

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTY-FIFTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

MAY 13, 1975



MAY 13 1975

1.

John Painter: "All those not entitled to the floor would you, please, go to the Gallery. All those not entitled to the floor would you, please, go to the Gallery." (Repeats two more times)

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order and the members will, please, be in their seats. We'll be led in prayer . . . Representative Gene Hoffman. O.K., you're raising the wrong hand, you're supposed to raise the right hand. We'll be led in prayer by Reverend Krueger, the House Chaplain."

Reverend Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. A leading university conducted psychological tests which show that most people are inclined to show greater respect for the opinion of a stranger than that of a friend. This was even more true of men than women. The explanation offered by the investigators is this: 'We tend to think that our friends don't know anything more about something than we do, or maybe even less. But the stranger is an unknown quantity, and we're inclined to attribute greater perception to people when we don't know their limitations.' Let us pray. All things wait upon Thee, O Lord. Thou openest Thy hand, and they are filled with good. Hear us, O Lord, and be merciful unto us, for Thy name's sake. Thou knowest our needs, teach us to feel them. Thou knowest our ignorance, teach us how to pray. Thou knowest our weakness, teach us how to look to Thee for strength. Thou knowest our indecision, teach us to call upon Thee for guidance to make only such decisions that are pleasing and perfect unto Thee; for Jesus Christ's sake. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Consent Calendar, Second Reading, Second Day."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1557, a bill for an act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. How about Senate first? Senate Bills, First Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 458, David Jones, a bill for an act . . . a bill to enact the American Bicentennial Celebration Act. First Reading of the bill. Senate Bill 23, take that out of the Record. Senate Bill 73, Greiman, a bill for an act to amend an act in relation to



MAY 13 1955

2.

adoption of persons. First Reading of the bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea, do you have some sponsors on Senate Bills, First Reading?"

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 297, Totten, a bill for an act to amend the Pension Code. First Reading of the bill. Senate Bill 419, Matijevich, a bill for an act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. First Reading of the bill. Senate Bill 486, Dan Houlihan, a bill for an act to amend the Administrative Review Act. First Reading of the bill. Senate Bill 461, Emil Jones, a bill for an act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Illinois Investigation . . . Investigating Commission. First Reading of the bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The order of business, Concurrence, appears House Bill 307, Representative Friedland here? O.K., Representative Friedland."

Friedland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of . . . of the House, I would move that the House concur in Senate Amendment Number 1 to House Bill 307. The Senate amendment increased the per da . . . the per diem from \$35 to \$45 per day for those persons on the per diem rate; and the minimum salary from \$7,500 to \$10,000 per year for those who are full-time employees. I would move for adoption of Senate Amendment Number 1 . . . er . . . concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members of the House. Ah . . . Would the sponsor of the bill indicate what kind of employees it is that are going to be getting, as I understand, \$45 a day, per diem?"

Friedland: "Yes, sir; Representative Lundy, the township road commissioners who are not employed full time, but work on a per diem basis only."

Lundy: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment Number 1. All those in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'. Final action, it takes 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? It's final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there are 91 'ayes', 1 'no'; and the House concurs in Senate Amendment Number 1. Is Representative Getty on the floor? Representative Friedland, have you looked at the board. Record Representative Friedland as 'aye'. Repre-



MAY 13 1910

sentative Getty on the floor? I call the attention of the members that there's only been about three or four Senate Bills, First Reading that have been picked up by House sponsors. It doesn't . . . go well for the legislative process if bills can go through without sponsors. Representative Geo-Karis is a little tardy this morning."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I was in the Senate trying to get some sponsors for my bills over there. I wonder if . . . if . . . am I in order to . . . ah . . . volunteer to . . . ah . . . take Senate Bill 73, has someone got them already? I don't know, see."

Speaker Redmond: "It's an adoption. I think Representative Shea has a sponsor on that, Representative, Saperstein."

Geo-Karis: "Is it . . . is it taken? How about 104 and 105?"

Speaker Redmond: "I think probably Representative Merlo on those."

Geo-Karis: "Well, whose bills on . . . on the . . . are available? Would that be improper to ask at this time, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know, Tom . . . there's . . . I've been advised by the Clerk that we have a tablet here. If you desire, you can . . . ah . . . sign up. House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 94."

Jack O'Brien: "House . . . House Bill 94, . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Jack O'Brien: ". . . a bill for an act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Redmond: "On priority of call, Representative Williams."

Williams: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker and members of the House, . . . ah . . . on House Bill 94, the Amendment Number 2 is now the bill; and the amendment was worked out with the . . . ah . . . Teamsters, with the Illinois canners, with the farmers groups, the Illinois Agriculture Association, the . . . ah . . . G.O.T.; and actually what this does is it says that in any urban or any area . . . ah . . . contiguous to a land fill operation, the . . . ah . . . a vehicle should be cleaned of mud before, you know, enters upon the street. This now does have the, we'll say, the approval or the endorsement of the canners and the Teamsters, the State Police, the Department of Transportation, and I believe the truckers have removed their objection to the bill. I



MAY 13 1975

4.

ask for a do pass on 94."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The gentle . . . Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Totten: "What's the penalty for . . . ah . . . spilling or tracking?"

Williams: "The penalty comes under the Vehicle Code. . . . ah . . . let's see, I have it here somewhere, it would be a, I believe, a Class C Misdemeanor. I believe it's a Class C Misdemeanor."

Totten: "A Class C Misdemeanor?"

Williams: "Yes."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? The question is, shall this bill pass? All in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, in relation to this House, now, I want you to visualize the driving of trucks . . . ah . . . throughout a county or through . . . ah . . . a city. A truck driver does his best to load the . . . the truck driver does not load the truck to begin with, and then he does his best to take that truck from wherever he's going to where . . . from where he's coming from to wherever he's going. Sometimes sand does come off, or dirt, or . . . ah . . . maybe debris; now, . . . ah . . . it's hard for a truck driver to know that he's has lost anything off of his truck. Ah . . . The . . . it's true that this is a nuisance under some cases. Now, I doubt if it's an excessive nuisance. Now, you take a farmer . . . ah . . . that's going in to town with a . . . with grain, for example and happened to be crossing some muddy roads. It's inevitable that he's going to take some grain . . . ah . . . some mud on his . . . ah . . . tires and take it along to a hard road, on a gravel road, it's inevitable. But . . . tell you . . . we make special laws that will make this kind of a possibility on all farmers, all truck drivers, anyone driving a truck throughout the State of Illinois. I agree that there's . . . that there is . . . there's problems sometimes, but there's greater problems, in my opinion, in relation to the attempt to stop this kind of an . . . happening. The farmer, indeed, that's taking



MAY 13 1975

5.

a truckload of grain to town can tell you, you've all seen it, I'm sure, if you're from a country area, for a short distance or even for sometimes half a mile, there may be . . . ah . . . some small bits of . . . ah . . . dirt increasing to where he entered the hard-road system to even some clogs. But it is unrealistic to pass this kind of a bill. It's just simply unrealistic, and the . . . ah . . . rains wash it off, passing cars . . . ah . . . smash them and wash it off and . . . ah . . . or blow it off and the roads become clean in a remarkable short time. If it's some object falls off . . . ah . . . then it has to be picked up. Sometimes the driver picks it up, sometimes he does not, drives on not even knowing it's fallen off; but we do have the township . . . the Township Road Commissioners, we do have in the city the crews that clean up; and they are used to the custom of doing something of this nature. Now, if it's a deliberate intent, that's another matter. I don't think that they are . . . that we have that often; and I think this is a very bad bill, myself, and will open all sorts of doors that we should keep closed."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 96 'ayes', 7 'no'; and the bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. Representative Washburn, for what purpose do you rise? Representative Washburn, for what purpose do you rise?"

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House. We're priv . . . privileged to have with us this morning in the rear Gallery, 100 students from the Rock Falls Elementary School. They're accompanied by teachers Neil Carmichel, Mike Shannon, Don Luftas and Randy Bulgot. Their representatives from the 37th District are Representatives Schuneman, Ebbessen and Mautino. Would the 100 students from Rock Falls, please, stand up and be recognized."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 102."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 102, Peters, a bill for an act to amend the Controlled Substance Act. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, . . . ah . . . House Bill 102 is a . . . really an amendment to the existing



MAY 13 1975

6.

Controlled Substance Act. It came out of a series of hearings of the Illinois Investigating Commission. In large part, it puts into our present Controlled Substance Act the same rules and requirements and scheduling of drugs as is found in the Federal statutes. It does change the enforcement provisions of this act from the Department of Law Enforcement to the Dangerous Drugs Commission in keeping with legislation, which this Assembly passed last session. It does provide a . . . some new definitions in keeping, again, with the changes made by other legislation. It does set up a definition of instructional activities, so that the Dangerous Drugs Commission can, in fact, monitor . . . ah . . . some of the experimentation in drugs and drug use . . . ah . . . in our educational institutions. It does also put into the statute a definition of, 'good faith', as it may apply to a physician or to a pharmacist in . . . in order to help in determining whether drugs were dispensed properly. It does add several sections which are rules developed by the Department of Law Enforcement and their regulation of various controlled substance drugs. I might also indicate that this measure has the approval and support of the Dangerous Drugs Commission, the Department of Registration and Education, the Department of Law Enforcement, and it has been supported in committee by the Illinois State Medical Society; and it is now fully supported by both the Cook County Retail Druggist Association and the Illinois State pharmaceutical Association. Those sections of the initial act, which they found to be somewhat objectionable in terms of the reasonable conduct in their business, have been amended out; and all of these groups and organizations are in support of this measure; and I, respectfully, request the approval of the ladies and gentlemen of the House on this measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? The question is, shall this bill pass? All in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 129 'aye', no 'nay'; the bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 141, Representative Porter."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 141, Porter, a bill for an act to amend the Illi-



MAY 13 1975

7.

nois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter."

Porter: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 141 is intended to take care of a ridi . . . ridiculous and inequitable result in the Illinois Income Tax Act. As was shown on the sheets that I passed out last night, a person, a taxpayer in Illinois, could have \$2,000 of capital gains and actually be taxed on \$3,000. Obviously, this was not intended when the original act was passed. It resulted from the fact that our Income Tax Act passed in 1969 was adopted at exactly the same time that the Federal government was adopting amendments to the Federal act under the 1969 Reform Act. The change in the law would, simply, . . . ah . . . effect individuals estates and trusts and would not have any effect on corporations. The maximum impact for each tax return for each year would be \$25, that is \$25 per tax return, and since there are about 4½ million tax returns in Illinois and we assume there's only about 1 out of 8 that have any sort of capital loss, the maximum impact would be about \$200,000 a year. It is the . . . the bill is favored by the Illinois Society of Certified Public Accountants. This bill passed the House two years ago, and . . . ah . . . was not heard in the Senate, because it was too late in the session. Ah . . . I'll be happy to answer any questions; and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, as you know, it has been the practice of the Revenue Committee and this House over the years . . . ah . . . since the Income Tax has been, in effect, to resist changes in regard to . . . ah . . . allowing for additional deductions in order to simplify our method of taxation and in order to . . . ah . . . maintain a posture so that we didn't have to have two or three volumes of rules and regulations. I would point out, however, that in regard to this bill, that what we're really talking about, if you view it in terms of Federal taxation, is a change in gross receipts and not a tax deduction. But we're talking about making a fair and equitable change . . . ah . . . in regard to how we determine what the gross receipts for taxation should be. So what I'm suggesting,





MAY 13 1975

8.

in effect, that the usual argument about changing our income tax structure is not applicable here. Ah . . . That this, indeed, is a good bill; it . . . ah . . . in effect, conforms us to the . . . ah . . . provisions of the Federal Income Tax; and I would urge your favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Lechowicz: "What is the revenue loss proposed in this bill, the estimated revenue loss?"

Porter: "Well, Ted . . . Ted, I just covered that, but it's the . . . it applies only to individuals, trusts and estates; it does not apply to corporations, . . . ah . . . since only \$1,000 would be an issue on any return, the maximum tax impact to any one return would be \$25. There's 4½ million returns filed each year in Illinois, and we assume that about one eighth of those might have a capital loss. So you . . . so the estimate would be around \$200,000. Ah . . . It . . . it could not be more than . . . if every single return in Illinois had a capital loss on it, the impact would be a little over a million dollars; but obviously they don't, very few have them, and I would say that about \$200,000 is a fair figure."

Lechowicz: "Well, the figure that I received from the Department of Revenue is \$1,700,000."

Porter: "No, the Department of Revenue filed a fiscal note on this and they said less than one million, which kind of hedged the question, I thought, and was rather left in candid, less than one million."

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Porter: "Oh, I'm sorry, I'm sorry, Ted, the Bureau of the Budget that said less than a million. It couldn't . . . it could no . . . there's no way it could possibly be 1.7 million dollars, it's impossible."

Lechowicz: "Well, they've been wrong before. O.K., thank you."

Porter: "They sure have."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell. Any further questions? The question is, shall this bill pass? All in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'; Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The



MAY 13 1975

9.

Clerk . . . Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I think that we ought to look on this as a tax relief bill, and it's a tax relief bill for the . . . ah . . . highest income group. I think that . . . ah . . . the figures I've seen are correct, something like the top 3 percent of the income brackets get 80 percent of the capital gain, and these are the people that we're giving this tax relief to. We can only afford \$25 per person for the elderly, but this is going to give . . . go to the . . . to the persons with the highest income, the top 3 percent income earners are going to get this tax relief. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter."

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, that simply is a misrepresentation. The bill is only designed, it's a very technical bill, it's only designed to put the Illinois Income Tax in the condition it was intended to be in the very beginning, and that is a complete taxation of both capital gains and capital losses; and the only reason it's not in its present form, is that the Federal Government changed the . . . ah . . . Federal law at exactly the time we adopted our tax act. So that is just not true. The . . . the only thing we're trying to do here, because Illinois taxes capital gains at 100 percent, as it should, is to . . . is to allow a deduction for capital losses at a 100 . . . at a 100 percent. It's merely a question of equity. It is certainly not a policy bill in any since of the word, and Representative Beaupre indicated that the entire subcommittee who heard all of the bills involving the Income Tax Act indicated to you, as is true, that this bill is one that does not deal with policy or with changes in the act, but merely seeks to correct an inequity that's contained in it right not. I would . . . I would urge everyone to vote 'aye' on this good bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, the Revenue Committee had a subcommittee again, and there are 15 or 20 bills in there that consider a change in the State of Illinois Income Tax, and even though it was studied already by a subcommittee, it would seem to



MAY 13 1975

10.

me, that if we're going to be piecemeal changing the Illinois Income Tax, we're making a mistake. I believe this bill should be reconsidered in the subcommittee along with all of the other bills recommending changes in the State of Illinois Income Tax, otherwise, we're going to have expenses, we're going to be changing the form every year. If we're going to make any changes, we should make . . . consider all the other bills along with this one, and I would urge that we vote 'no' on this at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, this is not the typical tax deduction measure that has been considered by . . . ah . . . the Subcommittee on Income Tax and the Revenue Committee. What we're talking about really is changing the formula for what gross receipts are. Now, on the front end, we tax them, as Representative Porter indicated, a 100 percent. So if they're entitled to a deduction for a capital loss, it seems to me, that in all fairness and in all justice and in all equity, we must give the taxpayers who pay that capital gains tax the same kind of deduction as we require them to pay on the front side. We're not talking about changing the entire formula for a tax structure, we have resisted in the Subcommittee on Income Tax nearly all the measures providing for additional deductions to the Illinois Income Tax. This matter has been committed . . . considered by the subcommittee, it has been considered by the Revenue Committee, and both committees demonstrated by their vote that it's just and equitable measure. It's merely a matter of clearing up the technicalities in our tax; and I would urge your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record."

On this question there's 93 'aye', . . . Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Well, if it passed, that's all right, I was gonna' say that this is not a fat-cat bill. It . . . It's a bill to . . . to correct an absurdity in our law as a result of a Federal tax law change."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 93 'ayes', 9 'nay'; and the bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. 322."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 322, a bill for an act to amend the Illinois



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 13 1975

11.

Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman. R. K. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House. House Bill 322 amends the Vehicle Code. Religious institutions and not-for-profit organizations may obtain special charitable plates, registration plates, which shall contain the prefix CB- for vehicles operating exclusively for religious or charitable persons. The reason for this bill, and presently, church buses are relegated to utilizing truck plates, even though they are issued to the churches at a reduced rate, they are truck plates, and, therefore, cannot . . . ah . . . travel on boulevards and must make all the weigh stations. In making the weigh station, they had difficulty as far as conforming to the required weight that they can designate the vehicle . . . ah . . . would . . . ah . . . normally carry. This has been worked with . . . ah . . . the Secretary of State's office and the Department of Transportation; and I would solicit an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Berman."

Berman: "Would the sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Berman: "Ah . . . Ron, how does this . . . ah . . . work out with . . . ah . . . Senate Bill 33, which . . . ah . . . was an extension, essentially, an extension of time on the School Bus Safety Program that we passed last year, and was passed this year, . . . ah . . . and in . . . also in relation to some of the bills that were introduced . . . ah . . . to strengthen the School Bus Safety and Church Bus Safety Programs that are pending in the Senate?"

Hoffman: "I would say they would be extremely compatible in as much as the only thing my bill does is allow them to have a special plate on it to designate it as that . . . ah . . . type of vehicle and not require it to go through the weigh stations, and enable it to go down boulevards. The other bills that you referred to set the safety standards, which . . . ah . . . also would . . . would be in the right direction."

Berman: "All right, so this . . . this would not preclude or . . . or so . . . or substitute for any of those other bills that are pending?"

Hoffman: "In no way."



MAY 13 1975

12.

Berman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Schlickman: "Is there a definition as to not-for-profit organizations within this bill as amended?"

Hoffman: "Not-for-profit is not defined in the bill, itself, however, the original difi . . . definition would be in the statutory provision as not-for-profit organizations."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative . . ."

Schlickman: "Ah . . . What effect will this bill have on state revenue?"

Hoffman: "None. Presently, the truck plates are issued to the churches that do have buses for a \$5 fee. The fee remains exactly the same, the only thing with the issuance and the acceptance of a specific plate designating CB or charitable bus, it eliminates the the requirement that they stay off the boulevards and also that they . . . ah . . ."

Schlickman: "All this bill is simply to change the designation that appears on the bus . . . on the . . . ah . . . license plate?"

Hoffman: "Correct, and give a proper connotation to what this bus is as far as the State Police are concerned, also."

Schlickman: "And the CB stands for charitable bus?"

Hoffman: "That's correct."

Schlickman: "And you could have not-for-profit organizations that are not charitable in nature having this designation on their license plates?"

Hoffman: "No."

Schlickman: "If you don't . . ."

Hoffman: "It . . . only . . . only to buses in those categories that would cover it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Would the gent . . . would the gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Catania: "Ah . . . Representative Hoffman, if these buses meet the safety requirements for school buses, then they qualify for regular school



MAY 13 1975

13.

plates, don't they?"

Hoffman: "The only reason they don't qualify for . . . ah . . . regular school bus plates, is the fact that they do not receive . . . for these institutions do not receive . . . ah . . . funds from the . . . ah . . . the Common School Fund. That's the determining factor, whether they receive school bus plates or they do not."

Catania: "Well, do they have to meet the safety requirements for school buses?"

Hoffman: "They will under Brad Glass' bill."

Catania: "But then they'll be eligible for school bus plates, won't they?"

Hoffman: "They will not, because they are still receiving funds from the Common School Fund."

Catania: "So there's still a distinction and they still have to meet the safety requirements whether they're church buses or school buses?"

Hoffman: "Under Brad Glass' bill, the safety requirements would be mandated. Yes, they would have to meet those requirements."

Catania: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Ah . . . Would the sponsor re . . . re . . . yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Deuster: "Ah . . . Representative Hoffman, I may be mistaken, but I thought that . . . ah . . . the legislation on this subject sponsored by Senator Glass did provide for a new special category known as a . . . a . . . ah . . . church bus, and that there would be special plates, and . . . ah . . . you may have already answered this question, I'm not sure, but . . . ah . . . is this consistent with that or is this a broader category that you have in mind? Do you have all the non-profit beyond just . . . religious?"

Hoffman: "No, Brad Glass' bill addresses itself to the safety standards similar to what . . . ah . . . Representative Catania approached last year with it. The only thing this bill does is provide for a plate, it does not touch on any of the areas that are covered by the Senate bills."

Deuster: "Well, then . . . the Senate bill does not cover plates at all."



MAY 13 1975

14.

I thought the whole heart of one of the Senate bills that's on Third Reading over there was . . . ah . . . that there would be a special category known as the Church Bus, and . . . ah . . . there would be special . . . ah . . . provisions for that if they chose that option, and that, also, one of those provisions would be there, would be a plate so the police officers could readily detect it and . . . but it is your understanding that's not so?"

Hoffman: "That is not so, Representative."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea. The House will be in order."

Shea: "Will the . . . will the sponsor yield for a question? Will the sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Shea: "Mr. Hoffman, you require a suffix CB. Do you know if CB plates have been issued by the Secretary?"

Hoffman: "They indicate 'no'."

Shea: "Pardon me?"

Hoffman: "They indicate 'no'."

Shea: "There have been no C.B. plates issued?"

Hoffman: "No, in fact, actually the bill has been changed . . . ah . . . with the help of . . . ah . . . Norm Billington and Frank Shaw to conform that which they require. Originally, we had . . . ah . . . prefix . . ."

Shea: "This is a suffix plate, right?"

Hoffman: "Right."

Shea: "So that it will have the number and then the letters?"

Hoffman: "That is what Amendment Number 1 does."

Shea: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Madison: "Ah . . . Mr. Hoffman, there are some churches who have buses who use those buses to transport their members to various places and they also use those buses for rental to other churches . . . churches that may



MAY 13 1975 15.

have . . . ah . . . may not be able to afford that equipment. Under your bill, would the . . . the designation not-for-hire preclude them from being involved in that activity anymore?"

Hoffman: "It would be not-for-hire for purposes other than which it was originally designated."

Madison: "Now, what I'm saying, Representative Hoffman, are there are churches who utilize buses for the primary purpose of transporting their members to various places not-for-hire; and . . ."

Hoffman: "If it is still within the purview of . . . ah . . . these buses transporting other church groups, it would be under this category. If they use these buses or would attempt to use these buses to . . . ah . . . incur revenue for some other purpose other than . . . ah . . . which it was designed, it would not be eligible under this act."

Madison: "Are you then saying that they cannot utilize them as common carriers?"

Hoffman: "Correct."

Madison: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? Ques . . . Question is, shall this bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', those oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 132 'ayes', no 'nay'; and the bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. Representative Cunningham 'aye'. Representative Borchers 'aye'. Representative Mudd 'aye'. Repre . . . The Clerk says that it's . . . ah . . . better practice to come down to the Clerk's desk. Indicates he desires . . . 360."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 360, Hirschfeld, a bill for an act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House. House Bill 360 would give the Secretary of State discretionary authority to suspend or revoke a license or permit where a person has violated the law by passing the school bus, which is loading or unloading passengers on a highway. This bill has been worked out with the Secretary of State's office; and I would appreciate a favorable





MAY 13 1975

16.

Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Would the sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Brinkmeier: "John, do I understand correctly, now, that one violation passing a school bus would be grounds then for losing a driver's license?"

Hirschfeld: "No, that's not correct. That was the way the bill was originally drafted. Ah . . . The Secretary of State felt that they had to have discretionary authority to suspend; and so we moved it to that section of the statute, because the mandatory revocation was felt like it was too tough a penalty for one time."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes. Any further questions? The question is, shall this bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'. Representative John Dunn, do you desire recognition? Representative John Dunn, do you desire recognition?"

Dunn: "I . . . thank you, Mr. Speaker, yes, . . . ah . . . by way of explanation of my vote, I wonder if the sponsor would explain . . . explain his vote to clear this up again. I don't understand the . . . ah . . . synopsis. It doesn't seem to be consistent to what the sponsor was . . . ah . . . pointing out in his . . . ah . . . remarks with regard to the bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Let me . . . let me explain my vote again, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry, it was not heard. Ah . . . The Secretary of State's office opposed mandatory revocation after one violation, and so the bill was amended to make it discretionary for a suspension . . . ah . . . in the Secretary of State's office in cases where people pass a school bus, because the Secretary of State felt that 1) the penalty was too tough the other way, and 2) they'd never be able to get a court to impose it. So it's now discretionary with the Secretary of State's office. They're supporting the bill in this concept; and, unfortunately, there's been so many cases the . . . ah . . . Digest is wrong



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 13 1975

17.

in its explanation of the bill after it has been amended."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 98 'aye', 8 'nays'; and the bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. 365. Representative Geo-Karis 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 365, Hirschfeld, a bill for an act to establish a uniform system of jury selection and service. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 365 would create in Illinois a uniform Jury Selection Act designed to make uniform, equitable and representative throughout the State of Illinois the manner, whereby, jury selection of each county is made. It would also insure greater cross section of the populous in the makeup of the jury panel. What this bill seeks to do is to insure that all qualified citizens can serve on juries, including Grand Juries and Coroners Juries. There was some objection to the bill in its original form due to the fact that it permitted other than just the Chief Judge to impanel Grand Juries, that was deleted by amendment; and I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 365."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Madison: "Ah . . . Mr. Sponsor, there has been a lot of discussion as it relates to the jury selection process about the inadequacy of the phrase, 'a jury of his peers'. Does your bill seek to define . . . ah . . . the . . . or any way make known of the peer group kind of relationship?"

Hirschfeld: "Ah . . . Representative, we do not use that terminology . . . ah . . . what we do use is the term, 'all qualified citizens', and we make that as broad as possible. Ah . . . Frankly, what happens now is that you . . . as you are well aware, I'm sure, is the master list in which the jurors are chosen initially, sometimes is only



MAY 13 1975

18.

that of registered voters or sometimes 1 out of 10. We permit those lists to be made up of residents, such as utility customers, property owners, non-property owners, income tax payers, motor vehicle registrations, driver's license registrations and any other list that the Attorney General may designate in order to get the broadest possible number of people to serve on a jury."

Madison: "So then, Mr. Sponsor, your bill only speaks to the . . . to the eligibility list and not the actual selection process?"

Hirschfeld: "That's right, that's all that I could go with this particular bill."

Madison: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "What will the partisan makeup of this . . . ah . . . five-member jury commission be? Is there a mandated party split?"

Hirschfeld: "I . . . I'm sorry, I did not understand the question."

Skinner: "Is there, . . . at the present time, in downstate counties, there are three jury commissioners, none of whom have to be from the Minority Party, which is fine in my county. Ah . . . What changes are you making, if any?"

Hirschfeld: "I'm not making any. As the bill says, that the jury commission in each county shall be composed of the Clerk of the Courts and four jury commissioners, who are appointed by the Circuit judges in the Circuit of which the county of appointment is a part."

Skinner: "Fine, what is the salary of the . . . ah . . . of these five people? I presume that the Clerk of the Court will not receive an extra salary for serving . . ."

Hirschfeld: "That's correct."

Skinner: "What is the salary for the other people?"

Hirschfeld: "Per diem."

Skinner: "Is there a maximum?"

Hirschfeld: "Let me check that to make certain I'm not misleading you. I don't see that right off the top of my head in the bill, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "O.K., let's assume there is no maximum. Now, why are you increasing it from 3 to 5?"



MAY 13 1975

19.

Hirschfeld: "Well, the number of jury commissioners, you're talking about?"

Skinner: "Yes, . . ."

Hirschfeld: "This is an entirely new bill . . . ah . . . and it's very similar, frankly, to what's being done in Cook County right now."

Skinner: "Well, it appears to me that you're just putting two more people on the payroll for a job that you really only need one person to do."

Hirschfeld: "Well, I don't . . . I don't see where you get that. Ah . . . I don't have any amendments that's changing it from three to five in the bill."

Skinner: "Well, House Amendment Number 1 according to the Digest says that it takes it . . . that . . . that the jury commission will be composed of the clerk of the court and four jury commissioners . . ."

Hirschfeld: "Well, that was in the bill originally . . . ah . . . Representative, that hasn't changed any, but they . . . they, inadvertently, left out a word in the printing of the bill. We didn't raise it in the amendment."

Skinner: "All right, then my question is, why are you changing it from three as exists now?"

Hirschfeld: "There's no particular reason that I can tell you except that those that worked on the bill, the Bar Association, felt that this is a figure that would be workable in each county and that's what we went with."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "You . . . you said that now you're changing it to a per diem from a yearly compensation?"

Hirschfeld: "It's my understanding that it's per diem. It is not in this particular bill, so I . . . I . . . as I said to Representative Skinner, I'm not absolutely certain of that."

Shea: "The . . . the reason I ask, John, is in Cook County, we have three jury commissioners that are appointed in their full-time positions, and their salary."

Hirschfeld: "Well, this would not change that as I read the bill."

Shea: "All right, would . . ."

Hirschfeld: ". . . it would have five."



MAY 13 1975

20.

Shea: ". . . with regarding the calling of the Grand Jury, would you explain that provision?"

Hirschfeld: "Yes, I, certainly, will. Ah . . . As I drafted the bill originally, it would have permitted any Circuit judge to impanel a Grand Jury, but, apparently, there has been a slight problem in at least one area of the state; and so we deleted that provision by amendment. It now permits only the Chief Judge to impanel a Grand Jury . . ."

Shea: "Or his designate."

Hirschfeld: "Right, which is the way the law is now."

Shea: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washburn, for what purpose do you arise?"

Washburn: "Thank you . . . ah . . . Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House. We're pleased to have with us this morning the students of Round Out School District Number 72, with Superintendent John and Mrs. Lions and Mrs. Sara Wells, all constituents of the . . . ah . . . 31st Legislative District, Lake County, ably represented by Representative Geo-Karis, Matijevich and Griesheimer. In the Speaker's Gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "Further questions? Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Ah . . . Yes, yes, John, on the last part of the synopsis book here, I notice it says . . . ah . . . 'provides for a coroner to hold inquest', and deletes, 'maternal or fetal death due to abortion'. Ah . . . Is this . . . ah . . . was this your idea to put this amendment in or did a committee recommend this or what?"

Hirschfeld: "Ah . . . This was the suggestion of the committee; and I think it's good suggestion, because as it reads now, it's far too broad in light of the Supreme Court decision on abortion; and I . . . I agree with that amendment. I don't know who's asking me that question."

Kelly: "O.K., John, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Ah . . . Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Hart: "Ah . . . As I understand this now, this is going to require . . . ah . . . each county to have a jury commission, is that correct?"

Hirschfeld: "That is correct."



Hart: "And . . . ah . . . do you think that it's necessary to have five members? Don't the ones that have jury commissions now, have three?"

Hirschfeld: "Well, Representative Hart, as I tried to say to Representative Skinner, I . . . there's no magic in numbers as far as I'm concerned. If you would prefer three, I'll be very happy to reduce it to three in the Senate. I don't think I'm going to have time to do it here. Five was the suggestion of the Bar Association, and . . . ah . . . I hadn't . . . ah . . . there's no magic in that number as far as I'm concerned."

Hart: "Well, I . . . I would like for you to do that . . . ah . . . because I feel that, you know, three can do that job. It doesn't take five, and it would be extra expense. Now, this will impose some additional financial burden on . . . ah . . . the counties, will it . . . won't it . . . will it not that do not now have jury commissions?"

Hirschfeld: "Well, in counties of less than 40,000, of course, the County Board now chooses every tenth name, as I'm sure you're aware, and they'll have to go to this system. So there will, I'm sure, be some expense in converting over; and . . . ah . . . the same thing will be true in some of the counties above 40,000 that have already gone to this system, and will now choose every 20th name."

Hart: "How will they choose the names under this system?"

Hirschfeld: "Ah . . . It'll . . . there'll be an active jury list made up of registered voters arranged alphabetically and put in a jury wheel from which the actual jurors will be chosen by lot."

Hart: "Well, in what way by lot?"

Hirschfeld: "The same way . . ."

Hart: "If we put all the names of the voters into the box and then . . ."

Hirschfeld: "It won't just be voters, it can be any list that's designated, in this case, by the Attorney General; it won't just be voters, that's the purpose behind the bill, to get a broader veneer."

Hart: "I see, but how will the Attorney General make that determination?"

Hirschfeld: "He can just specify as to what groups will be covered in order to broaden the . . ."

Hart: "I mean, could he say that . . . ah . . . take every tenth name off the voters . . ."



MAY 13 1975

22.

Hirschfeld: "No, his . . . that's not his prerogative. His prerogative is to define who's on the list to start with."

Hart: "And then . . . how does that list then become made up, so that . . ."

Hirschfeld: "The Circuit Judge will pull just like he does now."

Hart: "I see, O.K., well, I think if the present statutes . . . ah . . . say that, and I know I have at least one county in my . . . ah . . . district that has a Jury Commission, although I'm really not that familiar with how they operate, but if they're operating with three, I think that it would be . . . ah . . . advisable to amend it in the Senate to let 'em cut it down to three, because I feel that three can probably do the job, and it would just save a little bit of money in the counties so that they can use that."

Hirschfeld: "I'll be very happy to do that. Both you and Representative Skinner have made that suggestion. I'll be very happy to do that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Geo-Karis: "Did I understand you to say correctly that at the present time the . . . the Attorney General selects the . . . makes the list of perspective jurors?"

Hirschfeld: "No, no, under . . . that's not quite correct, Representative, under the bill, and this is what was felt advisable, we're trying to broaden the list of . . . available jurors . . ."

Geo-Karis: "But do I . . . did you say . . ."

Hirschfeld: ". . . and the Attorney General can specify a list other than just registered voters. For example, including in the list of possible jurors, we could put anybody who owns a driver's li . . . has a driver's license, anybody . . ."

Geo-Karis: "Well, my question is, . . . ah . . . at the present time, does the Attorney General have anything to do with making the list of jurors?"

Hirschfeld: "Not . . . not along this line, no."

Geo-Karis: "Well, but under your bill he would, wouldn't he?"

Hirschfeld: "Yes."



MAY 13 1975

23.

Geo-Karis: "But what would happen in case the Attorney General is fighting a case in that particular county about jurors?"

Hirschfeld: "That has nothing to do with the selection of jurors. Nothing."

Geo-Karis: "But . . . wouldn't it effect the way the paneling is done?"

Hirschfeld: "No, it has nothing to do with the impaneling with jurors, whatsoever. Just the master list. The people wouldn't even know that the Attorney General recommended their name, frankly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Is the synopsis' description of House Amendment 1 to this bill correct in the part where it refers to the statute on crimes takes a paragraph on evidence required?"

Hirschfeld: "Ah . . . Representative, I do not believe that is correct. What the amendment did, was number 1) correct the clerical errors that were raised in the committee, number 2) remove the section . . . ah . . . on the abortion, number 3) permitted only the Chief Judge to impanel the Grand Jury; and the only thing that I can think about that they may be talking about there was the committee suggestion that we not permit a Grand juror to testify against the defendant in the Grand Jury; and we did delete that provision in the bill."

Houlihan: "And that's to permit a Grand juror to testify against whom?"

Hirschfeld: "Ah . . . The defendant in the Grand Jury proceeding. That was deleted from the bill at the committee's suggestion. Those were the four suggestions the committee made that night."

Houlihan: "All right, so's there's nothing in this bill about evidentiary requirements, though?"

Hirschfeld: "Not that I know of and not . . . not in the amendment, certainly."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further . . . Representative Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, . . . ah . . . this is an excellent bill that Representative Hirschfeld has presented to us today, because it goes to the heart of a real serious question in the whole administration of criminal justice system; and that is it attempts to involve more people, John Doe citizens, in that administrative process. About a year and a half ago, the Sun Times, in a very edifying series dealing with criminal justice in Cook County, examined the



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



MAY 13 1975 24.

whole business of criminal justice, and made some rather constructive suggestions as to how it could be improved. I might say, incidently, that Cook County got good marks. But one of the suggestions they made was that the veneer and the base of the selection of jurors should be expanded drastically to involve more private citizens, and that's the main thrust of this bill. I think what it will do is bring into focus and into play and make more people realize that the criminal justice system depends upon people. It doesn't depend solely upon judges, it doesn't depend solely on the prosecutors or the police, but it involves the average, ordinary citizen; and this bill attempts to involve that citizen in the jury process; and for that reason I think it's an excellent bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Further questions? The question is, shall this bill pass? All in favor say 'aye' or vote 'aye', rather, and the opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Will . . . take the Record. On this question there's 152 'ayes', 2 'no'; and the bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. 557."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 557, Borchers, a bill for an act to amend the Illinois Inheritance Act. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow members of the House, I really think there can be really . . . a . . . very little objection to this bill. Every one of you here . . . ah . . . is . . . will be possibly in the future effected by it and your families. It's a very simple bill. What it does is make it impossible for the State of Illinois, the . . . oh, excuse me, the inheritance taxes to tax family records, family photographs, daguerreotypes, actual family material, and . . . don't disturb me . . . ah . . . actual family . . . ah . . . material. For example, pictures before the Civil War, daguerreotypes have become increasing . . . ah . . . in their . . . a very great increase in their value. If you happen to have a picture of your great grandfather, for example, standing by a cannon, it could actually bring a \$100. A family record, why with the Abraham Lincoln could be worth 4 or \$5,000; and I'm not only referring to material in any way that has not to do with your family, just your own family. But it would be a sad thing that a paint-



MAY 13 1975 25.

ing of your great grandfather or of you one day would have to be sold because of its value, and your family has to give it up because the taxing authorities will want to tax it and take your own family records, family pictures away from you. So I solicit your support. The bill also sets up what a family is, it's in the amendment. If you can't read it or if someone has a question, I'll be glad to answer it; but I think this is something we should do because of the increasing amount of value of old things that has to do with each of our families and the need that our children, our grandchildren and yourselves should have a right to keep them, and not fear that you'll have to sell them because of their increasing value. Your own family Bible printed by some certain anc . . . antique or ancient . . . ah . . . booksetter . . . setter could be worth maybe \$5,000. Why should you have to give it up, because someone wants to force you to pay a tax on it, including the gov . . . including the Federal or State government? Well, I can't do anything about the Federal government, but I try . . . can try to do something about the State government, so I solicit your support. You're all effected by this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rayson."

