

DoorKeeper: "All those not entitled to the floor, will you please go to the gallery? All those not entitled to the floor, will you please go to the gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order and the members will please be in their seats. May I introduce Representative Polk for the purpose of presenting the Chaplain of the Day."

Polk: "This morning, John and Marsha Clark-Johnson who are interns and seminarians from the Lutheran School of Theology in Chicago will give us the opening prayer. They're both... Both are serving their internship; one in Moline and one in Rock Island."

Marsha Clark-Johnson: "The Scripture that I've chosen to read for today comes from Matthew, Chapter 5. 'And Jesus opened his mouth and taught them saying, Blessed are the poor in spirit for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven. Blessed are those who mourn for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth. And Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness for they shall be satisfied. Blessed are the merciful for they shall obtain mercy and Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God. Blessed are the peacemaker for they shall be called children of God. You are the salt of the earth, but if the salt has lost its taste, how shall its saltness be restored? It is no longer good for anything except be thrown out and trodden underfoot by men. You are the light of the world, a city set on a hill cannot be hid. Nor do men light a lamp and put it under a bushel but on a stand and it gives light to all in the House. Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and give Glory to your Father who is in Heaven'. Herein Scripture for today."

John Clark-Johnson: "Today in your personal prayers we keep in mind Representative Keller's wife who entered the hospital this afternoon, I understand, for surgery. Let us Pray. Dear Lord, help us to honor and respect your gifts to us in



this world and to participate with you in protecting and re-
newing them. Give us faith to rely on your work and to live
a life that celebrates in that trust. Make us sensitive today
and all of our days to the needs of those people to whom we
serve; the lonely, the rich, the poor, the oppressed and even
people who are dying. Help us to serve with compassion. We
commit ourselves to you and help us to seek truths that have
not been seen and to obey commands which have been heard but
not yet obeyed. And trust each other in fellowship which you
have given us. Heavenly Father be with these public officials
today as they seek unity and justice and peace among our
human family. Into your hands, Lord, we commend all for whom
we Pray, trusting in your mercy through your Son, Jesus Christ,
Our Lord, Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll call for attendance. Representative
Washburn."

Washburn: "Thank you ah..., Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentle-
men of the House. I'd like to have the record show that Re-
presentative Hirschfeld is absent because he is ill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? The record will so show. Re-
presentative Giorgi, any excused absences on the Democratic
side? Representative Hart."

Hart: "Ah... I'd like to excuse Representative Keller because
of illness in his family."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa, I believe, is absent.
Any objections to the excused absences on the Democratic side?
The record will so show. Message from the Senate.?"

O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright - secretary.
Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representa-
tives that the Senate has concurred with the House the adop-
tion of Amendment 1 to a Bill of following title. Senate
Bill 294. Concurred in the Senate April 21, 1975, Kenneth
Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washburn."

Washburn: "Ah... Thank you ah..., Mr. Speaker and ladies and
gentlemen of the House. We're honored to have with us this



morning the eighth grade class from Sheldon in Iroquois County in the Speakers Balcony with their ah... sponsor, Richard Reynolds. Will you please stand ah... eighth grade class of Sheldon."

Speaker Redmond: "I have an announcement that I think is of interest. We have ah... telephone gadgets which will be available for the purpose is to block out the floor noise. We don't guarantee that they're going to be 100%, but anyone that is interested, will you contact Mary Beth Gaule in the Speaker's Office. The girl that sits at the front desk. Representative Brummet."

Brummet: "Ah... Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Brummet: "I would like to introduce ah... Mr. Don Lewis and his wife is sitting up in the balcony. He is the immediate past President of the State Historical Society and it so happens that my wife and I were his first pupils when he started teaching school. I believe he's sitting down there with Joe Lucco now trying to inveigle Joe into cleaning up his language in the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I'd like to have the privilege of introducing to you the students from the Madam Curie High School located at Arch and Pulaski Avenue in Chicago. There are 19 students ah... with their teacher, Mr. Oscar McBee and Raymond Garson. They're from the district of Don Fary, soon to be a Congressman, Representative Kozubowski and, I believe, I don't know the Republican from that district. I would like to have the class, Don Wall is the Republican from that district. I'd like to have the class stand."

Speaker Redmond: "Please come to order. The order of business is Resolutions on the Speakers Table and on the Speakers Table is House Joint Resolution 4, 4. Representative Deuster. House Joint Resolution 4. I've been advised by the Clerk that you have an Amendment that you wanted to have adopted.



Is that correct?"

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, there is an Amendment which was adopted in Committee to House Joint Resolution 4. Of course, the House Joint Resolution calls for a thorough and comprehensive study of all of the legal ramifications of the proposed equal rights Amendment to the United State Constitution. When this was introduced ah... the reporting day for this study, which was modeled after the study performed by the State of Virginia, was ah... to be April 15. Ah... of course, ah... it took us a long time to get organized so the ah... the Amendment changes the reporting date to January 1, 1976. The ah... other part included in the Amendment was to indicate that since a joint subcommittee of the Executive Committee of the House and Senate would be established that ah... any expenses associated with the study would be shared equally by the House and the Senate out of the regular funds that support our Committee work. I would be happy to answer questions, but I move the adoption of ah... I believe, it is Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 4 which was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Question is on the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 4. All in favor of the adoption, indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Representative Deuster."

Duester: "Well, I believe, Mr. Speaker, our normal practice when Amendments are adopted, normally with a Bill and my co-sponsor, Representative Hudson has arrived on the scene ah... and I'm sure that we may concur that normally with Bills, their Second Reading and Third Reading with respect to a Resolution.



We have adopted an Amendment and it ought to be, ah... all the members ought to be accorded the opportunity to look over the Amendment. So, what I would imagine we would leave this at the Speakers Table. Although, I yield to my colleague, Representative Hudson, on that point."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I think that Representative Deuster has ah... presented this well. I do feel that it would be in the interest of the Members to have a chance to consider the Amendment ah... to this Resolution and ah... would likewise request that it remain temporarily ah... at least, on the Speakers Table."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? House Joint Resolution 4 will remain on the Speakers Table. House Joint Resolution 14. Is Representative McAuliffe on the floor? Take that one out of the record. House Joint Resolution 16. Representative Yourell. Representative Yourell, House Joint Resolution 16. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Joint Resolution 16 is a Resolution that is designed to provide to the people of the State of Illinois a toll-free telephone number wherein they can call a facility set up by the General Services Administration to provide the voting record of any member of the General Assembly. Now, I believe that in order to restore the confidence of the people in the elective process and the individuals they elected to public office, that a system whereby they can be made aware of the way our Representatives are voting in the General Assembly is most important. I've found this in the last campaign that people tend not to



trust their elected public officials and you know that's happened all over the country, whether it be on a local situation, state, county or national. Now, the Resolution was amended in Committee to provide that in the case of duplicate subject matter, or subject matters that relate in a certain way to the same subject that the caller must provide a Bill number before the Legislative Information Program can be put into effect. Now, the General Services administration has advised me in prolonged conversations and discussions relative to this matter that they see no problem in starting up a pilot program and that the Clerk of the House, Mr. O'Brien, has assured me in conversations with him that it can be worked out and the Secretary of the Senate apparently will have difficulty with this because General Services has indicated that this would be a program that they would be delighted to participate in. Now, the Department of General Services has explored the possibility and they have indicated to me that the cost of the system should not be added to the Budget of the General Services administration but could be handled out of the House Appropriation and the Senate Appropriation. Now, I don't know what the feeling of the members of the General Assembly are but I think that pursuant to House Joint Resolution an affirmative vote to restore the confidence of the public in our system of government would be helped by the adoption of the House Joint Resolution and I would be delighted to answer any questions that you may have."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell, I've been advised that there's a... Amendment #1 that has not yet been adopted."

Yourell: "Ah... Oh, do you have the Amendment, Mr. Clerk?"



Well, then I explained the Amendment and I would move the adoption... What do we have to do? Move it back? I move the adoption of Amendment #1 which would ah... simply say that the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate may provide the Legislative Information only when provided with the appropriate Bill number. I move the adoption of the Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 16."

Speaker Redmond: "Questions on the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 16. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Proceed Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "I ah... I think, Mr. Speaker, that I've explained the very simple Resolution and all it does again is provide a toll-free telephone number to be published by the media of the State of Illinois so that anybody can call the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate and ask how John Doe voted on any Bill that they may have the number to and might be interested and I move for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the adoption of the Resolution. All those in favor of the adoption indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution's adopted. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Ah... Since this is going to involve money, you know, don't we have to have a roll call? Maybe..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "The only money that will be expended is out of the Clerk's ordinary contingent expense and it will not require the appropriation of any additional money by this House."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Thank you very much. I'm sure that you're going to announce the Resolution passed."

Speaker Redmond: "That's correct, yes. The Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 44. House Resolution 44, pardon me. Representative Giglio. Take that one out of the record. House Resolution 87, 87. Representative Steele."

Steele: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 87 is a Resolution which authorizes the Legislative Audit Commission with an arm of the Legislative Branch to investigate the use of State owned cars to determine if efficiency can be obtained both in the saving of fuel and the saving of cost of our..., in this particular area of government. This Resolution was originally ah... calling upon the Legislative Investigation Commission to make this ah... inquiry. It was amended in the ah... subcommittee of the Executive Committee so that the Legislative Audit Commission would ah... handle this inquiry. It was passed by the subcommittee of the Executive Committee. It was passed and approved by the Executive Committee and I would ask for a favorable vote on this Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "I understand that there's an Amendment to be adopted on this one, Representative Steele."

Steele: "The Amendment ah... Mr. Speaker, the Amendment was made in the Executive Committee which did authorize the Legislative Audit Commission to be authorized to ah... to ah... conduct this inquiry. That was the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you moving the adoption of the Amendment?"

Steele: "Yes, right."



Speaker Redmond: "The gentlemen has moved the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Resolution 87. All in favor of the adoption indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. And do you now move the adoption of the Resolution? The gentleman has moved the adoption of Resolution, House Resolution 87. The question is on the adoption. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The Resolution's adopted. The 'ayes' have it. House Resolution 115, 115. Representative Beatty. I understand there's an Amendment on this one, also. Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, members of the House, I'd move for the adoption of Amendment 1 which is ah... just ah... an Amendment to clean up the Resolution ah... limiting the investigation called for to ah.. those instances where there some complaint or reason to believe that there is some problem with the nursing home and it also adds in shelter care centers and I'd move for the adoption of Amendment 1."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the adoption of the Amendment #1 to House Resolution 115. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. On the Resolution, Representative Beatty. Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, members of the House, this Resolution is an extension of the original one calling, which called for an investigation due to some deaths in one county of the State. This Resolution requests that the Illinois Legislative Investigating Commission investigate those nursing homes and shelter care centers where there would be anyone there who's a charge of the State of Illinois or where someone had been placed where there was any reason to believe



there has been neglect or there where there have been any complaints received relative to that home. I've discussed it with the Chairman of the Legislative Investigation Commission. I think the basic idea here is to see that these homes are rendering more proper care for the patients who are placed there by the State of Illinois. I believe it will have a good effect in, and we'll see, and as a result of this Resolution if it's passed, we will find out what has been going on and what, and what care is actually been rendered to those charges of the State where we have reason to believe they have not been cared for properly. This Resolution was requested by a parents group, parents who have children in these homes. They want to see that proper care is rendered. They don't believe that this care has been given to their children and ah... this Resolution is ah... endorsed by the Illinois Association for the Mentally Retarded Citizen. I believe it will have a solid stability effect and it will let members of the General Assembly know just what is being done for these people in these homes so that we... We have the responsibility to see that proper care is rendered to these people. Indications are that proper care is not being given and that's the reason for the Resolution. I move for passage of the Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "We're ready for the... Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, Representative ah... Beatty, if I might ask a question. Are... Do you intend for the Social Science oriented people from the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission to assist in making policy recommendations ah... with the Illinois Legislative Investigating Commission."

Beatty: "This is a separate investigation to see ah..."



whether proper care is being given to..., in these nursing homes. What you're referring to and what would have to be separate investigation or separate matter."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, if I might speak to the Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Skinner: "I think that someone ought to be investigating this. I think that the Legislative Investigating Commission has experience in the criminal matter but I really think that it's broader than criminal. I think there are policy implications that go beyond the criminal factors and I really think that there ought to be ah... some involvement by either the Auditor General, social science type or the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission. Ah... social science type."

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

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I'd just like to add my support to the request for the passage of this Resolution. As all of you know, we previously passed a Resolution for the Legislative Investigation Commission to come to Lake County and investigate our nursing homes and they have not submitted their report yet, but it's my understanding there have been some significant findings made. There's been another Resolution introduced for the Legislative Investigation Commission to completely investigate all nursing homes throughout the State and I personally feel that we cannot investigate these organizations enough and that even though we are approaching this from a new standpoint, and there might be some duplication, the ultimate benefit to the residents of these nursing homes is warranted and I'd urge your support of this Resolution."



Speaker Redmond: "Are we ready for the question? Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow members of the House, for some six years I've been rather active in my area on matters concerning this Resolution. I would just want to tell one incident. I asked at one time for the Legislative Investigation Commission, State of Illinois to come down and investigate the ah... Adolf Meyer Clinic which is in Decatur. It was supposed, and I was assured it would be a secret. A secret meeting, that is ah... they would come in to the ah... Adolf Meyer Clinic without anyone knowing that they were coming. I wanted a surprise inspection. I assure you I found out shortly afterwards the Adolf Meyer people had been informed two weeks before the visit and were all ready. Everything was in apple pie order, even some of the people that were to be talked to ah... talked to in advance and I certainly support this Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? The question is on the adoption of the Resolution. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution 9. Representative Brandt."

