation of the Department of Transportation. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1072, Tipsword, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Illinois Fertilizer Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1073, Mahar, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Public Community College Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1074, Choate, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1075, Giorgi, a Bill for an Act to provide for the State Office Building in the City of Rockford. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1076, Giorgi, a Bill for an act making appropriations to the Capital Development Board. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1077, Tim Simms, a Bill for an Act to establish a state-wide Medical Examiners System. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1078, W. T. Simms, a



Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the Law in relation to Coroners. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1079, Kosinski, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary contingent expense of the Dangerous Drugs Commission. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1080, Pierce, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1081, Pierce, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to authorize Regional Councils of Public Officials and Private Regional Organizations. First reading of the Bill. House Bill 1082, Nardulli, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the payment of the compensation persons who are eligible for the Illinois World War II and the Korean Conflict Bonuses. First reading of the bill. House Bill 1083, Kempiners, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to Airport Authorities. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1084, Huff, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Viet Nam Veteran Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washburn, do you have any excused absenses?"

Washburn: "Yes . . . Yes . . ."

Unknown: "Is he sick?"

washburn: "Yeah, Yes, Mr. Speaker, . . . ah . . . ah . . . for the record, Representative Epton, Waddell, and Hirschfeld are absent because of illness. Epton, Waddell, and Hirschfeld."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? . . . the Journal will so show. Representative Madigan on the Democratic side, do we have any excused absenses?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, let the records show that Representative Brandt is excused because of illness."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Our Journal will so show. There being 153 members answering the roll, a quorum of



the House is present. Senate . . . ah . . . Senate Bills, First Reading. Representative Shea, do you have the sponsors on some of those?"

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 66, Friedland, a Bill for an Act to enlarge corporate limits to the Metropolitan Sanitary District of greater Chicago. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 225 . . . Senate Bill 225, Darrow, a Bill for an Act making a supplemental appropriation to the Department of General Services. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 96, Totten, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. (nothing on that last one)"

Speaker Redmond: "I'd like to make an announcement, we once again having trouble with the printers, so the . . . ah . . . talent . . . ah . . . which we have is kind of a make-shift operation. We're going to go to the order of second reading and it starts at the top of page three. I've been advised by the Clerk that some of the calendars are collated wrong and you'll find page five out of place with page three, so if you'll bear with us and watch the bottom of the page. House Bills Second Reading. On the order of House Bills Second Reading appears House Bill 1. Will you read the Bill, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I request a fiscal note for House Bill 1."

Speaker Redmond: "Is the Sponsor in the House? Sponsor in the Chamber? Take it out of the record. House Bill 79."

O'Brien: "House Bill 79, Emil Jones, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Small Business Purchasing Act. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. House Bill 111."

O'Brien: "House Bill 111, Griesheimer, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Two Committee Amendments. Amendment number one amends House Bill 111 on page one by deleting lines 16 and 17 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."



Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, . . . ah . . . House Bill 111, the First Amendment to that Bill, if I recall, . . . ah . . . , merely provides that the use of studded snow tires as banned by the basic Bill itself shall not apply to out . . . out-of-state citizens using Illinois highways; and I would move its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Lake has moved for the adoption of Committee Amendment Number One of the House Bill 111. Any discussion, Representative Griesheimer?"

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I was just advised by . . . ah . . . one of the staff members that I have confused the two Amendments. This particular Amendment . . . ah . . . ah . . . to this particular Bill is an exception to the prohibition of studded snow tires, so that . . . ah . . . emergency vehicles and rural mail carriers can maintain the use of studded snow tires in the State of Illinois; and I . . . ah . . . pardon the . . . ah . . . my error here in interpretation and would still move the adoption of . . . ah . . . Amendment One, Committee Amendment One to this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman from Lake is pardoned. The question is on the motion to adopt Committee Amendment Number One to House Bill 111. All in favor indicate by saying "aye", oppose "no"; the "ayes" have it, the amendment's adopted. Gentleman from Lake, Committee Amendment Number Two."

O'Brien: "Amendment Number Two amends House Bill 111 on page two on line 22 by adding after the period following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman from Lake."

Griesheimer: ". . . Speaker . . . ah . . . , Ladies and Gentlemen of the House . . . ah . . . this is the



Amendment I, previously, described to allow out-of-state citizens driving through the State of Illinois the opportunity to use and to have studded snow tires on their vehicles, notwithstanding the prohibition in the State of Illinois. I would point out to those members of the House that . . . ah . . . commencing April 1st the States of Wisconsin and Michigan have outlawed the use of studded snow tires on a permanent basis. The State of Minnesota has, previously, outlawed them two and a half years ago on a permanent basis. I move its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Lake has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment Number Two to House Bill 111. All those in favor signify by saying "aye", oppose "no"; the "ayes" have it, the amendment's adopted. Any further amendments from the floor? Third Reading. House Bill 114."

O'Brien: "House Bill 114, Hart, (I don't think Hart's here)"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart, is he in the Chamber? House Bill 121, Representative Porter in the Chamber?"

O'Brien: "House Bill 121, Porter, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. House Bill 128."

Unknown: "(Greiman's not here.)"

O'Brien: "House Bill 128 . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record, evidently, Representative Greiman's not in the Chamber. 202, House Bill 202. Representative Polk in the Chamber?"

O'Brien: "House Bill 202, Polk."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. House Bill 300. Representative Merlo. Take it out of the record. House Bill 323. Representative Griesheimer."

O'Brien: "Griesheimer doesn't want that called. Hold it. Hold it. He doesn't want that one called."

Speaker Redmond: "Take that out of the record. House Bill 357,"



Maragos; take it out of the record. House Bill 422, Representative Duff in the Chambers. Take it out of the record. House Bill 449, Lundy, will you read the Bill."

O'Brien: "House Bill 449, Lundy, a Bill for an Act to amend . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. House Bill 488, Representative Giorgi."

O'Brien: "House Bill 488, Giorgi . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. House Bill 584."

O'Brien: "House Bill 584, Lundy."

Speaker Redmond: "That out of the record? House Bill . . . 990."

O'Brien: "House Bill 990, Committee on Revenue."

Speaker Redmond: "Chairman . . . Chairman of the Revenue Committee is . . . is not on the floor. Take that one out of the record."

O'Brien: "We got through Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "I would just like to call to the attention to the members that the proceedings on the floor, I believe, are being taped and if we appear on the Roll Call and, subsequently, the tape indicates that we're not here, it may present a rather embarrassing situation. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 990 was called, but in checking my Bill Book, I do not have a copy."

Speaker Redmond: "That's been taken out of the record."

Schlickman: "Well, I would simply suggest that since its on the Calendar at the Order of Second Reading, somebody better be prepared to have that distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "Point is well taken. Representative Bradley."

O'Brien: "Representative Bradley in the chair."

Speaker Bradley: "House Bills, Third Reading. Representative Duff here this morning? Take it out of the record as House Bill 67. Representative Porter here, on House Bill 144, take it out of the record. Representative Kempiners



for House Bill 162. Take it out of the record. Representative Geo-Karis, House Bill 173. Now read it the third time."

O'Brien: "House Bill 173, Geo-Karis, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unemployment Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "ah . . . Thank you Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House . . . ah . . . House Bill 173 amends the Unemployment Compensation Act to provide claimants from whom erroneous payments are to be recouped, the right to a hearing before the commencement of recoupment. It also limits the amount stopped to be recouped to weekly increments no . . . no greater than 50 percent of the adjusted weekly benefit amount. This Bill was necessitated by the hardships encountered by people in our county, who were overpaid by the Unemployment Office erroneously; and then the Unemployment Office would just stop their payments completely, which put these families in a pretty bad shape. So this Bill allows for the recoupment of any overpayments; but it does allow in smaller amounts instead of just cutting them off completely. It does allow the claimant the right to appeal, and if the claimant is wrong, he's got to pay it back little by little; and I ask your respectful consideration in the passage of this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Any discussion? The gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "ah . . . Will Representative Geo-Karis yield to a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "She indicates she will."

Leinenweber: "Representative Geo-Karis . . . ah . . . is there a . . . some kind of a hearing or requirement to show that it . . . that the claimant did not purposely mislead the Compensation Board?"



Geo-Karis: "Yes, if it's shown that it's not . . . it . . . it . . . there's no willful fraud in the . . . upon the claimant, the claimant has no power except to recou . . . to pay back little by little what it was erroneously overpaid to him."

Leinenweber: "Whose burden is it to prove . . . ah . . . willfulness?"

Geo-Karis: "Well, it would be the Commission . . . the . . . ah . . . the Unemployment Office."

Leinenweber: "In other words, if it's disclosed that the recipient is overpaid, then it is up to the Unemployment Office rather than the claimant to prove that it was . . . ah . . . willful or as . . . as opposed to having the claimant prove that it was a mistake?"

Geo-Karis: "Right and there is a penalty . . . ah . . . for willful fraud."

Leinenweber: "Is that already in the Act or is that new?"

Geo-Karis: "ah . . . I don't have the Bill in front of me . . . ah . . . but it is in the Bill as I submitted it."

Leinenweber: "What was the reason for putting the burden on the . . . the Commission rather than on the claimant?"

Geo-Karis: "Because the Commission has erroneously made all the payments in a number of cases and then when it's found out it was erroneous it just . . . thought it was erroneous . . . they just stopped the payment completely and created a great hardship on the claimant; but this . . . under this Bill, if the claimant was overpaid, and the claimant is usually a person who isn't as knowledgeable as people from the Unemployment Office should be, and . . . ah . . . if once it is discovered that the error . . . there was an error in overpayment, then under our Bill the . . . ah . . . claimant will have to repay back the overpayment but will do it in smaller amounts per week. They're not excused from the overpayment; they have to pay it back."



Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Any further discussion? The lady from Lake to close."

Geo-Karis: "I respectfully ask for consideration of a very fair-minded Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is shall House Bill 173 pass? All in favor vote "aye", those oppose vote "no". Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 111 "ayes, 1 voting "no", 2 voting present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 196, Representative Tipword. Pouncey "aye" on 173. On House Bill 220 on Third Reading, Mr. Londrigan?"

Unknown: "Out of the record."

Speaker Bradley: "Take it out of the record. Take 221 out of record also. On House Bill, Third Reading, House Bill 251, Mr. Rayson; 251."

O'Brien: "House Bill 251, Rayson, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson."

Rayson: "ah . . . Mr. Speaker, if you'll take that out of the record, we are waiting for an Amendment . . . ah . . . with regard to some of the comments . . ."

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

O'Brien: "254 is next."

Speaker Bradley: "ah . . . Mr. Rayson, 254? You want this Bill read a third time and, Mr. Rayson?"

Rayson: "All right."

Speaker Bradley: "Read it . . . Read the bill, House Bill . . . ah . . . 254, read it a third time."

O'Brien: "House Bill 254, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson."

Rayson: "ah . . . Mr. Speaker and members of the House, House Bill 254 is a Bill to . . . ah . . . provide for alterna-



tive service for divorce to that of publication. Publication in divorce matters means if a defendant is outside of this state or conceals himself or is unable to be found, one can file a notice in a newspaper for three successive weeks and then a copy can be mailed to his last known address and this could be serviced for dissolution of divorce. . . . ah . . . The United States Supreme Court in the . . . ah . . . Voty versus Connecticut says that not only is the service where a Clerk can send a certified copy of a complaint and summons to the defendant at his last known address, not only is that . . . ah . . . ah . . . good service, but its better service than publication. Now this Bill is attempting to do just that. To allow alternative service by certified copy of de . . . of . . . ah . . . complaint and summons to the defendant at his last known address upon proper affidavit and that this is service for purposes of dissolution for divorce only. And for no other reason; and arises out of the fact that in Cook County, close to 3,000 indigent cases come before the courts and the County of Cook, because of the Voty case, has to pay for these publication fees, which would mean a cost to the County of Cook of maybe \$75 to \$100,000 per year. We think it's a good Bill and . . . ah . . . ah . . . many groups support this Bill and I would urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Any discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, members of the House."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me Mr. Schlickman; could we have a little order, please. Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, members of the House, . . . ah . . . House Bill 254 amends the Civil Practice Act as indicated by the Sponsor; but I do respectfully differ with him in suggesting that the contents of this Bill . . . ah . . . are an alternative . . . ah . . . to service by publication."



I, respectfully, suggest that the contents of this Bill constitute an alternative to personal service . . . ah . . . via a sheriff in a foreign jurisdiction. What I find . . . ah . . . inconsistent . . . ah . . . about the contents of this Bill is that the service of the summons and the complaint through this . . . ah . . . alternative method is by . . . ah . . . certified mail, return receipt requested, . . . ah . . . to be . . . ah . . . initiated by the Clerk; but that the proof of service isn't the return of the receipt showing that the individual has been served, but rather an affidavit by the Clerk that has simply mailed it . . . ah . . . I don't think that that's a . . . ah . . . a good or sound . . . ah . . . presumption . . . ah . . . by which a court gets jurisdiction and is able . . . ah . . . to enter a decree of divorce . . . ah . . . and for these reasons . . . ah . . . I, personally, . . . ah . . . will be voting "no"; and I am hopeful others will also be voting "no" on a Bill that I don't think . . . ah . . . has merit in an area of such critical importance."

Speaker Redmond: "Further discussion? The gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "I like to . . . I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question."

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he'll respond."

Hart: "I . . . I'm sorry I . . . I missed part of the explanation of the Bill . . . ah . . . what . . . what was the need for this Bill, who requested it and what . . . ah . . . ah . . . prompted the . . . ah . . . introduction to this idea."

Rayson: "ah . . . the genesis of the Bill arose from Arthur Young at the Legal Aid Bureau in Chicago. He said that there's some 3,000 indigent divorces, the County of Cook has been paying around 2,100 . . . ah . . . about a 1,000 poor people are being denied . . . ah . . . divorces because they can't pay the \$28 for the publication fee."



So he suggested that we put in a Bill and make it for indigents only because Voty versus Connecticut says it's a denial of due process to . . . ah . . . to deprive a purpose in . . . ah . . . in a divorce for dissolution of . . . of . . . ah . . . of marriage only and that the . . . ah . . . by requiring publication. So in Connecticut they changed the Law to have alternative service, service by certified mail to the defendant on his application, that the defendant is out of state and can't be found and resides elsewhere; and that this copy of the complaint and summons is . . . is . . . is good if not better service than service by publication. So in committee, we thought that it would be best to be applicable to all, not not classify it to indigents; and that's the reason for this alternative service Bill and it's strictly in ramp, strictly for dissolution of decree only and not any incident of divorce, whatsoever, could flow . . . ah . . . by reason of this procedure."

Hart: "Is . . . ah . . . does this apply only to indigents, then?"

Rayson: "Not it's . . . it's an alternative service Bill for anyone on proper application."

Hart: "Any . . . anybody . . . huh?"

Rayson: "Yes."

Hart: "Would it . . . would it be . . . ah . . . just as good if . . . ah . . . if somebody paid the publication? Like . . . like the Public Aid or . . . ?"

Rayson: "ah . . . ah . . . if . . . if one . . . if one exercises his option for publication, that's perfectly all right, too; in fact, that's the same thing."

Speaker Bradley: Further discussion or are you finished with your question . . . ?"

Hart: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The gentleman wish to close?"



Rayson: Well I'd just like to close Mr. Speaker, in response to Representative Schlickman. I think that he feels that the return we seek is an important element for service here, and I share his concern. However, I think we discussed in committee that in many cases there would be no receipt return, some would show he refused to accept a...some might show that he signed the receipt and had, in fact, a...received it. Then the question becomes what kind of service is that and we decided at this point that issue might be left to the courts and we could treat this bill only in the same way as we treat it for publication. Nobody knows, really, if the a defendant ever receives the copy of the complaint after publication. So since the court has suggested very strongly that this is as good, if not better service than service for publication for dissolution of divorce only. That is the purpose for the bill and I would urge a favorable vote.

Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, arise?"

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if the sponsor would yield for a question."

Speaker Bradley: "We are beyond that point, Mr. Dunn, would you, in your explanation of your vote, ask, and possibly he can answer you at that time."

Dunn: "Alright, fine."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is shall House Bill 254 pass, all in favor will signify by voting aye, all opposed by voting no. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sclickman, to explain his vote."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, in explaining my vote, I should like to point out two deficiencies in this bill that have been brought out by the floor discussion. Number one, the sponsor indicated that the purpose of this bill was to satisfy the needs of indigents. There is nothing, there is absolutely nothing in this



bill that limits it, or directs its benefit to the indigent. This bill is available for everybody, whether they're indigents or not. Number two, when the sponsor requests this kind of service with publication, he neglects to point out that there is nothing in this bill that provides that the plaintiff is to state that he doesn't know where the defendant is, that the defendant can't be found, and that's a requirement for service by publication. I think this is a bad bill, its one that will open Pandora's box, and it will lead to a multiplicate of problems, and adversely effect the rights of innocent people in an area that is so critical, an area involving the marital relation, and I think it should be defeated."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative D'Arco, the Gentleman from Cook, to explain his vote."

D'Arco: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this is a good bill, because it will help the indigent because the indigents are included in the category of people who will benefit by this bill. They need to be able to defray the cost of publication and this, as Representative Rayson, has pointed out, is one of the ways to do that, and it is just silly not to vote for this bill. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker to explain my vote, I was present in Judiciary I during all the discussion on this bill. This bill was brought in by Representative Rayson at the request of a group representing indigents and others, and was in response to a U. S. Supreme Court decision, which I have in front of me. Voty against Connecticut. The bill seems so attractive to the members of the committee that they ask that the limitation to indigents be expanded so that it will be applicable to all plaintiffs in divorce proceedings. Moreover, there is an affidavit required of a plaintiff in such a situation before this



alternative form of service can be used. I am convinced that alternative form of service is not only equal to publication, but it is probably superior. We all know that no one reads the Chicago Law Bulletin nor any other newspaper that is used for official publication. This bill, the purpose of this bill was applauded by the lawyers on the Judiciary I Committee. It updates and modifies and reforms our judicial procedure, and in no way, weakens the protection of defendants in divorce situations and I urge that those no votes recognize that and switch to a green so that we may pass this worthwhile bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines, to explain his vote."

Gaines: "I wish to explain my no vote because it says here in the digest that it is personal service and personal service means you have a right to get a judgement against the man and everything else. Whereas, when you try to equate it with publication, you don't, and this was opening Pandora's box. You get all kinds of judgements against a man and you never know a thing about it."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty, to explain his vote."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, members of the House, not all the members of Judiciary I were overly thrilled by this bill. I think that it is a mis-statement. I voted no in committee, I'm voting no. I think the groups that are so concerned with the indigents getting divorced ought to be more concerned with getting them from being employed, and worry about that. I think marriage is an important thing and I don't think we should be so concerned about making it easier to get a divorce, and I'm voting no."

Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook arise?"

Rayson: "A...the County of Cook is for this bill and they ask me to take it out of the record and I would like to take it out of the record at this time."



Speaker Bradley: "I'm sorry, we'll have to put it on Postponed Consideration."

Rayson: "Well, then let's put it on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Bradley: "Put House Bill 254 on Postponed Consideration. On House Bill's Third Reading appears House Bill 291. Representative Houlihan, James Houlihan, 291."

Houlihan: "Take it out of the record."