Rayson: "Is . . . would the gentleman yield to a question?"

Borchers: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Rayson: "Ah . . . I have something which I consider family memorabilia.

I picked it up about 4:00 in the morning in November about 1948. It's the Chicago Tribune, which says, 'Dewey Defeats Truman--GOV Landslide in Illinois'. Would that be covered under your bill?"

Borchers: "I doubt it. Is your name in it?"

Rayson: "No, but a few other guys are."

Borchers: "Well, if the Truman, if it belonged to the Truman family, it's possible the Truman family would consider that, and fall under that classification."

Speaker Redmond: "Any other questions? Representative Kane."

Kane: "Would the sponsor yield for a question?"

Borchers: "Yes."

Kane: "You don't define 'memorabilia' in the bill at all. I'm wondering



MAY 13 1975

26.

whether it would include such things as jewelry, antique furniture and things like that?"

Borchers: "No, it does describe no jewelry, antique furniture is not . . . is on a part of the bill. It says very clearly there. It says . . . ah . . . photographs, portraits, daguerreotypes, pictures painted by a member of their . . . the decedent's family, archival material; and archival material would be books, . . . ah . . . letters, documents things of this nature. They . . . archival material is certainly under this classification, not jewelry or antique furniture."

Kane: "But the . . . but the language of the bill says memorabilia such as family portraits, and that 'such as' is not a limit. The wording of the bill is not limited to pictures and portraits and . . . ah . . . such things as that, it's just . . . that's just an example, and I'm wondering whether or not under the language of this bill . . . ah . . . somebody could come along and say that . . . ah . . . jewelry that's given to them by their . . . ah . . . great, great grandmother was a . . . was a family heirloom."

Borchers: "I don't believe they can, myself, I think this strictly is a relation to written pic . . . ah . . . written documents of various sorts, and/or pictures, photographs, daguerreotypes."

Kane: "And . . . Because when we talked about this in the Revenue Committee, you were going to define what memorabilia was and . . . ah . . . ah . . . and I don't see that definition."

Borchers: "No, I told . . . said I would define what . . . ah . . . what . . . ah . . . family is, and that is set up . . . ah . . . in the amendment; and they are . . . ah . . . grand . . . great grand parents, grand parents, parents, children, grandchildren, great grandchildren, brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, great aunts, great uncles, grand nieces, grand nephews, and first cousins. That is the . . . the nucleus of a family."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, only to agree with Doug Kane. You just can't leave it open-ended, you have to define it. The amendment only defines a family, it doesn't define mem . . . memorabilia; and I just don't think we . . . we ought to pass



MAY 13 1975

27.

a law that . . . ah . . . that leaves it open-ended like this . . . ah . . . you know, we're going to pass enough laws that . . . that are bad, but let's stop and think a while. We . . . we've got to either keep this thing and amend it and define memorabilia or else vote it down. That's all we can really do."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions?"

Borchers: "Well, in closing, I think all of you should consider that this all . . . effects every person here, his family, and your own possessions may be this . . . under this very category; and . . . ah . . . I feel the . . . that the statement of jewelry and furniture should not be considered. I do not think that could be considered for family member album, itself, if you look it up in the dictionary, it doesn't indicate anything to do with jewelrey and furniture; it indicates the things I have already stated."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this questions there's 102 'aye', 23 'nay'; the bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. 671."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 671, Londrigan, a bill for an act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, this bill, as the law stands now, all unclaimed motor vehicles in garages and public facilities are all reported to the State Police. This provides that in municipalities, it be reported to the municipal police, and outside the municipalities, it be reported to the Sheriff or State Police. It also makes it a little easier to sell unclaimed motor vehicles who do not have the proper identification number of the block. It's a simple bill, and I would ask you approval."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion?"

Unknown: "Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 150 'ayes', no . . . wait



MAY 13 1975

28.

'til I find out . . . no 'nays'; and the bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. 750. 750."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 750, who's is that? Griesheimer, a bill for an act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Redmond: "He doesn't appear to be on the floor. The Chair would like to inform the members of the plans today. We plan to . . . ah . . . recess for lunch at 12:00 and return at 1:45. So far we've . . . ah . . . we've taken care of eight bills in two hours and fifteen minutes. So . . . Representative Stone will divide and multiply and subtract, which looks like two hundred days or two hundred hours to dispose of the bills we have on Third Reading; and the Speaker has today written to the Chicago Cubs and asked them when applications for World Series tickets will be in order. Yeah, it's 12:00 to 12:45. 750. 12:00 noon to 1 . . . to 12:45, forty five minutes for lunch. 750."

Fredric Selcke: ". . . is not here."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, pardon me, 751."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 751, Ewing, a bill for an act to amend the Revenue Act of '39. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, this is one of those very simple bills, and what it does it reduces the age at which Senior Citizens can sign up for the homestead exemption. Presently, you have to 65 on the first day of the year to be eligible to sign up for the homestead exemption. This, merely, reduces the age to 64, whereby, we will be able to provide the homestead exemption to people in their 65th year, and not in their 66th and 67th year. It does raise the homestead exemption, it, merely, lowers the age when it can be signed up for. It was passed out of the Revenue Committee unanimously; and I would ask for your favorable vote. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Gentleman has moved . . . and the question is, shall this bill? All those in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'. They're not on . . . 123 asked permission to make a few T.V. floor shots, it has been granted, so . . . ah . . . Representative Walsh will be on his good behavior. On this question there's 151 'aye', 2



MAY 18 1975 29.

'no'; the bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. 756."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 756, . . . ah . . . Stubblefield, a bill for an act to amend the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Stubblefield here? Take that out of the Record. 777, Londrigan."

Fredric Selcke: "House . . . House Bill 777, Londrigan, a bill for an act to amend the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, presently, before the Illinois Commission Division of Motor Carriers, it takes them as long as one year's time to come out with a decision on a very minor hearing concerning the granting of a truck certificate. When a truck . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you give the gentleman order, please?"

Londrigan: ". . . when a truck application is entered, the man has his trucks and is ready to go. Now, it takes him over a year. As you can see, he's ready to service his people and cannot and the economic situation makes it so that he cannot hardly apply for this period of time. This bill, merely, asks or requires the Commerce Commission to render a decision on these small matters of truck applications within 90 days of the hearing. I ask your approval."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Will the sponsor yield? Would the sponsor yield?"

Londrigan: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "Is there any precedence in the law for the Legislature mandating an administrative agency to render a decision within a prescribed period of time?"

Londrigan: "Representative Shea said if there isn't, there'll be one when this is passed."

Schlickman: "Why not follow the practice such as with the Environmental Protection Agency that if a decision is not rendered within a prescribed period of time, the petition then is considered to be denied so the applicant can then go for an administrative review?"



Londrigan: "Oh, Lord, they couldn't begin to pay . . . these are small truckers we're talking about, farm, the market truckers, they couldn't begin to go through an administrative review procedure. Why put the penalty on them? As I said, it's a mere, simple half hour hearing. There's no reason in the world why they won't do this, but the Illinois Commerce Commission has been remiss. I have been requested from those who practice before the agency to put this in on behalf of the public as well as the small truckers; and it went out of committee unanimously."

Schlickman: "Well, don't you think that perhaps the effect of this bill, if it becomes law, will cause the commission . . . ah . . . to expedite its decision-making process, and in the process do it so hastily . . . ah . . . and without the deliberativeness that we want the commission . . . ah . . . to engage in that some permits may be granted . . . ah . . . that are not meritorious?"

Londrigan: "Absolutely not, as I said, some of these hearings only take twenty minutes to an hour, the hearing officer could wrap his decision up immediately and send it to his secretary. They have a stumbling block in that they want all of the hearings to go through one man, and that's just a procedure to stall them, and they have refused to do anything about it; and it's putting a great, great hardship on truckers who have trucks ready to go to work and get the harvest out of the field, to get the sand and gravel on the highway where there's a shortage of trucks, and they can't go to work for another year."

Schlickman: "Do I assume that the commission opposes this bill?"

Londrigan: "Yes, they oppose the bill."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? The question is, shall this bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 140 'aye', 7 'no'; and the bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. 801."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 801, a . . . Berman, a bill for an act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Berman."



MAY 13 1960

31.

Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 801, merely, requests that the . . . that a new line be added to the Income Tax form to when . . . have the taxpayer indicate the school district in which he resides. Ah . . . The purpose of this and the purpose of the bill is to coordinate efforts between the Department of Revenue and the . . . ah . . . office of Education with a view towards evaluating in future years the feasibility of using an income factor in the determination on . . . and . . . ah . . . compilation of the School Aid Formula. Some states have moved in this direction, I think Illinois ought to determine whether or not it would be a viable feature. We're not asking that it be determined at this point. All we're asking for is the tools to determine . . . ah . . . what kind of income is attributed to each school district. This, merely, requests that a line be added to the Income Tax form to get this information."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "If the sponsor would yield for a question? Ah . . . Representative Berman, . . . ah . . . two questions. One, in the case of . . . ah . . . individuals downstate that may be in dual districts. Will there be two separate boxes for this?"

Berman: "Well, I'm sure that the . . . the bill doesn't go down to that particularity. It, merely, asks that . . . ah . . . that the director shall include on the forms . . . ah . . . a place for the taxpayer to indicate the place and if . . . ah . . . I would think that there should be enough room on . . . on the form to indicate one, two or even three districts in some cases."

Simms: "Well, or expectantly, if a taxpayer should neglect to do that, in case many people very well may not know what school districts they live in, . . . ah . . . would this . . . ah . . . would there be any penalty or would this in some way cause the form to be sent back?"

Berman: "Ah . . . I don't anticipate that. What we're going to do is a . . . is to . . . ah . . . authorize a statistical study. There are ways, statistically, to make up for those that don't throw it in."

Simms: "Ah . . . Thank you, Mr. Sponsor. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good bill, and I think . . . ah . . . in the future it has some great potentiality for determining sources of revenue for the various





MAY 13 1964

school districts; and . . . ah . . . I think this bill should be passed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I . . . ah . . . turned off the button. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Ah . . . Would the gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Pierce: "Mr. Berman, was this requested by the Department of Revenue or the State Office of Education, this bill."

Berman: "Ah . . . This came out of a recommendation from the School Problems Commission in evaluating the . . . ah . . . School Aid Formula."

Pierce: "Yeah."

Berman: "As you recall last year, . . . ah . . . my colleague to my left, Representative Choate, has put on one of the School Aid Formula bills a recommendation addressing itself to an income factor. Ah . . . This was taken into consideration by the School Problems Commission and upon further research we found that some states and Federal studies are looking at this. We felt that Illinois ought to take a look at it also."

Pierce: "Well, on this bill, Mr. Speaker, I think those of you in the suburbs should take a very careful look at this bill. This is the first step towards an eventual double discrimination against suburbanites that Doctor Cronan has already indicated he's considering. First, your suburbanites will pay a high State Income Tax, which will go to state government, and over a billion dollars of it will come back to . . . to school districts throughout the state based on their need. Secondly, once they have these figures, these income figures, they'll give more state aid to those districts with low income people, less to those of high income people, even though the real estate values are particularly high in the high-income areas, and there'll be a double discrimination, because first they're going to tax the suburbanite heavily on the State Income Tax and then they're going to discriminate in sending back the money to them in having an income factor in the School Aid Formula, which the sponsor indicated was one of the



matters under study and which first came up and surfaced last year. Now, this is particularly dangerous because the income of a district doesn't determine the . . . the . . . ah . . . the income of a parent's of the residents of the district doesn't determine the resources of the district, because a single family, residential area will never produce sufficient real estate taxes to . . . to support its schools, and the mere fact that the residents have a high . . . a high income, doesn't mean anything because their income does not go to the school district, but goes to the state and is distributed based on a formula of resources in the district per student. Now, if you get away from that formula and start saying . . . ah . . . districts with lower income, and the parents will get more money, and the higher income will get less, there's a double discrimination against those suburban districts. This is government snooping of the worst order. Ah . . . It is an invasion of privacy, but what it really is is a first attempt to put a double discrimination on the suburban . . . on the suburban taxpayer. First, he's going to pay a high income tax; and secondly, he's going to be discriminated against in the formula, because the people in the district happen to have a relatively high income, even though the assessed valuation may be low, as they are in many suburban districts that are residential in character, and, therefore, I urge you to vote 'no' on this bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I endorse, absolutely, what Representative Pierce said. There is no correlation between income and the need for educational service. There's no correlation really between income and intelligence. I suggest to you that this is, as Representative Pierce said, a first step toward establishing and building into our formula a factor that would give school districts that have . . . ah . . . a lower mean income more money. It's a . . . it's a crazy concept. It is . . . there is no excuse for it. Ah . . . Furthermore, there can be very high incomes and very low incomes within a particular school district that makes statistics such as this absolutely meaningless; and I submit further that if it's a good idea to do this by school districts, then it's a



good idea to do it by park districts, sanitary districts and you name it, all kinds of districts. Ah . . . There really is no excuse for this bill. You should vote 'no' on it, because it's a first step in a very bad direction."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Ah . . . Would the speaker yield? Mr. Speaker, would the sponsor yield, pardon me?"

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Hudson: "Art, I have been impressed with ah . . . what . . . Representative Pierce and Representative Walsh have said. My fear, too, is that if we begin to go this route and use the Income Tax form as a basis of study for whatever matter, if we aren't . . . ah . . . starting down the road to setting a precedent here. Certainly, other studies could be made in other areas relevant to other taxing . . . ah . . . special taxing bodies, whether it's sanitary districts, fire control districts or you name it. Ah . . . I would think that they would all be interested in . . . ah . . . knowing what people's income were relevant to their chance of getting a slice of the pie; and I really have serious questions as to whether our Income Tax Forms are the proper source or basis for a research of this kind. A research could be made, I think, but it would seem to me best made in . . . ah . . . in other ways. Now, . . . ah . . . this is both a question and . . . ah . . . a statement, I realize, to you, but would you respond to that, please?"

Berman: "I think it's a good bill, Ray."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Maybe I neglected to say, I think it's a terrible bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. . . . Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I'm a cosponsor of this bill. It's a product of the School Problems Commission; and there seems to be some confusion about what this bill does. This bill provides . . . is going to provide additional statistical data. It is not going to put anything into the Formula, it's not going to do anything other than do what the . . . ah . . . the statistics we have now for counties . . . does for counties. In other words, we indicate on the Income Tax form what county we're from. We have income . . . we have income data from census tracks. We have income data



from counties. However, since school districts overly census tracks, overly counties, in order to have accurate data, we need to get it by the school districts; and this is all we're asking. It'll be another . . . probably another box following the . . . ah . . . county to indicate . . . ah . . . what school district or districts, therein. No one will be in more than . . . than two districts, the high school and elementary district. This is an . . . an information collection bill (period). If we do anything . . . if we do anything else, if we put it into the formula, then this is going to have to come back to this House and then that becomes the issue. We're asking for accurate information, and for that reason, I would encourage your support of this bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Mr. . . . Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question of the sponsor, please?"

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

Lucco: "Representative Berman, might this type of a questionnaire be something that could lead us to the abolishment of property tax or the levying of tax on property for school support and lead us toward the levying of tax, we'll say, on income towards school funding?"

Berman: "Ah . . . Representative Lucco, I don't know where this is going to lead us. The whole purpose of the bill is, merely, to broaden our prospective of knowledge in relation to what are relevant factors for funding our schools. Ah . . . It's a one liner on the Income Tax Act. It's not a questionnaire, and all we want to do here is to find out some information."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Will the sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Waddell: "Number one, you have indicated that you are just going to have a box there in which you provide the space for them to tell you what district they're from, which of the school numbers do you want? In the case that we have out our way, where you have the high school, which is in one district and you have the grade schools, which are in another, which one do you want?"



Berman: "The intent of the bill and the line that would appear on the tax form would allow you to indicate the school district in which you reside if that's . . . ah . . ."

Waddell: "What if you reside in two of them?"

Berman: "Then you put down two numbers."

Waddell: "In as much as they can't even remember who their Representatives are, how are they going to remember the number?"

Berman: "I'm sure if you're representing them, they do remember the name of their Representative, and rightly so, and I think that . . . ah . . . as far as the school district number, I am sure that . . . ah . . . the con . . . the voters of the State of Illinois, the residents, are no less . . . ah . . . adept than . . . ah . . . voters of . . . ah . . . citizens of other states. Ah . . . The State of Kansas and I . . . ah . . . I know has the same procedure, and I'm advised that the State of Iowa does. If they're able to put it together, so can Illinois."

Waddell: I don't want to belabor the point, but what happens if they don't sign it?"

Berman: "Nothing."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on this miserable bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', oppose 'no'; and the 'ayes' have it. The question is, shall this bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'."

Unknown: "Who moved the previous question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Skinner. Representative Berman, I should have recognized you, but I didn't."

Berman: "That's . . . that's all right, Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote and close . . . ah . . . I can't understand why there are so many red lights or an absence of green lights. All we're asking here . . . all that we're asking here is to give us the tools to gather information. I don't think that this Assembly . . . I don't think this Assembly wants to take a . . . ah . . . a head-in-the-fan approach to infor-



MAY 13 1975 37.

mation that may, and I say may, in the future be relevant to our deliberations as far as school financing is concerned. Ah . . . This same approach as far as data information was recommended by the National Education Finance Project. It's been recognized in . . . ah . . . many other states, and all we're asking here is to be able to gather the information. There's other ways, let me point out, that . . . ah . . . can be used, but they're not as precise; and if this bill doesn't pass, there are other ways; and all that we're going to be doing is taking a look at imperfect data to try to find whether this is relevant information or not. All we're asking for here is the tools to try to find out what is the relationship between income level and school financing need, and . . . ah . . . I don't think that there's anything wrong with asking that question and getting those answers."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I'd like to concur with what the previous speaker said. I will simply throw this out for your consideration. Those of you who believe that we have an equitable system of financing education today, then you should oppose this bill. If you believe it's equitable today, I'd like to think that most of you are as dissatisfied as I am; and all we're proposing here is to conduct a study, get some valuable information, and come up with a possibly a more equitable system of funding our education; and I would urge a green light."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, the sponsor of the bill very honestly in his presentation said that last year . . . ah . . . bills were introduced that would've changed the School Aid Formula to put an income factor in the bill with those who live in higher income areas regardless of the low assessed valuation would be penalized, and those who . . . those who lived in low income areas regardless of the good assessed valuation would receive rewards; and in order to statistically study this question, the School Problems Commission decided for the first time in its history, they got along with it up to now, to ask for this provision in the Income Tax, and that's really what it's leading to. Doctor Cronan has said the same thing, he flew up into our county and



MAY 13 1975

38.

said, 'We've got to do something . . . ah . . . to . . . to recognize . . . ah . . . the income factor of the people in the district and the School Aid Formula'; and I would've asked him, had I been there, . . . ah . . . what does that have to do with school finance, because the schools are dependent on either their assessed valuation per student, which in single family residential areas, regardless of the areas, is usually on the low side, and in industrial areas, regardless of the income, is usually on the high side; and . . . but I couldn't ask him that question, I wasn't there. But I asked that question today. The income of the people in the district is irrelevant . . . ah . . . is irrelevant to these aid that the school needs. Now, if you're gonna' charge tuitions, that's different; but . . . ah . . . but until . . . unless we charge tuitions, the School Aid Formula should be based on the resources of the district, the taxable resources, which the Resource Equalizer does. It needs some improvement. It needs some correction, but let's vote up this bill, which will set up a new precedent that in my mind will be very destructive of our school districts."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I do want to reply to one of the comments of the . . . ah . . . one of the prior gentlemen in explaining their vote. I am one of those Representatives that very much is in opposition to the present funding system, and I do want to see a new funding system; but I think you're begging the issue on this particular problem. We're imposing a new obligation on every taxpayer in subjecting them to further complications by probably one of the most poorly run departments of State Government, namely the Department of Revenue. Ah . . . These people wait about three times as long for rebates as the Federal Government's taxpayers; and I'm just afraid that if we put this in as a statutory requirement, we'll find that our citizens are sitting back waiting six months for a reply on their rebate, and then they'll finally get a form letter saying, 'We're sorry, we cannot complete your . . . ah . . . form or your tax return, because you failed to complete it', and they'll return it to you; and this is just one of those a little . . . administrative or bureaucratic



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 18 1910

39.

boondoggles that will create a lot of trouble. I think we should look to a different way of serving the . . . ah . . . taxpayers of this state to get the same information."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, in explaining my green light over there, I would like to remind all of the Representatives on the floor today of the problems they find in their district when they talk to their constituents. Everybody is unhappy with the high property tax we have to pay, and the biggest share of our property tax goes to financing our schools. At the local level, everybody realizes we have to find some more equitable way of financing our services. I think there is also general agreement that the Income Tax is the most fair method of taxation we have at the state level. We are putting money into schools, and the best way we can use that money, has to be determined. If we can't get accurate statistics to even try to devise a program that is equitable, how can we possibly come up with a formula that does justice to our educational system. I, strongly, urge you to vote in favor of this bill, let us gather the statistics and do the best job that we can in devising a formula that will help everyone. If we find that that is not going to allow us to charge twice for those in high-income brackets, that will come out of the survey, but we don't even know how we are going to fund it if we can't get the statistics. Please, vote 'no' on this . . . vote 'yes' on this bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, the new School Aid Formula is specifically geared to rewarding tax efforts. The more that the local people tax themselves, the more state aid that they're going to get. The only problem with that School Aid Formula is that it measures effort only by tax rate, and tax rate is different depending on the . . . ah . . . amount of property that's in . . . that's in the district, the type of property, and it's not a good measure of tax effort. The only way that we're going to be able to have an accurate measure of the effort is by looking at the percentage of income that is being paid . . . ah . . . for schools in the district;



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



MAY 13 1975

40.

and the only way that we can get that information is by asking the people to indicate what school district that they are in; and if we're going to have any kind of an equitable school system and an equitable school financing system, we have to have this information; and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Matijevec."

Matijevec: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I really am not going to explain my vote, but I want to speak on the matter of explaining votes. Never, since I've been here in the General Assembly, have I seen the matter of explanation of votes abused as it has this session. In no reflection on anybody who has spoken on this issue, but the intent of the rule is really on close issues where one explains their vote where that explanation of vote may . . . may in some way pass or defeat a close measure, but so often in this General Assembly I've seen on matters where there's no way that a bill can pass or be defeated by that explanation of votes; and I think with so many measures coming up, I think we've got to do something about explanation of votes. I've never been one who's said we ought to restrict ones freedom of speech in this General Assembly, but with so many bills on the Calendar, I think we better think about restricting the explanation of votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster, for what reason do you rise? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 84 'aye', 75 'no'; the bill having failed to receive the required constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed . . . lost . . . lost. Representative Beaupre, for what reason do you desire . . . Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, as a result of some studies in the Revenue Committee and what was thought by the Chairman to be the consensus of the Revenue Committee, certain bills were filed last Saturday as being Committee on Revenue Bills. That position was challenged this morning in the Revenue Committee when we had this hearing, and, therefore, since it was not a complete Revenue Committee agreement, because some members of the committee thought that it was not done in the proper manner. I move to table House Bills 3004, 3008, 3009, 3010, 3011 and



MAY 13 1975

41.

3112, which were filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, besides the fact that I think he left out one of the bill that he mentioned in committee, what we have here is a failure to communicate, that is, attempting to come to classic proportions. The last Revenue Committee meeting we had before the deadline for reporting out bills, Representative Lundy's bill to bail out Cook County had been reconsidered and left in committee. The four . . . the five assessment reform bills that we had were not in final form and so we agreed, as far as I can remember, all the committee agreed, that we would like to have a public hearing on them next Monday night at 7:00 p.m. in the State Capitol in Room 118. Well, we introduced the bills, and because of the . . . the House rules, they all went to Second Reading automatically. Now, yesterday Representative Maragos moved to send the five assessment reform bills to committee, as had been the agreement, but, unfortunately, the Chair at that time would not allow me to come up and to stand up and point out that the other bill had been left off. Now, there is an alternative solution to this . . . ah . . . misunderstanding, and that is, merely, to take Representative . . . or what is now a committee bill, well, which started out as Representative Lundy's bill and refer it to committee also to buy . . . to bypass the rules on posting and to hear it next Monday night and everybody ends up being happy; and I would hope that the . . . the Chairman would reconsider his motion, and instead make a motion to hear Representative Lundy's bill next Monday night as well as the others."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the last speaker, Mr. Skinner, that in committee I offered to bring 3004 back into committee if that was motion or have Mr. LaFluer do it, but the point was brought up by Mr. LaFluer that none of these bills were properly considered by the committee before they were brought on the Calendar. So I told him at that time that I would table them all, since he had objections; and that's what I'm doing."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative LaFluer."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 13 1975 42.

LaFluer: "Yes, I wish to make an inquiry of the Chair. These series of bills that . . . ah . . . the Chairman of the Revenue Committee, Representative Maragos, is speaking of . . . ah . . . appeared on the Calendar yesterday. He moved, yesterday, to re-refer all of the bills except one back to the Revenue Committee. Now, the posture at this time seems to be that one bill remains on the Calendar, --04, the rest of them have been referred back to the Revenue Committee; and I'm making a request of the Chair of whether it's within our ability to table bills that have been re-referred to the Revenue Committee?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's the opinion of the Chair that the sponsor, or in the case of a committee bill, I would interpret that to be the Chairman of the appropriate committee, would have the authority to . . . to . . . ah . . . table the bills no matter where it is, whether it's in committee, whether it's on the floor or wherever it may be."

LaFluer: "If it's committee, would it need floor action or would it need committee action?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, tabling a bill requires floor action. You can't table it in committee."

LaFluer: "Because the one bill that is remaining is the bill that is concerned. The last action of the Revenue Committee was to postpone this bill in committee. So I don't know what actions are necessary, but if the posture was maintained where --04 was put back into committee on postponed, I think that would satisfy everyone at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, --04 was not mentioned in your motion, was it, Representative?"

Maragos: "No."

Speaker Redmond: "So . . . the Clerk says that it was mentioned."

Maragos: "It was mentioned today, but not yesterday."

Speaker Redmond: "I wonder . . . I wonder if . . . ah . . . Representative Skinner, Representative LaFluer, Representative Maragos and Representative Beaupre would go to lunch together and maybe we can solve the problem when we get back. Would you . . . Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "No, the challenge made today of the Chairman of this committee. was that this whole procedure, no matter what the position of the bill is, I offered to bring 3004 back to committee, but it challenged the



MAY 13 1972

43.

fact that the Chairman unilater . . . unilaterally proceeded to put these bills on the Caro . . . on the Calendar without consulting everybody, which was not fact; but since the gentleman feels that the Chairman acted illegally or irresponsibly, I told him that I would table it, which he agreed, and he fail . . . and he came subsequent to the committee meeting and he agreed that I . . . he had no objection in my tabling them; therefore, I still persist in my motion to table."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentle . . . Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, we are debating a very important matter. Unfortunately, we're tied up with procedure here that apparently is being insisted upon by some of the members of the Revenue Committee and . . . and I assure you that we're talking about a possibility of killing some very important bills. The tax . . . the Committee on Property Tax Reform has been working for nearly two years on these matters. These bills have been heard by the Revenue Committee. Last Friday we agreed that we would introduce a committee bill. There was . . . there was full agreement of the committee that we would introduce committee bills so that we would have an opportunity to discuss the matter more thoroughly so that we'd have an opportunity to call some of the Revenue Committee members from the Senate in so that they could have some input into these bills. They were reintroduced in accord with the agreement of all the members of the committee; and, merely, because we seem to have a personal conflict between two or three members of the committee, we're insisting on killing some very important legislation to the people of this state. The . . . the fact of the matter is that these . . . these bills have been studied for a year and a half or two years, a great amount of work has gone into their drafting, they've been heard in committee twice. It was the consensus of opinion in the committee that . . . that we have another hearing on the matter; in accord with everyone's agreement, these bills were redrafted and reintroduced to put all the amendments and codify them into the original bills. It would be totally irresponsible for this body at this point to allow these bills to be killed just because we have some sort of a personal conflict between two or three members of the Revenue Committee; and I, wholeheartedly,



agree, Mr. Speaker, with your suggestion that those of us who have been involved in this matter get together in the next hour or so, if be it over lunch or whatever, and get this matter solved. We can't allow personal conflict to enter into . . . ah . . . whether or not we're going to consider legislation which may be the most important issue we're going to face in this session."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I agree, wholeheartedly, what's been said, and I would like to add that all the work done between the Senate and the House committee and the members of the House in particular, these bills should be given a proper hearing; and I would like to suggest that apparently one objection is made to House Bill 3004 that the Chairman of Revenue include that to be heard so that all . . . all of them can be heard including Representative Farley's bill. I think that will solve the problem; and I would admonish these people that are objecting to these being . . . bills being heard are extremely important and we can't fail to give them a proper hearing."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, we're running into lunch time and I'm . . . I'll withdraw my motion with the right to reintroduce it after we return from lunch."

Speaker Redmond: "I wish you would do that. Fine, fine. Representative Hanahan, for what purpose do you rise?"

Hanahan: "A point of order. You made a ruling there . . . ah . . . very fast; and I was wondering if you knew the implication of the ruling of . . . that a committee bill is . . . is the property of or has the latitude of the Chairman's discretion on whether or not to table. I thought a committee bill was of the committee's and if a majority of the members were for a bill and the committee Chairman happened not to be for a bill and that bill came out in the . . . in a majority vote out of a committee that that Chairman, just because he happens to be the Chairman and in opposition to the bill, couldn't just take the bill because he was the Chairman of the specific committee . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "That's a new question . . . that's a new question right now, Representative Hanahan, because he's withdrawn his motion."



MAY 13 1975

Hanahan: "Yes, but you had already made a statement in the Record, and I was just wondering, because we have the same problem in Agriculture, where the Chairman was in opposition to a bill that a majority of the members were in favor, and then if we gave them the bill, he could table it."

Speaker Redmond: "When the time comes, we make a . . . we'll make ruling. I think you're . . . now."

Hanahan: "All right, O.K. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I'd like to have the proper rule suspended to hear the following bills in the Appropriation's Committee on Saturday morning, that's May the 17th, at 8:30 in the morning. These are the commission bills that were originally assigned to the Appropriation's Committee, and they were assigned into a subcommittee. Unfortunately, the subcommittee has never had time to meet; and for this reason I'm asking the leave of the House to have the following bills heard; and I will give the bill number and the sponsor, and also each sponsor will be . . . receive a notice of the time of the hearing. Again, this will be Appropriation's, 8:30 Saturday morning, May the 17th. It's House Bill 171, Representative Geo-Karis; House Bill 235, Representative Brinkmeier; House Bill 339, Representative Mugalian; House Bill 415, Representative Cunningham; House Bill 725, Representative McMaster; House Bill 1329, Representative Terzich; House Bill 1350, Representative Kozubowski; House Bill 1504, Representative Waddell; House Bill 1614, Representative Tuerk; House Bill 1711, Representative Epton; House Bill 1796, Representative Madigan; House Bill 1829, Representative Macdonald; House Bill 1903, Representative Maragos; House Bill 2120, Representative Totten and Kane; House Bill 2559, Representative Meyer; and in all these bills I have talked with the Leadership of both sides and haven't received any objection."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Gentleman has moved the suspension of the rules to permit the hearing of the bills which he enumerated. Representative Taylor, for what purpose do you arise?"

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this motion. I rise on three points, because once I tried to make the same motion and was denied."



MAY 13 1975

46.

One other is that when a man gives his word, that should be his bond. One motion that was made this morning was told to me last night that the bill had been posted properly on this floor. I found that it has not. One other reason, Mr. Speaker, I have opposed most of the commission bills and have promoted a bill that will abolish all commissions. I do not think that this practice should start today. I would hope that this . . . this House would defeat this motion of suspending the rules, which I think takes 107 votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is on the gentleman's motion to suspend the rules. It takes a 107 votes. All in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'. Representative Borchers 'aye'. Stearney 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, I'd just like to say, Mr. Speaker, that if we do not sustain the gentleman's motion, then the bills establishing commissions . . . ah . . . will not be able to be heard, and, presumably, will not be enacted; and . . . ah . . . I see no reason why should not suspend the rules, because there are many important commissions on that . . . ah . . . on the list read by the Chairman of the Appropriation's Committee. So I would . . . ah . . . urge everyone to vote 'yes' on the gentleman's motion, Mrs. Willer."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, I don't think that's quite true. I think they could still be heard Monday morning, could they not?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "The question on that, Mr. Speaker, the substantive bills are on the Calendar, and according to the ruling received so far, you can't move the substantive bill without the appropriation being on the Calendar, as well."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 116 'aye', 10 'no'. The motion carries. Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, a purpose of announcement to the members of Joint Subcommittee on Pro . . . Property Tax Reform. House and Senate has been changed. It will not be held Wednesday, it will be held Thursday, members of Joint Subcommittee on House/Senate."



MAY 13 1970

47.

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, I now move to re-refer House Bill 2104 for the Revenue Committee and suspend the appropriate rules in regard to posting to allow said bill to be heard by said committee on Saturday, May 17th."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The gentleman have leave? Gentleman has moved to suspend the posting rule to allow House Bill 2104 to be heard in the Revenue Committee on Saturday, May the 17th, and also to re-refer said bill to the Revenue Committee. All in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'. This requires a 107 votes. Representative Palmer, do you seek recognition? Representative Shea. Representative Barnes. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 123 'ayes', no 'nay'. The motion carries. Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and members of the House, the Subcommittee on Appropriation's II would like leave of the House to hear a . . . House Bill 592, Representative McAuliffe; House Bill 691, Representative Grotberg; House Bill 129 . . . 63, Representative Jaffe; House Bill 1297, Representative Palmer; House Bill 1318, Representative Keller; House Bill 1734, Representative Schraeder; House Bill 1904, Representative Schneider; House Bill 2012, Representative McGrew; House Bill 2995, Representative Flinn. These are all commission bills, which was assigned to the Subcommittee in Appropriation's II, and I would like leave of the House to have these bills heard at 8:30 a.m., Saturday, in Room 118."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the adoption of the gentleman's motion. All in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no' . . . 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there 123 'aye', 1 'no'; the motion carries. Representative Shea."

Shea: "I move that the House do now recess until 1:15."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino, for what purpose do you rise?"

Laurino: "I'd . . . ah . . . to suspend the proper rules to move House Bill 1317 to Third Reading, Second Legislative Day, due to an oversight yesterday it was moved to Third Reading and . . . ah . . . there seems to be a problem."





MAY 1 8 1900

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has explained to me that the fiscal note, although a fiscal note had been furnished, it wasn't moved and it appears on the Calendar on Second Reading today, is that correct? Does he have leave to move? 1317 to Third Reading. Hearing no objections, it will be moved. Now, the question is on the adoption of Representative Shea's motion."

Shea: "To 1:15."

Speaker Redmond: "To 1:15. When you go out, you can stop by the Press Room and buy your tickets for the Grid Iron Dinner and also stop in the Treasurer's office and get your tickets for this affair tomorrow night. We now stand in recess, 1:15. Members will be in their seats. For obvious reasons, we'll have to stand in recess for about 15 minutes. Everybody is going to move to reconsider the vote by which your bill passed. O.K. Does the membership all know about Tom Ohler is a new father? Number 5. He looks today like he had the baby."

Speaker Shea: "Senate Bills, First Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 157, a bill for an act creating the Land Use Study Commission. First Reading of the bill. Senate Bill 196, a bill for an act in relation to the practice of barbering. First Reading of the bill. Senate Bill 256, a bill for an act to revise the law in relation to Habeas corpus. Second Reading of the bill. Senate Bill 258, a bill for an act to amend an act to revise the law in relation to mandamus. First Reading of the bill. Senate Bill 321, a bill for an act in relation to the extension of time for filing returns under the Gas Revenue Tax Act. First Reading of the bill. Senate Bill 444, a bill for an act to amend the Pension Code. First Reading of the bill. Senate Bill 447, a bill for an act to amend the Chicago Sanitary District Act. First Reading of the bill. Senate Bill 448, a bill for an act to amend the Chicago Sanitary District Act. First Reading of the bill. Senate Bill 451, . . . Senate Bill 451, a bill for an act to amend sections of the Law Enforcement Officers and Firemen's Compensation Act. First Reading of the bill. Senate Bill 463, a bill for an act to amend an act concerning elections. First Reading of the bill. Senate Bill 470, a bill for an act to amend the Hospital Licensing Act. First Reading of the bill. Senate Bill 488, a bill for an act to provide



MAY 18 1975

for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Military and Naval Department. First Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 62. Mr. Duff on the floor? Take the bill out of the Record. . . . House Bill 63, Mr. Duff, he's off the floor. House Bill 64, Mr. Duff, he's off the floor. House Bill 65 and 66 are Mr. Duff's bills. House Bill 1 . . . all right, House Bill 62, Mr. Duff."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 62, a bill for an act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff. The Assistant Minority Leader, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of you as to . . . ah . . . what our priority call is or how you're calling bills? Are you . . . ah . . ."

Speaker Shea: "On the order of May 18th, I'm calling the first bill. The last bill to be called was House Bill 801, the last bill on May 17th. I'm now calling the first bill on May 18th, House Bill 62."

Walsh: "Well, weren't you on the order of Senate Bills a moment ago?"

Speaker Shea: "I went to Senate Bills, First Reading, and had some bills assigned to committee."

Walsh: "And now you've gone . . . ah . . ."

Speaker Shea: "I'm going right back to where the Speaker left at lunch, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "To House Bills on Third Reading."

Speaker Shea: "Yes, sir. Proceed, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to you that just before we left for lunch, the Speaker did tell me that he would go on some other order so that we would get some time to have some people on the floor for these important bills."