Brandt: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, Senate Joint Resolution 9 would authorize the Space Needs Commission to conduct closed meetings with the owners of property for the purpose of negotiating the purchase of two blocks of property contiguous to the Capitol Complex in Springfield. Such purchases, such purchases authorized by the Space Needs Act, Chapter 63, Section 3.02 and 3.04 and the Commission feels that the property owners will be more willing to negotiate in a private session. Gentlemen, under the existing statutes, public bodies are allowed to



hold closed sessions to discuss property acquisition. However, the State Constitution provides in Article IV, Section 5 that sessions of the General Assembly Commission may be closed only upon approval two-thirds of both Houses. So therefore, gentlemen, Section... Senate Joint Resolution 9 will authorize these closed meetings. But however, we need a two-thirds vote to pass this Resolution. The Executive Committee approved Senate Joint Resolution 9 without any ah... without any ah... dissenting votes. I'd ask a favorable vote on this Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 9. All in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. It takes 107 votes. Representative Griesheimer, for what purpose do you rise? Have all voted who wished? This takes 107 votes. Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, could we have some order. I think this is an important matter."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman is correct. Will the House please come to order. Representative Mann, do you want to proceed?"

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, with no reflection on the distinguished House sponsor of this Resolution, I must say that I have serious reservations about it. We do our business in the Capitol Complex. We have our offices here. Ah... whatever is done in closed session is very apt to reflect on all of us. We're talking about the expenditure of an awful lot of money. I don't know why these meetings should be closed. I, I tend to think that it would be poor public policy ah... to have them closed. I think we're talking about the Capitol that belongs to all the people of the State of Illinois. Ah... I think the people ah... ought to be entitled to sit in and



listen to debate. Ah... and testify ah... if they desire. I don't think that we should give the impression to anyone that this business which is the peoples business is going to be conducted in secret and ah... once more, while I'm not imputing the integrity of anybody ah... connected with the Commission or certainly the House sponsor, I think we ought to take a long, long look at it and I, my own judgment is that it would be bad public policy not to, to ah... hold these meetings in public so that everyone might participate in them. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, the Space Needs Committee is our Legislative Commission to worry about space and purchase property either for a new state office building or a new building in the Capitol Complex and unless they can have some of those behind closed doors, the price of that land would go just skyrocketing. Now, all we're asking to do is let this Commission on some occasions have closed meetings. I think it's absolutely essential to the orderly operation of that Commission and I hope that this Bill would pass, or the Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hill, do you desire recognition, Representataive Brandt. Representative Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, as a House member of the Space Needs Commission, this has to do with the meeting of the Commission to ah... acquiring and appraisals and acquiring property for the State use and this just does for the Space Needs Commission what any city council or any other government agency would have under the same circumstances."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brandt."



Brandt: "In answer to the question raised by Representative Mann. I wish to inform the members ah... that final determination of purchase will be made at open meetings of the Commission."

Speaker Redmond: "Any, any further discussion? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there's 107 'ayes', 10 'nos', 19 voting 'present'." Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Walsh: "Doesn't it take two-thirds ah... of the members the elected members. Doesn't this require 118 votes."

Speaker Redmond: "118, you're correct, Mr.... Representative Walsh. It requires 118. Better... Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, I... I'd just like to speak on the, on the question. I think we've been misled here a little bit ah... by one of the speakers in opposition to this. It just seems to me that if you're negotiating for real estate and the Resolution confines itself to the negotiation for real estate, then it's just impossible to do it at an open meeting. Because at an open meeting, everyone who is an owner will be informed and they will be informed of the State's interest in the property and it ah... has got to drive as the Majority Leader said, the price way up. So, we're really, this is a good government proposal sort of in disguise. But there's no other way to do it. You just have to negotiate for real estate just as you should negotiate personal matters in closed meetings. So, I would request that everyone vote 'yes' on the gentleman's Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll have to dump this roll call and take another roll call. Representative Ebbesen, do you desire recognition? Representative Ebbesen."



Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I just would encourage everyone to give this a 'yes' vote. I think... It is my understanding that the open meetings law has always been that you could discuss acquisition of property and ah... personnel and in all my time in local government, I know that's the premise on which we operate and I see no reason why there shouldn't be 140 or 50 green lights up there."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I don't think I misled anybody. I, I think I made my position very crystal clear and I want to repeat that position and I don't think it's good public policy when it comes to voting on matters effecting the Capitol Complex which effects all the people of the State of Illinois which is the place where our offices are located for deliberations to be held in private and I don't buy the arguments that it would necessarily drive the prices up since everybody whose land would be involved is certainly aware of it and the market price is going to dominate in any event. And I just want to ah... set my, my vote very clear on this position. I think it's bad public policy and I urge you to oppose it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? It requires 118 votes. Take the record. On this question there's 125 'yes', 14 'no', 6 'present'. The Resolution having received the necessary majority is hereby, is hereby declared adopted. House Resolution 44. Representative Giglio. Would you please give the gentlemen order? Giglio."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, ah... House Resolution 44 just simply asks that the news media, television, radio announcers and people who write the stories, refrain from using



the word, 'Watergate plumbers' with regard to describing what happened at Watergate. I, as a member of the plumbing profession and also a businessman in the plumbing industry ah... have ah... taken it to heart that the new media used the word 'plumbers' when describing what happened, what's happening. I'm not asking that they be censored. I'm not asking them to ah.. refrain from doing what they want to do. I'm just asking them to find another word when they're describing the incidents and therefore, I would ask that ah... everyone ah.. give me a favorable vote on this here in agreement with the way I feel and the way I see it."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question. The question is on the adoption of House Resolution forty... House Joint, no, House Resolution 44. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution's adopted. House Joint Resolution 14. Representative: McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Joint Resolution 14 would create the Prisoner Study Work Release Study Committee, 4 members appointed by the Speaker of the House, 2 members appointed by the Speaker of the House, 2 members by the Minority Leader of the House and 2 members by the President pro-tem of the Senate and 2 members by the Minority Leader in the Senate. They would study the Work Release Program and report back to the Legislature in approximately a year."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the adoption of House Joint Resolution 14. All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Is there any expenditure of money on this one, Representative McAuliffe?"

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, just to be on the safe side, we'd



better take a roll call vote on this one. The question is... Those in favor of the adoption of the Resolution vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Shea."

Shea: "When this is over, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. Have all voted who wished? Representative Mahar 'aye', Representative Luft 'aye', Representative Sharp 'aye', Sharp 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Leinenweber 'aye', Representative Duff 'aye', Representative Madison 'aye', Telcser 'aye', McCourt 'aye'. Better open it up again and vote. The question is on the adoption of the Resolution. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this is a Resolution which definitely needs to pass because we are engaged in a program of work release. It's been going on for some time. Now that it has had a chance to work, it seems to be time to go ahead and take a look at the program whether or not it is of certain value to the law enforcement system. Ah... Mr. Speaker, I would plead for an affirmative vote on this Resolution on a fine program. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. Schoeberlein 'aye', Kosinski 'aye'. On this question there's 126 'ayes', 1 'no', 7 'present' and having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared adopted. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, the posting notice for Transportation for Friday, April the 25 through inadvertence was not posted until yesterday morning. As you know, the Chairman



Representative Garmisa, has been absent for several weeks, so I've talked to the Minority Leadership with regards to this and they're aware of it so I would like to make a motion that the Bills posted on April 21 for a hearing in Transportation on Friday, April the 25th be allowed to be heard on that date and the appropriate rule be suspended. It would require 107 votes and I've talked to Mr. Telcser about that this morning and he's in agreement with me."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washburn."

Washburn: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. We do support Representative Shea's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved the suspension of the appropriate rule posting rule. It takes 107 votes. All those in favor in the suspension of the rules vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. It requires 107. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there's a 120 'ayes', 3 'nos', 1 'present' and having the necessary majority, the motion carries. House Bills, Second Reading. On the order of House Bills, Second Reading appears House Bill 114. I'm ready for call."

O'Brien: "House Bill 114, Hart. A Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

O'Brien: "Amendment number 1, Hart. Amends House Bill 114 on page 3, line 2 by deleting 'method of' and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart on the Amendment."

Hart: "Ah... I move that Amendment be tabled. It's ah... Well, I've got a substitute Amendment which Amendment number 2 is."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection to tabling the Amendment? The Amendment is tabled."



O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Hart. Amends House Bill 114 on page 3 by deleting line 24-30 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Hart: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, if you could get the attention of the House for just a minute. This ah... Amendment, ladies and gentlemen of the House, is now going to be the Bill. This is House Bill 114 which has to do with ah... Environmental Protection Agencies control over sulfur emission. I know that you've received a lot of mail on it and I am very pleased to say that ah... through this Amendment, ah... we have worked out an agreement, we have worked out an agreement between the ah... utilities, the coal operators and the Environmental Protection Agency in regard to sulfur emission and ah...with the adoption of this Amendment the Environmental Protection Agency will support this Bill. And you will receive a communication from them sometime today or early tomorrow in that regard, but ah... I want to extend my thanks to Director Briceland and his staff for their excellent cooperation in the extended negotiations over this Bill and also to everybody else who was very patient and helped through the Committee action and floor action and I move for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 114."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Hart, I wonder if you could hold this Bill for a few minutes. We haven't seen a copy of your Amendment."

Hart: "I can as long as the Speaker will get back to it because I'm running out of time and ah.. certainly ah... I will hold it if you don't have the Amendment. It was filed yesterday and it was on my desk this morning, but if you don't have one today, yet..."

Meyer: "Well, I ah... Representative Hart, I wish you



would have extended us the courtesy of participating in the Amendatory process and I would appreciate it if you would hold it for a moment."

Hart: "Certainly."

Speaker Redmond: "Take that one out of the record. House Bill 121."

O'Brien: "House Bill 121 was read a second time previously. Amendments 2 and 3 were tabled. Amendment 4 was adopted and ah... held on Second Reading. Amendment #1 was tabled."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter."

Porter: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, this Bill went to Third Reading yesterday. It's on the calendar on the order of Third Reading, also. I see that it's on both orders, but it went to Third Reading yesterday."

Speaker Redmond: "Request for a fiscal note, the Clerk advises me. It was held on Second because.."

Porter: "I believe we took a vote on it."

Speaker Redmond: "If I did it was wrong."

Porter: "Eighty to two."

Speaker Redmond: "If I did, I was wrong."

Porter: "Now what... Now what. It's listed on the calendar on the order of Third Reading, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "I guess that's what they call a scribblers error. It is on Second because a fiscal note is requested and the fiscal note has not been furnished."

Porter: "That request was not made in, in... on the floor. We took a record vote on that Amendment and you ordered the Bill to Third Reading and that's the first I've heard of it."

Speaker Redmond: "I've been advised that a request for a fiscal note has been filed, Representative Porter. Representative Duff."

Porter: "Prior to the time it went to Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "They have it on file is all I can tell you. Representative Duff."



Duff: "Well, Mr. Chairman, I recall the ah... debate on the roll call and there was no request ah... from the floor for a fiscal note. Ah... one might have been filed with the Clerk but it was never told to the House and the Chair did move the Bill to Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll check and see if there was one filed. If there was one, why... The question of the fiscal note, I guess, has been cleared up. It was an inquiry by one of the members and we were advised that there was one mailing involved and I guess that... It is on Third Reading. According to the Journal, it is not on Third Reading but we'll move it now. Third Reading on House Bill 121. Yes, that's a Third Reading. The order of business is House Bills, Third Reading. On House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 439. Representative Katz on the floor? Is Representative Katz on the floor? Take 439 out of the record. Representative Simms, for what purpose do you rise."

Simms: "House Bill 439 ah... I am the sponsor of, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bill 439, Representative Simms."

O'Brien: "House Bill 439. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relation to coroners. Third Reading of the Bill."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 439 as amended which Representative Matijeveich and I are now joint sponsors of requires that all deaths in state institutions and deaths of wards of the State and private care facilities, or programs sponsored by the Department of Mental Health, or the Department of Children and Family Services shall be reported to the coroner of the county in which they ah... reside or take place. If the coroner has reason to believe that an investigation is needed to determine



the death was caused by maltreatment or neglect, then the coroner shall have that authority to proceed under the Act which gives the coroner the authority to investigate. I believe that, based on the deaths which transpired in Rockford and in Waukegan and in other parts of the State, and based on investigations of the Illinois Legislative Investigating Commission, we need this type of legislation; and I feel that the coroner has the authority and should have the authority to look into these deaths where, in his opinion, it might be necessary to conduct an investigation. I think the Bill as amended takes care of the earlier objections and I would earnestly solicit your favorable support for House Bill 439."

Speaker Redmond: "Are we ready for the question? The question is on House Bill 439. Shall House Bill 439 pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Geo-Karis votes 'aye' from right field. Take the record. Representative Shea. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Is the... Would the Clerk look at the board? Are we, We're on Third Reading I'm sure, but we're talking about an Amendment up there someplace. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan 'aye', Representative Polk 'aye', Representative Cunningham 'no', Representative Choate."

Choate: "I realize we're on Third Reading, Mr. Speaker, and I realize that ah... you have a roll call up there that shows overwhelming support for the Bill. I also realize that because I was talking to the Majority Leader and some others about another ah... matter before the Legislature, I passed up my opportunity to ask a couple of questions on this Bill; but I would desire to ask a couple of questions if at all possible."

Speaker Redmond: "Leave granted, any objections? Proceed Representative Choate."



Choate: "Representative Simms, as I read the Bill, it simply says that, one of the things that disturbs me, it says that each and every individual who dies in the confines of a mental institution, the coroner shall make an investigation as to see what brought about the death."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Representative Choate, ah... Amendment #3 which Representative Matijevich placed on the Bill only requires that it be reported to the coroner in the county. It does not require an automatic investigation. It just requires that it be reported, Representative."