Speaker Bradley: "On Third Reading, there appears House Bill 301, on Third Reading, Londrigan, take it out of the record. 301 and 302, take them out of the record. On House Bill's Third Reading appears House Bill 330. Mr. VonBoeckman? Take it out of the record. On House Bill 342, on Third Reading, Representative Greisheimer. He wants to read that bill a third time."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 342, a Bill for an Act prohibiting smoking of tobacco in designated areas and providing a penalty for the violation thereof. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hope that this early hour and the desire of all of us to remove ourselves from the glorious Springfield Capitol as soon as possible does not in any way detract from the importance of this Bill. This Bill which was reported out of Executive Committee this last week, 12 ayes, 3 noes and 3 present is a very important Bill, a Bill which was amply discussed a year ago when it passed this House of Representative with more than 89 votes. It's a Bill that gives certain rights to non-smokers which would correspond with the rights of smokers, it does not, and I emphasize not, does not prohibit smoking generally throughout the State of Illinois. It applies to only five given restricted areas in the State of Illinois. Those area's are hospital patient rooms and hospital patient areas, elevators, museums, libraries and auditoriums. And even in this particular



situation, the owner of manager of these areas can designate spots for either smokers or non-smokers. Now if an instance, an owner of this property or manager fails to designate an area for smokers or non-smokers then the law would come into play and would prohibit smoking in these five designated public areas. The punishment or fine for this type of offense would be a \$10 fine and would be enforced by your local enforcement officials or your public health officials. The same law was passed in Nebraska. This is the identical law, two and one half years ago, and it has been enforced there. It is having a beneficial effect on many people who are suffering with lung disease and associated conditions which have some effect because of smoking. The same law was also passed in the State of Arizona, and it is operating well there. It is my understanding that a similar law has been proposed and also, the State of California. The City of New York passed a law approximately a year ago implementing this exact terminology. And I have read newspaper articles where it is being enforced and it is having a beneficial effect for those people who are non-smokers and merely wish to have some area, as is done on airplanes, where you can sit without smoke hindering you. Now we are not trying to make a medical determination of whether smoking is good or bad for your health. What we are trying to do is make a social determination that people that do not smoke should have the same opportunity of being in an area of where there is no smoke as those people who are that are in an area where they wish to smoke. And on this premise we have brought this bill to this point. I feel that since the bill did pass two years ago, and was sent by the House to the Senate, I would certainly ask for your similar support to pass this bill. In last instance, I would like to call your attention to the fact that this bill has had a massive impact upon members of our House.



Two years ago, Victor Arrigo stood before this House pleading for a non-smoker's area because of his emphysema, his lung condition. It was approximately a year ago, that Vic died as a result of this situation. I think that as a bare minimum we have to recognize the right of the non-smokers in the same way as we recognize the right of the smokers to light up and smoke as he pleases. And the only way to do this is to have designated areas within certain places where smokers and non-smokers can go. This bill establishes this as a matter of law, and I feel that it is most necessary in our State and I would urge its passage."

Speaker Bradley: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman. I was going to ask for order, but it has just quieted down a little bit."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield for a couple of questions?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "Do I understand that by your definition of designated area, you would include all patient rooms in all hospitals in the State of Illinois."

Griesheimer: "Within the definition of a designated area, that is correct, but I would point out to you, and this was testified by the representative of the Illinois Lung Association before the Executive Committee, the Director of a hospital would have the authority to designate certain patient rooms or patient areas for the purpose of smoking. As was pointed out, if a patient has terminal lung cancer, there's not much point in telling that individual that he cannot smoke any longer. And the doctor who appeared before Executive stated that he would have no hesitancy under that circumstance to designate that patient's room as a place where he could smoke a cigarette. The only time this bill comes into play is when the owner or manager or director of a parcel of



property fails to exercise the authority to designate areas within the definition of the five areas for smokers and non-smokers."

Schlickman: "What about indoor theatres?" You include within your definition of designated area, indoor theatre, does that mean that in no indoor theatre within the State, there could be smoking after this bill passed? And became law?"

Griesheimer: "No, again the purpose of this bill is again to impose the right for an area for non-smokers within a theatre and the manager of this theatre could designate portions of the theatre for non-smokers and another portion of the theatre for smokers. If he did that, he would be in full compliance with this law. I would point out, though, at the present time, it is my understanding that no smoking is allowed in any theatre in the City of Chicago, and I believe in the County of Cook, so we are not materially changing the law as it presently is. The idea is to impose upon the owners of the theatres or these various parcels of property an obligation to at least designate some area where non-smokers can sit without being bothered by smoke."

Schlickman: "Do I understand, then, that by your bill, as you explained it, you are giving to the managers of hospitals office buildings, indoor theatres, libraries, art museums, concert halls, or transportation companies operating buses, the discretionary authority in determining whether or not there will be designated areas and if they have made that decision, and they may not make that decision, if they have made that decision, if anybody smokes within one of the areas that they have designated, that will then become a criminal offense?"

Griesheimer: "Well I think you'd have to refer to this is a quasi-criminal offense at best. It wouldn't be in the nature of anything more than say, a parking offense in a



which technically it carries some criminality to it, but I don't think anybody has ever really made it a determination that a parking offense as such is a criminal offense. But it does give the authority to owners of property. I think we have to recognize that the owners of property have property rights and we can't just take them away from them without any way of controlling them. They would still have to comply with their local ordinances. This law does not attempt to override ordinances as implemented by any municipality in the State of Illinois. So that even though an owner or a manager of a theatre in Chicago may designate a smokers and non-smokers area, if the City of Chicago has passed a law where they say there shall be no smoking in any theatre then the more restrictive the law or ordinance would prevail."

Schlickman: "Well, under this law, if I managed a hospital, would I be required as the manager of that hospital to designate an area or designate areas where there is not to be smoking, or can I just ignore this bill if it becomes law and do nothing."

Greisheimer: "If the administrator of a hospital does nothing then the entire area where there are patients, in other words, patients rooms and patients areas become non-smoking areas, it is incumbent upon the hospital administrator to actually go forward and designate those particular areas where smokers can smoke cigarettes and, again, in patient areas and in patient rooms. We are not referring to the boiler room in the basement or the nurses area or the doctor's room, or things like this. We are talking about patient areas and patient rooms."

Speaker Bradley: "Further questions? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would the sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Madigan: "Representative Griesheimer, what would be the effect of this bill upon a home rule unit of government such as



the City of Chicago?"

Greisheimer: "We do not have a home rule provision, as such, in this bill. It would, therefore, be my interpretation that a more restrictive provision as passed by a home rule unit would have full application."

Madigan: "Would you be willing to amend this bill with a home rule amendment?"

Greisheimer: "I'm not quite sure what that would accomplish. In other words, we would like to have this have authority to override the terms of the home rule unit. Is that the point of the Speaker?"

Madigan: "What I would propose would be that you amend the bill that provided if the City of Chicago wishes to attempt to solve this problem through its own ordinance process in Chicago, that it could do it without regard to your bill."

Greisheimer: "Well, under the circumstances, I probably would have no objection. The idea is to see that this law does go into effect and if the present speaker feels that this would have a better effect in the City of Chicago, I'm not fully fluent with this area, other than going to a theatre there, yes, I would be willing to move this back to second reading and add that as an amendment."

Madigan: "Representative, do you think we could take this ought of record to examine the bill. Thank you."

Greisheimer: "Yes."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I so move."

Speaker Bradley: "Take it out of the record. On Third Reading there appears House Bill 602 and with leave of the House we will go out of order and move to House Bill 602. Do we have leave? House Bill 602. Mr. Beaupre. Read the bill a third time."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 602. A Bill for an Act to amend sections of an Act in relation to the rate of interest and other charges in connection with sales or credit in



the lending of money. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, of the some 1100 bills."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me, Mr. Beaupre, could we have some order, this is an important piece of legislation."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, of the some 1100 bills that have been introduced into the House of Representatives this session, a goodly percentage of them deal with the economic crises that exists in our country and in our State. Few of them are more important than this bill. Few of them tend to be more misleading to the public as to the effect than this bill. This bill, of course, is for an extension of our increase in the usury rate to 9 and 1/2 percent for an additional 2 and 1/2 years. Last year, we passed a bill similar to this allowing the interest rate on home mortgages in this State to go to a 9 and 1/2 percent limit. If you look very closely at the statistics of what happened in the building industry, of what happened in the mortgage market after the passage of that bill, you will see very clearly the wisdom of that action last year. Illinois, if we fail to pass this legislation, will go to a point where we have the lowest usury limit rate on home mortgage loans in the country. I could only sight to you as an example of the impending disaster, should that happen, our fellow State of Missouri, on our southwestern border. During the first month of this year, it became necessary for the Governor of the State of Missouri to call a special session of the legislation to deal with this problem. At that time, they had the same mortgage interest rate that we would revert to if we failed to pass this legislation. Housing starts in Missouri over the last year and a half have gone on down from 41 percent. Non-residential loans in the State of Missouri have gone up considerably because of their in-



creased percentage as a result of the relationship of home building. Unemployment and construction in Missouri had increased some 17.3 percent. And was about 35% higher than the national level. What I'm suggesting to you is that this Bill has a very significant impact on our State's economy. It is something that we must do, and I think if we look very clearly at the statistics in Illinois that we have increased, since increasing our usury rate to 9 and 1/2 percent, the percentage of housing starts in a significant amount over and above that of other States when you look at the total national average. It is not my intent to go on and on about this measure because I think most of you are familiar with the economics of it. Most of you are familiar with the impact it will have in our society. There are 190,000 construction workers in this State who depend upon this measure to keep their jobs. In the time of economic crises when we must stimulate the economy within our State, I would ask for a favorable roll call."

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

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the extension of the Usury Limitation Law is not a new battle to be fought in this House of Representatives. It seems that we spend an awful lot of time beating our breasts about how we are going to protect the consumer, and in fact, just yesterday, there were a few amendments offered on this Bill that I would have considered, protecting the consumer. And today, we are being asked to give it to the consumer. Give it to him good and hard. Rip him off. We are being asked today to take and change the whole concept that made America strong and that is the concept that money is to be lent at reasonable rates. We are going to prolong the fallacy, that by raising interest rates, some how, people are going to be able to afford to buy a \$30,000 home for \$100,000 worth of interest. And that's what we are talking about. Housing starts aren't



down because there is no money. Nobody ate the money. Nobody sank it in the earth. Nobody sent it to the moon. The money is still here in Illinois, but it is not being lent at reasonable rates. Our children, our neighbors, our people back home are not borrowing money, not because it is not there, but because of the usurious rates that are being charged by these savings and loans and the various lending institutions of this State. Labor is split on this issue. And I know many members on the floor of the House have asked me, what is the position of the A.F.L.C.I.O.? What is the position of the Building Trades Union? The real position, as I may outline, would be this. That we understand the seriousness of the unemployment in the building trades. I personally am a carpenter. I personally am a paid representative of the Carpenters Union. I certainly understand very deeply and concerned with unemployment among the building trade. But at the same time I recognize that this unemployment is because of the high rate, not because there isn't any money. It is because people don't want to pay this amount of money for money when they borrow for long term mortgaging. Now the trend is to turn it around. The trend is that money is going to be available at cheaper rates. Even the President of the United States has said that interest should be paid on checking accounts. Yesterday we pleaded for an amendment to be adopted to this bill that would have insured that your money, the consumers money, that's being held in escrow, that we would get some interest on that amount of money. It was ruled out of order and a very narrow type of ruling. We ask that service points not be adopted....not be considered on top of the usury rate, but to be considered as part of the total cost of borrowing money. Service points should be considered as part of the whole scheme when savings and loans come in and testify that they want



a higher interest rate they say because it costs that much more to administer over and above what they pay, the pass book saver, for their money. Now it doesn't sound reasonable to me that on top of that, they add a service charge. Now labor wants these kinds of protection. Labor wants to remove the sales brokers' commission from the Anti-Trust Law so that competition among real estate people can effectively be competitive. Just like some of the sponsors and the proponents of this measure say money should be in a free market. Why not the sales commission on real estate brokers be in a competitive market instead of being protected under an Anti-Trust Law. Labor wants to protect the consumer. But I predict this to you, labor is not going to take a position as a labor-oriented bill on this measure on your vote. You vote your conscience. I suggest to you that in consideration on how you vote on this bill that you take in mind that I predict one great fallacy. This isn't going, by passage of this bill, this isn't going to be another home built in Illinois, that wouldn't have been built without the extension, there isn't going to be anything else considered in Illinois because of the passage of this bill, because the cost of money is the product of a...a... conspiracy of the banking interests of this State and the savings and loans interests of this State..."

Speaker Bradley: "Would the Gentleman conclude his remarks?"

Hanahan: "I will sir. ...trying to bring about higher interest rates which is completely contrary to what made America strong and the difference between America and many foreign countries, or what made America..."

Speaker Bradley: "For the information of the members, we are using the timer of the debate. Have you concluded Mr. Hanahan? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I rise in support of House Bill 602 and I think it is important that we realize that any action that we take,



that the legislature takes in lifting the usury limitation on the home mortgage field will have no effect on the cost of the money, the interest rate that the borrower pays at the savings and loan at the bank. What does effect the cost of the interest that the borrower pays is the actions of our government, federal and state, through deficit financing and through excessive sales of bonds to finance public works and buildings. And also, the effect of the actions of the Federal Reserve System. However, what we do, what we actually do take in today in raising the limit of interest on real estate mortgages is the fact that the amount of money available to the consumers through our constituents who may desire to build or buy a home, and in fact, the workers who are to build these homes. I would suggest to you that one of the most competitive fields that there is is the savings and loan and the banking field. It is unfortunate that the federal government limits the amount of money that the banks can pay in interest in money to their depositors. We see that through the competition they are forced to compete through the use of giving incentive such as clocks and radios. I, too, would like to see the limit taken off the amount that the banks can pay. But I'd also like to see the limit taken off the amount they charge so that money will be available. Don't forget that effective inflation preys on the banks too, so if you pay 9 and one half percent interest on a 20 year mortgage, don't forget you are going to be paying that mortgage back in 1985 dollars, in 1990 dollars, and 1995 dollars. The banks are locked into this race. This is one of the reasons because of double digit inflation why they are...."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me, could we have some order please?"

Continue Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "This is one of the reasons why they are forced



to curtail the amount of money that they have available at 8 percent mortgages so I suggest to you once again if you want to help the consumer and want to help the consumer who may want to buy or build a home, or may want to work as a carpenter or a plumber in constructing a new home, then let's make money available to the consumer. So I would hope that you would support House Bill 602."

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Chairman, may I address the sponsor?"

Speaker Bradley: "Do you have a question of the sponsor? He indicates he will respond."

Kosinski: "Mr. Sponsor I supported this legislation in the last session, I thought it was good for our industry. I thought it was good for our banks and savings and loan institutions. However, in the rewrite of the bill you have extended the period from a one year period to a two year period with lowering interests rates generally around the country and fluctuating economic stability, I question the extension of time, what is your rationale?"

Leinenweber: "Representative Kosinski, the rationale for extending, actually the extension is for a 2 and one half year period, and there are basically two reasons for that. First of all, contrary to some of the comments that have been made, the usury limit does not set the going rate of lending in the State of Illinois, and while it is, indeed, true that the money market would appear to be in a declining position, that is to say the interest rates tend to be going down as we all know, the prime rate over the last week or so has a...numerous banks in the money market have indicated that the prime rate is going down. There is not necessarily a clear tie to the crime rate in banking and that going rate of mortgage funds. If you will look at this week's Time Magazine, which I think provides some of the more current statistics in regard to mortgage money available in the secondary mortgage



market, you find that the actual lending rate throughout the country, the national average is just something under 9%. While it may be true that over the next few months, that rate may decline somewhat, there is also a great possibility, I believe, that as a result of the federal government going into the bonding market, that the interest rate may tend to increase again. I'll answer your question if you'll give me a chance."

Speaker Bradley: "I think he was satisfied with the answer. Correct?"

Kosinski: "Yes, but one comment Mr. Chairman. Mr. Sponsor, I think you put our bill in jeopardy with that extension of time. There are people in this General Assembly who feel in view of the variables that two years is too long a period. Thank you."

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

Neff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I speak in support of House Bill 602. I think this is one of the most important bills that we have with the economy situation like it is today, and this will help keep the economy going, and certainly the home builder is very important to the economy of this State. And I might like to say at this time, if a person wanted to build a home and wanted to go into any lending institution and borrow money with this maximum interest rate at 9 and 1/2 percent, it is very likely that they wouldn't commit themselves for a loan that is going to be made this summer until thisthey know what they can charge on interest rate. Because I don't think any lending institute could lend the money and come out on it is going at ¹⁵ 8 and 1/2 percent. Now this helps the people we talked about were hurting. This helps the people to get the money and it is the only way they will get the money, is allowing these lending institutions to charge the amount of interest they need. Now we talk about rates. I agree with the remarks that have been made



on the floor that many States do not have any kind of a maximum rate and the supply and demand will always take care of this here as we go. In the past, some of us, a little bit older and too many years ago when the maximum rate was 7%, were borrowing money at 6% and we know that that caused them to get 7%. We know today, that with the maximum rate at 9%, most lending institutions are lending a . . . most of this money is going out at 9%. So this supply and demand, regardless of what we have on the maximum rate, the supply and demand will cause it to seek its own level. Again, I repeat, I think this is important, I commend the sponsor on trying to push this bill along. I think it's important if the public is going to plan on building this summer that they, the lending institutions, know what the rate that they can charge, and I'm sure this is going to help them make a decision and there will be more money loaned out. I think it's slowing up the building industry for the summer right at this time because the lending institutions not knowing what the rate will be after July 1st. Thank you."

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

Berman: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think there is some simple arithmetic that we are avoiding here. Last year, when we passed this bill, the prime rates were 10 and 11%. And we passed that bill to allow 9 and 1/2 percent mortgages. Now the prime rates are around 7, 7 and 1/2 percent. This morning's Sun Times quote the Continental Bank of Chicago reduced its prime rate to 7 and 1/2 percent. If the mortgage industry want a 9 and 1/2 percent mortgage when the prime rates were 10 and 1/2 and 11, they should have no problem living with 8% mortgages when the prime rate is at 7, 7 1/2. I think this is a bad bill. It's a rip off on the consumer, on the entire economy. The industry said that last year if we raise the mortgage rates, there will be more building, more home building,



more purchases of homes. That did not take place. All that happened was that the profit margin of the savings and loans and the lenders went up. The cost to the consumers went up. Now let's get it back down to 8%. Let's do other things to build the economy instead of building the pocket books of the lenders. I'm going to vote no."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Greisheimer."

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

I again, echo the comments of the distinguished speaker who just presented his position on this matter. I do believe that it is a matter of simple arithmetic and I think the arithmetic is that since we increased the usury rate one year ago, there has been more starts on homes than there were the year before, that there has been, in effect, which has been beneficial to the home owners of our State, and more particularly, to those people that are selling their homes that are generally in the laboring and working classes. Now the simple logic to this bill can be stated as follows: The average home loan in our State is only 7 years in length before the home owner sells his home; thus, the concept of the higher interest rate has very little effect when we take into consideration that when we increase the usury rate and therefore allowed higher interest rates by local credit...a...local credit savings and loans and banks, they are not paying any higher monthly payment. They are merely paying over a longer term of the loan. Where the average mortgage was 20 years, approximately 3 or 4 years ago, now they have gone to 30 year mortgages and the average home owner is not feeling any greater impact on his income on a monthly basis than he did before we changed the usury rates, and as the average home is sold in the 7 years, there is no practical effect upon the home owner. I assure you that these usury rates are most necessary. Do not be clouded by the prime interest



rate. That is something that can change in a minute and Illinois must continue its competitive status in the mortgage market. We do not want to go down to the position we were originally in when we were tied as the lowest maximum usury rate in the United States. We almost put many people out of work. And to the distinguished Representative from McHenry County, I would point out to him that I have received numerous letters from the electricians and the electricians union saying please support this bill we are in dire need of it. Do not allow the laboring tradesmen to be put out of work by the people of the A.F.L.C.I.O. who do not understand our problem and I would urge the passage of this bill."

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

Lundy: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I will not attempt to address the economics of this bill. I'm not an economist, I'm not a mortgage banker, I'm not a real estate man. Although I noticed that most of the pressure for this bill is coming from those industries and not from the consumers of home mortgage loans. What I will address is a commitment which I believe this General Assembly made to home buyers when we enacted the one year, I repeat one year, temporary increase in the usury limitation in this State. That commitment was that after that one year period of crises, persons who took home mortgage loans during that one year period of higher interest rates would be able to renegotiate those loans at lower interest rates when the rates came back down to the 8% that existed prior to the temporary increase. Now I have received letters from my constituents who took home mortgage loans on that assurance, on the assurance that not only could there be no pre-payment penalties as this General Assembly required when it enacted that temporary rate increase, but the temporary increase would only last for



a year and after that one year period they would be able to renegotiate their loans at a lower interest rate. If we extend the higher interest rate for another two years as is being proposed here, we will have broken that commitment to the home buyers in this State of Illinois who took loans during the interim period at the higher rate on the understanding that they would be able to renegotiate those loans without penalty after July 1 of 1975. I urge a no vote on this bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Randolph."