Speaker Shea: "I just did. It's now 1:35, Mr. Duff, it's twenty minutes after we were supposed to return from lunch. Why don't you go ahead and we'll see what happens on your bills."

Duff: "Fine, thank you. Well, Mr. Speaker, I hate to take up the time of the House . . . ah . . . on bills that have passed out of here before . . . ah . . . with a very strong support from both sides of the aisle,



but I feel perhaps it's appropriate for me to explain some of the matters behind these bills. First of all, let me make the point very clear to everybody . . . ah . . . because I did have a question at lunch from a couple of members on the bills. I want to make it absolutely clear so that when you listen, you will understand one point. These bills have absolutely nothing to do with nor are they connected with in any way any statewide Grand Jury bill. So I want to be sure that we precede on that premise. Now, premise or promise . . . now, House Bill, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could take . . . would it be appropriate to take these bills as a package, Mr. Speaker, or should we take them one at a time?"

Speaker Shea: "If you ask leave and you get leave . . . ah . . ."

Duff: "I would . . . I would to save the time of the House ask leave to take the bill as a package."

Speaker Shea: "That's House Bills 62, 63, 64, 65, 66 as a package? There's been . . . there's been objection."

Duff: "Fine, Mr. Speaker, that's all right. All right, then going on House Bill 62, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 62 has in it . . . as it's genesis the fact . . ."

Speaker Shea: "Proceed, sir."

Duff: ". . . that the historical protections of the Grand Jury which have been considered over the years to have been the protection of the innocent, have for a period of time, become, in fact, . . . ah . . . often times a tool of harrassment, a tool of extre . . . enormous costs and a great impediment to the time to speedy trial. England, which started the Grand Jury, eliminated it in 1933. There are only approximately eight states left in the nation which have a Grand Jury system similar to that of the State of Illinois. There are probably more than half of the states that have effectively eliminated the use of the Grand Jury in most cases. What House Bill 62 does, is allow the prosecutor an option by which if he choses he can go through a preliminary system, rather than through the Grand Jury. It will maintain and protect the Grand Jury for investigative purposes only. Experience in other states has indicated that the use of this bill will eliminate the use of the Grand Jury in approximately 94 percent of the cases. This would have



MAY 13 1975

51.

a tremendous effect on the system of justice at the present time. For example, at . . . right now because of the overload in inadequate number of judges, inadequate number of prosecutors and public defenders in a place like Cook County, the Grand Jury is . . . is an average from time of arrest to indictment of 105 days. Now, we have 120 days speedy trial roll. So you can see right away what 105 days does to that speedy trial roll. In addition to that, it would save, for example, the County of Cook between \$400 and \$500,000. Ah . . . The series of bills that we have will follow on that bill which allows the option. It has broad support from both parties on both sides of the rotunda as far as I'm able to determine. House Bill 63 . . ."

Speaker Shea: "You're on House Bill 62, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I thought we were . . . we're not handling this as a package then?"

Speaker Shea: "No, there was objection."

Duff: "All right. Now, the effect of the bill then would eliminate the requirement of an indictment of a Grand Jury as a prerequisite for felony prosecution. A State's Attorney could precede to his option by Grand Jury indictment or by his own information, the prosecutor's own charge. However, no prosecution could precede on an information by the State's Attorney unless preliminary hearing before a judge had been held and a finding had been made. The Grand Jury is supposed to serve as a device to protect an innocent accused from malicious prosecutions of baseless charges. Its value is such as the key to whether it should be retained as a screening device in all cases. As such a protective device, it is generally recognized as useless at best and potentially quite harmful, allowing a prosecutor to more easily, rather than less easily prosecute in some cases. In any case, the Grand Jury indictment requirement is pretty much a waste of time. The . . . In many instances over the country it has been determined that the power of a prosecutor in a Grand Jury is enormous. He can harrass, intimidate, coerce, threaten. He is allowed to bring in whatever witnesses he choses to and allowed to leave out whatever witnesses he choses to. The defendant or the witness has no protections, no council in . . . in the Grand Jury system and no opportunity to be invol . . ."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 13 1975

52.

informed of his own civil rights. What this bill will do then, in effect, is eliminate abuse, shorten the time of trial, save hundreds and hundreds of thousands dollars of cost state-wide. I think that the simple fact that this bill has been so strongly supported by this House before, and I have had indications from Leadership on both sides of the aisle that they approve of the idea of reforming or modifying the Grand Jus . . . the Grand Jury system, would indicate that . . . ah . . . we might well do today what we have done before and pass these bills out. I would ask then, Mr. Speaker, . . . ah . . . if there are any questions?"

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 62 pass? Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall House Bill 62 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Kempiners 'aye'. Randolph 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are a . . . on this question there are 117 'aye', no 'nays', no 'present'. House Bill 62 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. Call the next bill."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 63, a bill for an act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the bill."

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

Duff: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 63 . . . ah . . . is a response to the need when the Grand Jury is effectively not being used of defining in our statutes the preliminary hearing. Many lawyers are even surprised to find that the preliminary hearing is really not adequately defined either by case law or by statute in Illinois. This bill then clarifies the law that a defendant has the right to present evidence in his own behalf and cross examine prosecution witnesses at the preliminary hearing. It gives the defendant the right to subpoena witnesses for the preliminary hearing. I think it's a very important and valuable tool in conjunction with the other bill that we just passed; and it is part of the package that we have worked on now for several years. I would . . . ah . . . be happy to answer any questions on it. Mr. Speaker."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 13 1975

53.

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 63. Is there discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 63 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there is 125 'aye' votes, 1 'nay' vote, one voting 'present'. House Bill 63 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 64."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 64, a bill for an act to amend sections of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff, on House Bill 64."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, . . . ah . . . this bill, House Bill 64, does something that Cook County and many of the other large counties already do and that is that when a Grand Jury is held . . . ah . . . some of the counties, particularly Cook, do maintain a transcript of the record. Now, it requires a transcript of the record primarily for purposes of impeachment in the trial. The . . . ah . . . I must say that there were some queries expressed by some of the downstate counties as to what the cost would be. The principle matter of cost, however, because of House Bill 62 is reduced since we will be using the Grand Jury only in about six percent of the cases; and it is a protection which has been generally accorded if necessary by most of the writers and jurors on this subject."

Speaker Shea: "The question is the gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 64. Are there any questions? The question is, shall House Bill 64 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Shea 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 130 'aye' votes, 5 'nay' votes, 1 voting 'present'; and House Bill 64 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. Madison 'aye' on the last bill. House Bill 65."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 65, a bill for an act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the bill."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, . . . ah . . .



this bill is really designed to give a protection, the fundamental civil protection, to persons who are called before the Grand Jury as defendants in those cases where the Grand Jury will be used. We spoke earlier of the power of the prosecutor within the Grand Jury. He can, as I pointed out, bring in whomever he wishes. He can ask whatever questions and say whatever he wants before the Grand Jury. This bill says, 'that a defendant who is called before a Grand Jury may take into the Grand Jury room with him counsel'. The attorney who would go into the Grand Jury room with the defendant would not be allowed to be advocate, he would not be allowed within the Grand Jury room to participate, except as counsel; but the very real benefit of that is when a man is seated before the Grand Jury, man or woman, and they do not know their civil rights, they do not know when they have a right not to answer, when to self-incriminate themselves and so forth, they can have their counsel right there with them. Now, in many Grand Juries today . . . a defendant can walk to the door, talk to his counsel and walk back in. So we really don't have the problem of . . . ah . . . secrecy here since the attorney is under the fiduciary and responsibility and as an officer of the court to protect the secrecy of the Grand Jury. It is a fundamental protection of the right when a man's life is hazarded by an investigation by a Grand Jury."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 65 pass? Are there any questions? The gentleman from Will, Mr. Sangmeister."

Sangmeister: "Well, I don't have any questions, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to speak to the bill, if I may?"

Speaker Shea: "Proceed."

Sangmeister: "Ah . . . House Bill 65 in . . . in the following bill, which I presume will be called after it House Bill 66, I would like the House to pay particular attention to it because there are very substantial changes in the procedure before the Grand Jury system in Illinois. Ah . . . Those of us who have worked for it . . . with it have felt that it has worked very well. You are, of course, going to destroy the secrecy of the Grand Jury. It may sound palatable . . . ah . . . to begin with that a person should have his lawyer



MAY 13 1975

55.

in there when he is going to appear as a witness, as the next bill talks about, or as a possible defendant; and, of course, I don't know how you're going to determine whether or not the State's Attorney is seeking indictment against a particular individual in this case. But presuming that you are, then I suppose . . . ah . . . you're going to allow here to have the attorney in the Grand Jury . . . ah . . . proceedings with him. As we all know, the Grand Jury determines no guilt or no innocence; and . . . ah . . . to violate the secrecy is going to cut down on the ability of the State's Attorney to work with the Grand Jury particularly . . . particularly . . . ah . . . when he's conducting an investigation, where he is not seeking a particular indictment against a particular individual. I think it's going to make the proceedings much more difficult for the Grand Jury to work . . . ah . . . with the State's Attorney in an attempt to return indictments against people who properly should be as a result of that investigation; and I hardly urge that you consider this bill very seriously and give it a 'no' vote."

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

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House."

Speaker Shea: "D.L."

Houlihan: "I rise in support of this bill, and I disagree with the previous speaker that this will in some way . . . ah . . . violate the traditional secrecy of Grand Jury proceedings. If your client is going to be a witness before the Grand Jury . . . ah . . . having his attorney there is in no sense going to . . . ah . . . exaggerate a loss of secrecy which is already apparent to the witness who is being called before the Grand Jury. Now, this bill is limited solely to a target witness. This is the serious accusatory stage of the proceeding. The attorney who is present with his client who is a target of indictment before a Grand Jury does not have an advocates role in the Grand Jury proceeding. He is there simply to counsel his client, a counselling right which the attorney has today, but he has to do it outside the door of the Grand Jury and we have the rather ridiculous situation where the question is put to the witness, the witness goes outside to talk to his lawyer, comes back in and makes his answer.





MAY 13 1975

56.

I think it's a very reasonable bill. It does not violate . . . violate secrecy and I would urge your support."

Speaker Shea: "Is there any other . . . any further question? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, . . . ah . . . I would oppose this bill. I believe that our Grand Jury is working well now. I believe that we get two attorneys inside the Grand Jury room. We will turn this into an advocate situation and destroy many of the advantages of the Grand Jury; and I would hope that you would give this a 'no' vote."

Speaker Shea: "The gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

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

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Madigan: "Mr. Duff, Representative Houlihan indicated that the provisions of this bill only apply to a target witness. Could you explain to me how it is determined who is a target witness?"

Duff: "Any person charged of a crime by prior information or complaint or against whom the State's Attorney is seeking indictment is given the right to counsel when appearing before the Grand Jury."

Madigan: "Well, how do you determine if they're seeking an indictment?"

Duff: "Well, if he's charged by information or complaint, you know that."

Madigan: "Well, what if he's not charged by information or complaint, well, that's an easy situation."

Duff: "Well, the . . . the next bill refers to witnesses . . . ah . . . Representative Mardi . . . Madigan. You don't always know."

Madigan: "Well, I can see where an information or a complaint has been filed against an individual, that he would be considered as a target witness. But what about a situation which has occurred, where people have been brought before the Grand Jury told we're not interested in you, you're not a target in this investigation today, and then three weeks later he's indicted. How do we know that he qualifies under the bill?"

Duff: "That's why the next bill is so important, too."

Speaker Shea: "The gent . . . the lady from Lake, Miss Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I rise



to speak in support of this bill. We all know that when the person is indicted or even called before a Grand Jury unfortunately there is a signet that attaches automatically to that person, and attaches itself to his . . . his or her reputation. I think this is a very fine bill, and I think it's a good bill and may put you in conscious, both sides should be well represented and in the past the defendant never is; and I urge support of this bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevidch."

Matijevidch: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I . . . I want to compliment Representative Duff on his whole series. If I had any one criticism, it's the fact that he didn't go far enough. We ought to eliminate Grand Juries altogether, and this comes . . . this comes pretty close to it, 94 percent. We'll have to work on the other six percent in the next session, I believe; but I . . . I really believe that . . . ah . . . we . . . we've got to offer protections to individuals, and the original Grand Jury system was devised for that purpose, and . . . ah . . . you know, very often you're in a very informal study where the prosecutors are directing questions at a unsophisticated person and he really becomes the victim of circumstances; and Representative . . . Representative Duff by his series of bills and by House Bill 65 . . . ah . . . offers protections to the individual. I commend this bill to your support. I believe we need it and . . . ah . . . let's work towards the eventual elimination of all Grand Juries."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi. Shut off your little flasher there. The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow members of the House, I've debated whether to say anything about this or not. But I want to tell you very quickly an acutal and present-going occurrence. On April the 9th, last year, I was called for the Grand Jury, April the 9th. I found out what they wanted. I immediately went home and between April the 15th and May the 15th of last year, I collected affidavits from numerous people in my community including the police of Decatur, Illinois, the radio announcers in relation to activities that I was in, in relation to my duties on this floor of this House in '69



MAY 13 1975

58.

and '70, numerous affidavits I personally delivered to the prosecuting attorney. That's the last I heard of it until last November, and then I was indicted. Now, when Febraury came and we received under the law the copies of the . . ."

Speaker Shea: "Excuse me, Mr. Borchers. Proceed, sir."

Borchers: ". . . we received copies of the actions of the Grand Jury. To our amazement, not one of all the numerous affidavits from people who've known me from the time I was born and on what I've said on radio, what I've said on the floor of the House, including Senate hall, not one had been presented to the Grand Jury, zero. So now I've spent around \$4,000 so far defending myself, and I'll just say right now, they're going to have one hell of a fight. But I think these bills should be supported, and I would never have thought a thing about it a couple of years ago. But this is the truth and the fact. So vote 'aye'."

Speaker Shea: "The lady from St. Clair, Miss Younge."

Younge: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to very quickly say that I think this bill would . . . would tremendously strengthen the administration of justice for three reasons. First of all, I don't believe that there is a great deal of secrecy in reference to what goes on in Grand Juries anyway. We're experiencing in our counties trial by newspaper, where the United States Attorneys and the State's Attorneys say in the paper what they're going to present to the Grand Jury, so the objection that the . . . there's the violation of secrecy with . . . ah . . . an era of trail by newspaper is hardly valid in my ex . . . expa . . . in . . . in my way of thinking. Secondly, I think the bill would save the taxpayers a lot of money because a considerable expense is being . . . ah . . . done into as a result of indictments for perjury. A lot of people, apparently, do not know that one can go before a Grand Jury and lie and then be indicted for perjury in addition to what the original matter was. So it would greatly strengthen the administration of justice if a person had an opportunity to . . . ah . . . know that he could take his lawyer with him; and, therefore, I think that the trials for perjury would decrease; and thirdly, I think it would be . . . ah . . . a strengthening



MAY 13 1975 59.

of the administration of justice if the Grand Jury process were made an adversary proceeding. Over the term of a Grand Jury, apparently, the prosecutor becomes the . . . the person . . . that the persons . . . the jurors believe absolutely, and it . . . in many instances becomes his Grand Jury rather than the Grand Jury of the people of that particular jurisdiction; and for these reasons, I think it's a good bill and . . . ah . . . and it should be passed."

Speaker Shea: "The gentle . . . the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff, to close."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I would . . . I very much appreciate the comments that have been made by the members, and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 65 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 148 . . . 148 'aye' votes, 5 'nay' votes, 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 65 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 66."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 66, a bill for an act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Houlihan, J. M., on a point of order. Mr. Houlihan votes 'aye' on the last bill. Back to the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff, on House Bill 66."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, this bill should be considered as a companion to House Bill 62 and to House Bill 65, both of which have just passed. Ah . . . The advantage of the bill are . . . there . . . it provides that a witness before the Grand Jury may have counsel, and if an indigent, have one appointed. The . . . the advantages are that uncounselled . . . Mr. Speaker, I'll . . . ah . . ."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman moves for the adoption of House Bill 66. Is there discussion? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? On this question there are 100 . . . take the Record, Mr. Clerk . . . on this question there are 141 'ayes', 10 'nays', 2 voting 'present'. House Bill 66 having



MAY 13 1975

60.

received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed.

House Bill 110. The gentleman from Dekalb, Mr. Ebbessen."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 110, Ebbessen, . . ."

Ebbessen: "Ah . . . Yes, this is . . ."

Fredric Selcke: ". . . a bill for an act making appropriation to the Department of Transportation. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Dekalb, Mr. Ebbessen."

Ebbessen: "Ah . . . Yes, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I'll try to make this explanation as brief as possible, be very happy to answer any questions; but . . . ah . . . do not use the Digest as . . . ah . . . the bill has been amended in its present form. House Bill 110 appropriates one and a third million dollars to the Department of Transportation to furnish Am Trak Passenger Service from Chicago to Rock Island over the Chicago Northwestern Railway and then, of course, going to Dekalb, Rochelle, Dixon, Sterling, Rock Falls and over the Burlington Northern tracks to Rock Island. Ah . . . The . . . ah . . . \$900,000 of the proposed 1.3 million is a one-time outlay to improve the tracks over the Burlington Northern and 1/3 of this, or really roughly \$325,000 would be reimbursed to the state and what we're talking about on an annual basis here with a little buffer in there . . . ah . . . for two thirds of the operating defi . . . for any fiscal year an amount totalling \$400,000. Now, the history of this legislation is as follows: We had a bill for \$424,000 for the same service only going ending up in Clinton, Iowa last year, and the Governor saw fit to veto . . . ah . . . \$400,000 of this. He left in \$24,000 for the D.O.T. to do a feasibility study, which they did do. Ah . . . The department presented this testimony in both the Transportation Committee and Appropriation's Committee, and . . . ah . . . the . . . ah . . . saying that it was feasible to go not to Clinton but to Rock Island. I . . . ah . . . would be very happy at this time to . . . ah . . . answer any questions relative to the proposal."

Speaker Shea: "Question is, shall House Bill 110 pass? Is there discussion? The gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Fennessey."

Fennessey: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I rise to oppose this bill. I realize that . . . ah . . . we've had this same bill that



MAY 13 1975

61.

Representative Lechowicz did a very fine job I'm told in speaking the other day as to why it should not pass, but I do want to re-emphasize some of the things that he mentioned. If this bill passes, it's going to remove a train that presently serves the Rock Island area or the Chicago and Rock Island Railroad and the area from Chicago to Rock Island. Now, for years the Chicago and Rock Island tried to maintain rail service, passenger service, to the people of the area and . . . ah . . . Chicago Northwestern years ago gave up passenger service. Now, they're coming back and want to penalize the Rock Island by putting the train by that portion of Chicago to Sterling; and we heard testimony in the committee that from Sterling to Rock Island's section, it's never had passenger service, the track is obsolete, but could not . . . ah . . . a passenger train could not run on it, and I would like to point out that if this bill passes, the state is going to be obligating themselves for millions of dollars. We heard testimony that it . . . ah . . . possibly would take \$6 or \$7 million dollars to update this track so passenger train could run on it. So for these reasons, I would ask this House not to give this bill the number of votes to pass."

Ebbessen: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to that."

Speaker Shea: "Well, could you wait, you'll have an opportunity to close, Mr. Ebbessen? The gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill."

Hill: "I wonder if the sponsor would yield?"

Ebbessen: "Yes."

Hill: "Would this \$1,300,000 be paid to Am Trak or would we have some sort of control over it?"

Ebbessen: "Well, the . . . ah . . . first of all, the \$900,000 is for the capital improvements of the road . . . ah . . . right-of-way for the railroad tracks between . . . ah . . . a place near Sterling called Agnew all the way to Rock Island. That is a one-time situation. As I indicated, Am Trak would reimburse the state for these improvements roughly to about 325 to 350,000. That's a one-time expenditure. The two thirds of the operating deficit for any given fiscal year for that Am Trak service from Chicago to Rock Island is . . . ah . . . \$400,000; and I would like to point out one thing. Ah . . . In . . . Mr. Speaker,



MAY 13 1975

62.

may I get a little attention, please?"

Hill: "Maybe we could shorten this out, does the \$1,300,000 go to Am Trak, the people that operate Am Trak or doesn't it, or does some part of it go . . . go to or to Am Trak?"

Ebbessen: "Well, it . . . the \$400,000 is to pick up two thirds of the operating deficit for the service, like any Am Trak service."

Hill: "O.K. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say this."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Hill on the bill."

Hill: "That as far as I'm concerned, that board that operates Am Trak, not only in the State of Illinois, but the United States of America, couldn't even operate a Lionel train owned by my eight year old son; and when I first heard about this piece of legislation, I believe I told . . . ah . . . Mr. Grotberg that I could give him a vote on it. But if these monies go to Am Trak, the Directors and the Board of Am Trak, I'm not about without some protection giving them that money of taxpayers of the State of Illinois without any protection, whatsoever. This group of individuals that operate Am Trak in the State of Illinois and the United States of America are so inapt they don't have the slightest idea what it's all about. I read in the newspaper that they don't even use the trains. They fly around the United States in airplanes. Well, let me tell you this, that if they can't get on those trains and see how filthy and how rotten and how far behind they are, then as far as I'm concerned, I'm not going to let them play around with the taxpayers money of the State of Illinois; and I would suggest that you defeat this piece of legislation."

Speaker Shea: "The . . . the gentleman from Dekalb, Mr. Ebbessen, did you want to say something?"

Ebbessen: "Ah . . . Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to clarify a point."

Speaker Shea: "Well, can you do it when you close, sir?"

Ebbessen: "Well, I think it might save a lot of other questions. Well, then . . . O.K., fine, I'll wait 'til I close."

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

Palmer: "I have a question from the . . . for the sponsor. The question is whether . . ."

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he'll yield."



MAY 18 1975

63.

Palmer: ". . . the question is whether or not the Rock Island lines have approved the bill? They've carried the service all of these years at a loss."

Ebbessen: "Ah . . . Well, the response to that and I . . . I would like the entire House to listen carefully to these numbers if you will, going over the Rock Island line right now are two passenger trains that leave Chicago. They are twenty minutes to one half hour apart in time schedules. They both go to a point in Bureau County known as Bureau Junction. One of these trains, passenger trains, ends up in Peoria, the other goes from Bureau Junction to the west and ends up at the same point at Rock Island. Now, listen to this carefully, the total expenditure that the State of Illinois makes for both of these trains is \$1,000,000 to pick up that operating deficit. Now, the program calls that if we adopt this legislation and appropriate this money and put in this Am Trak service still ending up from Chicago to Rock Island, we eliminate one of these two trains. The train we will eliminate is one that costs \$550,000. Now, I would remind you that at that point in Bureau Junction in Bureau County where that one-passenger train goes to Rock Island, they pick up on the average according to this feasibility study an average of two passengers each day, two passengers each day, one of whom, I guess, is a card-carrying railroad worker. What I'm trying to say is we can still have a passenger service servicing more people in Northern Illinois for \$150,000 less expenditure of state funds. I . . . I do gather that Representative Hill was . . . ah . . . has changed his mind in opposition to this. But as . . . with . . . is . . . when the State of Illinois can better serve the people with service and capital improvements would . . . ah . . . by saving \$150,000 . . . ah . . . I don't see how anybody can be opposed to such legislation."

Speaker Shea: "Did that answer your question, Mr. Palmer? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen, in the interest of time, I think minds are made up. I move the previous question."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor will say 'aye', those oppose will say 'nay'. In the opinion





MAY 18 1973

64.

of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The gentleman from Dekalb, Mr. Ebbessen, to close."

Ebbessen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll make this very brief. You've heard my remarks. We will actually be saving \$150,000 in . . . and giving better train service to more people in the Northern Illinois area by adoption of this bill. Now, . . . ah . . . to me I think the basic object . . . objective in Government at all times, is to try to give people a dollars worth of service in capital improvement for every dollar that you're spending of their taxes, and believe me this is one piece of legislation that does exactly that; and I would encourage a 'yes' vote on the legislation."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 110 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg, to explain his vote."

Grotberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I have to take exception with one of my colleagues from the 38th District who is dropping numbers like ma . . . \$9,000,000 worth of track repair when the feasibility studies have come in at \$900,000 track repair, just about 90 percent less than that, and that these track repairs are going to have to be done anyway, and that this train, which will serve Kane County and . . . ah . . . Dekalb County, Fulton County all the way out to the Rock . . . to the Rock Island County, is probably one of the most valuable pieces of transportation that we can enact today. Now, all of the students of Northern Illinois University and God knows I'm always chopping away at those university budgets, but if we can get a way to get those kids in and out of the city of Chicago and from the far west into the Northern Illinois University, the . . . the population of that thing alone will make it a feasibility well worth while that we have gone through, and there is no real way that you can object to trying to solve one of the major transportation problems in the State of Illinois which exists in this area; and this is one sure way to do it. I would certainly recommend an 'aye' vote for everybody, and keep your word on this bill, because it has . . . it has been represented exactly as it is."



MAY 13 1975

65.

Speaker Shea: "Is there any further discussion? Have all voted who wish?  
Mr. Neff, the gentleman from Henderson."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On this legislation, I passed it out of the House, and it went through the Senate two years ago, a very similar bill, except it was amended as Representative Ebbessen said to go to Rock Island instead of . . . Rock Island, Illinois instead of Clinton, Iowa. The Governor vetoed it and he had good reasons to at that time. He said it needed some further study. He did leave 24,000 to do this study; and I want to say this, the Department of Transportation did a very thorough job on this study. I met with and along with . . . ah . . . Representative Ebbessen afterwards, they did recommend that the . . . ah . . . road instead of going to Clinton, Iowa to go to . . . ah . . . Rock Island because it would carry more traffic and has been brought out here this does serve a very big group of people and that's at . . . ah . . . Dekalb University, where there is a lot of students that would depend on this for . . . ah . . . transporting back and forth to the Chicago area; and there's an area up here through Sterling all the way through that have no type of transportation, whatsoever, it will conserve energy; and somebody brought up about the tracks. The Department of Transportation . . ."

Speaker Shea: "Will you bring your remarks to a close, Mr. Neff?"

Neff: ". . . The Department of Transportation did do a good job on the . . . ah . . . this study on this and, therefore, the tracks are capable of carrying it."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen, I rise in opposition to this bill, not because I would not like to see . . . ah . . . this bill of Representative Ebbessen's pass; but I'd like to remind you that we have for two years provided in this House and last year with the . . . ah . . . and in both years, with the Concurrence, and last year with the initiation with the administration funds for trains to serve the central Illinois; and that train has not yet been put on the track; and I don't think it is time for us to start adding additional trains that go between . . . ah . . . termini that are already served by trains paid for by the State of Illinois until the state has



MAY 13 1975

66.

made its obligation on bills that we have passed for the last two years here to serve an area of Illinois and central Illinois that has not been provided with train service; and so for that reason, I'm voting against this bill at this time."

Speaker Shea: "Is there any further discussion? Have all voted who wish? The gentleman from Stevenson, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Well, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, . . . ah . . . I don't want to belabor this point, but I'm afraid that as late as lights are flicking off and on that . . . ah . . . one point should be made. Those of us that live up in northwestern Illinois have, many of us I know, have supported appropriations that have helped the transportation problems of various parts of the state. I want to tell you exactly how long it would take to get down to Springfield, right now, from Freeport; and I know this is just the first step, but I understand it's a prerequisite to eventually getting Am Trak to run north/south. But it would take seven hours today to get from Freeport down to Springfield by bus. If we want to fly, we have to drive to Rockford, fly to Chicago and then fly down here. By the . . . ah . . . railroad, it's the same story. We have to take a railroad in order to get into Chicago and then to Springfield down; and I . . . I think I've supported some subsidies for transportation around the state for some of the rest of the members of this House and their areas; and I would appreciate their votes at this time, and I see I've talked too long."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wish? The gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Well, like Representative Fenness . . . Fennessey, the train that's on the Rock Island right now goes through my hometown and I'm gonna' lose it, I'm opposed to the bill, please knock it down."

Speaker Shea: "Gentlemen, the discussion on this bill took about twelve minutes. Explaining votes has now taken almost twenty. The gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation of my vote, I would like to simply point out that this train will run between the Quad-City area and the Chicago area. Now, the Quad-City area is an area which now



MAY 13 1975

67.

comprises approximately 250,000 people. The train will also serve the communities of Sterling and Rock Falls, a community of some 30,000. The committee . . . the community of Dixon, a community of some 18,000. I think this is a good bill; I think it's a step forward in the transportation system of our state; and I urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Ebbessen to explain his vote."

Ebbessen: "No."

Speaker Shea: "Well, is there anybody else that wants to explain their vote?"

Unknown: "Roll Call."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. The gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill."

Hill: "I'd just like to say this, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I have voted in this legislature for funds for Am Trak, but after I read what's happening in regards to the operation of Am Trak, the only thing I'm asking you people here today is to vote this down and put some sort of protection in the piece of legislation that Am Trak will not squander the taxpayers money. That's all I'm asking for, and that protection is not in this piece of legislation. If it were, I'd be happy to vote for it. It's a bad piece of legislation the way it is, not because of the route that it . . . that the sponsor is asking it to take, but because some of these monies will be funneled through Am Trak, and these people are going to squander that money, and that's why I'm asking you to vote in opposition to it."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, . . . or the gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Fennessey."

Fennessey: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, at the proper time, I'd like to verify this Roll Call."

Speaker Shea: "All right, on this Roll Call there are 97 'ayes', 47 . . . 47 'nays', and 2 'present'. There's been a request for verification required to the time we get into that, just one minute of your time, ladies and gentlemen."

Speaker Redmond: "Members of the House, a short interlude here to permit us to introduce our guests today, Mr. Allen Alda of 'Nash'. Mr. Alda."



Mr. Allen Alda: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I came to thank you for your vote, if I were here, I would have voted with you, and I'd like to explain that vote. I think when you . . . when you voted in favor of the Equal Rights Amendment, you did something good for your country, in my opinion and in the opinion of a lot of people around the country. There was a great wave of electricity that was felt all over when the vote in this body was made and we appreciate it. We thank you. We're with you, even those of you who still don't agree with it, because the debate on this issue is very important to our country. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Return the Chair to Representative Shea. State your point."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I, for one, resent carpetbaggers coming in here and telling us how we should vote on an issue one way or the other. I think this is uncalled for, I think . . . I resent the fact that the rostrum of the House of Representatives was used on one side of the issue or another, as I say, by a carpetbagger."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I would like to concur in that suggestion that we have many, many controversial issues and we all try to respect one another. I served two terms or one term sitting between two ladies who were ardent advocates of that particular subject and I remain as a father of four daughters believing that it is wrong. Now, I think the . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevidch, for what purpose do you rise?"

Matijevidch: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker, all of these comments come after the fact, we've already voted on the issue, the man is here as a celebrity and that's all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbessen. Representative Ebbessen."

Ebbessen: "Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time on this verification, I'd like a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "The time is appropriate right now. Representative Davis, do you seek recognition?"



Davis: "Mr. Speaker, thank you for recognizing me, but I do have the privilege now of presenting . . . presenting to this General Assembly the students of the B. U. Uppergrade Center. They are here with their teacher, Mrs. Louise Perrear. These fine, young Americans in the north Gallery here. Would you stand from the B. U. Uppergrade Center. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed . . . proceed with the poll of the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Fredric Selcke: "Brandt. Brummet. Calvo. Mrs. Chapman is recorded as voting 'aye'. D'Arco. DiPrima. Epton . . . ah . . ."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Clerk."

Fredric Selcke: "Representative Shea in the Chair."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Clerk, could we have some order, please?"

Fredric Selcke: "I can't . . . I can't call the Roll and maintain order, too."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Dekalb, Mr. Ebbessen."

Ebbessen: "Ah . . . Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your trying to get order. I . . . we . . . I can't hear and . . . ah . . ."

Speaker Shea: "All right, I will try to get some order . . ."

Ebbessen: ". . . and I do appreciate it."

Speaker Shea: ". . . while the Clerk calls the absentees. Ladies and gentlemen, will you please be in your seats?"

Fredric Selcke: "Fleck. Friedrich. Getty. Dave Jones. Leon. McGrew. McPartlin. Merlo. Myer. Nardulli."

Speaker Shea: "Leon 'no'. Nardulli 'no'."

Fredric Selcke: "Leon 'no'. Nardulli 'no'. Yeah. Pierce. Terzich. Washington. Willer."

Speaker Shea: "Have you fi . . . have you finished the call of the absentees, Mr. Clerk?"

Fredric Selcke: "Yes, sir."

Speaker Shea: "The absentees having been called, Mr. D'Arco. Mr. D'Arco votes 'no'. The absentees having been called, we will now proceed with the verification of the Affirmative vote. Will the members please be in their seats? For the purposes of an announcement, Mr. Madigan."



Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, seated in the Gallery at this time representing the southwest suburban community is the Mr. Junior Citizen, Mr. Dan Keatty, from St. Louis, Damonford School in Oak Lawn, and Miss Junior Citizen, Mary Murphy, from Crab Orchard School in Palos Heights; and they're from the district which is represented by Representatives Yourell, Palmer and Barnes. They're in the Gallery at this time."

Speaker Shea: "At . . . at this time, there are 98 'aye' votes and 50 'no' votes; and the Clerk will proceed with the verification and would the members please be in their seats."

Fredric Selcke: "Did he say call the Roll? Arnell."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Doorkeeper, would you please clear the floor of the people not authorized to be on the floor of the House of Representatives. We will proceed with the verification of the affirmative votes."

Fredric Selcke: "Arnell. J. M. Barnes. Beaupre. Berman. Birchler. Bluthardt. Brinkmeier. Capbell. Capparelli. Capuzi. Carroll. Catania. Chapman. Choate. Coffey. Collins. Cunningham. Daniels . . . . Deavers. Deuster. Downs. Duff. Ralph Dunn. Dyer. Ebbessen. Ewing. Farley. Flinn. Friedland. Gaines."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Clerk, would you hold on for a minute. Mr. Telcser, the Assitant Minority Leader, has been called off the floor, but he is here. Proceed, sir."

Fredric Selcke: "Geo-Karis. Giglio. Grieman. Griesheimer. Grotberg. Hirschfeld. Gene Hoffman. Ron Hoffman. Emil Jones. Kelly. Kempiners. Kent. Klosak. Kucharski. LaFleur. Lauer. Leinenweber. Lucco. Lundy. Macdonald. Madison. Mahar. Maragos. Matijevich. Mautino. McAuliffe. McAvoy. McClain. McCourt. McMaster . . . er. . . . Molloy. Mudd. Mulcahey. Neff. Pierce. Polk. Porter. Randolph. Reed. Rigney. Rose. Ryan. Schisler. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Schraeder. Schuneman. Sevcik. Simms. Skinner. E. G. Steele. Cissy Stiehl. Stone. Telcser. Totten. Tuerk. Waddell. Wall. Walsh. Washburn. Williams. Winchester. Younge. Yourell, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Fennessey, are there any questions of the affirmative



MAY 13 1975

71.

votes? We're starting out with 98 'aye' votes and 50 'nay' votes."

Fennessey: "Beaupre?"

Speaker Shea: "Is Mr. Beaupre on the floor? How is he recorded?"

Fredric Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Shea: "Take him off the Record."

Fennessey: "Farley?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Farley, is he on the floor? How is he recorded?"

Fredric Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Shea: "Take him out of the Record."

Fennessey: "Birchler?"

Speaker Shea: "Is Mr. Birchler on the floor? How's . . . how's he recorded?"

Fredric Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Fennessey: "Bluthardt?"

Speaker Shea: "Is Mr. Bluthardt on the floor? Mr. Bluthardt on the floor? How is he voted?"

Fredric Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Shea: "Take him off the Record."

Fennessey: "Davis?"

Speaker Shea: "Davis? Is Mr. Davis on the floor? How is he recorded?"

Fredric Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Shea: "Take him off the Record."

Fennessey: "Daniels?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Daniels? Is Mr. Daniels on the floor? He's in the back by Mr. Meyer."

Fennessey: "Downs?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Downs? Is Mr. Downs on the floor? Take him off the Record."

Fennessey: "Ewing?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Ewing? Mr. Ewing's on the floor."

Fennessey: "Kelly?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Kelly? Is Mr. Kelly on the floor? Take him off the Record. Or how is he recorded?"

Fredric Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Shea: "Take him off the Record."





MAY 13 1975

72.

Fennessey: "Lucco?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Lucco? Is Mr. Lucco on the floor? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Shea: "Take him off the Record."

Fennessey: "Jones, Emil Jones?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Emil Jones, is he on the floor? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Shea: "Take him off the Record."

Fennessey: "Klosak?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Klosak? 'He's on the floor?"

Fennessey: "Madison?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Madison's on the floor."

Fennessey: "McAuliffe?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. McAuliffe, he's in his seat."

Fennessey: "McClain?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. McClain is in his seat."

Fennessey: "McCourt?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. McCourt is in his seat."

Fennessey: "Mudd?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Mudd is in his seat."

Fennessey: "Ah . . . Chapman?"

Speaker Shea: "Miss Chapman? Is Miss Chapman on the floor? How is she recorded?"

Fredric Selcke: "The lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Shea: "Take her off the Record."

Fennessey: "Giglio?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Giglio? Is Mr. Giglio on the floor? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Shea: "Take him off the Record. The Chair . . ."

Fennessey: "Geo-Karis . . ."

Speaker Shea: "Excuse me, sir. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor."

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

Speaker Shea: "You're recorded as voting 'no'."

Taylor: "Would you change that to 'aye'?"

Speaker Shea: "Change Mr. Taylor from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. McClain."



McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think I'm recorded as 'aye', would you change my vote to 'present'?"

Speaker Shea: "Change Mr. McClain to 'present'."

Fennessey: "Geo-Karis?"

Speaker Shea: "Miss Geo-Karis? How is she recorded?"

Fredric Selcke: "The lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Shea: "Miss Geo-Karis, take her off the Record."

Fennessey: "Sevcik?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Sevcik's by his seat."

Fennessey: "Lundy?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Lundy? Is Mr. Lundy on the floor? Take him off the Record."

Fredric Selcke: "He's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Fennessey: "Dyer?"

Speaker Shea: "He's recorded as voting 'aye'. Miss Dyer is by her seat."

Fennessey: "Yourell?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Yourell is in his seat."

Fennessey: "Deuster?"

Speaker Shea: "Is Mr. Deuster on the floor? How is he recorded?"

Fredric Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Shea: "Take him off the Roll."

Fennessey: ". . . er."

Speaker Shea: "Who?"

Fennessey: "Mautino?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Mautino? Is Mr. Mautino on the floor? He's in the back."

Fennessey: "No other questions."

Speaker Shea: "Is there any further questions of the affirmative Roll Call?"

The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Pouncey."

Pouncey: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to change my vote from 'no' to 'aye', please."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Pouncey wishes to go from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Huff."

Huff: "Mr. Speaker, I also would like to follow Mr. Pouncey's example."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Huff goes from 'no' to 'aye'."

Fredric Selcke: "Wait a minute, O.K."



ROLL 10 10/10

74.

Speaker Shea: "Mr. White."

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

Fennessey: "Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Shea: "Is there any further questions?"

Fennessey: "Yes. Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Fennessey."

Fennessey: "McAvoy?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. McAvoy is in his chair."

Fennessey: "Wall?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Wall is in his seat."

Fennessey: "Tuerk?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Tuerk, he's in his seat. Mr. Ebbessen, did you wish recognition for something?"

Ebbessen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, as . . . ah . . . a point here, could we have a reading where we stand?"

Speaker Shea: "Well, we're still verifying the call."

Ebbessen: "All right. Thank you."

Fennessey: "Washburn?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Washburn's on the floor."

Fennessey: "No, I wouldn't . . . Capparelli?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Capparelli, how is he recorded?"

Fredric Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Shea: "Is he on the floor? Take him off the Roll Call. Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, if I understood the gentleman correctly, I thought I heard him to say some time ago that he had no other verifications."

Speaker Shea: "He said he had some more. He indicated that he did to me, sir."

Madison: "O.K."

Speaker Shea: "Is there any further questions?"

Fennessey: "Mahar?"

Fredric Selcke: "You're on."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Mahar is in his seat."

Fennessey: "Greisheimer?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Greisheimer? I think he was verified earlier, sir?"



Fennessey: "No, he wasn't."

Speaker Shea: "Well."

Fennessey: "Ask the Clerk."

Speaker Shea: "How is he recorded, sir?"

Fredric Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Shea: "Is Mr. Griesheimer on the floor? Take him off the Record.  
Mr. Hirschfeld on a point of order."

Hirschfeld: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House,  
I'm going to re-emphasize what Representative Madison just said a few  
minutes ago, because Representative Griesheimer and I were called  
back from the Senate Committee for this verification; and we stood  
here until we heard the person doing the verifying say he had no further  
questions of the affirmative; and Representative Griesheimer left at  
that time as did I, and I just happen to be talking to somebody at the  
back door and heard the verification start again. Now, I think the  
gentleman either ought to finish the verification and say so or else  
not. But when he tells us he's finished and we head back for a Senate  
Committee, I think it's more inappropriate to start verifying the  
affirmative Roll Call again."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Patrick."

Patrick: "Change my 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Patrick goes from 'no' to 'aye'. Now, Mr. Fennessey, are  
there any further questions of the affirmative Roll Call?"

Fennessey: "Kempiners?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Kempiners, he's on the floor, sir."

Fennessey: "No other questions."

Speaker Shea: "There being no further question of the affirmative Roll  
Call, Mr. Clerk, give me the affirmative Roll Call. On this question  
there are 86 'ayes' and 46 'nays'. Mr. Ebbessen. 48 'nays', I'm  
sorry. Mr. Ebbessen."

Ebbessen: "Mr. Speaker, was Representative Griesheimer removed frm the  
Roll Call?"

Speaker Shea: "Yes, he was."

Ebbessen: "Well, all I can say is that it looks to me like you've got them  
running pretty fast over there. I . . . I would just appeal to any . . .



MAY 13 1975

MAY 13 1975

76.

before they announce the final Roll Call here that . . . ah . . . anybody who is voting 'no' or 'present' that would like to get on an affirmative, I'd certainly appreciate it. Postpone Consideration."

Speaker Shea: "Postpone Consideration. House Bill 182."

Fredric Selcke: "Postponed. House Bill 182, . . . ah . . . Friedrich . . . ah . . . he's not here."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Friedrich is not here. House Bill . . . the gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I just ran up from the second floor . . . ah . . . I don't know what type of games we're playing here, but I sat in my chair on verification until the . . . ah . . . party verifying on the other side of the aisle said that was all and then I got up and went down to Senate Committee hearing. After I get down there, I find out he starts up again. Now, if there's any semblance of fair play left in this House, I think you'd better start adjusting the way he's handling this. This is not only unethical, this is just damn dirty business under the table, and if we want to revert back to the Bob Blair days, I think this is a good way to start it."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Lake Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, this is nothing new. This has happened time and time again, and anybody that's being verified ought to know you don't leave unless you've been verified or unless the Roll Call's been announced. Protect yourself. All you have to do is sit in your seat and that'll protect you."

Speaker Shea: "House Bill 260."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 260, . . ."

Speaker Shea: "The Minority Leader, the gentleman from Lundy."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, that's exactly the point, Representative Griesheimer was in his seat and had been verified and had finished the Roll Call, then started up after he left."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 260, a bill for an act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the bill. Kosinski."

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill



MAY 13 1975

260 as amended by Mr. Lundy is correctly and succinctly outlined in the synopsis of the newest Digest. The Bail Bond system and felonies is too loose. This bill as amended is in line with the latest Supreme Court decisions and codifies the condition of bail and appeals after a lower court's conviction in a felony. It emphasizes the . . . emphasizes the danger to the public and the possible denial of bail on that premise. I ask for your vote."

Speaker Shea: "Is there discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 260 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Shea 'aye' . . ."



COPIES 18 1973

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Daniels, 'aye'. Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there 127 'ayes', 6 'nays', 3 voting 'present'. House . . . or . . . House Bill 260 having received the Constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. Lauer, 'aye'. On the Order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 486."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 486, Williams, a bill for an act to amend the Unemployment Compensation Act. Third Reading of the bill."

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

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, . . . ah . . . House Bill . . . ah . . . 486 addresses itself to the, let's see, Unemployment Compensation for teachers. Now, let me make it perfectly clear, this does not include the summer months or any time that a teacher is on . . . ah . . . contract. I think that should be emphasized. This bill does not . . . ah . . . cover the summer vacation. This bill is intended for the teachers in this . . . ah . . . time of recession that could be layed off through . . . ah . . . cutbacks and it brings the . . . ah . . . teachers under the act of which a lot of other people are covered. It has the endorsement of the Illinois Federation of Teachers of the I.E.A. and . . . ah . . . Stanley Johnson, AFL-CIO; and I ask for your favorable vote."

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

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "As I read Section 6 on page 2 of the bill . . . ah . . . there's reference to nonprofit organizations, and I see in that the inclusion of nonpublic schools. Particularly, when I refer to page 4, Section A, which makes an exemption for those organizations which are operated primarily for religious purposes, which nonpublic schools are not; and I ask, is it your intention that House Bill 486 include nonpublic schools?"

Williams: "It . . . well, it says there in that Section A or just above it on page 4, the term employment 'shall not include services performed in the employment of a church or . . . or convention association of churches' and so forth and so on, which I think would . . . ah . . ."



MAY 13 1975

79.

bring in the private . . ."

Unknown: "260."

Williams: ". . . schools there."

Schlickman: "Well, I suggest to you that there are nonpublic schools, which are not affiliated with a religion, and that there are nonpublic schools affiliated with a religion, but which schools are not primarily for religious purposes. Their basic purpose is to teach secular courses within the context, perhaps, of a particular faith, but which are primarily a secular education in nature; and I, simply, ask you, is it your intention for this bill to include nonpublic schools?"

Williams: "Well, that language is in the bill. The only amendment to it there is on page 2, the underlined portion, and . . . ah . . . the intention of the bill, of course, is to bring . . . ah . . . teachers, who would become unemployed through the lean-year periods here through cutbacks in . . . in school programs and allow them to draw up the benefits that other employees are now allowed to draw; and this does not take effect, incidently, until 1976."

Schlickman: "Well, I'm going to respectfully ask the question once more. Is it your intention that this bill will include nonpublic schools?"

Williams: "I would have no objection to it if it did. I think it includes all teachers."

Schlickman: "Does it . . . is it your intention to include nonpublic schools?"

Williams: "Fine, yes."

Schlickman: "It is your intention to include . . . include . . ."

Williams: "Well, if they are included, I don't know where the language is in here, but if they are included or if you can find it somewhere, then I would have no objection to their being included, if you think they are."

Schlickman: "Do you have any idea what the cost burden will be on our nonpublic schools . . ."

Williams: "We . . ."

Schlickman: ". . . as a result of this bill?"

Williams: ". . . We have tried to find that out. Since there is no history of it at all, we have tried to . . . ah . . . get some sort of a . . ."





MAY 13 1975

80.

ah . . . figure on this and there are no figures available. Ah . . . I understand it would be a very small amount, but we can't get our hands on any kind of a figure that this might . . . ah . . . and we tried . . . we contacted the B.O.B. and so forth, and there's just no history of this. Ah . . . We haven't had any time in the past where . . . ah . . . there might be a possibility where . . . ah . . . teachers would be unemployed. We are getting into that period now, and this does not take effect until 1976 or, let's see, after January 1st, 1976, so . . ."

Schlickman: "If I may, I'd like to address myself very briefly to this bill. Number one, we have a bill here where the Sponsor isn't quite sure whether it covers and includes nonpublic schools. Number two, if it does, then we get ourselves involved in the Constitutional issue of excessive entanglement. The United States Supreme Court has said that we cannot, shall not provide economic assistance to nonpublic schools, because it will lead to excessive entanglement. Well, let me respectfully suggest to you, if we make the Unemployment Compensation Law applicable to nonpublic schools, we're going to have as much, if not more, excessive entanglement as we would have under the non-public school . . . ah . . . assistant program that this body has previously considered and which is presently considering. I would suggest that it constitutes bad public policy and would be unconstitutional; and, therefore, solicit your 'no' vote on this bill."

Speaker Shea: "Is there any further questions? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Madison: "Jack, . . . ah . . . is it not true that there are nonprofit organizations who do not . . . ah . . . who are not subject to the Unemployment Compensation Act?"

Williams: "Yes."

Madison: "Is it possible then that we are creating a bill that would allow persons, that would provide coverage for persons whose employer was not covered under the act or had chosen not to be covered? Mr.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 13 1975

. . . ah . . . He's not on."

Speaker Shea: "Turn Mr. Williams on, he can hardly whisper. Are you answering, Mr. Williams?"

Williams: "I'll just say I would like Representative Hanahan to answer that question."

Speaker Shea: "You'd like to yield for Hanahan?"

Hanahan: "Yes, . . . ah . . . Representative Madison, . . . ah . . . public employers paid back by actual usage of the fund. So we're not covering anyone new or adding any taxes to somebody who hasn't got it now. They pay back by usage and by bringing nonpublic employers such as schools, like the Catholic school system or the Presbyterian or Methodist school system, they would be entered in nonprofit section of unemployment and also be eligible for a payback into the . . . ah . . . into the Trust Fund on actual usage of that fund."

Madison: "Ah . . . My question Mr. . . . Mr. Speaker and . . . and to Mr. Hanahan goes to the subject of nonprofit organizations that have elected not to be covered under the Unemployment Compensation Act. Now, are you telling me that they can elect not to be covered and still pay back on a usage basis?"

Hanahan: "Yes, I am."

Madison: "Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hud . . . er . . . I'm sorry, from DuPage, Mr. Hudson. Mr. Hudson, do you wish to yield to Mr. Tuerk?"

Hudson: "I will yield to Mr. Tuerk, he was ahead of me, Mr. Speak . . ."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a couple of questions?"

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Tuerk: "If I'm a school teacher . . . I'll wait . . . if I'm a school teacher and I elect to be paid on a nine-months basis, although my salary is on an annual basis, would I be eligible for unemployment during the summer months?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Williams."

Williams: "It says in the bill, 'if a person has elected to receive the wages on a twelve-month basis in an academic year', he would not be



1975

eligible."

Tuerk: "That wasn't my question. I said if I'm on an annual salary and elect to be . . . be paid on a nine-months basis; and, therefore, I'm off three months in the summer and I'm not receiving any funds during the summer, would I be eligible for unemployment?"

Williams: "Ah . . . No, you wouldn't be able to do that."

Tuerk: "Why?"

Williams: "Yeah, you're on a twelve-month contract, and it . . . ah . . . specifically . . ."

Tuerk: "Yeah, I'm on a twelve-month contract, but you just answered the question if you were paid on a twelve-month contract. I wouldn't be paid on a twelve-month contract, I'd be paid for nine months even though I am on an annual salary increment."

Williams: "The bill explicitly . . . ah . . . states and in order to, you know, emphasize that, in Amendment Number 1 it says that . . . that no teacher could draw benefits while under contract."

Tuerk: "No, it says under contract for twelve months. Do you see, I think your bill . . . Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the bill."

Speaker Shea: "Proceed, sir."

Tuerk: "I think this is one of the failings of the bill. There is a lot of question in my mind relative to how I'm paid as a teacher whether or not I'd be eligible for unemployment comp'. In addition to that, the point that Mr. Schlickman made relative to the private schools of the nonpublic schools, where nonpublic schools are having all kinds of financial difficulty now, and if you put them under the umbrella of unemployment comp', this is gonna' increase their costs beyond what they're able to pay and create considerable hardships for them in addition to the public schools. In addition to that, the poor taxpayer is going to have to bear the expense of this cost. The taxpayer now and the schools now are hollering about shortage of funds. I don't know where the Sponsor of the bill suggest where the funds are coming from other than out of the taxpayers pocket. I would urge all the members to vote a negative red light on this legislation."

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

Beatty: "Would the Speaker . . . ah . . . the . . . ah . . . Sponsor



MAY 1 1952

yield for questions toward him."

Williams: "Yes."

Beatty: "Getting down to the cost element, here, the question I have is, would an individual teacher, who does not pay into the Social Security Fund or is not covered by this particular thing, but is, merely, under his Pension Fund with the school board and doesn't . . . doesn't pay into Social Security, would he be able to get unemployment compensation were he to fill the other requirements of this bill?"

Williams: "I don't know where . . . ah . . . Social Security would have anything to do with this . . . ah . . ."

Beatty: "Well, then if the . . ."

Williams: ". . . just for unemployment compensation."

Beatty: ". . . the Social Security has nothing to do with it, then who . . . who's going to pay for this if the Social Security doesn't. In other words, if I'm under Social Security, money is deducted from my wages and I paid part of the cost of the unemployed at a later date. I get . . . I paid part of the cost as an individual employee. Its taken from my pay or if . . . if I'm self-employed, I contribute to these . . . to . . . ah . . . Social Security of the employee who'd contribute. Now, who . . . who is going to pay the cost of this? If a teacher is not under Social Security, is he going to get unemployment compensation? That's the question; and if he is, who'e going to pay the cost of it. Do they get the best of both systems. Is this what the intention of this bill is? They get the benefits, but they don't pay the cost?"

Williams: "The employer, which would be the school."

Beatty: "They would pick up the entire cost of the employer and the employee cost of this?"

Williams: ". . . or maximum of \$80 a year, is what the cost would be."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Cook . . . er . . . I'm sorry, the gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "If . . . If the Sponsor . . ."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Doorkeeper . . ."

Simms: ". . . if the Sponsor would yield for a . . . a couple of questions. Ah . . . Representative Williams, what is the total . . ."



. . . ah . . . total financial cost of this program to the individual school districts in total in the State of Illinois?"

Williams: "There is no idea how much this would be. All I have been able to find out is that it would be very little."

Simms: "Well, if it . . ."

Williams: "But there's been no history of it, they have nothing to . . . ah . . . judge this on."

Simms: "Do you think it could be \$10,000,000,000 or . . ."

Williams: "Oh, no, no where near that."

Simms: "Maybe \$1,000,000,000?"

Williams: "No, maybe a couple of hundred thousand."

Simms: "Well, what you're asking the Legislature to do is to pass a piece of legislation, which is being passed on to the taxpayers of Illinois, a cost of a new program to institute, which you have no information as to what the cost is to the taxpayer of the State of Illinois. To me, Mr. Speaker, speaking to the merits of the bill, the Sponsor has admitted that he has no idea what this is going to cost the taxpayer. I don't think the taxpayers of the State of Illinois can afford to have a bill enacted like this. Its going to impose another type of cost to government; and let's face it, this is going to be transferred back to the taxpayers, to each individual school district, and that means an increase in tax to the local individual. Now, I don't know about your district, but my school district has some serious financial problems. I have received letters from pert near every school district around the northern part of the state saying they're in dire financial circumstances, they may have to cut back programs; and I think it would be very imprudent for the Illinois General Assembly to enact a . . . a type of tax increase on the taxpayers, to enact a new program without any type of financial responsibility or any cost to . . . ah . . . knowledge of the cost to the taxpayers of the state. So I just think this legislation deserves a great, big 'no' vote."

Speaker Shea: "There are a number of people on the floor of the House that are not authorized. May I ask you, please, to leave the floor? The gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."



MAY 18 1975

85.

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to a couple of questions?"

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Schraeder: "Representative Williams, I'm not familiar with the terminology of the teachers contract in the public sector. Are the teachers contracted for a nine-month period or do the contracts spell out their term shall run from a full, twelve-month period?"

Williams: "I guess they have both kinds of contracts."

Schraeder: "And do the private schools do the same thing? Are those nine-month contracts, or are they yearly contracts?"

Williams: "I don't believe the private schools, you know, have a contract. At least that's my understanding."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to talk to it, if I may?"

Speaker Shea: "Proceed."

Schraeder: "I think Representative Williams is to be commended for making an effort to help those teachers who may become unemployed; but the question in my mind is, and I'm looking at the language, apparently, those who receive a nine-month payment would be eligible for unemployment compensation during a three-month period. However, those teachers that receive a check for nine months are, in fact, employed for twelve months; and it would seem to me then it would be advantageous to those teachers who are now getting twelve monthly checks to revert back to nine months, and, thereby, being eligible for three months of unemployment comp'. That seems to be a . . . a real bad situation. In addition to that, it seems to me that we're putting the parochial school system in very serious jeopardy of maintaining their schools and their adequate supply of good teachers. They're in question now whether they can maintain their solvency, some are going bankrupt, some are consolidating; and it seems to me, we can't place any private school system in jeopardy by the passage of this legislation; and I . . . I think the intent is good and perhaps it needs some working over; and I would suggest that it be taken out and had someone study this. Someone maybe come up with a new bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from McLean, Mr. Deavers."

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



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 13 1975

86.

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall the main question be put? All in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'; the 'ayes' have it. The main question shall now be put, and Mr. Williams to close."

Williams: "Mr. . . . ah . . . Speaker and members of the House. Ah . . . Just two short statements here. First of all, the amendment, definitely, eliminates this idea of a teacher being able to draw benefits while they are under a contract; and number two, I cannot in any way see where this would be a tax increase. This is . . . ah . . . paid, actually, by the school, that's a maximum of \$80 a year they would put, you know, that they would pay per employee; and there is no way that this could be a tax increase for the State of Illinois. I think its a good bill. It addresses itself to a problem, and I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 486 pass? All in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Mr. Lauer will explain his vote."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, . . . ah . . . in explaining my vote, I wish to ask a question; and perhaps Representative Williams will . . . ah . . . answer it in his explanation. Was it your intent . . . intention, Representative, to permit the election by the individual teacher or would it be that . . . that if they were under a continuing contract where they receive pay on nine months or twelve months . . . ah . . . to . . . ah . . . have the option then of unemployment or no unemployment?"

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan, to explain his vote."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House . . ."

Speaker Shea: "There are . . . I just would like to point out for the purposes of this Record, there are 20 'aye' votes and 40 'nay' votes. Go ahead, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Thank you for reminding them how many votes are on there. It don't deter the fact of . . . of the reality of this bill. A lot of people have made a lot of allegations on the bill so far like tax increases and the rest. Whether we like it or not, whether this General Assembly passes this bill or not, we have already got, by Federal Law, the right



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NOV 13 1975

87.

for teachers to collect unemployment compensation starting this June. This bill actually would be a conservative bill insuring the fact that teachers who will have employment in September and will be continued along unemployment will not be eligible. If you ever want to stop somebody illegally collecting unemployment compensation, this bill would do it. First of all, let me point out that right now with the Emergency Act, it has been extended to teachers and other personnel of school districts who receive unemployment compensation. House Bill 486 will insure the fact that only those eligible by having no place to go to work in September, for those personnel to collect unemployment comp'. Now, this is in no way contradictory to any other employee that we grant unemployment compensation to. It will not, adversely, effect anyone's philosophy in granting to a teacher or to a school employee, a bus driver, a cafeteria worker, a janitor, a carpenter or what have you working for a school district from collecting unemployment comp'. I, too, join with those that prohib . . . that want to see people collecting unemployment compensation that do not deserve it, to see to it that they do not deserve it. Unless we pass this bill this summer in Illinois, people are going to collect unemployment compensation that truly don't need it nor deserve it under any real traditional . . . ah . . . sense of justice. Now, teachers who are employed twelve months a year will not be eligible to collect it under this bill. But many school districts . . ."

Speaker Shea: "Will the gentleman bring his remarks to a close?"

Hanahan: ". . . only employ 'em up to nine months or ten months and under the Federal ruling will be eligible. I suggest this is a good 'aye' vote. Its a good bill. If there's any technicality that needs to be straightened out, I don't know of it. If you are against giving people who don't deserve unemployment compensation, giving it to them, vote 'aye' on this bill, because it would straighten out a lot of mess and people who are eligible or ineligible according to need on employment compensation in getting this bill passed."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that a 'present' vote on this



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



MAY 13 1965

bill with all the questions up and a . . . got up and asked would be totally responsible and that's why I'm casting it. There are some questions, for instance, are state university employees going to be covered? Ah . . . If they're going to be covered, how much is it going to cost the state? We don't know the answer to that question. Ah . . . There's some questions I have as to whether local school districts are going to have the option. Is this going to be something that will be negotiated on a district by district basis? Ah . . . Is it, in other words, mandatory or permissive? What is \$80 times the number of school teachers in the State of Illinois and university . . . ah . . . teachers? We just don't know. I can fully emphasize with the . . . ah . . . Sponsor and what he is trying to do here, because when I was fired by Speaker Blair . . . ah . . . from my job as Budget Analyst in the Illinois General Assembly, Republican staff, I was not eligible for unemployment insurance. But I really think that we have to tighten up the . . . ah . . . tighten up the edges of this bill and answer some questions before we pass it."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Madison, Mr. Steele, to explain his vote."

Steele: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, . . . ah . . . I, certainly, support the principle of unemployment benefits for teachers, but as I understand this bill or at least as it reads, I'm not adequately satisfied that teachers who are under a nine-month contract would not still be able to collect unemployment . . . ah . . . even though they're employed on a yearly basis. So for that reason I would vote 'no'."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly, to explain his vote."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I, certainly, favor House Bill 486. I can't see why teachers aren't entitled to receive unemployment . . . ah . . . benefits just as well as are our other citizens in the State of Illinois; and that's regardless of whether they're in private institutions, public institutions or, for that matter as Mr. Skinner indicated, the university level. I know that the cost factor involved here is not that great, but I'd like to point out one thing, the school population has been dropping and



MAY 19 1976

dropping and will continue to do so and we're going to have more and more teachers unemployed; and its going to be a problem that we should face up to. Now, this bill has been en . . . endorsed by and supported by the Illinois Federation of Teachers, the I.E.A. and Mr. Stanley Johnson, who is President of AFL/CLO. I think its a good bill; and I, certainly, ask for your support."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. Yes, Mr. Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Shea: "Yes, sir, proceed."

Stone: "Ah . . . sir, I didn't explain my vote and I'm concerned about whether it will count or not since I didn't get an opportunity to explain it."

Speaker Shea: "It still counts if you just voted it."

Stone: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wish? On this question there are 69 'aye' votes, 33 'nay' votes, 21 votes 'present'. This bill having received . . . failed to receive the Constitutional majority is, hereby, declared lost. House Bill 622."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 622 . . ."

Speaker Shea: "Hold on for a minute, Mr. Clerk. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis for an announcement."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I'd like to present to you these young Americans who are in the north Gallery here from the Hefferon School with their teachers, Mrs. Grant, Mr. Lewis, Mrs. Richland, Mrs. Hossel. The 21st District, the school is located in the 21st District, Representative Jesse Madison, Langdon Patrick and Vince' Malloy. Will the class please stand?"

Speaker Shea: "Welcome to Springfield."

Davis: "Welcome to Springfield."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 622, an act in relation to rate of pay for state employees who are subject to Personnel Code. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."



MAY 13 1975

90.

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, House Bill 622 is to extend the prevailing rate concept to employees other than those who work for the Governor. As the law right now . . . it calls for a prevailing rate to be paid and the concepts of prevailing rate that we all understand so that we don't destroy the prevailing wage and undermine the prevailing wage of a community. The state now undertakes and pays this prevailing wage. In reviewing the laws the deficiency is that agencies outside of Directory Employment under the Governor do not have to do this. I might point out that the Secretary of State does pay prevailing wage, most state officers do pay prevailing rate, but there are agencies of government that have failed to do this, notably the Illinois Toll Highway Authority. It's about the only agency I know as of . . . as I stand here before you that does not pay the prevailing rate of pay for the building tradesmen of the community that this work is being performed in. This bill would bring them under the act and the concept of prevailing rate; and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 622 pass? Is there discussion? The gentleman from Dupage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. . . . Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield for a question?"

Hanahan: "Yes, I will."

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Hoffman: "Just to make sure I understand this correctly, . . . ah . . . what . . . what this bill does is says that if a state employee who works 40 hours a week . . . ah . . . 50 weeks a year or whatever it happens to be, would get the same wages as a carpenter who works for a private construction company who . . . who worked when the weather was . . . ah . . . was all right. In other words, it had no guarantee of 40 hours a week . . ."

Hanahan: "That is the law right now, sir."

Hoffman: ". . . ah that . . . that . . ."

Hanahan: "That is the law right now."

Hoffman: "Well, this bill then does what?"

Hanahan: "This just bring in those who are not covered by the act, and are generally getting paid this anyway , like the Secretary of State's



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 13 1975

91.

employees, the carpenters that work in your offices are not covered by the prevailing rate law. They are being paid the prevailing rate, but it would bring in under the law that opportunity to insure them that they will continue no matter who is Secretary of State, for example."

Hoffman: "I . . . I thought I heard you say something about the Toll Road Authority."

Hanahan: "The Toll Road Authority is the only agency of state government, now, we're talking about state employees, is the only agency of state government that I know that violates the intent of the prevailing wage law."

Hoffman: "All right, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, . . . ah . . . this is just an extension of . . . ah . . . of legislation that's already in the books, which seems to me to be very discriminatory against the person who . . . who gets the wages, who goes on the picket line if he needs to to get the . . . ah . . . carpenters wages up to \$9 or whatever they are; and here's somebody who gets on the payroll . . . ah . . . of the state and gets them with no effort at all. This seems to me to be unfair to the guy who has to go out and get the wages to begin with and it seems to me to be unfair to the . . . ah . . . taxpayers who have to . . . ah . . . have to pay it. This is an extension of a practice which . . . ah . . . which I generally think is bad and . . . ah . . . I find it difficult . . . find it impossible to support this bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer."

Palmer: "Yes, if the sponsor would yield for a question?"

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Palmer: "The . . . ah . . . front of the bill indicates that a fiscal note . . . the fiscal note act may be applicable. Is a fiscal note demanded?"

Hanahan: "Nobody requested it, sir."

Palmer: "Do you have any idea as to what additionally it'll cost the state?"

Hanahan: "Like I say, I don't . . . I've reviewed the prevailing rate



13 1500

practices in this state. I don't know of any state employee except a few that work for the Illinois Toll Highway that are not now presently receiving the prevailing rate. So for the few dollars the toll payers and not the taxpayers may have to . . . ah . . . you know, raise the . . . their wages up to the . . . I feel no state fiscal applicability here because all state agencies of the state outside of the Toll Road that I know are now paying the prevailing rate. That is the law."

Speaker Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. . . . er . . . from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Tuerk: "According to the information I have, this is going to effect several thousand employees. Now, what's your answer to that point?"

Hanahan: "I don't know where you got the information?"

Tuerk: "Well, I get the information the same place you 'gotted' your information, from the staff analysts."

Hanahan: "I'd check their . . . ah . . . history of their ability to analyze a bill of this nature. I'd question where this staff has brought up any type of assumption that this is going to effect thousands of employees."

Tuerk: "Well, then what's your answer, how many employees will this effect?"

Hanahan: "Like I stated earlier, I think it'll effect about 20 employees in the Illinois State Toll Highway Authority, that their wages would have to be increased if this was signed into law by the Governor; and they're not paid by the taxpayers, they're paid by the tollpayes. So I don't know of any taxpayer increase to . . . to follow this law. This is an extension, Representative Hoffman was alluding to an extension. The fact of the matter is right now all state agencies pay the prevailing rate. This will just insure that they continue to do it under law."

Tuerk: "What do those 20 people do on the Toll Road?"

Hanahan: "Carpenters, plumbers, electrician, painter."

Tuerk: "Only 30 . . . ah . . .?"

Hanahan: "I'd say there's about 20 that are working on prevailing rate. I don't know for a fact, I know there was at one time 20."



Tuerk: "Does this effect the Toll booth operates in any . . ."

Hanahan: "No, they're not prevailing rate employees. Once again we get down to what type of employees. We're talking about building craft trade unionists in the main. We're talking about electricians, and plumbers, and carpenters, and painters, and steam fitters. Those type of employees that are covered in the prevailing rate."

Tuerk: "Well, is . . . there has to be more than 20 people in all those categories you just mentioned."

Hanahan: "All those other employees are presently covered by law, that is the law. I'm not making a new one for them."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone, on a point of order."

Stone: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, it seems that this is an argument or a dialogue and is not permitted under the rules."

Speaker Shea: "Thank you, sir." Do you have any further debate, Mr. Tuerk?"

Tuerk: "No."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Hanahan to close."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I ask for a favorable Roll Call to extend the law to those employees that are not now covered by the prevailing rate law, but are enjoined with the concept and the philosophy of the prevailing rate so that it would be insured in the future to those employees."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 622 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 121 'aye' votes, 9 'nay' votes, 5 voting 'present'. House Bill 622 having received the constitutional majority is declared passed. Porter 'no'. Molloy 'aye'. Reed 'aye'. House Bill 623. McMaster 'aye' on the last bill; and Kempiners 'aye' on the last bill."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 623, . . . a bill for an act in relation to Police. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "Hanahan, 623 . . . the gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, House Bill 623 requires the overtime pay of time and a half times regular pay for State Police-



MAY 18 1977

men who are troopers, corporals or sergeants. House Amendment 1 permits State Police to receive compensatory time off at the rate of one and a half hours of overtime pay. Such compensatory time off shall be subject to rules and regulations of the Division of the Illinois State Police. House Amendment 2 deletes provision requiring overtime pay or compensatory time off for working a split shift. The troopers had requested that ability so they weren't sent in a court appearance in the morning, then sent home and then come back at a later time. That was in request of Representative Tuerk, and . . . ah . . . we agreed to that amendment. Representative Tuerk put that amendment on. The fact of the matter on time and a half for State Police is certainly in evidence right now that the United States Congress has passed into law the time and a half provisison for public employees. It's true that this act is now in before the Supreme Court in a hearing on whether it's applicable to municipal county and state employees. But in the meantime it seems quite unfair that people who we employ, such as state troopers or any other employee that they would not at least re . . . be given time and a half for their overtime pay in the year 1975. I doubt if you'd go back home anywhere in Illinois and say that you were against time and a half for overtime for any employee that the citizens would consider that a fair and just wage in Illinois in 1975. This bill was introduced at the request of the fraternal order of police. The state troopers deserve this time and a half for overtime; and I urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 623 pass? Is there discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer."

Palmer: "Ah . . . Mr. Hanahan, there's a fiscal note on this. Was . . . was one filed?"

Hanahan: "No request was made of one, sir."

Palmer: "Do you have any notion as to how much a taxpayer is going to be hit for on this one?"

Hanahan: "I doubt very much, sir, because this happens right now, and compensatory time off is not something new."

Palmer: "Does the state . . ."

Hanahan: "Might . . . might leave a few troopers off of the highway on 66



MAY 13 1975

95.

where we're coming to and from."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Hanahan, you'll have an opportunity to close."

Palmer: "Mr. Hanahan, do they . . . does the State Police now presently have a system of paying overtime?"

Hanahan: "Yes, they do."

Palmer: "At one and a half?"

Hanahan: "At one time."

Palmer: "Pardon?"

Hanahan: "At single time, time off, single time."

Palmer: "But it will cost the taxpayers some money, is that correct?"

Hanahan: "I doubt very much. They're not going to replace these people with other . . . there's only 1,600, so, and you know, they can't replace them with anyone else. They just probably will not be on duty while the Legislators are going to and from the General Assembly."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 623 pass? All in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Geo-Karis 'aye' from the aisle. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Luft 'aye'. Shea 'aye'. Holewinski 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. Farley 'aye'. On this question there are 137 'ayes', 8 'nays', 4 voting 'present'. House Bill 623 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 803."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 803, a bill for an act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the State Employees Retirement System. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Keller."

Keller: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, . . . ah . . . this . . . ah . . . House Bill 803 appropriates for the expenses of the State Employees Retirement System for the fiscal year beginning July 1st, 1975. I'd appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 803 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Ebbessen 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 144 'aye' votes, no 'nays', no 'present'. Stubblefield 'aye'. This bill having received the consti-



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



MAY 13 1975

96.

tutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 937."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 937, a bill for an act to amend the Public Utilities Revenue Act. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "Is there any discussion? Oh, turn Mr. Leon on, I'm sorry. I thought you talked about the bill already, Jack."

Leon: "No, no, it's not passed yet. I would like permission to have House Bill 937 and 938 heard together as they are companion bills."

Speaker Shea: "Gentleman has asked leave to have 938 heard with 937, is there objection? Hearing none, the bills will be heard together."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 938, a bill for an act to amend the Electric Supplier Act. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leon, on House Bills 937 and 938."

Leon: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 937 and 938 remove the imposition of an energy tax on service connected with the installation of appliances by public utilities. I believe it is a good bill; and I'd appreciate the support of the House."

Speaker Shea: "Is there any questions? The question is, shall House Bill 937 and 938 pass? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the speaker . . . er . . . sponsor yield?"

Leon: "Yes."

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "First of all, why the bill?"

Leon: "Ah . . . Because at the present time, the tax . . . ah . . . the statutes concerning the tax provide that services, that is the installation of . . . ah . . . power poles, appliances, receive the same treatment as energy. There is a tax on energy and that I am not attempting to molest. It is just the service charge, that service tax on installation of . . . ah . . . appliances and other pertinences necessary for the operation of a utility company."

Schlickman: "Well, you can't have the energy without the service to provide it; and I wonder why . . ."

Leon: "I'm sorry, you misunderstand, it's not the service, Gene, it is the, when I say service, I'm talking of the labor costs and say placing the . . . in operation an electric appliance that is bought



MAY 13 1975

97.

from the utility company."

Schlickman: "Well, what is the rationale for excluding services rendered in connection with the energy?"

Leon: "The simple reason is that this is the only commodity in the State of Illinois and with any taxes levied on labor for making an installation and . . . ah . . . and . . . ah . . . it unfair to hur . . . to tax a person for labor in connection with . . . ah . . . the providing of a . . . of a service."

Schlickman: "Well, we're not talking about taxing a person, we're talking about taxing a public utility, right?"

Leon: "Ah . . . The individual pays the tax."

Schlickman: "All right. What would be the cost to the . . . ah . . . state?"

Leon: "Ah . . . I haven't . . . ah . . . a fiscal note has not been requested. I believe it is a very small amount compared to the amount of tax that the energy sellers pay to the State of Illinois. I believe it's about 1 or 2 percent of the total amount that is collected as a result of the energy tax."

Schlickman: "Well, didn't you ask the Department of Revenue what the fiscal impact of this bill would be in the General . . . on the General Fund?"

Leon: "No, no."

Schlickman: "That doesn't concern you?"

Leon: "It . . . ah . . . didn't concern me because I believe the tax is unfair and . . . ah . . . being unfair, the Revenue Department would certainly say that this will increase their revenue, but I don't think that is the important question. The important question in this bill is whether or not it's a logical tax to impose when . . . as . . . considered as an energy tax. The placing in operation of an appliance is not for the sale of electricity."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, if I can address myself to this measure. It seems to me that before this body amends any tax to provide for an exemption that it should be incumbent upon the sponsor to find out what the fiscal impact is going to be. Ah . . . We meet here in the General Assembly, we pass a number of bills expanding the services of State Government . . . ah . . . improving the benefits



MAY 13 1975

98.

. . . ah . . . to the citizens and state employees . . . ah . . . increasing our costs of operation of government and then on the other hand, consider bills such as this, which will have a negative, adverse fiscal impact on the state; and . . . ah . . . I think it's incumbent . . . ah . . . for anyone to present a measure of this sort to give us a reasonable estimate of what the reduction in state income . . . ah . . . is going to be. Now, . . ."

Leon: "I . . . I have just received information from someone who seemingly knows. He told me that the total impact would be about \$34,000 a year."

Speaker Shea: "Did you have any further questions, Mr. Schlickman?"

Schlickman: "Well, just a comment that that \$34,000, if that's the amount, and I can only accept it, would probably be sufficient to take care of the prevailing wage bill that we just passed previously."

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

McPartlin: "Well, to answer his question, the . . . ah . . . it's 5 percent of gross and it would be approximately \$34,000, out of services."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Totten: "Do the receipts from this tax go into the . . . ah . . . utility fund that is used for the Illinois Commerce Commission?"

Leon: "I don't know."

Totten: "Can someone answer that question?"

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. McPartlin, to answer the question."

McPartlin: "Ah . . . That goes into the Department of Revenue."

Totten: "General Revenue?"

McPartlin: "Right."

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

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, J. M."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, . . . ah . . . the answer to Representative Totten's questions is the one I was asking as to what fund this comes out of; and I would remind everybody that we have appropriated additional funds from the General Revenue fund and we cannot afford at this time to take those funds and give this kind



MAY 13 1975

99.

of a tax reduction and I would suggest that we put this . . . ah . . . on Interim Study Calendar and let it be reviewed because we cannot afford this loss from the General Revenue Fund; and I ask for a 'no' vote on this."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Would the gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Matijevich: "Ah . . . Representative Leon, one of your sources there told you the loss to the revenue to the state was how much?"

Leon: "\$34,000."

Matijevich: "Well, my sources . . . a staff analyses, they tell me the total loss of revenue to the state would be \$2,000,000, now this is two bills, 937 and 938, would be \$2,089,823. I'm talking about these bills is what I'm talking about."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leon, to close."

Leon: "I . . . I believe these two bills are equitable, they are imposing a tax on services not connected with the supply of energy and I think that the public is not entitled to pay a tax for services in which no other commodity in the State of Illinois for services is taxed. I'll appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 937 and 938 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose vote 'nay'. Take two Roll Calls, Mr. Clerk. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. McPartlin, to explain his vote."

McPartlin: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I think what is kind of fouled up here is that what . . . ah . . . Representative Matijevich was talking about. He was talking about Common Wealth Edison and I.B.T., which they are not in this bill as far as services rendered. It is strictly the Illinois Power Company, downstate, is what this bill has to do with; and all it has to do with is \$34,000 from the Department of Revenue on 5 percent of gross on rendered services. That's all it has to do with; and I would appreciate some more green lights up there."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. Mr. Ewell votes 'aye'. Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On these questions . . . Geo-Karis



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 18 1935

votes 'aye' . . . on these questions there are 74 'aye' votes, 57 'nay' votes, 15 members voting 'present'. House Bills 937 and 938 having failed to receive the constitutional majority are, hereby, declared lost. House Bill 993. House Bill 993, Mr. Clerk."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 993, a bill for an act making appropriation to the Department of General Services. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. House Bill 993 appropriates \$9,305,400 to the Department of General Services for the payment of rentals to the Illinois Building Authority on behalf of the state agencies under the Governor. This bill will consolidate the Illinois Building Authority payment function for state agencies under the Governor into one agency the Depen . . . the Department of General Services; and I'd ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Shea: "Is there discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 993 pass? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the members ought to take a very careful look at this appropriation bill. Ah . . . What this does . . . ah . . . it . . . the approach that's being fostered in this measure hides the true cost of each executive agency. Ah . . . For example, . . . ah . . . the Department of Registration and Education will not have to . . . ah . . . have appropriated and pay \$402,000 for I.B.A. rentals like they have in the past. The total reduction is over \$9,000,000 that will come out of the Governor's Executive budget. In other words, what the Governor will be able to do this year is to hide an . . . an increase of \$9,000,000 in the Executive Agency by the passage of this bill, House Bill 993; and I would suggest that the members take a careful look at the procedure that is being employed in this bill; . . . ah . . . and I would recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Shea: "Further discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 993 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye' . . . the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor, with a question."

Taylor: "I wonder would the sponsor yield to a question, Mr. Chairman?"

Speaker Shea: "He will."

Taylor: "Ah . . . Representative Darrow, does your . . . does this . . ."



MAY 1 1951

ah . . . bill require to pay rent for the Governor's Action Office?"

Darrow: "I don't . . . I don't believe it directly does, Jim, . . . ah . . . possibly Emil Jones' bill will cover this if it gets through."

Taylor: "Possibly Emil Jones, but this bill does not, you're certain of that?"

Darrow: "There's no su . . . there's no agency under this, such as that."

Speaker Shea: "Hanahan's wrong again. The question is, shall House Bill 993 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Hanahan 'aye'. Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. Capuzi 'aye'. On this question there are 126 'aye' votes, 20 'nay' votes, 7 voting 'present'. House Bill 993 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 1080."

Fredric Selcke: "House Bill 1080, a bill for an act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Ah . . . Thank you, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1080, which was approved by the Insurance Committee, would require health and accident insurance companies and hospitalization insurance companies in the state to offer mental health insurance . . . ah . . . coverage to all groups and individuals . . . ah . . . who take hospitalization insurance. The individual or the group would not have to take the mental health insurance, but at least it would be a rate quoted to them. It also authorizes . . . ah . . . registered psychologists to be reimbursed . . . ah . . . as well as M.D.'s and psychiatrists, registered psychologists to be reimbursed for the aid received . . . ah . . . and given to the . . . ah . . . to the policyholder. That is now done under . . . ah . . . the insurance that covers Federal employees; and . . . ah . . . our state employment . . . ah . . . our State insurance does cover mental illness, but many private companies have not quoted this in the past; and I urge the . . . ah . . . passage of House Bill 1080."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 1080 pass? Is there discussion? The gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."



MAY 13 1975

102.

Leinenweber: "One question for the sponsor. Representative Pierce, is this to be additional coverage offered for additional premiums?"

Pierce: "Yes, whatever premium is quoted by the company. The bill does not in any way dictate the premium. Most of your companies do offer this now, but many do not. Ah . . ."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Pierce: ". . . Blue Cross does, for instance."

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

Terzich: "Yeah, Representative Pierce, . . . ah . . . most companies do offer mental health benefits, do they not?"

Pierce: "I understand that many do and . . . ah . . . many do not. Some of the bigger ones do."

Terzich: "What was the position from the insurance industry with regard to this bill?"

Pierce: "Ah . . . They had no opposition. In fact, they did not appear in Insurance Committee against. Ah . . . The only one who appeared was a doctor who didn't think the psychologists should be reimbursed for treating patients, maybe they don't charge enough for something, but the . . . ah . . . but the insurance industry in this was heard in Insurance Committee and their representatives are there in each and every hearing. I can assure you they in no way opposed the bill."

Leinenweber: "Well, do you . . . ah . . . think that the Legislature should dictate through the insurance industry what benefits they should offer to people and which they shouldn't?"

Pierce: "In the . . . some instances, yes. As long as we don't dictate . . . ah . . . that they have to sell it at an unprofitable or confiscatory rate. This bill has nothing to do with the rate. Ah . . . They can set their own rate, and then the group or the individual can determine, 'Well, that's beyond me, I can't afford to cover mental health, so I'll just get the . . . ah . . . less expensive policy'."

Terzich: "Doesn't the consumer dictate what type of benefits are offered by the insurance industry?"

Pierce: "Well, the insurance industry sometimes is not as consumer oriented as it might be; and in the past, we found that sometimes insurance



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 13 1932

companies are not the, especially hospitalization insurance companies, aren't always the most consumer minded of companies. Some of them . . . their profits sometimes come ahead . . . ah . . . of the interest of the consumer."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

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

Palmer: "If the sponsor would yield for a question?"

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Palmer: "Dan, I'm concerned about the use of the word 'registered psychologists'. Ah . . . Under the present law, what registered psychologists can diagnose and treat mental illness, clinical psychologists, I believe, can, but . . ."

Pierce: "Yes, the bill makes it clear . . . ah . . . the bill makes it clear that no psychologists can do anything for which he is not professionally . . . ah . . . qualified to do and licensed to do. I think . . . ah . . . your phrase clinical psychologists, although narrower than registered psychologists, has some . . . has some merit to it. Unfortunately, the Illinois . . . the State of Illinois does not license clinical psychologists, those we license are called registered psychologists. So I wouldn't debate that term with you. I'm not saying that you're wrong. That clinical psychologists might not be a better term to use than registered psychologists except for the fact, and I see you have the medical society man next to you there, except for the fact that . . . ah . . . we do register psychologists in this state. We do not license clinical psychologists as a separate . . . ah . . . as a separate skill."

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

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, very, very briefly I rise in support of this bill. Ah . . . I see the need is effecting mental patients who are in day hospitals. Ah . . . The trend seems to be to try to . . . ah . . . keep these patients out of over-night hospitals, but presently the insurance companies do not reimburse for day care; and I think that . . . ah . . . one way of keeping hospital costs down, is to reduce the demand for over-night care and . . . ah . . . for this reason, I think it's a good bill. The patients seem to





MAY 13 1975

104.

be better off if they can go back to their families and environments at night; and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Cook . . . er . . . from Lake, Mr. Pierce, to close."

Pierce: "Ah . . . Yes, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I ask for . . . ah . . . support of this bill. Although the Medical Society did have some questions about it, I understand now . . . ah . . . that they are going to . . . going to go along with it; and I certainly hope that we can . . . ah . . . support the bill on the floor, House Bill 1080, at this bill."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 1080 pass? All those in favor say . . . vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 134 'ayes', 6 'nays', 3 voting 'present'. House Bill 1080 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. House . . . House Bill 1147."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1147, Berman, a bill for an act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the bill."

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

Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House. Ah . . . House Bill 1147, I would point out, was amended so that it covers any Illinois insurance company, not just stock insurance companies, and it does for the insurance companies, substantially, as what we did for other corporations when we passed Representative Porter's bill, House Bill 134, several weeks ago. It allows for the indemnification of . . . ah . . . the Director's officers, employees and agents against expenses actually or reasonably incurred in connection with the defense or arising out of any civil or criminal action by reason of their association with the corporation. There are certain safeguards and guidelines built in as we . . . through . . . in order to . . . ah . . . trigger this indemnification and . . . ah . . . this bill was affirmatively voted out of the Insurance Committee by a vote of 15 to nothing. I'd appreciate your affirmative vote."

Speaker Shea: "Is there discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1147 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote



MAY 13 1919

105.

'nay'. On this question . . . take the Record, Mr. Clerk . . . on this question there are 136 'aye' votes, 5 'nay' votes, 4 voting 'present'. This bill having received . . . House Bill 1147 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 1320."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1320, Keller, a bill for an act making an appropriation to the Department of Conservation. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Keller."

Keller: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, . . . ah . . . this bill merely appropriates \$250,000 to the Department of Conservation for the state's share of land acquisition, planning and development of the conservation of the Louisville Reservoir in Clay County."

Speaker Shea: "Is there discussion? The question is, shall . . . the question is, shall House Bill 1320 pass? The gentleman from Dupage, Mr. Schneider, on a question. Do you have a little light there or do your students shout in class like that? You rap your knuckles."

Schneider: ". . . Mr. Chairperson. Ah . . . On the Louisville Reservoir . . . ah . . . I almost didn't get a chance to speak, I know the bill generally is . . . ah . . . greased to go. Just a few questions. Again, Charlie, is it your understanding that the Governor is opposed to this or is he now endorsing it?"

Keller: "I'm glad you asked that question, Glenn, because . . . ah . . . in the . . . in the past we have had some rather discussion, and last week in our Sunday's Herald and Reviews from Decatur the Governor come out wholeheartedly endorsing this program."

Schneider: "Then it's in the budget and we don't need the bill."

Keller: "Well, we . . . we need the funding of it there, though, so that we can get the money from the bud . . ."

Schneider: "It's going to be . . . it's going to be in his funding, if it's approved."

Keller: "No, well, he . . . he said that he is for this here."

Schneider: "So you need the press, right."

Keller: "We need it passed to make sure he's for it, put him on Record."

Schneider: "All right. Charlie and the Governor are both wrong. I suggest



MAY 13 1975

106.

a 'no' vote."

Keller: "And I'll . . . I'll show Jimmy Taylor that there's no . . ."

Speaker Shea: "You'll get a chance to close. The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow members of the House, I'd like to say a word, if I may, in favor of this bill. Ah . . . It's true that it is opposed by the gentleman named of Marlan, who Mr. Tipsword very well brought into account one day last year on another lake. But he, I want to tell this group, is against the creation of any lake whatsoever in the United States of America. He opposes our lake, he opposes this lake, but I think this is an excellent reason to support this bill."

Spekaer Shea: "The gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield to a couple of questions, please? Representative Keller, could you tell me, are you condemning the land . . . ah . . . around the reservoir . . . is it quick take?"

Keller: "No, it . . . it won't be quick take. The people there have been knowing that this project is coming because the Co. of Engineer has been working on it for the past, oh, eight or ten years."

McClain: "Is this with the approval of the land owners?"

Keller: "I would say that . . . ah . . . or as in any lake project, there's three or four probably in the area that are opposed to it, but the majority of them are for it."

McClain: "Ah . . . Is this the . . . ah . . . the situation where . . . ah . . . part of the land of the . . . ah . . . reservoir . . . ah . . . is owned by a family that's been in the family for years?"

Keller: "Well, I imagine that there would be such things in this. I don't know every one of the landowners, because this . . . this lake will cover some twenty miles from one end of it to the other. This is a lake project that on the size of Carlyle and in Shelbyville."

McClain: "I . . . I think I'm fully aware of and I think you know where I'm gettin' to . . . ah . . . I just think it's a bad bill, Charlie, I think it's really bad."

Keller: "Why? I . . . explain yourself."



MAY 13 1975

107.

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Keller, you can close. The gentleman or the lady from Champaign, Miss Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Representative Keller, can you explain to me, is this a reservoir that is now in existence or one that is in the planning stage?"

Keller: "No mam', this is not in existence now and it's been in the planning stage for the last eight to ten years; and most of the land here is really . . . ah . . . timber land and waste land, there is very little productive crop land that is being taken on this particular reservoir. It's unlike the Lincoln Reservoir where there is several hundreds of acres of valuable crop land being taken."

Satterthwaite: "Well, I realize that farther south we have a totally different terrain than we have in our area, and . . . ah . . . reservoirs are much more feasible there, but this is an Army Corp of Engineers Project?"

Keller: "It is an Army Corp of Engineer's Project, and one of the things that I have talked to the Army Corp of Engineer and they've been assured of that we will not have the soil erosion problems that they have had on some of the other lakes that they have built in the past."

Satterthwaite: "And there are Federal and State funds already available for the construction or what stage is that?"

Keller: "Well, the Federal funds were being held up until we had such confirmation from the Governor's office which he has sent communique' to Washington now . . . ah . . . in favor of this lake; and now we need some method of saying the Legislature is for it, too."

Satterthwaite: "Am I to understand then that these are the State funds that would go towards those matching Federal funds that would become available for the construction of the reservoir?"

Keller: "You're right."

Satterthwaite: "And it's really then for development of a conservation area around the reservoir?"

Keller: "Yes, it is, because the Federal government said that they would hold up the plans until the state approved their share of the conservation area."

Satterthwaite: "Thank you."



MAY 19 1975

108.

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

Schlickman: "Would the sponsor yield?"

Keller: "Go ahead."

Schlickman: "The bill provides that the sum of \$250,000 to be appropriated for the state's share of land acquisition, planning and development of the conservation area of the Louisville Reservoir. Ah . . . My first question is, what is the cost of planning?"

Keller: "Ah . . ."

Schlickman: "What is the total cost of planning?"

Keller: "Well, I can give you the total cost of the whole project when it will be completed, the lake and everything will be some where in the neighborhood of \$72,000,000."

Schlickman: "What is the total cost of planning?"

Keller: "And the state's share of this . . . well, Gene, I don't have the figures in front of me."

Schlickman: "Well, you don't know then. How was the state's share determined?"

Keller: "You're asking me something that I cannot answer right now. Ah . . . the state's share here totally in the end of the \$72,000,000 I interpret will be some where around \$2,500,000."

Schlickman: "Who determines the state's share?"

Keller: "I imagine the Federal Government did, because I got my information from the Corp."

Schlickman: "You mean the Federal Government is telling us what our share is?"

Keller: "Well, if we . . . if they . . . if we want the Federal money."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Wayne, Mr. O'Daniel."

O'Daniel: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak just a little bit on this project Ah . . . This is a \$48,000,000 Corp of Engineer Project. Ah . . . The . . . ah . . . Corp of Engineer will not participate in an . . . in . . . ah . . . recreation, but now the State of Illinois has agreed to go along with the \$2,000,000 recreation program, which would . . . ah . . . include campsites and . . . ah . . . boat launches and as such, and . . . ah . . . when this . . . when Representative Keller, and



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 1  
Cunningham and myself introduced this, the Governor had said the state would not participate in recreation. At the present time, now, they have changed their thinking on it and they say they will participate in this, and the recreation aspect of this lake will be \$2,000,000, 50 percent funded by the Federal Government, 50 percent funded by the State."

Speaker Shea: "Are there further discussion? The gentleman from Champaign Mr. Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House. I think this is a lot more than is being said it is by the sponsor. You know, we go back a few years in this House of Representatives and it used to be that when John Glue headed the Department of Water Resources, et al, in the State of Illinois, he was afraid to take these bills one at a time, so he put them in an omnibus water bill. He put about 35 projects in one bill, because he was sure he had 105 votes that way; and there was no way you could beat the bill because they log rolled one district against another. So this year we've got the bills one at a time, and I think it's time we take a good look at these bills. Now, it's fine to say that the Corp of Engineers has approved this bill and there's not going to be any problem. But, frankly, the Corp of Engineer would be better named the Corp of Beavers, because all they try and do in the State of Illinois is go around building dams; and it's unfortunate because there hasn't been a dam built yet that doesn't have unbelievable problems. What happens in this case very simply is that landowners below the dam will allegedly benefit from the dam if it does not flood, but you take the Shelbyville Reservoir, for example, which should have been one of the best in the State of Illinois, it had the fewest problems, it wasn't going to flood 40,000 acres of farmland like some of these others will do, and even at Shelbyville, the water has been so high in the last two years that it's been above the flood stage, that the Corp of Beavers predicted it would once in 100 years; and the simple fact of the matter is that the Corp of Engineers does not know what it's talking about most of the time. To justify these water projects they come up with what's known as a cost benefit ratio; and they try



and figure the cost as low as possible, and they figure the interest on the money at as low a rate as possible, sometimes as low as 3½ percent, and you tell me anybody that can borrow money at 3½ percent in the State of Illinois; and then to figure the benefit, they include water, water skiing, motor boating, fishing and they give all these a certain classification what they're worth. Well, who knows what they're worth, and the simple fact of the matter is that the sedimentation and erosion problems in these reservoirs are so bad that the only type of recreation that will actually ever occur there will be motor boating; and I frankly think it's more important that we preserve the natural floor and fawn in these areas that it is that we have one more place to motor boat in the State of Illinois. Now, I think some serious questions were as . . . were asked the sponsor of this bill which he was unable to answer. I don't mind giving a pork-bill project to any district of the state, but you know what really happens on this land with the eminent domain, a grunch . . . bunch of people have gone around this project for the last eight years knowing that the project was gonna' be located in the Louisville area, and what they've done is buy . . . bought up very, very poor farmland very, very cheaply, \$200-250 an acre. Then along comes the government and condemns it under eminent proceedings; and in those testimonies that come up these corporations, this is happening in every reservoir in the state, come up with fantastic appraisals, and so instead of getting \$200 or \$250 an acre for their land, these landowners and these blind corporations get \$1,500, \$1,800, \$2,000 an acre for their land. Then they take that money and they come back to a better part of the State of Illinois where the land is worth \$2,000 an acre, they buy the land there, and under the Federal tax laws, the Tax Free Exchange. Now, I see no reason for the State of Illinois to put a lot of money in reservoir projects to help fat cats find another tax loop-hole in this state. I think this is an ungodly situation, we've got the Corp of Engineer trying to set these up all over the State of Illinois. We have finally gotten rid of the concept of an omnibus water bill. Here is our chance to beat these down one at a time; and think this is a good place to start with House Bill 320; and I would



MAY 13 1975

111.

recommend a definite 'no' on this and all Corp of Engineer projects in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison. He said it all. Is there any further discussion? The gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I did not know what lake the gentleman from Champaign was talking about. But he certainly was not speaking about the Louisville Lake. It might have been the one at Charleston or the one over at Danville or the Decatur or some other lake, but he couldn't have been wronger with the facts if he'd tried to. Let me reply . . . let me reply it point by point. His statement to the speculators that bought up the land is simply not true. You can go down to the courthouse in Louisville and verify the inaccuracy of that statement. The idea that there is some evil conspiracy here by the Department of Engineers is so fantastic that it must be false. It's unworthy of the man to make the suggestion. The Department of Engineers have been nurturing the hopes and aspirations of the people in this neglected area for a dozen years on behalf of this well considered project. The proof of that is this, ladies and gentlemen, the Governor of the State of Illinois who has never been very hep on the idea of constructing lakes needlessly, is an enthusiastic endorser of this program and I hope that the gentleman from Naperville hears me when I make that particular statement. He was on television and radio the other day, he forgot to send the sponsor and me an invitation to appear with him on it, if it were so, it was lost in the mail. But be that as it may, we welcome the support of the Governor in this matter, and we say to you that friends and foe alike of this administration should unite in a vote of hope, of hope and goodwill, for the people of this section of this state. I am very proud of my colleague, Charles Keller, in this bill. It's in his finest hour; and I urge you . . . I urge you to stand as one, if there's a single red light up there on the board, it's cast in ignorance of the reality of the situation that's involved in this situation. It does . . . no, no, don't boo, it's . . . ah . . . what I'm telling is the truth, and the truth stings, but in this in-





MAY 13 1975

112.

stance, this project deserves your wholehearted support. On behalf of the taxpayers of the 54th District and all the people in the State of Illinois that have any hope in this matter, vote green."

Speaker Shea: "Are you through, Mr. Cunningham?"

Cunningham: "For now I am, Mr. Speaker, I'll call you back later on."

Speaker Shea: "The Clerk will . . . The Clerk . . ."

Cunningham: "I . . . appreciate your vote, too."

Speaker Shea: "The Clerk will make an original and six copies for your press releases. Mr. Keller to close."

Keller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House.

This is a vital bill to your sector of the state and especially for the industrial development of this area which has been . . . ah . . . inhabited because of the lack of water supply. We now have going up in the area a new power plant and also have an adequate facilities in our area; and we need water supply if we're going to attract jobs for our young people to stay at home; and . . . ah . . . I do hope that when the . . . the gentleman from Champaign got finished speaking a while ago when he . . . ah . . . becomes the Senator from Illinois that . . . ah . . . would vote for funds to send back to his home state here. I'd appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 1320 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'; and to explain his vote, the gentleman from Dekalb, Mr. Ebbessen."

Ebbessen: "Ah . . . Yes, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, very briefly, . . . ah . . . I . . . ah . . . think before we start appropriating more money for lakes or any development such as this or . . . ah . . . projects, we should start taking care of the areas that are natural lakes that are . . . that . . . ah . . . the State of Illinois and Department of Conservation should be spending what money they have available on those and in improving as opposed to projects such as this; and for that reason I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Shea: "Hart 'aye'."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker.?"

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Cunningham to explain his vote. Mr. Borchers, I'm sorry."



Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow members of the House, this thing . . . this matter is really dear to my heart, not because I'm there . . ."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Borchers, would you hold on for a minute? Mr. Stone on a point of order."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, I was reading the rules yesterday, and they state that if you've spoken on the main question, you are not allowed to explain your vote."

Unknown: "They haven't been . . ."

Speaker Shea: "I don't think . . . ah . . . and the . . . Mr. Cunningham talked, but I don't think Mr. Borchers talked on this one, did he?"

Borchers: "Well, this is explanation of vote. Do I . . ."

Speaker Shea: "I think that's on the proposed rules, isn't it, Mr. Stone?"

Borchers: "Well, you . . . don't disturb me."

Speaker Shea: "Have all . . . Mr. . . ."

Borchers: "Am I allowed to continue?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Borchers, please continue."

Borchers: "All right, I haven't even started. This, growing up in this area, I can understand their importance. I would like to refute in relation to what was said by Representative Hirschfeld in relation to flooding. Two years ago, we had a usual flood, I know that this is so because I'm a bottom-land owner, for over approximately six months the bottom land in all rivers of the State of Illinois in the central Illinois and southern Illinois that I know of to my knowledge were flooded. The year before that this was so. In the last five years, we have only been able to get two corn crops out of five years, because of the unusual flooding conditions. This cannot be held against it. One other point, in relation to ecology in this state, and I wish to God I had more time to talk about it, the only way we can return to the original ecology that we used to have over 150 years ago is by the creation of lakes. That . . . in relation to birds alone and water fowl, for the migratory fowl, this is the only way we can do it. I am telling you from knowledge and a . . . well, a lot of knowledge and information along these lines that the . . . the information put out in relation to the ecology by the environmentalists is incorrect . . ."



MAY 13 1975

114.

Speaker Shea: "Would you bring your remarks to a close, sir?"

Borchers: ". . . and I would suggest you vote for this project."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. The gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Would you record me as 'aye', Mr. Speaker, I's sorry I didn't . . ."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Simms is to be recorded as 'aye'. On this question there are 97 'aye' votes, 35 'no' votes, 14 'present' votes. Mr. Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "I respectfully request a verification."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Hirschfeld has requested a verification. Mr. Keller."

Keller: "Ah . . . Could I have the absentees polled, please?"

Speaker Shea: "You may, sir. Mr. Clerk, would you proceed to poll the absentees?"

Jack O'Brien: "E. M. Barnes. Brummet. Caldwell. Capparelli. Carroll. Collins. Cunningham. D'Ar . . ."

Speaker Shea: "Cunningham is absent. Mr. Cunningham having failed to read his speech, didn't vote 'aye'. Having read his speech, now votes 'aye'. Proceed . . . proceed, sir."

Jack O'Brien: "D'Arco. Duff."

Speaker Shea: "Duff 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "John Dunn. Epton."

Speaker Shea: "How is Mr. Sharp recorded, sir?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'present'."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Sharp wishes to go from 'present' to 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: ". . . ton . . . Ewing. Fleck. Friedrich. Emil Jones. Kempiners. LaFluer. Macdonald. Matijevich."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Matijevich, did you vote, sir? Mr. Matijevich wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "Merlo. Palmer. Porter. Sangmeister. Schisler. Schuneman. Simms."

Simms: "'aye'."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Simms wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "E. G. Steele."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Merlo wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Sorry, Mr. Clerk, proceed."



MAY 13 1975

115.

Jack O'Brien: "E. G. Steele. Terzich. Totten."

Speaker Shea: "Terzich wanted to be recorded as 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "Washington. Winchester. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Kempiners wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Mr. Clerk, would you tell me how many affirmative votes we're starting with on the verification?"

Jack O'Brien: "104 'ayes'."

Speaker Shea: "On this question there are 104 'ayes' to start with. Proceed to verify the affirmative Roll Call."

Jack O'Brien: "Anderson. Arnell. J. M. Barnes. Beaupre. Birchler. Borchers. Boyle. Brandt. Brinkmeier. Campbell. Capuzi. Catania. Choate."

Speaker Shea: "What about Berman? Can we get him to change?"

Jack O'Brien: "Coffey. Craig. Cunningham. Daniels. Darrow. Davis. Deavers. Deuster. DiPrima. Duff. Ralph Dunn. Dyer. Ewell. Farley. Fary. Fennessey. Gaines. Garmisa. Geo-Karis. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Hanahan. Hart. Hill. Dan Houlihan. Hudson. Huff. Jacobs. J. D. Jones. Kane. Keller. Kempiners. Kent. Kozubowski. Lauer. Laurino. Lechowicz. Kornowicz. Leon."

Speaker Shea: "Can I disturb you for a minute, sir? Mr. Brummet, do wish to be recognized?"

Brummet: "How am I voted, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Shea: "How is Mr. Brummet recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Brummet: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Brummet 'aye'. Mr. Schisler, do you wish to be re . . . Mr. Schisler?"

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

Speaker Shea: "How is Mr. Schisler recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Schisler: "Please, record me as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Shea: "He wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Mr. Calvo. Calvo 'aye'. Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "How am I voted, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Shea: "How is Mr. Winchester recorded?"



MAY 13 1975

116.

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Winchester: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker shea: "Mr. Winchester 'aye'. The gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll withdraw the verification."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman withdraws his request for verification.

McGrew 'aye'. On this question there 109 'ayes', 35 'nays', 14 voting 'present'. This bill having recieved the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce that the Chicago Cubs won 2 to 1 today."

Speaker Shea: "Speaker Redmond says he'll have World Series tickets on sale. On the order of Concurrences appears . . . you want to call that? House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 155. Mr. Hudson."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 155, a bill for an act to amend sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Dupage, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. House Bill 155 was introduced by Representative Juckett because of arbitrary actions on the part of governments subject to the Open Meetings Act in requiring newspaper reporters to cease tape recordings of public meetings; and I might add that this . . . ah . . . almost identical, well, this identical bill has passed out of these chambers on two different occasions and . . . ah . . . with unanimous support previously. The bill is an amendment to the Open Meetings Act and would establish by law the right of news media representatives to record public meetings by tape, film or other means. It would not apply to meetings of the General Assembly because it covers only those bodies already covered by the Open Meetings Act, which excludes the General Assembly. The bill would en . . . would promote accuracy in reporting because it would enhance a reporter's ability to reproduce accurately statements made and actions and votes taken. In instances of actual disruption by media representatives, the authority or council to maintain the quorum is protected. To be sure this authority is not abused, the bill requires the Board or council to prescribe reasonable rules in



MAY 18 1975

117.

advance. The bill also take into consideration existing state law regarding the rights of witnesses. In any instance, where the subsequent direct broadcast of a witness' testimony would entitle the witness to refuse to testify and where the witness is actually evoked the right to refuse on such ground, the board or council could require recording to cease for the period of the witness' testimony, consequently, witnesses could not duck testimony because of this bill. House Bill 155 would improve the public's right to know by helping the news media to report fully and accurately the activities of their governments. I would solicit an 'aye' vote . . . ah . . . my colleagues on this . . . ah . . . very good bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Grundy, the Assistant Minority Leader."

Washburn: "Thank you, . . . ah . . . Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentleman of the House, it's my pleasure to introduce this afternoon a distinguished group of gentleman from Kankakee, who are here to attend the Grid Iron Dinner tonight and watch Representative Ryan in action. The group is headed by Mayor Ryan and Commissioner Jack Grenelin, Dan Heckert, Pat Clary, Charlie Grapey, County Recorder, Berney Weiner and the Kankakee Journal Editor, Roy Baren, in the first row in the rear Gallery, fans of Representative Ryan."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, on House Bill 155."

Unknown: "Ah . . ."

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Hudson: "Yeah."

Mann: "Ray, do I understand this bill in its amended form . . . ah . . . to be permissive, that is, it merely grants . . . ah . . . the right to news media to record or are they required to?"

Hudson: "No, this is . . . ah . . . they're not required to, Bob, under this . . ."

Mann: "All . . ."

Hudson: "It simply . . . it simply permits . . . it permits them to tape and to film under reasonable conditions."

Mann: "Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 155 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 18 1973

118.

will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Kozubowski 'aye'. VanDuynes 'aye'. Leinenweber 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 152 'ayes', 2 'nays', no 'present' votes. House Bill 155 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. Laurino 'aye'. House Bill 442."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 42 . . . 442, a bill for an act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "On House Bill 442 . . . ah . . . Mr. Beatty, are you handling Mr. Lemke's bills or who's handling that bill, do you know? I know but we can't call on 'em here anymore. Mr. Madigan, are you handling this bill for Mr. Beatty, I mean for Mr. Lemke?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, House Bill 442 would amend a judge's retirement system article of the Pension Code and provide that benefits payable to a child of a judge shall not be terminated by reason of his attainment of age 18 if that child is dependant by reason of a physical or a mental disability, but that the benefits shall be paid as long as the dependancy continues. This bill would bring the judges retirement system into conformance with the Fireman's Pension System in Chicago, which also provides in the case of a retarded child, the child shall continue to receive the benefits after attaining the age of 18. I ask a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 442 pass? The gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Hirschfeld. Mr. Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Would the sponsor yield?"

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Hirschfeld: "I presume that this . . . ah . . . the Retirement System is uniform both upstate and downstate on this if this bill passes, is that correct?"

Madigan: "I presume that it is, but I . . . I couldn't answer that positively."

Hirschfeld: "And do the downstate firemen and policemen have this same privilege that the ones in the County of Cook have?"

Madigan: "I really don't think that they do. I believe that . . . ah . . ."



the only system that has this provision now for the retarded and the handicapped is the Chicago firemen."

Hirschfeld: "Well, . . . ah . . . Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I . . . I certainly favor the concept of the bill, but it seems to me inappropriate that once again the County of Cook makes out like a bandit and downstate is left holding the bag; and I . . . I think if we're going to do this for those in one part of the state, we should do it for all the state, and, therefore, I will not vote 'no' and I would be required to vote 'present'; and I'm hoping somebody will come in with a bill next year that will accomplish the same thing for those us that are downstate. There are two parts of the state, although it's sometimes ignored."

Madigan: ". . . strongly . . . Mr. Speaker . . ."

Spekaer Shea: "Yes, Mr. Madi . . ."

Madigan: "I don't know where Mr. Hirschfeld gets his information. I'm examining the bill and I don't see any special provisions for anyone. The bill attempts to help retarded children to provide that they be carried under the benefits of their father's pension system if their father happens to be a judge. There's no special provision for downstate or upstate."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Well, I just took the sponsor's word for it. I asked him if this was . . . he said this was the same as the Chicago and . . . ah . . . Police and Firemen's Pension; and so I was, therefore, in favor of the bill; and I asked him if that also was the same thing for the downstate firemen and policemen."

Speaker Shea: "This isn't the Firemen's Pension, I think is what he's saying, it's the Judicial Pension."

Hirschfeld: "I realize that, but I think that it's un . . . inappropriate that we have one thing upstate and a different one down, that's my only point."

Speaker Shea: "The gent . . . the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Ah . . . Will the gentleman yield to a question? Ah . . . What is the position of the Pension Laws Commission with regard to House Bill 442?"





Madigan: "The Pension Laws Commission has disapproved the . . . ah . . . the bill."

Katz: "Well, I would like to speak on . . . on the subject. The General Assembly . . . ah . . . has created a Pension Laws Commission. We fund it. It includes some very distinguished members of the House. We have constitutional provisions that really obligate the state to . . . ah . . . pay pensions regardless what happens. Once benefits are granted, they cannot be changed and the experience is that once a benefit is given, you just can't give it to one pension fund, as the gentleman from Champaign sort of suggested leap frogs from one to the other. If we're going to have a Pension Laws Commission, which we do have and I think it's very important that we do, I think it really behooves us to follow the advice of the Pension Laws Commission. This is their specialty. It is a creature of the Legislature. We fund it. We make the appointments on it, and we're going to be having a lot of these bills that are going to be coming up and I think that we ought to stick behind our Pension Laws Commission and maintain the solvency of the State of Illinois and vote 'no' on bills that they have disapproved as this one."

Speaker Shea: "The . . . the gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I'm reliably informed that the Pension Committee is just mildly in the opposition of this bill. It's a very fine bill. It's a humanitarian bill. It doesn't effect more than a half a dozen judges throughout this state; and what I may have said on other times and places, notwithstanding, we have some very fine members of the Judiciary in the State of Illinois; and to me it's wrong . . . ah . . . a terrible wrong that we should permit them to go on serving for years with the anxiety of a handicap child in their home, and not know that that child was going to be taken care of, when they were no longer here to do that; and that's all this bill does. The cost to the citizenry is just very small, minimal. I salute the gentleman from Champaign County in his concern that the County of Cook will swallow us all up, but as another downstater, I say to him and I say to each of you, this is as fair a bill as we've ever had or seen in this particular House."



It enjoys the confidence of all that have studied it. It deserves the 'aye' vote of all of us, whether we be from Cook County or downstate; and I urge you to vote green in the name of humanity and mercy in this matter."

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

Terzich: "Ah . . . Yes, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I happen to have sat on the Pension Laws Commission and did discuss this problem. Now, the Chicago Fire Department has had this . . . ah . . . provision on the books for about four or five years, and it has not caused any ill effects . . . ah . . . with regard to their pension system as well as, I believe, the Federal Government has the same provision under their program. Now, it's my understanding that this only effect maybe one or two people; and it's simply the . . . ah . . . handicapped children, and they have . . . ah . . . made provisions that they will fund this if necessary to support it, but . . . ah . . . there's no effect on their pension fund by adding on this particular provision; and I'm going to vote 'aye' on it."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "That you, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. If I may address the bill just a moment. To me it seems . . . ah . . . now an anachronism that . . . ah . . . the Judiciary should have been selected out for this particular thing. I can understand those who lay their lives on the line, and the firemen and the policemen being in that stance, and I can understand how that bill passed over the years, but . . . ah . . . the Judiciary is about the least threatened establishment in the State of Illinois, and probably have the most dependable income and the longest tenure of anyone alive in the State of Illinois and that is not to take away their tragedy if they have . . . ah . . . a child such as this in their family. But I wonder who's speaking for all of those other unknown people that would desire such a thing, but don't have the clout; and to me . . . ah . . . we got the thing wrong side too. I think the judges in their turn, fine; but I think the forgotten people are truly being forgotten; and. I would recommend a 'no' vote."