Choate: "Well, I didn't see the Amendment, Amendment #3. In other words, all it does, it says that it shall be reported to the coroner."

Simms: "That's correct."

Choate: "Then, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to change my vote from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change his vote from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Hart to change his vote from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Davis 'aye', Representative Hill 'aye'. On this question there's a hundred, Mr. Clerk, 127 is that what it is... 127 'aye', 5 'no', 4 'present'. The Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 488."

O'Brien: "House Bill 488, Giorgi. A Bill for an Act to amend the Unemployment Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, ah... I know that ah... these are serious times and this is a serious Bill and I know that everyone of us has received voluminous amounts of mail on the Bill and I must say that the Legislative synopsis is very



accurate in telling what the Bill provides. It provides for a weekly benefit equal to two-thirds of an individual's prior average weekly wage and it establishes maximum benefits of two-thirds of the State-wide average which is agreed at 184 dollars and it allows a dependents allowance of 8 dollars per child and in the event that either spouse, being unemployed, either one can claim the children. It provides for uniform duration of 26 weeks and it eliminates something we've debated for many, many years. The one week waiting period as well as allowing a person to receive compensation in the event ah... he had to cross a picket line, but the most ah... the... I think the toughest part of the package that the employers were lobbying against was the strike benefits and that's been removed. Now ah... when the Unemployment Compensation Act was first enacted, the average wage included in that first Act was 65% of a person's average wage. Today, with the cost of living and with everyone being very much aware of the unemployment situation picture in Illinois and in my area it's 10%, the Federal government has moved faster than the State governments in that some of the States some of the people are going to qualify for 65 weeks of unemployment benefits. We haven't been able to trigger that in yet in Illinois. One of the most, one of the, you might say, the inaccurate stories put out by the employer groups was that this Bill was going to cost 20 million dollars a week, a billion dollars a year and that's not true. If this Bill were law today, it would cost in the unemployment compensation trust fund which is in about a 450 million dollars. It would cost an additional 2 million dollars a week and this going to people that can't buy a job. We're in an economy now where we're, the State of Illinois, is even letting people go in the Illinois State Employment Services because they can't find



employment for these people. There's been a lot of ah... stories about ah... that someone would be better off staying at home and drawing unemployment compensation than they would be working. Well, in this General Assembly there are 177 of us and only 10 of us here would qualify for the maximum benefits and we'd have to have four more children. Over 50% of the people who drew unemployment compensation last year, drew 67 dollars. So, that isn't a bonanza and it isn't a give-away program like we've been led to believe. We ranked almost 49th of the 50 States in our average payment to the unemployment compensation recipient: Now, our unemployment compensation fund, the irony of it is that it has always been the employers fund. They've controlled that fund. They've dictated what would be in that fund and because of their formula, because of their formula, the unemployment compensation tax on the employer will be lowered next year. If it's an average of 2% this year on the forty-two hundred dollars of income the first forty-two hundred dollars of income, next year it's going to be lowered to 1.1 because they control the fund. But, they didn't want to face reality in the compensation program and in the boom years, before the war, after the war in the roaring 50's and the early 60's this fund could have been built up to where there wouldn't have been any problem with the fund and there is no problem with the fund, but they have controlled it as their own private fund and that's why their suffering today and trying to raise the fund to where a person will be able to at least meet his non-postponable expenses. We're talking about rent, food, utilities and some use of the automobile to find employment. Now, I know there's going to be a lot of discussion on the Bill and if I've ah... said anything you want me to clarify, I'd be glad to do it. I would wish that every



one of you who, no doubt, if you have a legislative office like I have, your offices become an unemployment office and you don't know where to turn to find jobs. Like we've planned for Public Aid in the budget, we're going to have to start planning for the people who can't buy employment. That's as plain as I can make it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ah... Mr. Speaker, at that time this ah... Bill was moved from Second Reading to Third Reading, it was ah... moved on the basis that it would be brought back to Second because an Amendment that I had prepared was ruled, technically invalid and I would like to remind the ah... sponsor that he did agree to move it back to Second Reading and I would like to have that done now for purpose of ah... consideration of Amendment #9."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, ah..I pleaded with Mr. Lauer and some of the people on the Republican side to let the Bill go to Third and I would move it to Second. They denied me that. His Amendment was applied on Second Reading and his Amendment was found to be irregular. I am afraid that I have been as fair as I can be and I don't feel that I should move this Bill back to Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, I think that Mr. Giorgi is taking advantage of a technicality because ah... the Amendment was ruled ah... technically incorrect, but at that time he did agree to take the Bill back to Second Reading ah... once the Amendment had been redrafted. And I would point out to Mr. Giorgi that, that if this is not done, then you stand self-convicted on this floor as breaking your word given to me."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi. I believe your last remarks were out of order, Mr. Lauer. Representative Giorgi."

Lauer: "You're right, Mr. Speaker. I ah... If it were true, I'd be hysterical."

Giorgi: "But ah... you refused to allow me to move this Bill to Third Reading and I... and I said then, I would let you apply that, that Amendment to Second Reading so this Bill was forced to remain on Second Reading. You applied your Amendment. It wasn't my fault that your Amendment was illegally drawn or irregularly drawing. I think I have been fair about this Bill. Many members have asked me repeatedly please move 488 up or down because the mail is becoming untenable, is becoming voluminous and I think I've been fair with you and I'm not going to get angry over it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Would the sponsor yield for a number of questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Giorgi: "If you give me multiple choices."

Kane: "Representative Giorgi, can you tell me what the current balance or the balance on January 1 of this year ah... is or was in the unemployment compensation trust fund?"

Giorgi: "The balance is four hundred million dollars."

Kane: "Four hundred million, when? On January first?"

Giorgi: "Yes, sir. That was December 31. You have different figures?"

Kane: "Could you tell me what the total unemployment benefits paid out in '74 was?"

Giorgi: "Ah... yes, three hundred and three million dollars."

Kane: "And the total receipts into the fund?"

Giorgi: "Well... That's hard to determine the total receipts because ah... in as much as the taxes based



on the first forty-two hundred dollars of income, you'll note that the great, the huge amount of money will pour in January, February, and March because a lot of people reach their forty-two hundred dollars in those three months. So, ah... I could get that for you if it's important for your vote."

Kane: "I'd appreciate it. Can you tell me if 488 passes in its present form what the estimated payout in unemployment compensation would be in 1975?"

Giorgi: "Yes, sir. Like I said earlier in my remarks, had the law, had the features that I have, we have introduced here, had they had been law this past year, it would have increased, it would have increased the, the two-thirds weekly benefit would have increased unemployment compensation by a hundred and ten million dollars. When we paid out two hundred and eight million dollars. Do you follow that? The dependents allowance would have increased at 15 million dollars. The uniform duration where everyone gets 26 weeks would have increased it 17 million and the one week waiting period would have increased it 13 million and none of that would have depleted the fund. Follow that."

Kane: "What would have been the total increase in 1974?"

Giorgi: "A hundred fifteen, twenty-two, thirty... a hundred thirty-six million dollars. Don't forget, going to ten per cent of the unemployed people in Illinois that still have to pay rent, heat, lights, telephone, utilities and medical care and food."

Kane: "Could you indicate to me what are the projections for 1975? If House Bill 488 passes, what the projected payout would be?"

Giorgi: "Ah... I'll give you the labor, the Labor Department's statistics. The average payout per week, this is February of '75, the week ending February 15, the



gross benefits paid were 11 million dollars. And 50 weeks of that, would be 550 million dollars, but the fund was at 400 million in December and like I said earlier, the employers now pay on the first forty-two hundred the next three months. So that's ah... the fund will be increased somewhat, but... Does that answer your question?"

Kane: "Not precisely. Do you have an estimate of what the payout would be in 1975? If 488 passes."

Giorgi: "No, because all the economic ah... soothsayers are telling me that things are going to pick up. So that means the unemployed will be off the roads and will be going back to work. So, I can't really determine... I can't plan the economy."

Kane: "Can you tell me what the average per weekly unemployment benefits in Illinois is under present statutes."

Giorgi: "Yes, sir. I'd very gladly tell you that. The average unemployment payment in Illinois last year was 60 dollars a week in anybody covered in unemployment insurance. I dare anyone to dispute the figures I'm giving you this morning."

Kane: "If 488 passes in its present form, what will be the average weekly unemployment benefits?"

Giorgi: "It all depends on the unemployment picture. I can't tell you that. If the..."

Kane: "The average weekly per person."

Giorgi: "Well, that's a good... I'm glad you brought that up, Doug. The employer groups have been sending letters to all the Legislators and to all newspapers in the State telling them of the people that are going to draw the huge amounts of money out of the unemployment fund. 50%, 55% of the people are only going to draw two-thirds of their average weekly wage because they're single drawers. Now, that means if you make a hundred a week, you're going to be drawing 65 dollars.



The people that are going to draw the huge amounts you read in the Chamber of Commerce brochures are only 6% of the population that are covered under insurance and if you took this House where there are 177 members, only 10 of us would qualify for the maximum payment."

Kane: "I'm not asking you for those figures, Representative Giorgi. I'm asking you what will be the average per weekly unemployment if House Bill 488 passes."

Giorgi: "All right. Well, it's... depends..."

Kane: "Right now you say that the ah... present weekly average is 60 dollars."

Giorgi: "That's correct."

Kane: "Ah... I have figures from unemployment compensation which says that last year it was about \$7.17 and that was before the increase."

Giorgi: "60 dollars. You're asking me again?"

Kane: "I'm asking you if 488 passes, what will be the average weekly per weekly unemployment benefit paid out."

Giorgi: "Well, I have to get into percentages again. 55% of the people are single and if they would draw 65% of their average wage. Now, because the State average wage is 184 dollars, you're talking about the ah... building trade. You're telling about the United Auto workers. You're telling about the, the ah... organized ah... high skilled people. If a person makes a hundred a week, 55% of them are going to draw 65 dollars a week unemployment compensation."

Kane: "Are you saying, Representative Giorgi, that you don't know what the average weekly benefit will be if 488 passes?"

Giorgi: "I, I can't tell you what the employment picture will be three months from now."

Kane: "Now, this doesn't have anything to do with the un-



employment picture."

Giorgi: "I can tell you that today 55% of the people drawing unemployment compensation are single wage earners. That ought to tell you that 55% of the people on unemployment compensation will draw two-thirds of their average wage. And if they're making 40 dollars a week, it's two-thirds of 40 dollars."

Kane: "Well the present average, you're saying, is somewhere between 60 and 65 dollars. What I'm asking you is, what will that figure increase to?"

Giorgi: "Well, if we're going... All right, let's say that ah..."

Kane: "Do you know?"

Giorgi: "I, I'll tell you from... I can only tell you from ah... past experience. If we don't go back to work tomorrow, no one will be drawing money."

Kane: "Given the same pattern of unemployment that we have had over the last three years, four years the average has not changed much. From '71 to '73 the average has stayed between 60 and 65 dollars regardless of the level of unemployment."

Giorgi: "We're going to increase... If all of these things become law, a hundred and forty million dollars will be the extra payout. 55% of that will be by single people, so the average will go up to maybe 90 dollars a week. 50% of the 60."

Kane: "Are you sure of those figures. Or you just pulling them out of the air."

Giorgi: "I have them here from the Department of Unemployment Compensation Insurance. I don't pretend to know..."

Kane: "Would you talk into the mike, please."

Giorgi: "I have the figures here from the Unemployment Insurance ah... actuaries in the Unemployment Insurance office."



Kane: "They're the ones who made the projection?"

Giorgi: "How's that again? Yes."

Kane: "They said it was 90 dollars. Or are you just making up that figure now."

Giorgi: "If there was anything, I was pretty good at arithmetic. We're going to increase the unemployment average about 50% which today is 60 will go to 90."

Kane: "Now, that was 60 before the increase in January first, right."

Giorgi: "That's the increase we're... Yea, but that's not the increase..."

Kane: "Sixty dollars is before the January first increase."

Giorgi: "Correct."

Kane: "Okay, what is it now after the January first increase?"

Giorgi: "No, you're talking about the new minimum in the law. The new minimum is 67 dollars per person that earns over and above what he needs. The average wage payment is still 60 dollars a week, last year."

Kane: "So, the average weekly benefit then will be somewhere between 90 and 100 dollars."

Giorgi: "Well, I wouldn't say 100, 90 to 95. What does that tell you?"

Kane: "Can you tell me what the national unemployment weekly average is? Payment."

Giorgi: "I know that Connecticut ah... gives 80% of their average ah..."

Kane: "Dollar figure."

Giorgi: "I don't know the answer because ah... Illinois ah... among the States, I think we're 49th in the rank in our pay on unemployment compensation insurance."

Kane: "Well, Illinois, right now, is 15th in average weekly payouts. Michigan is the highest at 73 dollars."

Giorgi: "Michigan is not the highest."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you bring your questions to a close, please?"



Kane: "Mr. Speaker, can I address the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I think it's evident that the sponsor of this Bill has not done his homework is that he doesn't have the figures that are available for..."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the gentleman your attention."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I think that it's evident that the sponsor of this Bill has not done his homework on this Bill. This is a far reaching Bill. We do have ah... problems with unemployment and unemployment compensation in this State. It's that we need to improve the benefits; but I think that before we make a judgement on what those improved benefits should be, that the least that we should ask of the sponsor of the Bill is that he know what he is doing and what it's going to cost and who is, who it's going to cost and how this is going to compare with other States in the Union. According to figures that I have compiled by the United States Department of Labor is that the average per weekly unemployment benefit in this, in the country is somewhere around 60 to 65 dollars per week and the highest State is Michigan at an average of between 70 and 75 dollars a week and that we're being asked now to increase the unemployment benefits in Illinois to between 90 and 95 dollars which would put Illinois somewhere between 30 and 40% above the next highest State. I think that before we take that step, we should look much more carefully at this Bill and we should ask the sponsor of the Bill to come up with some solid figures and not figures that he comes up with by doing instant mathematics on a piece of paper in front of him on the floor. And so, until we have those figures, I intend to vote 'present'."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Speaker, would the sponsor yield for a few questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Schlickman: "Representative, you indicated at the outset that the maximum limit upon the benefits and that an individual would be able to collect under House Bill 488 would be no more than two-thirds of the State-wide average weekly wage. Is that correct?"