Randolph: "Mr. Speaker I now move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The previous question has been moved, all those in favor say aye, opposed no, the ayes have it, the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre, to close."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the simple arithmetic of the matter is, as mentioned by several speakers, that even the prime rate, even the prime rate today, is no more than 3 quarters of a percentage point away from the usury limit that we will be reverting to if we do not pass this bill. The simple arithmetic of the matter is that during the first six months of 1973, when we had the 8% rate in effect in Illinois, our percentage in Illinois of total U. S. housing starts declined some 11.7%. After we increased the usury limit to 9 1/2 percent, during the second six months of 1973; we increased our percentage of the national housing start market by some 8.6 percent. What I'm suggesting to you is that what we did a year ago was right. What we did a year ago was for the benefit of all the people of this State for the benefit of our economy, for the benefit of seeing that our money did not flow to other States. This is a necessary bill to deal with the current economic crises, I ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is shall House Bill 602 pass,



all in favor will signify by voting aye, all opposed by voting no. Mr. McGrew to explain his vote.."

McGrew: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, as a realtor of a year and a half now, I rise to support House Bill 602. Frankly, as has been pointed out, the alternative is not to get home loans. Shortly, the federal government is going to get in business expansion projects that will take several billion dollars out of the money market. Now that's got to come from somewhere. If the rates do not be allowed to go up, they simply will begin to say we've got to have 30% down, 40% down, and in some cases, if you are in the wrong area, 60% down. I think it is an absolute necessity that we pass this bill and I urge an aye vote. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines, to explain his vote. "

Gaines: "I want to explain my no vote. I've been attending quite a few meetings in my district about abandoned homes. And one of the main reasons that these homes are abandoned is the lack of equity by the buyer. And one of the reasons for this lack of equity is the higher interest rates. That means more money goes toward the interest and less towards the principle. So when an owner finds himself in a bind, he just walks away, and that's one of the reasons I'm voting no."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, to explain his vote."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Notwithstanding the superior sponsorship of this bill and all of the fine and misguided legislators who have spoken for it, it is a very bad bill. But I fear that it will sail right through here and pass notwithstanding the present status of the total board. And the reason that will be, I fear, is that the money people have outsmarted the organized labor and they have too large a segment of



the latter out pimping for higher interest rates. Now in this particular situation a year ago, you were told all the nations ills to raise it. It was emphasized that it was only for a year. Many of you have moaned about that, but you should have known better, because there is more intellectual honesty in this bill than there was in that. There's 2 1/2....there's a year and a half more intellectual honesty. But if they really stated their position, they would say we are against usury entirely and just take it off the books. Most of the advocates of this would say usury is a bad thing, but when that day comes, ladies and gentlemen, the people of Illinois will have to look elsewhere than the legislature to protect the needy from the greedy. The bankers in this State have long had the discredited goal of high taxes. That Arthur Burns is their idol. And he solved all of the nation's problems, stalled us into a depression by raising the interest rates again and again beyond the reach of the house and home builders of this nation. There is an alternative, and the alternative is called government, and government puts its hand upon the shoulders of those that have the money and says you'll make it available, that to be homes for the people of Illinois and people throughout this United States of America, and you don't have to raise the profits of the B & L's any higher to serve your constituents. I hope that there will be enough of you to stand up and be counted and this bill can be defeated."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, to explain his vote."

Barnes: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, and members of the House, I think what we have before us is a bill that is going in the opposite direction from the economy in itself. As one of the former speakers said, the prime interest rate has been going down, and I have before me today's copy of the Chicago Tribune and its financial



and on...at the bottom of the financial page of today in the Chicago Tribune is a small article that states that for the sixth...for the sixth time, since October, the Federal Home Loan and Bank of Chicago, has received a reduction in the interest rates to them. I think based upon that kind of action and the action that the prime interest rate in itself has been going down drastically in the last few weeks, in the last month, to extend the usury now at 9 1/2 percent for a 2 1/2 year period is running counter to the economy in itself. I think what we say at large here is that if we raise the usury for one year trial period, and then go back and take a look at it, based upon the economy at the time, that that was a sound idea, but to now come in when the economy is beginning to stabilize itself and to come in with the same 9 1/2 percent proposal and extend the period of time for a 2 1/2 year period, I think it is counter to everything that we had promised the people of this State that we would do a year ago. I think we should keep our word with our constituents. If this bill in itself were saying that we would extend this for six months or a one year period, fine, I would be able to take a look at it and think on it favorably. But if we are saying for 2 1/2 years, we are going to allow someone, someone, to clean up on the housing market, I think we should not allow that from here, and until that change is made, I will vote present and if it is not made, I will have to vote no."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, to explain his vote. "

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a year ago, this General Assembly, as we all know, put us in the dilemma that we are in today. The reason for the action that was taken was to alleviate an emergency situation and to provide temporary relief. As a candidate for the House of Representatives in the Illinois General



Assembly. I addressed myself to the issue of the usury rate and indicated to my constituents that I was unhappy about the raising of the interest ceiling, but that I would vote to extend the usury rate ceiling if, at the time I was called upon to vote, there was no other way to go. And if I had to do that, I would do so reluctantly. Now it is one year later, interest rates have gone down, and there is another way to go. We have a bill before us that extends the usury rate for 2 1/2 years. There is no need to extend the usury rate for 2 1/2 years. If we have to extend this, if we have to continue temporary relief, if we consider ourselves still in the state of emergency, one year will do just fine. So there is another way to go. There is a better way to go and I cannot support extension of the usury rate ceiling at 9 1/2 percent at this time for 2 1/2 more years. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Hanahan. "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to make something very clear. Housing starts are down in Ohio. Housing starts are down in California. Housing starts are down in Wisconsin, and housing starts are down in every State in the Union. I don't know who's kidding who here, that says that somehow by raising interest rates, we are going to have better housing starts. It's a phony issue. It just don't add up. And we are not benefiting the consumer with this bill, we are benefiting, and let's put it right where it belongs, we are benefiting the money lenders. Don't kid yourself that you are doing something for some poor consumer, today. You are doing something for some money lender, and you ought to be ashamed of yourself in extending a temporary rule for 2 1/2 years. I suggest to the sponsor of the bill that if it does not get 89 votes, that possibly, you accept some of the amendments that we offered yesterday, in good



faith. And no trade unionist in this State asked for a 2 1/2 year extension. The maximum I ever heard from any union official in any trade was a year and a half. So let's not be hidin' behind some false facts here. If we are going to be extending the usury rate, let's extend it for a year and a half. Keep the votes under 89, maybe the sponsor will accept some amendments that will make it a lot more palatable after his vote fails."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain, to explain his vote."

McClain: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to reiterate Representative Berman and Representative Hanahan. I'd urge you to keep the vote under 89 votes. There are just too many inequities in the present law dealing with the usury rate, let's clean it up a little bit, let's remove the finance charges for refinancing. Let's remove the point system, and let's make it a clean usury rate, whether its 9 1/2, or ceiler, or whatever, but let's clean it up. Let's make the industry not...a...let's make the industry accountable to the consumer and not promote this ripoff. I'd urge you to keep this under 89 votes. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leon."

Leon: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I strongly urge a green vote...a green light on this roll call. The statistics are that the State of Illinois is the only State, an island, of the other States in the union that have a higher rate of interest on home mortgages. If we defeat this bill today, and in all probability the mortgage money that is available in the so called red lining area is going to disappear. If you have any concern for homes, purchases, and home builders, you will vote yes on this very important bill, it has been exposed and endorsed editorially by our newspapers. I feel that this bill is very important for the general public of Illinois and the interest rates on home mortgages will only be reflected by the money market, and if the money market is



eased as it now is, interest on mortgages will be reduced. If it increases we will have the ceiling of 9 1/2 percent so that we will know that there will be no home mortgages for more than 9 1/2 percent in the next 2 1/2 years. We are at the present time faced with a tremendous impact on the money market by the federal government in the State of Illinois. With all their bonds, The builders and bankers have told me that in the foreseeable future, it is possible that the prime rate will get as high as 15%. If that happens, you will rue the day that you did not vote yes on this very important bill. I vote yes."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I am very confused on this issue.

A previous speaker, the sponsor of the bill, said that it was a matter of simple arithmetic that we should vote for this. I see no simple arithmetic. I hold in my hand the latest statistics that I can find from the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation which indicates that the average costs of borrowing funds in the State of Illinois for federal savings and loan associations during the first half of 1974, was 5.97 percent. This publication also indicates that the interest returned on mortgages, the average interest return on mortgages, was 7.17 percent. And that's a 1.2 percentage point spread on the average, which is sufficient for savings and loan associations to be profitable if it is a deficient institution. Later data indicates that the average cost of funds is higher. For the last quarter of 1974, the average cost of funds was 6.23 percent. Now we have no information from the State regulatory agency at this time, and reportedly, they can't even come up with the information. I don't know what this means, but I do know that there are questions that aren't answered. And quite frankly, I would be very,

well, I would be willing to follow wherever the facts

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



would take me if any one can produce the facts. But right now, we don't know what they are, and I think there is sufficient doubt that I think I'm going to vote present at this time, and hopefully, the sponsor will withdraw the bill and come back after Easter vacation, after I can have read a memo that the savings and loan lobbyists will have prepared and maybe we can figure out who's telling the truth and who's not."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder, to explain his vote."

Schraeder: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and members of the House.

Apparently, most of the yellow lights, those voting present, seem to be confused as to the stand made by most labor unions in the State of Illinois. And as late as last week, I contacted my local labor affiliates, the building trades, constructions, and those in related areas of manufacturing, and they pointed out to me very strongly something that I think should be brought out. My community happens to be one of the most prosperous in the State of Illinois and I thank the Lord for that. And I believe, basically, it is because we do have good construction going on in my community. The trades have been employed. There is very little unemployment, and I think it is basically because when the trades are working, the community is working and you have a good economy. And I would like to say this, when we passed this legislation on the usury at the last session, the 78th General Assembly, it was unanimously agreed that this was a necessity. In my community it proved most fruitful. It is proving fruitful at this present time, and I would hate to see that we would not come up with the 89 votes to extend this. And I would like to say that, at this point, none of the savings and loan in my community have contacted me on this so this is not a savings and loan bill, it is a labor organization bill. They believe in it. And if the question now exists in Representative Hanahan's mind as to term of office...as

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
to term of usury, of a year and a half, that can be
STATE OF ILLINOIS



rejected in the Senate and reduced, and I would say that labor does support it and it is certainly getting mine."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Freidrich: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I can't help but feel that there is a lack of understanding among many of the members here and I think I'd like to explain my vote by telling you what really goes on in this area, in the Centralia area. Number one, the building and loans are paying 7 3/4's percent on a four year certificate. Which means they are locked in for four years. Now one of the members said that 1 1/2 percent was adequate, which there is no way in the world you can pay 7 3/4's on a certificate and make an 8 percent loan, and there is just no way you can do it. In fact, the Federal Bank Examiners require, when you borrow on a savings certificate, you charge at least 2 percent more than the certificate earned, which means if its a 7 percent certificate, you have to charge 9. The other thing I want to tell you is that in our area it is not the practice to charge a number of points. We charge strictly the closing costs. We have a number of loans at 8 1/2 percent we are making now and we are making some at nine. We are not making any at 9 1/2. All of our loans are direct deduction loans, which means that any day...any time you can get a better deal, you walk in and pay it off. But I can tell you that competition controls the money market. We don't have to make loans in Illinois, we can buy loans from States that make higher rates of interest and I can tell...."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre, rise?"

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to put this on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Bradley: "Postponed Consideration, does he have leave? Leave granted. Postponed Consideration. We'll go back to House Bill 342, which was taken out of the record. Its been read a third time. The Clerk will read a third time,

House Bill 342. GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



O'Brien: "House Bill 342, a Bill for an Act prohibiting smoking of tobacco in designated areas. Third Reading of the Bill.

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House . . . ah . . . this Bill . . . ah . . . is the Non-smokers Bill that was just up a few moments ago. I believe I explained it in some considerable detail at that time and there was a request made upon me by Mr. Madigan to . . . ah . . . take it out of the record for the purpose of an amendment. I wonder if it would be appropriate this time to yield to Mr. Madigan."

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

Madigan: "hmmmm . . . Mr. Speaker and members of the House, our conferences with Representative Griesheimer has solved the problem, which was raised previously. I, myself, will . . . ah . . . vote "aye" for the passage of the Bill; and I would recommend its passage."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer, to close the debate."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I have previously gone through this, I would just, merely, remind you that this is the so called Non-smokers Bill of Rights Bill, which merely gives the right to establish certain minimal designated areas in the State of Illinois for non-smokers, which again includes libraries, patient rooms, auditoriums, elevators and public buses and also gives the authority to the owners to designate areas for smokers within these designated areas so that its not absolute prohibition. I hope that we have not lost any of your knowledge or enthusiasm for this bill in the delay here and would urge its passage."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is shall House Bill 342 pass? All in favor vote "aye", those oppose vote "no". Have all voted who wish? The lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you arise."

Geo-Karis: "ah



this House . . . ah . . . whether people smoke or not, to explain my vote, we're not affecting them. I think this is a very good Bill and if we . . . I really, respectfully, urge another three votes up there because I, myself, don't like to visit people in the hospital and have other people smoking around them when they're sick. And this is one of the main purposes of the Bill and I certainly hope you get three more votes up here, thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer, to explain his vote."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I will not explain my vote, thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, to explain his vote."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I . . . ah . . . am a non smoker and I was a great dear friend of Victor Arrigo's and we were seat mates for a long, long time in this House and we're all aware of what happened to Vic, but that does not indicate that this Bill will forestall or prevent what happened to our dear friend Vic . . . ah . . . in any fashion. Now during the committee hearing on this Bill, it was brought out by one of the witnesses, who was a . . . ah . . . ah . . . a worker or a representative of the Veterans Hospital, Hines Veterans Hospital, that who testified for the Bill that they allow smokers to smoke along with non-smokers in the wards of that hospital. Yet, here's a man that testified for the Bill. The thing that's really drastically wrong with the Bill, and I agree with the the substance of it, is the fact that it cannot be enforced. There is no way that you can expect the police departments of every municipality, city village and county in this State to place a police officer in every theatre, every public auditorium, . . . ah . . . every concert hall in order to enforce the Bill. Now if it is not enforceable, then it should not pass. Now the . . .



the . . . the sponsor even indicated that in Committee that there's no way that this bill can be enforced and the fine of \$10 to \$100 would just clog up the courts and certainly would not do anything to prevent . . . ah . . . smokers from smoking in the presence of non-smokers. This idea, I am sure, can be accomplished by local ordinances in a greater . . . ah . . . ah . . . fashion than it can be by passing a State law. So, because of its non-enforcement procedures, I . . . I'm gonna vote 'no' on the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt, to explain his vote."

Bluthardt: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as a chain cigar smoker, I want to explain my 'no' vote. ah . . . the last speaker spoke . . . ah . . . on this subject along the lines that I'm thinking and that is, how are we to enforce this. Well, certainly it can be enforced because what we'll do in order to enforce it is deputize every doctor, nurse, airline stewardess, elevator operation and what have you; give them all citation books so they can issue the smoking tickets to those who are violating. I think it's a bad Bill, I think it's unenforceable. I think it ought to be defeated."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone, to explain his vote."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I speak as . . . as a person who has blown as much foul smoke in other peoples noses as anyone in this House. I was a smoker for many, many years. For several years I have not been smoking because I was a coward and didn't want to die from cancer. But I don't see why we . . . ah . . . a Bill like this would hurt anyone. I think that . . . ah . . . most smokers are polite people, they're just not thoughtful, and if we have no smoking areas and . . . ah . . . someone in that area calls to this smoker's attention the fact that it is a 'no smoking area', I believe that the smokers being, normally, polite people, would put out their smoke. And there are



people that have to be certain places that they cannot stand to smoke, just like Victor Arrigo was and and our friend, Doctor Douglas, and there's no reason why an unthoughtful person should be allowed to puff smoke into . . . ah . . . the air where people that cannot breathe it have to breathe it. I think this is a good bill. It can be enforced if its necessary and I think we should vote for it."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, to explain his vote."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in explaining my present vote, . . . ah . . . I attempted to get the . . . ah . . . attention of the Speaker of the House in order to raise a question of the Sponsor. I was not able to get the attention of the House and so maybe the Sponsor would be gracious enough through an explanation of his vote to explain to me whether or not the failure of an owner to so designate an area of smoking or non smoking has the implication that it is non-smoking. If I could get that explanation then I may be inclined to change my vote. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Griesheimer, to explain his vote."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my vote, I'll try to address myself to this question. The way this bill is set up is that it sets out five areas where there shall be no smoking. Those are non smoking areas. If the owner or manager of those places fails to designate smoking areas within these designated areas, then there shall be no smoking in them, whatsoever. They are minimal areas, though. I would point out to you, for instance, in the City of Chicago, everyone of them are already controlled by city ordinance and smoking is prohibited in these five areas already. So we're not doing anything new for the City of Chicago but we are giving the authority in areas that do not have

ordinances, the authority to an owner or manager to designate

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



nate areas where people can smoke and where people will not smoke, even within these designated areas. We are not infringing upon the property rights, whatsoever."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 99 yesses, 31 nos, 20 voting present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Is Representative Hirschfeld on the floor? On House Bills Third Reading, there appears House Bill 425, Mr. Lundy."

Selcke: "House Bill 425, an act to add Section 9.1 to the Nursing Home, Shelter Care Homes and Homes for Aged Act. Third reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 425 is a Bill to require . . . ah . . . licensed long term care facilities in the State of Illinois to file annually with the Department of Public Health, a financial statement . . . ah . . . setting out their receipts and expenditures. . . . ah . . . Its a Bill which simply enacts for those facilities a requirement which is already in effect for other health care providers . . . ah . . . it seems particularly appropriate for this class of health care providers because some 85 percent of the residents in long term care facilities are State-subsidized . . . ah . . . and it seems, therefore, appropriate for the Department of Public Health . . . ah . . . to know . . . ah . . . something about the finances of these health care providers as it already does in the case of hospitals, ambulatory surgical centers and so forth. . . . ah . . . The Bill does not create a great burden on the homes. They are already required to submit financial statements to the Federal Department of HEW if they receive Medicare funds . . . ah . . . and in any case, whatever costs are generated by this requirement will be reimbursable costs and, therefore, would be reflected in



their charges to the State and in the amount that they pay to these homes . . . ah . . . for care of the State-subsidized residents. I would be glad to respond to any questions. Again, I point out that . . . ah . . . this is a requirement which will be in effect on July 1, 1976, anyway under Federal Law. As of July 1, '76, everyone of these extended care facilities will have to file financial statements with the State anyway and so all this Bill does really is to accelerate the filing by about a year's time. I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion. The gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Kempiners: "ah . . . Joe, is there any limitation on the number of times within any period of time that the Department could ask for a financial statement from any of these homes?"

Lundy: "No."

Kempiners: "ah . . . Mr. Speaker, I'd like to not speak against the Bill, but speak against . . . ah . . . a handicap in the Bill that I can see."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Kempiners: "Thank you, we all know that sometimes Government is insensitive to the daily operation of business and of . . . of individuals. I believe that what Representative Lundy is doing is correct when State moneys and Federal moneys are involved. I believe we do have a right to see that those moneys are spent adequately and carefully on behalf of the people . . . ah . . . that they're contributed for. However, I sincerely believe that ought to be a limitation on government put into this Bill. For example, that the Department can request the statements no more often than



a month or once every other month. I could see where the administrative personnel in this home could spend more time working on paper than . . . than . . . than by delivering the services which these State and Federal funds are going to be paying for; and I would hope that the . . . the sponsor of this Bill, if it does pass, will consider an amendment in the Senate to this effect: putting a limitation on the number of requests that the . . . ah . . . the Department of Public Health could make for this type of information."

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

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. . . . ah . . . Will the gentleman yield?"

Lundy: "Yes."

McClain: "Yeah? I asked if the gentleman would yield . . . ah."

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will, I'm sorry."

McClain: "No, that's all right, I mean, I just didn't know what to there . . . ah . . . Joe, it is true that the long care . . . ah . . . facility . . . ah . . . industry is against this Bill, is that correct?"

Lundy: "A witness did appear on behalf of the . . . ah . . . Illinois Association of Nursing Homes and said that they were against the Bill, yes."

McClain: "Also, is it not true that . . . ah . . . in the Bill . . . ah . . . although it does not require a certified audit . . . ah . . . the Department could . . . ah . . . require certified audit, which means . . . ah . . . a substantially more money for nursing care homes, homes in the State. Is that correct? It doesn't restrict the Department from asking or requesting a certified audit?"