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



MAY 13 1975

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen, the essence of . . . the essence of fairness is justice for everybody. I think we do have to address this bill in context. We have been the fairest people with the Judiciary, and this is as it ought to be. But I do not believe we ought to single out the Judiciary, help them with the special problems engaged in their pension program unless we're gonna' do it for everybody throughout the state. I say to you it's heartbreaking when we look at any child who happens to be dependant; and I have no objections to voting for this bill for the Judiciary, but I point out to you that either we must vote for all the children of the state who are thus handicapped, give them all the same equity and the same right to exist in life as we are giving the children of the Judiciary. If we are not willing to take this step then I would ask that you have to either vote 'present' or 'no' on this bill, but if you are willing, then you may feel free to follow your conscience and vote for the children of the Judiciary. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Perry, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address the bill briefly, I'd like to say that I think this is a good bill. I think it should be extended to all of the systems at some future time, but the one before us presently is the one that would amend or change the Judges Retirement System; and if you have a handicapped child or a mentally retarded child, you know that a chronological age is not important. Many people . . . ah . . . many children who reach age 18 still have the mentality or the capabilities of a two-year old or less or something along that; and I think this is a bill of compassion. I think it's one that should be followed by the other branches of the Retirement System, Pensions System; and I, for one, am going to vote and urge all my friends to vote for this one for the judges children who have attained . . . attained the age 18 and keep them on the . . . on the system; and then I'm going to also vote for the other systems as they come up. I'd solicit an 'aye' vote for this for a judge friend of mine. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Madigan to close."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, regretfully there's been much discussion recently,



MAY 13 1975

123.

which is not directly related to this bill. This bill does not attempt to amend the Firemen's Code anywhere in the state, nor the Policemen's Code. It attempts to amend the . . . ah . . . Judge's Retirement System and provide that a retarded child will continue to receive the benefits provided under the Pension System after attaining the age of 18. I request a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Shea: "All those in favor will . . . the question is, shall House Bill 442 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Mr. VanDuyne, do you wish to explain your vote?"

VanDuyne: "Mr. Speaker, yes, I would. I'm gonna' . . . I'm voting 'aye' for the children, but if I thought by voting red that I could change some of the attitudes of our judges in this state . . . ah . . . to make them act a little more responsibly . . . ah . . . statutorily and morally, I not only would vote red but I'd vote to fire every one of them and start over."

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

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of this House, I'm voting 'aye' on this measure, but I'm also gonna' amend the State Employee's Retirement and our own retirement to provide the same type of measure."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and members of the House, as you see, I'm voting 'present' on this measure. I'm not opposed to it, but being very close to a family who resides next door to me that has a brain-damaged, mentally retarded child and had to have seen that child grow up, he's a . . . in a teenage stage now, I just wonder what . . . what would they feel like seeing special legislation going through like this where people can better afford to take care of those kind of children; and for that reason I am voting 'present'."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wish? I'm sorry, Mr. Barnes. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. Tuerk 'aye'. On this question there are 113 'ayes', 20 'nays', 21 voting 'present'. House Bill 442 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby,



declared passed. House Bill 533."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 533, McPartlin, a bill for an act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, House Bill 533 amends the Chicago Policeman's Annuity and Benefit Fund article of the Illinois Pension Code. It provides that the annuities for the children of deceased policemen be based on the current salary rate rather than the salary rate in effect at the time of the policeman's death. It also provides that the children's annuities for children of deceased policeman who become mentally or physically disabled before attaining age 18 are not to be terminated by reason of age; and I would appreciate your support on this measure."

Speaker Shea: "Is there any question? The gentleman from C . . . McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, would the sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Skinner: "Is this very similar to the judge's bill that we just passed?"

McPartlin: "It is the same, in effect, yes."

Skinner: "Here goes the dike."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Dupage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Bob, two questions, one is . . . ah . . . is there an additional . . . ah . . . cause factor allowed for by the policemen, do they contribute more? And the second question I have is that the language is completely a language I'm unfamiliar with, it says it relates to first-class patrolman, now, I'm not so sure what that means, now, is . . . are there first-, second-, third- and fourth-class partolman?"

McPartlin: "Well, there's first-class patrolman and there's sergeant and on up the line."

Schneider: "Now, is there anything below first-class?"

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman will yield to Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Yes, there's policemen who first start out. There's probationary policemen, it takes five years to work yourself up to a first-class patrolman."



MAY 13 1975

125.

Schneider: "All right, so he becomes eligible for a pension . . . ah . . . if he's a beginning patrolman . . . ah . . . he becomes eligible, according to the synopsis, for the same benefits as a first-class patrolman. Do you see what I mean, it's . . . he's receiving entitlement for . . . ah . . . the experience of a first-class patrolman without his having attained that status, according to the synopsis, 'shall be based on the correct salary rate for the first-class patrolman, rather than the salary rate in effect at the time of the policeman's . . . ah . . . death'. So he could have died for any number of causes including in the line of duty, I'm sure, but he would not have been contributing to the pension at a first-class patrolman's rate and still receive the benefits. Do you understand it that way?"

McPartlin: "Well, Glenn, regardless of that, it's the children that's going to receive the benefits. I mean, this is what we're aiming at. We're aiming at the children in this bill in order to take care of the ones that are physically handicapped."

Schneider: "I understand that and like the speakers on the previous bill, I have no problem with that except for a couple of things, one is the contributions that help keep the Pension System solvent and avoid us getting into the hassle of claiming that there's no public equivalent contribution or . . . ah . . . a participant's contribution, that's where the problem is. That is whether there's not equivalent participation. I can support the bill, but if there's not enough money to fund it, then we're into that same problem we're facing with teachers and others."

McPartlin: "There is enough money to fund it. I believe that they're funded at about 35 percent, which is a pretty good funding; and also if they . . . after the age of 18, where would these children go, they'll probably end up on the public aid roll. We're here to try to do it within their own confines."

Schneider: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Would the sponsor yield to a couple of questions? Under the previous bill by Representative Madigan that we just passed out, . . . ah . . . a question was raised is this . . . this particular bill, 533,



similar? Well, looking at the Digest, Mr. Speaker, I think the sponsor may have inadvertently given us a mis . . . false impression, because as I understand that bill, it had nothing to do with the salary schedule. 533 has to do with salary schedules as well. It says, in effect, that it'll be based on the salary currently paid patrolmen and not on the salaries paid when the policeman died. So there is a great deal of difference in this bill than the previous one. Now, I don't object to taking care of these deficient children, in fact, I think it's well and good, but there is a difference. We're talking about two pay scales . . . ah . . . the policeman when he died and the present scale; and again I . . . I would take in the same position I took on the other one, even in view of that fact that maybe we ought to vote 'present' on all of these bills, send them back to committee and treat everyone alike and not let's take care of judges and the Chicago Policemen, let's take care of downstate teachers, let's take care of state employees, let's take care of university . . . ah . . . personnel as well. Let's take care of all these at the same time, and not treat some of them unfairly. I will . . . gonna' vote 'present'."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker; and Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Dunn: "Should this bill pass and become law, will there then be a disparity in benefits between . . . ah . . . policemen on the Chicago Police Force and policemen on . . . ah . . . other police forces throughout the State of Illinois?"

McPartlin: "No, I don't believe so. What this does, the first portion of this bill has, more or less, to do with the orphan children of the policemen. The second part of the bill has to do with the physically disabled. As far as the rest of the state, I'm sure. I don't know how it would effect that."

Dunn: "Representative . . . that's not my question. As I understand the synopsis, the . . . ah . . . bill effects only the Chicago . . . Chicago Policemen's Annuity and Benefit Fund; and I wonder if there either are similar benefits in existence now downstate or if there is



MAY 13 1975

127.

legislation presently pending before this House that will . . . ah . . . match the benefits proposed for the Chicago police force. It looks to me like . . . ah . . . a police officer who finds himself in the predicament covered by this proposed legislation needs benefits every bit as much as a policeman from the City of Chicago."

McPartlin: "Well, I think that was brought before where Representative Tuerk where he said the only other one that was in being was the Chicago firemen and Representative Hirschfeld said that it should be done downstate and somebody should get a bill to that effect, which I firmly believe; and there was other statements on the floor that should be done all over; and I'm in the perfect agreement with this."

Dunn: "Would the sponsor then consider taking this bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of an amendment to include all police officers in the State of Illinois?"

McPartlin: "Well, I'm working strictly . . . it amends the Chicago Policeman's Annuity and Benefit Fund, and that's the one that I'm working with at the present time."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. . . ."

McPartlin: "You'd have to put in another bill in order to do this . . . what you want to do."

Dunn: "If I do, will you support mine?"

McPartlin: "Positively."

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

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the sponsor a question. Mr. Sponsor, could you tell me what is the present rate of funding of the Chicago Policeman's Pension Fund, approximately?"

McPartlin: "I took a guess at about 35 percent funding. Now, maybe Representative Terzich, who is on the Pension Laws, could . . . ah . . . answer that."

Speaker Shea: "Well, over to Terzich. Mr. Terzich, would you turn him on, please?"

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, with regard to other pension benefits, there have been approximately 200 bills that have been submitted with regard to revisions in their pension programs, and we will be coming up with all of these. Now, with regard to this particular bill, this





MAY 13 1975

128.

particular provision was approved by the Pension Laws Commission that the pro . . . the plan to fund this particular provision for the . . . ah . . . current rate of salary was to come out of the excess earnings and there was not to be any increase in the tax levy for this particular benefit, that you cannot just go . . ."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Terzich, they just wanted to find out how much . . . what was the fund, what is the Policeman's Fund?"

Terzich: "It's approximately 35 percent funded . . ."

Speaker Shea: "That's all, well, back to Mr. McCourt again then."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to the bill a moment. I have the latest report issued by the Illinois Public Employees Pension Laws Commission and they show that of the 17 state pensions in Illinois that this pension is number 2 from the bottom. It is only funded at a rate of 25.4 percent. It already has unfunded a crude liability of \$486,565,000+. Now, what you're doing here, you're trying to take care of some . . . some kids that have physical and mental disabilities, but you're doing it at the . . . by sacrificing the benefits and the people that are trying to get benefits that . . . that will not be able to get benefits if you keep adding on these new frills to these pension systems. Now, until these pensions systems are brought up to a proper rate funding, I think you are doing all the participants in the pension systems a great disservice; and I also have here from the Illinois Employees Laws Commission their report that they gave us when I . . . when we sat in the committee hearing this bill, and they say quotas of the recommendation of the Pension Law Commission be in that the entire bill should be disapproved; and I solicit you for the benefit of the people that are depending on having a proper pension when they are ready for a retirement to think twice in what you're doing here. The people that are going to be covered by this particular benefit are already covered by both Federal and State programs, and there is no sense in taking this out of the Pension System; and I solicit your 'no' vote."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. McPartlin, to close. Did you want recognition, Mr. Schlickman?"

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I can explain my vote very shortly."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Shea: "All right, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. McPartlin, to close."

McPartlin: "Now, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, this is a good bill. I wi . . . I just wish that the . . . ah . . . General Assembly Fund, the Pension Fund had it, because I had three disabled children; and, therefore, I respectfully vote your . . . would ask for your support."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 533 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Might I remind the young lady in the Gallery that there is no pictures in the House of Representatives. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Schlickman to explain his vote. I'm sorry, sir."

Schlickman: "That's all right, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I'm voting 'present' . . . ah . . . because I find three defects in this bill. Number 1, it applies only to the City of Chicago. It is not state-wide in application as the previous bill, House Bill 442. Number 2, it changed the basis for the annuity; and it changes the basis from the current salary rate for first-class . . . ah . . . to current salary first-class policeman, rather than the salary rate in effect at the time of the policeman's death. Number 3, . . . ah . . . is in the fact that there is not within the bill a def . . . definition of what constitute . . . ah . . . constitutes disability as was contained in House Bill 442; and I would hope that if this bill does pass . . . ah . . . this House, if the sponsor of it will secure appropriate amendments in the Senate."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this ques . . . on this question there are 116 'aye' votes, 16 'no' votes, 21 voting 'present'. House Bill 533 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 574, Mr. Washington."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 574 . . ."

Speaker Shea: "At the sponsor's request, 574 comes out of the Record. House Bill 619, Mr. Ewell."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 619, a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Ewell on House Bill 619. Did you just want a Roll Call,



MAY 19 1975

Mr. Ewell?"

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I should be delighted to have just simply a Roll Call, however, I would like to point out to the members of the body who are not totally aware that this bill is in effect a total hand-gun ban. Ah . . . It talks about the deletion of age limitation, however, I should just simply like to point out to the members that what we did in the bill was simply strike five words, 'under the age of 18 . . . er . . . under 18 years of age'. This, in effect, would make it unlawful for any person to give or to sell or give any firearm of a size which may be concealed about the person. That's a hand gun. It does nothing else to the present law other than completely ban the hand gun from either sale or possession; and I would not like anyone to be deceived by the annotations . . . very briefly, I am not a newcomer to hand gun control bill. In 1971, I came in with House Bill 1313, which was an effort to ban the hand gun and I . . ."

Speaker Shea; "Mr. Ewell, Mr. McClain, have you a question?"

McClain: "It was just a question. I just wanted to . . ."

Speaker Shea: "I thought that you were raising a point of order . . ."

McClain: "Heaven's no."

Speaker Shea: "I thought since you got a law degree, you'd make that one like the rest of us lawyers."

McClain: "I wouldn't wrestle with you, sir."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Ewell, continue, please."

Ewell: "I'm not a newcomer to hand gun legislation. I have advocated it since 1971. I should like to point out that this is an attempt to wrestle with the fundamental policy question that must be wrestled with within these states. I suggest to you that this solution is indeed a long-range solution. We would expect no miracles because this bill was enacted today, but in the long run it would prove beneficial to the people of the State of Illinois. I should like to take just very briefly the primary argument against the hand-gun bill. People point out that we need our hand gun, but I suggest to you that we already ban concealed weapons, we ban the possessions of automatic firing weapons, and we also ban shot guns that are less than 18 inches in length. I suggest to you as the fundamental policy question that the



people are better served by a banning of the hand gun. In the first instance, what happens to hand guns. I should like to point out that over a half a million hand guns are stolen from owners and places of business and enter the illegal traffic in hand guns. I should like to point out that people cry that we want guns for protection. But what happens to guns that are in the home? First of all, we have crimes of passion, crimes of passion between husband and wife; and it has been pointed out that three out of four murders are either domestic or where the parties know each other and committed with hand guns. So, therefore, an argument between husband and wife can escalate into violence leaving one or the other dead. The same is true as between neighbors and people that we know. Minor quarrels take disproportionate under the pressure of tempers and what happens? A person ends up slain. Again, what happens to the hand guns that we possess within the home? I should like to point out that there over 3,000 deaths as a result of hand guns within the home, and one fourth of these happen to be children. We have to pick up the paper every day to find out that some little child has shot a brother or sister or a neighboring kid with one of the hand guns that's around our homes for 'protection'. Also you have to add to it the number of suicides that are done with hand guns. Now, I cannot suggest that people would not commit suicide, but I will point out there's time to pump a stomach where there is no time to retrieve a bullet from within the brain. Next, people say that I want to defend myself against armed aggressors, but how much of a chance do you have against an armed aggressor when he knows he's going to assault you and you don't. The gun will give you an artificial sense of security, and send you into an alley that you don't belong in. I suggest to you that statistics indicate that people who are unarmed fair better against armed aggressors than people who are armed. I should like to point out that 75 percent of the murders that take place within this country or of all the murders that take place in this country, 75 percent of the people who commit them have never been in trouble with the law before. I suggest to you that the banning of a hand gun is the policy question. I ask that this body ban not just the hand gun or what we call the



Saturday Night Special, the hand gun that's available to the poor, but let's ban all of the hand guns and the hand guns which contribute to . . . ah . . . to an exorbitant death rate in this country, and as a fundamental issue, we must answer this. I feel that there is no place for anyone to sit on the aisle or sit on the fence. Either you're for hand gun control or you're against it; and at this time, I should be delighted to turn the argument over to any other members of the body or answer any questions."

Speaker Shea: "Is there any questions? The question is, shall House Bill 619 pass? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the bill? I have eight points of opposition to House Bill 619. It has been generally agreed by all knowledgeable that any gun control measures must be on a national rather than a local or state level to be at all effective. This is even part of the Democratic platform. This is a bill with a local restriction. Point two, House Bill 619 is contrary to the Federal Licensing and Interstate Commerce Regulations of legitimate gun dealers in Illinois. The Federal Government in its present interstate control of guns demands and permits Federal licensing of dealers. Point three, present legitimate gun collectors and owners have millions and millions of dollars invested in such private ownership and gun collections in Illinois. The value of such collections is based on a potential market established by such legitimate collectors. House Bill 619 would prevent sale from one collector to another. Thereby, eliminating the market and reducing the value of these tremendous investments to zero. Point four, banning legitimate sales on any local level will most assuredly increase gun thefts from private citizens and increase illegal interstate transfer and theft of weapons without reducing, I repeat, without reducing the criminal's ability to obtain such weapons. Point five, while the problem of conceivable firearms is accepted as one principally in large urban areas, House Bill 619 would oppose its restrictions of every town, village, hamlet, farm, and person in Illinois. Point six, if the honest people in Illinois about whom we are not concerned honor this legislation, the criminal will get his gun in Indiana, Wisconsin, Ken-



MAY 13 1975

133.

tucky, Iowa and Missouri. Point seven, House Bill 619 is . . . can amount to confiscation. Page 3, line 10 through 16 say, 'a person commits the offense of unlawful possession of firearms or firearm ammunition when he has in his possession any firearm of a size which may be concealed upon his person'. This would mean that several million constituents of ours who may own such weapons would be subject to up to one year in jail for such ownership the minute this bill became law. To compound the problem according to page 1, lines 8 to 14, these constituents would not be able to sell or give away their firearms without incurring a similar . . . similar penalty of one year in jail. I presume we're supposed to eat them. In close, may I say, despite the honorable intentions of the sponsor and my good friend, I submit that we, the General Assembly of Illinois, await the action of the Federal Congress in this matter and defeat this bill most soundly."

Speaker Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The lady . . . the lady from Lake, Miss Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you, honorable Speaker. Ah . . . Ladies and gentlemen of this House, I would like to ask the sponsor a question if he would yield?"

Speaker Shea: "He'd be happy to."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Sponsor, you were telling us in effect then if your bill is passed that not even a law-abiding citizen can have a hand gun, is that correct?"

Ewell: "Exactly."

Geo-Karis: "And, Mr. Sponsor, you are aware of the Supreme Court case, U.S. versus Haines, that was decided on January 29, 1968, which simply stated that Haines, the defendant, had the right to refuse to register a sawed-off shotgun because after all he was ex-felon and if he had registered his shotgun, his record would be known and he'd be infringing upon his constitutional rights, did you know that case too, do you not?"

Ewell: "I am totally familiar with that case; and I agree with . . ."

Geo-Karis: "Fine, then I'd like to speak on the bill."

Ewell: "What's the question?"

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Chairman, you answered my question, I mean, Mr. Speaker,



and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I am not prone to violence, honest, I'm not, but if this bill passes what we will be doing, in effect, is saying, John Q. Public, the honest, law-abiding citizen, does not have a right to protect himself with a hand gun in his home or in his business or anywhere else; and if this bill passes, then just think about the registration laws. What . . . the Supreme Court decision which says that the convicted felon doesn't have to register his sawed-off shotgun, but the honorable law-abiding citizen does, so what do you have? You have an anomaly of law. The second amendment to the United State Constitution."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from . . ."

Geo-Karis: "I'm not through, sir . . ."

Speaker Shea: "I'm sorry."

Geo-Karis: ". . . It says that 'a well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right to the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed'. I submit that if we pass this bill, we are allowing the fellows to run loose with their guns, because they're going to get them anyway, and the law-abiding citizens cannot protect themselves; and, therefore, I speak against the bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman . . . the gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ray, just one quick question. Is there a home-rule amendment on this bill? Pardon me, I'm sorry."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. McClain . . ."

McClain: "Mr. Ewell, is there a home-rule amendment on this bill?"

Ewell: "No, we believe that the law must be equal throughout all parts of the state and applied to all citizens equally."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, in all charity, this bill is an abomination, it's an excrescence on the face of . . . of legal jurisprudence and it's proven that . . . it's been introduced by this distinguished sponsor again and again and last year when he introduced it the Judiciary Committee, the legal purest, who now head that committee, voted against the bill. This year . . . this year he saw a chance for a bill to slip out that might slip through that would do a great deal of harm to the rights of the citizenry



JUNE 18 1975

135.

throughout the state, and it was permitted to do so; and the reason I say that the bill is so bad that it should make all of the legal purest in this House ill is, if you'll look at the bill, it has . . . there are seven or eight subsections. They're 24.3, Subsections A through I, and they have various categories of people to whom you cannot sell or give a concealable firearm; and, yet, all that the sponsor does with this bill is is just change the first category so it's all inclusive. If you left the bill in the form that you have it before now, when you read the law, you'll find first everybody, except those that come within the exceptions of the two prior sections, is forbidden to have, give, sell a gun; and then you find after that in the Subsection B through I, that if you're mentally deranged, you can't have a gun, if you're mentally deficient, you can't have a gun, if you've created a misdemeanor while you're under 21 years of age, you can't have a gun, if you're a convicted felon, you can't have a gun; and if you've violated certain Federal rules, you can't have a gun. Now, I say to you, lawyers and non-lawyers alike, that that is such demonstrable nonsense that there is a serious danger if this bill were passed in the form that it is that it would create such a shambles of the law as would then be on the books that the danger is that the Supreme Court would say that the statute was totally unintelligible. We must protect our reputations for the quality of our work against voting for a bill that is so demonstrably defective in the particular that I've pointed out. Leaving aside all question of the merits of the bill, there is no lawyer in this crowd that can vote for this bill for the reason of that particular defect, but I do want to address the merits just for a moment lest we be described by the press as being a 'yeah-who or a know-nothing'. The most intelligent comment that was made before the committee was the general council for one of the gun manufacturers and amunition and he pointed out . . ."

Speaker Shea: "Would you bring your remarks to a close?"

Cunningham: ". . . I've just started, Speaker, he pointed out that Cain slew Abel without any help from Colonel Colt, and he pointed out to that society needs to address the problem by trying to change the minds and hearts of the people. We need to be beaten on the head



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



of the man rather than trying to unilaterally disarm him. The wide eyed, starly realists who appeared before our committee, they spoke about the brotherhood of man and the fellow of the love, but they didn't go so far as to advocate putting signs on their door, 'this home is not protected by guns', don't believe for a moment that old song about a man's best friend is his dog, it may well be for frightened people who live on the rim of the volcano that the 38. caliber snub nose is the best friend he'll ever have to protect them and their family against extinction . . ."

Speaker Shea: "Your time ran out, Roscoe, but we'll let you finish up 'cause the Clerk couldn't miss this debate. How many do you want for your hometown newspaper on this? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speak . . . Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I knew the Lawrenceville Steven A. Douglas was huffing and puffing and ready to get involved in this debate, but I would ask him for how long are we going to be Charlie McCarthy's for the National Rifle Association? How long are the law and order enthusiasts who beat the drums for . . . for severe penalties and for incarceration suddenly going to retreat and be civil libertarian doves when we try to remove from the streets of Illinois the instruments of death, namely the hand gun. I've heard lawyers like Representative Geo-Karis talk about the militia and she knows the Constitution doesn't apply to the militia. I've heard people talk about protecting the rights of law-abiding citizens, we wouldn't have any deaths in our homes and our properties if we weren't allowed to possess guns. Now, a few weeks ago the law and order champions in this House struck down the enacting clause of a marijuana bill. Well, you may cheer, but I would ask you, how much marijuana kills people in the State of Illinois? I know that people, thousands of people, die from the use of guns every year in the State of Illinois. I also heard the argument that local officials or this is not a local issue and I'm hardly the spokesman for Mayor Daley, but I know he has supported consistently the banning of hand guns in the Illinois General Assembly. To put it succinctly, ladies and gentlemen and members of the House, it's really time we stood up to the National Rifle Association and tell them to peddle



MAY 13 1975

137.

their wares elsewhere. Really, fellows, they can't beat you in your district. You'll vote on about 4,000 bills a year. It's about time that you told them that in order to protect the lives that you represent that we have to ban hand guns once and for all. As long as we have hand guns lose in the streets of Illinois, the administration of criminal justice is a farce; and no matter how many bills you support to put people in jail, people will still be killed with guns; and I urge your support of this bill. It's overdue. It makes sense and please vote 'aye'."

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

Borchers: "Mr. . . . May I have order? I would like to ask the sponsor a question or two or three. First, . . . ah . . . I have some very beautiful, old, 200 year old pocket flintlock pistols, they're hand guns, that you can conceal in the pocket taken from the British Army 200 years ago. Now, do they fall under this bill?"

Ewell: "Yes."

Borchers: "So I would have to give up my pair of flintlock pistols, is that correct?"

Ewell: "The courts, I believe, would determine unifir . . . uniformly that it's a gun. A gun is capable of dealing death. If those guns could deal the same deaths this year, that they could 200 years ago, then they must go."

Borchers: "Incredible. Now, I'd like to ask something else. What about the automatic weapons. Now, I believe that that is against the law now, is that correct? Mr. Sp . . . Mr. Sponsor, is that correct, automatic weapons are against the law now and also cu . . . cutoff shotguns, sawed off shotguns? It's illegal, yes, just a year ago, Patty Hearst had in her possession an automatic weapon. So the law made no effect upon that point, did it?"

Ewell: "Patty Hearst has not been apprehended, but I'm sure that if we can ever apprehend her, she will be prosecuted to the full . . ."

Borchers: "Fine."

Ewell: ". . . of the law for kidnapping, attempted murder, bankrobbery and flight to avoid prosecution and any charges that . . . ah . . ."

Borchers: "But the . . . but the point is notwithstanding the law not



only Patty Hearst had an automatic weapon, but they never have been able to control automatic weapons, and that has been against the law since 1928 or thereabouts."

Ewell: "I should like to point out that such things as fornication and other sex crimes have been against the law since time immemorial . . .

Borchers: "And you cannot stop them."

Ewell: ". . . we cannot stop them, but nevertheless, we attempt to do the best we can to regulate them and to bring them under the control in the best interests of the populists."

Borchers: "Without success. Now, I want to point out several things in relation to crime. There were approximately 950 murders in Chicago last year. 62 percent exactly were by hand guns. May I . . . 62 percent were by hand guns, the rest were by other means, stabbings mostly, knives, on the same basis of logic because nearly 50 percent were committed by knives and bladed weapons, we should also confiscate . . . confiscate and make illegal every bread knife, every meat knife, every knife to cut our food with for every meal we eat. Now, I would like to point out a couple of other things in relation to this. For that . . . and approximately 80 percent of the crime in the State of Illinois was perpetuated in Chicago. So all of downstate, all of downstate is to be penalized, completely disarmed because of 80 percent crime in Chicago, but not downstate, this is not either logical or fair. As far as the Rifle Association is concerned. I am not a member of it. I want to possess weapons for my own family, for my own defense, and in my own right. I could care less about the right of the National Rifle Association; and I'd like to point out . . . may I have one more belt of order before I quit, could I have a little more order? Now, as an individual, and I think you'd better listen to this, we . . ."

Speaker Shea: "Will you bring your remarks to a close, sir?"

Borchers: ". . . as an individual interested in history, I'm pointing out to you that the way the march in history is going now, we will probably be within war within five years and maybe less; and we are idiots and asinine if we go to the extent of voting ourselves defenseless. This is the most . . . would be the most stupid thing that a nation can



do to itself and Illinois should never lead the way."

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

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker, this bill has been thoroughly discussed. I think it's time . . ."

Speaker Shea: "Go ahead, Mr. DiPrima."

DiPrima: ". . . and I would like to move the previous question."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor will say 'aye', those oppose 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The main question shall be put. Mr. Ewell to close."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, very briefly never did I think I would see the day when we caught the gentleman from . . . ah . . . the gentleman from the 54th District with an inaccurate reading of the law. This bill is so elementary . . . elementarily simple that it is immune to collateral attack. The sections that were quoted about a person who was a delinquent, a narcotic addict or a felon applies to any firearm. All you have to do is read the bill. You cannot give any firearm. The bill that I have proposed specifically refers to one class of weapon and one class of weapon alone, and that is the hand gun. I suggest to the members of this body that I was but a voice in the wilderness when I cried out as early as '71 and even before that the hand gun has to be banned in the interest of all the people of the State of Illinois, but I suggest to you that my voice is no longer alone, that there are hundreds and thousands of people, there are political leaders in all stature who are now coming to the front, and who are now beginning to agree that the hand gun has to be banned in the interest of all the people. I say that there is no other alternative, there is no other route, and we cannot be taken in by this piece of argument that a Saturday Night Special can be banned because it is a gun purchased by the poor and if the poor can be banned from a gun, so can the rich, the affluent and the rest of us. The essence and the substance of law is equality before equality; and equality demands that the hand gun join the Saturday Night Special in banishment. The question is, how many lives can we save, not a question of the value to collectors or to anyone else as to the value of guns. I suggest, only, that you follow your own conscience, that you listen to



the dictates of the people of your district and join with the progressive forces in the State of Illinois who recognize the need to ban the hand gun; and I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 619 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Does anybody really want to explain their vote on this question? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are . . . Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. . . . Mr. Speaker, I accept the judgment of the body. I shall return. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "On this question there are 44 'aye' votes, 112 'nay' votes, 7 voting 'present'. House Bill 619 having failed to receive the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared lost. Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "The electric unit isn't working, vote me 'no', please."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Waddell 'no'. House Bill 631. Mr. Cunningham . . ."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, could we have leave to have the same Roll Call for 1134 and 1135."

Speaker Shea: "You're out of order."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 631, DiPrima."

Speaker Shea: "Is Mr. DiPrima on the floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "A bill for an act to amend the Illinois Pension Code.

Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, may I handle these three bills together, they're 631, 632 and 634? They pertain to the same subject matter."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman has asked leave to hear 632 and 634 at the same time, is there objection? Hearing none, the gentleman can hear the three bills, 631, 632 and 634 at the same time."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 632, a bill for an act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the bill. House Bill 634, a bill for an act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the bill."

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

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, now, you were



MAY 13 1975

141.

waiting for the downstate police bills, well, here they are; and I have discussed . . . I've discussed this with Hirschfeld, and we're going to put an amendment to include that same provision that the Chicago police have pertaining to the mentally retarded child. Anyway, 631 is an escalator clause increasing from 2 to 3 percent for the retired police officers. House Bill 632 as amended increases contributions from  $7\frac{1}{2}$  to  $8\frac{1}{2}$ , in other words, paying for their increased benefits; and 634 brings in conformity what other police groups an increase of 1 percent after 20 years to help keep the experienced officers in the fold. I would appreciate your support. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "Is there discussion? The question is, shall these bills pass? All in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, I do have a question of the sponsor before we take the Roll Call on this vote. Ah . . . Larry, you said that you're going to amend these . . . ah . . . this bill for the handicapped children?"

DiPrima: "Yeah, I will . . . I discussed this with Representative Hirschfeld, and . . . ah . . . we're going to put an amendment in the Senate."

Terzich: "Well, there was also supposed to be an agreement on House Bill 634 that the increment was going to change, instead of 2 percent to  $1\frac{1}{2}$  percent. I didn't see the amendment on this bill."

DiPrima: "Well, we can take care of that in the Senate. Yes, Sam Romano will take care of it."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff, to explain his vote. Turn Mr. Huff on, please. You're on, Mr. Huff, did you want to explain you vote?"

Huff: "Ah . . . Thank you, Mr. Speaker, no, I wanted to . . . ah . . . speak to the previous bill, but you wisely saw to overlook me and I . . . I've calmed my passions down somewhat, so, therefore, I will quietly ask you to turn my blinking light off, please. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. Take three Records on this, Mr. Clerk. House Bills 631, 632, 634 having received the constitutional majority are, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 645."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 645, Griesheimer, a bill for an act to amend the



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Snowmobile Registration and Safety Act. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Griesheimer, did you have an announcement to make prior to the time we went with this bill?"

Griesheimer: "Well, only to bring to the attention of the House that the Senate Judiciary Committee just shot down the E.R.A., 11 to 8."

Speaker Shea: "Now, on the bill, sir."

Griesheimer: "Somewhat that . . . ah . . . sells an ominous string for my bill here. Ah . . . House Bill 645 is a bill set up to establish a safety program for minors who operate snowmobiles in the State of Illinois. Ah . . . The program would be administered by the Department of Conservation and is highly endorsed by the Department of Conservation and has also received the support of various private snowmobile clubs in the state. As a matter of information, the snowmobile clubs are at the present time unofficially giving snowmobile safety courses to various people in their clubs, and particularly emphasizing the safety factor for children. Ah . . . This is the whole input of this bill. It was originally drawn incorrectly by the . . . ah . . . Reference Bureau and we had to put an amendment on it in order to clarify the point of the safety program. The program would be administered by the Department of Conservation and would thereafter . . . ah . . . have designated instructors at various local levels so that local policemen, local deputy sheriffs, . . . ah . . . boy scouts, merit badge counselors, . . . ah . . . anybody in the local area could be designated a safety instructor by the Department of Conservation. The idea is to keep the . . . ah . . . keep the youngsters from getting hurt on these snowmobiles and also give him a certified safety course. There was a minor problem with this . . . ah . . . bill with the State Patrol and their concern that the certificate given to minors might allow them to operate these vehicles on highways . . . ah . . . for anyone concerned about this, there was a specific amendment put on on Second Reading which prohibits the use of these snowmobiles on any highways and . . . it states specifically that the snowmobile certificate given to a minor will not be interpreted as a driver's or operator's license so that they cannot drive these on the highways. I think we have sort of satisfied all the varying inter-



MAY 18 1975

143.

ests on this; and I would urge its passage."

Speaker Shea: "Is there discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 645 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. The gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: ". . . for a question. Will the sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Mautino: "O.K., were any amendments worked out, Ron, concerning 645 as well as 727, I think it was, that was VanDuyne's almost identical legislation? Did the department get together with amendments on the verbal or written agreement to use property?"

DiPrima: "I spoke with Mr. Jim Helper of the Department of Conservation and we both mutually agreed that Mr. VanDuyne's bill and my bill are certainly very different bills, and that they would endorse and go with both of them and we felt that it was best under the circumstances not to attempt consolidation and this bill at the present time . . . ah . . . has been the . . . ah . . . supported and is supported by the Department of Conservation just as they will support Mr. VanDuyne's bill."

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

Speaker Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 645. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 138 'ayes', 2 'nos', 2 voting 'present'. House Bill 645 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 646."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 646, Griesheimer, a bill for an act to amend the Boat Registration and Safety Act. Third Reading of the bill."

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

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In short, this bill does for boating and for minors in the safe operation of boats exactly what the last bill did for snowmobiles. It set . . . sets up a safety course which will be monitored and supervised by the Department of Conservation. It has all of the good aspects of the Snowmobile Act. It's also endorsed by the Department of Conservation. This is the same law that was passed





MAY 13 1975

144.

in Wisconsin a year and a half ago. They have seen significant benefits to the minors, the number of children involved in boat accidents has gone down significantly. I would urge its passage."

Speaker Shea: "Is there any questions? The question is, shall House Bill 646 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Yourell 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 153 'ayes', 2 'nays', no voting 'present'. House Bill 646 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. Hudson 'aye'. Waddell 'aye'. Merlo 'aye'. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 654."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 654, Brummet, a bill for an act in relation to payments for coal rights. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "Is Mr. Brummet on the floor? I know he was back with the Speaker a moment ago. Is Mr. Brummet on the floor? Take that bill out of the Record. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 669, Mr. Kempiners."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 669, a bill for an act to amend an act to prevent fraudulent and corrupt practices in the making of public contracts. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll be brief for the members of the House of Representatives who were here during the last session. This is a bill which received great consideration, and . . . ah . . . it passed this House by a vote of 35 to nothing, but due to the last minute business in the Senate, failed by two votes. Basically, what it requires is for every unit of government that deals in land, it requires total disclosure of the names of the people who are receiving the taxpayers dollars. It requires total disclosure of any individual involved in a land deal with any unit of government. This is a state-wide problem that this bill is trying to address itself to. It was put in as a result of a land transaction in Dupage County; and I would appreciate your positive support of this legislation."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 669 pass? Is there discussion? The gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Leinenweber: "Question . . . question for the sponsor, please."

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he'll yield."

Leinenweber: "Representative Kempiners, does it require disclosure if the property is taken through trial of an eminent domain proceeding, the property owner?"

Speaker Shea: "Turn Mr. Kempiners on."

Kempiners: "Yes."

Leinenweber: "The only thing that . . . ah . . . strikes me is that if the property owner choses to go to trial and a jury of his peers or the court awards him just compensation, the property is being taken presumptively against his will; and I wonder what the justification is to require that the actual owner be disclosed. I can see if it's a negotiated settlement that would be true, because it is not presumptively against his will and is not . . . ah . . . necessarily just compensation, but in the event of an actual trial, it is just compensation that he is being awarded, and is being taken presumptively against his will . . . wh . . ."

Kempiners: "This is an argument that I see as . . . ah . . . you know, there's some justification to. However, if I left that provision out, there would be a loophole in case somebody was really dishonest in trying to line his pockets with the taxpayers dollar . . . ah . . . and he served on the governmental unit he could, you know, use the eminent domain procedure to take land in which he has an investment. Ah . . . I understand there is some . . . you know, rational argument in that reason, but I just felt that this was a big loophole that I'm trying to close."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Beatty."

Beatty: "Would . . . would the sponsor yield for another question?"

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Beatty: "Mr. Kempiners, at certain times the Legislature has bills before it re . . . concerning pieces of real estate which the State Highway Department or some other State of Illinois body no longer needs, and this property is going to be sold back to the original owner. Does your bill call for that situation and re . . . and require that the purchaser or who is . . . the party who is getting that land back that



MAY 13 1975 146.

they have to indicate if there is a contract on the sale of that land?"

Kempiners: "That depends on the cost of the land. I have a threshold of a . . . of initial sale of \$2,000. If it's less than that transaction, this bill is not triggered. However, in the case of a land sale by the state and if it's over the threshold amount, it would require that type of a disclosure."

Beatty: "Well, would this bill require the initial owner who's getting the land back from the state on these bills going through the House to indicate whether or not he's got a purchaser and does the requirement then indicate who the purchaser is and what it's being sold for in amount of dollars?"

Kempiners: "Do you mean that once the owner gets the land back for the amount specified by the state, whether or not he's going to sell the land?"

Beatty: "Does . . . does your bill require him to disclose that?"

Kempiners: "Only if he has already entered into a transaction agreement with somebody at the time of the purchase . . . purchase. If he enters into this agreement after the sale of the land to him, no."

Beatty: "Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "Is there any further questions? The question is, shall House Bill 669 pass? All those in favor will say 'aye', those oppose 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 147 'aye' votes, 2 'nay' votes, 3 voting 'present'. House Bill 669 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. McLendon 'aye'. Maragos 'aye'. Gaines 'aye'. Capuzi 'aye'. Capparelli 'aye'. If there are any more people that want to get on, why don't you come down to the Well and talk to the Clerk. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 676."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 676, Matijevich, a bill for an act to amend an act relating to alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 676 was proposed by Illinois State Park Lodges to legalize what really is being done now. Very often seminars or private parties



are held and the present law prohibits the sale of alcoholic beverages except while a person is seated and with food served to that customer. Under the bill as amended, the state lodges when catering food to private parties or groups may sell alcoholic beverages across a bar. Presently, lodges set up small pre-party or post-party bars in conjunction with catered private parties, and this bill would legalize the present situation. The Department of Conservation supports House Bill 676. I know of no opposition; and I appreciate your support of it."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 676 pass? Is there any debate? Hearing none, the question is, shall 676 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Geo-Karis, in the back of the hall, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? On this question . . . Mr. Clerk, take the Roll . . . on this question there are 134 'ayes', 7 'nays', 14 voting 'present'. House Bill 676 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 727."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 727, Yourell, a bill for an act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the bill."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House; House Bill 727 amends the downstate Policemen's Pension Fund article of the Pension Code. It authorizes participation by policemen appointed after attaining the age of 36, if their appointment was made before October 1st, 1975. All this does is take care of about 12 or 14 Police Chiefs and Policemen in the State of Illinois so they can be covered by their Pension Fund who are now over 36 years old. This bill came out of the Pension Laws Commiss . . . Committee by a 17 to nothing vote. It was approved by the Pension Laws Study Commission; and it has the approval of the downstate Chief's Police Association, the Illinois Police Association, the Glenwood Police Department, and everybody else that I know of that's connected with the police in the State of Illinois. I urge your . . . ah . . . affirmative vote."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 727 pass? Is there discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor will vote 'aye', those



MAY 13 1975

oppose will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Gaines, would you hit Miss Geo-Karis' button 'aye'? Have all voted who wish? On . . . take the Record. On this question there are 160 'ayes', no 'nays', no 'present'. House Bill 727 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 784."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 784, VonBoeckman, a bill for an act to amend the State Parks, Memorials, and Parkway Act. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Knox, . . . er . . . Mr. VonBoeckman on Mr. McGrew's, which, is that it back there?"

Unknown: "No, no, no."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, this is a merely bill to keep the statutes up to date with our expansion of the State's recreational system. I solicit your support."

Speaker Shea: "Is there discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 784 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ewell 'aye'. Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 136 'aye' votes, no 'nay' votes, 5 voting 'present'. House Bill 784 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 804."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 804, Borchers, a bill for an act designating the State insect. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Beau . . . er . . . Mr Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow members, I'll make this short. Some thousands of children want this bill. Don't disappoint them. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Macon moves for the passage of House Bill 804. Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 804 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The gentleman from Know, Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I would just briefly like to say



MAY 13 1975

149.

that I have several students in my district that would like to vote on this question and . . . and I, therefore, cast a 'no' vote so that they can should this bill not pass."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears . . . on this question there are 145 'aye' votes, 7 'nay' votes, 8 voting 'present'. House Bill 804 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 818. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff, you have a question?"

Duff: "Yes, I was just wondering whether that last bill should've gone to the Bug Commission?"

Speaker Shea: "I thought . . . did you have a motion with regards to House Bill 900, Mr. Duff?"

Duff: "That's not in the order right now, is it, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Shea: "Yeah, I'll take the motion if you want to return it. The gentleman . . . you want to make the motion to return it to First Reading?"

Duff: "Not right now."

Speaker Shea: "All right. House Bill 818."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 818, Washington, a bill for an act to amend the Illinois Small Business Purchasing Act. Third Reading of the bill."

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

Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an amendment of the Small Business set aside Purchasing Act, that act which was passed about four years ago under the auspices of Representative Hirschfeld has proved to be an extremely effective act in stimulating small business in the wholesale, retail and service areas for the state, but there were some gimmicks which needed to be revised; and so it was felt that as an additional stimuli the definition of small business should be lowered from, in both the wholesale and retail fields, to smaller figures, and that also the three-bid requirement should be dispensed with because in many cases there were no three bids to be involved. It's . . . it's more or less in the nature of a housekeeping bill designed to stimulate small business. It passed out of the Executive Committee 23 to nothing. It's supported by the General Service Department. I know of no opposi-



MAY 13 1975

150.

tion. I solicit your support."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 818 pass? Is there debate? Hearing none, all those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 150 'aye' votes, 3 'no' votes, no voting 'present'. House Bill 818 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 876."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 876, Palmer, a bill for an act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the bill."

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

Palmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 876 would allow members of the six Illinois Constitutional Conventions who are not members of any other Public Retirement System, other than Federal Social Security, to purchase credit into the General Assembly and Judges Retirement System, duplication of credit for the same period of time would not be allowed; and the number of people that are effected are relatively small. I urge your favorable consideration."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall . . . House Bill 876 pass? Is there debate? Hearing none, all those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 99 'aye' votes, 20 'nay' votes, 32 voting 'present'. House Bill 876 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 894."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 894, Hudson, a bill for an act to amend an act in relation to compensation of members of General Assembly. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Dupage, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 894 makes a change in the compensation provision for members of the Illinois General Assembly. It precludes payment of the two-year salary at a time making provision for annual payments instead. That's all it does. I would solicit your 'aye'



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 13 1975

vote."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 894 pass? Is there discussion? Hearing none, . . . Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Ah . . . Mr. Sponsor, I'm reading from the Digest and this does confuse me a bit, do I understand all this does is prevents a Legislator from obtaining two-years salary at once but permits him to obtain one-year salary at once?"

Hudson: "Yes, that is correct. The Digest is not the . . . ah . . . story. The amendment that was attached really is the bill."

Kosinski: "Thank you, that's clear."

Speaker Shea: "Is there question? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Maragos 'aye'. Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 146 'aye' votes, 9 'nay' votes, 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 894 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 950."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 950, Skinner, a bill for an act to amend the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and members of the General Assembly, House Bill 950 . . . ah . . . puts a . . . puts the Boards of Review in all of the downstate counties under the Ethics Act; and that's all it does."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 950 pass? Is there discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 145 'aye' votes, 4 'nay' votes, 4 voting 'present'. House Bill 950 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 955. The gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 955, a bill for an act in relation to state payments to counties in which substantial areas of state and federal lands are located. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman asks leave to hear House Bill 955 and 956





together. Is there objection? Hearing none, leave is granted. Read House Bill 956."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 956, a bill for an act to add sections to the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the bill."

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

Hart: "Ah . . . Thank . . . thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. These two bills are sponsored by myself and Representative Choate and Winchester from the 59th District, and would provide funds from the state for impaction and to counties where more than 20 percent of the land is held out of taxation by governmental ownership. The results of the continual encroachment of ownership by government in these counties has created a terrific financial burden and these are the solutions that we have presented for the General Assembly. I would appreciate the support of the House on these two bills."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bills 955 and 956 pass? Is there discussion? The gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, has a question."

Cunningham: "Mr. . . . will the sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Shea: "He indicates that he will."

Cunningham: "Representative Hart, I noticed you were saying that 20 percent but the Digest says 15 percent of the law . . . of the land, which is correct?"

Hart: "Yeah, Amendment Number 2 or 3 raised it up to 20 percent."

Cunningham: "Well, . . . if the land is not held in fee by the Federal Government but they have the right to recapture, would they qualify for your . . . for the bonanza, specifically, an abandoned air force base where the federal government retains the right of reversion to recapture in case of National emergency, would we be eligible?"

Hart: "It . . . it provides where they're held and leased or by absolute ownership so that they are not under ad valorem taxation, and it is not a bonanza."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Rigney."

Rigney: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the sponsor a couple of questions."

Speaker Shea: "He'll yield."



Rigney: "Mr. Hart, can you tell me is there any precedent for this kind of . . . of bail-out procedure in years gone by in State Government? Have we ever had a direct bail out like this?"

Hart: "I'm not sure that there is in State Government, however, the Federal Government provides impaction aid for schools and also provides some where the ownership of land . . . ah . . . in this nature, but it is . . . it is very, very little . . . ah . . . of benefit as far as the counties are concerned. The school districts do receive some substantial amounts of money where so many people are in the district whose parents are employed people working for the Federal Government."

Rigney: "Can you also tell me what is their level of assessment in this county?"

Hart: "The level of assessment . . . ah . . . is less than 33 1/3 percent, but by amendments that were suggested by Representative Ewing and agreed to and to put on the bills, these counties that are . . . qualify under this bill will have to reach a level of assessment of 33 1/3 by January 1, 1978."

Rigney: "Well, then if they reach that level of assessment, are they going to be in need of these funds?"

Hart: "Yes, they are, but they will . . . it will provide for more local . . . ah . . . participation and . . . ah . . . that was one of the objections that was raised in the committee, which you're a member of, and we put the amendment on."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines. Do you need a lawyer after being struck by that man? All right Roscoe got it. The gentleman . . . the gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "Would the sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Shea: He indicates he will."

Waddell: "In these areas is the reason for this the fact that the Federal Government has come along with Federal forests, National forests?"

Hart: "Ah . . . Yes, and also the State Government with this conservation and other programs."

Waddell: "And what is the amount that the Federal Government has paid back for the impaction, thereof?"

Hart: "Very little. It's something like .50 cents an acre or .25 cents an



acre, and that program . . . ah . . . as I understand it, has not been reenacted."

Speaker Shea: "The gent . . ."

Waddell: "I would like . . . I would like to speak to the bill."

Speaker Shea: "Pardon me, Mr. Waddell, proceed."

Waddell: "It just seems to me that when the Federal Government comes in a proposition such as this, I can't see why the State of Illinois should be called on to bail out governments in this area; and I think if the proper modus operandi were to be followed here and get your Congressmen and Senators on the ball at Washington that that's where the solution should be, not for the rest of the state . . . people of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from McClain, Mr. Deavers. The gentleman from McClain, Mr. Deavers."

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

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor will say 'aye', those oppose say 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The main question shall be put. Now, Mr. Hart to close on House Bills 955 and 956."

Hart: "Ah . . . By previous agreement, with leave of the House, Representative Choate will make the closing remarks on behalf of these bills."

Spekaer Shea: "The gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate, to close."

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, if there was ever needed legislation for a couple of small counties in the State of Illinois, this is one time that it is needed. By the amendment that we drafted to raise it to 20 percent rather than 15, I'll be quite frank with you, we took out only one other county in the State of Illinois, and it was my home county, which would have qualified under the 15 percent. Secondly, to give you the history of why we must do this, if we're going to have the citizens of the County of Pope and Hardin adhere to the Constitution and to the statute of the State of Illinois, we must provide aid, simply, because in recent months it's been proven that not only have they layed off and are unable to pay, the qualified and dedicated employees of County Government, but, yes,



they can't even afford to pay the salaries of duly elected county officials in the County of Pope. This is all primarily brought about because of the State and Federal Government acquiring these thousands of acres of land which has been a bit of benefit to all of the people in the State of Illinois via the park and national forests . . . ah . . . avenue. So I would say, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of this House, that this is legislation aimed at solving a problem brought about by State and Federal Governemnt, and we would . . . we would certainly appreciate your vote."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall these bills pass? All in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, to explain his vote. Have all voted who wish?"

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask a little earlier, how many counties are involved in this and how many counties aren't; and I was hoping maybe Representative Hart or Choate could mention that. As I gather if you have . . ."

Speaker Shea: "Three counties. Three counties. They're being corrected by Mr. Skinner, only two. Well, listen, you and Mr. Skinner are going to have to get together 'cause he's never been wrong in a revenue matter in his life. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On these bills there are 137 'ayes', 15 'nays', 8 voting 'present'. House Bills 995 and 956 having received the constitutional majority are, hereby, declared passed. On the Speaker's table. On the Speaker's table appears House Joint Resolution 38, the Minority Leader, the gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Washburn."

Washburn: "Thank you, . . . ah . . . Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House. I think there is a committee amendment, Number 1, to this resolution which changes the reporting date back to the Legislature which I would move be adopted."

Speaker Shea: "Is there an amendment on this, Mr. Clerk? Read the amendment."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment 1 amends House Joint Resolution 38 on page 2 by deleting, 'May 1, 1975', and inserting in lieu, thereof, 'May 20, 1975'."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Grundy moves for the adoption of the amendment. All in favor will say 'aye', those oppose say 'nay'. The



MAY 13 1975

156.

'ayes' have it; the amendment is adopted. Now, the gentleman from Grundy on the Joint Resolution."

Washburn: "Well, thank you again, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, each year for the past several years this body's wrestled with the problem of whether or not State employees should receive a cost-of-living increase and if so, in what amount. This resolution would set out a procedure, whereby, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House would appoint five members, the Minority Leader of each body would appoint four, they would use all the resources at hand such as the I. of State's Department of Labor Statistics, the State of Illinois Statistics, the Economic and Fiscal Commission's data to determine whether or not the . . . cost-of-living increase were warranted for the next fiscal year and would report back if so and how much. Ah . . . Pro . . . an orderly process that has never been used before in the past, I say it's been a figure more or less pulled out of the air, and as I understand it, there's no cost-of-living . . . ah . . . increases provided in any piece of legislation to this date; and I would suggest that we pass this resolution so that the Legislatures themselves can determine the amount, and if so, when it will become effective."

Speaker Shea: "Is there an ex . . . there's no expenditure of money here, is there, Mr. Washburn?"

Washburn: "No, sir."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 30 . . . House Joint Resolution 38 pass? All those in favor will say 'aye', those oppose will say 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The resolution is adopted. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, there are a number of bills that members have come to the podium and asked to have brought back to the order of Second Reading for the purposes of amendment. There are about 15 bills in this category. It is the intention of the Speaker to start at that category from that list in the morning with leave of the House. Does he have leave? Are you objecting, Mr. Walsh?"

Walsh: "Well, I think I might be, yeah."

Speaker Shea: "Well, if you're going to object then I'll . . ."



MAY 13 1975

157.

Walsh: ". . . Yeah . . ."

Speaker Shea: "You're objecting?"

Walsh: ". . . well, I object."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, does the Speaker have leave to go to House . . . the order of House Bills, Third Reading, and recall a number of bills where the sponsors have had . . . yes, sir."

Walsh: "We might be able to work something out on this, Mr. Speaker, if you would submit to the Minority Leader a list of the bills that you're interested in going out of order to consider. Now, I think it's an affront to the Minority for you to make a motion like that without any notice."

Speaker Shea: "I've talked to Mr. Washburn . . ."

Walsh: "Now, why don't we talk about this . . ."

Speaker Shea: ". . . I've talked to Mr. Washburn about it, the list has been on the desk down here; I don't know what's on the list, but I'll be happy to have the Clerk show it to you and I'll get back . . ."

Walsh: ". . . why don't we make . . . why don't we hold this motion until tomorrow . . ."

Speaker Shea: "I will."

Walsh: ". . . so that we can look at it."

Speaker Shea: "Well, I'd like the members to know tonight. There must be 15 or 18 members that are very anxious and I assure you, Mr. Walsh, they are going to want to start making motions. That's why I tried to do it in an orderly fashion . . ."

Walsh: "All right, I'd like to do it in an orderly fashion . . ."

Speaker Shea: "The Clerk will show you the . . ."

Walsh: ". . . the way you approached it was not an orderly fashion though, Mr. Speaker, . . ."

Speaker Shea: "House Bills, Third . . ."

Walsh: ". . . we would like to look at them."

Speaker Shea: "House Bills, Third Reading. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 959."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 959, J. Dunn, a bill for an act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."



MAY 13 1951

158.

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House.

This is a bill which is a Senior Citizens bill. The bill permits Senior Citizens to camp free at State parks. I urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman moves for the adoption of House Bill 959. Is there discussion? All in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Mr. Borhers 'aye'. Mr. Capuzi 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Duff 'aye'. Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. Schneider 'aye'. On this . . . on this question there are 151 'ayes', 2 'nays', 3 voting 'presnt'. House Bill 959 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 981."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 981, Londrigan, a bill for an act to create the Administrative Procedures Act. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, this bill enacts the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act. Throughout our statutes and several hundred instances the Procedure Act is laid out in three or four paragraphs. This gives us one uniform act, also provides for uniform publication of rules. I ask for your vote."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 981 pass? Is there discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor knows this is a very, very, very significant bill he's proposing. He proposed it in the 77th General Assembly or something similar to it. Another bill was proposed in the 78th; and I think that the House deserves, if he would not mind, a little more fuller explanation of the significance of the changing he . . . changes that he's proposing. I am not against the proposal, I might say, Representative Londrigan, but I do think you are proposing one of the . . . one of the very significant pieces of legislation of the Session."

Speaker Shea: "Are there any further discussion? The gentleman from Sangamon moves for the adoption of House Bill 981. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Mr. Duff, did you want to talk further?"

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I made a request of the sponsor . . . ah . . .



MAY 13 1975

159.

this is a major piece of legislation and I think the House deserves to hear more about it in that very simple, not incorrect, but very simple explanation."

Speaker Shea: "Well, the gentleman will have a chance to when he closes if he wants to explain it further. The gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg. The gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Wi . . . Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the sponsor yield for a question or two on this major piece of legislation. Ah . . . Representative Londrigan, does . . . is there a cost factor to this bill?"

Londrigan: "No, there is not."

Grotberg: "That amazes me. I have . . . ah . . . a bill that I'm trying to get the publication of rules and regulations organizes in this State so that each agency . . . so that the public's right to find out where regulations come from may be unified and every agency in the State of Illinois is ducking it including the Secretary of State, the General Service Administration, the publication of the administrative procedures of the state. Now, where . . . who's going to do the work?"

Londrigan: "The reason I didn't give more explanation of this is because this bill has almost unanimously passed this House twice before. It's been bottled up in committee and the Senate once, and a subcommittee with other Senate bills last time, and six years ago Governor Ogilvie vetoed it after both Houses practically unanimously passed it. It's a permissive piece of legislation. After we get a uniform procedure act in rules and regulations, then we will come back next time and take each individual act, each act, and apply it or not to that act in the cleanup procedure. So all we're doing here is getting the uniform act on the statutes. If any agency or acts say they cannot live under it, then they will have an opportunity in the next session to get out from under it."

Grotberg: "I appreciate that. My bill was so good, Representative, that it went right from Committee to Third Reading, it never stopped on Second or anywhere else. It's one of those miracle acts. I want you to know it's still alive in case yours goes down, we can dress it up."

Speaker Shea: "Is there further discussion? The gentleman from Sangamon,





the gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, the Executive Committee didn't spend much time on this bill because it passed with a pretty good vote last session. After the bill passed out of the committee . . . ah . . . I realized that some of the agencies of the state including the Secretary of . . . Secretary of the State had wished that this bill be treated like many others that the Executive Committee sent to an Interim Study Committee in which we are going to form a subcommittee relating to the issue of, 'the right to know versus the right of privacy', and the agencies feel that this bill should be in that category; and I did talk to a man from the Secretary of State, who says that this bill belongs there, too."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan, to close."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, this is nothing but a uniform act making all the procedure acts uniform. It's putting it in one location and taking out all but three or four paragraphs. It is not, although it is a major piece of legislation, it is nothing nova or uniform; and has passed easily twice before. It has nothing to do with the Secretary of State or any other agency. It does not apply to anyone now. Each agency comes back individually and decides whether or not they're going under. We have had this in before our Legislature for the last ten years. It's passed twice before; and I ask for your support again."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 981 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this . . . on this bill there are 140 'aye' votes, no 'nay' votes, 12 voting 'present'. House Bill 981 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 987."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 987, White, a bill for an act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the bill."

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

White: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 987 is a simple bill. All it does, it amends the Chicago Teachers



MAY 3 1975 161.

Retirement System Article in the Pension Code. This bill authorizes the election of a reversionary pension at any time before retirement rather than six months. All this bill does is to permit the contributor to take a lesser pension leaving more funds in the Pension Fund for his wife or his survivors. I urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Shea: "Is there a question? The question is, shall House Bill 987 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Roll Call, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 152 'aye' votes, no 'nay' votes, 4 voting 'present'. House Bill 987 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 988 . . ."

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

Speaker Shea: ". . . Is Mr. Mudd on the floor? Is Mr. Mudd on the floor? Take the bill out of the Record. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 1051."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1051, Terzich, a bill for an act creating the Law Revision Commission. Third Reading of the bill."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1051 creates a temporary Law Revision Commission to recommend repeal of outdated and non-necessary laws. Ah . . . In recent years there's been a great increase in both the volume and complexity of the Illinois Revised Statutes. Over the last decade there's been an average of 318 pages added on. Now, I discussed this with the . . . ah . . . with the Legislative Reference Bureau and they're completely in favor of this bill and also it passed out of committee 23 to 0; and it would be inexcusable for this body, which is untimely responsible for the laws of the state, to ignore the confusion which results from the existence of obsolete . . . obsolete statutory provisions. The Legislative Reference Bureau with regard to bill drafting makes it almost impossible for the group to spend any unnecessary time. I urge your support."

Speaker Shea: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1051 pass? The gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Would the sponsor yield for a question?"



Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Kane: "Could this same job be done by a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee or by the Judiciary Committee itself?"

Terzich: "No."

Kane: "Why not?"

Terzich: "Well, because it . . . ah . . . it needs a commission made up of legislators because they are the only ones that have the statutory right to recommend . . . ah . . . or present bills in the Legislature."

Kane: "No, the Judiciary Committee, the Judiciary Committee of the House."

Terzich: "Well, it . . . ah . . . from the people that I have spoken to, Representative Kane, they would say, 'no'. They're all in favor of the commission system where they have expertise on the commissions."

Speaker Shea: "The battle of the commissions. Mr. Schlickman, do you have a question?"

Schlickman: "No, I don't have a question, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to address myself to the merits of the bill. We have al . . ."

Speaker Shea: "You're entitled."

Schlickman: ". . . thank you very much. We have already provided in the Legislative Article of the Revised Statutes that the responsibility for revision and codification of our statutes lies with the Legislative Reference Bureau, a bureau that has year end and year out provided us with revisory ads. It would seem to me that if there is further need in this area, that instead of establishing another commission to duplicate the statutory charge that we've given to the Reference Bureau that instead of establishing a new commission . . . ah . . . we simply provide more resources to the Legislative Reference Bureau which has demonstrated over the years its competence . . . ah . . . within this field. I further point out to the membership that we have a bill here that is without an appropriation; and I would suggest that it receive a 'no' vote."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen, I rise in support of this bill. This bill is complimentary to another bill that has been proposed by the Legislative Reference Board of the General Assembly in which they would propose in this separate bill a separate division of



the Legislative Reference Bureau to provide the expertise in drafting of . . . for the matters that are brought to their attention by the commission that this bill would propose; and I strongly urge that this complimentary commission to the proposals for the changes in the Legislative Reference Bureau be adopted by this . . . by this House."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 1051 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? On this question . . . take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 113 'ayes', 29 'nays', 10 voting 'present'. House Bill 1051 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 1121."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1121, Collins, a bill for an act to amend the Illinois State Auditing Act. Third Reading of the bill."

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

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, those of you who served in this House last year will remember that the Legislature in its wisdom refused to appropriate for four agencies of the . . . ah . . . State Government, namely the Governor's Office of Human Resources, the Office of Special Investigations, the Office of Collective Bargaining and the Illinois Information Service. Now, these offices were not appropriated for, but as we all know, they continue to exist, the members of these bureaus being on various payrolls throughout the . . . ah . . . the State Government. The Legislative Audit Commission in attempting to look into this problem, Commission of the Auditor General to investigate where the various people were working and what the rationale was for them for remaining on the . . . ah . . . on the State payroll. The Auditor General is authorized under the Auditing Act to make such investigations and to receive information from the various State agencies. However, the Auditor General found that in attempting to make these surveys and investigations, he was . . . roadblocks were continually thrown in this way by members of the various departments and agencies. So the bill which is sponsored unanimously by the members of the Legislative Audit Commission would merely direct that all agencies would promptly and without delay



co-operate with the Auditor General and . . . ah . . . and would supply to him the co-operation which is mandated by the statutes. It further would . . . it would state that the Auditor General if he does run into these difficulties would report to the Legislative Audit Commission, the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate as to the failure of these agencies to co-operate. I think it is needed legislation, it is sponsored by the Audit Commission; it came out of the Executive Committee by a vote of 22 to 1; and I would solicit the support of the House."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 1121 pass? Is there any debate? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, J. M."

Houlihan: "Would the gentleman respond to a question?"

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Houlihan: "Phil', after the notification, what is set up after that in the law?"

Collins: "No, I think it would then become incumbent upon the . . . ah . . . the two Houses to take further action if possible or as needed. I do think that it is important that the members of this House be aware of the lack of co-operation which we . . . the Auditor General received last year. It does . . . it does go further to say that they shall co-operate without delay and with . . . and promptly, which is not in the present act. I think the act is clear as to the duties of the agency to co-operate; however, there has been a lot of foot dragging. It is our attempt in this mild . . . ah . . . mild attempt to press upon the agencies their duty to co-operate with the Auditor General under the act."

Houlihan: "Phil', wasn't it true that in this case the Audit Commission was notified of the Auditor General's feelings and that it was taken up by the Audit Commission?"

Collins: "Ah . . . Yes, but the Audit Commission is merely one commission of the General Assembly. I do think that adding the weight of the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House may go a long way towards insuring further co-operation."

Houlihan: "Well, Phil', I . . . the Audit Commission is appointed by the Speaker and the President of the Senate, is that correct?"



MAY 18 1975

165.

Collins: "The . . . ah . . . Audit Commission is appointed by the Leadership of the two Houses, certainly, but does not speak for either."

Houlihan: "Well, it would seem to me that this is unnecessary legislation. I think that there already has been in the statute a clear indication that there should be co-operation. I think that the Auditor General then has the procedure of informing the Audit Commission, the Audit Commission acting as the arm of our Legislature of the House and the Senate is able to take proper action. I just think this is unnecessary legislation."

Speaker Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The gentleman moves for the adoption of . . . do you have a light back there, Mr. Washington? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington."

Washington: "I like the smooth way you do things, Mr. Speaker. Would the sponsor yield to a question? Yeah, I listened to you very carefully, Phil'. Haven't you overstressed this question of lack of co-operation. It seems to me, and all I know is what I've read in the press, that some allegations were made which to me, in this case the general reader, were never substantiated and then I read the report of the Auditor General which seem to indicate that there had been a rather intensive, extensive examination of agencies you alluded to and that all was peace and quiet. Now, you give us the impression that there is some diabolical scheme going on between some of the agencies of government or agents of government to not co-operate with the Legislative Audition Commission; and this is not the impression I received at all. Now, if your impression is false, I'd like to be . . . ah . . . I'd like to be just abused of my misconception. If it is, I'd like for you to spell it out a little more."

Collins: "Well, it certainly is, Harold, and I wish that you could have sat in the Audit Commission with us to hear the testimony of Director Hovey who told us that because he released a press release, this should resolve our problems. I . . . You say you read the report of the Auditor General, well, in there you find the fact that they . . . the refusal of various agencies to co-operate with him, even to the extent where there was a directive from the Governor's office that none of



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

these agencies were to co-operate with the Auditor General unless he put his request in writing and at that point he was to have his . . . ah . . . the matter referred not to the proper agency but to the counsels of the Governor, Mr. Goldberg; and Mr. . . . and Mr. Goldberg came before the Audit Commission and we spent three and a half hours of listening to him give us the run-a-round. So, yes, there certainly was a lack of co-operation and I can't stress too strongly the need for co-operation that is mandated under the act and we are simply trying to make it even clearer that the Legislature does expect co-operation with the Auditor General, who is acting as our agent in looking into matters such as came up in this particular investigation."

Washington: "Well, the simple fact is you got the co-operation. The Auditor General got his report, perhaps what I'm really saying is that I . . . I am a little bit disturbed about this insistent and constant attempt to draw friction between the Legislative and the Executive, we. Now, it seems we are certain of government of separation of powers, but there seems to me that somewhere along the line we should try to co-operate; and I think these cheap shots against the Executive is nothing . . . is doing nothing but demilitate and erode in the minds of the public of what this government is all about; and I would urge you, Phil', and my good friend, and all the rest of you who resort to these tactics to cease and desist this sort of thing. It adds nothing to the debate on the House floor. It certainly adds nothing to the caliber of the Legislation; and I, for one, suggest that we try to co-operate with the Executive wing, and hopefully, they'll do the same with us. That's not a question, just a statement."

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

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, this is very good legislation; and I move the previous question."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor will say 'aye', those oppose 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins, to close."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I'll close very briefly by saying that, Harold Washington, you are my good friend, but this is no cheap shot initiated



by the Legislative Audit Commission or an attempt to draw any friction between the Legislature and the Executive on the part of the Legislature. The friction existed coming from the Executive, the Auditor General did not receive the co-operation as you would suggest. It was a total lack of co-operation that he received, and it's a tribute to the Auditor General's efforts that he managed to write the report that he did, lacking any co-operation from the Executive. The friction if it is there was not . . . was not generated from Legislature, it came from the second floor, we're with you, we're trying to dispel this friction; and I think this is needed legislation. The Executive Committee agreed to the tune of 22 to 1. I hope the House will agree and I ask for a favorable consideration."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 1121 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 111 'ayes', 24 'nays', 7 voting 'present'. House Bill 1121 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 1319."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1319, Keller, a bill for an act creating the Illinois Rivers Marketing Study Commission. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "Hello, oh no, it's fine, give me Madigan. The gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Keller."

Keller: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, this creates the Illinois Rivers Marketing Study Commission of which is to be composed of fourteen members of the General Assembly, 7 from each House. The commission there is required to report its progress to the 79th General Assembly at such intervals it considers necessary. The intent of this bill is to encourage the study of Illinois rivers as transportation and commercial resources. Although the General Assembly has at various times authorized the creation of port facility, there's been no real attempt to consolidate the waterways into unified transportation in commerce network. This is expected to also address the opportunities offered by barge containers for the export of grain and other agricultural products. I move for the passage of House Bill 1319."





Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 1319 pass? Is there debate on that question? The gentleman from Cook, Houlihan, J. M."

Houlihan: "Ah . . . Charlie, will the speaker . . . sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Houlihan: "Charlie, is there an appropriation . . . bill?"

Keller: "Yes, and it's in the, what is it, omnibus appropriation bill?"

Houlihan: "What is the appropriation to cover this commission?"

Keller: "How much?"

Houlihan: "Yeah."

Keller: "\$150,000."

Houlihan: "It was amended? Because it's listed in the Digest as \$250,000."

Keller: "No, no, you're look . . . you're looking at the river bill."

Houlihan: "Oh, that's another one. Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House . . ."

Keller: "You're looking at the lake bill there, too."

Houlihan: "I'm sorry, I forgot . . . ah . . . getting the pork and the pig and the polk all mixed up. I'd like to speak against this bill for two reasons. One, I don't think we need the proliferation of commissions as was pointed out before in an earlier bill; and two, I don't think this is in the budget. We can't afford it; and I'd ask for a 'no' vote on this bill."

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

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this bill. We already have a Department of Business and Economic Development . . . ah . . . charged to do the same thing as is provided for in here. It seems to me that it's unnecessary, duplicative and wasteful of . . . ah . . . valuable financial resources within the state."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I just rise to speak in favor of this . . . ah . . . legislation. Ah . . . Being from Chicago, I know we have other problems in downstate that we have a Port Authority which is studying the question of . . . ah . . . containers which are studying the question of increased trade. If the Department of Business and Economic Development needs a little impetus



from the Legislature by the passing of this particular piece of legislation, I think . . . ah . . . we ought to do that. In terms of the appropriation, let me say that that appropriation is in a subcommittee . . . ah . . . and certainly . . . ah . . . in conversations with . . . ah . . . the sponsor is going to be reduced. I . . . I don't think that we should bypass the downstate situation on something that is needed in terms of their waterway and . . . and in terms of canals and things of this nature, the economic growth of southern Illinois."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from McClean, Mr. Deavers."

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

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor will say 'aye', those oppose will say 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The main question will be put. Mr. Keller to close."

Keller: "Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief, but what this bill does, it's gonna' help all the State of Illinois, and this is not just for . . . for downstate Illinois; it's for the four major rivers, the Wabash, the Mississippi, the Rock, the Illinois and the Kaskaskia; and . . . ah . . . it's a bill that's gonna' try to unify, instead of just going into these small port districts and spendin' money after money on all of them to try to unify a river system that will be . . . ah . . . give us a good transportation system . . . system in this country such as the Rhine does throughout Europe. I move for passage of this bill."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 1319 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. The gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, to explain his vote."

Kane: "I'd like to commend the . . . ah . . . sponsor of this bill for his idea. I think that we do need to improve the transportation system in the state, but I think that if we need this legislative oversight, that we have the structure in the House to handle that legislative oversight and we don't need to create another commission in addition to the 84 commissions that we already have."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Keller."

Keller: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I think there's a lot of things that people are overlooking here, because . . . ah . . . two years ago I know when



MAY 13 1975

170.

I was overseas at our office in Brussels and . . . ah . . . I was speaking with several of the people about the new procedure the way that we would containerize grain in this country compared to the way they are now presently getting grain in . . . in the European community . . . ah . . . that's what this would do, is help us locate port facilities along our rivers that are navigable and it . . . we could in the agricultural areas of central and southern Illinois and northern Illinois . . . ah . . . buy . . . put grain in containers; and by . . . when we put grain in these containers in this we can get the Illinois farmer . . . ah . . . all the way from .50 to .75 cents a bushel more for his product than . . . than we can . . . than he presently is getting, and this is because overseas today they are not receiving Illinois grain, Illinois grain has a higher protein, but they are receiving grain that is mixed when it goes to the port facilities in New Orleans in bulk grain and stuff like this, it is being mixed with South American grain, and half the grain they're getting over there is sand and silt and everything else. Ah . . . I'd like to see a few green lights up there because . . . ah . . . I think this is something that is beneficial to the whole State of Illinois."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. The gentleman from Effingham moves Postponed Consideration. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 1487."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1487, . . . you call it on the priority call . . ."

Speaker Shea: "1479, my mistake, Mr. Clerk. The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, on this bill."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1479, Matijevich, a bill for an act to amend the Alcoholic Intoxication Treatment Act. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1479 extends the effective date of the Alcoholism in Intoxication Treatment Act which we passed in the last session of the Legislature. From July 1st, 1975, to January 1st, 1976 a six-month extension, it is apparent that the law cannot be implemented by the effective date in the present law. Hospitals, community alcoholism treatment centers, law enforcement



JUN 18 1975

171.

agencies and others have been pleading for a reasonable extension of time to implement the law. There is a bill in the Senate to extend it one year so we have these two vehicles for extension. I'd appreciate your favorable support of House Bill 1479."

Speaker Shea: "Is . . . the question is, shall House Bill 1479 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Is there discussion? Mr. Duff."

Duff: "I'll wait and explain my vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Shea: "All in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'. Art . . . Mr. Duff to explain his vote."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say something for the Record. I'm a member of the Chicago Metropolitan Council on alcoholism, and I've been appointed by the Governor to the Alcoholism Commission, and I was a member of the commission with John Matijevich to prepare this initial bill; and I'm for it, but I just do want to say for the Record that I think it's a shame that the agencies of State Government have not proceeded with the alacrity with which they should've. We must do this, and it's a darn shame that they're a year behind where we should be on this very serious problem."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 147 'aye' votes, 3 'nay' votes, 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 1479 having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. It's the intention of the Chair when we come in tomorrow and go to the order of Third Reading to start with bills on May 22nd and start with House Bill 147 . . . 146 and proceed in the order of priority of call from that point. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 776. The gentleman from Dupage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Ah . . ."

Speaker Shea: "We're going to be out of here in two minutes."

Hoffman: ". . . Mr. Speaker, that Senate Bill . . ."

Speaker Shea: "Or Senate Bill 776, I'm sorry."

Hoffman: "776, perhaps some members of the House read the article in the newspaper in regard to Senate Bill 178 which we passed and is now Public Act 79-13. It was discovered after the bill was signed that the



Reference bill has been inadvertently left one word out of the original language of the statute. Now, Senate Bill 776 has been amended to take care of that one small item. I talked with the leader on . . . leaders on both sides of the aisle, the Speaker and . . . to correct this error as quickly as possible. Ah . . . I would like to make a motion to suspend the appropriate rule to move Senate Bill 776 from the order of First Reading to Second Reading without reference to committee."

Speaker Shea: "Is there objection? I think this takes 107 . . ."

Unknown: "Right."

Speaker Shea: ". . . is there any discussion? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those oppose will vote 'nay'; it takes 107 votes. Mr. Hoffman, has this bill been read a first time?"

Hoffman: "It's on the . . . It's on the list, I . . . it's on my list, I assume it's been read a first time."

Speaker Shea: "Well, when you say it's on your list, you indicated to me that it had been read a first time. The Clerk informs me it's not in the House yet."

Hoffman: "I assumed it was in the House, it was on my list from the . . . ah . . . Information Service. How would it get on . . . it's listed as being First Reading, Committee on Assignment of Bills. All right, let me withdraw the motion, and . . ."

Speaker Shea: "Well, let's find exactly where it's at."

Hoffman: "All right."

Speaker Shea: "Sam, get it in the morning, will you? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos, has an agreed announcement out of the Revenue Committee."

Maragos" "Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to have leave to hear . . . put House Bill 3004 back into Revenue Committee for a hearing next Monday night, and for leave to post 3004, 3008, 3009, 3010, 3011, 3012 for a hearing on Monday night, May 19th, after the House adjourns."

Speaker Shea: "You're still within the posting, if you post today, aren't you?"

Maragos: "No, it had to be at six and a half days, it was at noon today, . . . on leave, I need 107 votes . . . on Tuesday."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Hoffman, did we find out where your bill is? Your motion



then is to discharge the Committee on Assignments and put on the order of Second Reading?"

Hoffman: "Correct. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "On that question there are 122 'aye' votes, 4 'no' votes, 4 voting 'present'. Your motion is allowed. House Bill . . . er . . . Senate Bill 776 will be put on the order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day, on the Calendar. Are there further announcements? The gentleman . . . the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos, has requested the leave to hear those bills in committee on Monday night. All those in favor will vote 'aye', . . . is there some debate about this with Mr. LaFluer? Well, Mr. LaFluer seems to be raising some question, and if we're going to suspend a rule, we can do it in the morning as well as now. Is that all right? Well, you know . . . Mr. LaFluer."

LaFluer: "Mr. Speaker, you're treating the bill and you, from the Podium, said we had an agreed announcement. This is not . . ."

Speaker Shea: "I asked, Mr. LaFluer."

LaFluer: ". . . then I would submit that on --04 bill, that there is no bill, because it shows on the Calendar as a Committee on Revenue bill. There was never any action in the Committee of Revenue to make this bill a Committee of Revenue bill. His motion earlier today, when it was brought, was to table that bill; and I believe that is the only motion that can be made in regard to this bill. Then this bill would be in the same posture in the Revenue Committee as before and his action was taken. Then if the Committee on Revenue decides that they wish to make this a Committee . . . on Revenue Committee bill, they can take that action in committee, but I do not believe you can refer or post a bill that does not exist; and this bill does not exist and there can be no information shown that this was a bill that came out of the Revenue Committee."

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

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, subsequent to my motion this morning, 17 members of the committee have approached me in writing to show that this was their thinking that this were committee bills and that they be heard on May 19th, including 3004, 3008, 3009, 3010, 3011, 3012. I have the signatures of 17 members of the committee, 16 members asking me to



MAY 13 1975

174.

do this, and that's why I'm doing it at their bequest, therefore, it is a greater . . . 60 percent of the committee, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I have been talking with Representative LaFluer about this, and I agree with him absolutely, that 3004 is a non-bill, that can't be heard in the committee; and the problem is this, the bill was introduced, as I understand it, by Representative Lundy. The committee . . ."

Speaker Shea: "Well, Mr. Walsh, can I make a suggestion?"

Walsh: ". . . Well . . ."

Speaker Shea: "Can I make a suggestion, sir?"

Walsh: "I don't think I can stop it."

Speaker Shea: "I was going to suggest that they take the motion out of the Record and find out just what in the devil we're doing here, and we can do it first thing in the morning."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm game for that certainly, yes, we can do it first thing in the morning, but I submit that Mr. Maragos has got to have someone talk to him about procedure, because his procedure is all wrong."

Speaker Shea: "Well, I don't know about it being a non-bill, but there is a piece of paper with a number on it and it appears to be a bill."

Walsh: "Well, it says committee bill and it is not a committee bill."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Maragos."

Walsh: "A committee bill must emanate from the committee and must be read a first time as a committee bill. The problem is that this bill was read a first time as Representative Lundy's bill. Now, . . ."

Speaker Shea: "Well, we're taking the bill out of the Record for tonight. Mr. Lechowicz, do you have an announcement?"

Lechowicz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, just for a matter of announcement. I'm asking that the appropriation to I members and to please be prompt in the morning. We have a number of bills to be considered that will be starting at 8:00 in the morning. We only have two hours to work and I would ask that the members be prompt. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ma . . . Mr. Yourell, do you



MAY 18 1975

have an announcement?"

Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Counties and Townships will meet in Al at 8:00 and we have seven Senate bills on the call, and those House sponsors of the Senate bills, I would advise them that they expire on the Calendar tomorrow on May 14th. So if you are a sponsor of these Senate bills, please be there, if not, the bills will be reported out and dead by Rule 23D."

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

McLendon: "Mr. . . . Mr. Speaker, I'd like to remind the members of the Pensions and Personnel . . . Personnel and Pensions Committee to be prompt tomorrow morning in 122A. We have about 12 Senate bills and we should be out shortly. Thank you very much."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we recess for five minutes and then adjourn until 10:30 in the morning."

Speaker Shea: "You've heard the gentleman's motion. All in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. We stand in recess and then we'll adjourn until 10:30 a.m."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bills, First Reading, Senate Bill 208, a bill for an act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the bill. Senate Bill 333, a bill for an act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. First Reading of the bill. Senate Bill 417, a bill for an act to amend the Mental Health Code. First Reading of the bill. Senate Bill 456, a bill for an act to amend the Game Code. First Reading of the bill."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Clerk, will you hold on? I just want to remind the members yet that we will start on House Bills, Second Reading, on those bills that have been requested to call back to Third Reading for amendments. Go ahead, Mr. Clerk."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 459, a bill for an act to amend the Health and Safety Act. First Reading of the bill. Senate Bill 1488, a bill for an act making a supplemental appropriation to the Department of Finance. First Reading of the bill. Messages from the Senate . . . messages from the Senate. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary; Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has attached the bill of the following title and passage of which





I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit'. Senate Bill 543 passed by the Senate May 13, 1975, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary; Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurred with the House in the adoption of the following preamble and joint resolution to wit'. House Joint Resolution 41 concurred in by the Senate May 13, 1975, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title and passage to which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit'. Senate Bill 392 passed by the Senate May 12, 1975, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed bills with the following titles and the passage to which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit', Senate Bills 490, 496, 502, 511, 514, 518, 520, 521, 524, 525, 526, 527, 529, 544 and 545 passed by the Senate May 13, 1975, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Committee Reports. Mr. Garmisa from the Committee on Transportation to which Senate Bill 401 and 631 was referred. Reported the same back with the recommendation that the bills do pass. Mr. Taylor from the Committee on Cities and Villages to which Senate Bill 299 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 Senate Bills 58 and 119 was . . . were referred. Reported the same back with the recommendation that the bills do pass. Consent Calendar. Mr. Taylor from the Committee on Cities and Villages to which House Bill 1670 was referred. Reported the same back with the recommendation that the bill do pass. Mr. Fennessey from the Committee on Elections to which Senate Bills 96, 144 and 145 were referred. Reported the same back with the recommendation that the bills do pass. Consent Calendar. Mr. Fennessey from the Committee on Elections to which Senate Bill 29 . . . 280 was referred. Reported the same back with the recommendation that the bill do pass. Mr. Fennessey from the Committee on Elections to which Senate Bill 146 was referred. Reported



MAY 13 1975

the same back with amendments, thereto, with the recommendation the amendments be adopted and the bill as amended do pass. Consent Calendar. Mr. Katz from the Committee on Judiciary II to which Senate Bills 28 and 317 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 Bills 167 and 377 were referred. Reported the same back with the recommendation that the bills do pass. Mr. Katz from the Committee on Judiciary II to which House Bill 695 was referred. Returned the same and pursuant to Rule 23D the bill was ordered tabled. No further committee reports. The House stands adjourned until . . . when . . ."

Unknown: "10:30 a.m."

Jack O'Brien: ". . .10:30 a.m., May 14th."



INDEX

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 13, 1975



GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
1	10:30	Speaker Redmond	Call House to Order
1	10:31	Reverend Krueger	Prayer
1	10:32	Speaker Redmond	Roll Call, Consent Calendar
1	10:32	Jack O'Brien	House Bills first reading
1	10:33	Speaker Redmond	Senate Bills first reading
1	10:33	Jack O'Brien	Reads SB's first reading
2	10:41	Friedland	SB 307 Amendment #1
2		Speaker	
2	10:41	Lundy	
2	10:42	Speaker Redmond	Amendment #1 Concurred
3	10:44	Geo-Karis	discussion
3	10:45	Speaker Redmond	discussion
3	10:45	Speaker Redmond	House Bill 94
3		Jack O'Brien	House Bill 94 third reading
3	10:46	Williams	House Bill 94
4		Speaker Redmond	
4		Totten	Yield?
4	10:47	Williams	discussion
4		Speaker	
4	10:49	Borchers	
5	10:51	Speaker Redmond	House Bill 94 passed
5	10:52	Washburn	Rock Falls Elementary School
5		Speaker Redmond	
5		Jack O'Brien	House Bill 102 3rd reading
5		Speaker Redmond	

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
5	10:52	Peters	sponsor
6		Speaker Redmond	House Bill 102 passed
6		Jack O'Brien	House Bill 141 3rd reading
7		Porter	sponsor
8		Speaker Redmond	HB 141
9	11:03	Kane	House Bill 141
9	11:03	Speaker Redmond	
9	11:03	Porter	House Bill 141
9	11:05	Speaker Redmond	House Bill 141
9	11:05	Beatty	House Bill 141
10		Speaker	House Bill 141
10	11:05	Beaupre	House Bill 141
10	11:07	Mugalian	HB 141 passed
10		Jack O'Brien	House Bill 322 3rd reading
11		Speaker	
11	11:08	Hoffman, R.K.	House Bill 322 sponsor
11		Speaker	
11	11:08	Berman	question
11	11:09	Hoffman	
12		Schlickman	Yield?
12	11:10	Hoffman	
12	11:11	Catania	Yield?
13		Hoffman	
13		Speaker Redmond	
13	11:12	Deuster	Yield?
13	11:13	Hoffman	
14		Speaker	

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
14	11:13	Shea	Yield?
14		Hoffman	
14		Speaker Redmond	
14	11:15	Madison	Yield?
15		Hoffman	
15	11:16	Speaker Redmond	HB 322 Passed
15	11:16	Jack O'Brien	House Bill 360 3rd reading
15		Speaker Redmond	
15		Hirschfeld	sponsor
16	11:17	Speaker Redmond	HB 360
16		Dunn, J	explain vote
16		Speaker Redmond	
16	11:18	Hirschfeld	
17	11:19	Speaker Redmond	HB 360 passed
17		Jack O'Brien	House Bill 365
17		Speaker	
17	11:20	Hirschfeld	sponsor
17		Speaker Redmond	
17	11:20	Madison	Yield?
17	11:20	Hirschfeld	
18		Speaker Redmond	
18		Skinner	question
18	11:21	Hirschfeld	discussion
18		Speaker	
18		Shea	
18	11:25	Hirschfeld	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
20	11:25	Washburn	students
20		Speaker Redmond	
20		Kelly	
20		Hirschfeld	
20		Speaker Redmond	
20	11:27	Hart	Yield?
20		Speaker Redmond	
2		Geo-Karis	Yield?
2	11:30	Hirschfeld	
2		Speaker Redmond	
3	11:31	Houlihan, D	
3	11:31	Hirschfeld	
3		Speaker Redmond	
3	11:33	Washington	
4	11:34	Speaker	House Bill 365 passed
4	11:35	Jack O'Brien	House Bill 557 3rd reading
4		Speaker Redmond	
4	11:35	Borchers	sponsor
5		Speaker Redmond	
5		Rayson	
5	11:37	Borchers	
5	11:37	Kane	
5	11:38	Borchers	
5		Speaker Redmond	
5	11:40	Matijevich	question
7	11:40	Borchers	
7		Speaker	House Bill 557 passed
7		Fred Selcke	House Bill 671

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

PAGETIMESPEAKERINFORMATION

7	11:42	Londrigan	
7		Speaker Redmond	House Bill 671 passed
8	11:43	Fred Selcke	HB 750 3rd reading
8		Speaker Redmond	
3	11:45	Fred Selcke	HB 751 3rd reading
3		Speaker Redmond	
3	11:45	Ewing	Sponsor
3		Speaker Redmond	HB 751 passed
7		Fred Selcke	HB 777 3rd reading
		Speaker Redmond	
	11:47	Londrigan	HB 777 sponsor
	11:48	Schlickman	Yield
	11:48	Londrigan	discussion
	11:48	Speaker Redmond	HB 777 passed
	11:52	Fred Selcke	HB 801
		Berman	sponsor
	11:54	Simms	question
		Berman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		McClain	
	11:55	Pierce	question
		Berman	discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
	11:57	Walsh	
		Speaker Redmond	
	11:59	Hudson	
	12:01	Berman	
		Speaker Redmond	



## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
34	12:01	Hoffman, G.	
35		Speaker Redmond	
35	12:02	Lucco	question
35	12:03	Berman	
35		Speaker Redmond	
35		Waddell	question
36	12:03	Berman	
36		Speaker Redmond	
36		Skinner	
36	12:05	Speaker Redmond	Aye-move previous question
36		Speaker Redmond	HB 801
36	12:05	Berman	explain vote
37		Speaker Redmond	
37	12:07	Brinkmeier	explain vote
37		Speaker Redmond	
37	12:08	Pierce	explain vote
38		Speaker Redmond	
38	12:10	Griesheimer	explain vote
39		Speaker Redmond	
39	12:10	Satterthwaite	explain vote
39		Speaker Redmond	
39	12:12	Kane	explain vote
40		Speaker Redmond	
40	12:12	Matijevich	
40	12:13	Speaker Redmond	HB 801 lost
40	12:14	Maragos	table bills
41		Speaker Redmond	
41	12:15	Skinner	

## TRANSCRIPT ION INDEX

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
11	12:16	Maragos	
11		Speaker Redmond	
12	12:17	LaFluer	
12	12:18	Speaker Redmond	
12		Speaker Redmond	HB 801 cont.
12	12:19	Maragos	
12		Speaker Redmond	
13	12:20	Beaupre	
14		Speaker Redmond	
14	12:23	Schraeder	
14		Speaker Redmond	
14	12:23	Maragos	
14		Speaker Redmond	
14	12:24	Hanahan	point of order
14		Speaker Redmond	
15	12:25	Lechowicz	leave to have House Bills in Committee rules suspended HB's 171,235,239,415,725, 1329,1350,1614,1711,1796 1829, 1903, 2120, 2559
15		Speaker Redmond	Leave
15	12:26	Taylor	
16		Speaker Redmond	motion to suspend rules
16	12:27	Walsh	
16		Speaker Redmond	
16	12:28	Shea	
16		Speaker Redmond	
16	12:27	Lechowicz	
16		Speaker Redmond	motion carries

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
46		Schraeder	
47		Speaker Redmond	
47	12:29	Beaupre	return HB 2104 to committee suspend posting rules
47	12:29	motion	
47	12:30	Barnes	
47		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries
7	12:32	Shea	recess till 1:15
7		Speaker Redmond	
7	12:32	Laurino	return for fiscal note
8	1:15	Speaker Redmond	stand in recess for 15 min.
8	1:15	Speaker Redmond	Tom Ohler is new father
3	1:30	Shea	Senate Bills first reading
3		Jack O'Brien	Senate Bills first reading
9	1:34	Speaker Shea	HB's 3rd reading HB 62.
9		Jack O'Brien	House Bill 62
9	1:35	Duff	House Bill 62 3rd reading
		Speaker Shea	
		Walsh	
	1:36	Duff	
		Speaker Shea	
	1:37	Duff	Ask leave to take as package (HB62,63,64,65,66)
		Speaker Shea	no
	1:38	Duff	proceed with HB 62
	1:42	Speaker Shea	HB 62 passed
		Jack O'Brien	HB 63 3rd reading
	1:43	Duff	sponsor
	1:45	Speaker Shea	HB 63 passed
		Jack O'Brien	HB 64 3rd reading

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
53		Speaker Shea	
53	1:45	Duff	sponsor
53	1:46	Shea	HB 64 passed
53		Jack O'Brien	HB 65
53	1:46	Duff	sponsor
54		Shea	
54	1:48	Sangmeister	speak against bill
55	1:50	Shea	
55	1:50	Houlihan, Dan	
56		Shea	
56	1:51	Ewing	oppose
56		Shea	
56	1:52	Madigan	Yield
56	1:53	Duff	
56	1:54	Shea	
56	1:54	Geo-Karis	
57	1:54	Shea	
57	1:55	Matijevich	
57		Shea	
57		Borchers	
58		Shea	order
58	1:56	Borchers	
58		Shea	
58	1:57	Younge	
59		Shea	
59	1:59	Duff	to close HB 65
59	2:00	Shea	HB 65 passed

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
59		Fred Selcke	HB 66 3rd reading
59	2:00	Shea	
59	2:00	Duff	
59	2:00	Shea	HB 66 passed
60		Fred Selcke	HB 110 3rd reading
60		Shea	
60	2:00	Ebbessen	sponsor
60	2:03	Shea	
60	2:04	Fennessey	
61		Shea	
51	2:05	Hill	Yield
61	2:05	Ebbessen	discussion
62		Shea	
62	2:06	Hill	on the bill
62		Shea	
62	2:07	Ebbessen	
62		Shea	
62	2:08	Palmer	Yield
63	2:08	Ebbessen	discussion
63		Shea	
63	2:10	Kosinski	move previous question
63		Shea	eyes have it
64	2:11	Ebbessen	to close
64	2:12	Shea	HB 110
64	2:12	Grotberg	
65		Shea	
65	2:13	Neff	
65		Shea	BRING remarks to close

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
65		Neff	
65	2:15	Shea	
65	2:15	Tipsword	
66		Shea	
66	2:16	Brinkmeier	
66		Shea	
66	2:17	Anderson	
66		Shea	
66	2:17	Schuneman	explain vote
67		Shea	
67		Ebbesen	
67		Shea	
67		Hill	
67		Shea	
67	2:19	Fennessey	
67		Shea	
67		Speaker Redmond	introduce Allen Alda
68		Allen Alda	
68		Speaker Redmond	
68		Collins	
68		Speaker Redmond	
68		Deuster	
68		Speaker Redmond	
68		Matijeovich	point of order
68	2:19	Speaker Redmond	
68	2:19	Ebbesen	

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
68		Speaker Redmond	
69	2:20	Fred Selcke	calls absentees
69	2:20	Shea	proceed with varification
70		Madigan	
70		Fred Selke	
70	2:26	Shea	
70	2:29	Fred Selcke	verification
71		Shea	
71		Fred Selcke	
71		Shea	
71	2:35	Fennessey	
71		Shea	
71		Fred Selcke	
71		Shea	
72	2:38	Taylor	change to aye
72		Shea	
73	2:38	McClain	change to present
73		Shea	
73		Fred Selcke	
73	2:38	Fennessey	
73	2:39	Pouncey	change to aye
73		Shea	
73		Huff	change to aye
73		Shea	
74	2:39	White	change to aye
74	2:40	Fennessey	
74		Shea	

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

AGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
4	2:40	Ebbeson	
4	2:41	Madison	
4		Shea	
4	2:42	Fennessey	
5	2:43	Hirschfeld	point of order
5		Shea	
5	2:43	Patrick	change no to aye
5	2:43	Madison	he was verified
5	2:43	Shea	
5	2:43	Ebbesen	postponed consideration
6		Shea	House Bill 182
6	2:44	Fred Selcke	
5		Shea	
5	2:44	Griesheimer	
5	2:45	Shea	
5	2:45	Matijevich	
5		Shea	House Bill 260
5	2:45	Washburn	
5		Fred Selcke	House Bill 260 3rd reading
5		Shea	
5	2:45	Kosinski	
7	2:47	Shea	House Bill 260 passed
3	2:48	Fred Selcke	HB 486 3rd reading
3		Shea	
3	2:48	Williams	sponsor
3		Shea	
3	2:49	Schlickman	yield
3		Shea	



## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
2:49	Williams	discussion
	Shea	
2:49	Madison	question
2:55	Williams	
	Shea	
2:55	Hanahan	
	Williams	
2:56	Shea	
	Hudson	yield to Tuerk
	Shea	
2:57	Tuerk	yield
2:57	Williams	
2:59	Shea	
	Beatty	yield
	Williams	
3:01	Shea	
3:01	Simms	
	Williams	
	Shea	
3:05	Schraeder	
3:05	Williams	
3:05	Schraeder	speaks on bill
	Shea	
3:06	Deavers	move previous question
	Shea	Ayes have it
3:07	Williams	to close
	Shea	
3:08	Lauer	to explain vote

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
86		Shea	
86	3:08	Hanahan	explain vote
87	3:11	Shea	bring remarks to close
87	3:11	Skinner	explain vote
88		Shea	
88	3:13	Steele E.	explain vote
88		Shea	
88	3:13	Kelly	explain vote
89		Shea	
89	3:14	Stone	parliamentary inquiry
89		Shea	House Bill 486 lost
89		Fred Selcke	House Bill 622
89		Shea	
89	3:15	Davis	Announcement
89		Fred Selcke	House Bill 622 3rd reading
89		Shea	
90	3:16	Hanahan	
90		Shea	
90	3:17	Hoffman, Gene	question
90	3:17	Hanahan	discussion
91		Shea	
91	3:19	Palmer	fiscal note
91	3:20	Hanahan	
92		Shea	
92		Tuerk	yield
92	3:20	Hanahan	discussion
93		Shea	
93	3:23	Hanahan	to close

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
3	3:24	Shea	House Bill 622 passed
3		Fred Selcke	House Bill 623
3		Shea	Hanahan - 623
3	3:25	Hanahan	sponsor
4		Shea	
4	3:26	Palmer	
4	3:26	Hanahan	
5	3:27	Shea	House Bill 623 passed
5	3:28	Fred Selcke	House Bill 803 3rd reading
5		Shea	
5	3:28	Keller	sponsor
5	3:28	Shea	House Bill 803 passed
5	3:29	Fred Selcke	House Bill 937 3rd reading
5	3:29	Shea	
5	3:29	Leon	937 & 938 heard together
5		Shea	
5		Fred Selcke	House Bill 938 3rd reading
5	3:30	Leon	House Bill 937& 938
5		Shea	HB 937&938
5	3:30	Schlickman	yield
5		Leon	discussion
5	3:34	Shea	any further questions
5		McPartlin	
5		Shea	
5		Totten	yield
5	3:35	Leon	
5		Shea	
5		McPartlin	
5		Totten	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
98		Shea	
98	3:35	Houlihan, JM	
99		Shea	
99		Matijevich	yield
99	3:36	Leon	discussion
99	3:37	Shea	
99	3:37	Leon	to close
99	3:37	Shea	HB 937 & 938
99	3:38	McPartlin	
99		Shea	
100	3:39	Fred Selcke	HB 937 & 938 lost
100		Shea	HB 993 3rd reading
100	3:39	Darrow	sponsor
100		Shea	
100	3:40	Totten	no
100	3:40	Shea	
100		Taylor	yield
01	3:41	Darrow	
01	3:42	Shea	
01	3:42	Fred Selcke	HB 993 passed
01		Shea	HB 1080 3rd reading
01	3:42	Pierce	
01		Shea	
02	3:43	Leinenweber	question
2		Pierce	
2	3:44	Shea	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

AGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
02	3:44	Terzich	question
2		Pierce	discussion
3		Shea	
3	3:46	Palmer	question
3		Pierce	
3	3:47	Shea	
3	3:47	Mann	support
		Shea	
		Pierce	
	3:48	Shea	HB 1080 passed
	3:49	Jack O'Brien	HB 1147 3rd reading
		Shea	
	3:49	Berman	
	3:50	Shea	HB 1147 passed
		Jack O'Brien	HB 1320 3rd reading
		Shea	
	3:51	Keller	sponsor
		Shea	
	3:52	Schneider	
	3:52	Keller	
	3:53	Shea	
	3:53	Borchers	
		Shea	
	3:54	McClain	question
		Keller	
	3:55	Satterthwaite	question
		Keller	

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
108		Shea	
108	3:58	Schlickman	yield
108	3:58	Keller	go ahead
108		Shea	
108	3:59	O'Daniels	
109		Shea	
109	4:00	Hirschfeld	
111	4:03	Shea	
111	4:04	Cunningham	
112	4:07	Shea	
112	4:07	Keller	to close
112	4:08	Shea	HB 1320
112	4:08	Ebbessen	
112		Shea	
112	4:09	Borchers	
112	4:09	Shea	
113	4:10	Borchers	
114		Shea	
114		Simms	record AYE
114		Shea	HB 1320
114		Hirschfeld	requests verification
114		Shea	
114	4:12	Keller	pull absentees
114		Shea	
114	4:12	Jack O'Brien	verify absentees
114	4:13	Shea	proceed to verify

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
114		Jack O'Brien	verification
116		Hirschfeld	withdraw verification
116	4:18	Shea	HB 1320 passed
116		Schlickman	
116	4:20	Shea	HB's 3rd reading
116		Shea	HB 155
116		Jack O'Brien	HB 155 3rd reading
116		Shea	
116		Hudson	explains HB 155
117		Shea	
117		Washburn	introduction of group from Kankakee
117		Shea	
117		Mann	question of sponsor
117		Hudson	discussion on bill
117		Shea	vote HB 155 passed
118		Jack O'Brien	HB 442 3rd reading
118		Shea	
118		Madigan	explains HB 442 for Lemke
118		Shea	vote on HB 442
118		Hirschfeld	question
118		Shea	yields
118		Hirschfeld	question & discussion
118		Madigan	question & discussion
119		Shea	question & discussion
119		Madigan	question & discussion
119		Shea	question & discussion
119		Hirschfeld	question & discussion

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
119		Shea	discussion
119		Hirschfeld	discussion
119		Shea	discussion
119		Katz	question
120		Madigan	discussion
120		Katz	discussion on HB 442
120		Shea	
120		Cunningham	supports HB 442
121		Shea	recognition of Rep.
121		Terzich	supports HB 442
121		Shea	recognition of Rep.
121		Grotberg	opposes HB 442
121		Shea	recognition of Rep.
122		Ewell	opposes HB 442
122		Shea	recognition of Rep.
122		Dunn	supports HB 442
122		Shea	recognition of Rep.
122		Madigan	to close on HB 442
123		Shea	vote on HB 442
123		VanDuyne	votes AYE explains vote
123		Shea	recognition of Rep.
123		Lechowicz	explains vote
123		Shea	recognition of Rep.
123		Barnes	explains vote
123		Shea	take the record HB 442 passed
124		Jack O'Brien	HB 533 3rd reading
124		Shea	HB 533



## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
124		McPartlin	explains bill-pension bill
124		Shea	
124		Skinner	question
124		Shea	yields
124		Skinner	question
124		McPartlin	answer
124		Skinner	"There goes the dike."
124		Shea	
124		Schneider	discussion
124		McPartlin	discussion
124		Shea	yields to McAuliffe
124		McAuliffe	response & discussion
125		Schneider	discussion
125		McPartlin	discussion
125		Shea	
125		Schraeder	question
126		Shea	
126		Dunn	question
126		Shea	indicates he will
126		Dunn	question
126		McPartlin	discussion
126		Dunn	discussion
127		McPartlin	discussion
127		Shea	discussion
127		Terzich	discussion
128		Shea	
128		Terzich	discussion

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
128		Shea	
128		McCourt	discussion
128		Shea	
129		McPartlin	to close on HB 533
129		Shea	vote
129		Schlickman	explains vote "present"
129		Shea	HB 533 passed
129		Jack O'Brien	HB 574 3rd reading
129		Shea	HB 574 out of the record.
129		Jack O'Brien	HB 619 3rd reading
129		Shea	recognition of Rep.
130		Ewell	explains HB 619-sponsor-handgun ban
130		Shea	continue
130		Ewell	HB 619
132		Shea	
132		Kosinski	speaks on the bill-8 points of opposition
133		Shea	any further questions
133		Geo-Karis	question
133		Shea	yields
133		Geo-Karis	question
133		Ewell	discussion
133		Geo-Karis	discussion
133		Ewell	discussion
134		Geo-Karis	opposes HB 619
134		Shea	

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
134		McClain	question
134		Ewell	discussion
134		Shea	
134		Cunningham	opposes HB 619
135		Shea	bring comments to close
135		Cunningham	"I've just begun."
136		Shea	
136		Mann	supports HB 619
137		Shea	
137		Borchers	question of sponsor
137		Ewell	answer & discussion
137		Borchers	discussion
138		Ewell	discussion
138		Borchers	discussion
138		Shea	bring comments to close
138		Borchers	opposes HB 619
139		Shea	recognition of Rep.
139		DiPrima	
139		Shea	continue Rep. DiPrima
139		DiPrima	moves previous question
139		Shea	motion passed
139		Ewell	to close
140		Shea	vote on HB 619
140		Ewell	
140		Shea	HB 619 lost
140		Waddell	votes no
140		Shea	
140		Cunningham	

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
140		Shea	
140		Jack O'Brien	HB 631,632&634 3rd reading
140		Shea	
140		DiPrima	asks leave to hear 631,632 and 634
140		Shea	leave granted
140		Jack O'Brien	reads bills
140		DiPrima	explains HB 631,632&634
141		Shea	vote
141		Terzich	discussion on the bills
141		DiPrima	discussion
141		Shea	
141		Huff	
141		Shea	take 3 records. HB 631, 632&634 passed
141		Jack O'Brien	HB 645 3rd reading
142		Shea	HB 645
142		Griesheimer	announces ERA is defeated in Senate Committee
142		Shea	now speak on the bill Rep.
142		Griesheimer	explains bill-snowmobiles
143		Shea	vote
143		Mautino	question
143		Shea	yields
143		Mautino	question asked
143		DiPrima	discussion
143		Mautino	thank you
143		Shea	all voted? take the record

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
143		Jack O'Brien	HB 646 3rd reading
143		Shea	HB 646
143		Grieshmeier	explains bill-boat minors
144		Shea	vote-take the record-passed
144		Jack O'Brien	HB 654 3rd reading
144		Shea	out of the record
144		Jack O'Brien	HB 669 3rd reading public contracts
144		Shea	recognition of Rep.
144		Kempiners	explains bill-sponsor
144		Shea	recognition of Rep.
145		Leinenweber	question
145		Shea	yield
145		Leinenweber	question asked
145		Kempiners	discussion
145		Leinenweber	discussion
145		Kempiners	discussion
145		Shea	yields
145		Beatty	question
145		Shea	yields
145		Beatty	question
146		Kempiners	answer & discussion
146		Beatty	discussion & question
146		Kempiners	discussion
146		Beatty	discussion
146		Shea	vote HB 669. take the record passed
146		Jack O'Brien	HB 676 3rd reading
146		Shea	recognition of Rep.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
146		Matijevich	explains bill-selling of alcoholic beverages
147		Shea	vote - passed
147		Jack O'Brien	HB 727 3rd reading-pension code
147		Shea	recognition of Rep.
147		Yourell	explains bill - sponsor
147		Shea	vote-take record-passed
148		Jack O'Brien	HB 784 3rd reading
148		Shea	
148		VonBoeckman	explains bill - sponsor
148		Shea	vote - passed
148		Jack O'Brien	HB 804 3rd reading-state insect
148		Shea	
148		Borchers	explains bill sponsor
148		Shea	vote
148		McGrew	vote no
149		Shea	HB 084 passed
149		Duff	question
149		Shea	discussion
149		Duff	question
149		Shea	discussion
149		Duff	
149		Shea	HB 818
149		Jack O'Brien	HB 818 3rd reading
149		Shea	
149		Washington	HB 818 explains bill small business act

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
150		Shea	HB 818 vote- passed
150		Jack O'Brien	HB 876 3rd reading pension code
150		Shea	
150		Palmer	explains bill-con con
150		Shea	HB 876 vote-passed
150		Jack O'Brien	HB 894 3rd reading
150		Shea	
150		Hudson	explains HB 894
151		Shea	
151		Kosinski	question
151		Hudson	discussion
151		Kosinski	discussion
151		Shea	vote on HB 894-passed
151		O'Brien	HB 950 3rd reading
151		Shea	discussion
151		Skinner	explains bill
151		Shea	HB 950 vote-passed
151		Jack O'Brien	HB 955 3rd reading
151		Shea	leave to hear 955 & 956
152		Jack O'Brien	HB 956 3rd reading
152		Shea	
152		Hart	explains bills 955 & 956
152		Shea	
152		Cunningham	question
152		Shea	yields
152		Cunningham	question
152		Hart	

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
152		Cunningham	discussion
152		Hart	discussion
152		Shea	
152		Rigney	question
152		Shea	yields
153		Rigney	question
153		Hart	discussion
153		Rigney	discussion
153		Hart	discussion
153		Rigney	discussion
153		Hart	discussion
153		Shea	
153		Waddell	question
153		Shea	yields
153		Waddell	question
153		Hart	discussion
153		Waddell	discussion
153		Hart	discussion
154		Shea	
154		Deavers	moves previous question
154		Shea	so moved
154		Hart	leave to let Choate close.
154		Shea	
154		Choate	to close
155		Shea	vote
155		Deuster	explain vote
155		Shea	take record-HB 955&956 passed



## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
155		Washburn	HJR 38-committee amendment
155		Shea	
155		Jack O'Brien	amendment #1 of HJR 38
155		Shea	vote-passed amendment
156		Washburn	explains HJR 38
156		Shea	
156		Washburn	
156		Shea	vote on HJR 38 - passed
156		Shea	asks leave for 15 bills to be returned to second reading for amendments
157		Walsh	objects
157		Shea	restates the leave motion
157		Walsh	requests Speaker to list bill numbers
157		Shea	discussion
157		Walsh	discussion
157		Shea	
157		Walsh	
157		Shea	
157		Walsh	
157		Shea	
157		Walsh	
157		Shea	House Bills 3rd reading
157		Jack O'Brien	HB 959 3rd reading
157		Shea	HB 959
158		Dunn	explains HB 959-senior citizens bill

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
158		Shea	vote on HB 959-passed
158		Jack O'Brien	HB 981 3rd reading
158		Shea	
158		Londrigan	explains bill
158		Shea	
158		Duff	
158		Shea	vote
158		Duff	
158		Shea	
158		Duff	
159		Shea	
159		Grötberg	question
159		Londrigan	discussion
159		Grotberg	discussion
159		Londrigan	explains bill again
159		Grotberg	
159		Shea	further discussion
160		Matijevich	speaks on bill-form Committee
160		Shea	
160		Londrigan	to close
160		Shea	vote HB 981-passed
160		Jack O'Brien	HB 987 3rd reading
160		Shea	
160		White	explains HB 987-Chicago teachers pension code
161		Shea	HB 987 vote-passed
161		Shea	HB 988 take out of record
161		Jack O'Brien	HB 1051 3rd reading

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
161		Terzich	explains bill-commission to examine old laws
161		Shea	
161		Kane	question
162		Shea	yields
162		Kane	question
162		Terzich	discussion
162		Kane	discussion
162		Terzich	discussion
162		Kane	discussion
162		Terzich	discussion
162		Shea	
162		Schlickman	speaks on bill
162		Shea	
162		Tipsword	supports the bill
163		Shea	take record-HB 1051 passed
163		Jack O'Brien	HB 1121 3rd reading
163		Shea	recognition of sponsor
163		Collins	explains bill state accounting
164		Shea	recognition of Rep.
164		Houlihan JM	question
164		Shea	yields
164		Houlihan	question
164		Collins	discussion
164		Houlihan JM	discussion
164		Collins	discussion
164		Houlihan JM	

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
165		Collins	discussion
165		Houlihan JM	discussion
165		Shea	
165		Washington	discussion
165		Collins	discussion
166		Washington	discussion
166		Shea	recognition of Rep.
166		Taylor	move previous question
166		Shea	so moved
166		Collins	to close
167		Shea	HB 1121 vote-passed
167		Jack O'Brien	HB 1319 3rd reading rivers commission
167		Shea	recognition of Rep. Keller
167		Keller	explains bill
168		Shea	
168		Houlihan JM	question
168		Shea	yields
168		Houlihan JM	question how much?
168		Keller	150,000
168		Houlihan JM	discussion
168		Keller	discussion
168		Houlihan JM	speaks against bill
168		Shea	
168		Schlickman	opposes the bill unnecessary
168		Shea	
168		Peters	speaks in favor of bill

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
169		Shea	
169		Deavers	moves previous question
169		Shea	so moved
169		Keller	to close
169		Shea	HB 1319 vote
169		Kane	to explain vote
169		Shea	
169		Keller	
170		Shea	take record-postponed consideration HB 1319
170		Jack O'Brien	HB 1479 3rd reading
170		Shea	
170		Matijevecich	explains HB 1479
171		Shea	vote
171		Duff	
171		Shea	
171		Duff	explains vote-supports bill
171		Shea	HB 1479 passed
171		Hoffman	Senate Bill 776-explains bill suspend the rules to correct an error
72		Shea	vote on SB 776 suspending rules
72		Hoffman	will withdraw motion
72		Shea	SB 776 wait, lets check
72		Maragos	asks leave HB 3004 put back to Committee for hearing. also HB 3008,3009,3010, 3011& 3012
72		Shea	SB 776 motion allowed goes to 2nd reading

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

SEE	TIME	SPEAKER	INFORMATION
73		LaFleur	raises objection
73		Shea	discussion on objection
73		LaFleur	discussion
73		Shea	discussion
73		Maragos	discussion
74		Shea	discussion
4		Walsh	discussion
4		Shea	discussion
4		Walsh	discussion
4		Shea	take motion out of record
4		Walsh	discussion
4		Shea	discussion
4		Walsh	discussion
4		Shea	takes bill out of record
4		Lechowicz	announcement of hearing
4		Shea	recognition of Rep.
4		Yourell	announcement
4		Shea	
4		McLendon	announcement
4		Shea	
4		Madigan	move to recess for 5 min. and then adjourn
4		Shea	motion passed
4		Jack O'Brien	Senate Bills first reading
4		Shea	reminds membership
4		Jack O'Brien	continues Senate bills first reading
4		Jack O'Brien	Committee reports
4		Jack O'Brien	House adjourned