Giorgi: "A sin... You're talking about a single person, the single benefit, yes."

Schlickman: "Who will determine the figures used to determine the State-wide average weekly wage?"

Giorgi: "It's ah... it's an agreed figure among the employers and the unemployment ah.. compensation insurance office. Bureau of Labor Statistics."

Schlickman: "What if there can't be agreement?"

Giorgi: "Well, they've seemed to agree in the past because they figure their wage factor on that."

Schlickman: "But you, there is no certainty as to how that State-wide average weekly wage will be determined in the future, if at all."

Giorgi: "Oh, yes it is. It's done by a totalling up all the people under an insured program and dividing by the number of employees."

Schlickman: "Which figures will be used?"

Giorgi: "Those figures. Those that are under insured employment, covered by the unemployment insurance."

Schlickman: "Now this quotient will have to be revised every year. Is that correct?"

Giorgi: "That's correct."

Schlickman: "Okay. What do you estimate will be the percentage increase?"

Giorgi: "Well, if we..."

Schlickman: "Using this maximum that you've established here."



Giorgi: "I think that the average State wage will drop this year because of 10% unemployment factors in many parts of the State. That's for '75, usable in '76."

Schlickman: "Now, by your Bill, you eliminate the one week waiting period. Is that correct?"

Giorgi: "Yes."

Schlickman: "Isn't the policy or the philosophy with regards to the one week waiting period to encourage the unemployed to seek new employment and if so, why are you removing this incentive?"

Giorgi: "Well, what's happening is, we've debated this one week waiting period and it seems to be very important in the automobile industry and the ah.. and the construction and the farmer you are... employers will shut down for a week and the person loses a weeks wages and ah... I think they look at the ah... railway act where the railway workers, none of them are penalized that waiting week. They're... They get unemployment compensation benefits immediately and we think it's just ah... something put in there by the people that were legislating the law years ago when it, you know... Eleven States have removed the one week waiting period."

Schlickman: "Would you agree that by the elimination of this one week waiting period that the cost of unemployment compensation to the employers will increase by approximately 20 million dollars annually?"

Giorgi: "No, sir. The figures ah... that Mr. Kane disputes from the Unemployment Compensation office had this law been into effect last year, it would have cost 13 million 7 hundred thousand dollars."

Schlickman: "Somewhere between 13 and 20 million dollars. Is that correct?"

Giorgi: "The actual figure is 13 million, 7 hundred and 98 thousand dollars. I'll give you a copy of the



figures if you want them."

Schlickman: "Now as I understand your Bill, you expand the definition of child support to allow an individual to claim a child, a dependent, if the individual pays any portion of the cost of support of the child. Now presently, an individual must actually provide one half of the support for the child. Ah... I'm just wondering, should an individual be granted full compensation for a dependent when he or she may be working only part-time and may be actually contributing only 5% of the families income. Where's the rational on the relationship?"

Giorgi: "Well, it seems that when ah... a family, one of the breadwinners is laid off, they have the option of taking the dependents as their dependents during the layoff period and that's frozen for that one year's benefit period. And if they're part-time workers like you say, there isn't much unemployment compensation."

Schlickman: "How much do you estimate that will cost?"

Giorgi: "The dependents allowance? Again, in spite of what the previous questioner said, would have cost 15 million, 8 hundred and 83 thousand dollars. A 7% increase."

Schlickman: "Representative, one final question. You indicated that Illinois now ranks 49th among the 50 States with regards to unemployment compensation benefits."

Giorgi: "Yes."

Schlickman: "It's been suggested that by your Bill, Illinois will go from 49th to first in the country. Is that correct?"

Giorgi: "Say that again sir, I didn't quite hear you."

Schlickman: "I say it's been stated that by your Bill, Illinois will go from 49th to first. Is that correct?"

Giorgi: "I have never heard that. I don't think the



Chamber of Commerce has even printed that statement.

I'm not aware of your statistics."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "As the previous opponent of this Bill, the gentleman from Sangamon, ah... mentioned and I agree with him wholeheartedly, there's no question that this Body should be concerned about the plight of the unemployed and I don't think there's any question ah... that we in Illinois should improve unemployment compensation ah... program, particularly at this time. However, I do suggest, respectfully, that by this Bill we are going from one extreme to another and in so doing, we'll be placing an almost intolerable burden upon business and industry in this State and I respectfully suggest that it's not government that creates jobs, but its business and industry. And if we want to keep business and industry in the State of Illinois and if we want to produce the jobs in the State of Illinois that are needed for our citizens, we ought to be very concerned about the effect of this Bill. There are many, many figures that are thrown about, 20 million, 30 million ah... Tremendous percentage increases. And, unfortunately, the sponsor himself doesn't know what the real effect of his Bill is going to be. I respectfully suggest that, in light of the uncertainty of the effect of this Bill and considering the almost exaggerated increases in benefits that would take place, that it is an inordinate ah... kind of measure ah... to be passing at this time. Particularly ah... when we note that businesses are leaving the State ah... to other States ah... where the climate is more condusive ah... to engaging in business and thereby taking jobs from Illinois to other States. I therefore, would encourage



a 'no' vote on House Bill 488."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Ah... yes, Mr. Speaker and ah.. ladies gentlemen of the House, ah... Mr. Speaker, would the sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Ebbesen: "Ah... Representative Giorgi, in your opinion do you feel the adoption of House Bill 488 will provide the stimulus for creation of these jobs for those now unable to find jobs in Illinois that you were indicating earlier?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Ebbesen, in the Rockford land area the rate of unemployment is 10%. We couldn't buy a job by increasing unemployment compensation. All we're providing and the Federal government has noticed the plight of the unemployed. Last week, they passed Legislation allowing loans of up to 250 dollars a month for those that are on unemployment roles to pay for their mortgages, insurance needs, and taxes and whatever. All this is going to do is going to allow that fellow in the marketplace who can't find a job that has achieved a standard of living of paying a mortgage and paying for an automobile to not file bankruptcy like a lot of you fellows would like to have them do."

Ebbesen: "Well, Representative Giorgi, would you give an answer to my question. Yes or no, do you think the adoption of House Bill 488 is going to provide these jobs here in Illinois."

Giorgi: "Provide jobs?"

Ebbesen: "Yes."

Giorgi: "I think that the 2 million dollars that we're going to put into the economy every week in the event 488 is passed is going to provide a lot of jobs for the small shopkeepers that depend on that income."

Ebbesen: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address myself



to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Ebbesen: "Now, House Bill 488 concerns me as a Legislator because of this. The long range impact it will have on business in this State. Now, we all know that more and more manufacturing businesses are departing from Illinois because they find it impossible, impossible to compete in the national and the international market because of the increasing cost of doing business in Illinois. Now, House Bill 488, to me, is just going to do nothing but compound the problem. Besides the impact on the business cost, it fails to make sense to increase the benefits of unemployment compensation to make it more attractive not to work. Our national policy concerning welfare and ah... food stamps, already creates a climate that encourages people to stay on welfare versus the getting a job at a minimum wage. Likewise, in eliminating the waiting week, is going in the wrong direction and it will discourage those who are laid off from seeking other employment. I realize that we took out of the Bill the Section on the strikers, but the very fact that it was even put into the Bill made a bad Bill even worse. For that, I'm happy that it was eliminated. In the interest of keeping industry healthy and growing in Illinois, in other words, discourage industry from leaving, I urge everyone to take a firm stand against House Bill 488 as it will certainly have a detrimental effect on the producing industries in our State. These are fundamental issues ah... even though we all have high compassion for those that are displaced and particularly in the times of tough economy. If the elements of this Bill are put into law, it could create permanent job er... displacement as opposed to temporary due to the economic condition. I hope all members concur with my feelings that we should



not let the short range economic displacement that has engulfed the country cause us to make what will do, in my opinion, permanent damage to the health, and viability of the industries in the State. And I would certainly encourage everyone to cast a 'no' vote on House Bill 488."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, would the sponsor yield for a few questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Tuerk: "One of your colleagues on that side of the aisle suggested to me earlier this morning that maybe I give you the opportunity to ah... for multiple choice answers because you don't seem to answer my questions to well, but... On a very serious vein, ah... would you mind reviewing for the membership, for their benefit because we have a lot of new members and a lot of the veterans don't recall what the historical pattern of unemployment compensation benefits has been in the last three or four years."

Giorgi: "Well, Fred, really I think that ah... I can hardly refresh our memories somewhat, but I think you're probably closer to that than I am except that when enemployment compensation..."

Tuerk: "No, I haven't been sponsoring these Bills and you have."

Giorgi: "Yes, but you've been ah... very observant and a student of the unemployment compensation process. But anyway, when comp... when Illinois... when the unemployment compensation act came into being in 1935, effective in 1937 the employers and the ah... that were advising the Congress, both the Social Security and the Unemployment Compensation Program, were based on the first three thousand that any per- would earn. The tax was based on their first three



thousand dollars. Well, since that time Social Securities has evolved to where the employees contributing and now it's up to 13 thousand 5 hundred that both the employee and employer contributes on. But the unemployment compensation program that started at three thousand dollars has escalated to forty-two hundred. Only once, in forty years, was that base moved from three thousand to forty-two hundred. Now, and the theory in 1960, in '35 and recent as last year from the Presidential Commission struck by former President Nixon, it recommended that 65% was a truer figure when you're helping people ah... in the transition period between unemployment and looking for a job. So that ah... And then evolved the theory in Illinois where the employer group, the employee group and three independents would study the unemployment compensation program as they effect the State and would study the workmans compensation program as they effect the State and there would be an agreed Bill processed. Now I think, I think that process has fallen apart. Does that, does that bring you up to date?"

Tuerk: "No, it hasn't. Ah... I'm aware of the fact the agreed Bill process hadn't worked recently but that's another subject. It's been because the Governor of this State only just recently finally appointed some members to that advisory board which would sit down and knock out a negotiated settlement on unemployment comp. It hadn't been because people hadn't wanted to talk about it and come to some reasonable settlement on that, on the situation. But, you still haven't answered my question. The question is, would you tell the membership how much unemployment compensation benefits have risen in the last three or four years? That's all I want to know, not back in 1937 because that's forty years ago."



Giorgi: "The last ah... program that was, became effective in '73, the popular word around the State was that we had increased benefits 10% but in reality, we had only increased them 7%."

Tuerk: "Well, that's not true."

Giorgi: "Yes, it is. We're going to have an opinion on that. But, the point is, the average, the average wage in the State of Illinois is 184 dollars as agreed by the employee and the employer group. The average wage in auto in Illinois is about 240 dollars a week, but when a person goes on the unemployment roles, no matter what he made a week, he's confined to 67 dollars a week. That's the basic payment to a single person. Do we agree on that? Do you agree to that?"

Tuerk: "I haven't looked over the schedule. I could look in the Bill and the benefit is about 60 dollars for a single person, yes, on full employment. For a single person."

Giorgi: "67, and 55% of the unemployed receive 67 dollars a week."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk, are you finished?"

Tuerk: "Oh, no, I'm just beginning."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I think maybe you should do it on the explanation of your vote rather than the questioning..."

Tuerk: "Well, now, wait a minute, Mr. Speaker. Ah... I've asked him one question. Do I not get 10 minutes?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Tuerk: "He still hasn't answered my question and on the ah... when I speak to the Bill on explanation of vote I'll enlighten the membership just a little bit on that score. Unfortunately, the sponsor never is able to answer the questions we ask him. Especially if they're kind of tough ones."

Giorgi: "That's right, I've got limited intelligence."



Tuerk: "Now, who ah... who establishes this weekly ah... average rate of pay?"

Giorgi: "The unemployment compensation office."

Tuerk: "Well, I've asked them for that figure and I haven't been able to get an answer out of them, but do you not agree that a person with some dependents, if they're laid off, can under your Bill, actually draw more money while unemployed while they were employed?"

Giorgi: "Fred, for me to be fair, I've got to refer to to the Chamber of Commerce letter ah... circulating throughout the State very heavily. You're talking about the fellow with four children that is making over the top wage. He's making over 250 dollars a week and he has four children and as I said earlier of the 177 members sitting here, only 10 of us would qualify because we have four or more children. Only 10 of us out of 177 would qualify because only 6% of the people on unemployment qualify for the maximum benefits. Six per cent."

Tuerk: "Is that your answer?"

Giorgi: "I can't be any ah... I know I went to a parochial school, but..."

Tuerk: "Well, you've had some questions on this one week waiting period ah... the elimination of that. Philisophically, you know how I've been opposed to that concept ah... over the years. But, you've given a figure that it would cost somewhere in the area of 13 million, I would point out that probably it would be closer to 20 million. Do you have any comment on that?"