Lundy: "Well, no, it doesn't restrict the Department from requesting a certified audit, but neither does it give the Department the authority to request a certified audit. It says an audited financial statement. That doesn't mean it has to be a certified statement. ah . . . I have ab-



solutely no doubt that the Department tried to require the audits to be certified and the industry thought that that was placed an unreasonable financial burden on the industry, that they would refuse to comply with it unless the Department would take them to court. It does . . . the Bill in its present form, does not say certified audit."

McClain: "O.K., thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Speaker, oh there, . . . ah . . . Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House, I'm going to give you a little case history. ah . . . At the pro to this particular Bill. We had a Nursing Home Bill to my community, that it was necessary . . . ah . . . after several months of very hard fighting to get a new . . . ah . . . ah . . . director to the . . . would comply with the rules and regulations. We had to even force a hearing in my community on this particular nursing home. They were . . . they're a stock-owned company. They also own the nursing home here and other parts of the State of Illinois. More and more, we're coming to a point where corporate . . . ah . . . handling of nursing homes is the way of life. Now this particular nursing home is trying to make a good show on their financial records to the stockholders. We . . . we finally forced in the hearing to put on 27 . . . 27 more employees to comply with the rules, 27. They had for . . . for example, for 52 incompetent old people one, one floor of this particular nursing home, they had two people on the floor to take care of . . . of first shift, to take care of 52 incompetent old people. Now a financial and audit, such as required here, will help the Department to be able to analyze and find out and check to see if this is more for the benefit of the stockholder than it is for the care of the old, and the people that are helpless. They are laying right at this minute in some of our . . . in many of our nursing homes in this State. Now, I think this is the information that is vital to the needs and the responsibilities



we have towards our old people in these nursing homes, shelter care homes, and I certainly support this bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I sat on the committee when this bill was heard, and the testimony was made by the . . . ah . . . opponent that testified that 75 percent of the income from these homes comes from public funds and it seems to me that since we are using public funds, it re . . . that we should do what the Federal Government is going to do in a year, require an accounting of these institutions; and I would urge everyone to support this Legislation."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman to close, Mr. Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. That to respond, briefly, to the . . . ah . . . comments of the gentleman from Will, I would say that the way the Bill is worded, the presumption clearly is that all that the Department will require is an annual financial statement. In exceptional cases, the Department is authorized to ask for statements more often than that, but it certainly is not the intent of the Bill, and I would be happy to clarify that . . . ah . . . in the Senate if its necessary, although, I don't think it is, that the Department be able to request statements . . . ah . . . so often that they would be able to harrass the . . . ah . . . licensees. The presumption is that its an annual statement, if there are extraordinary circumstances, such as a change of ownership or or what not where an additional statement might be justified, then it would be authorized, but . . . ah . . . its not the purpose of the bill to authorize the Department to be asking for weekly financial statements from licensees. ah . . . House Bill 425, I think, will be an invaluable tool . . . ah . . . in . . . ah . . . carrying out this Legislature's intent that the Department of Public Health,



effectively regulate the quality of care provided in licensed long term care facilities into line with the . . . ah . . . practice that now applies to hospitals and other health care providers and I urge your favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is shall House Bill 425 pass? All in fi . . . favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Barnes 'aye', Bradley 'aye'. The gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, to explain his vote."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief. Again, I'm not voting against this Bill because I disagree with the concept of the . . . an accountability of the use of public funds; but I don't make any presumptions that is not written into law. I think there . . . there ought to be specified in this Bill, probably exactly what Mr. Lundy said in answering my remarks, that they are not to require the submission of these reports more than one a year. I'd even go, you know, four times a year. I have no problem with that, but I want it specified in there . . . ah . . . I don't presume that a bureaucrat sitting in the Department of Public Health is gonna sit there and say, well, this is what the author intended. I've handled legislation before and worked with it, where once the bureaucrats got their hands on it, they did entirely the reverse of what we intended in the legislation. My complaint is that it is not specified in black and white what is intended by this legislation, therefore, I regret that I am voting 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, to explain his vote."

Deuster: "an . . . Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my vote, I'm a little concerned any time that we require an audited financial statement . . . ah . . . not only annually or more often because I know."



I've been delaing with . . . ah . . . some small businessmen . . . ah . . . grain dealers, for example, . . . ah . . . I had one case where a grain dealer, just a small firm and feed store said it cost a \$2,000 to produce an audited financial statement. Now, when we're calling upon people to . . . to provide something that is audited, I guess that means by a certified public accountant and, if it could be more often than once a year, it could be a tremendous financial burden and concern and I'm, I'm not a member of the Committee, so I don't know whether testimony was rendered on how much money this would cost, what the cost might be. Perhaps the sponsor, if he hasn't explained his vote, might be able to respond to that. But I'm certainly concerned, based on my experience with business operations, when the government tells them they have to have an audited financial statement with the immense cost, of course, would be conveyed on, and relayed on . . . ah . . . to those who receive the services of the institution or the business, whatever it might be, in this case it's the nursing home."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 'ayes', 30 'nos', 8 voting 'present'. This bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. With leave of the House we'll go . . . To what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, arise?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce a young man, who is standing next to me on the Floor, Mr. Roberto Valdez from Nicaragua. Roberto is an open-door exchange student living in the town of Benton for approximately five months, and he's here today serving as an honorary page. He's down in the district which is represented by Representatives Hart, Choate and Winchester. He's right next to me and I'd like to introduce him."

Speaker Bradley: "With leave of the House, we'll go to messages from the Senate."



Selcke: "Messages from the Senate, Mr. Wright, secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate's adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution and the adoption, which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit'. Senate Joint Resolution Number 25. Resolved by Senate of the 79th General Assembly in the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein, that when the Senate adjourns on Wednesday, March 26, 1975, it stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 8, 1975 at 12:00 noon and when the House of Representatives adjourns on Wednesday, March 26, 1975, it stand adjourned until Monday, March 31, 1975 at 2:30 p.m. and when it adjourns on that day it stand adjourned until Monday, April 7, 1975 at 2:30 p.m. and . . . and when it adjourns . . ."

Speaker Bradley: "This is the Adjournment Resolution, gentlemen."

Selcke: ". . . and when it adjourns on that day its stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 8, 1975 at 12:00 noon Central Daylight Saving Time."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you've heard the Adjournment Resolution."

Selcke: "Yeah."

Shea: "It says when we adjourn today, we will adjourn until Monday, March 31, which will be a Perfunctory Session. We will then adjourn until Monday, April the 7th, which will be a Perfunctory Session and will re . . . will return on Tuesday, April the 8th, at 12:00 noon for Regular Session. You have the schedule or the tentative schedule for April on your desk. Mr. Speaker, I would move that we do now adopt the Adjournment Resolution."

Speaker Bradley: "All those in favor of adopting the Adjournment Resolution say 'aye', those oppose . . . the 'ayes' have it. Its adopted. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg, arise?"

Grotberg: "ah . . . On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



Speaker Bradley: "State your point, sir."

Grotberg: "My point is that the day after tomorrow Adeline Geo-Karis becomes a birthday celebrant and in the fact that we have discontinued the practice of birthday celebrations, I have made a commitment to Mrs. Geo-Karis that I will not sing to her and it has made her very frustrated; but I have assured her that each member of this House will today before we go . . ."

Speaker Bradley: "I think you're out of order, sir."

Grotberg: "Thank you, and . . ."

Speaker Bradley: ". . . I . . . I only guarantee to her that each of us will go down and sing to her privately, today, and wish her well on her . . . ah . . . ah . . . 25th birthday."

Grotberg: "Well, we certainly all appreciate that."

Speaker Bradley: "We're going to continue the Third Reading, so . . . ah . . . the lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, thank you, Mr. Grotberg, thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen; and I do want you to sing me happy birthday in spite of Joe Ebbesen's miserable resolution."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Knox, Mr. McGrew, arise?"

McGrew: "ah . . . Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I'd like to move to table a House Resolution and a Bill of which I am a chief sponsor. ah . . . its House . . ."

Unknown: "What's the number?"

McGrew: "House Bill 839 and House Resolution 126."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the gentlemen have leave? Vote, so ordered."

McGrew: "Thank you."

Selcke: "839 and 12 . . . and House Resolution 126."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the gentlemen from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk, arise?"

Tuerk: "ah . . . Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I'd like



to table House Bill 469 . . ."

Selcke: "I called them up and they're making them."

Speaker Bradley: "Are you the principal sponsor?"

Tuerk: "I am."

Speaker Bradley: "So move. Does the gentleman have leave to table--what was the number again, Representative Tuerk?"

Tuerk: "4 . . . 469."

Speaker Bradley: "Does he have leave to table House Bill 469? 469, leave, so move it. On the calendar on Third Reading appears House Bill 433, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy. 433 . . ."

Selcke: "House Bill . . . o.k. . . ."

Speaker Bradley: ". . . it will be read . . . read a third time."

Selcke: "House Bill 433, a bill for an act to amend Section 15 of an act codifying the power and duties of Department of Mental Health and support, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 433 is an attempt to clarify the existing ah . . . Mental Health Code, which now authorizes the Department to place discharged State mental hospital patients in a licensed . . . ah . . . sheltered care facility. Now the reason the law needs to be clarified is that . . . ah . . . a dispute has arisen as to the status of a sheltered care facility, whose license has been suspended or revoked by a local . . . ah . . . licensing agency, but who has . . . ah . . . filed an action for Administrative Review . . . ah . . . and what this bill would do, is simply make clear that during dependency of that Administrative Review Action, the Department is to temporarily suspend placing new patients in that facility until such time as . . . ah . . . the Administrative Review Action is completed. ah . . . It would not require the relocation of any patients already placed in that facility. And on Second Reading in response to . . ."



ah . . . some comments that were made in the committee, the bill was amended. And so . . . ah . . . I'd ask you to correct your description of the bill in the Digest. The word 'suspended' was deleted from the bill, so that now it will present placement of discharged patients only in in sheltered care facilities whose licenses have been revoked by the local authorities, not those which have been suspended. The reason for that is that . . . ah . . . suspensions are often done on a short-notice basis without an opportunity for the licensee to to . . . ah . . . have a . . . a hearing. Revocations, on the other hand, normally are accompanied by due process protections, which permit the licensee to . . . ah . . . make its case and they also are normally not done without due deliberation by the licensing agency. ah . . . As I say, it simply clarifies the Legislative intent. No . . . No one appeared in opposition to the bill . . . ah . . . when it was heard in the committee and the . . . as the bill has been amended on Second Reading, I know there's no opposition to it. I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber. The gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Yes, will the Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Grotberg: "ah . . . Representative Lundy, . . . ah . . . having heard this bill in committee, I am now reminded, do you say that it now applies only to those . . . ah . . . places whose licenses are revoked, is that correct, not suspended?"

Lundy: "Well, more . . . more accurately, Representative Grotberg, it applies to facilities whose licenses have been revoked or not renewed, but it does not . . . it does not apply to facilities whose licenses have been suspended, that's right."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Grotberg: "O'kay. Then it becomes . . . is it or is it not a mood question? There's no possible way to refer a patient to ah . . . ah . . . an outfit that's out of business by virtue of their revocation or non-renewable of licenses? Am I correct?"

Lundy: "I don't understand the question."

Grotberg: "Well, you can't run a shop without a license. Now, how do they get . . . are we currently sending . . . ah . . . referring patients to institutions that have no licenses?"

Lundy: "If those licensees or former licensees have filed an administrative review action relating to the license revocation or refusal of the local licensing authority to renew, the Department has taken the position, the Director took a position in a letter to me, that as far as the Department was concerned, that wasn't a valid revocation, as long as an administrative review action was pending. I wrote back to him and said I don't think that was the Legislature's intention when we've said you can only place in licensed facilities, and I will introduce a Bill to clarify that ambiguity in that existing law. And the Department did not appear to oppose the Bill when it was heard."

Grotberg: "I remember that. Well, Mr. Speaker, then may I address the Bill. Ah . . . as I understand the nature of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it helps to clarify the role of some of the nursing home experiences that we have had in other institutions that we have had, where the scandal comes after the fact and not before the fact and I believe that Mr. Lundy, that is really what he is attempting to get at, to remove any doubt in that particular phase of the referral business, and I would support the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The gentleman to close. The question is, shall House Bill 433 . . . for what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, arise?"



Schlickman: "If I can, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to pose a couple of questions to the sponsor, if he'll yield."

Bradley: "He indicates he will yield."

Schlickman: "Representative, do I understand the law correctly that the Department is requiring to suspend, revoke or not renew a license if the local unit of government has certain requirements that are not met?"

Lundy: "Well, the licensing authority at the State level, Representative, is the Department of Public Health. This Bill does not refer to the Department of Public Health. It refers to the Department of Mental Health and to placements made by DMH, when it discharges patients from its State hospital facilities. So that this Bill really doesn't go to the question who is the licensing authority at the State level. It's a different Department than is involved in this Bill."

Schlickman: "You haven't answered my question."

Lundy: "Maybe I didn't understand it."

Schlickman: "A facility..... a facility must be licensed. Is that correct?"

Lundy: "Yes, under the law, that's correct."

Schlickman: "And the licensing is by the Department of Public Health. Is that correct?"

Lundy: "It's by the Department of Public Health, unless the Department of Public Health has designated a local municipality, having a licensing coordinator and enforcement set up at least as good as that of the State to do the licensing. There are only three such municipalities in Illinois. City of Joliet. City of Evanston. City of Chicago."

Schlickman: "Now, by your Bill as amended are you giving to a unit of local government, the authority to determine whether or not there is adequate programming, staffing and medical or adjunctive services?"

Lundy: "No, it already has that authority."



Bradley: "Are you through, Mr. Schlickman?"

Schlickman: "Why is this Bill needed?"

Lundy: "Because the Department of Public Health... Department of Mental Health of this State took the position in a letter to me that despite the fact that the Mental Health Code says the Department of Mental Health may place, discharge patients, in a licensed long-term care facility, the Department nevertheless took the position that if the license of a long-term care facility had been revoked by a local licensing agency, and the licensee then brought an action for administrative review, that in effect, if li..... had been revoked, even though it had been revoked and that the Department was still free to place patients in that facility. What this Bill does is to resolve the ambiguity which the Department thought was inherent in the Statute as to what the status of that revocation action is, pending an action for administrative review."

Schlickman: "Just one last question. During the administrative review process, the exhaustion of legal remedy, the resident of that home will remain. Is that correct?"

Lundy: "That is correct. The Bill imposes no duty on the Department to relocate any expatients who were placed in that home during the time it was licensed."

Schlickman: "So, what we're talking about perhaps, using your words, is to avoid a compounding of a matter?"

Lundy: "That's correct."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Chair recognizes the Minority Leader, the gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Washburn."

Washburn: "Ah.... thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce a visitor in the gallery this morning, Mrs. Myra Gilya of Helsinki, Finland. She's accompanied by ah.... Mrs. Mitchler and Representative Schoeberlein, right behind the Speaker's podium."



Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Ah . . . thank you. I'd like to ask the speaker a question . . . I mean the sponsor a couple of questions. Ah . . . does this apply to private facilities. I mean like . . . ah . . . local homes run for a profit."

Lundy: "I'm not sure I understand the question, Representative. It applies to the Department of Mental Health."

Hart: "Yeah, I mean, but the facility that's had its license revoked, could that be a private facility?"

Lundy: "Of course. Those are the only ones that are licensed. Public facilities aren't required to be licensed."

Hart: "All right, then I'd like to speak to the Bill very briefly, Mr. Speaker. I think the problem with this Bill is that . . . ah . . . if there are facilities, small ones in communities, we have a lot of small ones in my area, and if they can't take any new patients, Don, they're liable to go broke during the period of time the administrative review is pending. We've had reviews that I know about that have gone on for a year, and in that time through death, attrition or other means, many of the personnel who were housed at the time, ah . . . were moved out of the facility, and I don't feel really that there's an area of the law here that needs correcting to this extent. If the facility is capable of keeping the patients that it has, pending the review, then I see no need for . . . ah . . . a restriction such as this, and I think it would be a hardship on the facilities involved, could result in financial disaster and I don't believe the Bills bears the support of this House."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy, to close."

Lundy: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I had not intended to take the House's time, but in light of the comments of the last speaker, let me respond. With all due respect to him, and I do hold him in high esteem, I don't think he understand the Bill. In the first place, it would not require any facility whose license is revoked to . . . ah . . . transfer out any patients. Ah . . . all it

does is to prevent the Department of Mental Health from

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



placing ex-state hospital patients in that facility. Number 2, it would not even prevent such a facility from taking new patients from sources other than the Department of Mental Health. What the Bill says is, that when the Department of Mental Health gets ready to discharge a patient from a State facility and decides to make a placement of that person, in the vast majority of cases, the ex-patient really has no say as to where he goes, he or she goes. That in that situation a State agency should not place a State ward in a facility whose license has been revoked by a local licensing authority. Now I might say ah.... that ah.... the Bill.... well, I think that's enough said. I simply think that the opposition of the last speaker was based on a misunderstanding on what the Bill does, does not require transfer out of patients. Indeed, they would continue to be entitled to be subsidized by the Department of Public Aid, as 85% of them now are. It does not say that a private agency or other private agencies in the Department of Mental Health, for that matter, could not continue to make placements in that home. It says that in respect to the Department of Mental Health, since we already require in the existing Mental Health Code that ex-patients be placed in a licensed facility, that a facility won't be considered licensed, after its license has been revoked simply because it filed an action for administrative review. It ah.... I think it's a simple clarification of existing law. It will not impose a hardship in my view, and it seems to me that since the purpose of the licensing system is to protect the patients and not to protect the operators of nursing homes that this is the least we can do to insure their protection: to be sure that DMH is not placing its discharge patients in facilities, whose licenses have been revoked. I ask for a favorable vote."



Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall House Bill 433 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all those.... have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 103 'ayes', 2 'no's', 2 answering 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Third Reading appears House Bill 439. The Clerk will read the Bill for the Third time."

Selcke: "House Bill 439. Bill for an Act to amend Section 10 of an Act to revise the law in relation to coroners. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 439 as amended requires that the coroner make a preliminary investigation in the case of a death of a person in a residential program, which is sponsored or funded through the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disability. The substance of this legislation is based upon the problems that have transpired at Peoria State Hospital, Elgin State Hospital, a nursing home in Rockford and I believe two or three nursing homes in Waukegan, Illinois. Ah.... that there have been a large number of individuals that are in State institutions and in some of the residential programs and nursing homes that have not had the proper care. In many cases, the death of the individual was not properly reported. The death certificates were erroneous and it is felt that there has to be a type of a monitoring situation, where someone else, a third party comes in and makes a preliminary investigation to ascertain that there was no foul play, accidental injury or other type of injuries to the patient. In Committee, Representative Gaines very ably pointed out many individuals in State institutions from Chicago are placed downstate.



Individuals that don't have families that are still living. Individuals may not be in direct contact with their relatives in institutions, and it's necessary that there's a third party that intercedes and looks out for the welfare of these patients, and for this reason, I respectfully request a favorable vote on House Bill 439."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, arise?"

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce a distinguished guest that's with us today. The Treasurer of the State of Illinois, the Honorable Alan Dixon."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Simms, ah... what happens to this Bill, when your other Bill comes through abolishing the coroner?"

Simms: "With the other legislation, Representative Yourell, the successor, those statutes would go to the medical examiner."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support this Bill. For those of you who were present approximately a month and a half ago, when I introduced a resolution to have the House Investigations Committee look into the nursing homes in Lake County, and then last week, I believe, we had a similar resolution to look into nursing homes throughout the State of Illinois. I would point out that if this Bill had been passed and were law in the State of Illinois, chances are a good deal of our investigation might not be necessary. In the County of Lake we had a nursing home down in the Highland Park area where there was a death approximately a year and a half ago. The doctor signed the death certificate and the body was in due course buried. When it was brought to the attention of our coroner that there could be some possibility of impropriety by the nursing home, he took it upon himself to order the exhumation of this body and then he found out that the

causes as stated by the doctor was 100% incorrect on the

GENERAL ASSEMBLY



death certificate, and it caused him to... led him to believe that there had been some extreme hanky-panky going on in this particular nursing home. As a consequence of this activity, we now have our investigation going on of the nursing homes in Lake County. We have the Federal District Attorney looking into it, and also the States Attorney of Lake County. Two grand juries and a Legislative Investigation, I think, are sufficient to cause us to have some orderly way of having the death of people who are in the care of these nursing homes, which are supported by State money, carefully examined. I think until we do have a better means of doing it, that our coroners are the correct people to do it and I certainly urge you to support the concept of having every body postmortem in a case where a person is a resident in a State supported or a State-aided nursing home facility or a State hospital."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Capuzi."

Capuzi: "Will the gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Capuzi: "Under this Legislation, Ken, you're saying that any person that dies in a mental institution. Is that correct?"

Simms: "Yes."

Capuzi: "Irregardless of what the cause of death might be."

Simms: "It must be reported to the coroner."

Capuzi: "Do you have any idea of the cost and how many patients die in these institutions every day?"

Simms: "There's approximately between 19.... January 1, of 1973 and July 1 of 1973, there were approximately 2000 patients so its approximately 900 a year, in that area."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Bladley: "He indicates that he will."

Matijevich: "Representative Simms, in your reply to Representa-

tive Capuzi, you stated that the death must be reported

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



and I look at the Act and what you do is go beyond reporting. I'm not even sure that the Act relates to reporting. What it relates to is the investigation of every death. Now I wasn't aware of this Bill and I just came back from the Reference Bureau to get a Bill drafted and I think we could do it with this Bill if you hold it. I really do think that there ought to be a requirement of reporting of every death of a person, any state institution or a ward of the State in a private health care facility to the coroner, but I don't think that the coroner has to investigate every case, as you mandate under this Act."

Simms: "It requires that the coroner, subject to a preliminary investigation, Representative Matijevich, and this pertains to an individual that is in a State institution, or in a nursing home in a residentially sponsored program, so in the case of Lake County, these individuals that were in nursing homes, that they would be covered under this, under Amendment Number 2 to House Bill 439, so it would be required of a preliminary investigation. It's up to the Coroner as to the nature and extensiveness of what that preliminary investigation would do."

Matijevich: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think... and I come from the County that had the unfortunate death, and I think that something ought to be done about it, but I don't think we have to go this far, and require tremendous workload on coroners. I think what we ought to demand of the law is a reporting of death to a coroner, but this legislation goes far beyond that, and I don't think it's necessary. I think... if we held this Bill on Second Reading and amended it to make sure it just mandates reporting and also includes, by the way, Representative Simms, all you've included is the wards under the Department of Mental Health. There are wards



of the State under Children and Family Services that ought to be included too, but I don't think you have to go this far in mandating investigations."

Simms: "Representative Matijevich, first of all, in order for the coroner to have jurisdiction, it must be a mandated type situation, where if necessary, the coroner can order an autopsy. It must be one of those categories of death that comes under his jurisdiction. Now the coroner can make the determination as to the extensiveness of it. Secondly, the Coroner's Association are in favor of this legislation, as are various Mental Health organizations. The Department of Mental Health took the position of ah... no position at all. In fact they said they had no objection to the Bill, although they did not testify for it in Committee, but ah.... I talked to the Coroner's Association. In order for the Coroner to have the jurisdiction to go in and order an autopsy, in those cases where he determines it necessary, it must be in those categories where he has authority and strictly reporting it to him does not give him the authority to go ahead and mandate ah... the type of investigation that is needed."

Matijevich: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Skinner showed me a Bill and I don't know what number it is or if it has a number yet, but a draft of a Bill, wherein it allows the coroner to order an autopsy with respect to any death from whatever the cause, when he deems it ought to be advisable. I think that this makes more sense, but I think that the Sponsor of this Bill ought to either hold it. As far as I'm concerned, the language of the Bill goes much farther then we have to go. Really what he presumes by his legislation that every death of every mentally ill in the State of Illinois involves ah... something that requires an investigation, and I don't think that's true even though we've had these unfortunate circumstances. So I would ask the Members of the House to either vote no or present on



this Bill or ask the sponsor to hold this Bill on second reading until we get at the problem and not go way beyond the problem."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill as introduced would require, as I read it, the coroner to hold an inquest in performing an autopsy. No, this is adding Section F to the Ah, ... Coroners Act and there's no question that in my mind, as reading the Bill, that it would mandate the coroner to do this and quite frankly I feel that ah.... the Coroner ought to have some discretion on a lot of these, especially older people. Many of them who are geriatric that are dying of a combination of causes, and plus this is another example of mandating the counties who by and large are pretty financially strapped to spend more of the county taxpayers money. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms, arise?"

Simms: "Well, the previous speaker evidently did not read the Bill or is unfamiliar with the Coroners Act. It does not require that the Coroner hold an inquest, nor does it require that he mandate an autopsy. It has just placed it in the category of giving him the jurisdiction. If he suspects foul play, etc., he could request an autopsy or order one. I'll take this out of the Record and have an opportunity to talk with Representative Matijevich about it and see if we can't work out some of the differences, but I'll ask that it be taken out of the record at this time."

Speaker Bradley: "Take it out of the Record. Committee Reports. For what purpose does the gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, arise?"

Skinner: "I think I have a point of order."

Speaker Bradley: "State your point."



MAR 26 1975

73.

Skinner: "Does House Resolution 157 have a sponsor and if not, why has it been distributed?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Sponsor is the Committee on Rules and it is written on top of the Read the Report on Committee on Rules."

Selcke: "Report on the Committee on Rules. At a meeting on the Committee on Rules held Tuesday, March 25, pursuant to notice, the Committee adopted the House Resolution and House Joint Resolution attached hereto as Committee Resolutions, reports back same to the House for introduction with the recommendation that both Resolutions to be adopted. William Redmond, Chairman."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the first one is House Joint Resolution 30, which will provide for temporary joint rules of the House and Senate of the 79th General Assembly. The first portion of the rule 1A talks about the dates, April 1st being the last date to request a Bill from the Legislative Reference Bureau, April 12th the final day for the introduction of all Bills in the House of origin, May 2nd the final day for standing committees of each House to complete all actions, May 23rd, the final date for Third Reading and passage of the Bills in the House of origin, June 13th for the final date for standing committees of each House to complete all actions on Bills originating in the other House and June 26th the final day for Third Reading and passage in each House of Bills originating in the other House. Section B talks about in the even numbered years, all Bills will be referred to Committee on Rules, except those Bill that implement the State budget are introduced by a standing committee of either House. To provide the exceptions to the Bills



enumerated in A, those are (1) Bills appropriating funds for the operation of State government; (2) A Bill introduced by a standing committee of either House and (3) a Bill determined by a Majority of all the appointed members of the Rule Committee to be an emergency. Part II provides that the suspension of this Rule can take place only upon concurrence of three-fifths vote of both Houses and the fourth part is a repealer when we adopt permanent joint rules. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Jerry, the Reference Bureau has indicated that they will not accept requests for Bills after April 1 and I wondered if, in fact, this is true and if it is true, do we have any jurisdiction over that situation?"

Shea: "I don't know who made that statement. I talked to George Nichols this morning. They are still accepting Bills or request for Bills. They will accept requests for Bills by mail and that Bills, you can always request a Bill from the Legislative Reference Bureau. The only thing is, that if a Bill request is not in by April 1, they cannot guarantee it will be out by April 12, but nobody is shutting off any Members from going to the Reference Bureau and requesting Bills."

Mann: "But they will accept them, but they just cannot guarantee their production. Is that correct?"

Shea: "That's correct."

Mann: "Thank you."

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

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Bradley: "He indicates he will."

McClain: "Representative Shea, are you planning on trying to pass this Resolution today?"

Shea: "I am going to move for its adoption."



McClain: "Ah . . . I, personally, have some problems . . . ah . . . considering . . . ah . . . knowing how I was last legislative session . . . ah . . . considering passing a Resolution . . . ah . . . dealing with the April 1st foundation of submission of requests for the Legislative Reference Bureau. For the newer members . . . ah . . . I think this might have caught some by surprise and I . . . I wonder if . . . ah . . . if that couldn't be relaxed . . . ah . . . in this instance, considering the date by which we're proposing this Joint Resolution."

Shea: "Mr. McClain, I . . . I think we've announced and I'm sure the Speaker has announced from the podium for the last three weeks this day . . . ah . . . The Speaker will be in Springfield and I'm sure over the next few days and everybody will try to accommodate anybody, both new and old members, in helping them to get their Legislation . . . ah . . . and Request Form by April the 1st."

McClain: "Thank you, I . . . I believe you answered it."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Ah . . . Thank you. I'd like to ask about the interpretation of the words, 'Standing Committee'. If a bill, which is an exception to the rule, is introduced by a Standing Committee, does that mean every member of the Committee's got to be a sponsor of it. Does that mean the Chairman's got to be a sponsor. What does that mean?"

Shea: "I would assume a bill introduced by a Standing Committee would require a majority of the members on the committee."

Hart: "I think we ought to clarify it in that regard before we adopt it, otherwise, I believe that it would be a loophole . . . ah . . . which you could drive a mack truck through and . . . ah . . . I . . . I don't believe this rule should be adopted without . . . ah . . . a . . . an amendment . . . ah . . . stating, 'with reference to the exception for Standing Committee, it must be a majority of those members serving on the committee'."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion . . . ah . . . the gentle-



man from Will, Mr. Sangmeister."

Sangmeister: "Representative Shea, . . . ah . . . does this May 2nd date mean that . . . ah . . . that was gonna' be . . . that all Bills that are, presently, in Committee are automatically extended now over the 45-Day Rule to May 2nd. Is that what we're saying here?"

Shea: "No, it is not."

Sangmeister: "So the 45-Day Rule is still in affect on those Bills which were filed earlier, is that right?"

Shea: "The 45-Day Rule is in affect and has been extended to all Bills until May 12."

Sangmeister: "April 12."

Shea: "I mean April 12."

Sangmeister: "Oh, April 12, all right, thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman."

Chapman: "Representative Shea, I'm wondering when you anticipate with these kind of proposals that we're going to be getting around to considering and adopting permanent Rules."

Shea: "Its my understanding that the Rules Committee met last night. I think you were there Representative Chapman. The propo . . ."

Chapman: "That's why I'm worrying."

Shea: "The proposal . . . the proposals were submitted to them and its my understanding that the Chairman of the Rules Committee will call a Rules Committee meeting upon our return to Springfield after the Easter holiday."

Chapman: "Well, my question was, when do you think that the floor will be considering and adopting permanent Rules, sir?"

Shea: "I would imagine either the first or second week upon our return."

Chapman: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The . . . the Representative from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the

House, . . . ah . . . I like the fact that we've got a



Joint Rule that's going to mean that . . . by May 2nd, all bills are going to be out of committee, but I . . . I'd like to ask the Gentleman a question, because before me I've got the schedule of the House in April; and if there's anything I don't like, it's a Rule that isn't going to be abided by. Are there any provisions in those last two weeks of April where . . . ah . . . we spend all of our time in committees rather than floor action. Because I think the only way we can live up to this Rule, and I think it's a good one, if we have provisions for it, is to be in committee action only, and that probably would mean that the major committees meet twice a week, which is all right with me; but I think something has got to be done in that regard."

Shea: "Ah . . . Mr. Matijevich, if I might answer that. The tentative schedule agreed on between the Speaker and the Minority Leadership today provides us adequate opportunity for doing that and I think that's a scheduling problem that the Leaders of the House will work out. I think it's a good suggestion and certainly . . . thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Jerry, I have two points. One, as far as the suspension of this Rule with this Joint Resolution 30, how many votes does it require? Does it require 107 or 89?"

Shea: "It would require, to suspend the Rule, 3/5 vote of both Houses."

Lechowicz: "All right, because . . . on House Resolution 157, that's included but it's not included in yours . . . Well, I'm sorry, it is. It's on the back. I didn't see that."

Shea: "There is, there is . . ."

Lechowicz: "Right, I'm sorry. Number two, just as a matter of input, if we could designate a certain amount of days for the . . . ah . . . Conference Committee Reports and then we could have . . . we'd have final action for the adoption of the Conference Committee. We can schedule between the



13th and the 26th that would agree with the . . . the format."

Shea: "I . . . I'm sorry, I didn't get it. The . . . that schedule, I believe, provides adequate time for Conference Committees."

Lechowicz: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "ah . . . Thank you, Mr. Speaker. would the gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Madison: "ah . . . Representative Shea, does the . . . ah . . . does the . . . ah . . . deadline for final date for introduction of all Bills in the House of origin and the deadline for the final date for Standing Committees of each House to complete all action on Bills. Would those two deadlines negate the . . . ah . . . effect of giving individuals, who, for instance, file Bills on April 12th, negate them having . . . ah . . . 45 days?"

Shea: "It . . . it would not give them 45 days for a Bill to be in committee."

Madison: "Well, then isn't this Resolution present . . . rather prejudicial against those individuals who would file Bills say after April 1st?"

Shea: "Wh . . . when you say . . ."

Madison: "And that it would not give them 45 days?"

Shea: "Wh . . . the time schedule, I think, Representative, will give them adequate time to get their Bills out of committee and there'll be enough committee meetings scheduled so that everybody will have an adequate opportunity to get their Bills heard. As . . . as Representative Matijevich has suggested, and it's the intention of the Speaker and the Minority Leadership, that in the month of May that many of those weeks there'll be two or three committee hearings of the Standing Committees."

Madison: "Then . . . ah . . . Representative, would your . . . would you . . . would you be amenable to relaxing of the



April 12th deadline . . . ah . . . at least for those of us who are Freshmen and did not have an opportunity, for instance, to prefile Bills."

Shea: "Well, there . . . the Senate has an identical Bill that is now, or an identical Senate Rule to this, and if we relax the Rule, I don't think they'd ever get heard in the Senate. As I've said, and I made this statement to Representative McClain, Representative Madison, that there will be . . . the Speaker will be here and I will be here all week and certainly give you every effort to help you put anything you want into Law by April the 1st, into Bill form. We'll have people here to help you do that."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? If not, the gentleman will close. Oh, I'm sorry, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will?"

Washington: "Representative Shea, looking at on page 2, Suspension of Joint Rules, requiring a 3/5 majority to . . . of each House to suspend the Rules. Now from a practical point of view, doesn't that really mean, in effect, that these Rules will never be suspended?"

Shea: "You . . . you can never say, 'never'."

Washington: "Almost never?"

Shea: "Well, well that's the intent of the Rules, Representative, you know. We've spent in the last two years, we've been here almost through mid-July. Now, I think it's time that we take this bull by its own horns, and we're the ones, and adhere to a schedule that will get us out of here by June 30th. That's what this is an attempt to do."

Washington: "Yeah, I . . . I can sympathize with you because I like many other members have suffered under this mountain of Bills and things, which we've been having, and suspending the Rules sort of "willy-nilly" to accommodate somebody, be

he powerful or otherwise. But it seems to me, what you've done

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



is . . . ah . . . in effect . . . is to make it almost impossible to deal with those rare situations when the Rules should be suspended, when the Senate in its cantankerous, usual form, may say: 'The hell with the House and we're not going to do anything, simply, because you want it.' In other words, what you have done with this . . . prohibition here is to effectively tell the members of the House that your're going to be run by the Senate. That's what disturbs me. I'm not opposed to a 3/5 rule in either House to suspend the Joint Rule, but to have both Houses do so, in effect, means that some unforeseen, maybe untoward circumstances may arise and we will be, in effect, unable to do anything about transacting our own business. So I'm not fighting your basic proposition. I'm simply saying, I think you should . . . ah . . . consider this a bit stronger and even lo . . . lower the extraordinary majority required or at least consign it to one House."

Shea: "Mr. Washington, if you'll see there're some exceptions to this."

Washington: "Yeah, I saw those."

Shea: ". . . And, I think the exceptions would cover, without a doubt, the things that you're talking about, that rare emergency. We don't take care of one Appropriation Bills are not covered by the Rule. They're an exception. A Bill introduced by a Standing Committee, and we have an Amendment about to be offered by Mr. Hart, which will be a Bill determined by a majority of the members of the Standing Committee, can be introduced. Certainly, being a Committee Chairman, I'm sure you have faith and trust in the Committees, that they will act properly and then a Bill determined by a majority member of the . . . ah . . . by a majority of the appointed members of the Rules Committees of both Houses. I think that leaves us sufficient leeway to take care of



those emergencies that you talk about and, yet, have stringent enough rules so that the public will be taken care of and we'll be out of here by June 30th."

Washington: "Well, in conclusion let me simply say, I agree with the reason why you're moving in this direction. I simply think you've gone too far and I say we should confine this extraordinary 3/5 majority to suspend the Joint Rules in either House to one particular House. I, simply, don't feel that it is feasible and wise for the House of Representatives, known as the Lower House, to deliver themselves to the Senate in this manner."

Shea: "I . . . I might, respectfully, say that if either House could suspend the Rules unilaterally, then we really don't have Joint Rules, and I would go the other way with you, Mr. Washington, the Senate cannot act without the concurrence of this body."

Washington: "Yes, but one thing that makes this body unique and, frankly, more palatable to the public, I think, is the fact that there is a certain informality which permeates this House and I think the public finds it somewhat delicious. If I had any criticism of the Senate at all, it's that it's a little bit 'strided' and 'formal' and shall we say . . . ah . . . 'puffy-wuffy' . . . ah . . . The House has a character. It has an integrity, and I think is . . . it is wrapped up in the looseness of our procedures and the 'camaroderie' which floats through this House, and I think you're frustrating that tradition and I think it's bad policy, frankly. I, for ten years, have enjoyed the sort of loose way we operate over here. We do get the job done, but when we don't get the job done, it's never because of what happens in this House, it's what happens on the other side of the rotunda."

Shea: "Well, you know I . . ."

Washington: "I . . . I'm through."

Shea: "I . . . I can only answer you this: The man that is now President of the Senate is a good friend of yours, one of



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

our former House colleagues and I'm sure he understands the people as well of any . . . as well as any of us, Harold."

Washington: "And he's also my Senator."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentle . . . the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker . . . ah . . . Would the Sponsor yeild to a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Barnes: "One of the things that bothers me about this, Jerry, is the final day of submission for Bills to be prepared by the Legislative Reference Bureau. The reason I say that, there's a couple of things that, . . . ah . . . and I realize you've explained that the Leadership is going to stay here and attempt to get these things out, but I'm . . . I found just in recent experience, I had a little ole' Resolution that was sent down to the Reference Bureau two weeks ago and hasn't came out of there yet. Now, it seemed to me, based on that experience, to . . . ah . . . say to us at this late date and we're leaving today, and we're not gonna come back until after this date, we will come back about a week after this date that's in this thing. (I . . . not be here, Monday.) I think that the . . . I think that something should be . . . ah . . . some leeway should be given on those dates, especially since we have the provision on the 3/5 majority in each House for . . . for rescinding or adjusting any of these Rules. I think you've locked us into a situation here that we won't be able to get out of."

Shea: "In what respect, Representative?"

Barnes: "Well, you got the April 1st day for submission to the Reference Bureau. We won't be here then. We're leaving today. We won't be back until the 8th."

Shea: "As I said, I talked to the Reference Bureau. They'll accept requests by phone or by mail."

Barnes: "And they will have them out by the 12th?"



Shea: "That's what I've been led to . . ."

Barnes: "What happens if they don't have them out by the 12th?"

Shea: "That's the point I'm getting to. They have assured me . . ."

Barnes: "If they don't have them out . . ."

Shea: "They have assured me they will have them out by the 12th, and if you'll notice the temporary schedule that we have calls for perfunct sessions on the 12th to handle that."

Barnes: "Well, assuming, let's take it one step farther; assuming that they are not out by the 12th. These Rules must be adjusted or rescinded in any fashion with concurrence by 3/5 of both Houses. Do you think that that's reasonable to assume that the Senate, in its wisdom, and it rarely has any wisdom that I've seen, will go along with changing . . . ah . . . the date to accommodate the House if that happens?"

Shea: "Well, if they don't get the Bills out of the Reference Bureau by the 12th, Senators are also bound by that rule."

Barnes: "The Senate don't introduce too many Bills that I've seen. They usually originate in the House."

Speaker Bradley: "Are there further questions, Mr. Barnes?"