Giorgi: "Fred, I have before me the figures written by the actuary used in the unemployment compensation insurance office in Chicago. And he said, had this been law during 1974, the removal of the one week waiting period would have amounted to 13 million, 7 hundred and 98 thousand dollars. Now, you have



to show me where your figures dispute this. What you base yours on. This is from the actuary. That's why I resent someone said I didn't do my homework. I've had to live with this Bill."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I could go on and ask many other questions, but if I may, I'll speak on the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Tuerk: "I asked the sponsor of this Bill in Committee, I've asked him on the floor of the House on a number of occasions and the membership never really gets an answer to the question relative to benefit structure over the last several years. I remember full well, two years ago, when a similar Bill came into the House which asked for a 25% increase. At that time, we were able to sit down and work out a, what we considered to be a reasonable compromise and that was a 15% increase. Now a while ago, you heard him say that it was a 7% increase. So, you see, he's answering my questions in 50% fashion. Ah... last fall, for example, we knocked out another agreement which ah... called for a 12% increase. Back in '71 there was an increase. Ah.... so, in the last three to four years there's been increases amounting to somewhere in the vicinity of 50%. Now, this Bill calls for increases over and above that and increases the benefits beyond the 50% level. Now, the membership of this House knows full well what my concept on unemployment compensation is; and that is, the unemployed should be compensated. We've set up a program of long standing ah... There should be a reasonable approach to taking care of the needs of the people who are unfortunately unemployed. But when it comes to the point where you can make more money, in some cases, when you're unemployed than when employed, then I say the concept of unemployment has gone backward many,



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

many years. Now, many people in this House have eluded to the point that business and industry is moving out of the State of Illinois at a higher rate than it's coming in and this is a truism. And really if this Bill passes, you're going to find a much more rapid exodus of industry and business leaving the State of Illinois and therefore, the result of this Bill can be very counterproductive, rather than productive. As a matter of fact, it can be in a situation where some industry and business is laying off people so that it can pay its rightful tax on unemployment comp. For many other reasons the one week waiting, the fact that the dependency allowance is in this Bill to where either one or the other can claim dependents, regardless of how much its ah... responding to the care of the child. For these and other reasons, even though the one real bad, bad fact of this Bill was eliminated the other day in an Amendment. For these reasons and others, I would urge the membership of the House to reject this Bill, perhaps so that we can sit down and rap out what is considered to be a reasonable approach to this problem and move on to more orderly process of this entire problem for the people of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, for many employers, large and small throughout the State of Illinois, House Bill 488 might well be the final straw that broke the camel's back. Or to reduce this matter to barnyard language, the workers throughout this State can't go on milking the cow forever without feeding her. And the feed that I'm talking about is the difference between what the employer takes in in his receipts and his cost of doing business and it's called profit. The present climate of business is such that it's absolutely impossible. The resistance



of the public forbids and raising of the price you can sell items for. So, what follows as the night to day that any increase in the cost of business is deducted from that profit and when the profit back to the employer sinks to zero or below, the employer no longer has the incentive, yea, he no longer has the ability to continue to be an employer and so sadly he has to join his former employees in the unemployment lines. Now, happily there's a way that we can avoid this threatened social disaster and the way we do that is to exercise with restraint and common sense. The figures show at the present time, in the cost of doing business that this unemployment compensation which is a strict gift, a strict gift from the employer to the employee runs as much as 2% of the total payroll. And there are lots of figures to support the proposition that many small employers in this State, that costs of business would be double by passing this Bill. The employers simply cannot abide such an increased burden. And you must recognize that and all of the employees must recognize that. Organized labor in Illinois has come to one of those important crossroads or a 'Y' in the road, if it where, and the choices are these. One, they could and should forego any increase in unemployment compensation at the present time in the name of helping business and helping themselves, but too, if they feel that they must have an increase in unemployment compensation, they should say, here am I, send me, I want to share in the cost of that increase. There was a very novel suggestion the other day. A very fine, an Amendment that would permit everyone to help bear the burden, share together. I, for one, do not believe that the workers of this State want to be freeloaders, regardless of how enthusiastic the sponsors may push that proposition. Now, I think that the pride would come



in sharing the burden, would more than offset the pain and cost of it. Really, should consider these propositions before they take the third alternative. And the third alternative is, to continue hell-bent down the road on which they're presently traveling which surely will end up in killing the goose that laid the golden egg. Now, before I sit down, I want to publicly disassociate myself from some criticism that emanated from this side of the House last week against Mr. Stanley Johnson for alleged illegal, illegitimate distribution of some publication on this floor. I, for one, believe that Stanley Johnson is peerless. I know and respect and admire and love the man. We... There are none like him, that I know of. He needs no defense from me because he deserves, he deserves the confidence and affection that he's held by all that know him. But despite that position, I must publicly say to you, ladies and gentlemen, you'll never have a better opportunity, never have a better opportunity during this session to stand up and strike a lick for the whole State of Illinois than by joining hands and resolving together this Bill shall not pass."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House of Representatives, will the sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Marovitz: "Representative Giorgi, if this Bill passes ah... and this is just a question I would really like to know for myself and I'm sure it's of interest to the rest of the members of the House. Would Illinois, then, have the highest overall unemployment compensation benefit structure in the country, if this Bill should pass?"

Giorgi: "I don't believe so, Bill. I don't know that. I don't know what the other 50 states are doing. I know that two or three other States ah... pay more than we



do. They pay a bigger per cent than we do. But I, we can't ah... Illinois is the third State in personal income. I realize that our State is receiving maybe 55 billion dollars a year in State income. I don't think we can compare ourselves to Mississippi, Alabama and South Carolina. Although, Alabama pays more than we do."

Marovitz: "You say we're the third State in personal income."

Giorgi: "That's right."

Marovitz: "How about in comparing ourselves to State one and two?"

Giorgi: "Ah... incidently, New York and California ah... Their States unemployment is so bad that they have gone to the, their... The people in those States can receive up to 65 weeks of unemployment compensation benefits."

Marovitz: "At what rate?"

Giorgi: "Ah... I think that ah... three States have better rates than ours and I don't know if California is one of them. I don't... You know, I don't know what all 50 States are doing. I think there is a ah... I don't know what the other States are doing."

Marovitz: "Okay, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, would the sponsor yield?"

Giorgi: "Yes."

Hudson: "Representative Giorgi, you eluded ah... sometime back to this one week waiting period. I realize you have answered questions about it before, but, I may have misunderstood you're answer. My information has it that ah... only one State and that is Michigan has done away completely with the one week waiting period. I say done away completely."

Giorgi: "If I'm going to believe the statistics that I



receive from the people in the field, 9 States have eliminated the one week waiting and the States include Alabama, Connecticut, Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Nevada, New Hampshire."

Hudson: "Well, this is..."

Giorgi: "The Governor..."

Hudson: "Excuse me, I... I did not mean to be rude and interrupt your answer. Ah... this would seem to tie in ah... The information I have is that eight other States do permit a waiver of the requirement if an applicant can prove severe hardship. Now, that, in my opinion, is different than completely removing the one week waiting period such as we are doing."

Giorgi: "We're... That was the Amendment you suggested. You're talking about a..."

Hudson: "Well, whatever it may have been, it didn't make it."

Giorgi: "Correct, because now in the unemployment compensation fields, there are employee...employee groups, employee service companies that are employed by the employers to challenge claims capriciously and according to your Amendment, it would allow them... I think they're challenging 30 thousand claims a month now and with that ah... terminology and the language, I'm afraid it might jump to 50 or 60 thousand on account of the one week waiting period which not only would challenge your claim but it would also throw their claim back eight or nine weeks."

Hudson: "Well, I don't ah... I don't follow that and I don't agree with it. It would seem to me that we are, we are stepping well ahead of other States, most other States, if not practically all of them have seen fit to do when we go the course we're doing. But, you've answered the question. We'll move on to another one. Ah... Representative Giorgi, ah... you have already been passed, asked if this passes, was



it your answer that it would ah... that Illinois then would lead, would lead the States in unemployment compensation?"

Giorgi: "I'm not sure... I don't know the answer to that question because I don't know what all the States are doing. But I do know this, we are the third State in personal income but there are other States that pay more in the unemployment compensation insurance act than we do. So, we ought to be within the first three States in our payment of unemployment compensation claims if we're the third greatest State in income."

Hudson: "If ah... that ah... is where we end up, my information has it that Connecticut now has the highest rate and its trust fund is broke. Would you respond to that?"

Giorgi: "Yes, ah... It's true. I've got the... I've found the sheet here. Connecticut pays 83% of their average earnings and Pennsylvania pays 64% which is greater than ours. Those are the two States that pay greater than we do. And Connecticut, unemployment compensation fund is already been cushioned and reinforced by the Federal government. It's a Bill that Ford signed ah.. I think, December 31."

Hudson: "If our trust fund goes broke and it could, what then does the State do?"

Giorgi: "The Governor asks the Federal government to give them the money to replenish it, the trust fund."

Hudson: "Ah... and that would have to be paid ah... back to the Federal government in the way of a loan, would it not?"

Giorgi: "Yes."

Hudson: "Within two years or there is an interest penalty. Is that correct?"

Giorgi: "We hope to get the same break that Russia and some of the other countries have gotten in lend-lease



programs."

Hudson: "One more question, Representative Giorgi and that is on the business of ah... how much the individual must contribute in the case of unemployment. Let me ask you this; if you had two people working, a man and wife and the man, let's say was a highly paid executive. He might be making a hundred thousand or a hundred fifty a year. The wife was also employed but she was laid off. Could she ah... realize full unemployment benefits under this?"

Giorgi: "Yes, sir. In that family or in other families she could be the high priced employee and he could be the lesser priced employee."

Hudson: "Yes, but none the less, the family itself would still be ah... you might say even affluent. Is that true? The family itself in aggregate could be an affluent family, but still drawing unemployment compensation."

Giorgi: "Based on the person individual prior average weekly wage."

Hudson: "Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll address myself to the Bill. When this measure was heard in Committee, I described it as not simply a nail being driven into the coffin lid of business and industry, but indeed, a 10 inch spike being driven into the coffin lid of business and industry in the State of Illinois. I haven't changed my point of view in this regard because that's exactly what I believe it is. Not just an ordinary nail, but a spike driven in the lid, coffin lid of business in Illinois. I have been impressed with the statement from the printing industry and I think this is reflective of many industries where they say that in the last 10 years, the printing industry in Illinois has lost 30% of its share of the national printing volume to low-cost labor areas who assess industry, file less taxes, workman's compensation,



unemployment compensation, sales and property taxes. The reduction in volume suffered has cost, they say, Illinois not less than 20 thousand jobs directly concerned with printing and an untold number in those companies utilizing minority help for processing printing and catalogue publishing houses, etc. Well, this I believe to be illustrative of what can happen, what may be happening as the demand of these kinds unemployment. Although, we may be sympathetic with ah... the concept generally, but when the demands become excessive, I think that we're really doing is driving business out of this State of Illinois. I, for one, like to feel that one way of helping the working man is to create a climate in this State that encourages business and industry and creates jobs here. I cannot see and it seems to me that it is counterproductive to introduce those measures which will have the opposite effect. The effect of driving business and job opportunities out of the State of Illinois increasing the very unemployment that we purport to be addressing ourselves to ah... with measures of this kind. I think it is, I think it is bad, Representative Giorgi. I think it will produce the opposite effect, the opposite effect of what you have in mind and to me, we ought to label your Bill maybe Highway 488, Highway 488 which will lead, I think, in the direction of fiscal, ah... of ah... insolvency and ah... possibly bankruptcy. Certainly ec..bankruptcy of the fund and certainly economic disaster in the State of Illinois and I would heartily urge my colleagues to vote 'no' on this measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, Zeke, I talked informally with one of the advocates of the Bill and it's my understanding that there will be an effort to amend the Bill in the Senate and as a



member of the House, I'm having a hard time with this Legislation and in the past I've been unflinchingly in favor of it, but I've been persuaded to ah... take a second look at it. There's a lot of merit to what is offered ah... ironically enough by my colleague, Representative Hudson. Would you quit dancing and I think we ought to really be serious about ah... whether or not we in the House ought to be the ones that are going to bear the brunt of a very difficult ah... difficult vote. There are the perimeters of this ah... economic impact is significant for a lot of us. I think it is something that we ought to really look at in final detail and if we're going to amend this Bill in the Senate, I don't want to be the one who goes out on the limb and ah... supporting a Bill that has some problems, you know. So, could you perhaps, give serious thought to sitting down with ah... the members of labor and industry and commerce and small business, talk seriously about what really is going to come out of this House and I would feel, as a member, that it would be fair for me to give it the kind of vote it deserves. Right now, I think, a lot of us are admitting publicly and privately that this is a very difficult Bill to vote for. Ah... can you give me a comment or some kind of assurance on that?"

Giorgi: "Representative Schneider, I couldn't begin to tell you what the Senate is going to do with this Bill. I know that ah... I've been on the Industry and Labor Committee for years. I've wrestled with unemployment compensation Bills for years and you listen to the gentleman from Peoria tell you of all the great gains in unemployment compensation payouts, you still have the magnificent sum of 67 dollars a week for a person who is unemployed and he could have been earning 300 dollars a week in gainful employment. He reaches a standard of living where today



he has to file bankruptcy. I can't tell you what the Senate is going to do. You know better than I what the Senate might do."

Schneider: "Well, I'm really sympathetic. You know, I come from a laboring background and my whole family is in that tradition, yet and I know pretty much first-hand about the problems of that ah... sector of our private and public economy. All I'm saying, is that if we're going to have a Bill that is going to be dramatically different or more ah... realistic in terms of how we approach unemployment in a recessionary period and uncertain economic period if it's really authentic in terms of our criticism that business is going to be leaving Illinois and I'm not so sure I can accept that. But even, even to make it as one of the criteria, all those things brought together I would like to know if you can really give me some ah... suggestions from your point of view as to why we cannot just hold the Bill for a while and meet with those groups, Labor and Commerce informally and publicly. In any kind of capacity in order to get a real Bill out of here. Ah... now that ah... I'm taking maybe a handle on a rumor or suggestion that may or may not be true, but maybe you ought to be able to suggest to me ah... what your vision of that rumor is or what you're willingness is to talk to these various sectors. Zeke, I think we have, we're going to have a hard time passing the Bill."