Barnes: "All right."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Duff: "Representative Shea, if . . . ah . . . this Resolution . . . ah . . . 30, includes in it, it seems to me, all the control dates that the House needs to function. But, of course, it does not include any of the other rules. Now, it seems to me possible that if the House would adopt these rules . . . I mean . . . this motion now, there would really be no strong thrust for many to go ahead about the work of having permanent Rules and all of the other effects of Rules besides this. So the question I would like to ask is, would you accept an amendment which would have an automatic expiration of these temporary Joint Rules? . . . ah . . ."



and the reason I would suggest that amendment would be so that we do not lose the need to continue to go ahead and pass permanent Rules."

Shea: "I don't think anybody's gonna' lose sight of the fact of . . . that you were at the Rules Committee last night, I assume, I thought I saw you there, and you voted these out in this form. Now, I think you know full well, that the Rules Committee will meet next week. We've got a set of proposed Joint Rules . . . ah . . . The Senate seems to have somewhat of a problem getting them over to us . . . ah . . . I think, perhaps, the way it might be, is that we adopt them and send 'em over there to them."

Duff: "Well, I recognize that and I . . . yes you're right, I did vote for these last night. I've come . . . become aware, however, looking to . . . at this and listening this morning to the debate, of the fact that if we do pass these, we will take a great deal of the need off for this House . . . ah . . . to pass permanent Rules; and there are quite a number of things . . ."

Shea: "Permanent Rules of this House?"

Duff: "Right."

Shea: "Why is that?"

Duff: "Well, because the . . . this Resolution does, in fact, include all the major control dates and time problems that the House needs to function. However, you and I know that when we sat last week for about eight hours in the Rules Committee and listened to 99 different proposals, that there are many, many members who would like to make some changes in our permanent Rules of which we don't have yet; and it seems to me that if this Resolution passes, the pressure will be off entirely to pass permanent Rules and I think that would be an unhappy circumstance . . . ah . . . from any people who would like to change some major portions of the Rules; and so all I'm asking is, wouldn't it be



reasonable to include on this Resolution an automatic termination date?"

Shea: "I . . . I don't think it will, Representative Duff. You remember the Rules Committee. You certainly are going to push as hard as anybody else for permanent Rules. The Rules Committee is split 10-11. You know you have the assurance of the Speaker, Representative Katz and myself that we want Rules. You know that Mr. Washburn, the Minority Leader, is interested in getting permanent Rules. Certainly, there's nobody more interested than Mr. Walsh in doing that, and you know that we're going to meet in April and move in that direction."

Duff: "I don't know what the Senate's going to do, Representative Shea, and as far as the Joint Rules are concerned, and I know the Joint Rules are holding the Rules Committee up."

Shea: "Now are you talking about House Rules or Senate Rules?"

Duff: "Well, I'm talking about the fact that if we are going to hold on the production of House Rules waiting for the Senate's action on Joint Rules, we may wait forever and I . . . and suggest . . . and it is not a matter of partisanship or it is not a matter of . . . ah . . . concern for motives or the intentions of any member of the Rules Committee. It's a concern for the Members of the House who would like to have permanent Rules adopted soon, many of which should be changed, and which effort the existence of these Joint Rules will diminish in necessity."

Shea: "Well, Representative Duff, I can't agree with that logic. . . . ah . . . The next Resolution I have is House Resolution 157, which will conform our temporary Rules to this Joint Resolution."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the last comment of the . . . ah . . . Majority Leader . . . ah . . . is precisely . . . ah . . . the indication that I am concerned with; and I really do believe that if we pass



this and then pass the next Resolution, to which he refers, which will conform our temporary Rules to this Resolution, we will have taken off all . . . the Leadership on both sides of the aisle to some extent the urgency the need of moving forward with permanent House Rules and I think that it is now the middle of March. We're leaving now. It'll be the middle of April when we get back here and we don't have any permanent Rules . . . ah . . . and apparently, we're not working towards it and if we pass this Resolution, I think we're working against it."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook arise? Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to pose one final question of the Sponsor, if I may?"

Speaker Bradley: "I think you've already asked the . . . ah . . . the Sponsor . . . ah . . . indicates he will yield, one question."

Madison: "Representative Shea, by this Resolution you said April 12th was the final date for introduction of Bills and, yet, this Resolution does not at all speak to a limitation on the number of Bills that can be introduced. You and I both know that we have some very prolific Bill writers in this . . . in this House and if, pretend, each 177 members were to submit an average of 10 Bills to the . . . to the Reference Bureau, there is no way under God's Son or your influence, and I'm not suggesting which is greater, that the Reference Bureau could possibly put out that many Bills by April 12. So I would suggest, . . . ah . . . Representative, that there be some relaxation on the April 12th date."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the gentleman care to respond?"

Shea: "I'm informed that the Senate has adjourned, so I'm thinking that to solve some of the problems that if we might just hold these in abeyance until I have a chance to talk to the Minority Leader and the Speaker, and we'll see



how we want to proceed with this . . . ah . . . if you'll just hold this for a few minutes. The report has been read and we'll see where we go."

Speaker Bradley: "We will hold it on the Clerk's desk. On House Bill . . . on the Calendar on Third Reading appears House Bill 639. The Clerk will read it a third time."

O'Brien: "House Bill 639, McPartlin, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Office of the Auditor General. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is the appropriation for the Auditor General. It was amended and it is now \$5,448,600 and I would appreciate the support of the House in the passage of this Legislation."

Speaker Bradley: "Any discussion? If not, the gentleman to close. The question is shall House Bill 639 pass, all in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. The Clerk will take the record. Have all voted who wish? Bradley 'aye'. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 140 'ayes', no 'nos', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of Third Reading appears House Bill 521. Read it . . . will the Clerk read it a third time."

O'Brien: "House Bill 521, Washburn, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Comptroller. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Washburn."

Washburn: "Ah . . . Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 521 . . . ah . . . amends the Comptroller's original appropriation . . ah . . . Bill . . . Appropriation Bill involves a total of \$717,500 \$545,000 which is new money, the remaining \$172,500 is transferred from within the original budget request. Now, basi-



cally, seven items make up the bulk of the need for this sup . . . supplemental transfer request, and I'll run through them rapidly: Number one, is to reinstate . . . reinstatement of the 'Legal Services' veto; and number two, the emergency move from 125 West Adams Record Center; Number three, cost of second \$50 a month employee's salary increase, which by the way is \$136,000; Implementation of the new Tax Withholding Program required by the IRS, which pertains to our employees . . . ah . . . at home; Additional personnel necessary to administra . . . administer vending . . . vendor payment speed up; Garnishments on the Legislative Expense Records; and number six, additional tele-communications for the new customer service activity; and number seven, additional funds to meet increased printing and postage costs. This Bill was amended downward by \$35,000 in the Appropriations Committee and eventually passed out of that Committee with a 17 to nothing vote and I ask for your favorable vote today."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

McClain: "Fred, would you . . . ah . . . inform me . . . ah . . . and explain what the Legal Services veto is?"

Washburn: "Ah . . . Yes . . . ah . . . Representative McClain, this is the portion of the money that we depleted from some budgets last year . . . ah . . . transferring legal people over to the Attorney General's Office, which eventually, was vetoed by the Governor. This reinstates the money into this budget to pay for those Legal Services."

McClain: "O.K., thank you very much."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? If not, the gentleman to close. Pardon me, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."



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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Houlihan: "ah . . . Bud, you indicated that there was a . . .
 ah . . . amount which was reduced under reduction veto
 by the Governor . . . ah . . . your staff indicated to us
 in Committee that that was not the reason for those funds,
 that it was not for Attorney General's fees, but, rather
 as I recall, it was for Les Jones, and his services; and
 also, for some legal contractual services and wasn't at all
 related to the Attorney General Amendment. Now, I realize
 that your staff had at one time indicated that it was for
 a reduction veto; but we were informed, subsequently, that
 that was changed. Are you indicating that this is . . .
 ah . . . a change from what was presented in the Committee
 in your explanation of this bill?"

Washburn: "This is the . . . excuse me . . . this is the
 information I received from my staff. I hope its correct.
 I . . . I knew of no other information, contrary information,
 that has been . . . ah . . . given to anyone else."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lemke."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Lemke: "What did you say the cost for handling Garnishments
 are for the State?"

Washburn: "The cost for what?"

Lemke: "The cost for handling Garnishment procedures for the
 State."

Washburn: "Well, partially, this is in the lump here, Garnish-
 ments and Legislative Expense Records, \$45,000."

Lemke: "\$45,000?"

Washburn: "Yes, sir."

Lemke: "ah . . . My understanding that the . . . is this in
 regards to the any court decision that makes the State
 liable for Garnishments?"

Washburn: "I can't answer that, I can only answer . . . ah . . .



in this manner. It says that the \$45,000 is the use for additional personnel necessary to administer vendor payment speed up, Garnishments and Legislative Expense Records."

Lemke: "Ah . . . My understanding . . ."

Washburn: "A total of \$45,000."

Lemke: "My understanding under the Law, the State can't be Garnished and there's been no court decision that makes the State liable on Garnishment; that this is a decision by Attorney General Scott on Garnishments and Comptroller Lindberg to recognize Garnishments on State employees. Then it's not a court decision and I don't think the State can be Garnished. The only remedy is through the Court of Claims."

Speaker Bradley: "Is that a question . . . ah . . . Mr. Lemke?"

Lemke: "Yes, why do we have to expend \$45,000 for Garnishment Procedures?"

Washburn: "That's a . . . that's a question we'll have an answer to in a couple of seconds."

Speaker Bradley: "O.K., in the meantime, we'll . . . we'll come back to you . . . ah . . . we'll go to Mr. . . . a gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House . . . ah . . . to answer two questions that were posed on the floor. One, as far as the \$78,539 which is incorporated in House Bill 521, it was originally in the Comptroller's Appropriation for Legal Services and the Governor line-item vetoed this amount; and the \$78,000 is based upon the two attorneys that he has working in his office and in turn the two law firms that were conducting studies, and the cost involved in that does not have anything to do with Attorney General's Amendment or his personnel. This is expressed quite specifically by Comptroller, George Lindberg, in the Committee, and in turn, was received by his staff, as well. As far as the \$45,000 on the . . . for the processing, the Comptroller has initiated programs to speed up vendor payments and the Comptroller



has started processing Garnishment against State employees, but the \$45,000, the primary dollar amount, is for a more up-to-date, accurate method of keeping Legislative Expense Account Records, which is being, presently, implemented; and this is a Bill appropriates \$45,000 in that amount. It's not a . . . ah . . . a fight between the courts and the . . . ah . . . and the Comptroller and the Attorney General. And I'd just like to also point out that his Bill had a very thorough and extensive hearing in the Appropriations Committee and I want to compliment George Lindberg and his staff for their fine co-operation; and this supplemental Appropriations deserves the support of the membership of the House. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Meyer's."

Meyer: "In response to Representative Lemke's . . . ah . . . question . . . ah . . . the State of Illinois and all other municipal corporations . . . ah . . . as of approximately six weeks ago, are subject to Garnishment. That was a recent Supreme Court decision of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Lemke, did you hear the reply and answer to your question from Mr. Meyer's? Would you repeat the . . . for the benefit of Mr. Lemke, Mr. Meyer's."

Meyer: "ah . . . Public employees of the State of Illinois and all other municipal corporations are as of six weeks ago in the Illinois Supreme Court decision a . . . a case against a park district employee, are subject to Garnishment."

Lemke: "If you were real . . . you're talking about the Henderson versus the Urbana Park District case. The one that the money lenders rammed through in . . . in Urbana?"

Meyer: "Yes, sir."

Lemke: "That decision does not apply to State employees, it applies to Municipal employees. State employees, if you look at the Kane louny . . . Kaneland case in Aurora, the bus case of personal liability, that applies to municipal employees. The statute has never been extended on personal



injuries to the State. Your remedy is in the Court of Claims and no other court. The . . . the Judicial Branch of Government does not have jurisdiction over the Executive Branch or the Legislature. We have advised the Legislature sets up the procedures. If you read that decision, it's up to the Legislatures, except the procedures for Garnishment. It's up to this body, not to the court; and they . . . and it's in the dicta in that case; and therefore, I don't think the State should recognize Garnishment against them. And I think that Attorney Scott and Lindberg to take that decision and have . . . and have the Supreme Court remedy that and start protecting the working man in this . . . in this country, in this state, instead of the financial people and the money grabbers who make these small loans and 32 percent interest."

Speaker Bradley: "Further . . . is there further discussion? The gentleman from Grundy wish to close?"

Washburn: "ah . . . Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just ask your favorable support for this Supplemental and Transfer Bill for one of the greatest public officials Illinois has ever had."

Speaker Bradley: "Question: is shall House Bill 521 pass? All those in favor will . . . signify by voting 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. The Clerk will take the record. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. This Bill . . . on this question there are 141 'ayes', 5 'nos', 2 voting 'present', and this Bill having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. On Third Reading appears House Bill 445. The Clerk will read it for the third time."

O'Brien: "House Bill 445, Catania, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the School Code, Third Reading of the Bill.

Speaker Bradley: "The . . . ah . . . lady from Cook, Ms. Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members of the House.



House Bill 445 passed this body last Session and was approved unanimously in the Senate Education Committee, however, it was two votes short of passage on the Senate floor. What it would do, is to make a commemorative holiday . . . ah . . . February 15th, which is the birthday of one of the greatest American women, Susan B. Anthony. I would point out to you that a commemorative holiday does not close the schools or banks or state offices; and I have no intention of attempting to do that . . . ah . . . certainly it would not help the working mothers in the State of Illinois to ask them to stay home from work to take care of their children on a school holiday. What it does do is to provide that on February 4 . . . February 15th, the birthday of Susan B. Anthony, a portion of the school day, which would be entirely at the discretion of the teacher, would be set aside to honor Susan B. Anthony; that she would be honored but the portion that would be set aside would be up to the teacher, could be five minutes or an hour or whatever the teacher felt was appropriate. Now, I would like to say that Susan B. Anthony was not just any woman and we did not have to search for a woman to honor. We are asking that Susan B. Anthony be honored because she has long been neglected in our history books, and we have a lot of great men that we honor, and we have a lot of people for the little boys to identify with; but we really don't put enough emphasis on the great American women for the little girls to identify with. Susan B. Anthony stands out in American History because she was outstanding in her work in three areas. She worked very hard for the abolition of slavery, she also worked for recognition of womens' rights and was the leader in getting the votes for women. And she was also the leader in the Temperance Movement, although I would point out that when she went to a National Temperance Meeting, she was not allowed to speak, because she was told women were to be quiet and listen and learn."



Speaker Bradley: "Is the . . ."

Catania: "So I thought I'd conclude my remark, now, by pointing out that, well, I certainly agree with those who say that we need to . . . ah . . . concentrate a little more on reading and writing and arithmetic. I would also say that we need to teach history, and we need to emphasize that this great woman should take her place in the history curriculum of Illinois schools. This bill is supported by the School Problems Commission, by the Illinois Federation of Teachers and many other groups."

Speaker Bradley: "Is there further discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fleck."

Fleck: "ah . . . would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "She indicates she would."

Fleck: "Susan, I think this is a very good idea that . . . ah . . . the ladies at least have someone that they can look up to: to have a commemorative holiday for a woman who has moved in the . . . ah . . . direction liberalizing the suppression of women of all kinds. And I was wondering I tend to vote for this. that . . . ah . . . I was wondering maybe you would support a bill if I put in and make John Wayne's birthday a commemorative holiday. You'd support that one for us men, so we have someone to look up to."

Catania: "I didn't know you were anti-Indian."

Speaker Bradley: "The lady from Lake, Miss Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "May I address my inquiry to the Sponsor?"

Speaker Bradley: "She indicates she will yield."

Geo-Karis: "Representative Catania, is this the same lady who after the Fourteenth Amendment was passed, guaranteed the rights to every person, the same? Is that the same lady who was arrested when she went to exercise her rights to vote?"

Catania: "That's correct Geo-Karis."



Geo-Karis: "And she didn't . . . and . . . and because she went by the Fourteenth Amendment, she failed in her right to vote because she was arrested. Is that right?"

Catania: "That's right."

Geo-Karis: "I'd like to speak in favor of this Resolution . . ."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Geo-Karis: ". . . and I . . . I would like to have you all join unanimously rather this amendment . . . well, I'm . . . you get me all mixed up on my birthday; but anyway, I would like to ask as a birthday present to me, give it a unanimous vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The . . . the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Calvo."

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

Speaker Bradley: "She indicates she will."

Calvo: "I just wondered . . . ah . . . what . . . what's the first name of this lady we're honoring here?"

Catania: "Her first name is Susan."

Calvo: "Oh, . . . ah . . . I see. The only other question . . . ah . . . Representative Catania, I just wondered if . . . ah . . . you've got too close to Webber Borchers . . . ah . . . I remember you . . . wait . . . I remember you for several years and . . . ah . . . just a minute . . . ah . . . I remember for several years and you . . . and I don't remember you being such a historian before, so I thought maybe that's what happened."

Catania: "Well, Webber's helping me out I'm . . ."

Calvo: "O.K., fine, thank you and . . . ah . . . it'll be a pleasure to vote for your bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "I would like to say something to a point of personal privilege now. My name is mentioned on the floor of this House and the matter of history came up. So I'm gonna' give



you some history and why I'm gonna' support this Bill. I want you to know that my aunt, Leona Bowman, was the first woman ever to be elected to Public Office in the State of Illinois in 1906. I want you, further, to know that we had a hell of a fi . . . I wasn't born at that time, but I know about it. Now I want you to know they had, or we had, a hell of a fight at that time because she could not even vote for herself when she was elected to Public Office, and there were certain gentleman in our area who decided that since she couldn't vote for herself she couldn't . . . didn't have the right to hold the office. But fortunately for my aunt, she was permitted to hold the office because, you see, when they wrote the . . . Constitution of the State of Illinois, it was undreamed of at that time that any female would run for Public Office and there was no point to cover. So she won the right and did become the first woman to be able to be elected to Public Office in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Bradley: "The . . . the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "ah . . . Mr. Speaker, let me say that I'm not going to follow the historians. I'm going to vote against this Bill. It seems to me that the School Code is so cluttered with thi . . . with things that are mandated to be taught today that this Bill becomes sort of ridiculous. We have to teach Arbor Day. We have to teach everything from Arbor Day on down. I think if anybody looked at that School Code, they would be appalled at the things we would have to teach in our Public Schools. Nobody pays any attention to them anyway and all I think we do is, actually, just play with the School Code and with other things and we really shouldn't be doing that. In addition to that I must say that I'm not a great fan of Susan B. Anthony. I don't think that she's a great woman. I think if we honor any woman it ought to be a woman from the State of Illinois; and I think it ought to be Jane Adams and I'm going to put in a Bill for that effect;



and I would hope we would vote this Bill down."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "ah . . . Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor might yield to a question or two?"

Speaker Bradley: "She indicates she will. I might remind the members here you're eating up your lunch time."

Deuster: "All right. ah . . . I served on the School Problems Commission and voted against this Bill, but then I had some second thoughts and co-sponsored it; but I think it's important for the Sponsor to clear up something just so we all know. I'm looking at the School Code, and it does consist of a lot of pages, but on this page we do have a commemorative holiday for Dr. Martin Luther King. Your Bill does not delete that, does it?"

Catania: "No, all this does it to put in Susan B. Anthony and it does not . . . ah . . . make the same kind of holiday that we have for Dr. Martin Luther King. His birthday is also mentioned in another section of the statutes, which is why I . . . we had closing of State offices in many schools on his birthday."

Deuster: "And the second question, the last question, Casimir Pulaski is also honored in the School Code, and you don't take him out, do you?"

Catania: "God forget, I should take out Casimir Pulaski."

Deuster: "And this makes three, King, Pulaski and Anthony?"

Catania: "That's right."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The . . . the lady to close."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is shall House Bill 445 pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all oppose by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Bradley 'aye'. Take the record. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fleck."



Fleck: "I think Susan made a very good remark in regards to my being against Indians. So if I amend my Bill to making Sitting Bull, his birthday, a holiday, will you support it?"

Catania: "You said it's Sitting Cow?"

Speaker Bradley: "On this question there are 113 'ayes', on this question there are 113 'ayes', 5 'nos', 7 voting 'present'. This Bill having received a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."

Speaker Redmond: "I'd like to thank Representative Bradley for the job he did. I hope he doesn't like the job too well, though. On the order of Postponed Consideration appears House Bill 602. Representative Beaupre, the gentleman from Kankakee."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to request that the Bill be moved back for the purpose of an amendment to Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the gentleman have leave? Representative Berman."

Berman: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, . . . ah . . . is it the . . . is it the posture of the Chair that when a Bill is on Postponed Consideration, that it will not be considered again on the same day for Third Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Berman: "So if it's brought back today, it won't be moved to Third today?"

Speaker Redmond: "You are correct."

Berman: "Thank you."

Beaupre: "Do I have leave, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: ". . . leave . . . Second Reading."

O'Brien: "Amendment Number Eight, Beaupre, amends House Bill 602 on page one, line 21, by changing 'July 1, 1977' to 'January 1, 1977'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the spirit of compromise and in the interest of . . . ah



seeing . . . ah . . . some very needed Legislation in this General Assembly pass out of this House, I move the adoption of Amendment Number Eight."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Question is on the adoption of Amendment Number Eight to House Bill 602. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's: adopted. It goes back to the order of Postponed Consideration. Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "In addition, thereto, Mr. Speaker. In order to be consistent with that Amendment, which was just adopted by the House, I would move to table Committee Amendment One, which was the Amendment which amended the original Bill from two years to two and a half."

Speaker Redmond: "Leave. Representative Matijevich, Representative Matijevich?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I . . . I think a . . . your Parliamentarian is over there; but I think the procedure is he's got to reconsider the vote by which that was adopted and then table it. Is that right . . . ah . . . Dave? I'm . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman from Lake has read the lips . . . ah . . . of the Parliamentarian. You are correct."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "In view of that ruling, which I concurred in, I would, having voted on the prevailing side of the vote which considered Committee Amendment Number One, I move that that vote be reconsidered."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? . . . moves that the vote by which Committee Amendment Number One was adopted by reconsidered. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', oppose 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. . . . Mr. Speaker, I therefore move to table Committee Amendment Number One to House Bill 602."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Gentleman has moved to table



House Bill 1 . . . or . . . ah . . . Committee Amendment Number One to House Bill 602. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', oppose 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. The amendment is tabled."

Unknown: "This goes to Third Reading . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "485."

O'Brien: "House Bill 485, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Copper Purchase Registration Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Speaker, Members of the House. This merely deletes one . . . ah . . . item there in the Copper Purchase Registration Act, which at the time that the price of copper was so, you know, high they . . . they brought out a 300 millimeter cannon to shoot a mouse, as they said, and required the scrap dealers to report within a 72-hour period on a triplicate form: one which went to the County Clerk and which went to the IBI, and neither Department seemed to know what to do with these and with the mails the way they are; actually, the report was not getting there in the . . . ah . . . 72-hour period. So this sets up the same procedure that is used now with the abandoned cars and that is that they may keep a ledger and they are required to put in the ledger the name and address of the copper dealer, the date and place of each purchase, the name and address of each person/persons and so forth. It's quite restrictive and the ledger is open to inspection by any law enforcement official from the . . . ah . . . actually, any local law enforcement official, any member represented by the common carriers and utility companies and so forth. All this has done is suspend a . . . a burdensome . . . ah . . . requirement on your very reputable scrap dealers, and I ask for . . . ah . . . favorable vote of the House."



Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Ray Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I feel obligated to stand up and oppose this Bill. I'd like to say that I was on the Committee that heard the Bill. The Bill came out by one vote and I think that that's a tribute to the friendship of the members of the Committee for . . . ah . . . the Sponsor. We heard from experts in the field of Law, from the Utilities and various other areas all who opposed this Bill. And the reason they oppose is very simple. The loss of copper, which can come from the loss of copper wires, copper bars, ingots or even gutters from peoples houses, have been an accute problem in the State of Illinois. The Bill was designed to prevent unscrupulous scrap dealers from taking in huge chunks of copper and then just dumping it back on the Copper Market to be repurchased again by the Utilities, in terms of phone wire, in terms of wire that goes into housing and even in terms of the old copper gutters that have been in peoples homes. I would like to say that the only people who requested that this Bill be passed were a few copper dealers. Now, we acknowledge that the vast majority, the overwhelming number of copper dealers are honest, completely scrupulous; but when it comes down to having the copper ripped out of everything, from phone wires to copper gutters, you have to do something about it. All the Bill did . . . what this Bill does is repeal the section which makes the copper dealer tell where they got the copper from; and very simply, all they want to do is be able to trace some of this copper to make sure that certain dealers aren't dumping thousands and thousands and tons of your phone wire, your gutters, your copper equipment back onto the Market. I think that what it represents is an unwarranted intrusion upon the area of Law enforcement and upon the area of the welfare of the people of the State of Illinois, for the benefit of a very,



very small group of people, and I believe that if you had been in Committee and had heard the testimony of the people from the Utilities, from Law Enforcement, and from all of these other agencies that oppose the Bill, I don't think that you, I, or anyone else, in good conscience, could vote for the Bill; and I cannot say, Mr. Speaker, that we should all pay our friendship to any sponsor. I think that sometimes you've got to take a look at bills on their merits and say they're good or bad. This is a bad Bill and I would urge the membership to vote . . . to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Ah . . . In response to . . . ah . . . my good friend, Representative Ewell, in Committee, and this does not eliminate any of the things of the Copper Purchase Act, which I am totally in agreement with, . . . ah . . . one of the questions that was put to the Law Enforcement people and the people that were there from the Utility Companies and asked if they had been able to apprehend anyone and the answer was 'no'. They have not had an apprehension and this is just, I say, a burden that has been placed upon the businessman that . . . ah . . . Actually, they have said that most of the purchases or all of them as far as, I guess, they know are actually sold out of State. They're not in the State of Illinois. So all this does is just remove a burden from the businessman. They are to maintain the records and all the information and I believe you said that they don't have to record who is the purchaser. That is not true in the Bill. They have to record all the information and that ledger is kept. It has approved to be an effective mechanism when it comes to the abandoned cars and the scrap cars and this just allows them to do the same thing that they have been allowed to do with the abandoned automobile. If it had proved to be successful, this Bill would not be introduced, but . . . ah . . . that's the reason



I am because it's just a burden to your honest businessman, and I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is shall House Bill 485 be passed? All those in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'; have all voted who wish? Representative Geo-Karis you having trouble? Representative Geo-Karis is not in her seat, but she indicates she votes 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this vote there is 53 'ayes', 20 'nos', 96 . . . er . . . 8, rather, and the Bill having failed to receive a constitutional majority is hereby declared pass . . . lost, pardon me. I don't know Jack. From the Speaker's table there is House Joint Resolution 30. Repre . . . in House Resolution 157 for which purpose Representative Shea, the gentleman from Cook, is recognized."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, there are substitute motions up there now. The only difference between the ones that were distributed and the ones that are the substitute motions contain the verbiage that Mr. Hart added and that is on page one in sub-paragraph B. In line four there's been added a majority of the members, and on page two, line three, a majority of the members. That was to clarify that it took a majority of the members of the Standing Committee to introduce Legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Would you go through where we can locate that one more time . . . ah . . ."

Shea: "On House Joint Resolution Number 30 on page one, subsection B, commencing in line three or line four these words: 'majority of the members of a'. That was to clarify that it was a majority of the members of the Standing Committee that could introduce a Bill. The same appears on page three or page two, Mr. Walsh: on line three inserting the words 'majority of the members of a'. That was to clarify it. It was my understanding that's what we discussed and I think that the draftsman left that portion out."

Walsh: "Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I have missed some of the debate earlier and I hope I'm not doing something that's been heard before. But we do have a problem. I've had a bill in the Reference Building being drafted for . . . for some time and I . . . I'm just afraid that they're not going to get it out and it's been there for some three weeks . . . it's a lengthy one. And I just wonder if April the 12th is an acceptable date? That's what I ask of the Speaker . . . gentlemen . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

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

Schraeder: "Sir, I just question the April 12th date and I've got a Bill in that's been in three weeks and I haven't gotten any results from it . . ."

Shea: "I've been assured. I've been assured by the Reference Bureau. I talked to Mr. Nichols this morning, that any request in by the 1st will be out for introduction by the 12th."

Schraeder: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion. Representative Washburn, do you desire recognition?"

Washburn: Well, yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House . . . ah . . . Representative Shea has moved the adoption of House Resolution 30 and certainly I concur in his motion and would ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on adoption of House Joint Resolution Number 30. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', oppose 'no'; I guess . . . I guess we need a Roll Call. Those in favor vote 'aye', those oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this Resolution we have 128 'ayes', 2 'nos', 2 'present'. The Resolution's adopted. House Resolution 157, will you read . . . Representative Shea."



Shea: "Mr. Speaker, the House Resolution 157 conforms our Rules to the proposed or to the temporary Joint Rule. The only difference between the copy that has been substituted and the one on the members desk is on page one, subsection C of Rule 26 in line four. The addition of the words 'a majority of the members' to indicate that when a Committee Bill is introduced it must have the concurrence of the majority of the members of the Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion?"

Shea: "I would move for the adoption of House Resolution 157, substitute Resolution . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washburn."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I concur with Representative Shea, and I ask for a 'yes' vote on House Resolution 157 also."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the adoption of House Resolution 157. Those in favor vote 'aye', those oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? On this question 124 'aye', 123 'aye', 2 'no'; having received the majority . . . declared passed . . . huh? Representative Shea votes 'aye'. Mr. Ewell 'aye'. Order of business, Committee Reports."

O'Brien: "Mr. Garmisa from the Committee on Transportation, to which House Bill 41 was referred, reported the same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation the Amendments be adopted and the Bill as amended Do Not Pass. Mr. Garmisa from the Committee on Transportation, to which House Bill 325 and 410 was referred, reported the same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation the Amendments be adopted and the Bill as amended Do Pass. Mr. Garmisa from the Committee on Transportation to which House Bill 477 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bill Do Pass. Mr. Garmisa from the Committee on Transportation to which House Bill 467 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation the Bill Do Pass. Consent Calendar. Mr. Garmisa from the Committee on Transportation



which House Bill 281, 282 and 283 were referred, reported the same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation the Amendments be Adopted and the Bill as amended Do Pass and be re-referred to the Committee on Assignment of Bills. Mr. Schneider from the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education, to which House Bill 534 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bill Do Pass. Mr. Schneider from the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education, to which House Bill 487 and 496 were referred, reported the same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation the Amendments be Adopted and the Bill as amended Do Pass. Mr. Leon from the Committee on Banks and Savings and Loans to which House Bill 129 was referred, recommend that the Bill be assigned to Interim Study Committee. Mr. DiPrima from the Committee on Veteran Affairs, Registration Regulation to which House Bill 78 was referred, reported the same back with Amendments thereto the recommendation the Amendments be Adopted and the Bill as amended Do Pass be placed on Consent Calendar. Mr. DiPrima from the Committee on Veterans Affairs, Registration Regulation to which House Bill 115 was referred, reported the same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation the Amendments be Adopted and the Bill as amended Do Pass. Mr. DiPrima from the Committee on Veterans Affairs, Registration Regulation to which House Bill 528 was referred, reported the same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation the Amendments be Adopted and the Bill as amended Do Pass to be placed on Consent Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Motions . . . Representative . . . recognize Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to move to suspend Rule 67B in reference to motions to discharge Committee. Or I would move to discharge the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education



from further consideration of Senate Bill 178, which is identical to House Bill 534, which received a Do Pass motion in Committee yesterday. I've discussed this with the Speaker. I've discussed it with both sides of the aisle and . . . ah . . . I have their affirmative . . . ah . . . support of this . . . ah . . . Motion and I would move for the suspension of Rule 67B so that we might bypass committee with . . . ah . . . Senate Bill 178."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the gentleman might yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Bradley: "I know we're on the Motion, but I think that this Bill is important enough that I wish you would explain to us just what this Bill is doing."

Hoffman: "I'd be happy to. This Bill . . . ah . . . allows those . . . ah . . . school districts that passed the referendum between . . . ah . . . the 1972 operating rate and October 31, or October 1st of 1973 . . . ah . . . to include that operating rate in their roll back provision under the new formula, which means that they would be allowed to include that referendum which the people had passed as the point from which they would have to begin to roll back their taxes. It doesn't cost the State any money. It merely means that they are rolling back from the last point from which the people passed a referendum for the effective date of this Bill."

Bradley: "Thank you very much. I think that it in . . . ah . . . a was does cost the State or some other school districts some money, because who'll argue a Bill or the point when we get to the Bill. I'm not going to object to your Motion, so Mr. Speaker, I will talk to the Bill when it gets there at Third Reading and I have no objection to your Motion."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I must say I don't understand the Bill from the synopsis and I probably wouldn't understand the Bill if I had the Bill in front of me, and I therefore think that the Bill ought to be referred to Committee, so that ah.... maybe they can attempt to understand it. As a matter of fact, I introduced a Bill that affected the School formula and it was referred to a subcommittee, just because it affected the formula. I ah.... certainly think it's unequal treatment to ah.... take some Bills affecting the formula and ah.... refer them to second reading without reference to committee and others to refer to a subcommittee. So I therefore object to the gentleman's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Berman."

Berman: "Well, I stood, Mr. Speaker, in support of the Motion. The identical Bill was considered by the Committee yesterday and was voted out, I believe, without a dissenting vote. Ah.... It was ah.... It also had gone to subcommittee and ah.... recommended out by the subcommittee. I think we're just trying to save some time. Time is a precious element in our situation here these days. I see no problem with it and again the committee and subcommittee fully considered this Bill, so I would support the Motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Ah yes, I would hope the Assistant Minority Leader would withdraw his opposition. It is the identical Bill to a Bill like his Bill that was referred to the subcommittee. Matter of fact, I protested it going to the subcommittee, the subcommittee on Education on School Ed formula matters, and was approved by that subcommittee and only yesterday afternoon about 5:30 was approved by the ah.... House.... School House Education Committee. It's the identical Bill. It's passed the Senate. It's something of an emergency



matter up in our area for some of these school districts whose rate increases came too late to be fully included in the formula and, therefore, I think this is a case where we can let the Bill come to second reading without doing any damage to our principles."

Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "I would also support the Motion. In a way all we're doing is having a House sponsor of an identical Bill that has come over from the Senate sort of defer to have the Senate Bill substituted. They're exactly the same. It will avoid duplication in the legislative process, and I would hope you would support the Motion for that purpose."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washburn."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think that this has been adequately explained that the House Bill, an identical House Bill, was passed by our Education Committee yesterday. This is an emergency measure and ah... will affect some school adversely, if it isn't passed at its earliest possible moment. The Assistant Minority Leader and the Minority Leader had a slight lack of communications here, but we have total understanding now and I would ask for your support of Senate Bill 178."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the appropriate Rule be suspended to permit House Bill 178.... Senate Bill 178 to bypass the Committee and be placed on the Calendar at Second Reading. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, to be discharged from Committee, because it already has been assigned there, and placed on Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "I've been corrected by my colleague. To be discharged from Committee and placed on the Order of Second Reading. All in favor, vote 'aye'. It takes 107 votes. Vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. All voted who wished? Take the Record. On this question, there are 125 'ayes', one 'no', two voting 'present'. The Motion prevails. On the Consent Calendar, Third Reading. House Bill 51."



O'Brien: "House Bill 51. Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Nursing Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 71. A Bill for an Act to amend Unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 257. Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unemployment Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 304. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to promote the welfare of wage earners by regulating the assignment of wages. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 527. Bill for an Act to provide for the recording of livestock brands. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 570. A Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall these Bills pass? All in favor vote 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. On these Bills, 112 'ayes', no 'nay', 15 'present'. The Bills having received a Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. I've been corrected. Second Reading, Second Day."

O'Brien: "House Bill 230. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 636. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to Alcoholic liquors. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. The next order of business is announcements. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, the industrial or the Personnel and Pension Committee will meet immediately after adjournment in Room 122B. The Public Utilities Committee has been canceled. Their meeting at 4:00 PM today has been canceled, and now, Mr. Speaker, I would move that the deadline for House Bills that will expire..... that are presently on the Calendar and would expire prior to April 12, the deadline for those Bills, be extended to and including April the 12th. I believe that will require a roll call vote."



Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved the suspension of the deadline for all those Bills that would have expired on April 12th. Representative Grotberg, for what purpose do you rise?"

Grotberg: "Question of the Majority Leader, if he would yield. Would it be possible, Mr. Shea, on the 12th for somebody upstairs to give us the death date on all of the Bills. It's not appearing in our calendar in the order of their occurrence as I recall. 423, for instance. The parenthesis figures on the daily calendar...."

Shea: "That is the 30 day rule."

Grotberg: "That's the 30 day rule. What about the 45 day rule out of Committee?"

Shea: "Those are Bills in Committee and we'll have those for you if you want to look at them."

Grotberg: "Yeah, I'd like.... I think it would be good for all of us who have early bills and late bills as well. Thank you."

Shea: "I'll renew my Motion, Mr. Speaker, to extend the deadline for all Bills on the calendar to and including April the 12th."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, the adoption of the Motion. All in favor, vote 'aye' and opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. On this Motion, there are 127 'ayes', no 'nays'. The Motion is adopted. Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask leave to ah.... hear House Bill 375 in Counties and Townships today. It was inadvertently left off the posting."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman asks..... Any discussion? Gentleman asks leave to hear House Bill 375. Representative Washburn."

Washburn: "Ah.... thank you, Mr. Speaker. What Bill was this and what... could the Sponsor explain it a little bit and ah.... repeat his Motion."

Ewell: "Well, I'm not the Sponsor. Yes, it was inadvertently left off the posting notice. It's House Bill 375, and the



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sponsor of the Bill, Representative Stearney, requested that I make the ah.... Motion for leave."

Washburn: "Would you repeat the Sponsor again?"

Ewell: "Stearney."

Washburn: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Fary."

Fary: "Ah.... for the purpose of announcements ah....."

Speaker Redmond: "We haven't taken the roll call yet, Representative. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, leave for the last unanimous roll call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "I don't want to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the adoption of the Motion to suspend the Rules for posting. All those vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Explanation of my vote. I not only object to a Bill being heard in Committee without notice to the Public, but here's a Bill that amends the Code of Criminal Procedure and has been assigned to Counties and Townships and that's why I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "This requires 107 votes. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. On this Motion, there are 92 'ayes', 8 'nos', 11 'present', and having failed to receive the necessary Majority, the Motion is lost. Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker, in the interest of economy for the taxpayers of the State, I was asked to make an announcement. You have on your desk a report from the Commission on the Status of Women. There have been requests from groups all over the State for copies of this report. Any of you who have finished reading it, please, instead of throwing it away, if you'd see that your extra copy gets to the desk of Representative Catania, we would be most grateful. Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions."

O'Brien: "House Resolution 152. Beaupre. House Resolution 155. Younge."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre, do you desire recognition?"

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 152, congratulatory resolution to the Waseka Warriors for having one third place in the Class A State high school basketball tournament. I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor, indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Resolutions are adopted. Representative Lechowicz, for what purpose do you rise?"

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on the purpose of making an announcement."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there further announcements?"

Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir. Ah... the House Appropriations Committee will meet today at 2:00. Division I will meet in Room 114. Division II will meet in Room 118."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Fary."

Fary: "Ah... those of you who have not paid for the St. Joseph's Day Dinner tickets, please do so, because the surplus goes into the General Assembly Welfare fund. We want to wrap this up fellows, so ah... get together on it huh? And I wish to make another announcement, that Labor and Commerce, contrary to rumors, will meet at 2:00 PM sharp in Room D-1 across the Street."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, State Commander, Rober McMann, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars has asked me to remind you that upon returning here on Tuesday, April the 8th, the VFW is giving its annual Legislative Dinner, which includes a nice beautiful steak and drinks and so forth, and to make sure that ah... you don't forget to attend it on that evening. I would like to know between now and then, anybody that was unable to attend. But it's



going to be a wonderful affair and I hope you'll all be able to attend."

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions. Do we have another Agreed Resolution?"

O'Brien: "House Resolution 154. Caldwell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Giorgi."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I have House Resolution 154 and 155. They are Agreed Resolutions. 154 ah.... extended the Committee created by House Resolution 450 of the 78th General Assembly as a special committee of the House. This is the Committee that studies the policy name game in Chicago. The policy game in Chicago, and House Bill Resolution 155 by Mrs. Younge honors William T. Coleman of Philadelphia, who is the first black candidate officer to be appointed by President Ford, and the second black to serve in the Cabinet in the United States history. I move for the adoption of both Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor, indicate by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Giorgi, there's a death resolution."

O'Brien: "House Resolution 156. Grotberg."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I thought it fitting that the House could know, that yesterday, that I and Paul Costello of the Minority staff and Mrs. Leahy from the Administration, attended on behalf of this Body the funeral of Alfred Angster, the Executive Director of Luthern Welfare Services of Illinois, who has been down here testifying for as many years as many of us have been around and passed away sitting watching television Friday night, smoking his cigar, and we miss him greatly. We would pray that each of us would remember him and his



family, and I would like for the unanimous approval for all the Members of this Body to be shown upon the resolution that will go to his widow, Mrs. Alfred Angster. The State of Illinois has lost one of the greatest workers for social reform that it has ever known, and we are very sad about his loss."

Speaker Redmond: "Leave granted to add all Members name to this Resolution? Is leave granted? Representative Capuzi."

Capuzi: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know where the Committee on Personnel and Pensions is going to meet and at what time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McLendon."

McLendon: "I know but I'm asking Jerry Shea. He's got it set up."

Shea: "I made the announcement, Mr. Capuzi, that it would meet immediately after adjournment in Room 122B."

Capuzi: "Thank you, Mr. Shea, but I didn't hear you."

Shea: "You were worried about collecting that money with Fary."

Capuzi: "Right."

Speaker Redmond: "This is on the adoption of House Resolution 156. All in favor, indicate by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Resolution is adopted. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, one announcement before we adjourn. The Motor Vehicles Committee that was scheduled at 2:00 PM on Monday, April 7, has now been rescheduled to be heard with the Bills on Thursday, April the 10th. So there will be no meeting. That meeting has been canceled. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now stand adjourned."

Speaker Redmond: "Move the House stand adjourned. All those in favor, indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. House stands adjourned. Have a happy Christmas."



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-FIFTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

MARCH 26, 1975



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

INDEX

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 26, 1975



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
1	9:30	Speaker Creeger	Prayer Roll Calls & Message from Senate
2	9:32	O'Brien	Message from Senate
	9:33	Redmond O'Brien	H.B. 955 1st Reading Intro-1st Reading
3		Speaker	
4-8		O'Brien	
	9:50	Washburn Speaker Madigan	Excuse Absentees Excuse absentees
	9:51	Speaker	Senate Bill-1st Reading
9	9:52	O'Brien	Senate Bill 66-1st Rdg
	9:54	Speaker	Trouble with printers
	9:55	Speaker Walsh Speaker O'Brien Speaker	H.B. 79- 2nd Reading Fiscal Note for H.B. 1 H.B. 79
	9:56	O'Brien	H.B. 111
10		Griesheimer	Amend #1
	9:58	Speaker O'Brien	Amendment Adopted Amendment #2
	9:59	Griesheimer	
11		Speaker	Amendment #2 Adopted
		Speaker O'Brien	H.B. 114 1st Reading H.B. 114 Hart absent
	9:60	Speaker	H.B. 121 2nd Reading Out of Record

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
11	10:00	Speaker	H.B. 128
		O'Brien	H.B. 128-Greiman absent Out of Record
		Speaker	H.B. 202
		O'Brien	H.B. 202 Polk absent Out of Record
		Speaker	H.B. 300 Merlo absent Out of Record-H.B. 323
		O'Brien	H.B. 323 Griesheimer-hold Out of Record
		Speaker	H.B. 357 Maragos Out of Record
		O'Brien	H.B. 449 Lundy Out of Record
		Speaker	H.B. 488 Giorgi Out of Record
		O'Brien	H.B. 584 Lundy Out of Record
12	10:01	Speaker	H.B. 990,
		O'Brien	H.B. 990, Revenue Comm. Out of Record
		Speaker	Out of Record
		O'Brien	10:02
		Speaker	10:02
		Schlickman	No copy of HB 990
		Speaker	10:03
		Schlickman	10:03
		O'Brien	Bradley in Chair
		Bradley	10:03
13	10:05	O'Brien	H.B. 173 Geo-Karis 3rd Reading
		Bradley	10:05
		Geo-Karis	10:06
		Bradley	10:06
		Leinenweber	10:07
	10:06	Geo-Karis	Explains bill

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
14	10:07	Geo-Karis	
		Leinenweber	
		Geo-Karis	Discussion
		Leinenweber	
		Geo-Karis	
		Leinenweber	
		Geo-Karis	
	10:08	Leinenweber	
15	10:10	Geo-Karis	To close
		Bradley	Vote - Passed H.B. 220 3rd Reading Out of Record
	10:11	O'Brien	H.B. 251 3rd Reading
		Bradley	
		Rayson	Wait for amendment
		Bradley	Out of Record
		O'Brien	H.B. 254 3rd Reading
16	10:12	Rayson	Explains bill
		Bradley	
	10:13	Schlickman	Discussion
		Bradley	
17	10:14	Schlickman	
		Redmond	
	10:15	Hart	
	10:16	Redmond	
	10:17	Hart	
		Rayson	Explains bill
18		Hart	
		Rayson	
		Hart	
		Rayson	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
18		Hart	
		Rayson	
		Bradley	
		Hart	
	10:18	Bradley	To Close?
		Rayson	To Close
19		Bradley	
		Dunn	Question
		Bradley	
		Dunn	
		Bradley	Vote
20		Schlickman	Explains vote
		Bradley	
		D'Arco	Explains vote
		Bradley	
	10:22	Mugalian	Explains vote
21		Bradley	
		Gaines	Explains vote
		Bradley	
		Beatty	Explains vote
		Bradley	
	10:25	Rayson	Take it out of record
22		Bradley	Postponed Consideration
		Rayson	
		Bradley	H.B. 291 3rd Reading
	10:27	Houlihan	Take it out of record
		Bradley	H.B. 301 Out of REcord
		O'Brien	H.B. 342 3rd Reading
		Bradley	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
22 - 24	10:27	Greisheimer	Explains H.B. 342 3rd Rdg
		Bradley	
		Schlickman	Yield?
		Bradley	
		Schlickman	Discussion
25	10:30	Greisheimer	
		Schlickman	
		Griesheimer	
		Schlickman	
		Griesheimer	
26	10:35	Schlickman	
		Greisheimer	
		Bradley	
		Madigan	Yield for question
		Bradley	
27		Madigan	Question
		Greisheimer	
		Madigan	Discussion
		Greisheimer	
		Madigan Greisheimer	
		Madigan	
		Greisheimer	
		Madigan	Examine out of record?
		Bradley	Out of record
		O'Brien	H.B. 602 3rd Reading
28	10:38	Bradley	
		Beaupre	
		Bradley	
29		Beaupre	Explains bill

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
29		Bradley	
29-31	10:42	Hanahan	Remarks re: H.B. 602
		Bradley	
		Hanahan	Concludes
		Bradley	
32	10:47	Leinenweber	Remarks
		Bradley	Order, please
		Leinenweber	Remarks
33		Bradley	
		Kosinski	Address the sponsor?
		Bradley	
		Kosinski	Remarks
		Leinenweber	Remarks
34	10:50	Bradley	
		Kosinski	Comments
		Bradley	
		Neff	Remarks
35		Bradley	
	10:55	Berman	Remarks
36		Bradley	
		Griesheimer	Remarks
37		Bradley	
	11:00	Lundy	Remarks
38		Bradley	
		Randolph	Move previous question
		Bradley	Vote
		Beaupre	To Close
39		Bradley	
		McGrew	Explain vote

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
39		Bradley	
	11:05	Gaines	Explains vote
		Bradley	
		Cunningham	Explains vote
40		Bradley	
	11:07	Barnes	Explains vote
41		Bradley	
		Dunn	Explains vote
42		Bradley	
	11:11	Hanahan	Remarks
43		Bradley	
		McClain	Remarks
		Bradley	
		Leon	Remarks
44		Bradley	
	11:15	Skinner	Discussion
45		Bradley	
		Schraeder	Discussion
46		Bradley	
	11:18	Freidrich	Discussion
		Bradley	
		Beaupre	Postponed consideration?
		Bradley	Leave granted-H.B. 342
47	11:20	O'Brien	H.B. 342 3rd Reading
		Bradley	
		Greisheimer	Explains bill
		Bradley	
		Madigan	Explains vote
		Bradley	
48		Greisheimer	Remarks

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
48	11:20	Bradley Greisheimer	
		Bradley	
49	11:24	Yourell	Explains vote
		Bradley	
		Bluthardt	Explains vote
		Bradley	
50	11:27	Stone	Remarks
		Bradley	
		Madison	Explains vote
		Bradley	
		Griesheimer	Explains vote
51		Bradley	Vote Passed
		Selke	H.B. 425
			H.B. 425 3rd Reading
		Lundy	Explains bill
52		Bradley	
		Kempiners	Yield to question?
		Bradley	
		Kempiners	Discussion
		Lundy	
		Kepminers	
		Bradley	
		Kempiners	
53		Bradley	
		McClain	Yield?
		Lundy	
		McClain	Remarks
		Lundy	
		McClain	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
53	11:30	Lundy	Discussion
54		McClain	
55		Bradley	
		Borchers	Remarks
		Bradley	
		McCourt	Remarks
56		Bradley	
		Lundy	Comments
		Bradley	Vote-
		Kempiners	Explains vote
57		Bradley	
		Deuster	Explains vote
		Bradley	
		Madigan	Remarks
58		Bradley	
		Selcke	Messages from Senate
		Bradley	Adjournment Resolution
		Selcke	
	11:47	Bradley	
		Shea	
		Selcke	
		Shea	Remarks
59		Bradley	
		Grotberg	Point of privelege
		Bradley	
		Grotberg	Remarks
		Bradley	
		Grotberg	
		Bradley	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
59	11:50	Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	
		Bradley	
		McGrew	H.B. 839 & HR 126
		Bradley	
		McGrew	
		Selcke	
		Bradley	
		Tuerk	Table H.B. 469
60	11:49	Bradley	
		Tuerk	
		Bradley	Leave to Table H.B. 433
		Delcke	H.B. 433 3rd Reading
		Bradley	
		Lundy	Explains bill
61		Bradley	
		Grotberg	Sponsor yield for question
		Bradley	
		Grotberg	Question
		Lundy	Discussion
62		Grotberg	
		Lundy	
		Grotberg	
		Lundy	
		Grotberg	
		Bradley	To close
63		Schlickman	Sponsor yield to question
		Bradley	
		Schlickman	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
63	11:52	Lundy	Discussion
		Schlickman	
		Lundy	
		Schlickman	
		Lundy	
		Schlickman	
		Lundy	
		Schlickman	
64		Lundy	
		Bradley	
		Schlickman	Question
		Lundy	Discussion
		Schlickman	
		Lundy	
		Schlickman	
		Lundy	
		Schlickman	
		Bradley	
		Washburn	Remarks
55		Bradley	
		Hart	Question to sponsor
		Lundy	Discussion
		Hart	
		Lundy	
		Hart	
		Bradley	
5-67		Lundy	Remarks
		Speaker	Vote-Passed H.B. 439
		Selcke	H.B. 439 3rd Reading

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
67		Bradley	
		Simms	Explains H.B. 439
68		Bradley	
		Shea	Remarks
		Bradley	
		Yourell	Question
		Simms	
		Bradley	
		Griesheimer	Remarks
69		Bradley	
		Capuzi	Question
		Bradley	
		Capuzi	
		Simms	
		Capuzi	Discussion
		Simms	
		Capuzi	
		Simms	
		Bradley	
		Matijeovich	
		Bradley	
		Matijeovich	Question to sponsor
70		Simms	Discussion
		Matijeovich	
71		Simms	
		Matijeovich	
72		Bradley	
		Meyer	Remarks
		Bradley	
		Simms	Remarks

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
72		Bradley	Out of Record H.B. 439
		Skinner	Point of Order
		Bradley	
73		Skinner	Questions
		Bradley	
		Selcke	Report on Committee on Rules
		Bradley	
		Shea	Remarks
74		Bradley	
		Mann	Question
		Shea	Discussion
		Mann	
		Shea	
		Mann	
		Shea	
		Mann	
		Bradley	
		McClain	Sponsor yield?
		Bradley	
		McClain	Question
		Shea	Move for adoption
		McClain	Remarks
		Shea	Discussion
		McClain	
		Bradley	
		Hart	Remarks
		Shea	
		Hart	Remarks

PAGE

TIME

SPEAKER

DESCRIPTION

75

Bradley

76

Sangmeister

Question to sponsor

Shea

Discussion

Sangmeister

Shea

Sangmeister

Shea

Sangmeister

Bradley

Chapman

Question

Shea

Discussion

Chapman

Shea

Chapman

Shea

Chapman

Bradley

77

Matijevich

Remarks

Shea

Discussion

Bradley

Lechowicz

Remarks

Shea

Discussion

Lechowicz

Shea

Lechowicz

Shea

Lechowicz

Bradley

78

Madison

Sponsor yield for questior

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
78		Shea	Discussion
		Madison	
		Shea	
		Madison	
		Shea	
79		Madison	
		Shea	
		Bradley	
		Washington	question to sponsor?
		Bradley	
		Washington	Question
		Shea	Discussion
		Washington	
		Shea	
		Washington	
80		Shea	
		Washington	
81		Shea	
		Washington	
		Shea	
		Washington	
		Shea	
		Washington	
82		Shea	
		Washington	
		Bradley	
		Barnes	sponsor yield to question?
		Bradley	
		Barnes	Remarks

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
82	12:39	Shea	Discussion re: Joint Rules
		Barnes	
		Shea	
		Barnes	
83		Shea	Discussion
		Barnes	
		Shea	
		Barnes	
		Shea	
		Barnes	
		Shea	
		Barnes	
		Bradley	
		Barnes	
		Bradley	
		Duff	Yield to question?
		Bradley	
	12:40	Duff	Question
84		Shea	Discussion
		Duff	
		Shea	
		Duff	
		Shea	
		Duff	
85		Shea	
		Duff	
		Shea	
		Duff	
		Shea	
86		Duff	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
86	12:41	Bradley	
		Madison	Question to sponsor
		Bradley	
		Madison	Discussion on Joint Rules
		Bradley	
		Shea	
87		Bradley	H.B. 639 3rd Reading
	12:48	O'Brien	H.B. 639 3rd Reading
		McPartlin	Explains bill
		Bradley	Vote-Passed H.B. 521
		O'Brien	H.B. 521 3rd Reading
		Bradley	
88		Washburn	Explains bill
		Bradley	
		McClain	Question to sponsor
		Bradley	
		McClain	
		Washburn	
		McClain	
		Bradley	
89		Houlihan	Yield to question?
		Bradley	
		Houlihan	Question
		Washburn	
		Bradley	
		Lemke	Sponsor yield to question
		Bradley	
		Lemke	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
89	12:52	Washburn	Discussion re: H.B. 521
		Lemke	
		Washburn	
		Lemke	
		Washburn	
		Lemke	
90		Washburn	
		Lemke	
		Bradley	
		Lemke	
		Washburn	
		Bradley	
91		Lechowicz	Remarks
		Bradley	
		Meyer	Discussion
		Bradley	
		Meyer	
		Lemke	
		Meyer	
92	12:57	Lemke	
		Bradley	
		Washburn	Remarks
		Bradley	Vote-Passed H.B. 445
		O'Brien	H.B. 445 3rd Reading
		Bradley	
93		Catania	Explains bill
94		Bradley	
		Catania	Close

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
94	1:00	Bradley	
		Fleck	Sponsor yield to question
		Bradley	
		Fleck	Question
			Catania
		Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	Inquiry to sponsor?
		Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	Question
		Catania	
95		Geo-Karis	Remarks
		Carania	Discussion
		Geo-Karis	
		Bradley	Proceed
		Geo-Karis	Remarks
		Bradley	
		Calvo	Sponsor yield to question
		Bradley	
		Calvo	Question
		Catania	
		Calvo	Remarks
		Catania	
		Calvo	
		Bradley	
96		Borchers	Point of privilege
		Bradley	
		Jaffe	Remarks
97	1:08	Bradley	
		Deuster	Sponsor yield to question

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
97	1:08	Bradley	
		Deuster	Remarks re:H.B. 445
		Catania	Discussion
		Deuster	
		Catania	
		Deuster	
		Catania	
		Deuster	
		Catania	
		Deuster	
		Bradley	
		Catania	
		Bradley	Vote-
98		Fleck	Remarks
		Catania	
		Bradley	H.B. 445 Passed
	1:11	Redmond	H.B. 602
		Beaupre	Moved back for amendment
		Redmond	
		Berman	Parliamentary Inquiry
		Redmond	
		Berman	
		Redmond	
		Berman	
		Beaupre	Leave?
		Redmond	Leave 2nd Reading
		O'Brien	Amendment 8
		Redmond	
		Beaupre	Remarks

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
99	1:13	Redmond	Vote on Amendment #8 Adopted-Postponement
		Beaupre	Remarks
		Redmond	
		Matijevich	Parliamentary Inquiry
		Redmond	
		Beaupre	
		Redmond	
		Beaupre	Remarks
		Redmond	
100	1:15	Beaupre	Table Committee Amendment #1 to H.B. 602
		Redmond	H.B. 485
		O'Brien	H.B. 485 3rd Reading
		Redmond	
101		Williams	Explains bill
		Redmond	
102	1:16	Ewell	Remarks
		Redmond	
103		Williams	Discussion
		Redmond	
		Shea	Remarks
		Redmond	
		Walsh	Remarks
		Shea	Discussion
104		Redmond	
		Schraeder	Comments
		Redmond	
		Shea	Discussion
		Schraeder	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
104		Shea	Remarks re: H.B. 485
		Schraeder	
		Redmond	
		Washburn	Remarks - Adoption of H.R. 30
		Redmond	Vote-Resolution Adopted H.R. 157
105		Shea	Explains Resolution
		Redmond	
		Shea	Move for adoption
		Washburn	
		Redmond	Vote-Resolution Passed Committee Reports
106		O'Brien	Committee Reports
		Redmond	
		Hoffman	Suspend Rule 67B from SB 178 (HB 534)
		Redmond	
		Bradley	Yield for question?
		Redmond	
		Bradley	Question
		Hoffman	Remarks
		Bradley	Remarks
108		Redmond	
		Walsh	Remarks
		Redmond	
		Berman	Comments
		Redmond	
		Pierce	Remarks
109		Redmond	
		Deuster	Remarks

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
109		Redmond	
		Washburn	Remarks-support of SB 178
		Redmond	Suspend HB 178
		Hoffman	SB 178 bypass Committee
			Discharge from Committee
			Placed on 2nd reading
		Redmond	Vote-Motion prevails
			H.B. 51
110		O'Brien	H.B. 51 3rd Reading
			71
			257
			304
			527
			" 570 "
		Redmond	Vote-All Passed
		O'Brien	H.B. 230 2nd Reading
		Redmond	3rd Reading
			Announcements
		Shea	Announcements
111		Redmond	Suspension of deadline
			for expiration April 12th
		Grotberg	Question of Majority Ldr
		Shea	Discussion
		Grotberg	
		Shea	
		Grotberg	
		Shea	
		Redmond	Motion Adopted
		Ewell	HB 375
		Redmond	
		Washburn	repeat motion
		Ewell	
112		Washburn	
		Ewell	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
112		Washburn	
		Redmond	
		Fary	Purpose of announcements
		Redmond	
		Yourell	Leave for last unanimous roll call
		Redmond	
		Schlickman	
		Redmond	Vote
		Schlickman	Explains vote
		Redmond	Motion lost
		Dyer	Announcement
	113		Redmond
		O'Brien	HR 152
		Beaupre	
		Redmond	Vote-Resolution Adopted
		Lechowicz	Announcement
		Redmond	
		Fary	Announcement
		Redmond	
		DiPrima	Announcement
		Redmond	Agreed Resolution
114		O'Brien	HR 154
		Redmond	
		Caldwell	
		Redmond	
		Giorgi	HR 154 & 155
		Redmond	Vote-Resolutions Passed
		Shea	Death Resolution
		O'Brien	HR 156

PAGETIMESPEAKERDESCRIPTION

114

Redmond

Grotberg

Announcement

115

Redmond

Leave granted

Capuzi

Question on Committees

Redmond

McLendon

Shea

Announcement

Capuzi

Shea

Capuzi

Redmond

Vote-Resolution 156
Adopted

Shea

Announcement

Redmond

Move House stand adjourned

Vote-Adjourned