Giorgi: "Representative Schneider, I sat here last session with an unemployment compensation Bill went up to the deadline. This year, because we were going to enact some type of unemployment compensation, I felt I ought to get the Bill out early enough. So, without getting dramatic I'd like to remind you that the same people that were screaming we were going down the road to socialism and communism when Social Security was



enacted and the unemployment compensation act was enacted and when the A.M.A. said that Medi-care was the ruination of this country and the next bet, Penn Central was in the Congress asking to nationalize themselves. So, I think you're using, you're buying the same argument that the Chamber of the Commerce has generated out of this mimeograph machine."

Schneider: "Well, I know about the inconsistencies of those kinds of arguments and I see the failures of applying particular cases like Penn Central and Lockheed and all of that to a ah... kind of a mixed free-enterprise system and I know what you're saying and I really want to suggest to you that I ah... can make the distinction between idealogical ah... questions you're raising. So, I don't think I'm being duped. I want to say to you as a pragmatic matter as it appears in my district that there is legitimate concern. I think it's real concern and I am a person who is never failed to vote for this kind of proposal and I'm suggesting again that if it is going to be changed and amended as I understand it will be in the Senate, I don't want to be a House member going out on a limb for a Bill like this in its form when the Senate can have easier row to hoe. So, I think ah... like some of my other colleagues on this side of the aisle that I'm uncertain at this point as to whether or not I can support this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. Would the sponsor yield for one short question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Grotberg: "Representative ah... what is the minimum number of employees ah... that of... you have to have in your firm before you must participate in the un-em. comp."



Giorgi: "One person."

Grotberg: "Thank you. With that answer to my question, may I address the Bill, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Grotberg: "I believe that in... for reference purposes only that the House should be aware that last night in the area of public policy with public employees that a Bill went out of this House that if enacted, has the ultimate ah... cost to the State of Illinois and to the taxpayers of significant millions of dollars in the days ahead. Now, today we are dealing in the area of public policy with private employment and the benefits thereof of unemployment. Now, my question and the question, the philosophical question we must ask ourselves is, where does money come from? It's so simple. Money has to be generated by the business and industry in this State. The State of Illinois prints no money. Government has completely unproductive. There is nothing in government that generates money, federal, state, or local. It all ultimately comes from business and industry starting with the one man or the mama or papa store. I will let others speak to the point of the large employers in this State and the fact that we have lost 195 of them in the last year, but I, for one, would like to address myself to the small business and industry of this State. I happen to make a phone call this morning to find out that with the grace of God in the small business that I operate, we broke even in the month of March. I have been fighting small deficits. I have been trimming the sails. I have been doing everything possible except lay off 60 employees. Now, I am within the 2% margin of staying alive in a small town in Illinois for the Department to which I am responsible. I submit to this House and to this Body



that our obligation to the people of Illinois is to keep a healthy climate so that we can generate money. We have a reasonable unemployment compensation program now. Certainly, it may not be enough but business and industry was not created to pay for unemployment and it's created to pay for employment. Thank God, in the words of the sponsor of this Bill, it looks like things are going to get better. As they do get better, I would urge this Body to again remember that we are elected to come down here, not to spend the peoples money in the private sector any more than we are in the public sector. Our job is to keep Illinois healthy and that money only comes when it is generated. Now, the marginal businesses in this State, I can think of at least 5,000 that I'm aware of from published data, that are on a shoestring. One way or the other and 2% is like 200% of, in any increase in any formula that will chip away at the opportunity to stay in business today when we need jobs worse than we need unemployment. It's almost a ridiculous concept and anyone who has ever had to meet a payroll knows of all of these things that I'm speaking of. So that, I would beg of you, plead with you to let somebody make a buck in this State so we can all get jobs and take approach rather than hang another albatross by virtue of this elective body around the only energy that is left to the people of the whole United States and let us only deal with Illinois. The opportunity to generate income through a healthy, thriving business and industry in the State of Illinois. We've done everything else to kill that and this could be the goose, er... the straw that breaks the camel's back. The goose that breaks that camel's back, I think, would be more appropriate. So, I would urge everyone here to consider the public polity regarding



private employment again and where money comes from. There is no other money in the State of Illinois that except what is generated by business and industry. We need help and we need jobs. We don't need a more generous unemployment compensation program, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer. Representative Willer."

Willer: "Mr. Speaker, I know I'm not quite as embarrassed to confess what I have to confess after listening to my learned colleague, Glenn Schneider. Ah... I feel exactly as he does. I was, I am committed to increasing the benefits of unemployment compensation. I do not understand enough about this Bill. There are two things I am against and it's, no waiting period and allowing a spouse to collect for, I mean, collect benefits for her dependents if the other spouse is earning a good living. But what really perplexes me, is that there are too many questions unanswered. There are too many questions unanswered in my own mind. I agree with Representative Schneider. I wish something could be done if it means waiting for an Amendment in the Senate. Ah... I'm afraid I'm going to have to vote 'present' on this. Now it may be, as the previous speaker said. This will be the, it will kill the goose that laid the golden egg and this may be the last straw. Unfortunately, I have heard this for so many years from the same people about so much legislation that now maybe I'm in the category, sort of in a position of thinking, are they crying wolf once more? I don't want to hurt the little businessman and I think this may hurt them. It won't hurt big industry, I don't believe. But, I would add my request to Representative Schneider's that somebody do something because I'm going to be put in a position of voting 'present' on this Bill as it stands now."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Ah... It disturbs me when I hear people talk about the fact that there's no waiting period. We have people that are working all their lives and all of a sudden they have no income and to meet their bills which go to support the small businessman in their district, these people need money and they don't need it next month. Their car will be gone. Their house will be gone, then. They need it now, and with administrative snafu's of this administration, they will be lucky to get it in six or eight weeks. So, you're only penalizing them extra when you have a one week waiting period. And I also wish to address myself to the question about if a spouse is working. In this day of high prices, both spouses have to work in my district in order to meet the basic needs of the family. And therefore, when you penalize one spouse, you penalize the whole family and you are... These are people who are working people and they don't want to be on any aid. You're going to cause foreclosures. You're going to cause all the evils that you're trying to avoid if you don't put this Bill up because the people who are working, the laboring people in this country need help now. They don't need it next month. We sit here. We're safe. We have our salaries. But the people who are working and have their salaries taken away from them, need help. And these are the little people that we should be looking out for and you tell people in the black community to pull themselves up by their bootstraps and here you want to take the bootstraps away from them. So, what I'm saying is that vote for this Bill and you'll be helping more people than you'll be hurting, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."



Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is shall the main question be put. All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. I've been advised it's two-thirds of those voting. Representative Hoffman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I rise to explain my vote on this issue."

Speaker Redmond: "A little previous, I believe. The question is... Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 120 'ayes', 17 'no', 7 'present', 33 absent and the motion having received the necessary majority is hereby declared carried. Representative Giorgi to close."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, yes. Just a moment. I'd like to, just ah... someone just, listening to the debate, sent me a comparative ah... cable of unemployment compensation states and how we rank. At the present time, on the minimum, the 67 dollar minimum, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, The District of Columbia, New Jersey, Ohio and Pennsylvania pay more than we do. And the ah... and on families ah... Connecticut and Ohio pay more than we do, but ah... I know that many of the members have sought me out personally. They asked me what was in the Bill. I know that every member on this House wants this Bill dispensed with. Now, I think that ah... I've had to live with this Bill and I think all of you know as much as I do about it now, but, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield to my co-sponsor, Mr. Hanahan, for a couple of remarks and then ah... send the Bill up or down."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Hanahan to explain his vote."

Hanahan: "Speaker, I'm... as chief co-sponsor with Representative Giorgi very interested, I'd like the



membership of the House to know that this Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman is explaining his Bill. He hasn't spoken before."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, I am the chief co-sponsor, hyphenated sponsorship with Representative Giorgi and we're closing debate on House Bill 488. I would like to close by saying that I'm in support of House Bill 488 in its entirety because we're not talking about freeloaders, we're not talking about people asking for a handout. We're talking about unemployed people who want a job and want the job that they're unemployed from. We're not talking about doling out taxpayers money. We're not talking about people who don't want to work. Anyone that doesn't want to work that's collecting unemployment compensation and you know about it, you have an obligation to object to it. We're talking about people who justly deserve these, the benefits. The benefits that they had given up in a sense of not asking for more wages out of the profits the company makes by demanding good unemployment compensation and a just reward if they are unemployed against their will. We're not talking about freeloaders. We're not talking about people who want a handout. When you talk about the one week waiting period, you're talking about people who are jockeyed out of a job for a short period of time. That's somebody who could go and find another job that are purposely unemployed by their employer for a week or two just to change shifts, just to change or clean up their operation and put on an unemployment role that will not be able to get that unemployment benefit unless we eliminate the unemployment waiting week because these people can't go and get a job someplace else. There are no jobs available for those types of people in a short period of time. Nor does their employer truly want them to go



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

get another job. But they're really being subjected and in areas of steel mills especially. Where the steel mill shuts down for a period of one week or two weeks. These people are put unjustly on unemployment and everyone knows they have no chance of unemployment comp. You talk about the spouse not receiving, er... some people objecting to the spouse having equal rights on that. This is a very concept I've heard time and time again, parrotted out here that we want equal rights amendment. We're talking about people who should be treated individually as a wage earner, not because they're male, not because they're female, but because they're unemployed and whether or not they support their dependents. That's one of the reasons. And people who come here as conservatives and they're saying to me that the economists are wrong in debating or giving back money to people who cannot go out and earn money. Well, let me tell you then you ought to talk to your President of the United States and the conservative party of this United States that Gerald Ford was at one time a part of. When he prolonged... when he said that he was..."

Speaker Redmond: "You're time is coming to a close, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "He wanted to give money back and we're going to all receive rebates on our income tax. That's to spur the economy on and that's the concept of unemployment compensation that keeps the economy going. Not a dole, not a handout, but a social just wage."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, you were very gratuitous to the proponents of this Legislation by giving Representative Hanahan a chance to ah... debate the issues of the Bill after we had moved the previous question. I wonder if you'd allow ah... an opponent to have a chance to get their licks in before we call for the



question."

Speaker Redmond: "I understand that Representative Hanahan was a sponsor. The chief co-sponsor of this measure. Everybody will have an opportunity in the explanation of their vote. The question... the question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Hoffman. Ron Hoffman."

Ron Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I rise to explain my vote. I had intended to speak on this, on the original question, but having worked in industry for 20 years, one of the things I realize is that in the last few years, the trend in Illinois has been extremely unfavorable to having industry in Illinois. This Bill goes a long, long way in driving out that which employs our people. In the last four years, we have lost in the State of Illinois, manufacturing plants with 20 employees or more to the tune of a hundred and ninety-five manufacturing firms representing a hundred and eighty-seven thousand jobs that went to other States. Last calendar year, statistically, State of Illinois population has dropped forty thousand. We have forty thousand less people in the State of Illinois and if you check you'll find for those manufacturing firms that have left the State of Illinois, they've done it because they can't exist here anymore. One of the previous speaker said, well it would hurt the little person. The little manufacturing firm, but it certainly won't hurt the big corporation. Well, I beg to differ. The biggest problem is with the large manufacturing firm. They have such a high overhead and such a high cost factor in this State now that they're forced to move out and they are moving out. They're moving out to southern States and they're taking some of the people with them and what's left behind?"



Unemployed. People who have no place to go get jobs. I asked everyone here, quit looking at industry as that large being that can endure all legislation, pay all taxes, solve all ills, employ all people and sustain itself. Because it's not going to do it, ladies and gentlemen. We're driving it out at a more rapidly increasing rate, year after year. And if we don't watch the type of legislation that we implement in this State, we're not going to have that large being, that large entity to employ anybody. It won't be here and then what? These people that are leaving the State of Illinois, these are the ones that represent your tax base. Your corporations represent your tax base. You destroy that and you won't pay the revenue into the State of Illinois. So, before you cast any 'aye' vote on this Bill, consider what you're doing to the little people, consider very carefully, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washington."

Washington. "Ah... Mr. Speaker, members of the House, the previous speaker ah... touched on a question which I wanted to ask of the principal sponsor, Mr. Giorgi. I didn't have time and that question to me was the only valid one that was brought up in whole debate. And that was, to what extent, if at all, increase in taxes or other beneficial payments to the State or its workers. To what extent does that drive business out of the State and if it does, where does it drive them to. I don't know. Mr. Hoffman says it drives them to the south. It might well be that it drives them to a State with higher taxes. I don't know, but I think the question is inter-related with a false assumption and perhaps poor philosophy which is emanating from the other side of the aisle. There seems to be theory over there that ah... the goose that lays the golden egg is business. There seems to be a



theory over there that wealth is generated by business. Well, that's certainly contrary to all of my historical and analytical powers to find out what's going on. I was always on the assumption that business thrives in this State for two reasons. One, we have the material wealth here. We are the industrial hub of this great country. And two, an even more important we have the skilled labor and the labor resources by which, which brings people here to capitalize upon that skilled labor as a base here. I don't buy the foundation of that at all. I am greatly disturbed by the philosophical confrontation that I find here. And the philosophical confrontations what it's all about, really. There's a basic assumption that businesses will be driven out. That has not been demonstrated. It has simply been said. I would like to know those 184 businesses that left here within the last year or so, where they went, why they went there. It might well be that they've left here that they did it for other reasons. I support this. I support this Bill for one very solid reason. The social disorganization which has come into our State within the last few years..."

Speaker Redmond: "Your time is expiring, Representative Washington."

Washington: "is basically due to the fact that we have unemployed or underemployed poorly paid people and unless you address yourself to that question, which seems to me to be paramount and supersedes anything we can talk about with business, your not going to have a healthy climate for people to live in. Crime is on the upswing. Violent crime, crime for economic gain and most of it stems from the fact that people are unemployed. That's the issue to address yourself to. The unemployment and the underemployment and it seems to me that since business passes on these ex-



penses anyway to the poor taxpayer and the poor consumer, it seems to me that business should be addressing itself to the fundamental question of how best they can increase these compensations for benefits to workers. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I would like to vote for some reasonable approach to this problem, but I feel that this legislation 488 is entirely too unrealistic and too far advanced. More importantly, so far as this State is concerned, I think we should concern ourselves with delivering the paychecks to those people that are now not employed and eligible to receive them rather than worrying about what additionally they're going to get because it's a damn site more important that we get those checks to the people today that are not now getting them and who are eligible. I would also like to say that this being too unreasonable, Abraham Lincoln said it a hundred years ago, that you can not help the wage earner by tearing down the wage payer and I simply want to say to you that redraft it, come up with a realistic approach and then perhaps we can get this Bill passed. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I voted for this and I'm somewhat shocked to watch some of my colleagues here on the floor in their votes. When this State needed money to run, we voted a 4% tax on corporation. This isn't a 4% tax on corporations but we voted for that because we said we needed money to make government run. When we got in trouble back in '71 when we started to have a depression, we put millions and millions and millions of dollars into public aid and put doles to people so they could feed themselves. Now, what we're asking to do is to



give the wage earner a chance when he's put out of a job to get his money now to do away with the waiting week and to have a chance to have a decent, decent standard of living when he's unemployed. Well, that wage earner you talk about this State, that wage earner is the man that's paying the tax. That income tax. You talk about a goose that's going to ah... that's going to kill the goose, if you don't start looking after the wage earners in this State, if you don't start looking after the working people in this State, you will kill something and I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow members of the House, I've been trying to find some facts and figures. I've found one. Now, this is based on EPA and on economic conditions and this Bill portrays economic conditions, obviously. There are 28 foundries that have closed in Illinois in the last year due to economic conditions and EPA. There are 153 ah... This is a brochure ah... a questionnaire sent out. A 153 factories ah... because of economic conditions and EPA. I propose considering with those two statements, that such a Bill will more adversely, seriously effect the economic conditions of this State and the possibility of industry and ah... and ah... small business continuing to operate. So, I think we should think very carefully what we're doing."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sangmeister."

Sangmeister: "Well, look... In looking at the board ah... apparently the Bill may be in trouble and I don't expect my explanation of vote is going to help one way or another although that'll probably fly up there when the Speaker calls for the final vote, but I've been hoping as a Democrat ah... that the sponsor of the Bill and those concerned in this area would have



done something to bring this Bill into line so that myself and other people could have supported this Bill and although it was partially helped with the strike provision being taken out the Bill was not put into a line that we could support it. Ah... I am genuinely concerned, not so much that business is going to leave Illinois because of this Bill, but it's Bills like this that is going to discourage businesses from coming in and I know full well that this will probably be the worst political vote that I'll ever make this session. But one thing, it'll be the best conscience vote that I'll ever make and that's what I've got to live and I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote I am deeply concerned of the long-reaching effects of this Bill on labor. I feel labor, the good, conscientious laboring man and woman are going to be deeply hurt by this Bill in the long run. When you have the interpretation of someone who's supporting a child being limited to less than 1% and being allowed to collect unemployment compensation which will deplete the trust fund, no doubt the amount of 10 to 15% and if you... when you have a minimum requirement completely erased as to how much you can make to qualify for 26 weeks of unemployment, you are hurting the laboring man's trust fund and I regretfully have to vote 'present' because I am for labor to work with business and I'm afraid labor's going to be hurt."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to explain my vote. I think one thing is being overlooked in all of the discussions that I've heard in regard to this Bill so far. And that is, what is



really going to happen with the compensation that is paid under this Bill. What is really going to happen with it is, it's going to permit the working man to continue to pay his house payment to the financial institution from whom he has borrowed that money. He's going to continue to be able to pay something towards the education of his children so that those who are in the teaching profession will continue to be employed and so that we can continue to be employed and so that we can continue to benefit this country by having educated children. He's going to continue to buy groceries at the grocery store. He's going to continue all of the necessities of life from all of the small businessmen in the community in which he lives. And they will therefore, continue to stay in business and to be able to ah... make a profit in the enterprise in which they're engaged. He's going to continue to use this to buy the product of industry throughout this State and through all of the States of this Union. So, I think if we just look to where this money is actually going to go, it's going to provide a livelihood for the worker's family. It's going to continue to provide him dignity in those times when he cannot work and it's going to continue to insure that small business and industry and all of the other areas from which he must consume will continue themselves in a healthy state and I would suggest that this is good, both for industry as well as for labor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer, Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ah... I also wish to explain my vote on this. Ah... for those of you who know my record, especially with the Chamber of Commerce, you probably expect to see a flashing red light up there. But I can't bring myself to vote that way on this Bill. I really felt that there



needed, there was some very drastically needed change in the unemployment compensation field. Very few, if any, of the people that are presently for it are even getting it in 30 days let alone 7 days. But I was most sympathetic with idea of doing away with this 7 day waiting period. It's hard to explain to your children when they sit down to the dinner table and you have no food to serve them that you're sitting out a 7 day waiting period. I talked to our local union in my own district and they wanted this abolished. They also told me this was their principle interest to abolish the 7 day waiting period and to have some form of reasonable increase in the benefits which I also agreed with. But the reason I cannot vote 'yes' on this Bill, is that the gluttonness attitude of the sponsors of this Bill is to take all or not take anything at all and I think this is most unfortunate for the laboring people. It's not the fault of labor. It's not the fault of the unions on this matter. I think it's purely and simply the attitude of the sponsors on this Bill. I similiarly had an unemployment compensation increase Bill up in Committee and they killed this Bill in Committee on the theory they could get so much more in their own Bill that they didn't need any other help from anybody else whether he be a Republican or someone that has pro-business voting record as I have been. I think that this is very detestable to the laboring people who need help in this area and I cannot vote for such a Bill. I'm not going to vote 'no' because quite frankly our people in our area are too concerned about this for me to turn my back on it. I hope they'll put this matter on postponed consideration and really go to work and offer us some legitimate amendments to this Bill so it can be supported at some time in the future."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I'd like to explain my 'yes' vote. I, too, regard this is as a conscience vote. I think the conscience involved here is what will be the role of government when people, through no fault of their own, are unable to sustain their family in terms of feeding, clothing and housing them. That's the issue before this House, ladies and gentlemen and no matter how many diversionary tactics or unique questions that are asked that have been drafted by the ah... AMA or the Illinois Chamber of Commerce are asked. The real issue here is, what will be the role of government in the time of need of working people here in the State of Illinois. That's the issue. I've sat here for 12 years and I'm sick and tired of hearing people tell me that every Bill that's proposed that will assist human beings to get along better in our society is going to drive business out of the State. Corporate profits are at a record. The gross national product of Cook County alone is over 50 billion dollars. When F.E.P.C. came up, we were told it would drive business out of the State. When we've tried to improve workmen's compensation laws, we were told that it would drive business out of the State. When the question of a State Income Tax came up, we were told it would drive business out of the State. That's all fallacious. It's phony. It's untrue. It's highly speculative. Illinois has one of the most hospitable and favorable climates for big and small business of any State in the world. Face it, if you want to talk about conscience, what we're talking about is helping people get over a very, very serious and difficult time in their lives and the lives of their children. If you want to turn your back on



them, be honest about why you're doing it. Be honest about it. Don't rationalize it with a bunch of phony statistics. And I vote 'aye'!"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, this has been an agonizing month, six weeks, two months, whatever you want to call it. But I think most of us have been faced with the problem of an iron-clad co-sponsor of this piece of legislation. It seems to me that if we are going to be responsible, that we have to take a look at each piece of legislation and determine whether it's good legislation, mediocre or bad. And I have determined after having discussed this not many, with many businessmen, many labor people, many legislators and yet, almost every legislator had this on his mind constantly for the last four weeks. And nowhere have I turned, have I found the advocates and the, and particularly one co-sponsor whom I will not mention. I think most of you know who he is. Under no condition will he ever accept an Amendment to any of his Bills because it will tear the Bill apart in his mind, but ladies and gentlemen, I think this Bill needs some correction. I can't support a Bill that is not in its best form and I've been ah... Over the years, I've served on both labor and management and I was business agent for eight years and I represented those people. I happen to think I did a good job. I happen to be a small employer at the present time and I think I've furnished a pretty good employment situation for 13 employees. And I say this legislation needs some correction and I'm willing to stand up before my constituents next year in the face of threats from my labor people that if I do not support this, I will not be supported in the next election. Ladies and gentlemen, my conscience will not let me take those kinds of threats. I'm



going to vote 'no' against this Bill until we have some amendments that improve it and make it a workable Bill. If I am subject to opposition in the next election because of this vote, let it be that way."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Calvo."

Calvo: "Well, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, we hear a lot of talk about why industry leaves Illinois and why the plants have closed and one of the prior speakers said, well, it's EPA and it's the economy. Yes, it's the economy, but let's see what happens to the economy and what has happened to it. And let's look at history just a second. I wasn't born then, but my Dad told me about the great depression and he explained to me a little about it and he said, you could buy a white shirt to wear for 10 cents and I said, gee, Dad that had to be a great time. I could, you know, I could buy a lot of shirts for 10 cents. He said, you could now, son; but you couldn't have then because people weren't working and people didn't have 10 cents and, by the way, they didn't have unemployment compensation to pay them. Now, if you want to keep your plants and factories and get this economy turned around, you've got to support legislation like this that'll put the buying power where it'll do the most good. If people can't buy products produced by these factories, that's when the factories close. When the people don't have the buying power. This legislation will assist the people. The people who are out will have enough money to still buy food and clothes and products produced by this great industrial country of ours. And I urge you to vote 'yes' for this Bill because that is what it takes to keep the plants from closing and turn the economy around is to have the buying power where it works. In the individual wage earner. Let me tell you one other thing. We talk about... Could



I have a little order, Mr. Speaker. I'll talk quieter if they'll give me a little order."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your remarks to a close, please."

Calvo: "I'll certainly do that and talk a little quieter.

Mr. Speaker, I know of one plant that closed and they said they closed because of the economy and EPA. But I was very interested in seeing plant to continue to work as it employed a lot of people in my district and in my town. But you know why they closed? They hadn't sold one unit of their product in 18 months. That's exactly why they closed. So, let's not kid ourselves. You can blame EPA for its closing. You can blame a lot of things for closing, but when the sales aren't there, the goods that are being manufactured. That's when they close. So, let's vote 'aye' and get this economy moving and help the people that need the help the worse and will help the economy the most, the wage earners of this State. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, members of the House, in explaining my vote, the extended debate on this Bill demonstrates what a complicated matter it is. Until a few years ago, the unemployment compensation equation was worked out by a joint conference committee of labor and industry in what was called an Agreed Bill. It appears to me that now is the time to return to the Agreed Bill process for the benefit of all parties concerned, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stubblefield."

Stubblefield: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, there's not much that hasn't been said on each side of the question, this morning, concerning the passage of Bill 488 and I'll try not to be redundant and talk about things that have already been spoken to. But I think a few things deserve some attention."



The opponents of this Bill would have us believe that unemployment compensation is a gift of the employer. I think they're losing sight of the fact that every dollar they have and every dollar that they contribute for unemployment compensation is a result of productivity. None of which they make. That productivity comes from the man in the blue jeans and the workshirt. The guy who makes the chips on the machine. It's not the employers that's contributed to the State for the payment of unemployment compensation. It's contributed in work and sweat and men and women who have worked in the plant and who's money is held in escrow and paid into the government for this source. I think we should also deal with the question that has been raised that perhaps this should be under a shared payment. Sharing the payment would only increase the cost because the employer, in order for the employee to give the money back as a... his share must receive it from the employer and it would be taxed before they got it. And every dollar that he gave back would cost approximately a dollar and twenty cents. The only one who would benefit from that would be the Federal government. Let's talk a little bit about the one week waiting period. Obviously, members of this House don't know what it's like to be poor and work in a plant and be off without a paycheck and very few working people can afford that week in which they receive no pay. We're not talking about a week in which they delay the payment, but we're talking about a week of pay that never comes in. And that cuts a hole in their family budget at the tune of fifty, 1/52 for each such week. We're talking about employment. The one week waiting period encourages plants to frivolously close the plant when otherwise they wouldn't do so. And if you don't believe that, you talk to an individual who's



represented employees from various plants that has actually seen it happen. That one week when they pay nothing, is an encouragement for them to close the plant when otherwise they would not need to do so. We have been talking about an increase in payment that the opponents of this Bill suggest are too steep. There's been very little talk this morning about years in which there's been no increase at all. There's been very little talk about whole sessions when there's no increase in unemployment compensation..."

Speaker Redmond: "Your time has expired. Would you bring your remarks to a close, please?"

Stubblefield: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And there's been no discussion of the time where over a period of time we have moved from a 33, er... two thirds per cent down to approximately 33 and 1/3 per cent. And now it's just a case of the chickens coming home to roost, picking up the payment that should have been made through the years."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative..."

Stubblefield: "I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jacobs."

Jacobs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, it's not often that I rise to explain my vote. But I just want to go back a few months ago when we sat in this assembly and raised our pay. We thought we needed and we did need it. Now, we are now confronted with the unemployed. Think of it. Those are the people now that we have to help. Those are the ones who really need it. We didn't have this much trouble passing our own pay increase. So, let's be fair. Let's pass this Bill out, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Ah... Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. Ah... the board indicates that we are getting



ah... very close to passing a Bill that does important things for the working people of Illinois. You know, they talk about a fellow earning almost as much on unemployment comp. as he does when he is working. Well, the fact of the matter is he eats as much. His expenses are the same. His household costs are the same. His mortgage is the same. His expenses continue. They talk about providing that the fellow will be paid the first week he's off during the waiting period. What's so terrible about that? He eats as much the first week as he does the second week and the third week. His kids need the same kind of shoes. His mortgage has to be paid in the same way. All of these things are continuing expenses that do have to be met. Our unemployment compensation system recognizes that and I hope we will give this boost here to our economy and to the working people of the State by voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "VonBoeckman, Representative VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I've spent some twenty some odd years in the labor movement. I'm now with management of a large firm. I went into the personnel manager to ask his opinion on this very issue. And he says it would not hurt the company one bit. So, I think it's a myth to say that we're driving industry out of Illinois. I think it's high time we helped the unfortunate people who are the working class. So, therefore, I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and members of the House, it seems to me pretty clear that this, what we're voting on here and now seems to be getting tough sledding. But I would like to remind some of the members of the House that in a sense maybe we are involved in



some special legislation here. But it seems to me, that this House is always involved in some manner and some part of the sector of government and business and private sector of this State of being involved in special legislation of some type. It seems that just recently in the recent past, a few weeks ago, we was involved in a debate concerning the interest of the mortgage bankers and the banks and savings and loans in this State as it relates to the usury rate. And it seems that some of the same people that are opposing a small raise in the unemployment compensation for working men and women were some of the same forces who were hollering the loudest for the increase in the interest rates that these working people will have to pay in the next year and a half or two years in this State. If you come to my district and see the number of houses that are abandoned now because of the downs, the hard economic climate that we've been faced with in the last couple of years because those mortgage payments could not be made. You would be willing to vote for any increase possible to maintain those stable families and those stable communities so that we could have the kind of upturn in the economy that we desire in this State. I think you say on the one hand that business must survive and then you say on the other hand we will not give the ah... unemployed people the opportunity to maintain themselves until that survival can come about. I think it's unconscionable that we would vote in this manner on a Bill that would help the working people and turn around in just the recent past and help people who did not need our help in terms of raising the usury rate in the fashion that we did. I vote 'aye' on this Bill. I would hope that, at least, 12 more members would reconsider what they're doing and realize that



there are more working people in this State than there are businessmen, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. Representative Giorgi. On this question... You desire recognition, Representative Giorgi? Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, after you take the record I'd like a poll of the absentees. Ah... continue."

Speaker Redmond: "Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 81 'ayes', 65 'nos', 17 'present'. The Bill having failed to receive... Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "I'd like a poll of the absentees, sir. Before you announce the roll call."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees."

O'Brien: "Capparelli, Ewell, Fleck, Garmisa, Hirschfeld, Keller, Kosinski, Kozubowski, McGrew, Schneider, Stone, Terzich, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Speaker 'present'. Further... On this question there are 81 'aye', 65 'no', 17 'present' and 14 absent. The Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed, lost rather. Resolutions. Representative Schlickman, for what purpose do you rise."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I move that we reconsider the vote by which House Bill 488 was declared lost."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I move that motion lie on the table."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman has moved that the vote by which House Bill 488 lost be reconsidered. Representative Duff has moved that motion lie on the table. All those in favor vote 'aye'. I think we'll have... There's five members that want a roll call so



I think we'll have a roll call vote. All in favor of the motion to lie it on the table. The motion's been withdrawn. Resolutions."

O'Brien: "House Resolution 209, Kelly. House Resolution 210, Molloy. House Resolution 212, Mann. House Resolution 213, Mann. House Resolution 214, Porter.

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi, Giorgi. Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, ah... House Resolution is from Representative Kelly on the golden anniversary of the Midlothian Fire Department. House Resolution 210 honors Theodore A. Meyer on his 101st birthday. House Resolution 212 by Mann honors Ms. Ginger Mack of Chicago. House Resolution 213 by Mann honors Mr. Paul Berger of Chicago and House Bill 214 honors ah... Connie Reif. I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved the adoption of the Resolutions. All in favor of the adoption indicate by saying 'aye'; oppose 'no'. The Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolutions."

O'Brien: "House Resolution 202, Tuerk. To respect the memory of the former State Senator Carl M. Behrman. House Resolution 204, Taylor. With respect to the memory of Mr. John M. Bailey. House Resolution 211, McPartlin. With respect to the memory of Dr. Percy Julian."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi has moved the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The Death Resolutions are adopted. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now stand in recess for 5 minutes that the Clerk then be allowed to read in messages from the Senate and House Bills, First Reading and then we do adjourn until tomorrow morning at 11:15."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Molloy. Representative Molloy, Molloy."

Molloy: "Before you entertain the motion of the Majority Leader as the sponsor, I would ask leave of the House at the present time to table House Bill 774."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman asked leave to table House Bill 774. Is that the number. Does he have leave? He not only has leave but a gold star. 774. House Bill 774 is tabled. Representative Schneider

Schneider: "I'd like to just announce very quickly to the members of Elementary and Secondary Education that we will be meeting at 2:45 ah... Take time for lunch and then we'll work until we clear our load ah... that is before us this afternoon."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Ah... yes, Mr. Speaker. I would ah... respectfully request that since there are so many Bills posted before the different Committees that the aids and Chairmans insure those that are going to testify and appear at those Committees that those Bills will be printed and available for those Committee Meetings. We had a little problem this morning and I hope that ah... by early tomorrow morning in some of the other meetings that this will be corrected and those Bills will be printed and available."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd, I believe that most of the Bills are printed. Representative... Well, let me finish this and if they aren't in the Bill room, they're available over in the armory. So, if you'd send an aid over there a page over there... Representative Leon. Representative Leon."

Leon: "Ah... Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, Banks, Savings and Loan Committee will meet at, promptly as possible. We will have a floor full of witnesses and I think it's only fair to them that we get there and give them a proper hearing for the



Bills that they're interested in. I'd appreciate the members of the Committee reporting promptly, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, may I have leave of the House to table ah... House Bill 698 which I'm the sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Leave granted. The Bill is tabled. Representative Schisler."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to announce for the benefit of many members who have Resolutions of all kinds before the Executive Committee that the Executive Committee, Resolutions Sub-Committee will be meeting tomorrow morning at 8 o'clock in Room D3. Now, this is not one of our regular hearing rooms. D3 is in the West wing at the North end of the State Capitol Building and what would be a ah... a conference room in the center of some offices on the second floor. But it's on the first floor, Room D3 which is just West of our regular hearing Room D1 on the State Office Building at 8 o'clock in the morning and we're going to take those Resolutions in the order that the sponsors of the Resolutions show up. And we'll do it as rapidly as possible."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. Just in the matter of announcements, Appropriations I will be meeting tomorrow morning at 8 o'clock in Room 114. Appropriations II will be meeting in Room 118 at 8 o'clock in the morning. I would ask that the Democratic members of Appropriations I meet with me tomorrow morning at 7:30 in 512. We'll go over the Bills, if there's any question. If not, we'll meet you at 8 o'clock in the morning, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea. Representative



Fennessey, first."

Fennessey: "Elections Committee will meet immediately after adjournment in 122A."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "I renew my motion on adjournment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the motion to recess for five minutes and then adjourn. All in favor of the motion indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion's carried. 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 concurred with the House of Representatives the passage of the Bill of the following title, to wit. House Bill 639, together with Amendments thereto, passed by the Senate as amended April 22, 1975, Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee Reports."

O'Brien: "Mr. Schneider from the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education to which House Bill 502 was referred; reported the same back pursuant to Rule 23D was ordered tabled. Mr. Schneider from the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education to which House Bill 520 and 744 were referred; reported the same back with amendments thereto with the recommendation that the amendments be adopted and the Bills as amended do not pass. Mr. Schneider from the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education to which House Bill 438, 647, and 675 were referred; reported the same back with amendments thereto with the recommendation the amendments be adopted and the Bills as amended do pass. Mr. Taylor from the Committee on Cities and Villages to which House Bill 615 and 797 were referred; reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bills do not pass. Mr. Taylor from the Committee on Cities and Villages to which House Bill 573 was referred;



reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bill do pass. Mr. Taylor from the Committee on Cities and Villages to which House Bill 506 was referred; reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bill do pass. Mr. Taylor from the Committee on Cities and Villages to which House Bill 554, 697, and 1284 were referred; reported the same back with amendments thereto with the recommendation that the amendments be adopted and the Bills as amended do pass. Mr. Taylor from the Committee on Cities and Villages to which Senate Bill 44 was referred; reported the same back with amendments thereto that the amendments be adopted and the Bill as amended do pass. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee to which House Bill 609 and 610 were referred; reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bills do pass and be re-referred to the Committee on Assignment of Bills. Mrs. Chapman from the Committee on Human Resources to which House Bills 612, 618 and 824 were referred; reported the same back with amendments thereto with the recommendation that the amendments be adopted and the Bills as amended do pass. Mrs. Chapman from the Committee on Human Resources to which House Bills 682, 737, 758, 870, 939, and 983 were referred; reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bills do pass. Consent Calendar. Mrs. Chapman from the Committee on Human Resources to which House Bill 607, 780 and 985 were referred; reported the same back with amendments thereto with the recommendation that the amendments be adopted and the Bills as amended do pass. Consent Calendar. Mrs. Chapman from the Committee on Human Resources to which House Bills 794 and 817 were referred; reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bills do not pass. Mrs. Chapman from the Committee on Human Resources to which House Bills 741 and 984 were referred; reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bills do pass.



Mrs. Chapman from the Committee on Human Resources to which was referred House Joint Resolution #5; reported the same back with the recommendation that the Resolution be adopted. Mrs... Mr. DiPrima from the Committee on Veterans Affairs, Registration and Regulation to which House Bills 13, 14, 15, 148, 156, 500, 583, 616, 1433 and 1436 were referred; reported the same back with amendments thereto with the recommendation that the amendments be adopted and the Bills as amended do pass. Mr. DiPrima from the Committee on Veterans Affairs, Registration and Regulation to which House Bill 551 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. DiPrima from the Committee on Veterans Affairs, Registration and Regulation to which House Bills 693, 759, 820, 822 and 823 were referred; reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bills do pass. Consent Calendar. Mr. DiPrima from the Committee on Veterans Affairs, Registration and Regulation to which House Bills 968, 969, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430, 1431, 1432, 1434 and 1435 were referred; reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bills do pass. Mr. DiPrima from the Committee on Veterans Affairs, Registration and Regulation to which House Bills 2728 and 588 were referred; recommended the Bills be assigned to interim study calendar. Mr. DiPrima from the Veterans Affairs, Registration and Regulation to which was referred House Resolution 122; reported the same back with the recommendation that the Resolution be adopted. Mr. Schneider from the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education to which House Bills 493, 992 and 1066 were referred; reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bills do pass. Mr. Schneider from the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education to which Senate



Bill 70 was referred; reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bill do pass. Mr. Matijevich from the Committee on Executive to which House Bill 1391 was referred; reported the same back with amendments thereto with the recommendation that the amendments be adopted and the Bill as amended do pass. Introduction of First Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Introduction First Reading."

O'Brien: "House Bill 2964, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning land titles. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2965, Younge. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Southwest Regional Port District. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2966, Younge. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Depressed Area Land Use and Community Development Authority. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2967, Geo-Karis. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Illinois Energy Resource Commission. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2968, Katz. A Bill for an Act to conform various Acts to the Constitution. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2969, Palmer. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Chicago-Rock Island Pacific Railroad Company. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2970, E.M. Barnes. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the State Compensation for services rendered to the State. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2971, Berman. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the State Board of Education. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2972, Tuerk. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the State Board of Education. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2973, Deuster. A Bill for an Act to create the Chain O'Lakes, Fox River Authority. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2974, Deuster. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House



Bill 2975, Catania. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2976, Totten. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2977, Totten. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2978, Totten. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2979, Totten. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2980, Totten. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2981, Totten. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2982, Totten. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2983, Totten. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2984, Totten. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2985, Emil Jones. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary contingent expense of the Governor's Action Office. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2986, Lundy. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Secretary of State. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2987, Shea. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary contingent expense of the State Board of Elections. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2988, Committee on Elections. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2989, Hanahan. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary contingent expense of the State Board of Education. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2990, Epton. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to regulate the practice of dental surgery and dentistry in the State of Illinois. First Reading



of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bills, First Reading."

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 146, Waddell. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 167, Macdonald. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 200, Kane. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to meetings. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 283, Beatty. A Bill for an Act creating the Local Government Tax Study Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 292, Dyer. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary contingent expense for children. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 298, Schlickman. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Library District Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 299, Schlickman. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Library District Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 332, Sharp. A Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 351, Kelly. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act for the ah... assessment taxation of private car-line companies. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 368. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to Township Organizations. Carroll is the sponsor on that. House Bill 385, Sevcik. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to provide for the ordinary contingent expense of the Illinois Investigation Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 420, E.M. Barnes. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making an appropriation to the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 426, Meyer. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary contingent expense of the Department of Agriculture. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 431, Pouncey. A Bill for an Act



making a supplemental appropriation to the ordinary contingent expense for the Board of Vocation, Education, Rehabilitation. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 455, Sangmeister. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary contingent expense to the Bureau of the Budget. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 513, Davis. A Bill for an Act making a supplemental appropriation to the Fair Employment Practice Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 631, Brummet. A Bill for an Act to restore excess rights in Madison County. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "No further business, therefore, the House stands adjourned until 11:15 tomorrow."



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FORTY-SEVENTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

APRIL 22, 1975



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES