

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTY-EIGHTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

MAY 16, 1975



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTY-EIGHTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

MAY 16, 1975



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Redmond: "The House will be in order and the Members will please be in their seats. Good morning. We will be led in prayer this morning by Reverend Krueger, the House Chaplin."

Reverend Krueger: "O Lord, Bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. Will Herberg reported in the U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT: The survival of Judaism and Christianity depends on God: they are instruments in God's hands. About thirty years ago.... I wrote.... that the survival of Jewry was a matter of divine providence, not of a "strategy of survival." That is true. If God has no purpose for Judaism and Christianity, why should they survive? If God has a purpose for them, all the forces of the world won't be able to destroy them. Let us pray. O Thou our Lord and God, our merciful Father in heaven, we entreat Thee with yearning hearts, give us in this world what ever is truly good and well for us in soul and body, according to Thy holy will and pleasure. May we live as instruments of Thy Will, endure with patience, purposefully serve Thy people, that such legislation we may enact will provide peace and hope; we ask this in Thy Eternal Name, for Jesus Christ's sake. Amen."

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

Jack O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of Bills of the following title to wit: House Bill 184, passed by the Senate May 15, 1975, Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will be at ease for about ten minutes. The House will be in order. Introduction, First Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3013, Londrigan. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3014, Shea. A Bill for an Act making appropriations for the expenses of certain special elections. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3015, Londrigan. A Bill for an Act making emergency appropriations to the Illinois Historical Library. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3016, Shea. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Labor. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."



Shea: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with reference to House Bill 3016. It's a very short Bill and if I might, I would like to take a moment of the House to read it and then I would like to move this Bill to the order of Second Reading without reference to a Committee. Mr. Speaker, might I have permission to just read this very short Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Shea: "It says, 'Whereas delay in receiving unemployment compensation checks is working great hardship among many unemployed workers and their families, and whereas in income instances, persons have been forced to go on general assistance because of the delay in receiving their first unemployment compensation check. Therefore, be it enacted by the people of the State of Illinois represented in the General Assembly, the sum of \$10,000,000 or so much thereof that may be necessary is appropriated to the Department of Labor for the purpose of making emergency loans in amounts not to exceed \$150.00 to individuals in need thereof pending receipt of the borrowers first unemployment compensation check. This appropriation shall be available for expenditures through June 30, 1976.' Now I can say that I don't know if this is the answer or one of the answers or what the problem is or how we solve it, but at least I'm willing to take this first step. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be put on the order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day, without reference to a Committee and would move to ah... suspend the appropriate rule."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washburn."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wonder if Representative Shea would hold that motion for a moment because we haven't seen the Bill or talked about it and ah...."

Shea: "Fine."

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Washburn: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The order of business is House Bills, Third Reading, priority of call. We'll take those whose terminal date is today. On House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 598."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 598, Gene Hoffman. A Bill for an Act to amend



the Mental Health Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative G.L. Hoffman here? 779."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 779, Willer. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vital Records Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I apologize for taking a lot of time of the House with this terribly important earth-shaking Bill. I'm sure it's going to engender at least one hour of debate in question, but I think it is a vitally important Bill. In fact, two counties downstate, Edgar and Washington County..... and what it does is simply provide that the State Registrar may I'm sorry.... provide that the State Registrar may appoint ah... administrators of hospitals as Deputy Registrars if he cannot find either the County Clerk, the Township Clerk, or the Road District Clerk, to do ah... to take upon this duty. Now ah... as I say, I'm sure that you're going to have a lot of questions, so fire away."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill pass. All those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 102 'aye' and 11 'no' and the Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 838."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 838, McGrew. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to use the last Roll Call? House Bill 838 provides for the advertizing of bids for ah... by the County Clerk for election supplies. I have tried to accomodate the various Members and objections of the House and have placed three different ah... two different Amendments, three different substantive ideas, that would let the County Clerk escape responsibility for a defaulted bidder as well as let them purchase emergency election supplies if the bidder has defaulted. I move for the adoption of House Bill 838."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill pass. All in favor



4.

vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Berman, do you seek recognition?"

Berman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, what this Bill says is that there cannot be any purchases ah... without competitive bidding by the election ah... by the County Clerk's and the Election Officials. I made an inquiry up our way and I was told that this ah... in Chicago, at least, is probably unworkable. There are requirements, when you're servicing 3,000 some precincts on an emergency basis, where even if you buy a pen or a pencil for a precinct, ah... for each of the judges, if they're short, you're going to be over \$500.00. I just don't think this Bill ah... it may sound interesting, but I'm told that it's just not workable on a \$500.00 no bid basis. I'm going to vote 'no'."

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

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would really want to point out that as a matter of record, that the County Clerk in Cook County, actually does advertising for bids now and ah... in fact, it probably has served as a model for the rest of us and it is the problems that we are having elsewhere that this Bill seems to correct. I have tried to point out that this can be abused, whereas the particular County Clerk does not have to advertise for any bids, be it voting machines or otherwise and I think that there is great room for abuse. There are cases on record where the County Clerk charged nearly \$200.00 for a packet that included pencils, envelopes and tally sheets in one of the downstate counties and ah... I think that is a travesty of justice and a waste of the taxpayers dollar and this Bill would go far to rectify it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 46 'aye' and 22 'nay' and the Bill having failed to receive the constitutional majority is hereby declared lost. The order of business is House Bills, Second Reading, House Bill 555."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 555, LaFleur. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relation to divorce. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."



Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 620. Representative LaFleur, for what purpose do you rise? Representative LaFleur."

LaFleur: "On House Bill 555, that was the Bill that was identical to land slide race and the no fault divorce Bill and I would like to return this to Committee ah... have leave to refer this to Committee so that it could be placed in Interim Study with the rest of the no fault divorce Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? It will be taken off the call and put in the Interim Study. 620."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 620, Jaffe. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code and the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. This Bill has been read a second time before. Amendment #1 was adopted. Amendment #2, Hart and Byers. Amends House Bill 620 on page 1 by deleting line 7 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "I would like leave of the House to withdraw Amendment #2. I'm the Chief Sponsor of it. In favor of another Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Amendment #2 is withdrawn."

Jaffe: "Amendment #3, Jaffe. Amends House Bill 620 as amended on page 2, lines 22 through 24 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative ah... who's the Sponsor of the Amendment?"

Jack O'Brien: "Jaffe."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, this is an Amendment ah... agreed upon with the County Clerks downstate and throughout the entire state and showed to Representative Hart and basically what it does is that it permits duplicate counties to be utilized in school board elections and I would move it's adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, as I understood the original Amendment, you provided for the binders to go out? Is that correct?"

Jaffe: "That's correct."



Shea: "All right. What do you provide now? I don't understand the duplicates."

Jaffe: "Well, ah.. in other words, the school boards can now make up special binders by making up Xerox cards and they can up date them and we have reached this agreement, Jerry, with the County Clerk."

Shea: "Well, I don't understand reaching an agreement with the County Clerk. What's wrong with bringing the binders out?"

Jaffe: "Well, the problem that we had downstate with bringing the binders out is the many instances that we had different counties involved and they would have to juggle the cards because school districts don't conform with the same boundries that other ah... boundries are."

Shea: "Well, do you feel that by doing it this way, that when people go to vote in school elections, they'll be registered voters?"

Jaffe: "That's exactly right."

Shea: "Well, are you assured, you and Mr. Hart, that this will do it?"

Jaffe: "Not only Mr. Hart and myself, but also the County Clerks are assured of this."

Shea: "All right."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 620. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' and all opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Campbell. Amends House Bill 620 on page 2, line 19 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah... Amendment #4 is technically incorrect. Am I ah... since it has already been distributed, I move to table Amendment #4... all right, I'll just ask leave to withdraw it."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has asked leave to withdraw it. Any objections? Amendment #4 is withdrawn."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Campbell. Amends House Bill 620 as amended on page 2, line 24 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

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



this just instructs the Board of Election Commissioners where they have jurisdiction to do the same thing that the County Clerks do.

I move for the adoption of Amendment #5."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #5 to House Bill 620. All in favor say 'aye' and all opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further."

Speaker Redmond: "No further Amendments, Third Reading. 1136."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1136, Hanahan. A Bill for an Act to amend the Minimum Wage Law. Second Reading of the Bill. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was tabled. Amendment #2 was adopted. Amendment #3, Rigney. Amends House Bill 1136 on page 5 by inserting immediately below line 1 the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the effect of this Amendment is simply to exempt agriculture labor from the provisions of this Bill. I think it's going to be necessary to do this because frankly, that labor is rather seasonal. There are times where maybe we use it sixty hours out of a week and ah... so I think that it's only proper ah... it has been exempt ah... historically and I think it's going to be necessary to continue to be exempt."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Well, the Sponsor of this Bill isn't on the floor so I think it oughta be taken out of the record.."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "I'm here, Dick. I'm back. This Amendment is not the exemption of the total effect on agriculture workers on the minimum wage, it's the exemption to the time and a half provision after forty hours, which is in compliance of the Federal Act. Representative Rigney and the farm groups have asked for the same coverage of the ah... the time and a half provisions that this Bill, House Bill 1136, brings into the Minimum Wage Act and I concur with the adoption of this



Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 1136. All in favor say 'aye' and opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further."

Speaker Redmond: "No further Amendments. Third Reading. 680."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 680, Skinner. A Bill for an Act in relation to property tax relief. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was withdrawn in Committee. Amendment #2 was tabled. Amendment #3 was adopted and the Bill was held for a fiscal note."

Speaker Redmond: "Has the fiscal note been furnished? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "The very day that it was held for a fiscal note, I wrote both the Department of Local Government Affairs and the Department of Revenue. Now under the Fiscal Note Act, the Department that required.... if my memory serves me correctly, to reply within five legislative days, I believe ah.... perhaps the Clerk can tell us whether five legislative days have passed since then."

Speaker Redmond: "When was the fiscal note request?"

Jack O'Brien: "It was read a second on May 6th."

Speaker Redmond: "What was the date of your letter to the....department?"

Skinner: "My letter was dictated that day and it was mailed that day and it should have arrived on May 6th. I would respectfully submit that at least five legislative days have passed since then and I would ask for the Speaker's advice on how to proceed from here."

Speaker Redmond: "It should have been furnished by the 10th, as I compute it."

Skinner: "Well, what should I do?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Berman."

Berman: "I just have an inquiry of the Sponsor. Have you talked to anyone over there?"

Skinner: "I have talked to the General Council of the Department of Local Government Affairs and he said that the Amendment was unavailable."



I at that time checked with the Bill Room. I got him a copy of the Amendment. It has been ah... it had however been in our binder since the date of its adoption. So that means that the Amendment was available for any enterprising department."

Berman: "Well, how long has it been since you handed him the Amendment?"

Skinner: "When was Director Kirk confirmed? Was that two days ago?"

Berman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, my point is that ah.. aside from the technicalities involved, apparently it's been approximately two days since the department has had the Amendment in question in their hand, so I would suggest that we just wait three more days and then the same point oughta be raised."

Speaker Redmond: "I'll have somebody from my staff contact the department."

Skinner: "So far the Department of Revenue has yet to even ask for a copy of the Amendment, so I must assume that they did not have the same problem that the Department of Local Government Affairs had. I would wonder what excuse we could offer for them."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll have to hold this Bill, but if you'll give me a copy of the letter that you sent to each department, ah.. I will contact them and ah.... take that one out of the record. 1064. Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of introduction; in the back balcony, we have 130 campfire girls from the 9th, 10th and 47th Districts, ably represented by Representatives Rayson, Mahar and Kelly, Miller, Getty and Arnell, Leinenweber, VanDuyne and Sangmeister. Their leader is Liz Griffth. If they'll stand for recognition, please."

Speaker Redmond: "1064."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1064, Choate. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. This Bill has been read a second time previously...."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. The Sponsor is not here. 1111, Representative Choate.... take that out of the record. 1167, Representative Maragos."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1167..."

Speaker Redmond: "Marovitz."



Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1167, Marovitz. A Bill for an Act in relation to the Illinois Consumer Product Safety Act. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. There was a request for a fiscal note on this and ah... the fiscal note has been filed. There are no fiscal implications. This is an Act which expands the present authority of ah... hazardous substances and incorporates all of the different Acts into one and it makes this Act uniform with the Federal Act. It came out of Committee 14 to 1 and I would respectfully ask that this Bill be moved to Third Reading. There's an Amendment, I believe. After the adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk advises me that the Bill is now in order."

Jack O'Brien: "I've got a second Amendment to be put on."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment #2 is on the Clerk's desk."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Marovitz. Amends House Bill 1167 on page 4, line 14 and so forth."

Marovitz: "O'kay, I would ask for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 1167. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye' and those opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "No further Amendments. Third Reading. 1785."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1785, Garmisa. A Bill for an Act to license and regulate landscape architecture. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Walsh. Amends House Bill 1785 on page 8 by inserting between lines 20 and 21 the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh. Are you in agreement with the Amendment? Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an agreed Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa has moved the adoption of



Amendment #1 to House Bill 1785. All in favor say 'aye' and the opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Dan Houlihan. Amends House Bill 1785 on page 8 by inserting immediately after line 17 the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Houlihan informs me that he would like to table Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman asks leave to table Amendment #2. Is there any objection? Amendment #2 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Leinenweber. Amends House Bill 1785 on page 8 by inserting after line 20 the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Leinenweber would ask that this be tabled and that Amendment #5 be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Is that correct? Leave? Amendment #3 is tabled."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Garmisa. Amends House Bill 1785 on page 16 by deleting all of Section 30 and so forth."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment exempts the home rule units. I would ask for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4 to House Bill 1785. All in favor say 'aye' and the opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Leinenweber. Amends House Bill 1785 on page 7 by striking line 35 and so forth."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #5 is an agreed Amendment between the landscape architects and the real estate and residential home industry and it makes it a little easier for them to proceed. It merely eliminates the requirement that the landscape architect be required to sign the preliminary and the final plat. I move for the adoption of Amendment #5."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #5."



to House Bill 1785. All in favor say 'aye' and the opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "No further Amendments. Third Reading. 1938."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1938. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Savings and Loan Act. Second Reading of the Bill. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted. Amendment #2, Deavers. Amends House Bill 1938 on line 1 by striking '3-1' and inserting '3-2' and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "I move to ah... adoption of Amendment #1 which does the same thing ah.... or Amendment #2, excuse me. It replaces Amendment #1. This is an Agreed Amendment with the Chairman of the Banks and Savings and Loans because it was a Committee Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "What's on there now? Is #1 on there now? #1 was tabled. The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 1938. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye' and opposed 'no' and the Amendment is adopted. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "I'm sorry, I thought this was another Bill that Mr. Deavers had. Does this one deal with banks or ah... what does this one deal with, Gil?"

Deavers: "Jerry, this is the one that you have a Floor Amendment for and I'd like to hold it on Second."

Shea: "Well, now is this 1938 or is this 1955?"

Deavers: "This is 1938?"

Shea: "Well, I made the Amendment for 1955. Is that one of your Bills?"

Deavers: "I don't think so. 1955 is Keller's Bill."

Shea: "All right, then ah... I understand why they've gone ahead and done this so go ahead and move it and I'll talk to you about it."

Deavers: "All right. I'd like to move it to Third then."

Speaker Redmond: "No further Amendments. Third Reading. 2109. Representative Jones.... take that out of the record. 2277, Is Represent-



tative White on the floor? Is Representative White on the floor?
Take that out of the record. 2347."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 2347. Pierce. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amends House Bill 2347 on page 4, line 20, by deleting 'may' and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Committee Amendment #1 is an Amendment that satisfies some problems of the independent insurance agents had and that they... and that the...a...life insurance agents had on temporary licenses and clarifies the 'Grandfather Clause' on financial institutions. It is not controversial and, therefore, I move the adoption of Committee Amendment #1 to House Bill 2347, which is agreed to by the Department of Insurance and the effected associations."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 2347. All in favor say aye. Opposed no, the ayes have it, the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the sponsor a question about the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schuneman: "Representative Pierce, your Amendment include the deletion of the...a...a...county district mutual companies that we talked about a few days ago?"

Pierce: "That Committee Amendment did. The original Amendment #2, which we're coming to does, but I've been asked by the Department to table Amendment #2, which you have on your desk, which will then make your Amendment #3 relevant and you should pursue that if that is your objective. Amendment #4 is a new Amendment too, which doesn't do what you wanted done, which original Amendment #2 did do. So we're not quite there yet, but you should pursue your Amendment if you want to achieve your objective."

Schuneman: "Alright, thank you."

Pierce: "Amendment #1 had nothing to do with it, that was the Amendment



14.

we adopted in Committee. Now on Amendment #2, if you'd call that, Mr. Clerk, I will move to withdraw or table or whatever's appropriate, Amendment #2. That's not a Committee Amendment, that's an Amendment I sent up there at the suggestion of the Department of Insurance and they've now incorporated that into Amendment #4, so we can table Amendment #2 or withdraw it, whatever is appropriate. I don't think its ever been offered."

Speaker Redmond: "Has it been adopted?"

Pierce: "No its never been adopted, its not a Committee Amendment. Withdraw, I think, is the proper thing, and that brings us to Amendment #3, which is Mr. Schuneman's Amendment."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Schuneman. Amends House Bill 2347 on page 10 in line 13, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #3 would simply remove a deletion and it would remove the deletion that appears in the original draft of the Bill, which would exempt from any licensing requirement those agents of county, district, and township mutual insurance companies, which have not been covered under the agents and brokers licensing law for the State of Illinois, and would include those within the purvey of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 347. All in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it; the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #4. Pierce. Amends House Bill 2347 on page 1, line 22 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Amendment #4 is...a...Amendment #2 updated and clarified, its the Illinois Department of Insurance's Amendment that apparently will provide for the residency and the examinations to be given by the outside agencies that are going to be giving the insurance examinations in the future. It also provides for the...clarifies the consultant's licenses. Its a technical Amendment and I move the adoption of Amendment #4 and hope there aren't too many questions about it."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment



#4 to House Bill 2347. All in favor signify by saying aye. Oposed, no. The ayes have it, the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #5. McPartlin. Amends House Bill 2347, as amended, by deleting Subsection E and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #5 records the law in its present form whereby financial institutions through their subsidiaries may continue to sell insurance and pay the postage to the depositors of their institution. If this Amendment is defeated, it would allow a company executive to appoint a personal friend or himself to keep the proceeds. What this does, it makes the proceeds go back to the depositors of that institution. And I move for the adoption of Amendment #5."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, the Department of Insurance is in opposition to this Amendment. What it does is removes the prohibition in House Bill 2347 against savings and loans in banks and trusts companies engaging in the property insurance business where they have the mortgages. The Bill did 'grandfather' in those savings and loan associations October 1st of this year,...a...will have insurance agents and brokers licenses. They were 'grandfathered' in...Tallman's and First Federal and so on, but apparently they want to eliminate completely the prohibition against savings and loans obtaining... obtaining insurance agents and brokers license because...a...they want to keep doing. The Department feels that it leaves a tie-in sale, undue influence, coercion, or whatever, and the mortgage borrower obtaining their fire and home owners insurance and so on through the savings and loan where he makes his mortgage. I think Representative McPartlin's Amendment #5 goes further, even, than he intended because by deleting Subsection E, Section 492.1, what he does, he doesn't say the page here, but I believe that's on page 6 of the Bill...."

Speaker Redmond: "Page 5."

Pierce: "Page 5 of the Bill, what he does there is knock out the existing



prohibition against banks and trust companies that's been in the law since 1949. They had a 'Grandfather Clause' back in '49, but since '49, no banks or trust companies have been eligible to be licensed to sell insurance and I think Representative McPartlin, and I just discovered this last night, may go further with his Amendment #5 than he intended to and may not only authorize savings and loans to continue to do what they can do now and that is sell property and home owner's insurance, but authorize for the first time since 1969, banks and savings and loans to give licenses as insurance agents and brokers. At any rate, the Department is opposed to Amendment #5 and, therefore, I will oppose it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Like I said, Mr. Speaker, what this Amendment...if this Amendment is defeated, it would allow a company executive to appoint a personal friend in order to keep the proceeds on the premium, and that's why I would move, I wanted to satisfy the people of that institution, the depositors, themselves, and I move for the adoption of the Amendment #5 to House Bill 2347."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #5 to House Bill 2347. All in favor say aye...Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against this Amendment. This House has heard a great deal of debate since I've been in this chamber about usury rates charged in the State of Illinois and I'm sure there is a great deal of concern on the part of many Members about the rates that are being charged on loans. I would like to offer this suggestion to you that if you're concerned about the financial institutions in the State, that perhaps you should pay closer attention to the impact of this particular Amendment. This Amendment would permit the continuation of the intrusion of savings and loan associations throughout the State into the insurance agency business in the State of Illinois. What it does is pit a financial institution in a competitive situation with the average insurance agent or broker that you might know in your community. And I submit to you that the savings and loan institutions are in a position to exercise a great deal of coercion in the granting of credit by requiring that the



17.

savings and loan be permitted to write the insurance on the insured property. I suggest to you that this is a bad Amendment and should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment #5 to House Bill 24...2347. In view of the controversy, I think we'd better have a Roll Call vote. Those in favor of the adoption vote aye. Opposed vote no. Have all voted who wished? Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Just to reiterate so we know what we're doing here. We are not only eliminating the portion of the Bill that would have prohibited savings and loan associations to affiliated companies from holding ...a...insurance...a...brokers and agents licenses to sell insurance to their borrowers or to have tie-in salesman to borrowers. You can argue that either way...a...I think...but it also wipes out the prohibition that's been in the law in the Insurance Code since 1949 prohibiting banks and trust companies from being licensed as insurance agents and brokers and they make loans too. The problem is apparently that some institutions have put a certain amount of pressure on the mortgage borrowers to take out their insurance through them rather than through independent agents and brokers and I'm not saying that the large savings and loan in Chicago have been guilty of that. Sometimes its been the smaller ones and Representative McPartlin does have a valid argument that the Bill does not prevent the individual officers and directors of the savings and loan from having a license. They can still continue and might even be encouraged to do it. So he's got a point there, but I think the weakness in the Amendment is that it will allow banks as well as savings and loans to a...a...for the first time since 1949, be licensed to sell home owners insurance and property insurance through their own borrowers, and therefore, I'm opposing it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is an extremely important Amendment. In fact, it probably will determine the concentration of wealth in the banking and savings and loan industry in this State for decades to come. Let me tell you what happens eventually if this passes and other Amendments like this pass. The



State of North Carolina has one bank. Its called Citizens and Southern. They handle virtually all the travel agency business in the State of North Carolina, all the insurance business in the State of North Carolina, it's an unbelievable concentration of wealth and power in one huge institution. Now if that's what you want in the State of Illinois, I would suggest very strongly you vote yes. If you don't want that in the State of Illinois, if you think a pluralistic economy and a pluralist banking and savings association system is ...an...an a pluralistic system is better for the State of Illinois, I would very strongly suggest that you vote no on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I don't want to underestimate the importance of this Amendment and for that reason I would respectfully ask for a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. The Clerk will proceed."

Jack O'Brien: "Arnell. Berman. Caldwell."

Speaker Redmond: "Berman, no."

Jack O'Brien: "Caldwell. Carroll. Daniels. DiPrima. Duff. Ralph Dunn. Epton. Flinn. Gaines. Getty. Greiman. J. D. Jones. Katz. Keller. Kent. Kucharski. Lauer. Lechowicz."

Speaker Redmond: "Record Lechowicz as no."

Jack O'Brien: "Madison."

Speaker Redmond: "Madison, no. Representative Simms, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Simms: "I'd like to change that to no."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed with the Roll Call of the absentees."

Jack O'Brien: "Mahar. Marovitz. McCourt. McGrew."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McCourt."

McCourt. "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"



Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

McCourt: "Would you please record me as aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as aye. Proceed."

Jack O'Brien: "McGrew. Merlo. Mudd."

Speaker Redmond: "Record Representative Mudd as no. Representative Anderson, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Anderson: "Change me to no please."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman to no."

Jack O'Brien: "O'Daniel. Palmer. Porter. Rigney."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter desires to be recorded as no."

Jack O'Brien: "Rose. Satterthwaite. Schlickman."

Speaker Redmond: "Record Representative Rose as no."

Jack O'Brien: "Schraeder. Sharp."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder, no."

Jack O'Brien: "Sharp. C. M. Stiehl. Stone. Telcser. VanDuyne. Walsh"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh is aye. He begs your pardon, no. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, please record me as no."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as no. Representative DiPrima, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

DiPrima: "Vote me aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as aye. Representative Lucco. Lucco?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Lucco: "Change that to no please."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as no. Terzich. Representative



Terzich, how is the Gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich, change him to no. Arnell, record him as no. Record Representative Getty as present. Representative Grotberg...record him as aye. Representative Bluthardt, for what purpose do you rise?"

Bluthardt: "Will you please change my vote from present to no."

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

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, please change my vote from aye to no."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman from aye to no. Brinkmeier.

Continue with the poll of the absentees."

Jack O'Brien: "Telcser. VanDuynes. Washington."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Klosak. Record Representative Washington as no. Representative Ebbesen, aye."

Jack O'Brien: "And...a...White."

Speaker Redmond: "64 aye, 75 no. Representative Merlo."

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

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Merlo: "Please vote me aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as aye. Representative Marovitz."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded? Marovitz."

Jack O'Brien: "Marovitz. The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Marovitz: "Please record me no."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman no. Representative Maragos. Maragos?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting aye.

Speaker Redmond: "Put the Gentleman present. Representative Palmer."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"



Jack O'Brien: "Who is it?"

Speaker Redmond: "Palmer."

Palmer: "Vote me no."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as no. Representative Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, please vote me no."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as no."

Jack O'Brien: "Is that it?"

Speaker Redmond: "On this question, 64 ayes, 78 noes, and the Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "No further Amendments. Third Reading. 2832."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 2832. A Bill for an Act to regulate the practice of medical service of finance companies. Second Reading of the Bill. This Bill has been read a second time previously and held for a fiscal note. The fiscal note is now filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Order of business, Consideration Postponed. On Consideration Postponed appears House Bill 160. Today is its death date. Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, 160 expires today. I doubt if it'll be....it'll be two years more before something can be done about this....a....a....serious problem in our State again. It happens that I have tried to give the information before but I'll repeat a little bit that there is anywhere between 300,000 to 400,000 illegal aliens in the State of Illinois. They send back millions and millions of dollars of monies to other nations, not helping, of course, our economy. They are, in truth, slave labor. They do not report themselves, and the employer of them says nothing about it, because they are working for less than minimum wages. Now we've put Amendments on to try to clear up the matter and to satisfy the Farm Bureau, and I have here a telegram from the A.F.L.C.I.O. supporting this Bill. Its important that all people be given the jobs instead of people that are aliens....a....illegal aliens in our nation...in this country, and we've got to do something about our country, but this

is a problem of Congress and there is Bills, nationally, there now, but we have anywhere, according to the Attorney General of the United States, from 7,000,000 to 12,000,000 illegal aliens. The amount of money they send back is incalculable. No one really knows. A lady illegal alien has a baby in our State or in our country, becomes ...a...the child becomes an instant citizens, that would allow the privilege of ...in many cases, to support them as of the cost of birth and, perhaps, for even eighteen years. If they should be sent back or leave this country, have a right to come back in and get on our welfare programs. If taking jobs from our black and white people who need the jobs in this State, alone, by possibly as much as \$200,000 to \$250,000. If the next two years, we do not do something this year, it is perfectly possible that based on the past two years, we might have as high as the next two years a 50,000 more illegal aliens coming into our country. We don't owe them this, we have no obligation to have to support them. We have an obligation to our own people, our own State inhabitants. So I solicit your support and the Farm Bureau, I believe, has been satisfied. We have the support of labor on this. We have the support of the maintenance people on this Bill and its only common ordinary American patriotism should be the final argument to support this Bill. I earnestly support for our country, for your future, our children's future, the support of this Bill. What will happen in the future if we don't take action now, I cannot predict, but it will certainly keep going up to astronomical numbers. Help stop it now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "Will the sponsor yield to a question or two? Weber, in the Amendment form, does the Bill now have the support of the Illinois Chamber of Commerce?"

Borchers: "The Illinois Chamber of Commerce has not given me any indication of what their position is as the Bill is now amended."

Mann: "In its original form I understand they opposed it."

Borchers: "They opposed it, but I would say unconditionally, with for selfish reasons and that only, not American reasons."

Mann: "I see. Now speaking of American reasons, how will this Bill



effect the Vietnamese...I mean, the Vietnamese who are now in this country at our invitation?"

Borchers: "The Vietnamese that are now coming into this county will have entry permits and will be legal aliens. I'm speaking only of illegal aliens."

Speaker Redmond: "I call to the attention of the Members that this Bill has had full debate once before and I would like to bring the matter to a close."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, may I address myself very briefly to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Mann: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have no doubts that the sponsor is sincere and I do think that there are problems with the presence of illegal aliens and we do want to protect employment if we can, but this is a federal matter, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, and I don't see why, if the sponsor is sincere in his contentions that agricultural workers ought to be exempted, or anybody else. In other words, if they're being exploited, let's not have that exploitation only for agricultural workers, let's come in with a Bill to protect their status, give them good housing, give them all the protection they need. Now what the Bill calls for, I want to tell you, in terms of the employers in your district, is it calls for \$10,000 fine if some personnel officer hires an "illegal alien" which I do not see defined in the Bill. I think you ought to take a long hard look at the Bill. The idea is sound, the mechanics of the Bill are unsound, I don't think it's good policy and I would urge a no vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is...Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "In closing, the Bill very specifically says 'knowingly or wittingly' so the employer is not going to be in trouble unless he 'knowingly and wittingly' does it deliberately on purpose. As far as the migrant workers are concerned, and others, if he...if Representative Mann read the Seventh Amendment, he would see that this is not discriminatory just for agriculture. It protects all employers, whether agriculture or a landowner or a factory owner. And the Seventh Amendment takes care of that, so I solicit your support."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill pass. All in favor

indicate by voting aye. Opposed, voting no. Have all voted who
GENERAL ASSEMBLY



24.

wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 100 aye, 29 no, 9 voting present, and the Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Collins, present. Collins, aye. On Consideration Postponed appears House Bill 522. Recognize Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to bring this Bill back to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment, which I think will remove some of the objections."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave?"

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I offer Amendment #2...a..."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 522. Friedrich. Amendment #2, amend House Bill 522 and so forth."

Friedrich: "I offer Amendment #2, which has been distributed, this increases the board to 24 members with the members electing their own chairman. One shall be from each congressional district. I think this removes the objection that the district would be gerrymandered to...for racial or ethnic purposes, and I think it would also assure every Member of this House that there be at least one member from his area on his State Board of Education, which is so important. I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Washington."

Washington: "Less it be misunderstood, I certainly didn't agree to any such Amendment. As a matter of fact, the Amendment is worse than the original Bill. But I'm not opposed to putting the Amendment on it just to make the Bill worse, and I think we should defeat it on Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 522. All in favor say aye. Opposed, no. All in favor vote aye. All opposed vote no. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 71 ayes, 20 noes, the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments? Return to Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Return to Consideration Postponed. House Bill 567. Representative Hirschfeld."



Hirschfeld: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 567 would have amended the State University Retirement System, and I have now been informed that the Pension Laws Commission is opposed to the Bill so I have spoken with them. I would very much like to pass the Bill, but I think we should follow the Pension Laws Commission, there's no sense in having it, so I'm going to let the Bill die on the calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hirschfeld has said 'Let it die'.

Twist slowly in the breeze. 644. Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, this Bill was up on consideration the other day providing that the doctors in the State of Illinois be paid for public aid patients within 90 days after they submit their statements to the Department. At that time, Representative Hill and Representative Schlickman raised the issue as to the way the Bill was written could cause a great problem because of the fact that there was no provision in there for the Department to reject questionable or objectionable requests for payment. Thus, it was brought back to Second Reading the other day and there was a specific Amendment placed on it stating that the Department either must pay the doctor's claims within 90 days, or they must file with the doctor within 90 days a statement that it is contested and the reason why it is contested and then within 30 days thereafter, set up a hearing. This completely takes care of the situation of those doctors who may either incorrectly fill out and reply for payment, or for other reasons that they are not properly qualified for payment with the Department. We have completely discussed this before, but I would like to take the time of the House, if I may for a moment here. The very day this was voted down the first time, I received a letter from the dentist in Waukegan, and the last paragraph summarizes the plight of doctors so completely that I'd just like to read it. It just says 'Ron, in this area, we've reached a crisis. Labor costs, materials, gold, labor, and other increase prices have gone up very high. We're at a point where most of the dentists in Waukegan, because of the failure of the Department of Public Aid to pay them, sometimes as long as four years, are now refusing to take anything but dire emergencies in public aid



cases. If there isn't something done immediately, no doctor in Lake County will take a public aid patient. This is a crisis situation in our State. If we really have a feeling for helping those people on public aid who have medical problems, I think it is mandatory that this Bill be passed. I would urge its passage."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion. The question is shall this Bill pass. All in favor vote aye. Opposed, vote no. Have all voted who wished? Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I know it's senseless to explain your vote on issues like this, but it's come to my attention that the Medical Society and the doctors in particular earn \$100,000,000 a year processing public aid claims in Illinois. That means that every week \$2,000,000 flows out to the doctors. I don't think they need any special consideration like this Bill provides. I think this Bill ought to die a natural death."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter."

Porter: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it seems to me that this Bill does something that all of us want to do and that is provide equal quality care service for those who are on public aid. And I think that's a worthy objective. Further, we are seeing in Illinois, today, a situation where doctor's claims are not paid for a long, long time. And what's grown up around that practice is a factoring of those claims, the selling of those claims by the particular doctor having it to someone else who then holds it and eventually supposedly collects it. I think that the chances for fraud involved in that factoring are just so evident that this Bill also solves that very great problem and I would urge an aye vote. I think it's a darn good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want to reemphasize Mr. Porter's remarks. One of the most serious problems going out of the slow payment of doctors who service public welfare recipients has been the fact that these factoring agencies have grown up taking 15 and 20 per cent of some of these doctors gross fees for their services. Now quite obviously, that's going to have an effect on



a doctor when he attempts to set his fee. Now only that, in some of these instances, these factors I must say categorically have resulted to, at best, some unethical practices. When a doctor gets wrapped up with one of these factoring services, he's at their beck and call. He's at their mercy, he can't even keep up with the books. The average doctor who is busy trying to service the public is not a fiscal expert, knows nothing about accounting, and he runs into all sorts of problems. And by the State not paying this on time, you're simply delivering these men into the hands of some of these unscrupulous factoring agents. But even more important, even more important, it has gotten to the point where the doctors don't want to service public aid recipients, they are refusing to take the cases because they can't afford to have accounts receivable of \$20,000, \$30,000, \$40,000 or \$50,000 a year with the tremendous overhead they've got. There is simply no earthly reason why this State can't pay this money out, not in 90 days, not in 60 days, not in 30 days. The State of Mississippi pays in three weeks. Michigan pays in two weeks. There is no reason at all why we can't pay these doctors within two weeks. I think it's a very sensible Bill and I think they should have their funds and I think we should vote for it because if you don't do this, you're going to lower the degree of health services which are provided for people on welfare. It's just that simple. I urge you to vote green."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I can honestly say in explaining my vote that I've had at least forty doctors in my own district who have made the same complaints that the prior speaker has enunciated. Now, they have also told me if this is done... if...if something isn't done about it, they're going to stop taking patients from public aid. And I assured them we were going to try our best to do something to rectify the situation in the legislature. Now when people cannot pay their bills and people are expecting them to come in, are supposed to operate and do a good job in their various professions, what are they going to do? They are going to have to borrow money at high rates of interest to survive, themselves. And they have a payroll to meet. I think we are doing an injustice that we don't



help pass this Bill. Therefore, I urge everyone to vote yes as I so have done."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is not only unnecessary, its unfair. You have singled out one Department and profession or two only. Now my Bill has passed out of this House already, passed out of Committee in the Senate. This Bill will provide a one percent penalty on all goods and services...on all goods and services, and will be...."

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

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for the same point that was raised by the other side of the aisle yesterday when Ms. Geo-Karis got up and starting talking about her Bill. Now the fact that another Member has another Bill going through this legislature has no germane use to the Bill that's being discussed now and I don't know what's going to happen to his Bill in the Senate. If he wants to speak to this Bill, I certainly won't object, but I don't think it has any parliamentary procedure to start telling us what type of Bill he has now."

Speaker Redmond: "Your point of order is well taken. Confine your remarks to House Bill 644."

Londrigan: "My remarks were to this Bill. This Bill is a pay Bill, the same as the other one. This one provides for a 90 day on one profession, on one public aid only. Why doesn't it apply to all goods and services? What happens if they don't pay in 90 days? This Bill does not address itself to the total problem and I think it is unnecessary and unfair and should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: Mr. Speaker, very briefly, again you can see the handwriting on the wall, the hand of special interest. Here we have...here we have a particular group of people, the doctors, the beloved people in this thing who have been rippin off the State in terms of public aid to the tune of millions of dollars and all you have to do is look into the budget and total it out to find out how much they've been



taking. You have people here who haven't stood up and represented the interests of the poor before who are now coming forward to protect the poor in the name of the doctors. I think this is hypocrisy in the first degree. If they were really interested in the poor, perhaps they'd make sure that some of the landlords got paid for their particular services. But there will be no bill emanating from that direction, there will be no attempt to have anybody else paid for by public aid, only the doctors. It's an unfair Bill, it's a Bill dedicated to special interests and it ought to be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the special interest group that benefits from this piece of legislation, today, are the recipients of public aid, not the M.D.'s. And if we don't pay these people a fair fee for their services, what you're going to have is no services available for the recipients of public aid. And I would urge an aye vote on this. We have paid...we've got Bills here for prevailing wages in a lot of the labor things and that's all this is a type of prevailing wage. It's an excellent Bill, it's necessary, and I would urge an aye vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, maybe talking against windmills up there, I have no disagreement with paying the doctors for their services, but if you tell me how the Department of Public Aid can compete in the private sector where it says as I read this Bill that they'll take into account what...persons who are paying, as private clients, and in effect say that the Department will pay that same, I can't understand that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman...no, I think we're on it already."

Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record.

Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Well Mr. Speaker, I tried to listen quite carefully what the



sponsor said the Amendment did. And I thought it took out that provision as far as paying the same rates as in a private sector, but it did not. I thought that his explanation tended to say that they have to be paid within ninety days and in turn, if they didn't receive the payment within ninety days, they would receive a notice from the Department and that it would be a month after that they could go into review. But now that that Section is still in there, as far as if they're going to have to pay the same sector, I think that at the proper time, I am, unfortunately, ask for a verification because the cost will be staggering."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I was standing trying to be recognized when you locked in the vote, but I would like to respond to that because I know that Mr. Lechowicz is very concerned about this. This Bill does not say that the Department of Public Aid will pay the going rate. It says, and the words are 'shall consider the fees and rates charged in the community'. It doesn't say they will pay. We very purposely put those words in there in that manner."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hill. Representative Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I objected to this Bill when it was first called and consequently, this was one of my objections. The Gentleman brought me an Amendment over yesterday, I believe it was, and I thought that that Amendment had taken this area out also and I find out, now, that it doesn't and I'm just forced to switch my vote from aye to no."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I, as an explanation of my vote, I think we all ought to realize that the Medic-Aid Program requires, requires now, the federal government requires that we negotiate these fees. Now are you going to allow sometime for the fees to be negotiated or are you going to just pay them on blanket terms? Medic-Aid holds us to that and I think you ought to know that. As a member of the Advisory Committee, I'm advising you that the fees are to be negotiated. We spent quite some time studying the computerizing the State computerized. And even in the States where



they computerize, they hold out certain bills for doctors because Medic-Aid requires them to negotiate it. And I'm afraid you're going to run into trouble with the federal government, that's why I'm going to vote no."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I don't have any personal stake in this Bill, but I think in fairness, we ought to at least call the absentees if we're going to verify."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Skinner: "I would make that request."

Hanahan: "Change my vote from aye to nay please."

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded? Hanahan.:"

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Change it to nay. Representative Craig."

Craig: "I want to change my vote from aye to no."

Speaker Redmond: "Change Craig to no. Representative Chapman. How is the Lady recorded? Representative Chapman."

Jack O'Brien: "Chapman? The Lady is recorded as not voting."

Speaker Redmond: "She desires to be recorded as voting no. Representative Hill....from aye to no. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you change me from aye to present."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from aye to present. Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. I think this is only my first time doing this in two and a half years. Representative Hill, I want you to listen to this because I think that if any person deserves some comment here, he has inferred that I tried to pull a fast one on him. First of all, he did not read the Amendment when I went over there. I very precisely described it to him and now he's inferring that I took something out that didn't even need to be taken out because it doesn't say what it says now. Now I know what's going on here and everybody else does. In the City of Chicago, the process of factoring is a big multi-million dollar business. And we have a very good idea why we want to keep the situation as it is now. These factors are making fifteen percent on



every public aid claim. Now all we're asking is that the doctors, they either get paid in ninety days or they are objected to in ninety days, and that the Department of Public Health will at least take into consideration what the going rates are for similar fees in the community. It doesn't say they have to pay those and, therefore, I really object to any inference that anybody's havin any wool pulled over their eyes. Let it be saddled on your shoulders when the doctors of this State just turn a deaf ear to the welfare patient. And I can't understand for the life of me, how those distinguished minority Representatives of my minority groups, I should say, in the majority can vote against this. We're talking about your people more than any others. They need this help."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well Mr. Speaker, I think maybe this is on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Shea: "I don't like the inference that I'm fronting for some factors. If you want to look at my record on this subject, you'll see that two sessions ago, I sponsored a Bill to provide payment within ninety days. It was vetoed by the then Governor. I sponsored the same Bill last session and it got killed in the Senate. And I will tell you I'll fight to get the payment, but I'll be damned if I'll sit there and make the...a...Public Aid pay the same as private services."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Fennessey. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Change him to no. Representative Lundy."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Lundy: "Would you please change that to present. The Gentleman has a Bill that's two-thirds good and one-third at fault, I can't vote for the one-third, I wish he'd taken it out, but he didn't. I vote present."



Speaker Redmond: "Vote the Gentleman as present. Representative Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, record me as present, change my vote from aye to present."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman will be recorded as present.
Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to change my vote from yes to present."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman to present. Pierce.
Representative Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if I let the idea that Representative Griesheimer had...a...mislead me or given me the wrong information, I want to apologize, but the Section that is still in there is the Section that I got up on the other...last week, I believe it was, and spoke in opposition to the Bill. And if I owe you an apology I certainly would like to apologize. I'm not accusing you of doing anything devious."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I would just like to appeal to everybody's good judgement here and say that I certainly hope that you know what you're doing."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Ryan has already had his two minutes, he's out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "Your point is well taken. Representative Laurino.
Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, could we possibly have a new Roll Call?"

Speaker Redmond: "I think, probably, that's a good idea. Let's dump this Roll Call and have a new Roll Call. There will be no explanation of votes on this new Roll Call.. The question is shall this Bill pass. All in favor vote aye. Opposed, vote no.
Representative Ryan, for what purpose do you rise?"

Ryan: "I'd like to explain my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Ryan: "I would suggest to Representative Griesheimer, he's got a good Bill, here, evidently he's got one that's not going to pass. If you can work out your problems in the Senate, Ron, I think that you



ought to try and do that. What you're going to have, here, is exactly what Representative Ewell said, the people are going to go into their physician for public aid, here, and the doctor's going to say 'I can't afford to take care of you, go some place else'. Consequently, you get the mill set up that Representative Ewell is talking about and the rip-off comes in the State."

Hill: "He already explained his vote, Mr. Speaker, this is futile."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring it to a close please."

Ryan: "You've got a good piece of legislation that should be straightened out here, Ron, and I really think that most of these people would like to go with you and I think you ought to try and get it worked out if you can."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a point of personal privilege, because some of my friends have been here to me personally to say 'how can a minority do this'? Don't point your finger at me, point your finger at Medic-Aid and the federal government. I'm telling you that as a member of the Advisory Committee, you can bring Senator Don Moore and all of them over here, I'm telling you as a member of the Advisor Committee on Public Aid, the federal government requires that these doctors' fees be negotiated. So I'm not saying it, the federal government says it. Now do you want to saddle the State of Illinois with these Bills? The federal government will not give us the matching funds if you don't negotiate these fees. Where it ought to be changed is in Washington."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 72 ayes, 52 nays, the Bill having failed to receive the constitutional majority is hereby declared lost. 718."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 718. A Bill for an Act to amend the Horse Racing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill has been debated fully in the House last Saturday about allowing people in the horse racing business to contribute to political campaigns, referendum issues, parties, and what-not. I feel because of disclosure, because of ethics, because of campaign limitations,



and because of the informant system that the governments use and the eavesdropping devices, I think that we can trust ourselves to be honest and I urge a yes vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is...Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "The sponsor yield...will the sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Waddell: "Zeke, inasmuch as I did not hear this before, how far down the line do you go here? Do you go down as far as the owner of the..."

Giorgi: "The entire spectrum is repealed from the law. Everybody in the racing business can contribute if they want to, to their party, to their referendum, to whatever political issue they want to contribute to without fear of it being a crime."

Waddell: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Saturday, I spoke against this and my position really hasn't changed. I think this is a bad idea. We're talking about an industry that's been very heavily, or is very heavily regulated and has a lot of scandal. I think that we're best served by maintaining this prohibition against contribution and I would urge a no vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is shall this Bill pass. All those in favor vote aye. Opposed, vote no. Representative Calvo."

Calvo: "Well Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd just like to reply briefly to the comments of the last speaker. I think this is a good Bill because all you do by prohibiting this is you make these people go break the law in a devious way. Now they're contributing to the people they want to, I'm sure, they're not contributing to me and they probably never will and that's fine. But why should you have a law that is really meaningless. If they want to contribute to someone, they're going to find a way to do. Let's have it out in the open so that the person who receives the contribution has to report it and everyone can see that he's getting a contribution from these interests. You would be much better voting for this Bill, have it out in the open, and handle it so that everybody can look at the campaign



statement and see who contributed how much to what...to what individual. I suspect that those who are voting red might be the ones receiving the contribution. I don't know. Because they don't seem to want the public to know what they're getting from the racing interests. But further than that, let me tell you one other thing. We talk about campaign ethics and campaign disclosure. The U. S. Congress, just yesterday, passed legislation in the Senate which says that if you're a doctor or an attorney, and you receive a contribution, political contribution, from someone who is your client or patient, you don't have to disclose that. Now you think ...we've got disclosure, if that isn't the biggest loophole I ever seen in the disclosure that they have in the congressional, federal disclosure, I'll put in with you. And I think this is good legislation and should be supported because, then, everything will be open and above board and you'll be able to look at the statement and see what these interests contributed and to whom and how much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I haven't voted yet. I think its kind of a difficult question, but I see in it, and I'm talking to those who are voting red, there...there's civil liberties problem here. If the business of horse racing is legal in this State, I can't quite see how under a civil libertarian basis, you can say that they cannot exercise freedom of speech merely because they are engaged in that business. I'm really doubtful whether or not we should prohibit any class of lawful occupation from contributing to campaigns. And so I'm going to vote aye on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 55 ayes, 65 noes, the Bill having failed to receive the constitutional majority is hereby declared lost. 719."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 719..."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, if I may, just on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Peters: "I think last night we did have a Bill, here, which pertained to



a study of a toll road. I think in that debate several things were mentioned which would lead some individuals to believe that something might be scandalous, something might be wrong in the background. Today we passed the discussion on other Bills in which we said 'well, maybe there's some factoring interests employed here, or interested here'. We've had statements made that maybe those voting red on this Bill are the ones getting contributions. Now Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I do not think that we serve our purposes as Members of this legislature by having such free use of the language and making charges that cannot be substantiated. I think we've got enough of our own problems in terms of public image, and I just suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in any arguments or debates, I think we ought to be able to substantiate what we're saying or not say it at all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Calvo."

Calvo: "Well Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. I'm well...well the comments of the last Gentleman was aimed in my direction. I'm sorry if he took them that way, it wasn't intended that way. I was using it in a manner of argument in saying that it would appear to me that it would be better to have the matter out in the open and that if anyone, what I was getting to, that if anyone who ...a...would not feel that way, would probably vote no. And I certainly didn't intend the inference that everyone that was voting red was guilty of anything and I'm sorry if it seemed that way."

Speaker Redmond: "719. Representative Giorgi. 719."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, you know in talking about 719, it has to do with repealing a Section of the Insurance Code that prohibits political contributions of insurance companies. I think that I remember reading somewhere in the State of Illinois where one of our leading insurance financiers contributed millions of dollars to the Republican Party. Well, I'm a little disturbed having been down here half a dozen terms and watching some of the hypocrites in the House grabbing for the gambling dollars for their agricultural premium fund...funding of their county fairs and grabbing gambling dollars for school funds and home extension courses in the 4-Ed and the 4-H Clubs. I've been trying, with



my Bill, to reveal the hypocrisy in this House. Now I introduced a Bill for race gambling because I'm not ashamed of where my contributions come from. I have never received a contribution from a race track interest. I intend to divulge all of my contributors in July, I don't want anybody to think this Bill was introduced at anyone's request but my own research..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane, for what point...purpose do you rise?"

Kane: "I think that the Gentleman that is speaking should confine his himself to the merits of his Bill and not the motives and speculations of what the rest of the Members are..."

Speaker Redmond: "Your point is well taken. Confine your remarks to the Bill."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, we can't divorce what happens on this House floor from some of our presentations. For example, what happened here last night wouldn't have gotten an apology from me, and if Representative Kane..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "I would persist in my point that the Gentleman should confine his remarks to his Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "The point is well taken. Please confine your remarks to House Bill 719."

Giorgi: "Did he say something that I could take a point of personal privilege? I don't think Kane would invite me to the General Assembly like I wouldn't invite him to the General Assembly."

Speaker Redmond: "Please confine your remarks to the Bill, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I have to say something because I've been on this Assembly's floor when we've introduced Bingo Bills and Lottery Bills, when Members have come to my desk and tell me they vote for it if the money went for education, and then refuse to vote when the Bill came up for a final passage."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane persists in his point and I have ruled that it is well taken. Please confine your remarks to House Bill 719."



Giorgi: "Let's see, House Bill 719. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as some of the people here are having psychological hangups on voting for these type Bills, I move to table House Bill 719."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I thought it was a good Bill because the insurance companies give bonuses to certain key employees who have been instructed to make certain contributions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is shall this Bill pass. All those in favor vote aye. Representative Giorgi, did you table the Bill?"

Giorgi: "Well could I table it after I get the 89 votes to pass it, Mr. Speaker? Alright, after urging from my Majority Leader, I will call the Bill up for passage. I urge that House Bill 719 be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall House Bill 719 pass. Those in favor vote aye. Opposed, vote no. Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "I've explained my vote. Mr. Giorgi is one of my oldest friends in the General Assembly, the Gentleman from Winnebago, and certainly I know what he's trying to achieve here to get away from the hypocrisy of the individual owners, directors, and officers of insurance companies giving donations after they get some kind of a ...after they get some kind of a bonus from their company. But the Insurance Code has prohibited insurance company political contributions for decades and this is a good prohibition. Throughout the country, there have been scandals in legislatures where insurance companies have directly tried to effect legislation. Our first objective in insurance should be to protect the policyholder. If an owner of an insurance company, Clement Stone, or whoever it may be, wants to give money out of his own pocket, that's his business and we should maybe put a restriction on the amount he can give, the way the federal government, the federal Congress, ah...But its one thing to give money out of your own pocket and its another thing to give money out of the policyholders' reserves which donations would be directly from insurance companies. Disclosure laws don't prevent anything. The donor is not required to disclose. The insurance company wouldn't be required to disclose, and if the donee chose not to disclose, the political candidate, then there would



no disclosure and no penalty on the insurance company because no where in our disclosure laws is the donor required to disclose. And therefore, this prohibition has been in the law, we've lived with it, there's been some violations of the spirit...a...a...the previous Governor, I know, and maybe this Governor too, had political dinners with people in the insurance industry who solicited and gave money supposedly out of their own pocket for a table here, a table there, but the prohibition is a good one and therefore, we should support it and oppose the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say something in regard to this Bill. I say here last session and was one of four that voted against that Campaign Disclosure Act. And I heard all the cries about how everybody was makin a lot of money under the table and we need this, and we need that, and I can't see what's wrong with this Bill nor the previous Bill. If there is something wrong with people that have insurance companies, there are people that own liquor license who would have ...why can't they contribute like everybody else? I don't see anything wrong with this Bill, I think its good. And as long as they got that Campaign Disclosure Act, I think everybody should have a right to contribute."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 75 ayes, 60 noes, the Bill having failed to receive the constitutional majority is hereby declared lost. House Bill...It is the intention to clear off and to call all of the Consideration Postponed. Representative Ebbessen."

Ebbessen: "Did you call..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbessen?"

Ebbessen: "Yeh, did you call House Bill 110? Yes...I...I...would like to hear this...House Bill 110."

Speaker Redmond: "Well I didn't yet, but I will."

Ebbessen: "Fine."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bill 921."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 921..."

Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me. Mr. Fleck, I haven't announced the intention



MAY 16 1975

41.

of the Chair with respect to the breaks today. Inasmuch as we didn't come in until 10:45, very few having gone to Committee meetings, it has been recommended that we have but one break today, and that's from 2:30 to 3:30, then return and to work this evening as long as we can. Some people call the noon hour, dinner. Representative Fleck."

Fleck: "Mr. Speaker, I request that you hold House Bill 921 on Postponed Consideration, an Amendment is being prepared. It is being printed right now."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Redmond: ". . . Take it out of the Record. 1319. Oh, Representative Keller isn't here. Senate Bill 23."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 23, a bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Transportation. Third Reading of the bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washburn, 23."

Washburn: "Well, thank you, . . . ah . . . Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 223 was the bill that was heard last night, and . . . ah . . . a great deal of discussion on it. Just to refresh your memory if you weren't here, it appropriates \$200,000 to the Department of Transportation for a study of the feasibility of construction of the Fox Valley Toll Highway from Lockford . . . Lockport to Interstate 90. A similar piece of Legislation was contained in the omnibus bill last year. There was two minor variations from this one. This bill appropriates the . . . ah . . . money to the Department of Transportation. That was the reason given for the veto last year that . . . by Governor . . . ah . . . Walker that it did not appropriate to the Department of Transportation, and last year's bill extended the road into McHenry County up to Route 12. This year it terminates at the Northwest Toll Road in Elgin. I would . . . ah . . . point out, again, that this is not money appropriated to construct a highway, it is money for a Feasibility Study to de . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Washburn: ". . . termine . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "For what purpose do you rise?"

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Schraeder: ". . . where does this appear on the Calendar?"

Speaker Redmond: "Consideration Postponed."

Schraeder: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, Mr. Washburn."

Washburn: "I would . . . ah . . . point out that this is not an appropriation to construct a highway, its an appropriation to the Department of Transportation for a Feasibility Study to determine whether or not such a highway is needed through the fastest growing area in Illinois, one of the fastest growing in the Country; and I would ask for a



favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Quest . . . Any further discussion? Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, this bill is just as bad a bill today as it was yesterday. Plus the fact that we all know that the \$200,000 is nothing short of a gift that we might make to a grade-school class who knows how the Feasibility Study's gonna' come out in the first place; and I suggest to you that when you want to lower the boom on a bunch of taxpayers so that they can pay twice, instead of once, for a highway that should be a freeway; and, if there was ever a year that this could be a freeway, this is it, then I submit to you that you are for unequal treatment of the taxpayers in the State of Illinois; and I, for one, urge its defeat."

Speaker Waddell: "Representative Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I renew every remark I made last night. I don't withdraw any of them, I just wanted to put you people on . . . give you the knowledge that I have of this particular Feasibility Report. I, certainly, don't want to get anyone in trouble. I still have not found out the names of the Aurora Development Group, who, apparently, although I have not been able to find out, have moved their headquarters from the middle of the Chicago River to 111 East Wacker Drive. My secretary called that management group that manages that . . . that particular complex. It doesn't appear in the directory; there is no telephone listed for it; and it seems to me as a duly, elected Legislator from that area . . ."

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

Grotberg: "A parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Grotberg: "I thought we were . . . you've made several rulings that the Speaker should address himself to the bill under discussion, not to the middle of the Chicago River or Lake Michigan. This is a . . . ah . . . a Feasibility Study in the Fox River Valley, and all of the extraneous remarks that are made here are meant only to lead people on into spurious thinking. My own personal stake in this thing is only to move



people from the north end to the south end, and I wish the Speaker would confine his remarks to that subject."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman will confine his remarks to House Bill 23."

Hill: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, as long as I made those remarks twice now, I won't repeat 'em again. I still am interested, though, in the names of that group; and many of the taxpayers from that gentleman's district and my district would like to know who is espousing this Feasibility Report. I don't know why the secrecy is here; I, certainly, would like to find out. In order to point out to you people, this corridor has been established many years ago. There has been a lot of speculation on that land in this corridor, and I assure you that I know of this. I don't know the individuals. Some of their property is held in trust and its impossible under the state Law to find out who owns it. I want to know who it is. Secondly, Route 59 that runs parallel has much of the property purchased for it to widen that area into a free-way. It seems to me, instead of spending all that money, the taxpayers money, over again, and this \$200,000 comes right out of the General Revenue Fund, it comes from all the taxpayers of the State of Illinois, I would suggest . . . I would suggest that you vote "no" on this piece of Legislation; and not get caught up into a scandal a year or two from now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "If you're in favor of increasingly rapid growth in the Fox River Valley, you, certainly, should vote "yes" on this bill. If you want more commerce than industry to be lowered from the inner city to the affluent suburbs, you should vote "yes" on this bill. If you think those of us in the Fox River Valley should be forced to pay both to keep property values of Loop merchants up in the Loop and to drive the new, suburban shopping and . . . and to drive to the new, suburban shopping centers, where these Loop merchants are now building new stores, you ought to vote "yes". If you believe this area is the fastest growing area in the state, however, for "God's sake", why should this be a tollway? You know, about 2 1/3 years ago, our incumbent governor said in his inauguration speech that, 'the free ride is over'. Well, it is, indeed, over for Fox River Valley residents. My colleague,



Representative Waddell, is right. The \$200,000 consulting fee is a gift to whoever gets it. Everyone here knows there's a need for a road. Nobody here can explain why it ought to be a tollway. I can't understand why the Loop stores want to convince those of us in the Fox River Valley that it is in our best interest to have to pay tolls to be able to drive to their forthcoming, suburban shopping centers. If a new road is needed, it, certainly, should be a freeway or let's have a tollway to Decatur, a tollway to Quincy, a tollway to Mt. Vernon, a tollway to Rock Island."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa. Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I was absent last night during the debate on . . . ah . . . Senate Bill 23. I didn't hear all of the arguments that were expounded on before last night, but listening to those that have been propounded on this . . . on the floor of the General Assembly this afternoon, I have to take issue with quite a few of the remarks. The one thing, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I serve as the Chairman of the Toll Road advised to a Commission; and, as such, we did hold a meeting not too many months ago of that Toll Road Advisory Commission at which quite a few of the mayors in that area appeared asking for this Feasibility Study. They told us what the great needs were in that area for an "Express Corridor". Now, I'm a firm believer, myself, in the "pay as you" go concept of highway usage, and if anybody in that area or anybody in Illinois that wants to go on a safe highway journey anywhere in any part of the state, there wouldn't be a damn thing wrong, as far as I'm concerned, with a toll road to take them there in a safe manner and in a very, quick manner. The . . . if we, under the present highway conditions now with all of our waiting on the Federal funding, waiting on the state approval of the environmental concept is concerned, we will not see any highways built within the next generation; and no expressways, whatsoever; and ladies and gentlemen, if we're going to want to use our highways in the manner that we ought to be using 'em, we would vote for this study to be made. This is no guarantee there'll be a tollway built there. What we're asking for here is that a Feasibility Study be made as to whether or not that tollway is needed in



that area, and, believe me, ladies and gentlemen, from what testimony we heard in the Toll Road Advisory Commission, it is sorely needed; and I would ask for a "yes" vote from every member of this General Assembly on Senate Bill 23."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for those of my colleagues who agree that the cross-town ought to be a tollway, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll all answer in one minute. Representative Madison, I overlooked Representative Downs for a moment, Representative Downs."

Downs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, ladies and . . . and . . . ah . . . gentlemen of the House, I'll be very brief. Ah . . . I have learned that the thing respected above all else here is the Representative who truly represents his district and fights for his district. We heard about how business, industry and the people of this area will be benefited by this road, and I'm prepared to accept that as true; and I, therefore, respect those who will fight to pass this bill because of the need that they see to serve to their people. But there will be, if last night's vote was any indication, a lot of Chicago votes up there supporting that road out in the Fox Valley; and if those individuals, including myself, want to see the continued sack of the City of Chicago by business and industry and the leaving of its good people, then go ahead and support that road to serve the people who are represented, not by you, but by others here and represented well; but don't for a second think or try and tell anybody that you are representing your district. This is not in the best interest of the city, it is in the best interest of the Fox River Valley; and I urge a "no" vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schoeberlein."

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, as I said yesterday, Representative Hill and I are from the same district; and here we take opposite views and there it ends. Now, Aurora became a great city because of a toll road in 1800 and some, when a plank road was laid from Naperville to Aurora to bring grain to the mills, had two of them on the Fox River in Aurora. That was the first toll road. 15 cents to go from Naperville to Aurora, and that is why Aurora became



a big city as it is today. Now, we don't know this is gonna' be a toll-way. This is a study, a Feasibility Study. If it finds that there isn't sufficient traffic, then let the Transportation Department build that road; but somewhere along the line, we cannot procrastinate on this. I don't know who owns the land, and I don't care 'cause my name isn't on it; and I hoped they're picked up if they're pulling something shady. I'll . . . I'll help prosecute 'em. I'll help get good lawyers to prosecute 'em, but something has to be done. Any of you, who have traveled 59 today, who live that way, and see the accidents that are occurring because its a half-ass job, part of its four lane and the other half is two lane. Now, are we going to continue that kind of road building in the State of Illinois. You've got a shopping center out there, you got 4,000 acres of land that had been taken into the City of Aurora. There are 14,000 homes gonna' be built out there. In addition to manufacturing, a lot of industry and business. Now, as I say, I don't care if its a toll road or a freeway, but let's get the study going so we have something when we come back here next Spring; and give us the green light to get this \$200,000 Feasibility Study."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison, now."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion for the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All in favor signify by saying "aye", oppose "no"; the "ayes" have it. The question is, shall this bill pass? All in favor . . . pardon me, Representative Washburn to close."

Washburn: "Well, thank you . . . ah . . . Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House. Just very briefly, I would like to state, again, as I did last night that the local, governing units, some 17 towns and . . . ah . . . two or three counties, by resolution has . . . ah . . . voiced their support of Senate Bill 23; and I would like to point out, too, that the bill that contained was similar to this one with the two exceptions that I pointed out in my opening remark, the bill last year that was vetoed by the governor, the sponsors were Washburn, Lechowicz, Hanahan and Totten. I would appreciate your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this bill pass? Those in favor vote



"aye", oppose vote "no". Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I must say that I was amused by the comment from the distinguished gentleman from Cook, who ended on the expression he believes in "pay as you go", because I can think back a Session or two ago when we had the . . . ah . . . Mass-transit Bills in here, and that particular gentleman was, certainly, pushing as hard as he could, and, of course, the only ones it paid was the State of Illinois, and the ones that went were Cook County in the five-collar county; and I find it most interesting, and I have to say this, and this is with all due respect to the House sponsor, but I find a deplorable lack of leadership in the Senate . . . in the Senate sponsor of this bill. If there's ever a time we ought to be going for free roads in downstate Illinois, its when Cook County is trying to get a cross-town expressway; and it doesn't show much leadership to me emanating from the Senate from the Republican side of the aisle when they're willing to force us to pay for things and they'll probably go and hand over to the City of Chicago the cross-town expressway, if for no other reason because they don't have enough votes to stop it over there, and I think Senator Harris ought to reassess his position. He's supposed to be a leader of the Republican Party, he's not supposed to be selling us out, particularly, those of us that are downstate; and I find this bill, frankly, and I'm addressing it to the Senate, I find it an affront to those of us that are downstate one more example of selling out; and I'd like to know what they got in return for it because we sure didn't get anything downstate."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I don't know if John has seen the new map, yet, or not. I don't think Bill Harris is even in his district. I do . . . I do think, however, that every Republican or Democrat should be aware that there are people that live in different parts of the state. Now, frankly, for a sick five years now, I've been fighting to get rid of the tolls on the Tri-State Toll Road and on the Northwest Expressway; and I've never got a vote on that effort out of the City of Champaign. As long as we're paying tolls in the Northwest . . . Northeast corner of the state, I'm gonna' vote for every



Toll Road Bill that comes to the Legislature."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, I been in here a short period of time and I've seen quite a bit of money appropriated out for various and sundry things, and I don't see why they shouldn't . . . ah . . . have a Feasibility Study. As a matter of fact, it may even turn out that the Feasibility Study will give information that will lead us to not building the road, I don't know; and . . . ah . . . not knowing that area, I think a Feasibility Study might edify me and also some other citizens. So I urge that you vote "yes" on this."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, we all must do what we all must do. I'm going to be very interested to see how the Chicago papers can possibly play this story . . . ah . . . because if you compare this Roll Call with the Roll Call for the cross-town, I think you may see a very large correlation. Ah . . . Obviously, this is going to pass. Every debt that could possibly have been accumulated over the past years has been called in and debts have been created in the future, which . . . ah . . . we probably won't know about until after the end of the Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of introduction, up in the balcony . . . ah . . . from the . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner, for what reason do you arise?"

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, this has been an affront to the entire House. We are in the middle of a rather crucial bill. Now, I've seen this happen throughout the Session, and this is not . . . this has nothing to do with Representative Simms, it is happening with all the Legislative leaders. I have seen people that have been in the middle, in the middle of their "cotton pickin" concluding speech, and they get interrupted by . . . by introductions. Now, can't you, you know, can't some act of discretion be exercised?"

Speaker Redmond: "I never know for what purpose they rise. I didn't know what purpose you rose, you might have introduced something. My own . . . my own idea is that I think that in this week we would be well-advised not to have any introductions, quite frankly. But, in the



meantime, proceed Representative Simms."

Simms: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, . . . ah . . . in the upper Gallery from . . . ah . . . Holy Rosary School in Wau . . . from North Chicago, Illinois, Sister Mary Hilda and Mrs. Mary Ga . . . Gargus . . . ah . . . are here today with their class, they're ably represented in the General Assembly by Representatives Geo-Karis, Matijevich, and Representative Griesheimer. If they'd, please, . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish on this bill? Have all voted who wish? Representative LaFleur."

LaFleur: "I . . . I do not know whether there is going to be a verification of this Roll Call, I cannot anticipate that, but I do know that this . . . ah . . . study will transverse the entire length of my district. I can assure the people here that the people need a road, they need help. Now, we would, certainly, be happy to take a freeby, we would, certainly, be happy if you could assure us that we would get a road that would not be a toll road. We are trying to solve our problem, we're trying to solve it in a reasonable way, we're trying to tell you that we need a road. If we have to pay for it, we will; but, please, let us get started. Give us the money for the study, and let us get on with the job of working with our people and trying to provide transportation."

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

Hill: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, at the proper time I'd like to ask for a verification."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . question there's 97 'ayes', 51 'nos'; gentleman requests a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be recorded voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the gentleman as 'aye'. Proceed with the Affirmative Roll Call."

Jack O'Brien: "Anderson. Arnell. E.M. Barnes. J. M. Barnes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, could we poll the absentees first, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "I respected that motion before. Representative Skinner."



Skinner: "On a point of parliamentary inquiry, is his . . . is his request made in a timely fashion?"

Speaker Redmond: "Poll of the absentees has been requested."

Skinner: "Is that in order at this point after . . . ?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes. Hereafter, be a little quicker."

Skinner: "Thank you. Well, hereafter, if someone else makes the mistake, I assume the ruling will be the same?"

Unknown: ". . . do you mean?"

Speaker Redmond: "I may not be here. Call the absentees."

Jack O'Brien: "Chapman. Collins. D'Arco. Epton. Geo-Karis. Greiman. Katz. Keller. Lauer. Schlickman. Stearney. Telcser. Walsh."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed with the verification."

Jack O'Brien: "Anderson. Arnell. E. M. Barnes. J. M. Barnes. Beatty. Berman. Borchers. Bradley. Brandt. Brinkmeier. Campbell. Capparelli. Capuzi. Catania. Coffey. Daniels. Davis. Deavers. Deuster. DiPrima. Duff. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Ewell. Ewing. Farley. Fary. Fennessey. Fleck. Friedrich. Gaines. Garmisa. Giglio. Giorgi. Griesheimer. Grotberg. Gene Hoffman. Huff. Emil Jones. J. D. Jones. Kempiners. Kent. Klosak. Kucharski. LaFleur. Lechowicz. Leinenweber. Kornowicz. Leon. Macdonald. Madigan. Mahar. Marovitz. McAuliffe. McAvoy. McCourt. McLendon. McMaster. McPartlin. Merlo. Meyer. Miller. Molloy. Mudd. Nardulli. Neff. O'Daniel. Patrick. Peters. Pierce. Polk. Porter. Pouncey. Randolph. Reed. Rigney. Rose. Ryan. Schoeberlein. Schraeder. Schuneman. Sevcik. Shea. Simms. E. G. Steele. C. M. Stiehl. Taylor. Terzich. Totten. Tuerk. VanDuyne. Wall. Washburn. White. Winchester. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call? Representative D'Arco."

D'Arco: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is the gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

D'Arco: "Would you vote me "aye", please."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the gentleman "aye". Any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call? Representative Hill."



Hill: "Yes, what am I starting with?"

Speaker Redmond: "98, is it?"

Jack O'Brien: "99."

Speaker Redmond: "99."

Jack O'Brien: "Ah . . . Brinkmeier jumped on too."

Speaker Redmond: "99."

Hill: "Representative Brandt?"

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Brandt here? How was the gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting "aye"."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Hill: Representative Deavers?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Hill: "Ralph Dunn?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Hill: "Ebbesen?"

Speaker Redmond: "Ebbesen is here."

Hill: "Ewing?"

Speaker Redmond: He's here."

Hill: "Farley?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Farley? How is the gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting "aye"."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Hill: "Gaines?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines? He's here in the center aisle."

Hill: "Klosak?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Klosak's in the rear."

Hill: "Kucharski?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kucharski . . ."

Hill: "I see him, I see him. Mahar?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar is here."

Hill: "McPartlin?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPartlin? How is he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman's recorded as voting "aye"."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."



Hill: "Malloy?"

Speaker Redmond: "Who was that?"

Hill: "Malloy?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Malloy is here."

Hill: "O'Daniel?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Daniel? Is Representative O'Daniel's
here? How is he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting "aye"."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Hill: "Polk?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk is here."

Hill: "Pouncey?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pouncey's here."

Hill: "Reed?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reed . . ."

Hill: "Rose?"

Speaker Redmond: ". . . he's here. Representative Rose, here."

Hill: "Sevcik?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sevcik? He's here."

Hill: "E. G. Steele?"

Speaker Redmond: "E. G. Steele is here, both Steele's are here."

Hill: "VanDuyne?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative VanDuyne is here."

Hill: "White?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative White? How is this gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting "aye"."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Hill: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines, was he taken off the Roll Call?"

Jack O'Brien: "No, sir."

Speaker Redmond: "O.K., any further questions, Representative Hill?
. . . questions, Mr. Clerk?"

Jack O'Brien: "94 "ayes", 51 "nays"."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 94 "ayes", 51 "nays" . . ."

Jack O'Brien: "15 "present"."



Speaker Redmond: "15 "present". The bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Having voted on the prevailing side of this issue, I move that the vote by which it was taken be reconsidered."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman's moved that the vote by which the bill carries is re . . . reconsidered. All in favor say "aye". Representative Simms."

Simms: "I move that motion lie on the table."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved that the vote by which the bill passed be reconsidered; Representative Simms has moved that that vote lie on the table. Question is on the motion to table. All in favor say "aye", oppose "no"; the "ayes" have it, the motion is tabled.
House Bill 110 . . ."



Speaker Redmond: "House Bill 110. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 110 is an appropriation for 1.3 million dollars that the Department of Transportation...it did get a good hearing and good discussion the last time the Bill was before the House. I'll just highlight a few things and then I'll be glad to respond to any questions, but the...a...it provides, on the basis of a feasibility study, that the...a...a...similar Bill went through the 78th General Assembly, most of it was vetoed and we used \$24,000 appropriated to the D.O.T. for a feasibility study for passenger service from Chicago to Rock Island over the Chicago and Northwestern tracks, along with the Burlington-Northern from Sterling on to Rock Island. Now in essence, what this Bill does one time only, \$900,000 for a right-a-way improvement over the Burlington-Northern and the \$400,000 is for two-thirds of the operating deficit for the coming fiscal year, and it would be that expenditure each and every given fiscal year. However, I would like to explain one thing...in comparing the objective of the Department of Transportation, there are two trains that presently go from Chicago to Rock Island over the Rock Island Line, but when they get to Bureau Junction, one of those passenger trains goes South to Peoria, the one that goes on to Rock Island after it hits Bureau Junction, only picks up on the average of one and half to two passengers a day. Now that particular train, I want to emphasize this, costs the State of Illinois \$550,000 annually. And so what I'm really saying by providing...with...with an objective of providing more passenger service to a larger number of people in Northern Illinois, by adopting this Bill and sending it on to the Senate and then for the Governor's signature, we can provide passenger service starting in Chicago with the point of termination at the same place, and that's Rock Island, \$400,000 that we approved this passenger service, eliminate in two years, the one train over the Rock Island Line, and still save the taxpayers of the State of Illinois \$150,000 and with that, in essence, is what the Bill does and I'd be very happy to respond to any questions, otherwise, I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Fennessey."



Fennessey: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, do you remember when this Bill was called last week, I objected...had some objections to it. Since that time, I have had several meetings with the Department of Transportation. They have assured me that they will continue to have rail service...passenger service on the Rock Island, and I would like to announce I withdraw my objection to this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Yes Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I would like to go on record as supporting this Bill and I'd like very briefly to tell you why. Those of us that live up in Northwestern Illinois, when it comes to any form of transportation, whether it be bus, railroad, or air transportation, find themselves way out in left field. I'm told that this is the prerequisite to eventually, hopefully AMTRAK line, running North-South, probably from Sterling to Peoria, on into Springfield. As I mentioned the other day, if my wife should want to come down in Springfield over the weekend, then if she goes by bus, its going to take seven and one-half hours, she's going to have to go East to Rockford, South to Bloomington, Southwest, and on in. If she elects to take the train, its going to take seven hours because she'll have to go all the way to Chicago to transfer. If she elects to fly, she has to fly from Rockford in and then transfer. If she wanted to go to Moline-Rock Island, Rock Island-Moline, its almost the same situation for the plane or for the railroad. So those of you who, in the past, can remember when those of us from Northwestern Illinois helped to support and subsidize the C.T.A. and help those for appropriations for AMTRAK and other forms of transportation in other areas of the State, now its our turn and I'd certainly appreciate a green light."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I would just like to reiterate what I had...I said for a few minutes the other day when this Bill first came up. You know, two years ago, we made some provisions for some new trains in this State of Illinois. The Department of Transportation has put them all on but one. Even though last year, they came in on their own and put an appropriation, a large



appropriation in their budget for the fifth train that was among those that were authorized two years, and that's the train from Chicago to Champaign to Decatur. At this time, they have never yet put that train on and now here I understand they're okaying that there can be another train put on in a new area before they take care of the obligations that they've already committed themselves to for which they've done absolutely nothing. And so until such time as the Central Illinois area gets some...either a toll road or a train or an interstate road so that there's some means of getting in and out of the largest city in the State that does not have any kind of service of that kind, I would request to the Members of this House to vote against this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? Representative Ebbesen to close."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just very briefly, I would encourage a yes vote. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill pass. All those in favor vote aye. Opposed, vote no. Have all voted who wished? On this question...the Clerk will take the record. 116 ayes, 11 noes, and the Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Borchers. Record Representative Borchers present. Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of order. And I'd like the House Members, particularly the new Members, and some of the older Members to refer to Rule 57, which discusses decorum in debate. It says 'all persons shall observe the following rules of courtesy during debate'. And in subparagraph (c) it says 'when recognized by the Chair, the Member may then speak to the question under debate, avoiding personalities, names, and discourteous language'. Now Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm sure we've all been guilty to a certain extent of using names of others in debate. But in the last couple of days, I think that the language in the House of Representatives has reached a sad state. And perhaps for the Members its not quite so bad because we know each other on a first-name basis. But from some of the comments I've heard from the people in the gallery



58.

I think we are losing the respect of which we are entitled by letting slips of the tongue interfere with the orderly debate. And I would just like to suggest to the House, as one Member, having been guilty of using names, myself, that in the future, we refer to the people as the Lady or Gentlemen from the County to which they are attached, and that we be a little more careful in our use of language on the floor, and try and keep this in a dignified and elevated manner, I think you will go a long way towards an orderly debate, particularly as the session gets more heated in these final weeks. Thank you Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, its not my intention to disagree with the last speaker, but...a...I think...a...lot of our rules probably emanated over the years from the average of fifty attorneys in the House each year, which is almost a third of the House, and I think that because of their appearances in courtrooms and their fear of irking the judge, you might have gotten some rules that don't really reflect the tone of the populus. This is the people's House, and we reflect the populus, we reflect 12,000,000 people, and they aren't all brilliant and they aren't all stupid, and they aren't all even tempered, and they are bigoted, narrow minded, prejudice and hypocritical. So let's not kid each other, there are times when we go to Committee meetings and we are insulted by some of the seemingly intelligent Members of the House. They ban together to make a fool of you Well, there's times when you are on the Assembly floor you get even. Now I'm speaking for the people I want to get even against this structure, and I'll keep doing it whenever I feel like it."

Speaker Redmond: "On Consideration Postponed appears House Bill 14. Representative Duester."

Duester: "Mr. Speaker, it would be my request, at this time, to take this Bill back to the order of Second Reading for the purpose of a technical Amendment with respect to the definition of weight, this is the subject area, a point that Representative Skinner has raised.. I would ask leave to return this to the order of Second Reading for that purpose."



Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Proceed."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #4. Duester. Amends House Bill 14, as amended, in Section 9.1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duester."

Duester: "In the Bill, itself, there was a definition of 'wake' which had been given to me by the Department of Conservation. Representatives Skinner, and I think Representative Catania, also pointed out that it was a little broad...a...it says 'for the purposes of this Section, a wake is defined as a movement of water created by a boat underway, which is sufficient to disturb a boat at rest'. And I agree and I have offered...I'm offering Amendment #4 to take that language out so after that language is taken out, the Bill will say that under... simply with respect to wake 'that under no circumstances shall a boat underway exceed five miles per hour while within a posted no wake area'. And I...if there's any questions, I'll be happy to respond, but I move the adoption of Amendment #4 to House Bill 14."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #4 to House Bill 14. All in favor say aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it. The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Return to the order of Consideration Postponed. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, earlier today, I introduced House Bill 3016 and ask for leave to move that to the order of Second Reading without reference to a Committee. At that time the Minority Leader, Mr. Washburn, asked if I wouldn't hold it. I think we've worked everything out that...I know of no objection and at this time I would ask...again ask leave of the House to move it to...a... House Bills' Second Reading without reference to a Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Need a Roll Call on this, it takes 107 votes. All in favor vote aye. Opposed, vote no."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, in case anybody didn't hear me originally, this appropriates \$10,000,000 to the Department of Labor so that it can make emergency loans to individuals in the amounts not exceeding \$150 pending receipt of their first unemployment compensation check."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I know ah.... taking the Dale Carnegie course, I haven't made friends or influenced people this morning, but this Bill, and that's the first time I've disagreed with my Majority Leader, if you think you're going to speed up the unemployment recipients receiving of money, you're only going to ingulf the unemployment compensation office with more paper work. This Bill, I've read the Bill. I took a moment and read the Bill. This Bill says you're going to take 150 million dollars and you're going to give.... ten million dollars and you're going to give to the Department of Labor, and you're going to give a 150 dollar loans to an unemployment compensation recipients that walk in off the street. What he really wants is his check. When you start processing twenty thousand claims for loans, you're only going to slow up the process that much further. This Bill doesn't provide who's going to be handling the loans, what kind of security is going to be needed. There is nothing in the Bill that provides any of this information and this is an ideal Bill that should go to Committee, but of course ah.... inasmuch as I told it like it was this morning, I don't expect to have much success today, but this is a terrible Bill and it ought to go to Committee, but I know how we reflect, thinking of the populus, we do as we please, and we'll keep doing as we please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in spite of my respect for this previous speaker, I'd like to indicate my support for this Bill. I've gone down and signed up as the Sponsor of the Bill and it is not perfect, and by virtue of this vote, it's going to go to Second Reading, but I would like to suggest to the Chief Sponsor of the Bill, and I would be delighted to work with him in any way that I could, that we should put some means here of providing that the persons who receive or are entitled to \$150 under this Bill, are persons who are likewise entitled to their unemployment compensation, so that we do not find ourselves in a situation of paying out \$150 to people whether or not they are entitled, and one of the things that has been slowing down unemployment comp, is the determination of eligibility



for unemployment compensation. It is true that the system itself is what needs to be worked out. It appears to me that apparently, in many ways, many of those who are in that unemployment central office, need to be worked out of their positions and someone who knows what they're doing placed in their place. If you've ever tried, and I'm sure many of you have tried to track down what's happened to some of your constituents' checks. This is, however, a need that must be met, because I've had literally hundreds of people, who have called me saying we're out of money. We can't find anything to live on. We're entitled to unemployment. We've been told we are suppose to get a check for six weeks, for eight weeks or for ten weeks, so this is some help for them, and I hope we can clear up this Bill, so we can determine who makes the payment, who handles it and also on what basis they are entitled to receive it. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, I had one question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Tuerk: "What's the procedure for the repay on these loans? I frankly think this is a good idea. I also share some of the thoughts that were made relative to the administration of the whole mess. I don't think it's going to be a panacea, but I think it's a good start. Now how do you provide, or what will be the provisions for the repayment of the \$150 loan?"

Shea: "I would imagine they'd repay it when they get their first check. I don't have all the solutions, as I said last night. I've got a Bill. I want it to go to Second Reading, and I'll work with any Member on the Floor of this House that can improve it, because all I know there are people that need their checks, need the money now. They're not getting it. I'm taking one step. If somebody's got a better solution to this, then I've got, then I'll support that. I'll support any solution that will get the money to the unemployed now."

Tuerk: "Well, in other words, you don't have in the Bill at the moment, how the ah..... the loans would be repaid. Is that correct?"

Shea: "It said 'in need of pending receipt of the borrower's first unemployment check'. I would imagine that it would provide, I don't spell it out in the legislation, but I would imagine, at the time they make the



loan to the individual, that it would be pending receipt of the check. If you think you've got some better language, I'd be happy to accept it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the concept of Representative Shea here is putting forth is an excellent one, but just happen to think the procedure is very critical. There are a lot of open ends, and rather than support this Motion for putting it on Second Reading, I would like to suggest to Representative Shea that he move that he move... the posting requirements be removed, go to a immediate hearing before a proper committee, which is probably Labor and Industry. Let's then come back with the answers in an agreed committee bill and we'll pass it out within a few short days. I would prefer that rather than pass out something that is very vague and indefinite, and I would suggest that, Representative Shea."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

R. Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I want to commend the Majority Leader on the idea of doing something like this. I'm certain that down in the far south, we've had plenty of problems, as I'm sure all of you have. A few weeks ago, I called the computer center to see if I could help one of my constituents, and some Lady answered, and said if you'll get us more money, we'll do more work up here, and I've been kind of ticked off and burned ever since then. I don't know who she was and I didn't ask, but this is the attitude that we're getting up there. I find, and I just offer it as a suggestion for the Majority Leader of the Committee, California has a plan that we might look into, where when they walk into the office to sign up, I think they're given their first check. At least it's something like this, because they don't have this period, and I certainly commend the Majority Leader on his efforts. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, I would echo Representative Schraeder's remarks. I don't see any reasons why we should bypass Committee. I would certainly vote to waive the posting rules so that it can be heard immediately, but Labor and Commerce Committee, is one that is staffed with People who understand these things, who can take a look at the Bill



find the flaws in it in a less pressed atmosphere than this Bill has received so far, put it into shape so that we can pass it. Certainly there's a need. There's been a need for more than just this week for legislation in this area, so I think we're moving to hastily. I think that ah..... we can certainly get this Bill out within a few days, even after having a special committee meeting for it, so I would certainly urge that people get off of this and send it to committee meeting and waive the posting rule."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, if you have been reading the newspapers in the last two weeks, you know that we have a very, very serious problem in the State of Illinois. Now we discussed a Bill earlier today that would give the Doctors some money. I can assure you that all of the doctors I know are going to eat tomorrow and they're going to eat next year, and they're going to have any of the frills that they want, regardless of whether the State ever pays them. Now I also heard Representative Shea stand on this Floor last night and beg Representative Giorgi to give him an idea or to tell him what he could do or what we could do for these poor people who are hungry. Representative Giorgi gave him no satisfaction. Representative Shea then went out and figured out something for himself, and I tell you that I think he is to be congratulated for this and this is what he came up with, and I think we should put it on Second Reading and pass it and if you have any suggestions, then we can improve it. He has said he would listen to anyone. He has given us an alternative here to..... to having people go to bed hungry, and I think that we should definitely give it a lot more green lights and get on with other business."

Speaker Redmond: " Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Those who are opposed to the abolition of the one week waiting period should certainly be voting for this Motion. All of us know that unemployment compensation bureaucracy in this State is either grossly understaffed or totally incompetent. Personally, I'm just happy my State Senator sent out the press release that announced the increase in unemployment compensation in January, and I assume his office is the one that is receiving most of the complaints. We know how to get



a check out in two days now. But those people don't call until they're desperate, when they need the money, and I think this is a good stop-gap measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to compliment the Majority Leader also on his compassion, but I think he's let his emotions get away from him. What we're really doing here in bypassing committee, is maybe even forcing people not receiving their unemployment checks when they ought to be. What we're really doing is bull dogging, bog.... oh well, crap, what I'm trying to get to is that what we're going to do to the Department of Labor, is we're going to force them to send out these loans so that they cannot give to the unemployment compensation eligible people their eligible checks. I'd urge you to vote present, so that we can amend this Bill in Committee, so they can get the money they deserve. Don't pass this thing by bypassing committee this way. It's a gross injustice. Gross."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washington."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Washington: "Mr. Shea, ah... I wish you would enlighten me, what seems to be the bottleneck in the Illinois Bureau of Employment Security, as to why these checks aren't being paid?"

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Harold, I don't know what the bottleneck is. I haven't got the foggiest idea. I've heard for the last three months, or two months, here on the Floor of this House, that there is a problem, that they're not getting their checks, that we're working on solutions. One of the Representative's said to me, perhaps we ought to give them some more money and hire some more people. I don't have the answer to the problem, but I have at least a solution or what I think is a solution. I don't say it is the only one. There may be a lot better. Come up with a better solution, and I'll support that one and get rid of this one. But in the meantime, I'm trying to do something. I'm informed at least in suburban Cook County, the unemployed are going on general assistance. In downstate Illinois, they tell me they can't even get on general assistance or public aid, because they've got the check coming and are ineligible. Now you tell me and you and



I go a long time back on this issue if a Man can't get money from the Department of Public Aid, if he can't work and get money, and he's got some hungry kids, you know where he's going next, Harold, with a gun out on the street."

Washington: "Well, Jerry, I ah.... I responded to your emotional appeal based on obvious hardships and frustrations out in our economy by voting green, but as I listen to the question and some of the comments, it occurred to me that the very nature of the questions that were posed to you almost dictated that this matter go to a Committee so questions like I asked can be answered, so questions like those raised by Skinner and Schraeder and McClain could be answered and frankly I don't think that a two day or three day period would make that much difference. I think we're all concerned about this matter and I know you aren't going to challenge anyone's good faith, if they don't agree with you in bypassing committee, but I think the thing is simply complicated, the matter is just too.... too involved for us to jump out here, put a Bill on the Floor and for you to challenge us to come up with something better. Hell, we don't even have the facts. We can't come up with the solution. I'm going to change my vote, Jerry, and I suggest strongly that this Bill go to Committee, suspend the posting rules, and let the committee, which is designed to do this sort of thing, and has the skills and get the witnesses in, give a thorough going discussion to that or if you think it's that critical, perhaps you can.... we can have a Committee of the Whole, but I think this thing needs to be gone over thoroughly, and it might get to the proposition that they need more employees. I don't know. So I'm going to vote to.... against this bypass of Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to give you just a little background, a Committee was set up comprised of the House and the Senate. We had, if you will investigate, the unemployment compensation situation in the State of Illinois. We have had three meetings, and because of the terrific workload of the House and the Senate, it's been almost impossible to have another meeting. We do intend to have other meetings. But by setting up that particular Committee, we could accomplish this



much, that the Federal people have brought in now to the State of Illinois, between 20 and 25 experts in this particular field, from all over the United States of America, and they are reviewing the whole system in the State of Illinois. In testimony that was given to us, the State people admit that there is a very severe problem in the State of Illinois. The only sad part of that particular report, it won't be fully out until August. In regards to the Committee itself, it's going to take a short period of time at least for us to have more meetings and come up with reasons of what is happening in that particular Department. We have some already. There have been some changes made in the Department to try to speed things up. One of the most difficult areas, is getting that name on what they call the line to the computer, and if the manual operation of getting that name to the line in the computer falls down, then consequently the individual's check is held up, and sometimes then he's paid out of emergency funds, but that only goes on for a month, and his name still isn't in the line, and consequently he don't get paid again, and you have to call up and go through this whole procedure. I'd like to say this, that I'm voting for this piece of legislation because the Sponsor has agreed to hold it on Second Reading, and as he says, I don't have the answers to this yet, I hope I can secure the answers. I think the answers will come out of this House and Senate Committee and the Federal review that is taking place now, but in the meantime, I think it's a very good idea to provide something like this, because these people are having a very difficult time and they're having to go to township funds. Those are funds donated from your property tax, and it seems to me it's much better getting the money out of the general revenue fund instead of hitting those taxpayers, the property taxpayers over the head again in our local districts, and I would suggest that you should vote for this piece of legislation and let's see if we can make it a better piece of legislation on Second Reading. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the ah.... Gentleman from Cook, ah.... yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."



Winchester: "Representative Shea, it's my understanding that the Department of Labor is now in the process of laying off as much as 300 to 500 ah.... employees within the Department of Labor. I support this Bill. If this Bill goes through and the money is made available, what assurance do we have that the People will get it if we don't have the employees there to administer it?"

Shea: "I was just told by Jack Hill, those people are not being laid off in this Division of the Department of Labor. You know, we've got the people there now. Evidently, they're taking the welfare, or I mean taking the claims for unemployment compensation. Again, I say, I don't understand what the problem is. All I know is, I've got the problem in my district, and I think every man and woman on this Floor has the problems within their district. Now, it's been bandied about in talks and almost talked to death. It's going to be July or August, as Mr. Representative Hill says, before we get a report. Well, we're going to be out of here in August, hopefully, and then what is it, October before we're back. By that time, we might have ten percent unemployment in this State. I don't know. I've taken one step forward. I would hope that I'm supported by 107 Members."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I was away from the Floor. Can I ask the distinguished Majority Leader, just a short explanation because it's not in my book. Just briefly."

Shea: "This, Geo-Karis, is a simple Bill. I provide a fund of ten million dollars, let the person seeking unemployment get a loan of \$150 when they apply for their unemployment compensation. Mr. Tuerk raised a question of how they pay it back. I'll be happy to sit down and work that out. You know, all I want to do is try to do something...."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I still have the Floor....."

Winchester: "I wasn't finished with my question as a Representative."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester, pardon me."

Winchester: "I just wanted to speak to the Bill. I think it is a very good Bill, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like to see some more green lights up there. I'm getting a lot of ah.... my constituents are calling about



this problem. I think this is a way of helping, and I urge all my colleagues to put some more green votes up there. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Now, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Ah.... I was going to speak in favor of the Bill, as a Member of the Joint house committee, investigating unemployment audits, and he's right, I think it is a good Bill and I want everybody to vote for it, because it's a necessary thing. Period."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, two things have been generally agreed upon. One, that there applauses for the Sponsor, Mr. Shea. The second, that there is a definite emergency need. Now the yellow lights have argued that committee amendments may be in order. Now they may be. However, may I point out that this is not a passage stage. It is the Amendment stage. May I further point out that the expertise of committee staffs is also available to the Majority Leader. I assume Amendments will clarify. I say put it on Second and permit Mr. Shea to use his Leadership in any necessary corrections and make this a true emergency measure. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, no one can be blind to the need for some action in this area. The administration of the office of unemployment compensation has been just deplorable and we are all aware of it. It seems to me that action is necessary and that we are here for the purpose of taking action and this is action. I don't ah.... I don't find anything wrong. Perhaps we would be better off referring to a committee, suspending that rule and hearing the committee testimony tomorrow, but I don't see what we can gain by that, because I think the Bill would be reported out, because all we have to work with. Now I think if this were in the hands of a good principal sponsor, I think we would have no trouble at all, and I think..... I think that we ought to really look to the merits, look to the need, and put this Bill on Second Reading, at a point where we can amend it."

Speaker Redmond: "Is that an offer, by Representative Walsh, to co-sponsor this with Representative Shea, to furnish the deficiency as far as Sponsors are concerned?"



Walsh: "Yes, we will handle that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, very briefly, on March 13, Representative McGrew and myself and many other Members of this House, passed House Joint Resolution 23 and a special committee was formed for the purposes of what we're talking about now on May 15 or May 16. I believe that that Resolution called for an answer. On May 1, 1975, from that Committee, it was so appointed. Everyone admits that the needs of the unemployed and unemployment itself is one of the major, major ah... needs of our society to be met by this General Assembly. I think Representative Shea waited long enough that this Special Committee that was created by House Joint Resolution 23 had plenty of time to do something. People are tired of waiting back home. People need some help. Representative Shea should be congratulated that he took the effort necessary to at least provide some hope for those, God help them, and those in the future, from almost being devastated, with first, not only losing a job, but second of all, not being able to collect the very necessity of life, the money needed to pay for milk and money needed to pay for food, the money needed to pay the rent. These people deserve it. It's not a matter of emotion. It's a matter of justice, and I commend Representative Shea and urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, someone said earlier that a person that goes to the unemployment compensation office and doesn't.... and they tell him that he might be entitled for unemployment compensation, now there's been a directive issued by the Department of Public Aid that that person will receive Public Aid until his unemployment checks arrive. That's part of the record for the last three weeks. This Bill would help if it were sent to a Committee where the committee could work on implementing the Bill. You're talking about taking House time to put Amendments on the Bill. This Bill could almost be used to move 488 again, if some of you want to reconsider some of your wrong votes on that issue, but the point is, this is going to cause the unemployment compensation office now, which is having trouble now, because there are employers objecting to 30,000 applications a month. They're engulfed in paper work, and there is talk of a layoff, and there might be a layoff which would indicate



less people to handle claims. When you... talk about allowing all new... every new application to be granted \$150 loan, you're going to stall that check that much longer. You're not going to help the guy..... because it's still going to take him eight weeks to get the check. \$150.00 ah.... you know what we're talking about? We're so great with our unemployment compensation checks, that a fellow that earns \$180.00 a week in Illinois today, can only get the magnificent sum of \$67.00 a week when he is unemployed. We've got the same people that wouldn't vote to increase that person's plight, want to embarrass the Unemployment Compensation Office, who couldn't handle this Bill;.... we don't know where the money is coming from.....no, I'm just explaining my vote, but ah... I think it's a bad Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, there's nothing so sacrosanct about ah... bypassing Committee. When we get into wee hours of the morning on the 30th, we're going to be voting on Bills written in total that none of us are aware of. I think that this is a pressing issue and let it come out on the floor and let's at least take some kind of chance with it. Representative Shea told you that he didn't know all of the answers, but at least he wants to make an attempt and I think we need these 107 solid votes to help bypass Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 112 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill having received the constitutional majority.... Representative Catania."

Catania: "Mr. Speaker, has this Bill been printed? Does it have to be printed for us to take this type of action?"

Speaker Redmond: "No."

Catania: "It doesn't?"

Speaker Redmond: "I've been advised that it is in the process of being printed, but it does not have to be printed for this. I was wrong in ah.. in announcing the question the ah... the question is on the adoption of the motion and the motion is adopted. Now Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I could, I would like to appeal to you on your ah.... decision or ah... you announcement that we were going to have a recess between 2:30 and 3:30. It would just seem to me ah... yesterday when we recessed for an hour, it took us another hour to



get started and we lost two hours and I think that many of the Members would really ah.... rather get out at 8:30 instead of 10:30 so we could have a good meal and work right through. Most of us have had lunch and I wonder if you would consider that?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't believe that the decision is capable of being appealed and let me tell Representative Totten the reason for my ruling. I've been here nine terms. In my ninth term, ah.... it's a rare Session that at least three Members do not die. I've seen people fall out of their Chairs. I've seen them dragged off. I've seen them in wheelchairs and I think that the health and the welfare of the Members is so important that we should ah... there's nothing as important as the health and the welfare of our Members and that's the reason that I have had a break for lunch and a break for dinner. On Postponed Consideration appears House Bill 522. Representative Friedrich is recognized."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is ah.. under the rules, this is the last day for this Bill to be heard and I'd like to make a motion to suspend the rules to extend the time one day on this particular Bill so that it can be heard tomorrow. I did delay this yesterday ah... to try and accomodate some people who ah.. had some hang-ups on the fact that this creates some ethnic problems, which was never intended. So I would move to suspend the rules to extend the time on this Bill one day so that it can be heard tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "This is the Bill that you took out of the record to permit the discussion on the Amendment, is that correct?"

Friedrich: "That's right, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "And the Amendment was adopted and the Bill is now in Enrolling and Engrossing, is that correct?"

Friedrich: "That's right."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washington."

Washington: "May I correct the Speaker, if I may?"

Speaker Redmond: "Go right ahead."

Washington: "It was not taken out of the record, it was postponed, which makes a tremendous difference."

Speaker Redmond: "You're right. The question is on the Gentleman's motion



to suspend the rules to extend the expiration date of this Bill one day from May 17th to May 18th. All in favor vote 'aye' and all opposed vote 'no'. It will take 107 votes. 107. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, You said that it extended one day to the 18th.

I think you mean to the 17th rather than the 18th."

Speaker Redmond: "You're correct."

Matijevich: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "You're pretty sharp today, John. Have all voted who wish? Representative Byers."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, I think that this is a bad Bill and it should be defeated now. I don't think we should continue this. We debated this yesterday and we couldn't get enough votes to pass it and I don't think it deserves 107 votes today. I think we should vote 'no' on this."

Speaker Redmond: Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 'ayes' and 21 'nay' and the motion carries. We will return the order of House Bills, Third Reading. On the Priority of Call ah.. there's one more Bill there that's endangers sudden death. House Bill 598. Representative G.L. Hoffman."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 598. A Bill for an Act to amend the Mental Health Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, yesterday we adopted Amendment #3 to House Bill 598, which provides a ah... schedule for ah.. families of children in private residential care facilities, as well as institutional care facilities. This ah.. Amendment is a result of protracted discussions with the Department of Developmental Disability and many of the parents from places such as Miseraecordia, Little City and others, ah... who were paying ah... costs far and above what many of us thought were reasonable. Due to the discussions with the Department of Disabilities ah.. we have worked out a program where in fact ah... it will be ah... a actual gain to the taxpayers of the State of Illinois because we've developed a program to use ah.. federal funds for the cost of medical care, which have been paid for out of state funds up to this time. So not only is it going to be a benefit to ah.. parents, but it's also going to be a



benefit to ah... the taxpayers of Illinois and ah.. I ah.. respectfully solicit your support of House Bill 598 as amended."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates that he will."

Lundy: "Representative Hoffman, now do I understand that with the Amendment the table that you've added that the department has withdrawn its opposition to the Bill?"

Hoffman: "Yes, that's correct."

Lundy: "Thank you."

Hoffman: "They are in support of the Bill and ah... have done something, I think, that ah.. many of us had hoped they would do ah... on their own."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummet."

Brummet: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have a question of the Sponsor."

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

Brummet: "We have ah.. a predicament down in southern Illinois where the old P.B. Sanitarium at Mount Vernon has one floor that's operated by the Mental Health Department and they are billing the parents of those people that are in there for care because they say that it belongs to the Public Health Department. Will your Bill take care of this inequity?"

Hoffman: "I don't ah... I can't answer that question. I don't believe so. Right off the top of my head, I don't think my Bill is addressing that particular problem."

Brummet: "Well, there's no reason why they should be billing them to begin with because ah.. before ah.. it was part of the Mental Health set up and it still should be."

Hoffman: "I would be pleased to discuss that issue with you and do anything I can to help."

Brummet: "Good, I'm for your Bill 100%. Don't misunderstand me. I think we should pass it."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill pass. All those in favor



vote 'aye' and the opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 127 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. The order of business is House Bills, Third Reading, in the order of numerical sequence... the order on which they appear on the call. On that order of business appears House Bill 70."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 70, Duff. An Act concerning fees and allowances paid jurors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill ah... had as its genesis the study of the National Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, which was a comprehensive study and done nationally on the problems in the Criminal Justice System. One of the points that was made is that there is not enough participation nor willingness to participate ah.. on the part of the citizenry in the process of trials. This Bill addresses itself to the fact that today in Illinois, many counties pay as little as \$4.00 a day for a juror. The largest counties, like Cook, pay \$10.00 a day for a juror. Now some companies reimburse their employees when they are on jury trial, but many do not and many of the poorer citizenry in the nation, who have a job and have to leave it and not get reimbursed, they try to avoid it. Many of us, I'm sure, have received calls from people saying, 'How can I avoid serving on a jury?' Once they have the experience, they enjoy it. In fact, this is a general rule. What this Bill does is increase the juror's compensation to \$20.00 a day, which I think really is a modest amount. It also reimburses it from the state. It has an effective date of July 1, 1976 and consequently it has no fiscal implications for this year. I think it is a good thing to try and foster the cooperation of people in criminal jury trials, which is where this applies. I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "A question for the Sponsor. Representative Duff, does your Bill provide for an increase for civil jurors too and not to be paid by the state; or does it just leave the civil juror the same payment ah.. the same as it always was?"



Duff: "Well, that's a good question. It does provide for an increase for civil jurors, but with the state paying the criminal juror in its entirety, which it does not do now, it's our opinion that in almost all counties, it's approximately a draw as far as trials are concerned."

Leinenweber: "Thank you. I think it's a good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: Any further discussion? Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Do we have a price tag on this? What would it cost the state?"

Duff: "About \$2,000,000. Not for this year, however."

Beaupre: "Well, maybe you oughta explain that, if you will."

Duff: "It has a fiscal ah... it has an effective date of July 1, 1976.

This gives the counties time to budget."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? The question is shall this Bill pass. All those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 108 'ayes' and 3 'nays' and 6 'present' and the Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 72. Representative Borchers, 'aye'."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 72. A Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill which was a product ah... which was introduced in the Judiciary Committee and sent to the Sub-Committee ah... Representative Houlihan pursuant House Resolution 69. That Sub-Committee worked out the compromises of the Amendment and it came out of Committee with complete agreement. This Bill responds to the recent Supreme Court decision of the Lewis case, which some of you have read about in the newspapers, which said that when ah... a person is under the 120 day rule, under speedy trial, ah... that ah... and a continuance is asked for, a legitimate continuance during that course of 120 days, that instead of the present ah.. or previous practice of then having 120 days start all over again, it totals the period of time. Now what the Sub-Committee did was have public hearings in Chicago and ah... had people from different walks of this trial ah..process come in and ah... we changed the effective date from ah... I think,



January 1, 1975 ah... is that right, Representative Houlihan? Ah.... 1976, excuse me. Then we also provided for at the tail... at the very end of the speedy trial period, where you would ah... perhaps have a continuance requested with just a few days to go, instead of putting the state in a bind of not being able to provide witnesses; we provided, in that instance, for an additional twenty-one days. This is a Bill, which ah... with the efforts of Representative Lundy, Houlihan, Fleck and others ah... we are making a significant step forward, a very significant step forward in the speedy trial situation. In some counties today, it takes as much as 352 to get to trial. I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill pass. All in favor vote 'aye' and all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 121 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. /4. John Dunn, 'aye'. Representative Washburn, for what purpose do you rise?"

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We have in the gallery to the right of me, at the present time, Mr. Dave Harrison, Mr. Dave Harrison, Chairman of the recent Tennis Marathon that was held at Eastern Illinois University. He has with him the four participants; Ann Warrell, Chris Mont, Randy Berk and Chuck Cooksley. Now these four students broke a record by continuous ah... in a continuous tennis match, taking place on May 2nd through the 4th, fifty-one hours and ten minutes. Not only did they break the world's record, but they also raised \$1600 for muscular distrophy for the event. I am certainly happy to recognize them this morning. Will you please stand?"

Speaker Redmond: "House Bill 74. Representative Porter."

Porter: "I'm a little confused. Ah.... we've been going by days and suddenly we're going by numbers. Can you explain to the House ah...."

Speaker Redmond: "According to the rules, the Speaker can go to the order of House Bills, Third Reading in numerical sequence....."

Porter: "I realize that you can, but I just wondered why you are."

Speaker Redmond: "It looked like the better procedure."



Porter: "Well, it's taking Bills that aren't going to expire for a long time, early."

Speaker Redmond: "It looked like the better procedure to me. Representative Duff, House Bill 74."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 74, Duff. An Act concerning fees and salaries. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't have my Calendar here, but I think this expires tomorrow or the next day. Ah... this is a witness compensation Bill, quite similar to the juror's compensation Bill that came up before. It provides that every witness attending a new judicial proceeding should have ah... \$10.00 a half day and \$20.00 a full day. It also provides that the vouchers are reimbursed through the county by the Comptroller."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Representative Duff, ah... will you respond to a question, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Kosinski: "I think that the House should be aware that there was a companion Bill of an appropriation. Possibly you should explain your rationale there, Sir."

Duff: "Because of the fiscal implications and the necessity for budgeting it in before the Appropriations Committee, I tabled.... I agreed to table the Appropriation Bill, which I did, and change the effective date to July 1, 1976."

Kosinski: "There is no appropriation with this then?"

Duff: "That's correct."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is shall House Bill 74 pass. All in favor ah.... Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "I'm concerned about ah.... Mr. Speaker, if the Sponsor will yield for a question, ah... Amendment #2 and ah.. ask if it was adopted."

Duff: "Amendment #2 was adopted."

Palmer: "Then explain ah... begining on line 21, ah... 'the payments shall be made on a bi-monthly basis begining with the period for July



through August, 1976'."

Duff: "Would you give me a page reference, please?"

Palmer: "Page 3."

Duff: "What did you say ah... line what?"

Palmer: "Line 22 and begining on 21. You deleted January through February of 1976 ah.. you inserted July through August."

Duff: "Representative Palmer, I can't hear you. I'm sorry, but there's a conversation going on around me and you were speaking rather lowly. Would you please ah..."

Palmer: "I don't want to take up too much time, ah.. just clarification. Line 21, page 3 ah.. 'the payments shall be made on a bi-monthly basis begining with the period for July through August'."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, my light keeps going on and off and I don't know why. Would you ask the gentleman that as long as I'm presenting the Bill to leave the light on?"

Speaker Redmond: "Leave the light on."

Duff: "If you'll look at Amendment #2, ah... it.. it amends page 3, line 18 by deleting 'January.....'"

Palmer: "I've got that... I'm down there."

Duff: "On page 3, line 22 by deleting 'January through February' and in lieu thereof inserting line 'July through August' and on page 4 after line....."

Palmer: "I understand that, but I'm just talking about this line 22."

Duff: "It just puts it off for a full year."

Palmer: "Well, I'm not certain that you made....."

Duff: "Well, it changed the effective date, you'll notice and changing these months ah.. is necessary in the wording of the Bill in order to make the change in the effective date necessary."

Palmer: "Well, I suggest that you review the language again."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates that he will."

Cunningham: "Representative Duff, is this ah.. postponement of the effective date indicate that unless there's an appropriation made next year, that the Bill would be meaningless or else work a hardship on



counties that are directed to follow this schedule?"

Duff: "This really isn't going to cause a hardship on the counties ah...."

Cunningham: "If that be true, why would the appropriations refund half of the money to the county?"

Duff: "I'm not sure I understand you."

Cunningham: "What was the purpose of the appropriation if there was no...."

Speaker Redmond: "Attention of the gallery.....we do not permit the taking of pictures."

Cunningham: "My question is, if there were no hardship on the counties, why did you deem it necessary to have a companion appropriation initially?"

Duff: "The appropriation was for the state portion."

Cunningham: "Well, then there is a hardship to that extent. My next question is; is it your thought that the financial crunch will be any less next year than it is this year? That's an election year when people will be more inclined to ah.. support a tax raise at that time?"

Duff: "The key thing, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in response to the Gentleman's question is that we are trying to encourage the participation of people in the judicial process. There are many people who will avoid being a witness. They get ah... they are a witness to a crime and they get asked to come downtown, they're going to lose wages or pay ah.... and we have situations where a person ah...."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, he's not answering my question. He's arguing..."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, if the Gentleman will....."

Speaker Redmond: "Answer his question."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, once again, would you ask the gentleman to leave my light on while I'm presenting my Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "The problem is that ah.... when both start talking at once why ah.. one light has preference."

Duff: "Well, I'll give reference to Representative Cunningham. However let me just say that if you will allow me to finish...."

Speaker Redmond: "How do you know which is the wrong one?"

Duff: "If you will allow me to finish, I will answer his question."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Our goal here is to get people to participate in the judicial process. When you have a situation that, perhaps, a girl gets raped and there are series of five, ten, fifteen, continuances requested over a long period of time and the boss says 'yes, you can take a day off, of course you can' the first time and the second time and the sixth time, but pretty soon, he starts discouraging her from going in, or somebody sees a shooting in a street and they get continuances five or six times, and they get discouraged because they lose work...."

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

Meyer: "Question of the sponsor. I hate to be such a rat being so close to him too."

Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me, I think maybe we'd better let the...a... previous pair have their duet. Representative Duff."

Duff: "A...so, the point is, Representative Cunningham, that, yes, this is going to cost some money. There's no question about it. And if the Members of this House don't feel that it is worth it to increase the compensation of witnesses and to clarify the ambiguity in the statute right now, then perhaps, we shouldn't do it. It is my feeling, and I know I'm joined by many others, that it is a beneficial and health thing to increase on a valid, legitimate basis, the participation of the citizenry in the system. If our criminal justice system is going to be improved, we are going to have to reasonably make it possible for people to participate."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Now if I may have thirty seconds to say why I'm against the Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Cunningham: "Its sheer utter nonsense for this House to continue to vote for pretty words for ideas that we all think are fine like encouraging participation in civil trials by reimbursing and listing the jurors unless you're willing, also, at that time, to finance it. Its no accident that the wise men and women who do our Constitution said that when we have State expenditures we must have balancing State revenues. The same principle is applicable here. The sponsor says its an



excellent idea, its time has come, its absolutely necessary, but we'll put it off until July 1 of 1976 and hope to God that at that time we'll find some way to finance it. I say to you its an excellent idea and after you've found the way to finance it and are able to look your taxpayers in the eye, and say you're going to pay through the nose for this particularly good idea, then you should vote for this Bill. But until its accompanied by an appropriation...appropriation Bill that will offset the expense involved, you are guilty of hiding behind reality. I urge you to vote no."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyers."

Meyers: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Section 47, line 10 of this...on page 1 of this Bill, and I want to...if I could have a little attention...this says 'every witness attending any judicial proceedings ta da da da da will receive the sum of \$10 that the State will pay for any civil matter'. This means that the State of Illinois is going to be paying \$10 to plaintiff, witnesses, in civil litigation, personal injury, car accidents. Now if you're talking about paying people for criminal trials, yes, there's an overwhelming compelling public necessity to attract people to come to criminal trials. But by God I don't think the State of Illinois should be paying \$10 witness fees, the State, and I might add, the county, and this would place an intolerable burden on Cook County. Its a bad Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Lechowicz."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, if I can answer that, if that's what the Bill did, I wouldn't like it either. And what the Gentleman is referring to is the fee schedule, he's not referring, and I would refer him to earlier on page 2, line 12..."

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

Bradley: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker, I don't recall that the previous speaker asked him a question, and I think he can close and answer the question at that time."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further question? Representative Duff to... Representative Lechowicz."



Lechowicz: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker. I stand in opposition to House Bill 74. Not with the concept, but with the unfortunate cost and the raid on the State treasury. Now Representative Kosinski has a similar measure, but the funds come from a different source, and that's federal money. I think since that is an available source of revenue for this type of a situation. I'd rather see that type of a Bill passed in lieu of a raid on the State treasury. Thank you. I request a no vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, very briefly, the criminal justice system in this State and every State and on the federal government level has broken down. There's simply no question about it. Our jails are filled, the courts are clogged, they can't get to trial. We don't have enough Public Defenders, we don't have enough skilled criminal lawyers, we don't have enough judges, we don't have enough court rooms. Something has got to be done. Now there is a growing theory in this country and I share it along with Representative Duff and Hirschfeld and others, that in order to jack-up this criminal justice system, in order to make it function better, we have got to involve John and Mary Doe in every aspect of the entire spectrum of the criminal justice system. Its just that simple. Now Mr. Hirschfeld got passed out of here with a substantial vote, a Bill providing for broader base of selectivity for jurors. And the purpose of that Bill was to make certain that people got involved in the criminal justice system. We just passed a Bill by Representative Duff providing that you pay jurors more money. We want jurors to come to these courts willingly, serve willingly, and not worry about their bread and butter and rent. We want to involve people in the criminal justice system. It follows as night does day that you have to also deal with the witnesses because people don't want to lose time coming to court as such and so forth. This Bill just wasn't born this morning or this session; they've been working on this Bill for three years. Its not the best possible Bill in the world, but its bottomed on a philosophical approach, which I innunciated when I began, but unless you involve people in the criminal justice system, it isn't going to work. You can get the best Police Department



in the world, the best judges, etc. and so forth, but unless the people cooperate with that system, it won't work. Now Roscoe Cunningham raised a very serious question about the money and you can't be careful about people's money, but people have to understand that if you're going to have an adequate criminal justice system, you're gonna cost them some money. And you have to tell them that and don't quibble about it and don't play politics with it. They either pay the cost of an adequate justice system or you have no justice system. This Bill is a part of a package designed to do that. I solicit your support, go back home and tell them its going cost them somethin in 1976, its just that simple."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff to close."

Duff: "Well Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, because there have been some good questions asked, I would appreciate some attention because I can give an adequate answer to each one of them, I believe. It is true it is a Bill which takes a good reading and I hope that those who would have question of it would read it and I will refer to the three points that were made. In the first place, one Representative asked some questions about the payment of civil cases, unfortunately, for the debate, what he was doing was reading from the fee schedule and not from the area where it talks about what will be paid. In fact, the Illinois statute now provides for compensation to witnesses. There is an ambiguity in the way its written and some counties are not and have not been providing the monies that they should for witnesses. That is one of the reasons why we have made the effective date July 1, 1976, because some of the Members from the downstate counties pointed out to us that the counties would need the time to budget for what they should be doing already anyway. There is already an obligation to compensate witnesses. Now, the Bill does provide an additional compensation in felony cases which will be paid by the State. As far as Representative Lechowicz' comment on the federal money, I would refer him to page...to the...a...second to last page of the Bill and the last line where the Bill provides for the Comptroller to apply to the State...to the federal government for any monies that might be made available in that regard and that is



essentially the same thing that the other Bill to which the Representative referred, so it is not a ripoff of the State treasury. I might point out that as respects all Bills in this regard, there is no certainty of federal money and we would be conning you if we tried to tell you otherwise. There is a high probability of federal money because the L.E.A.A. has indicated they would like to cooperate and participate in these items. I hope it's an adequate answer to the three questions that were raised. They were good questions, but they are taken care of in the Bill. I would very much appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote aye. Opposed, vote no. Representative Lundy. Representative Schneider, will you take your seat?"

Lundy: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a very important Bill. Your constituents and mine are bothered because the criminal justice system doesn't get felony defendants to trial quicker and doesn't get them convicted when it eventually does get them to trial. Part of the reason the system isn't working is because witnesses won't show up, they won't come to court because they don't get reimbursed in many cases. Now that's what this Bill is all about. We have a State judicial system in this State. It's a unified State-wide system. We shouldn't leave the cost of reimbursing witnesses solely to the counties as we presently do. All this Bill would do is say that the State, in felony cases, will reimburse the county for half the cost of witness fees. It seems to me that's the minimum we can do to try to make this system work better. As long as we refuse to pay the cost of making it work, you're constituents and mine, are going to continue to complain to us that the criminal justice system doesn't do the job it was designed to do. This is a very important Bill, I hope the Members will vote aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you. Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as a freshman, I see the red votes up there, I don't understand that. I do not understand how we, as legislators, can take an action that in the final analysis, shall cease to litigate the criminal



position in our communities and militate against those who have ...who are the law abiding citizens. Our criminal justice system does need help. Now we're talking about...the fact that we're talking about monies...a...is...is...inconsequential because we are going to pay one way or the other. The man on the street pays when he's knocked in the head by the criminal on the street who's probably out of jail on bond that he never will pay. I don't understand this. I think that we're hear to solve problems and not compound them. I think this is a good Bill and we should get those red votes off of there and turn them into green ones for the benefit of the people who are locked up in fear in their houses now, afraid to come out. I want this vote to pass...this Bill to pass. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we want to curb crime, but we're not going to curb crime if we're not going to make funds available to get necessary witnesses to the trial. We talk about spending money, well how about spending lives? If we permit criminals to go unprosecuted because material witnesses are not going to go because of financial expenditures involved, then we are just going to permit more crimes to run rampant. I urge all of my colleagues, here, to give it an aye vote. And I so vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well Mr. Speaker, obviously, there's some misunderstandings on this Bill...a...and I think that the debate has not been a happy one because some of the aspects of the Bill I have, apparently, not been able to make clear. I will say to you that it is possible that some people will prefer another method of compensation. This Bill provides, I think for the simpler method, but so that I may take the time to clarify to people who might have questions in their minds, I would like to ask to put the Bill on postponed consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "On postponed consideration. Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Speaker, in light of your recent ruling, I just want to remind you that it is past 2:30."



Speaker Redmond: "I think your point is well taken. We are now in recess until 3:45."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will be in order and the Members will please be in their seats. It looks like we have kind of a sparse...a...and the ah..... Clerk will put his tie on and the Republican staff will stop sitting on the desks. We'll be at ease for about fifteen minutes. Committee Reports."

Fred Selcke: "Mr. Pierce from Environment to which Senate Bills 323, 359, were referred, reported the same back with recommendation that the Bills do pass. Mr. Pierce from Environment to which House-Joint Resolution 15 and House-Joint Resolution 25 were referred, returned to same and pursuant to Rule 23(d) were ordered tabled. Mr. Pierce from Environment to which Senate Bill 326 was referred, reported the same back with recommendation that the Bill do pass. Mr. Yourell from Counties and Townships, to which Senate Bills 82, 165, and 368 were referred, reported same back with recommendation that the Bills do pass. Mr. Yourell from Counties and Townships to which Senate Bill 69 was referred, reported same back with Amendments thereto, with the recommendation that the Amendments be adopted and the Bill, as amended, do pass. Mr. Katz from Judiciary II to which House-Joint Resolution 28 was referred, returned the same and pursuant to Rule 23(d) was ordered tabled."

Speaker Redmond: "A new challenge has been poised to the Speaker. We now have a meat-chopping block up here. Now maybe nobody can break it. House Bills' Third Reading. House Bill 85."

Fred Selcke: "Duff's not here, is he? House Bill 85. Duff."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Duff on the floor?"

Fred Selcke: "Not here."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. 153."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 153. Macdonald. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code and Highway Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Take that out of the record? Take that out of the record. 164. Representative Grotberg."



Fred Selcke: "House Bill 164. Grotberg. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would not want to jeopardize the Bill, Mr. Speaker, for lack of a quorum, but I'm willing to give it a run if you'd like to call the troops together. What would you suggest?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, this is a non-controversial Bill."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "Why don't you give it a run."

Grotberg: "Alright. Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 164 is probably one of the more important people's legislation that we'd find today in these uncontroversial times. We have two kinds of energy in the State of Illinois and in this world. One is provided by nature and the other is provided by people. This brings the two together. This is a Solar Energy Bill, which has been in the hopper for a couple of years, but was tied up last year in rules because it was not an appropriation or an emergency Bill. In the meantime, this good Bill has just gotten better. Solar energy has become one of the frontiers of our energy...solution to our energy crisis and this Bill simply would do this. It would mean that a man like the Gentleman from Eureka, who put \$15,000 into his solar energy home, in his domestic situation, and each one of us may investigate and invest in a solar energy heating or air conditioning unit for our domicile for a domestic heating or cooling purposes without having the assessor penalize us for the rest of our life for such an investment. It merely says this. 'That anyone who invests in a solar energy device for heating or cooling of his home, under rules and regulations to be promulgated by local government affairs, shall have that unit assessed as if it were conventional heat so that you will not be paying a prime rate on an addition to your house and taxes for the rest of the life of you and your relatives'. This will turn on the domestic resources of enterprising people in Illinois who care enough to investigate and invest new ways of heating their homes. And I would simply recommend a do pass motion...not a do pass motion, all the green votes that we can get on this good Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill pass. All in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'."

Grotberg: "Hit them all because there's no way that this should go out of here without 177 votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, there is. Representative Telcser isn't here. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record."

Grotberg: Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Anybody that wants to get on the Roll Call, it will not effect the outcome of it, and wants to be recorded for the people is welcome."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there are 108 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."

Grotberg: "That's solar everyy that turns on the lights, Webber Borchers."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann, 'aye'. Representative Peters, ah... question.... state your question."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, after we've concluded ah... House Bill 164, I wonder if ah.. it might be with ah... the desire of the Chair possibly to go to House Bills, Second Reading, while we've got a lull here. Representative Telcser has one Bill there and he asked me if I would just move that to Third for him."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we'll consider that a little bit later. What is this ah... House Bills, Second or ah... what order is that?"

Peters: "House Bills, Second."

Speaker Redmond: "What number is it?"

Peters: "1584."

Speaker Redmond: "There's been an objection. We'll go back. 170."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 170, Geo-Karis. A Bill for an Act creating a Lake Michigan Shore Line Study Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah.. House Bill 170 creates the Lake Michigan Shore Line Study Commission consisting of four House Members and four Senate Members to study not only erosions, but the water quality problems relating to the Lake Michigan Shore Line. Lately we have had reports of national sources



and local newspaper sources that possible cancer agents are being found in drinking water and Lake Michigan does supply our drinking water and I ask for a favorable vote on my Bill. I might say this Bill has the blessings of the Waterway Department of the State of Illinois. Leo Eisel, Director, tells me that it's the only Bill that relates to the quality of water."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Geo-Karis: "Yes."

Borchers: "Now is.... doesn't this fall under the Commissioner on Water Resources in the State of Illinois?"

Geo-Karis: "Ah... Mr. Eisel told me that there is no Bill that goes into the quality of water and ah.. he is working with me on this Bill."

Borchers: "Well, suppose it does come under the ah... Department of Water ah.... Water Resources Commission of the State of Illinois, ah.. it might be stopped in the Senate? I'm a little uncertain ah... now I'm on that Commission, but the first first thing it looked to me is that this ah.... our Commission does cover this particular activity."

Geo-Karis: "That may be so, ah.. Representative, this Bill is not going to stop the work in anyway ah.. the waterways. This is simply a Legislation Commission to go into the quality of the water... the drinking water."

Borchers: "Well, we have a Commission and we've met with the Wisconsin officials and ah.. not much more than two and a half months ago about some of these very matters. I don't want to make a judgement and I don't want to say anything about it. I won't make a judgement because I think it will be amply taken care of in the Senate if it is transgressing on the Commission. So I won't say anymore about it."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you and I appreciate that and I ask the blessings of the Waterways Department."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative John Dunn."

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

Geo-Karis: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "She indicates she will."

Dunn: "Just one quick question. Is the Appropriation Bill to with this



ah...in the Sub-Committee, Appropriations I?"

Geo-Karis: "Yes, that's right. Action will be taken on it tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester, do you seek recognition? The question is shall this Bill pass. All in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 92 'aye' and 2 'nay' and the Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 175."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 175, Kosinski. A Bill for an Act to amend Section 47 of an Act concerning fees and salaries and so forth. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave of the House to hear the companion Bill also, 176?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Leave."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 176. An Act making an appropriation to the Comptroller. Third Reading of the Bill."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 175 and House Bill 176 refers to payments of witness in felony trials on an existing hourly wage basis prevalent of the time. Presently, we have found about a 22% drop-off in witnesses due to the economic and apathy reasons. We know it's the state's responsibility in prosecution of a state case against a felon to provide witnesses. The findings are that the witnesses drop off after continuances. As a matter of fact, in the City of Chicago, the police department will pick up witnesses and give them coffee money and take them home just to keep witnesses coming. This refers to felony trials only. Witnesses say the Judge, the Baliff, the Clerk, the Comptroller ah.. rather the Court Reporter, the State's Attorney, the Guards, the Jurors, all get paid. Even the women that scub the floor get paid, but the witnesses are expected to give up their daily wages to support a state's prosecution in a felony charge. The cost to the counties is nothing. This is designed to accept 10 to 1 federal match funds. The recent L.E.A.A. feeling has been instead of subsidizing Mar's lights and bricks, they wish to direct money from the omnibus Bill to victims and witnesses.



Now this Bill and its companion passed out of Committees and passed the House once and was put into the Senate. It was in that period, you folks that were here last year will remember, when the Senate determined that it would not hear Bills other than ah.. Bills in reference to appropriations for the various departments of the state. It was never heard in the Senate. I would like to put it back there and have it heard. Would you please give me you 'yes' vote?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Calvo."

Calvo: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Calvo: "Roman, ah.. 176, which is the next Bill and it calls for an appropriation for this, did you ah.... \$500,000 ah.. did you ask that those be heard together?"

Speaker Redmond: "He did."

Calvo: "Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't catch that. That's fine."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Representative Kosinski? Ah... will he yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Beaupre: "I noticed, Representative Kosinski, that ah.. the Digest indicates ah... provisions in the Bill, whereby ah.. for instance, if the attorney who happens to be prosecuting the case or ah.. acting as a plaintiff for the defense counsel, certifies that a witness is going to testify to some material fact and ah.. should that turn out not to be true, that there are some criminal sanctions involved and I wish that you'd explain that provision to me."

Kosinski: "The only part of the provision was that we wouldn't be ripped off. We want agreement by the State's Attorney and by the court and a signed voucher by the witness that he in fact was present and he was a material witness and he was a portion of the state's case. We do not wish to pay out the money for nothing."

Beaupre: "Well, according to the Digest, this applies to civil cases also, is that correct?"

Kosinski: "No, it does not."

Beaupre: "O'kay, that answers my question."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? The question is ah... Represen-



tative Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, just for the sake of clarification ah.. because we had another Bill earlier this morning on this subject and so that we will ah... everybody will have the full sense of what we are doing here; I would ask the Sponsor some questions if he will yield."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "What are your questions, Brian?"

Duff: "Amendment #2 says, 'This Act takes effect when the state receives funds from the federal government sources for witness compensation'. When would you expect that would happen?"

Kosinski: "Well, the way this was originally set up; I.L.E.C. came in in testimony in support of this Bill in the last Legislative Session with the hope of planning it with federal money at that time. Now I do know that there is a possibility that I.L.E.C. has locked itself in on the use of some federal funds at this time. In consequence, not wishing the state to support the major portion of this burden, I have made a flexible effective date as the availability of these funds. It's I.L.E.C.'s hope, as I understand, to approach this problem at the very earliest moment. Now whether that still occurs still this year or next year, is problematical."

Duff: "Well, the question I have, I guess in that respect is that if you don't know when the Act is going to take effect, why do we have an appropriation?"

Kosinski: "Well, the appropriation is similarly geared into an effective date of being effective at the time that the federal monies will be passed out to the state and I.L.E.C. will program this."

Duff: "Well, it's my understanding that L.E.A.A. has not taken any firm decision yet in terms of funding and I would ask you what would happen if this Bill did not go into effect under this provision for two or three years under some future General Assembly?"

Kosinski: "Well, that is not the hope of the Sponsor, nor, as I understand it, the intention of I.L.E.C. The effective date was merely, I repeat, so that we wouldn't be using state funds at a time when federal monies are not available. I think it was a reasonable way of handling the matter. It actually puts it on the Governor's desk for an effective date

I know he is in accord with this kind of thinking. I am hoping that it



will be extremely early."

Duff: "All right, now ah... when state received funds ah... does that mean complete funding or does that mean partial funding or...."

Kosinski: "That means 10 to 1 funding, Brian. It's a 10 to 1 match with a million dollars funding."

Duff: "The money in front?"

Shea: "You'll get a chance to close, Mr. Kosinski, do not argue."

Duff: "Sir? Mr. Speaker, I didn't understand your comment."

Shea: "If you're going to answer or ask and answer questions, that's fine, but this colloquy is not supposed to go on."

Duff: "I didn't understand your comment, Mr. Speaker. What would you like? I would like to ask questions and I am asking them."

Shea: "Well, I reminded the Sponsor of the Bill that this is not the time for debate. He'll have an opportunity to close."

Duff: "Representative Kosinski, if it's matching funds, does that not mean that the federal government has to fund after the state has spent the money?"

Kosinski: "No."

Duff: "Well, how can the state provide for dollars to be matched when the Amendment says that the Act takes effect when the state receives funds from the federal government sources? Is it your suggestion then that the federal government will come up with the money first?"

Kosinski: "The thought is that this should run concurrently. When federal monies are channeled down to I.L.E.C., which I.L.E.C. can program for this project, this will become effective."

Duff: "All right, now how long will the I.L.E.C. be willing to fund it? Do you know that?"

Shea: "Mr. Stone on a point of order."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that it is proper to ask a few questions, but that continual questions ah... asking the questions and answering ah.. is not in order and I object."

Shea: "Just a few questions, if you please, Mr. Duff. You have five minutes and you've used three and a half of them."

Duff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, Representative Kosinski, I won't ask a question now, but in the close I would appreciate it if you



would comment on how the funding program works on the per diem because that is the essential difference. You know that I agree with you very much. There should be this compensation."

Kosinski: "Thank you for your agreement."

Duff: "But you know that I feel that the funding method is very important to the simplicity for the sake of the county."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, may I respond to that question at this time?"

Shea: "You may respond...."

Kosinski: "It think that it is pertinent, Sir. It's ah.. the beauty of this and why the Digest gave seven pages of ah.. comment to this Bill was the fact that we do have in essence a sliding scale. Our hourly wage today may be one thing. Our hourly wage at another time may be another. This is unique in that it pays the hourly wage existing by law at any particular time."

Duff: "No more questions, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Kosinski to close."

Kosinski: "I merely ask my fellow Members to let me put this back in the Senate where it was; where it wasn't heard originally, so that they might work on it. Thank you."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 175 pass... and 176. All those favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On these Bills there are 106 'aye' votes and 5 'nay' votes and 5 'present' and House Bills 175 and 176 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Ms. Stiehl, 'aye'. Ms. Geo-Karis, 'aye'. Lundy, 'aye'. House Bill 229."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 229. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act of '39. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Calvo."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a very simple Bill. What it does is increase the amount of tax levy that can be used for the purpose of running the Supervisor of Assessment's Office and the counties who have supervisors of assessments. I believe, and I could stand corrected, that all but three of the counties ah... all but two of the counties other than Cook; in other



words, 99 of the counties have a Supervisor of Assessments Office. I was requested to put this Bill in by my own county because the amount of work involved in their office... the amount of the expenditures necessary to have it function properly could not be handled within the one cent assessment that was allowed under the current Statute. What this does is amend it to two cents and of course the amount can be levied up to ah... not to exceed that amount, in accordance with what they need. I think this is good legislation. I was informed by Mory Scott, at the time this was heard in the Revenue Committee, where it passed out in good fashion, that in order to keep this assessment out of the county ah... general fund or ah... general assessment, it would be necessary to amend another Section of the Statute. Now it was the intent of the Legislature when this Statute was originally enacted that it would not be part of and it is not now a part of the general fund. However, Mory thought that some work ought to be done relative to that to make it certain and ah...we're working on getting that done. It does not directly effect this Bill and I would appreciate your support for my county and any of the other counties who need additional funds. They do not have to use any additional levy if they're getting along all right within the one cent, but ah.. some counties I'm sure are not. I'm sure that there are counties like mine where they cannot do an adequate job with that amount of money. I would appreciate a favorable vote."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 229 pass. All those in favor ... on the question, the Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question or two?"

Shea: "He indicates he will."

McMaster: "Representative Calvo, I understand that this is a permissive tax that is levied by the County Board over and above their general corporate rate."

Calvo: "That's correct. It is permissive and ah.. if we increase it, of course it will still be permissive. If they levy it they can levy it up to two instead of one cent."

McMaster: "Another question ah... Horace. How many counties are currently levying this tax?"



Calvo: "I don't really know. I mean ah.. there are 99 that could. I don't know how many of those are."

McMaster: "Aren't we mandated in this state that every county must have a Supervisor of Assessments? If not, I think that probably two of them ah... or ah... more can share a Supervisor of Assessments."

Calvo: "I don't know what's happening with those two, but 99 do have a Supervisor of Assessments."

McMaster: "Well, probably ah.. does not the County of Cook have an elected Assessor?"

Calvo: "Well, yes they do have a little different set up. They've got a complete office and everything."

McMaster: "One of your counties down there ah... it's either Madison or St. Clair also has the elected Assessor, do they not?"

Calvo: "Well, that's correct. They ah... have a Board of Assessors, which takes the place of a Supervisor of Assessments."

McMaster: "So ah.. essentially, that would leave 100. You mean there's one county that does not have or perhaps shares with another?"

Calvo: "I ah.. I don't know how they handle it, Tom. We were looking at it and they do not have a Supervisor of Assessment listed as being presently serving so whether they are sharing with another county or ah... I don't know how they are working it. I don't know of any other arrangement, other than Cook and St. Clair, but there is apparently one other."

McMaster: "No I haven't talked to Mory Scott about this, Horace. You say that he is in support of this?"

Calvo: "He didn't have any objection to it in Committee. The only thing he told me ah... he felt that I needed to amend the power Section of the Act, which is Section 406 of the Chapter 38 ah... or not 38 but ah... the County Section, and ah.... 34, I believe it is; and ah... we're looking at that and trying to find a vehicle to do it. He thought to make it certain that this levy was outside of the counties corporate levy, that we should have some Amendment to another Section."

McMaster: "Horace, my county at home, Knox, was one of the first counties to go to Supervisor of Assessments ah... this was back in about 1955 or 1956, I believe. We are not, to my knowledge, levying this. Ah...



I'm not really so much in opposition to this Bill; I realize that we're doubling the amount of money that the County Board can levy for this purpose. It is a permissive thing. The County Board is the one that will eventually have to put the levy on, if it is put one, but I think that you know and I know that we have sat down here for several years, both of us, Horace, and ah... have ordinarily opposed any opportunity for tax increasees without referendum. Nevertheless, if you think that this is going to go for a good purpose, I'll ah...."

Calvo: "Ya, look.... my problem is Don, is I don't know ah.. you know, I know that some of the counties are able to absorb this without any difficulty, but in a county the size of mine where some of the assessors aren't getting paid ah.. you know, the Township Board isn't voting them any money, than it is necessary for the Supervisor of Assessments not only to do the work he normally would do, but also to handle the assessing in this township. We've just got to the place where we can't make it on the levy and they are levying separately for it."

Shea: "Again Gentlemen, we have a colloquy between two Members going on. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I think that the Speaker has been very lenient in terms of the questioning. Now the Speaker ah... Mr. Redmond, has talked to us time and time again about the number of Bills that we have facing us, the amount of time that we have to get those Bills out. He spoke about the possibility of even limiting the right of Members to ah... to ah... to explain their vote and here we have a situation where the Gentleman who is now questioning, ah... this particular Bill is on the Committee that heard the Bill. He was present at the time that the Bill was heard and the Bill went out of Committee 16 to 0. Now I say that it seems to me a little ludicrous at this point to be raising questions that were not raised in the Committee and the Gentleman was there and I object, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "We're going to get back. Mr. McMaster, do you have any further discussion with regards to the Bill?"

McMaster: "I could only object to this point, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I was present and we did raise questions and I think that when this House



refuses to allow debate or discussion to the point that clarifies matters, to the Members of this House, than I think that we are getting in a very bad state of affairs. I told you that I was not necessarily opposing the Bill. I think that we are trying, Horace and I both, to make all the Membership aware of what we're doing. This is all that we're trying to do, Jerry."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Calvo to close."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, I think that the Members who were paying attention know exactly what the Bill is about. I don't think it is necessary for any further comment. I would appreciate your favorable vote to let the counties throughout the state who need additional funds for this purpose to have the opportunity to get them."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall House Bill 229 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and all those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 92 'ayes' and 6 'nays' and 14 voting 'present' and House Bill 229 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 237."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 237, Brinkmeier. An Act creating the Advisory Committee on the compensation of General Assembly Members. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, ah... I'm sorry.. the Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like leave of the House to have House Bill 236 and 237 heard. They are companion Bills."

Shea: "House Bill 237 and what Bill?"

Brinkmeier: "236."

Shea: "Does the Gentleman have leave to have House Bills 236 and 237 together? Is there objection? Hearing none, please read 237. 236, I'm sorry."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 236. An Act to amend Section 2 of an Act creating an Advisory Commission on compensation of appointed state officers and so forth. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Brinkmeier."



Brinkmeier: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 236 removes the Members of the General Assembly from consideration ah... what is presently an existing Advisory Commission. Now this Commission has been in existence for a good many years, but I doubt if more than 5% of the Membership is aware of it because they have been practically nothing. The Commission that exists today is supposed to consider and make recommendations for compensation to ah.. not only to the Members of the Legislature, but to the Executive and Judicial and even state and local governmental officials. Very obviously, this is quite an undertaking and they haven't done anything. Therefore, House Bill 236 would take us out of that consideration. House Bill 237, which is really a substantive Bill, would create a seven Member Commission to make a study of what they believe the Legislation compensation should be and make recommendations to us within one week ah.. after we report back in the next General Session of the Illinois General Assembly. This Commission would be composed of seven Members. The four Leadership people in the House and the Senate, two each, would appoint one Member each. Three would be appointed by the Governor, no more than two from any one political party. Frankly, I think this is something we need. I think it would give a little more confidence to the general public if they believe that whatever Legislative compensation recommendations are made, came from some source that has made ah... a hopefully comprehensive study of this matter and I would urge your support."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bills 236 and 237 pass. Is there debate? Hearing none, all those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On these questions there are ah... Walsh, 'no'. On these questions there are 96 'ayes' and 21 'nays' and 4 voting 'present' and House Bills 236 and 237 having received the constitutional majority... Mr. Schraeder, I'm sorry... are hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I was just wondering how we got on Bills such as 236 and 237? Their expiration date isn't until June 5th. Can't we get back to the Priority Calendar?"

Shea: "The Speaker asked me to call Bills on Third Reading starting with



the first Bill and go through the Calendar. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 337."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 337, Hart. A Bill for an Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "He's off the floor. Read House Bill 338."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 338, Mugalian. An Act creating the Land Resources Management Study Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 338 would create a Land Resources Management Study Commission. The Commission would consist of eighteen Members. Ten would be Members of the Legislature and eight are public Members. Four of the public Members are appointed by the Legislative Leadership, that is one by the President of the Senate and one by the Senate Minority Leader and so forth. The remaining four Members are appointed as follows: One by the Illinois Municipal League, one by the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission, one by the Southwestern Illinois Metropolitan and Regional Planning Commission and one by the Director of the Department of Agriculture. The Commission will report to the 80th General Assembly by February 1, 1977. The scope of the Commission's study is as comprehensive as it can be..."

Shea: "Excuse me, Mr. Lechowicz on a point of order."

Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Dick, but ah.. as you know, the Appropriations Committee for this ah...Commission is in Appropriations I and is supposed to be heard tomorrow. I know that the expiration date is June 5th and I was wondering if this Bill has to be called at this time?"

Shea: "Take it out of the record until the Appropriations Bill comes out of Committee. Yes, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Ah... with leave of the House, I would like to consider this Bill on its merit at this time. If for some reason the Appropriations Bill is not passed or is reduced, that would be the will of this House, but I have prepared to have it heard today. I have passed out ah... an explanation of this which would be current and fresh in the minds of the Members of the House. I would appreciate going ahead with it."



Even if we don't get an appropriation, I intend to pass the hat to try to fund it for a very necessary project."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Mugalian, its my understanding, and I think I was the maker of the motion, that certain Bills would be heard. Other Bills were not assigned to the Appropriation Committee, but went right directly to the calendar. Now it is the normal course that the companion appropriation Bill would be heard with the substantive Bill and I would so wish that you would hold it sir. It would be the Chair's thought that it would be better to hold it."

Mugalian: "Well, I'm afraid if that waits beyond the May 23rd deadline, since the Appropriations can wait that I may just lose the Bill that is of the most importance to me in my entire legislative career."

Shea: "Do you wish to...the Bill is marked, you know, for June 5th, we've got until May 23rd. Do you wish to proceed with it sir?"

Mugalian: "I would very much like to, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Meyer, on a point of order."

Meyer: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker, if you remember, I had two Bills one of which got to Third Reading and there was a ruling of this Chair that that Bill should be recommitted to Appropriations Committee, Appropriations I and the substantive Bill which was held on Second Reading, First Legislative Day."

Shea: "I entirely agree with you sir, but I cannot make motions from the Chair."

Meyer: "Well I would make the appropriate motion."

Shea: "The Gentleman's motion is that House Bill what? While you're waiting on that motion, Mr. Peters on a point of order."

Peters: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The motion, Mr. Speaker, that you made from the House floor pertained only to those Bills that would have been, those substantive Bills, that would have been caught somewhere in that last crunch when we had to get them out of Committee, I think there's only twenty-some Bills, many of those appropriations have been reported out, or are in the process of being reported out. The Bill under consideration now is not one of those Bills that was included in your motion..."



Shea: "I've made that eminently clear. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, I recall before we went to lunch the Speaker, Representative Redmond, was in the Chair and we were trying to follow the emergency list, the priority call list you had here and he announced that you were calling from the daily calendar and that's the way we started and someone questioned that and he said 'well, this is the way it was going to be'. Now I think if you have changed that order, I think its only fair to the Representative, here, that that should have been known. That's all I'm saying, I'm trying... I guess I'm arising on a point of order. If you've changed that, I think we ought...it...it should be announced and...and let us move on so that...."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure what I should do, I'd like to defer to the judgment of the Chair. My only concern was that since appropriation Bills can be held until beyond May 23, that the substantive Bill might get lost. If I have to wait...."

Shea: "I assure you you'll get back to this Bill sir."

Mugalian: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I ask that it be taken out of the record."

Shea: "Take 338 out of the record. So everybody understands exactly what the Chair is doing, I was informed by the Speaker to start with House Bill 70, or he started with House Bill 70, he took 72 and then I think he took 74. He had started at the first Bill on the calendar order of House Bills's Third Reading and wants to start at those Bills and go right through the calendar. That's exactly what I'm doing. Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Well Mr. Speaker, I don't want to interfere with the business of the House, but it seems to me that we do have a priority call and I'd like to bring to your attention, and the Members of the House, that we're now discussing some Bills dated 6-5. And would you believe that we've got thirty-five Bills under date of May 23rd, we've got thirty-five under date of May 25, we've got eighty-five under date of May 26th, we've got 165, May 28th, we've got thirty on



May 29th, we've got forty for May 30th, 31st, we've got forty-five, June 1st, ninety, June 5th, two-hundred. Those are priority items in that order and it seems to me that the Speaker should take them in priority and I'm not going to make a motion, but that seems to be the real way to do it."

Shea: "Well, he'll be back shortly, Mr. Schraeder, and you can talk to him. On the order of House Bills' Third Reading appears House Bill 373. Stearney."

Fred Selcke: "Not here, I don't think."

Shea: "Is the Gentleman here? House Bill 374, Mr. Stearney. House Bill 395, Mr. Cunningham."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 395. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act of 1939. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the first Bill that Representative Younge and I have together, I hope that that goes to the merit and influences your vote about the Bill. You passed this very same Bill out last year with an overwhelming vote. What it is is an effort to, in small way, deal with the problem of defunct railroads. As you're all aware, more than 10% of the railroads in the State of Illinois have been marked as excessive and should be phased out according to the Department of Transportation. We're saying in this Bill that the Department of Local Governmental Affairs can make an allowance to those railroads who are marked for extinction or for the removal of a portion of their lines for the difference of between their upkeep of the track from one year to the next. So its an encouragement to the railroads to spend more money in upgrading the track. Its a boot-strap operation and on that basis, and upon the fact that the Department of Revenue supports the Bill, a very determined Revenue Committee gave an overwhelming vote of support. We ask for your green light."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 395 pass. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Is there anyone from the Revenue Committee to comment on this



Bill? I see the Chairman is off the floor."

Shea: "It looks like we're short people on Revenue. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, would the sponsor yield for a question?"

Shea: "I didn't hear you Mr. a...."

Lechowicz: "Will the sponsor yield to a question or two?"

Shea: "He indicates he will."

Lechowicz: "Is there any fiscal impact to this Bill?"

Cunningham: "Practically none. Minimal, the Department of Revenue did have a man present, testified for it in the Revenue Committee.

Representative Skinner, here, was present at that point to testify in this regard. We have not..."

Lechowicz: "What did he say?"

Cunningham: "He said it was a good Bill. He said it when it passed a year ago."

Lechowicz: "What was the fiscal impact, Roscoe?"

Cunningham: "The reason the fiscal impact is to slight is that these railroads aren't..."

Lechowicz: "How much?"

Cunningham: "Well they said minimal. Minimal, they didn't give any..."

Lechowicz: "What does that mean?"

Cunningham: "Inconsequential. Slight...a..."

Lechowicz: "Dollar amounts...how much?"

Cunningham: "They didn't put any dollar sign on it, but apparently there are no zeroes involved."

Lechowicz: "Cal, can you respond?"

Shea: "I've got two Gentlemen on the Revenue Committee behind you that are looking for recognition. We'll bounce back and forth between the Members. The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder, the Vice-Chairman of Revenue."

Schraeder: "Well Mr. Speaker, Revenue did oppose this. Its inconsequential, only \$10,000,000."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."



Cunningham: "My distinguished friend from Peoria is in error. Dale Young appeared. \$10,000,000 was never mentioned. It has never been mentioned to this day. I have great confidence in Representative Schraeder, and after he thinks about it a minute, he'll realize that he's thinking of another Bill. This has nothing to do with that kind of numbers. You've passed this Bill out before, Representative Schraeder got up and endorsed it."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my recollection of the debate in Committee on this may be somewhat faulty, but my best effort at trying to recall the discussion that took place was in regard to cost, that there were no figures involved because nobody could possibly estimate what the expenditures would be for tract maintenance. In addition to that, it seemed to me, at the time, and it still seems to me that its a rather unfortunate precedent for us to establish to provide State funds for maintaining one of our public utilities in effect. We all realize the crisis that is taking place with regard to the elimination of some of these railroad lines in our State. But it seems to me that there must be a better approach than this. That was the argument that I made in Committee. I think we could be faced with a tremendous expenditure here. I know that we are talking about considering it, we are not talking about a specific appropriation, but we could be talkin about an awful lot of money and it seems to me its inconsistent with our revenue policy."

Shea: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Well for starters, all of the railroads in the State only pay about \$34,000,000 in property taxes, so the suggestion that it is going to get rid of \$20,000,000 of that base I think is somewhat premature. I don't see anything wrong with this Bill. I don't see any reason to vote against it. I'm going to vote in favor of it."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Cunningham, could you explain to me how we can get an increase in expenditures when a railroad line has been abandoned?"



Or when its been recommended for discontinuance by the Department of Transportation?"

Cunningham: "Well yes, its very simple. The D.O.T. studies have not resulted in any line being closed down. They are recommended as being expendable for abandonment as it were. But they're still in operation. And there are many small communities throughout Southern Illinois who are vitally concerned in this matter primarily in regard to elevators and the transportation of grain and products. And one of the largest railroad systems through there is Penn-Central, which is as you know, been in bankruptcy now for seven years. And during that length of time, it has paid no taxes to any of the counties to which it travels. Now in those instances..."

Shea: "Mr. Cunningham...."

Cunningham: "Now, I'm answering his question..."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Cunningham, you can answer the question, but I've had raised several times here, and I think the Members are absolutely right, you'll have an opportunity to close. Proceed Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Well very briefly, Mr. Cunningham, I think we are reaching into the State treasury just a little bit too deep. I think there are alternative methods which we are studying as to how to move grain by the waterways, here. We move it by truck and to ask this of the State I think is just a little dip once too often."

Shea: "Is there any further debate? Is there any further debate? The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, to close."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, its regrettable that there a degree of misunderstanding involved here. You're not reaching into the State treasury for a dime. Not one dime. I can't emphasize that too much. Rather than meet the fate that seems apparent, I request that this be taken out of the record."

Shea: "Take 395 out of the record. House Bill 414. Cunningham."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 414. Cunningham. A Bill for an Act creating Medical and Dental School Admission Study Commission defining its powers and duties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook...er...from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Parliamentary inquiry. Once a Bill has been called by the Speaker,



it can't be taken out of the record, can it? Once the debate has started, he has to put it on postponed consideration?"

Shea: "Well, there was no vote. Perhaps I should have put it there, Mr. Kane, but..a...I've made the ruling, it may be in error."

Kane: "Is that...is it then only when a Roll Call has started?"

Shea: "Its my understanding when the board lights up. 414. Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, happily, 414 is a Bill in which there can be no, or should be no objection whatever. It bears the enthusiastic support and endorsement of the Majority Leader, the Minority Leader, the Chairman of the Republican Caucus and the Chairman of the Democrat Caucus. And what it seeks to do is to simplify bookkeeping in the State of Illinois. We've had for several years, the policy of add-ons in regards to judicial salaries. And..."

Shea: "You're in the wrong Bill, Mr. Cunningham, you're on 414."

Cunningham: "Well, I was just practicin on ya."

Shea: "You'll have your opportunity on 439, next."

Cunningham: "I'm ready if you are, Mr. Speaker. All of the nice things that I said about 439...437...are applicable in spades to 414."

Shea: "Mr. Lechowicz on a point of order."

Lechowicz: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker...a...the appropriation Bill is still in Committee. In fact, its due to be heard tomorrow."

Shea: "And the Commission Bill?"

Lechowicz: "Yes sir."

Shea: "Do you want to take this one out of the record also, Mr. Cunningham?"

Cunningham: "Let me respond. I didn't call it, someone else did. I want to go along and be friends with all of you people..."

Shea: "Take it out of the record, its House Bill 439....er, 437."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 437. A Bill for an Act to amend the Fees and Salaries Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, is there some way that we can keep this microphone on I think I lose the...the community of thought when the thing is turned off now and then, and the distraction is almost



fatal. I was telling you earlier in regard to 437, the people that I assured you, the leadership of this House, is unanimously, enthusiastically, and unabashedly, for this particular Bill. But more important we need your support because your votes are necessary to pass it. The judges, for years in Illinois, have received an add-on. The add-on at the present time, is \$7500 for every full judge throughout the length and breadth of Illinois. The associate judges get \$4500. Now the add-on principle was in effect in DuPagein a...in Cook County for a dozen years, and its been in effect in DuPage County for two or three years, and it just went into effect last year for the rest of the State, the other hundred counties. There is no judicial pay raise involved here. I cannot emphasize that...that fact too much because some of you have expressed the fear that there was somehow a judicial pay raise involved. I seek to allay that baseless assumption. What's involved is an intolerable bookkeeping system. The court administrator, the Honorable Roy O. Gulley, is directed by this legislature to bill the counties for the add-on in the hundred counties, and then the two that were standing separate and apart, Cook and DuPage, have their own bookkeeping. He agreed and came and testified in support of this Bill that it makes a great deal more sense that the State of Illinois assume full responsibility for the judiciary system. At the present time, they have a divided pay system. It'll just simplify the bookkeeping to that extent. And on that basis, I respectfully urge your support. Thank you."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 437 pass. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Cunningham, I have some authoritative economic sources here that tell me that this Bill will cost the State \$1,761,000. What do you say to that?"

Shea: "Tell him where the appropriation Bill is, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Its 596, its on Third Reading, your figures are accurate."

Shea: "Do you want to call them together sir?"

Cunningham: "I would be delighted to do so."

Shea: "The Gentleman asked leave to have the appropriation Bill in that



amount heard with the Bill. Is there objection?"

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 596. An Act making appropriations to the Supreme Court. Third Reading of the Bill."

Cunningham: "Have I answered Representative Ewell's question? I pray for his vote."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 537...437 and 596 pass. On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Just one question, Mr. Speaker, if I may. Roscoe, as you know, the Bill normally come out of two categories. And I was wondering is that money all out of general revenue?"

Cunningham: "Yes. Yes."

Lechowicz: "Its not a proportionate share like we have in the normal judge's appropriation."

Cunningham: "I think the answer is no."

Lechowicz: "There is no money that comes out of the motor fuel tax."

Cunningham: "No."

Lechowicz: "Can I ask you why? You know in order to be...I don't want to set a bad precedent here by having everything come out of the general revenue fund for the judges because we do have a proportionate share that comes out of the...on their normal budget, out of the motor fuel tax fund."

Cunningham: "Well Ted, I a...the thought never occurred to me to try to siphon off some of the motor fuel tax, but I recognize your expertise in this and if you wanted to make such an addition over in the Senate, I'd be happy to work with you."

Lechowicz: "I guarantee you it will be done."

Cunningham: "I'll appreciate it."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am not rising to oppose this Bill as such, but I think you should know the full fiscal impact of it. These two Bills as they are now before us, the full fiscal impact of the State...a... the State obligation will be upon enactment of these two Bills so the judges of the Circuit Court would be \$3,895,000. That's the full impact. \$3,895,000."



Shea: "Is there further debate? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I have a question for the sponsor."

Shea: "He indicates he'll yield."

Leinenweber: "Roscoe, House Bill 596, as I read the Bill, the appropriation only covers the additional salaries of judges in single county circuits. As I understand it, the only single county circuit are the 18th and Cook County. In other words, DuPage and Cook County. Was it your intention only to pick up this add-on tab in those two counties?"

Cunningham: "Yes, that's the effect of it for the reason that the statute is somewhat different in regard to the other hundred counties. In those two, the add-on is paid directly by the county. At the present time, the State of Illinois is paying the add-on for the other hundred counties so it needs no appropriation ordinance. And I might add that the State, at the present time, is making no effort to collect from the other hundred counties because they regard the procedure as somewhat cumbersome."

Leinenweber: "Well, as I understand it, may you could correct me, the add-on for the other one hundred counties does not...the add-on for the other hundred counties, including Will and Lawrence, is not effective until July 1st, so that the State...no one is picking up the add-on right now, it is not being paid. Now, is the State indicating that despite the wording of the present law that they are going to pay the add-on when it goes into effect on July 1?"

Cunningham: "No, the present law is that they will pay it. You need to recheck the statute on it. The State...the Court Administrator's office is not in defiance of the Statute, but the statute provides specifically that the State will pay it and then seek to recover it from these other counties. That's why I say that there's a difference in the two counties that you've enumerated from the rest of the State."

Leinenweber: "What makes you think that the State is not going to seek to recover from the other one-hundred counties? I..."



Cunningham: "Well of course that will depend somewhat on the passage of this Bill, but the State offices involved have suggested that there is a great deal of book work involved and the procedure is somewhat cumbersome. You note there that they have to prorate among the various counties according to population for the refund that is directed."

Shea: "Will you bring your remarks to a close sir? The question is shall House Bill 437 and House Bill 496...596 pass. On these questions all in favor will vote aye, those opposed will vote nay. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell, to explain his vote."

Ewell: "Just very briefly, Mr. Speaker. I have some additional economic information...thanks to Mr. Barnes, and we didn't want to say this realizing that the total impact to the State is \$3,895,000, it seems sort of ridiculous for us to be sitting here constantly shifting burdens to the State and yet when we ask for the money to pay for it, not a soul will step forward and come... will come forward and come over here and support some of these tax Bills. And its ridiculous, I think that if we haven't got the guts to sit up and pay the Bills and collect the money, then we ought to quit shifting all the burdens to the State. And I think it is totally ridiculous that we should take this type of posture to this type of Bill."

Shea: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Now I may be totally mixed up on this Bill, but I have a feeling that the Gentleman from Cook, who I believe earlier today, pleaded for justice at any price. He may have been one of the people that voted for the pay raise for the judges. Now if there were ever a shift of burden suggesting that county government has to pay, has to create out of thin air, the amount of money that he says is going to take from the county...from the State treasury. My heavens, these are State judges, not county judges. The State should pay the cost."

Shea: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take



the record, Mr. Clerk. The Gentleman from McClain, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "I'd like to ask for verification."

Shea: "The Gentleman has made a request for verification. The Gentleman from Lawrence asked for a poll of the absentees. Kelly, aye.

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Aye."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Sangamon?"

Londrigan: "How am I recorded?"

Shea: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Londrigan: "Change me to no."

Shea: "The Gentleman goes from aye to no. The Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Boyles."

Boyles: "Change me from aye to no."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Boyles, goes from aye to no.

Would you please poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk? Mr. Stubblefield, how do you wish to be recorded sir?"

Stubblefield: "I'd like to change my vote to yes."

Shea: "Mr. Stubblefield goes to yes."

Fred Selcke: "Brandt. Brummet. Byers. Capparelli. Chapman. Downs. Dyer. Epton."

Shea: "Dyer, aye."

Fred Selcke: "Epton. Ewing. Flinn. Geo-Karis. Giglio. Hanahan. Hirschfeld."

Shea: "Mr. Beaupre. Excuse me, sir."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with the assurance of the sponsor that the language contained in this Bill that we have not been able to take it out does indeed make it legal for the Court Administrator to not collect the add-on from the other hundred counties, I would like to change my vote from present to aye."

Shea: "Mr. Beaupre goes from present to aye. Continue with the Roll Call sir. Mr. Downs? Mr. Downs votes aye. Continue, Mr. Clerk."

Fred Selcke: "Hirschfeld. Dave Jones. Katz. Keller. Klosak.



Kosinski. Lauer. Leinenweber."

Shea: "Leinenweber, aye."

Fred Selcke: "Leon. Lucco. McAvoy. O'Daniel."

Shea: "Kosinski, aye. Polk, aye."

Fred Selcke: "Wait a minute. Kosinski, aye. Polk, aye."

Shea: "Kornowitz, aye."

Fred Selcke: "Who was that? Oh, from no to aye."

Shea: "Mr. McAvoy."

McAvoy: "Aye."

Fred Selcke: "McAvoy, aye."

Shea: "Mr. Daniels?"

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

Fred Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting present."

Daniels: "Please switch that to aye."

Shea: "Mr. Daniels, aye. Mr. Capparelli, aye. Mr. Sangmeister, aye."

Fred Selcke: "Palmer. Rayson. Rose. Schisler. Schlickman. Sharp.
Telcser. Terzich."

Shea: "Terzich, aye."

Fred Selcke: "Totton. VonBoeckman. Wall. White. Younge."

Shea: "Younge, aye."

Fred Selcke: "Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Despite the fact that I can't seem to find any co-sponsors,

I'm going to sit over and have you reconsider the matter, I'm
going to vote aye if we want to spend the State's money, fine.

Never let it be said that I'm an obstructionist."

Shea: "Ewell, aye. Mr. Mautino, aye. Mr. Farley, did you wish
recognition? Mr. Madison, aye."

Fred Selcke: "Just a minute. Just a minute."

Shea: "Alright. Mautino, one aye, Mr. Clerk."

Fred Selcke: "Now who was the next one?"

Shea: "Madison went aye. Leon went aye. Jones went aye. Jones, Emil
Jones, went aye. Mr. Wall votes aye. Mr. Bradley, do you seek
recognition sir?"

Bradley: "Yes, it appears we've made a decent Bill a heck of a good Bill



and we've got a lot of Members back on the floor, and because of those two things, I withdraw my request."

Shea: "Will you give me the numbers on this? Mr. Minority Leader, has Parks got a proxy?"

Fred Selcke: "Just a minute."

Shea: "Vote Jones aye. Mulcahey, aye. On these questions, 119 ayes, 25 nays."

Fred Selcke: "No, wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute."

Shea: "If there are any late changes, come to the well."

Shea: "119 ayes, 20 nays, 9 present, House Bills 437 and 596 having received the constitutional majorities are hereby declared passed. McClain, aye on those two Bills. Mr. Cunningham wishes to thank the House."

Cunningham: "Thank you Mr. Speaker for my re-election. Thank you very much."

Shea: "It may have been a mistake. House Bill 498. Mr. Jaffe."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 498. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 498 provides that when an arrest for speeding is based upon a reading of radar as defined in the Section, the person arrested or cited for speeding has the right to request and observe a test of such radar's accuracy. The request is to be made at the time of the arrest only. The test may be made by the tuning fork assigned for rate and testing, the test will be made at the location of the arrest only. Let me say that we have discussed this with the Illinois State Police. They appeared before the Judiciary II Committee, they testified that they have no objections to this Bill. This Bill passed out of Committee 16 to 1, and as a matter of fact, they maintained that its their policy to do this and so I would ask for a favorable vote."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 498 pass? Is there any question? All those in favor will vote aye. Those opposed will vote nay. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the



record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 122 ayes, 12 nays, 2 voting present, and House Bill 498 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Ryan, aye. Collins, aye. On the order of House Bills' Third Reading appears House Bill 504. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. D'Arco."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 504. An Act to amend an Act to provide into law in relation to mechanic's liens and so forth. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "Mr. D'Arco."

D'Arco: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 504 amends the Mechanics' Lien Act to require in the case of a single family residence that the subcontractor material man, in order to perfect his lien, serve notice by certified mail upon the owner that he attempts to start a project. It amends Chapter 82, paragraph 5, by requiring that each contractor shall provide each owner, either as part of the contract or a separate printed statement, a sworn statement of persons furnishing material and labor before any payment required to be made to the contractor. It also provides that it should be the duty of the subcontractor to furnish material to give notice to the owner of the residence within fourteen days from the day that the material has been furnished. It also provides that the subcontractor shall give notice to the owner, otherwise to this prejudice that he has furnished materials for the job or is about to begin labor on the job. I would ask...it also amends Section 2 of the Act to change the name of the Act from Material Man's Act to Contractors and Material Mens' Liens Act instead of Mechanics' Liens Act. I would ask for a favorable vote on this Bill."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 504 pass. Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "A question for the sponsor."

Shea: "He indicates he yield."

Leinenweber: "Representative D'Arco, does this Bill also require that the contractor notify the owner that he should have a waiver of land from the subcontractor prior to making any payments to the



contractor?"

D'Arco: "A...requires that the contractor submit to the owner proof of the labor of lien from the subcontractor that to the effect that the subcontractor has been paid for whatever material or labor that has been furnished, or whatever labor has been done on the job."

Shea: "Excuse me for a minute. There are a number of unauthorized people on the floor, would they please remove themselves? Proceed Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, if I may address myself to the Bill, this is quite similar to the recent Bill that the House acted on and did not pass, and I would hope the House will do the same to House Bill 504. There are two major defects to the Bill. There is one good point. Unfortunately, the defects outweigh the merits. The merits of the Bill is I think its a good idea that we legislate the requirement that a contractor advise the owner that he must obtain from the contractor, the contractor's sworn statement, but the Bill goes on and requires a useless Act on the part of the subcontractor and that is the furnishing of a fourteen day notice. He already has to furnish a sixty day notice and to have a duplicate notice for a notice after receiving information that a subcontractor is on the job, have the subcontractor advise the owner of that fact, is a needless act. And finally, the other thing wrong with this Bill is that it requires the contractor to perform an act which is contrary to the way many contractors do business. That is that they receive from the owner, periodic payoffs which they pay the subcontractors the material costs. Now require them to pay and receive a waiver of lien from the subcontractor would put many contractors who do not have the financial capabilities of advancing all of the costs of the job is a distinct disadvantage, so I think this Bill ought to be defeated."

Shea: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr....thank you Mr. Speaker, would the sponsor yield? A...Representative Leinenweber has brought out...a...many of the questions that I was going to ask, but I think, Representative, my



question to you would be, in light of the fate that Representative Palmer's Bill met the other day, in what way to you feel the measure that you present now is superior...a...to his? Or let's say, how do the two compare?"

D'Arco: "Well, Representative, I don't feel that it is superior to his, but I do feel that there is one major distinction and that is the proof of service of notice in my Bill would run from the time that the notice is received, either personally by the owner or certified mail, return receipt requested. I believe in Representative Palmer's Bill it would begin from the time that the notice was mailed."

Hudson: "Thank you."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. D'Arco, moves for the passage of House Bill 504. All those in favor will vote aye. Those opposed, vote nay. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. D'Arco."

D'Arco: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my vote. I believe this is a good Bill...and part of the reason I believe it is a good Bill is because it protects the consumer against scrupulous contractors who refuse to pay the subcontractors for services rendered. And this is one way to protect all three people involved by providing that the subcontractor will not be given a change to perfect his lien until a waiver of that lien has been presented to the owner by the contractor. That means that all three parties involved will be legally protected by providing that the owner will not have to pay twice for services rendered by the subcontractor initially. And the reason for that is that the owner does become liable to the subcontractor and the subcontractor can't perfect his lien if the contractor refuses to pay the subcontractor and this way the subcontractor's protected, the owner's protected, and the contractor's protected. And I wish I could see more green votes up there. Green is my favorite color."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Leinenweber...from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would certainly hope that we



would not get enough green votes up there. The House defeated the ... almost the identical Bill. The Sponsor's own indication was that there is not real difference between his Bill and the one that was heard last week. And ah... if you'd take the record right now, it'd be the same."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "To explain my vote, Mr. Speaker. Ah.... it seems to me that we have, really, to weigh a number of interest here and we weight the interests of the inconvenience to the subcontractor, we weigh the interests to the general contractor, we weigh the interests of the innocent, the men who usually have in good faith, entered into a contract and is looking for someone to repair or remodel this home. And I think that that homeowner is the one we should, in the end, weigh in favor of this Bill because it is for this innocent in this transaction, this person is not knowledgeable, who the General Assembly must come to his rescue. In so many cases that I know, I've handled professionally, and that I've seen, there is legitimate interests for us to be concerned with. I see there is 91 votes and I will sit down."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Dunn to explain his vote."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'd like to explain my vote. As I understand it this is nearly the same Bill that we defeated that was represented by Representative Palmer last week. This is a Bill that will not protect any one in particular, it causes a lot of paper work and I think an unnecessary Bill. It's a Bill that really doesn't address itself to doing anything except perhaps having homeowners be able to not pay for the material that is used or have the contractor not be able to pay for the materials supplied and I would urge a 'no' vote and I'm voting 'no'. Thank you."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? On this question there are 93 'ayes' and 38 'nays' and 24 voting 'present'. The Gentleman from Will, Mr.



Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "That's close enough, this Bill really isn't that good and I think we should have a verification."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. D'Arco asked for a poll of the absentees. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Clerk, how am I recorded?"

Shea: "You are recorded as voting present."

Kane: "Change my vote to aye."

Shea: "Kane to aye. McGrew, no. Mr. Flinn wishes to vote aye. Mr. O'Daniels votes aye. Mr. Leinenweber?"

Leinenweber: "I'll concede."

Shea: "On this question, there are 96 ayes, 38 nays, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will bear with me, I guess I'm just a little bitchy today. I'm in favor of this Bill and I voted for it, but I get a little concerned when I count...I sit here all day, Mr. Speaker, and I've seen certain lights come on of Members of the House that I know are not here. Now Representative White has not been here all day and yet his light has constantly come on. He is either voting for or against a particular Bill. I think that is unfortunate. Mr. White may not want to vote for a Bill or against a Bill and for anybody to arbitrarily decide how he's going to vote, I think reflects bad taste on the part of this Assembly and I would suggest that the Speaker remind the Members that they are to vote for themselves only and to enforce that rule even to the point of locking their keys. Thank you Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Your point is well taken, Mr. Madison. Take Mr. White off the record if he's not on the floor."

On this question there are 94 ayes, 38 nays, 24 present, House Bill 504 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Call the next Bill."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 505. Ron Hoffman. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to provide for the exercise, drive-in domain. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "Mr. Hoffman, R. K. from Cook."



Hoffman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 505 amends the eminent domain law to require that property taken by condemning body and not used within five years for the purpose for which it was taken be offered for sale back to the owner at the price paid to him. If he declines to purchase the property or cannot be located after public notice, it shall be sold at public auction. It amends the Highway Code. The reason for this Bill is last year we had a proposition that successfully passed through the House, but we discovered a citizen in the State of Illinois had property taken from him through condemnation proceedings. Ultimately the project was abandoned and this piece of property laid in the file for twenty one years as unused and off the tax rolls. We feel this is not the type of situation that we want to possibly happen to our constituents and this vehicle here would provide, and we've accepted two Amendments to it, would provide that if the projects are abandoned, the property would go back to the original owner and not inconvenience them any longer. The first Amendment that was accepted was submitted to us by the Illinois association of county superintendents of highways. It was a clarifying Amendment. The second Amendment that was adopted was submitted to us by Representative Madigan and provides that the project for which the property has been acquired has been fully abandoned by the condemning body and no other project for proper public purpose has been provided for. And I would solicit an aye vote."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 505 pass. Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Question for the sponsor. Representative Hoffman, how many parcels of property would this effect or how many..a..."

Hoffman: "We would have to have ah..... that researched by every condemning body in the State of Illinois, Representative."

Leinenweber: "A...last year, if I recall, two years ago, was this Bill referred to a specific parcel of property, did it not?"

Hoffman: "No, Representative, what you're referring to is one that is presently on Third Reading in the Senate now that refers to a specific piece of property. However this is the remedial change that



we ah.. were preparing at that time because of the nature of these ah.. this type of legislation was not moved through the Rules Committee and was not considered."

Leinenweber: "What is the justification for returning the property at the price it was acquired at?"

Hoffman: "The justification for that is we ah.. I strongly feel that the government should not be a land speculator. I can understand where property is acquired for public purpose and ah.. I would be willing to yield my property under those circumstances, but I would hate to feel that government is profiting on something like this, if the end result is the project is abandoned. I think it's only fair and just that our citizens are protected in the fact that if it is taken, the project is abandoned, then I have the right to get my property back, which I didn't want to give up in the first place for the price that they gave me."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, if I might address the Bill very briefly."

Shea: "Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "The Bill, I think has a defect. One thing we all know, we hold all of our property subject to the eminent right of the state to acquire our property through condemnation, however, the state is limited to acquiring property for a purpose authorized by statute and when that is necessary... and I think that is very important to emphasize the word necessary... because ah.. the question of necessity can and often is, contested in court; and if the governmental unit cannot prove necessity, then it cannot acquire the property. So it isn't the case of idle speculation on the part of the government. Now certainly, property values tend to go up over the years and over a five year period, depending on where the property is, there may be a considerable increase in the value of the property. However, we must remember also that the property owner has had in his possession during this period of time, ah... the just compensation which is awarded to him by court or by a jury of his peers. So he has had the use of the money. The property value can go up or down, depending on the circumstances, but usually they go up. I don't really see any justification why the property should be returned to the owner at



the price he payed for it because of the fact that he has had use of the just compensation that has been awarded to him, that the laws currently prohibit the government from speculating. So I do think that we ought to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for one question?"

Shea: "He indicates he'll yield for one question."

Brinkmeier: "Ron, I like the concept of this Bill, but I'm wondering would it be applicable for the Department of Conservation also or ah.. is it just restricted to the ah... to the D.O.T.?"

Hoffman: "It would be applicable to any condemning body."

Brinkmeier: "Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak in support of this Bill and although the Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber has suggested that it is possible for the land owner to defend himself, I have defended this kind of a case ah... and I remember one case ah.. the Lake County Forest Preserve District took some property and anybody who gets involved in these knows that there is hardly any way to defend it at all if the governmental body passes a resolution indicating that they need this for their purpose, that's it. You're done. The only thing that you can debate is the price and so I think that this Bill moves in the direction of protecting the poor land owner ah.. a person who might have a little farm somewhere or a little property somewhere and if the government takes it and doesn't use it for five years, he oughta have the right to come back and get his property back. I urge the support of House Bill 505."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I think that this is a very bad Bill. I recall the last Session of the Legislature, we had a Bill in to provide that the state sell a piece of property back to a prior owner. The property was worth several hundred thousand dollars and he was being purchased back at just a few thousand dollars. Now the Senate Bill that was being eluded to just awhile ago, I believe, and I may be corrected on this, but I believe



and I may be corrected on this, but the property there is worth approximately \$120,000 and ah.. the state is going to have to sell it back for \$5,000. I just think this is wrong and I think we have no business passing such laws as this."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Deavers."

Deavers: "I move the previous question."

Shea: "The question is shall the main question be put. All those in favor will say 'aye' and those opposed 'nay' and the 'ayes' have it and now the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hoffman, R.K., to close."

Hoffman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Certainly at this point here, you would have to appreciate that there are some people that are put in the position where possibly, ah.. and the one case that we're eluding to here, was a piece of property that was purchased for a specific reason. The gentleman in question had hopes of putting a restaurant on there as a means of sustaining a profession that he was involved in and building a business for his children. The property was ultimately taken away and he was deprived of this opportunity. Now when one of the gentleman got up and spoke and said that this was a concept where he had use of this money; the money that he had was not just compensation as far as he was concerned. He was deprived by the State of Illinois of that which he has every right to have, an opportunity to do business in the area that he wants. He was able to purchase that piece of property and I think that the citizens deserve the right to have some type of recourse in this. Some type of fairness to be portrayed back to them. I think that ah... this is a concept that is well overdue. It is nothing more than just fair to get some of this property back into the hands of the owner so that it can be put back on the tax rolls in the municipality that it lies in and I think to compensate the people who have lost this piece of property. It is no more than fair than to give them the opportunity to have it returned to them at the same price that they ah... exchanged it for originally. I would solicit an 'aye' vote."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 505 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and all those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all



voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 118 'ayes' and 18 'nays' and 2 voting 'present' and House Bill 505 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Luft, 'aye'. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 554, Mr. LaFleur."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 554, LaFleur. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

LaFleur: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the synopsis on this Bill is quite accurate. It amends Chapter 24, paragraph 11 that raises a number of petition signatures for a referendum. If you look at the synopsis, it says 1% to 10%. There is two Amendments on this. One Amendment changes that to 5% and Amendment #2 is a home rule Amendment. This came out of Cities and Villages unanimously and I would appreciate an affirmative vote."

Shea: "Is there discussion? The question is shall House Bill 554 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 125 'aye' and 1 'nay' and 2 voting 'present' and House Bill 554 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 559."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 559, McMaster. An Act to revise the provisions of the State Revenue Sharing with local governmental entities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "Take that Bill out of the record. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 569."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 569. An Act in relation to taxation of mobile homes. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 569 changes the assessment of mobile homes from the mobile homes privilege tax to real estate tax. It seems that in the last several months there have been some two or three court cases....."

Shea: "Excuse me, Mr. McMaster. Mr. Hudson, do you have a point of order, Sir?"



Hudson: "Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry, if I may? I noticed that we omitted one Bill coming down the line, 558, I wondered if there was any particular reason."

Shea: "Yes, Sir. At the Sponsor's request, it was not called."

Hudson: "Thank you."

Shea: "Proceed, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, some ah.. three, I believe, circuit courts in the past several months have held that the Mobile Homes Privilege Tax Act, that we have been operating under for the last couple of years, was unconstitutional in that it did not have any variance of the mobile home due to value. My purpose with House Bill 569 is to do away with the Privilege Tax Act and put the mobile homes back on real estate where they can be assessed as to their proper value, not just based upon their size, but as to actual value. They would be subject to the ah... various deductions for senior citizens. The Homestead Exemption and ah... deductions such as that. I would answer any questions ah.. on the legislation and I would urge an affirmative vote."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 569 pass. Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer."

Palmer: "If the Sponsor will yield for a question?"

Shea: "He indicates that he will."

Palmer: "The question is ah... at what rate or ah.. the real estate in which trailer homes are located, ah.. is it uniform throughout the State of Illinois?"

McMaster: "Well, as you know, real estate and land is assessed at ah.. what its value is ah.. depending upon how ah..."

Palmer: "Well, what I mean by that is ah.. well, is it assessed residential or commercial or industrial or ah...?"

McMaster: "It depends on where it's located in the specific area."

Palmer: "Then it will not be uniform throughout the state."

Shea: "Gentleman, please..... you can ask questions and you can give answers, but do not get into a debate."

Palmer: "I didn't intend to, Mr. Speaker. I thought I was asking questions. Now on the constitutionality of the thing ah.. it seems to



me that there was a case, some time ago, that indicated that trailer homes could not be assessed ah.. as real estate."

McMaster: "I disagree with that."

Palmer: "All right."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Shea: "He indicates that he will."

Huff: "Mr. McMaster, could you explain to me ah... my understanding of real property ah... is defined by the items ah.. such as a trailer or a home being attached to the ground. How do you ah... how does this sound with your Bill?"

McMaster: "We define this, Mr. Huff, as being attached to water or sewer outlets and being used for residential purposes. I have been told by a gentleman who is an attorney for the Department of Revenue that ah.. he would ah.. be willing to say that this legislation is constitutional at any time. He says he will say it in any place."

Huff: "All right, thank you."

Shea: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Bill. From the standpoint of the County Problems Commission, two Joint Sub-Committees of the Revenue Committee to which ah.. similar Bills have gone; I think Mr. McMaster has researched this program probably better than it has been done since the Constitution of 1970 and it would be my hope that we could send this Bill out of this Body with a unanimous statement that there is an opportunity for ah.. such a Bill to become law and be constitutional. The best work has been done on this particular Bill in the concept of real estate. The other repair Bills of the existing mobile hold-back follows this and ah.. we'll speak to that later, but ah.. Mr. McMasters Bill has the full support of the County Problems Commission and most of the revenue experts in the State of Illinois who would like to attempt to change this to real estate. Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kozubowski."

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



Shea: "The question is shall the main question be put. All those in favor say 'aye' and the opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it. The question is shall House Bill 569 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed will vote 'nay' and Mr. Greiman to explain his vote."

Greiman: "Well, I ah.. I really wanted to make inquiry and I did have my light on prior to the motion being made. What I wanted to know is whether we have a situation where ah.. a tax feat ah.. would be forthcoming if the mobile home owner didn't pay his real estate taxes. If that were the case, what effect would that have on the owner of the underlying fee? Can anybody tell me that answer to that? The owner of the mobile home lose ah... mobile home park, ah.. lose or have a car in his title ah.. if one of his mobile home ah.. owners or occupiers didn't pay the real estate taxes for the given year?"

Shea: "Mr. McMaster, I suppose you could answer this question. It's rather important."

McMaster: "I would be happy to. You are saying that the owner of a mobile home and a real estate park in which the owner of the home does not own the property upon which it is sitting ah.. do I understand you correctly?"

Greiman: "That's the usual case, I would imagine, ya."

McMaster: "No always the usual case, but many of the times. Let me say that we assess many buildings in the State of Illinois under different ownership and the property upon which that building sits. This is the same concept that we are using here and I do not believe that the ah... cloud upon the title of the home itself, would provide a cloud upon the title of the land upon which it sat. I do not believe this would be true."

Greiman: "Well, we have...."

McMaster: "Let me finish."

Greiman: "I'm sorry."

McMaster: "We have gone through this with the Department of Local Governmental Affairs and ah.. we have written into the Bill everything that they felt was proper for protection against such cases as this."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Maragos



to explain his ah... have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 114 'ayes' and 10 'nays' and 15 voting 'present' and House Bill 569 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of House Bills Third Reading appears House Bill 573. Is Mr. Giglio on the floor?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Not here."

Shea: "Take that Bill out of the record. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 574."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 574, Washington. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 574 ah... disregard your synopsis because the figures there are wrong. The Bill has been amended. Now the Bill is divided into two parts. I will explain the first part and Mr. Lechowicz will explain the second. 574 amends the State Employees Retirement System Article of the Illinois Pension Code. It increases the maximum monthly allowance permitted to survivors annuities from \$250 to \$350 for spouse only or for dependent parents and from \$350 to \$500 to spouse and dependent children or for the dependent children only. Now this Bill has the endorsement of the Pension Laws Commission and it came out of the Committee with a good vote. The Majority Leader asked me a question which I was unable to answer the other day. He wanted to know the ah... unfunded liability... the amount now in existence and how much this would increase it. The present unfunded liability in this ah... trust, is a total of \$500,000,000. This would increase this by about 3% or \$15,000,000 or a total pay out per year of about... in addition of about \$200.00. There's a second part of the Bill, an Amendment which was put on by Mr. Lechowicz, Amendment #1 and he can explain that if I have leave of the House."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, to explain the children's Amendment."

Lechowicz: "That is absolutely correct, Mr. Speaker. It's the same type of Amendment that ah.. as the Judge's Retirement Bill that was placed before this Body; providing benefits for disabled or a mentally disturbed child, even though they've reached passed the age of eighteen.



The child would be entitled to the benefits. We voted the Judge's Retirement Bill out unanimously. I thought in all fairness you would be available to the state employees as well and they're also going to amend their own retirement system to provide for that function."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 574 pass. Is there any questions? All those in favor will vote 'aye' and all those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Mann, 'aye'. Byers, 'aye'. On this question there are 138 'ayes' and 4 'nays' and 5 voting 'present' and House Bill 574 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 583. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 583. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 583 was introduced by myself on behalf of ah...to my knowledge, the only winemaker in the State of Illinois, who happens to reside in the 42nd District. He is a small winemaker who has been operating under intolerable restrictions which have absolutely prevented him from effectively competing in the wine industry. The law currently prohibits an Illinois winemaker from making wine in an addition to any more than 10,000 gallons. It prohibits him from selling wine at the winery, and more than 1,000 gallons and it prohibits him from distributing his product. Now the problem faced by an Illinois winemaker is that fact that because he can only make 10,000 gallons, he cannot get a distributor to handle his product. This Bill very simply removes this restriction and has been worked out with the distributors... the liquor distributors and the liquor retailers. It increases the amount he can sell at the winery to 5,000 gallons and provides than he can hold a wine manufacturers license and in effect, make an unlimited quantity, but ah.. does not permit him to distribute. I feel that it's good legislation and will held enhance the wine industry in the State of Illinois and urge its adoption."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 583 pass. All those in favor



ah...is there discussion? The Lady from Lake, Ms. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just want to help the little old winemaker and I'm going to vote 'aye'."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff."

Huff: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a very small question?"

Shea: "He will."

Huff: "All right. My question is, ah... can Mr. Leinenweber tell me ah.. what provisions of controls work into this Bill? When you're talking about 10,000 gallons of wine fermenting in a vat, I can foresee ah... hopefully that not happen, but there is a possibility of explosion."

Leinenweber: "I didn't quite get that last ah..."

Huff: "I'm talking about control ah.. quality control."

Leinenweber: "Oh ah.. well, he still must be licensed and whatever quality controls currently exists for wines ah.. apply ah... it makes no control to adjust the quality controls and I suppose the final quality control is how good it taste."

Huff: "O'kay... right on."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Shea: "He will."

Matijevich: "Representative Leinenweber, the only ah.. part of what you've said that bothers is the matter of ah... the on premises ah.. something about no less than 1 case can be sold on premises and I understand that's not for home consumption or for resale. Is that right?"

Leinenweber: "The current law permits a winery ah.. a wine manufacturer to sell at retail up to 1,000 gallons a year. The Bill merely raises that to 5,000 gallons. The reason for this is that one of the ways that wine manufactures use to promote their product is by having tours. They like to be able to sell the product at the winery. In other words, make it a one product retail outlet. This was worked out with the retail distributors who have no objection to that amount. I might also add that the State of Illinois Liquor Control Commission



has ah... does not opposed the Bill. They did not appear in support or opposition. I did receive correspondence that they like the idea of the Bill, but they wanted to help promote Illinois Wine Industry."

Matijevich: "Well, that's the only part of it that I don't like. The report, as I understand, says that the wine sold at retail must be for home consumption and not for resale, but ah.. I don't like the idea of a manufacturer selling retail. That's the only thing that bothers me."

Leinenweber: "Well, he can right now."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 583 pass. All those in favor 'aye' and the opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Shea, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 113 'ayes' and 1 'nay' and 9 voting 'present' and House Bill 583 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Maragos, 'aye'. Kosinski, 'aye'. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 598. McMaster, 'aye'. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 607. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Sangmeister."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 697. A Bill for an Act to amend the Housing Authorities Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Sangmeister: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the purpose of this Bill was to eliminate discrimination in the housing authority. The problem was that certain housing authorities were putting ah... having a residency preference list and would tell people that when they got on this list, that when they reached the top of the list, they would be able to get into the housing authority. Some of these people were on these lists for two or three years and then when they reached the top of the list, they were bounced off for no good reason. That's the whole purpose of this Bill. The Amendment now says that the housing authority cannot change the residency preference of any prospective tenant once the application has been accepted by the authority. Now the housing authorities came in on this Bill because they were obviously concerned in this area. We worked it out and really this is their Amendment, not mine. I would



ask for a favorable Roll."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 607 pass. On the question, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Just one question, Mr. Speaker. Representative Sangmeister, I understand your purpose is so they probably can't move people down on the list, but I had one situation where ah.. for legitimate and legal reasons I was able to have somebody moved up on the list. Is that still possible under your Bill?"

Sangmeister: "The way the Bill is worded, Representative Duff, they will still take care of situation ah.. for example, where there's a condemnation, where people have been burned out of their houses, emergency situations will still be able to taken care of with this language being in the Bill... and errors."

Duff: "Any what?"

Sangmeister: "Errors. E-r-r-o-r-s."

Duff: "Well, I presume any error in how you were put on the list or where you should be, naturally could be corrected. Thank you."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 607 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and all those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 119 'ayes' and 2 'nay' and 2 'present' and House Bill 607 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 612. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 612. An Act creating the Illinois Welfare Rehabilatations Services Planning Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 612 would require the Human Services Department of state government to formulate and submit to the General Assembly and then annually update plans to carry out their statutory mandate to provide services to the people of the state. Last year we imposed this kind of requirement on the Department of Mental Health. This year we would simply do the same thing for the other Human Services Departments of state government. The Bill came out of the Sub-Committee of Human Resources that worked last year and was Chaired by Representative Grotberg, on which



I served. The provisions of it have been negotiated with the Bureau of the Budget ah.. which now supports the Bill in its amended form. They'll be no fiscal impact because of the planning requirements already imposed by federal law. What the Bill would do would be to simply bring into the planning process, the General Assembly and the interested public. The Bill came out of the Sub-Committee, which heard it, unanimously ah.. which was Chaired by ah.. Chairman Taylor Pouncey. It came out of the Committee unanimously. It's supported by the Committee on Children and the Illinois Association of Mental Health, the Illinois Association for Retarded Citizens and other. I know of no opposition to the Bill so I'll ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Shea: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."

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

Just a word to say that this is one of Joe Lundy's better Bills and I would recommend an 'aye' vote on it too."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 612 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 134 'ayes' and no 'nays' and 1 'present' and House Bill 612 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 618. On the last Roll Call, Richmond, 'aye'. 616, I'm sorry."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 616, Madigan. A Bill for an Act to regulate real estate appraisers and so forth. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 616 will provide for licensing and regulation of real estate appraisers by the Department of Registration and Education. The Bill was drafted in complete cooperation with the department so that the regulatory features of the Bill correspond exactly to other Bills which have been passed by this General Assembly in other pieces of legislation which provide for the regulation and the licensing of professions by the State of Illinois. There are basically four exemptions or exemptions provided in the Bill. Number one, a real estate broker when performing



an appraisal for listing purposes only, is exempt. Number two, an architect, in the practice of his profession is exempt. Number three, township and county assessors are exempt. Number four, appraisals of single family detached homes are also exempt. The last exemption was placed in the Bill at the request of the Savings and Loan League which after the exemption was placed in the Bill, ah.. support the Bill before the Licensing and Regulations Committee of this House. I might add, there's been quite a bit of notoriety and publicity relative to this Bill and I should point out to you that there is a grandfather clause in the Bill. So that any person who holds himself out as an appraiser today, who earns a living, earns income from appraisal work, would be able to appear before a committee and apply for a grandfather clause."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 616 pass. On the question, the Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wonder ah.. is there a companion appropriation Bill on this?"

Madigan: "At this time, there isn't, but if the Bill passes ah.. I can introduce one."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

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

Shea: "He indicates he will."

Madison: "Mr. Madigan, what is the position of the Chicago Real Estate Board on this Bill?"

Madigan: "I'm not aware of the Chicago Real Estate Board, but the Illinois Borad of Realtor's, which may be the association that you're referring to, that's Mr. Robert Cook, ah.. they're opposed to the Bill."

Madison: "Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, the Assistant Minority Leader."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill, even though the Bill would make me a grandfather. There are one hundred and eighty-one licensed occupations in Illinois. One hundred and eighty-one occupations that we, in our wisdom, have seen fit to license. I'll bet there isn't anyone here



who can name fifteen of them. It's absurd, Mr. Speaker, to proliferate this and it is not in the public's interest. I have some knowledge of real estate, I even do some appraising. Let me tell you how appraisals are usually done. Consider the real estate agent who is asked to appraise a two-flat building. He goes and does it and ah... for twenty-five dollars, tells the person what they what to know; namely how much the building is worth. If we have a licensed appraiser do it, the local real estate man is ineligible probably because there simply isn't enough of that business to have him pay one hundred dollars for a license. So they call downtown and get some expert to do it. He goes to their house and he measures it and takes pictures and sets everything off and then goes to the real estate man, who would have been called in the first place and asks him how much it's worth and that's the value he puts on it. Now Mr. Speaker, this Bill is simply not in the public's interest. For those properties that require specialized appraisals where ah... for whatever purpose, ah... an expert appraiser is required, one who has more training than the local real estate man, they can call in a member of the Master Appraisals Institute and he can perform this service. I suggest to you that he is more expert than the requirements of this Act. It is simply an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, for a group of people to set themselves apart and to charge more for a service because there are a few of them. There's no point in exempting single family residences if you don't exempt six-flats, five-flats, four-flats, and so forth. There's no purpose for this Bill. There's no need to proliferate the licensed professions. There's no crying public need and I ask you to vote 'no'."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield for a question, please?"

Shea: "He indicates he will."

Tipsword: "Mr. Madigan, would this apply also for all of the appraisals that are necessary for state purposes no matter what the size of the estate, except where there is only a single family residence?"

Madigan: "It seems to me that it would."

Tipsword: "So we would no longer be able to ah.. in small communities,



get our local real estate man or whoever it might be, to do our appraisals for ah.. farm land or small tracks of land or unoccupied land ah... unless he happens to be a licensed appraiser at ah.. what I regret might be a very increased ah.. largely increased fee?"

Madigan: "Well, what specifically is your question?"

Tipsword: "Well, I think ah... specifically ah.. Mike, I'm thinking of small estates that are not small enough to be under the Small Estate Act in the State of Illinois. Someone owns a small unoccupied track of land in joint tenancy, who passes away leaving only his wife with the surviving joint tenant. It's necessary in that case, probably, to do nothing but file an inheritance tax return to clear the title of the real estate, but wouldn't we then have to get one of these licensed appraisers to appraise that small track of joint tenancy real estate in order to file an inheritance tax return for her?"

Madigan: "Well, Rollie, the answer to your question is yes, but you seem to be insinuating or referring that there would be no appraisers occupying or practicing their profession in your area and I wish to disagree with you because I think that you'll find that the people who practice who practice appraisal work in you area now would be practicing appraisal work after this Bill is passed and they'd be working under the grandfather clause license that they would receive."

Tipsword: "Well, a lot of these people are not making appraisals their occupation, Mike. The difficulty we run into ah.. I'm afraid that a lot of small communities ah.. they might not even go license themselves for this purpose. I would hope that they would, but it might cause us to be in a very difficult situation and I can tell you in a lot of these small estates, many of these with us with have an acquaintant who has been in the real estate business or who has been a banker who has appraised property for loans ah... they've been acceptable at least for the Illinois income tax purposes and often they'll do it and won't even charge them anything because it's really a matter of form."

Madigan: "Rollie, then that would be exempt from the Bill. Only when there is a fee being paid. If a person is doing appraisal work gratuitously, it's exempt from the Bill."



Tipword: "Okay, thank you."

Shea: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I'd like to ask the sponsor a couple of questions. One, with regard to the blanketing in of those who are already appraisers; number one, what are the minimum qualifications to get the license without examination under your Bill?"

Madigan: "Representative Friedrich, the procedure for the application of the 'Grandfather Clause' would be the establishment of a special Committee by the Department of R. and E. for this purpose. That Committee, once established and appointed, would set the standards that would be applied to all those who would apply for the license."

Friedrich: "What you would mean that not necessarily all those who are now appraising could qualify unless this Committee decided they could qualify? Right?"

Madigan: "You'll have to have some kind of a screening process. I assume this was followed in other instances."

Friedrich: "I know a lot of people who are doing the appraisal that Mr. Tipword spoke about for inheritance tax and matters of that kind who do it as a part time thing and certainly wouldn't meet very rigid requirements. The other question I want to ask is let's suppose, I am an appraiser incidently, and let's suppose as a matter of practice, I appraise only farms and I go before your Committee and I'm a licensed appraiser, do I have to get another license to appraise commercial property, or...a..."

Madigan: "There's one license."

Friedrich: "One..no matter what I've been appraising, I'm qualified to appraise everything?"

Madigan: "If someone wishes to hire you."

Friedrich: "Well, but I can get a license."

Madigan: "See, there's an element of free enterprise in here."

Friedrich: "Yeh, but I..but...but..."

Madigan: "I hope so."

Friedrich: "That's what we are operating under now, but my question again is if...if...if...suppose I am confining my appraisals to



single residences now and I've been doing it for twenty years just for an example, I go before this Committee, could they turn me down for an appraiser's license because I hadn't appraised farms or because I hadn't appraised commercial property?"

Madigan: "I couldn't speak for the Committee."

Friedrich: "Well, then just one statement, I think that..I think you might be blanketing in some people who are incompetent and yet they'd be licensed to do something they really aren't competent to do, that is my fear and because I do appraising."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in opposition to House Bill 616. As Representative Walsh indicated earlier, the State of Illinois now regulates 181 professions in the State. That's a rather unique distinction and that it ranks as first in the nation. House Bill 616 addresses itself to regulating appraisers who are now self-policing their own profession by several rather successful associations. And I don't see any demonstrated need to add the 182nd regulated profession in this State. In conclusion, I think that we can appraise this Bill as a very unneeded and bad Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't know the effect of this Bill on Cook County, but I'm certain that I know the effect of it on the small counties downstate outside of the northern counties that are heavily populated and I'm afraid that we could hardly live with it and if we did live with it, it would be very very expensive to the people of our counties and I would hope that we get no votes here."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines."

Gaines: "Will the sponsor yield for questioning?"

Shea: "He indicates he will."

Gaines: "Do you know what position of the Dearborn Real Estate Board is on this matter?"

Madigan: "Well, they didn't communicate a position to me, but they are generally arm in arm with Cook from the Real Estate Board."

Gaines: "Were they contacted?"



Madigan: "By who?"

Gaines: "By whoever drew up this Bill."

Madigan: "Well, the Reference Bureau drew it up..."

Gaines: "By whoever instigated the Bill."

Madigan: "Who instigated the Bill? No, they weren't contacted."

Gaines: "I'm getting a little tired of having one-fourth of the City of Chicago ignored...a...when these regulation Bills are being drawn up, no one consults the black community, and that's one-fourth of the City of Chicago by conservative estimates. Some say is a half. But I think that this Body has to realize that when the State wants to license things that a lot of people are effected, and if you bureaucrats are trying to put people out of business and you try to encourage business to entitle unemployment, you'd be making unemployment rolls, you're puttin fellows on unemployment compensation, which the Speaker mentioned is hard to get on. So I think it ought to be pulled out of the record until you consult with the people in the industry."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Vermillion, Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this was a bad Bill in Committee and its still a bad Bill. It did pass out of Committee 7 to 6. But I want to tell you downstaters that this is proliferation of government, and you'll rue the day if you help pass this Bill. And its going to hurt us downstate and I simply want to say to you and ask you to vote no."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

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

Shea: "The question is shall the main question be put. All those in favor will say aye. Those opposed, nay. The ayes have it and the question is shall House Bill 616 pass. All those in favor will vote aye, those opposed will vote no. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 41 ayes, 86 nays, 8 present. House Bill 616 having failed to receive the constitutional majority is hereby declared lost.

On the order of House Bills' Third Reading appears House Bill 618."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 618. Ewell. A Bill for an Act in relation



to medical treatment administered solely for the purpose of prolonging human life. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I have premonitions about that board, but nevertheless

I have faith in the Body and...a....I want to say to the Members of the Assembly that this Bill does deal with a delicate subject. Its not delicate, its a subject that has come about simply because of our progressive technology and science. This Bill simply is an act relating to the medical treatment administered solely to prolong human life. It authorizes the individual who's at least eighteen to sign a statement indicating he does not wish such treatment and makes it unlawful for the physician to ignore the person's wishes. The Bill has two Amendments to it. We put it in so that two physicians must be consulted and we've also provided for notice to the next of kin. All the Bill simply does is return to the individual the right to control his life. It does not apply to the life of any other person. This Bill will not allow anyone to make a decision for anyone else. It does not allow the doctor to make the decision, it does not allow the hospital to make the decision. It allows the individual to simply make a decision on his own behalf that he simply desires no treatment that will only prolong life. And what do we mean by that? In this modern day and technology, it is possible to give this person a respirator for as long, a catheter to take away the waste matter, its possible to put him on a kidney machine, its possible to dialize his blood, and its possible to have a person hooked up to machines to what has been said, you go to a hospital where before, where people used to die and they were afraid to go, now they are afraid to go, because they can't die. What we want to do is take away the decision as to when the plug should be pulled and put it in the hands of the individual if he is competent. It is a good Bill, its a little advanced in the technology. Perhaps it may not be accepted at this state. And I do tell the Body that there is a great deal of misunderstanding. Last year, or the year before, when the Bill was brought before the Body, one of the telegrams that arrived was that we are opposed to euthanasia. And it was Y-O-U-T-H-I-N-A-S-I-A.



Nothing whatsoever to do with the Bill and its an absolute misconception that this Bill has anything to do with euthanasia.

I should point out that even the Papacy has said that there is nothing wrong with a person refusing this type of medical treatment. In the interest of time, I should be glad to answer a few questions or two and then take a vote."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have no question, only to alert the Body that this is the Death with Dignity Bill. First of all, I want to tell the Members of this Body that there are not two Amendments, as Representative Ewell, there is only one Amendment, the second Amendment failed on the floor of this House. I think, as a legislative Body, we've got a lot of work to do with the dignity of life before we get involved in this issue of death with dignity. This issue is fraught with many complexities, many legal entanglements. We talk about sound mind, let me tell you, we work around the clock here sometimes and sometimes, some of us don't think we are in sound mind, and I don't know what we'd consent to when we're working around the clock. Some days we think we are in sound mind and then the following week, we aren't. People can change their mind. I think that we ought to look at this Bill very closely. I think that if we pass such a Bill we will have the case where hospitals and physicians will not take steps to prolong life, and we ought to be concerned about that. Hospitals and physicians do many things. It ...I think that...a...that are threupetic that help to prolong life and that's what they ought to do. The physicians, when this Bill was held in Human Resources Committee last year, and the hospitals were vehemently opposed to it. Now Ladies and Gentlemen, we have the problem in the State of Illinois and all over the country about malpractice suits. We're trying to resolve that problem right now. If we..."

Shea: "Excuse me sir. Could we have some order and would the Members please be in their seats? And the unauthorized persons off the floor. Excuse me, Mr. Matijevich, please proceed."



Matijevich: "I will quickly close by saying we've had a lot of malpractice suits. We know that's the real problem. We're trying to solve that problem. If we pass this legislation, let me tell you there's going to be a lot more malpractice suits. There's going to be a lot more legal entanglements relative to medical care and I think that this Bill only harms medical health care delivery system and I would hope that you vote against House Bill 618."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart. Would somebody turn off his flasher there? The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the problem with this Bill is not what it is, but what door does it open? And of course, if you call it Death with Dignity, and you vote against the Bill, you are allegedly voting against Death with Dignity. But let me tell the Members of this House what's happened in Florida and Wisconsin and Hawaii in recent months, which started with this same Bill. And of course the proponents of the Bill said that it will do nothing more but permit rights we should have anyway. And as soon as it passed, it opened up the door for what's know as "Voluntary Death with Dignity". And what that does is this, it says if I'm lying on my death bed suffering from incurable cancer, I can ask to have an air bubble put in my arm. And nobody objects to that much, perhaps, but you see it opens the door. And the Bill also says that if I'm so overcome with pain that I can't make that decision, my wife can make it for me. Now Rita and I get along reasonably well most of the time, and I shouldn't make light of it, but I don't want a member of my family making that decision. And then the Bill goes even further and just as a natural transition in these Bills, and says if the family is so open "traumatized emotionally" whatever that means, a court appointed psychiatrist can decide to take a life. And that's the natural second step and those Bills are already in three States, Florida, Wisconsin, and Hawaii. And then we'll come to the third step, because it is like taxes, once you open the door you can't stop it. And that will be involuntary euthanasia. And we'll be able to solve the welfare problems in the State of Illinois because we can eu hanatize the people on welfare. And the retarded



children and the thalidomide type disaster. And what we will approach is the same thing that the Nazi Germans had in World War II, where a few people, in this case the State of Illinois, are permitted to take the life of someone else because their existence is uncomfortable or inconvenient to someone else. And in conclusion let me say this, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the best thing that I have ever seen written about the subject of euthanasia was by a young law student in the University of Pennsylvania Law Review said simply this 'I went to the aquarium today and saw a crab euthanatizing a fish'. Doubtlessly from the highest motives. And you think about that for awhile and you'll realize that the best government is the least government particular in the field of so-called Death with Dignity or Euthanasia Bills and I urge a no vote."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I listened to the Gentleman from Champaign and I listened to the Gentleman from Lake, and they were talking about a couple of other Bills. They weren't talking about the Bill that is before the House now. They were talking about a Bill that might be put (tape trouble) but nothing that would come from this Bill if this Bill were passed. I guess the question is, there is sometimes...a...pain is almost certain and what we do is we require that person to wait until the cancer or the disease, or whatever it is, reaches a vital organ and brings a merciful death. And that's a judgment that a person should be able to decide for themselves. How much pain? How much horror? How much shall the serpent of pain play upon me or play upon the individual? I think that's a decision that that person should be able to make for themselves. This Bill gives them that right. This Bill let's them say 'I am through with the horror of pain. And this is a good Bill and this is not the Bill that they are talking about, this is a good Bill, it should be passed."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines."

Gaines: "What Mr. Greiman has said is most of what I was going to say, but I would like to say that the Gentleman from Champaign in his scare tactics, those are the things this Bill will avoid in having



happen, because this Bill is based on the individual, him or herself, making the decision, not any relative or any doctor. And I think that when you have this situation, it removes the probability of the things that he's talking about. And I want to say that those of us who come from the urban areas feel very strongly, but we see it 'en masse' and those of you who may have a few people who are on these machines, don't know what you're talking about. I have a parent who is on one of these machines, and they pumped fluids in from one end and they pumped them out of the other. And it serves no good purpose and I certainly don't want to undergo those types of treatment, so I feel that if you have any dignity at all about death, in your thoughts of dignity, you should pass it...a...a...vote aye on this Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Assistant Majority Leader, Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to say to my young son, and especially the one who sponsored this Bill, that I don't believe in victors. I do not believe in victors. I do not believe that I'm the captain of my soul. Rather I believe Tennyson who said 'sunset and evening star and one clear call for me, may there be no morning at the bar when I put out to sea, for tho for amount of time borne of space'. I know I have a captain. Not like in this, I know I have a captain and I want to meet him face to face when I have crossed the bar. I want to say to you, young men, that Satan is an angelic being and he has certain permissive powers. If you read the Book of Job, it'll tell you about his permission. He had power to do everything to Job but kill him. That power, my God says is appointed unto man once to die, and after that, the Judgment. That power is within the hands of almighty God. And I'm gonna vote no. I like these young minds, they...they have...they think, but I'm an old fundamentalist and I believe I have a captain of my faith. Thank God for it."

Shea: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson."

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

Shea: "The question is shall the main question be put. All those in favor will say aye. Those opposed, nay. The ayes have it, the main



question shall be put. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell to close."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, the first thing you have to do is read this Bill because all it does it allow the person to make the decision for himself. It does not give this power to the doctor where it currently resides because the doctor is the one who has to go up and tell the family then the family and the doctor ah.. they have a conference and then the arguments begin. Some say pull the plug because we're eating up the family estate and so the plug is pulled. When you talk to the hospital administrators, it might be that these machines cost \$20, 30 and 100,000 and they need to be utilized. Let him stay because his insurance is there. Or the decision might be that we have used the last of his insurance and it's time to pull the plug. I say that these are hard questions, but they are questions that inevitably each and every one of us will cross one day for that it is written that we shall all pass away and I say to you that we cannot avoid hard decisions. We cannot avoid responsibility. We cannot duck our heads into the sand and say that this will never effect us, that this is like a child who has been afflicted by a disease and we might push him a corner somewhere. Mr. Speaker, I ask only for a favorable vote. I have used my time."

Shea: "The question is shall this Bill pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 17 'ayes' and 112 'noes' and 9 Members voting 'present' and House Bill 616 having failed to receive a constitutional majority is hereby declared lost. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 625."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 625, Birchler."

Shea: "Hold that, Mr. Clerk. The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "I believe you recorded that one incorrectly, it's 618 not 616."

Shea: "I'm sorry, it was House Bill 616 that failed to receive a constitutional majority. The same fate as 616. House Bill 625."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 625, Birchler. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Randolph, Mr. Birchler, please."

Birchler: "Mr. Speaker and Members of this Legislative Body, House Bill 625"



helps teachers who have had twenty-five years of teaching, who are not sixty years of age and whose retirement is less than \$10.00 per month, per year. The Bill came out of Committee 13 to 0 and I've had research on this Bill. The most that could be effected is fifty-eight teachers who are now drawing between \$125 and \$160 dollars a month retirement. We've had all kinds of Bills here saying let's help those that need help. I respectfully ask a 'aye' vote, a green light on this so that we don't have to issue public aid checks for these friends. I do ask for an 'aye' vote."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 625 pass. Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "A question for ah... Representative Birchler. Does this reduce the age to which a teacher may retire from sixty to fifty-five?"

Birchler: "This is only for those older teachers that have no base to have their pension figured from that retired and ah.. within the five year period, they will all be back into that sixty age bracket anyway. We're picking up these few people so that they don't have to go on public aid."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 625 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Shea, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 141 'aye' votes and 4 'nays' and 1 voting 'present' and House Bill 635 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Congratulations, Mr. Birchler. McMaster, 'aye'. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 645. 647."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 647, Mautino. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 647 is exactly as it appears in the Digest. It amends the School Code to include transportation to residential facilities within the State of Illinois for those children who are deaf and blind. It is ah... it is recommended and it was amended to ah.. include only those



students who are deaf and blind and with a maximum of \$100 per year, per student. The cost of the program is approximately \$112,000 on a 4/5's share. If there are any questions, I'd be happy to answer them."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 647 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted.... the Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "I guess I'm a little late, but ah.. I just did hear ah.. what is the fiscal impact of the state?"

Shea: "\$112,000. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 137 'ayes' and 1 'nay' and 1 'present' and House Bill 647 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 658."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 658, Griesheimer. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to regulate the employment of children and to repeal an Act named herein. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This particular Bill is being submitted for the sole and main purpose of allowing children who are participating in school in federally funded work experienced career exploration programs, to actually take part in the vocational program as funded by the federal government. Under the present Illinois law no minor can participate if they ah... until they are sixteen years of age or older. The problem that we're having in the schools is that the federal funds are providing us with the necessary programs, but the children can't go out at the ages of fourteen and fifteen and use any of this experience. Therefore, the federal funded program ah.. we're actually wasting the money. By the time the children are old enough to participate in the federal program, many of them have already dropped out of school."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 658 pass. Discussion? All those in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 143 'ayes' and 1 'nay' and 2 'present' and House Bill 658 having received the constitutional majority is hereby



declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 666."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 666, VanDuyne. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is designed to allow the County Chairman to designate each... designate one person in each precinct to be designated by the County Clerk as a Deputy Registrar and it also deletes the obligation of that registrar to register the effective people in his home or in his office. That's simply all it does and I would appreciate your affirmative vote."

Shea: "Are there any questions? The question is shall House Bill 666 pass. On discussion, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose House Bill 666. Now I ask you to take a look at it and consider the potential for ah.. abuse in this Bill. This would allow the appointment of Deputy Registrars, Precinct Captains, if you will; in every precinct in the state outside of the County of Cook. Well, that's about the attitude that I expected to be expressed by the other side of the aisle however, it does remain that the prospect for abuse here are monumental. Not only does it allow everyone to register people in the precinct in their office or in their home, but in any place on any car top and every saloon any place in this state. I wouldn't think it would be in church, Leroy, because I would hope that you'd be paying attention to the services. I do ... I do suggest to the Body that this is a bad Bill and it should be roundly defeated and I urge the rejection of House Bill 666."

Shea: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to join with Representative Collins in opposing this Bill. There's just one more point that I would like to add. State law assigns to the County Clerk the jurisdiction of conducting elections and we are taking out of the hands of the County Clerk a very responsible action and that is the registration of people to vote. In addition to fraud, there's plenty of



room in this type of procedure for honest mistakes. Somebody going out and taking all kinds of registration and just putting them in a suit coat pocket and forgetting to turn them in. Somebody then goes to vote on Election Day, thinking he is registered and it turns out that he is not. This is a very bad Bill and I would urge you to vote 'no'."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. VanDuyne to close. Mr. Doorkeeper, there are unauthorized people on the floor of this House. Would you remove them from the Chamber, please?"

VanDuyne: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah.. I wouldn't even want to remark about Mr. Collins's or the other Gentleman's remarks on this Bill. I'm really surprised that they're trying to be so discriminatory of a poor struggling Representative like myself so I'll just plead for an affirmative vote. Thank you."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 666 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer."

Palmer: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill ah.. by excluding the County of Cook is patently unconstitutional and I refer you to Section 4 of the State Constitution. 'Laws governing voter registration conduct of elections shall be general and uniform'."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers to explain his vote."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I remember the Elections Committee also and ah... we heard the arguments for this and ah.. Mr. VanDuyne would like to get people registered to vote. Now I don't know what's wrong with that. I think that we should get these registrars in each precinct appointed by the County Chairman and it's a good idea and I think that the Democrats oughta get behind Leroy and we'll send it over to the Senate and ah.. in their wisdom ah.. they'll probably pass it over there too. Let's get 89 votes up there for this Bill."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the re.... Mr. VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah.. you know, we read in the newspapers all of the time about the public



participating in our election processes. We also read about the dilemma that we have as far as the cost of people voting. Ah... we hear ah.. as Mr. Cunningham says, the hand wringers and the bleeding hearts are always screaming about the cost of our elections and the lack of interest in our ah.. process. Now I'm telling you right here and now that in our county, ah... our County Clerk has done more ah.. to keep the status quo and keep Will County a Republican County than any Member of the Republican Party in the State of Illinois. I think he ah... from a Republican point of view, I think he should be commended ah... and I can see why the Representatives from Will County are opposing this, but if you are really interested in letting everyone who is allowable to vote in this state, to vote in this state, I see no reason in the world why anybody should be regimented to register a person in their house or in their office if the person is allowable or authorized to vote and if the person trying to register this person is an authorized registrar. I don't really think it's ah.. being in any way, shape or form, discriminatory against the County Clerk. If you had decent County Clerk's the County Clerk would want to have anybody ah.. register anybody wherever they could find them. Now ah... I realize that ah.. some of the County ah...."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Chairman, I think that each and every one of us, during elections and during the years between elections, we see our Elections Commissions throughout the state going out on drives spending hundreds and hundreds of dollars trying to ah... get people registered to vote. I think this would ah.. save a lot of money and give everyone the opportunity to vote ah.. or to register to vote at a convenient place within their precinct. I would ask for an affirmative vote."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question... the Gentleman from Will, Mr. VanDuyne moves that the Bill be placed on postponed consideration. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 674."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 674, Tipword. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipword."



Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill... is a very minor Bill. It amends the downstate police ah... the pension fund of the downstate fire pension fund and provides sole and only that local units of government cannot change the effect of their pension systems for those who are currently under those systems. I would ask for the adoption of this Article."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 674 pass. Is there discussion? The question is shall it pass. All those in favor vote 'aye' and the opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 139 'ayes' and 0 'nays' and 0 'present' and House Bill 674 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. DiPrima, 'aye'. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 675."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 675, Gene Hoffman. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman is not here. Take it out of the record. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 687. Oh no, ah... I skipped one. House Bill 679."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 679, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to provide for a privilege tax on mobile homes. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 679 is a Bill ah.. that was a result of an effort ah... in the last Session of the General Assembly to repeal a privilege tax on mobile homes and because of the prolific number of Bills introduced in that Session and in this Session relative to the same subject; the Revenue Committee assigned all of the Bill to a Sub-Committee dealing with this subject matter. This Bill came out of that Sub-Committee with a 4 to 0 vote and it deals with letting each county decide whether they want to ah.. levy a tax on mobile homes. The proceeds of that tax can be designated to be placed in the corporate fund of the county. Now this makes it permissive because it was determined that some counties did not want to collect that tax, simply because it cost them more to collect it than the revenue realized from



the...a...from the collection of the tax. And so we made this Bill more compatible in that we made it permissive and we're allowing each county in the State to determine by ordinance whether they want to initiate this tax on mobile homes or not and the money to be put into the general corporate fund of the county and distributed any way they see fit and I urge a yes vote on this Bill."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 679 pass. Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I think we should all be aware of what this Bill does. I'd like to read from the Digest. 'Provides that the proceeds will be paid into the county corporate fund', and listen to this part, 'instead of being distributed to a taxing authority in which the mobile home is located'. If we pass this, you're taking the rights from the townships, school boards, park districts, sanitary districts, fire districts and getting those from the proceeds. This is a bad policy to start following when we're trying to give those townships and other units of government more funds. With this, we're taking it away. In addition to that, we're giving it to the counties and this is a State right. I would certainly oppose this measure. This got out of Revenue Committee by a margin of one or two votes."

Shea: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hoffman, R."

Hoffman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the last speaker was absolutely correct, but I think if you'll question the sponsor you'll find that he has been working on this for two years and the reason for this, is if you break it down to the various municipal bodies that would receive something out of it, its a negligible amount. We had discussed this at length and I think the sponsor's approach is correct and I would support him on this."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer."

Palmer: "If the sponsor would yield for a question...a...was this Bill amended at all?"

Shea: "The answer...."

Yourell: "No."



Palmer: "Well aren't you proposing here toan additional tax upon the people who reside in these trailer parks? Many of them being senior citizens?"

Yourell: "Romis, you're from Cook County and I want to point one thing out. This is absolutely permissive legislation..."

Palmer: "Yes....I...I...understand that, but I don't know of a county board that wouldn't go for something like this..."

Yourell: "Well I can tell you that the County Board of Cook will not go for it because they testified they do not want to levy the tax and they don't want to levy it simply because the local unit that Representative Schraeder talked about would not get any money, or very little money because they collected in Cook County in the first year of this tax, \$171,000. Now if you can distribute \$171,000 to all of the local taxing bodies in Cook County, you'll come up with a figure less than \$100 per unit, and that's the reason. Now that's why we did it this way so if the downstate counties, or any other county in the State of Illinois wants to levy the tax, they can by ordinance. But Cook County has demonstrated that it cost them more to collect the tax than the revenue derived from the collection of the tax. There are seven different county offices that have to be involved in the collection of the tax. If the mobile home owner, for example, does not wish to pay the tax, then that tax has to be collected through the State Attorney's office, a lien filed in the County Recorder's office, and right on down the line. And when you get through with it, the average tax on a mobile home in Cook County came out to \$92. Now if you can take \$92 and multiply that \$92 by the number of mobile homes in Cook County, and by experience, Cook County has indicated that less than half of the people paid that tax, the distribution formula that Representative Schraeder speaks to is just not fair. And Cook County has indicated that in our County, you know that we assess real estate tax by real estate on the property in which the mobile homes are placed at a commercial rate of 40%. And we felt through that kind of taxation through real estate the local taxing units would get more through the regular taxing of the real estate rather than an additional privilege tax on homes. Now



Representative McMaster's passed a Bill out of here today that would place this tax on real estate. And I think that's the correct approach. What I'm saying to you is Cook County has indicated they don't want the tax, and this is by ordinance and its permissible."

Palmer: "Well what I'm saying is this. Cook County might not now want the tax. Sometime later on they could, of course, any time that the County Board might determine this, but there are other counties in the State, 102 of them. And what you're setting up here is a vehicle by which you can tax those poor people, senior citizens that reside in trailer parks and there are many of them throughout the State. It seems to me that this is no time to start levying taxes on people any more than what they've got on their backs right now."

Yourell: "Well, Representative Palmer, Cook County has already repealed their ordinance in not collecting the tax. So don't worry about those poor people in Cook County, they're not going to be soaked with this tax."

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman from Bradley in the Chair."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield?"

Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Kempiners: "Buz, the way I read this...the way I read the synopsis, Buz, is that it is not creating a new tax, its just taking the tax from the State and leaving it up to the county whether it wants to preserve an existing tax. Is that correct?"

Yourell: "That's correct."

Kempiners: "Okay, thank you."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill is the product of a study that we made for three years now. Ralph Dunn was on that Committee, three years ago, Subcommittee with me. We discussed these Bills and you see that they are sponsored by him and Mr. LaFleur from our Committee. And this is a thing that can be done and said by all on a permissive basis. No one has to take this if they don't want it. The local taxing districts involved here are not going to lose any amount of income or have very little consequence. And therefore,



so that it is permissible legislation, it should not be forced on the counties that don't want and should not...and the one's that do want it, have the opportunity to put it on. I think we should vote an aye vote on this Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

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

Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Totten: "A...Representative Yourell, are the....last year when this Bill was up in Committee, I can remember some municipalities being down here testifying against it. Did they have the same position? Did they testify against it this year?"

Yourell: "I can't answer that question, Don, because I wasn't in the Subcommittee, but I may, perhaps, a Member of that Subcommittee can answer that question. Perhaps the Chairman of the Commission. Sam?"

Totten: "Let me address the question to Representative Maragos that last year I wasn't in the Committee, but I know there were some municipalities down...a...testifying against it. I wonder whether their position was the same this year with this piece of legislation?"

Bradley: "Turn Mr. Maragos on please."

Maragos: "I would like to state that Mr. Dunn worked with us last year and I think they worked all the problems this year, and beside that, the Municipal League did not oppose it this year like they did two years ago."

Totten: "What was...what was the difference?"

Shea: "The Gentleman...I'm trying to review where we're at...Mr. Schraeder, have you talked on this question yet?"

Schraeder: "No."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker...a...I was going to speak for this Bill. This, as Representative Maragos said, this is the Bill that has been introduced as a Committee Bill two years ago. Last year...it doesn't change the amount of tax, it only allows counties to assess it or not. In answer to your question, I don't think that there is any opposition to it this year. Actually the people that would probably be opposed to it are municipalities and school districts. But this...a...a...is



not mandatory that it be put on. The people who own the mobile homes are certainly in favor of this kind of legislation. The counties want it because it helps replace the revenue they lost in the new Constitution when they couldn't get the 2% or the 3% fee for collecting taxes. This will give revenue to the counties where its needed and it wouldn't hurt any other taxing body that I know of of any consequence and I'd urge the adoption of it. Does that answer your questions, Don?"

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, D."

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

Shea: "The Minority spokesman on Appropriations, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Representative Dunn was trying to answer a question for me, and I still haven't got the answer or one that I think I can understand and that is, what is the difference in not having municipal opposition to this, this year, as there was last year? That's the question that I'd asked that I was trying to get an answer to."

Shea: "Well, we'll try again. Mr. Stone, I realize I'm out of order. I was trying to get the debate cut off on this, but perhaps I'm doing it the wrong way."

Yurell: "Mr. Speaker, may I respond to Representative Totten? Don, not one municipality has communicated with me relative to this Bill this... this Session. Now the Municipal League does not oppose this Bill in Subcommittee or in Revenue Committee when it was passed out. Now I cannot answer the question truthfully and factually because I don't have any knowledge of any opposition. Now one village, including my own, which has three trailer parks in them, had anything to say about the Bill. So that's all I can tell you."

Totten: "Is it exactly the same piece of legislation that you had last time?"

Yurell: "No. No."

Totten: "What's the difference?"

Yurell: "Its permissive now."

Shea: "The question is, as put by Mr. Houlihan, shall the main question now be put. All in favor will say aye, those opposed will say nay. The ayes have it. Mr. Yurell moves that House Bill 679 pass. All



in favor will vote aye. Those opposed will vote nay. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Skinner to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Only until it gets 89."

Shea: "Well then, Mr. Schraeder to explain his vote."

Schraeder: "I just want to answer the questions that the Representative from the other aisle was saying. This Bill was opposed by the people that opposed it last year or the year before, they're still in opposition."

Shea: "Have all voted who wished? Mr. Tipsword to explain his vote."

Tipsword: "I'll be very brief Mr. Speaker. The thing that bothers me about this Bill is that I can foresee the same thing that we have had. Great pressures on County Boards from those who have mobile homes asking them not to put the tax on. County Boards will be pressured into taking their tax off. Then, those people who own houses, no matter what their station is in life, are going to be paying the taxes for those mobile home owners in regard to schools, local services, and all of the other things for which we pay taxes in local government. And that just simply isn't fair."

Shea: "Have all voted who wished? Mr. Friedrich to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "The City of Centralia furnishes garbage pick-up, police protection, fire protection, streets, and everything else by the people who live in mobile homes, and there are a lot of them there. And they went for years without paying any taxes and I think they should pay their fair share and I don't think it should all go to the county, because the city furnishes these services to these people, they're basic services of sewage and all these things. I think you are making a mistake if you eliminate these local branches of government from receiving part of the tax."

Shea: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question, there are 91 ayes, 31 nays, 15 voting present, and House Bill 679 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of House Bills' Third Reading appears House Bill 687."

Jack O'Brien: "Take that out of the record."

Shea: "Take that out of the record. House Bill 690."



Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 690. Yourell. A Bill for an Act to repeal an Act for the sale of United States Steel Corporation to the interests of the State of Illinois in certain lands. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the genesis of this legislation goes back almost twelve years and I have distributed to each Member a statement that I put together and also a statement by the Wildlife Federation, a statement by other conservation groups in the State of Illinois, and I might just briefly because of the interest generated in this legislation, go through the beginning of the...of the Bill as it developed in the last twelve years. In June, twelve years ago, 1963, Senate Bill 782 was passed which gave away the right title and the interest of the State of Illinois in almost two hundred acres of land in Lake Michigan from the Chicago shoreline to the Indiana State line. This grant was effective relative to certain conditions embodied in Senate Bill 782 and those conditions in 782 shall not become effective until those criteria had been met. Number one was that the amount of \$19,460 be paid to the Treasurer of the State of Illinois by U. S. Steel Corporation or any legal successor thereto. And that the Chicago Park District has conveyed to the State of Illinois all its rights, title and interest in and to the real estate described herein and indeed making such conveyance duly recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds in Cook County. In complying with the provisions of Senate Bill 782, those provisions were never accomplished by U. S. Steel, thus making Senate Bill 782 not valid. What has happened in effect, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the State of Illinois has held this two hundred acres of land in trust for U. S. Steel for the past twelve years. Not one cent of taxes was paid on this land. U. S. Steel has not moved one way or another to do anything in the matter of developing this land, and the opponents of the legislation who are primarily those people in U. S. Steel, will tell you that if this repealer is passed, that unemployment will be ripe on the Southeast side of Cook Coun....Chicago, which simply is not a matter of fact because not one job was lost or gained by the acquisition or the



release of those two hundred acres of land. Because U. S. Steel, from June of 1963, until the present time, has not made one single effort to do anything with that land. Now two years ago, when this Bill was us and debated on the floor of the House, the proponents...the opponents of this legislation indicated that U. S. Steel would move to Indiana, that there would be great unemployment in that area. This two hundred acres still has not been developed and there has been no loss of jobs and I maintain that there will be no loss of jobs. If you look at the map distributed in the material that I submitted to you earlier today, you'll see that the two hundred acres of land will precede to a common boundary line that is known as the Illinois-Indiana Stateline. Now with the acquisition of those two hundred acres, the State of Illinois will no longer have any right of way to that two hundred acres of land. Now there's been discussion and talk that just to the South, there is another sixty-four acres of land that U. S. Steel is trying to acquire which will give them all of the land south of that area to the end of U. S. Steel property, which them becomes only, only, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Indiana Stateline. Now if you recall, Indiana has developed a very liberal land-fill policy and if you'll look at the map, you'll see that once this two hundred acres of land is acquired, whether or not they get the additional sixty-four acres, then they can go right on into the Lake as far as they want as long as they have Indiana approval, they will no longer need the State of Illinois or any of the statutes to allow them to develop that Lake. Now they will argue that while they did that with Northwestern University, and I would like to call your attention to some of the statements developed by the Lake Michigan Special Commission on Lake Michigan, created by the 78th General Assembly, that indicated that Nipsy for one, has indicated that no portion of that Lake should be developed by a private corporation or any private interest, but rather should be maintained for the public access and the recreation of a great natural resource. Now it will be argued too, it will be argued that this is something that is not in my district, U. S. Steel, that is right, it is not in my district, but I maintain that Lake Michigan, which is the biggest Lake



in the Midwest, is in all of your districts, and it belongs to all of the people of all of your districts, and not to U. S. Steel. Just prior to the...or just after the introduction of this legislation in 1973, U. S. Steel hauled ashes down to the State Treasurer's office and submitted a check in the amount of \$19,640 and the State Treasurer then and now, Alan Dixon, refused the check and said 'no, you're too late, this thing is being adjudicated in the court'. The Attorney General of the State of Illinois is joined by the Governor and every other State office, Michael Howlett, George Lindburg, Alan Dixon, and the Attorney General of the State of Illinois in fighting this case in order to bring that two hundred acres back to where it belongs, the people of the State of Illinois. Now the human cry again was unemployment. The steel workers union had people writing letters two years ago. This time the steel workers are on my side, Ladies and Gentlemen, and I quote "Ed Sandlowski, the President of the District 4, the largest steel union local in the United States said that U. S. Steel does not need this land, there is plenty of expansion land to the South and that public property belongs to the public and Lake Michigan should be maintained for the recreational and public access to the people of the State of Illinois and not be given to any private corporation". Now, ever since 1906, when the original plan for the Lake Front was developed by Mr. Burnan, and that was in 1906, and one of the publications submitted for your approval by the opponents of this legislation misquoted Mr. Burnan because he stated that the public land along the lake shore of Lake Michigan belongs to the public and nobody else. And the Supreme Court ruled in a case versus...Illinois Central versus the City of Chicago tho, that did not give them the right to do anything with Lake Michigan. Now Ladies and Gentlemen, there much material relevant to this land-grab by U. S. Steel. The only thing that I can tell you when they argue employment, don't believe it, don't buy that bag of marbles because it is not there. U.S. Steel has not, since June, 1963, hired one person because of the acquisition of this two-hundred acres of land. They're not doing it now, they're not going to do it in the future. In the Senate Bill 782, there was nothing said that what they're going to do



with this land. They can develop that land and sell it. They can do any damn thing they want with it and I maintain that its public land for public use and ought to come back to the public from whence it came. How would anybody like it if one big corporation in any of your towns or counties suddenly had your park land sold out from under you and given to some private corporation for development because of unemployment. This is a hoax, it's not fair, you know it's not fair, and I solicit your favorable support of House Bill 690."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 690 pass. Discussion? The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that's a pretty hard act to follow, but I rise in support of the Gentleman and I, of all people, because I happen to be one of probably many in here that own stock in U. S. Steel, should probably be saying ...should probably be saying 'thanks for the gift and thanks for theft' from the people of the State of Illinois. I was never for this thing in the first place, I thought it was unconscionable of the steel company in the first place, I haven't changed my mind one bit, I believe as the sages have said that history is written by people, not by corporations. And I think, in this case, when you're taking and trying to defame, defame, that jewel that we have in the central United States known as the Great Lake, I don't think that any corporation has the right to come in and to spoil that resource. And I too, wish that you would vote a favorable vote."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to House Bill 690, which does effect an industry, a great industry, which adjoins my district, and which does employ some ten thousand people, many of whom live in my district, and the adjoining district. Now the sponsor of this Bill has sought to make light of the economic impact of this Bill and the scare tactics which he was referred to them about the threat from the State of Indiana. However, I think its a recognized fact that much industry has left us along the Lake and has been moving into the Indiana area, especially as their port has developed and ours has been neglected



despite the efforts of our own Economic Development Commission in this area. But we do have National Steel, we do have Bethlehem Steel, and we do have Inland Steel, who have chosen to move into the Indiana area. So I don't think that this is a scare tactic, I think its a reality that we are facing competition from the...our sister State and we must rise to meet it. Now the implication was made by the sponsor that organized labor is in support of this Bill. Well anyone who knows the situation in the United Steel Workers of America, knows that there's a vast difference between the support of Ed Sandowski and the support of the International Union of the United Steel Workers of America. So I would not want that inference to stand, but because one union official wants, one local official in U. S. Steel, has stated his support that the Union has withdrawn its support of the...the a... the a...this opposition of this Bill. Now the sponsor quite correctly traces the genesis of this Bill back to 1963, when Senator Dougherty and the leaders of the Senate at that time did pass this Bill which allowed the sale of this land to U. S. Steel. This was in 1963, and at the time, U. S. Steel did commence conversation with the park district as to the expansion in this area. However, suits were filed at that time which were not decided until 1967. In 1967, of course, when U. S. Steel had to embark upon their environmental clean-up program at a cost of \$50,000,000, other things necessarily had to be put aside in light of the environmental situation at the time. So the project was slowed down by litigation. Litigation again filed in 1967, which is still pending. I think I missed one point at the start of my remarks, that this expansion is absolutely necessary in the direction in which it is proposed for it to move. They can't... they can't go to the north because this is recreational area in the north and would destroy beaches, park lands, boat ramps, etc. They can't..they can't go west because of the industrial...or the...a... urbanized area, the homes and neighborhoods they would have to destroy by expanding. And they can't go south because the Calumet River is right there on the south, and the land across the Calumet River hopefully will be purchased by the State of Illinois for our containerized facility. So the only way they can...the U. S. Steel can



90 is to the east into this land, so-called, which is deep under water, and there's a lot of talk about theft and gift because of the price, remember, that its going to take \$100,000 an acre to fill this in and it is probably going to be even higher than that in the final analysis. Now you can't make an environmental argument against this project, it just isn't there. This project will have to answer all environmental standards and certainly contemplate doing so. When we beat this Bill last year, the U. S. Steel Corporation did attempt to take affirmative action to expand...to tender the money to the park district and to commence some planning of the...of the...a.. expansion. They worked for it by the State officers as the sponsor has pointed out and by indicated court action. However, the fact does remain that this an installation which is imperative. It is needed in our area. U. S. Steel is one of the largest employers in our area. We are in an area which is suffering from chronic unemployment right now and rising unemployment. This does mean jobs, this does mean tax monies, this is a shot in the arm for the economy of the City of Chicago in the State of Illinois and I urge...and I urgently urge every Member of this House to vote no on House Bill 690."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff."

Huff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I suggest we move to the previous question."

Shea: "The question is shall the main question be put. All those in favor will say aye. Those opposed will say nay. The ayes have it, Mr. Yourell to close."

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I think, at this time, perhaps everybody has made up their minds as to how they're going to vote on this important legislation. And I would just finally and in conclusion say that Representative Collins is absolutely one hundred percent correct, that U. S. Steel had many many problems relating to the environment at their south works. In fact, they were know as the number one polluter in the State of Illinois, and they were forced to comply with the environmental protection of the waters and the air in that area because the Attorney General of the State of Illinois brought suit against them. It was also said that because of this suit, that, they didn't have the money or they were too concerned with those



problems rather than to trot down to Springfield with a little old \$19,000 check. The last court action ended in 1967, and the new one did not begin until 1973. They had six years to bring a check for a lousy \$19,000, and they didn't do it. I know how you are going to vote and I appreciate that. Thank you very much."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 690 pass. All in favor will vote aye. Those opposed will vote nay. Mr. Borchers, I'll recognize you to explain your vote."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, I think you're gonna make a terrible mistake. I want ya to understand that I've been in this area. Two hundred acres, that is 640 acres in a mile, square mile, 200 acres is less than a third. As far as the ecology is concerned, it don't mean a thing. I have...our family has filled land by many many acres. This is going to be hard and expensive work for that steel plant. The only way they can go is this way. I do not own U. S. Steel stock, but I've been there and I'm telling you you're making an economic mistake for the State of Illinois and this part of the City of Chicago. Now I received letters, and its true, I'm on that Committee and I heard the arguments and I disagree with Representative Yourell on this. This is for the best interest of the City of Chicago and this State to continue to allow the U. S. Steel to be there. And 200 acres is nothing. It has no effect on the ecology and conservation as has been indicated. It means nothing."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, to explain his vote."

Mann: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want to commend the sponsor of this legislation. I was here in 1963 and was one of eight votes when this Bill rushed through the General Assembly without reference to Committee in either House. Now the sale of this water, this land, for \$100 an acre is the biggest give away since the Indians sold Manhattan Island for \$24. This project of U. S. Steel is in direct violation of the Chicago lake-front plan which says 'there shall be no, absolutely no development of recreational land anywhere along the lake front of the City of Chicago'. United States Steel needs this land so desperately for employment that they've sat on their haunches



for twelve years and not come to us with a measly \$19,400 for this acreage. You allow them to commence to build on what is now Lake Michigan water, and you're going to be able to build a concrete peninsula across to the border of Indiana. This is an excellent Bill, it ought to receive unanimous approval. And once more, I want to commend the sponsor for this legislation. I just want to add one more thing. In the Supreme Court case of Drawsey versus Kerner, the United States, I mean the Illinois Supreme Court reversed its previous position, which it said that an individual did not have the right to sue and said that the Chicago Park District even if it wanted to, could not give away land which was held in trust for the people of the State of Illinois. And I urge an aye vote."

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

Miller: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'd like to address myself to the environmental concern addressed by the sponsor, and other people here too, that like to think that maybe, maybe, just maybe, we might be able to develop that area into park land and recreational use for the citizens of that area. I would suggest to you that is a total, total impossibility that that land will never be used for park use. And the reasons for that is, it costs \$100,000 an acre to fill it in and there's no way you can justify paying a hundred grand an acre to develop any park land."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell, to explain his vote."

Caldwell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I too, congratulate the sponsor for his persuasive ability to take something...take nothing and make something of it. I think we ought to keep in mind the fact that I wasn't here in '65, but I've been here since '67. I'm aware of the fact that if the Park District was going to utilize this land, they had a considerable, had a decade in which to do it. Now you've heard information to the effect that in order to develop this 200 acres, or whatever it is, out of Lake Michigan, its going to cost \$100,000 an acre. And I'm certain that even if this land were resurrected and excavated, you still could not use it for recreational facilities because the steel mills are there, its been there for a long, long time and what we are talking about is an extension into the Lake.



I think that we ought to all be..."

Shea: "Go ahead, Mr. Caldwell, finish up, you're almost out of time."

Caldwell: "Well, I think we ought to be...I'm...I'm merely suggesting that we ought to be realistic. What's going to happen to the land, and I can guarantee you if it isn't available for use to U. S. Steel, if the economic situation ever permits the steel mills to continue to expand and supply the...the citizens in that area and throughout Chicago, jobs, we're driving most of the business out of Chicago anyway, and I think we ought to be practical and not allow the Park District to regain title to the land because they are not going to do anything with it. I move...I move...I suggest that we get some of the those green lights off the board."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Assistant Majority Leader, Mr. Davis, to explain his vote."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to join my friend, Lou Caldwell, who just preceded me, because his district is a little south of mine. I have people in my district who work at U. S. Steel, and I'm sure he does. And I'm sure many of you have people in your district who work for U. S. Steel. U. S. Steel is the largest steel plant in Illinois. And they say that this will have effect, definitely will have effect on them. And from what I can understand, and if I'm wrong, I'd like for you brilliant lawyers, it is now being adjudicated, it is now in the courts. Again I want to repeat to you whatever you think about U. S. Steel and these large plants, this is the goose that's laying the golden egg. And if there is a chance, if there is a chance of saving this land and preventing the firing of people, why not? Why should we rush into this thing all of a sudden? When they say that it will have an effect, an adverse effect upon us, I think that perhaps if we wait awhile, find out what the court says, that one of the largest employers in the State of Illinois, I think if we wait awhile, we might be able to save some jobs. Where are we going to get these jobs, we are going through the highest state of unemployment known since the '30's and the President of the Nation is working with this problem. The Mayor of our City and the Governor of our State here is



floating a bond issue, if you please, a 4.1 million bond issue to find jobs. And I don't want to do anything that will adversely effect the people who are....(tape trouble)...lay the golden egg. I think we ought to go slow on this thing and give the courts a chance to decide. That's why I'm voting no."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Randolph...from Cook, Mr. Randolph, to explain his vote."

Randolph: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to House Bill 690. By passing this Bill, the legislature would be revoking a commitment it made to legislation in 1963, which I supported, which enables U. S. Steel to reclaim and improve land which is presently unproductive. In the wisdom of the legislature this plan was sound in 1963 and I believe it is sound today. Thousands of dollars have already been spent in accordance with this plan. To go back on our word at this time would cause a tremendous loss in jobs and would substantially erode the progress of our State, the economy of our State. Therefore, I urge you to vote no on House Bill 690."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff. And I might disturb you for a minute sir. I hear people shouting, I still have ten people that want to explain their vote, the Chair is bound by the rules to let each Member have the two minutes to explain his vote. Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain to the House that I don't want to take the time, but I have had my light on. Mr. Speaker, I have had my...."

Shea: "Excuse me sir. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this matter was raised at the Democratic caucus this morning. There are 103 votes on the board. I seriously question any further explanation of votes is going to change anyone's mind as to how they will cast their vote. And it was requested at our conference that the leadership of our party encourage people not to ask for explanation of votes in situations such as this. I only ask that we move along with the business of the House. That's all."

Shea: "Mr. Duff to finish his explanation. Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I see up there three green



lights where I know for a fact, the people are not here. Now if this Bill receives anything under 105 votes, I think that it should be verified. And I think it is extremely discourteous on the part of any Member to yell out when another Member is recognized to talk. And I think that they ought to realize that they will be asked some day or they will want to talk, and that other Members ought to yell at them. And I find, Mr. Speaker, do you know I find that the people that are yelling out are the people that were Mr. Choate's supporters that became Mr. Redmond's supporters."

Shea: "You're out of order with that remark. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I tried to say that I do apologize for taking this time, but I would like those Members who are disturbed to know that I have had my light on since Mr. Yourell closed his opening remarks. And statistically because when the motion was made to stop debate after only two speakers, I wanted to ask an important question to Mr. Yourell who knows how hard I'm trying to decide on this subject. And I would just like to ask in my explanation, if I could get just a nod of a head, two years ago, I was one of those who helped work out the compromise between Representative Yourell and United States Steel, and which a period of time was given for United States Steel to act because in my mind, the..."

Shea: "Mr. Duff. Mr. Duff, could I disturb you for one minute? This is House Bill 690. The board to my left shows it, the board to my right has a tube burned out in it, it looks like its House Bill 670, its House Bill 690. Proceed, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Thank you Representative Shea. Now did United States Steel supply that...meet that six months compromise or not? They did not. Well Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd be happy to support them if they had kept their word on the compromise that I and Representative Yourell worked out with them two years ago. I vote no...I vote yes."

Shea: "Mr. Duff votes no, no, yes, he votes yes. Have all voted who and explained their votes who wished? Take the record. Your light, I don't see it on up here. Mr. Collins to explain his vote."



Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, very briefly in explaining my vote, and I'd like to speak to Representative Mann in particular because I wish his memory were as sharp as his articulation. Because in 1963, this Bill did receive hearing in Committees in both Houses so the error in his memory, he is in error, it did receive full hearings in 1963. Now much has been made about the so-called Burnam Plan concerning this land. And I've got to point out to the Members of this House that all of this land is south of 79th Street and everything south of 79th Street has always been considered industrial land. It's the land to the north that is park land, is beach land, is boat land, none of which will be disturbed by this so-called fill in. Again, this is not prime land we're talking about, its land that is submerged under water and it can only be filled in by U. S. Steel because it is worthless to anyone else because it would be inaccessible to anyone except over U. S. Steel land. So too much spector has been raised here. If this Bill isthis Bill is unreasonable, we should honor our commitment to that we made in 1963. I look up at that board and I see so many people voting, so many from downstate and I'm reminded of the plaintiff cry that I heard on this floor so many times when some issue came up effecting the economy of downstate Illinois, and its always been 'leave us alone'. Well Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this effects our economy vitally. And I just say to you 'leave us alone'. Reject this Bill because by leaving us alone, you're working in your own best interests in the long run. Please vote no."

Shea: "Have all voted who wished? I'll recognize you on a point of personal privilege, Mr. Mann. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. Alright, there are 106 aye votes, 25 nay votes, 19 votes voting present. House Bill 690 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Mann on a point of personal privilege."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege, the Gentleman questions my memory, I question the Gentleman's memory because everything south of 79th Street as industrial property. Phil, I suggest that you go out and take a look at Calumet Park, which covers a couple



of acres right south of 79th Street. I think that's recreational property."

Shea: "On the order of House Bills' Third Reading appears House Bill 693."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 693. Mudd. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Chairman, Members of the House, in the beginning, I wish to say in the interest of safety that this isn't the Bill that has anything to do with any State Policemen, so nobody will jump up and hurt themselves. This Bill is simply a housecleaning Bill to amend the Municipal Code to put some of the...a...a...different divisions of it in the same order as others for interpretation and...a...a...equality so I ask for a favorable vote and will answer any questions."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of House Bill 693. Is there discussion? All in favor will vote aye, those opposed will vote nay. The Gentleman from...Mr. Lechowicz, do you desire recognition? Turn Mr. Lechowicz on."

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

Shea: "He indicates he will."

Lechowicz: "You're talkin about a reference in division 2.1 as far as that Act. Does that cover the City of Chicago by any chance?"

Mudd: "A...no, Representative, this has nothing to do with Chicago, it pertains only to downstate...a...a..."

Lechowicz: "Downstate policemen?"

Mudd: "Yes sir."

Lechowicz: "Municipalities?"

Mudd: "Municipalities...a...downstate...a..."

Lechowicz: "What are you doin with the veterans points on the downstate system?"

Mudd: "What it does is in the paragraph that it speaks to, you'll note it states 'no person shall receive a preference for a promotional appointment granted by this division, 2.1, after he has received one... a'...it says 'appointment or promotion from the eligibility lists on which he has allowed such preferences'. In other areas of this...a..."



municipality...a...law or code...it refers to one or the other only. And this here is just to clarify that so they will only receive preference from one area."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Representative."

Shea: "Is there any further questions? Is there any further questions?"

Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 112 ayes, 0 nays, 8 voting present, House Bill 693 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Yourell, aye. Maragos, aye. Alright let me get these real quick around. Porter, aye. Terzich, aye. Willer, aye. Campbell, aye. Hudson, aye. Kempiners, aye. Reed, aye. We'll spend a little more of the State's money, all in favor will vote aye, those opposed will vote no. Mr. Washburn, would you and Mr. Walsh come up here for a minute? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 142 ayes, 0 nays, 5 voting present. House Bill 693 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of House Bills' Third Reading appears House Bill 714."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 714. Craig. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. The Gentleman from Vermillion, Mr. Craig."

Craig: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is where they are going to make an audit of the books. It only makes them to post the amount of the deficiency or some lower amount agreed upon by both parties, rather than the full amount of the deposit that was in the, or the amount that was involved. I don't know of any opposition to this. It also prohibits the records, or the examiner, provisional section or reporting auditor of the Secretary of State from being used as evidence in any criminal proceedings or citations or violation of this Act. When they make these audits, when they go in and take the total amount, they have to put this amount up at the present time. This Bill will give them the right to make up...just put up the amount of the deficiency or some lesser amount. I appreciate your support on this measure."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 714 pass. Is there debate? All



in favor will vote aye. Those opposed will vote nay. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 89 ayes, 0 nays, 45 voting present. House Bill 714 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of House Bills' Third Reading appears House Bill 723."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 723. Mugalian. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act in regard to feasibility, entry and detainer. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the synopsis is very hard to understand. Maybe its sufficient to say that this Bill received a unanimous vote out of Judiciary I, which consists entirely of lawyers of both sides of the aisle. Its a Bill proposed by the bar association to qualify an ambiguity in the statute. It does not take away any substantive rights, but makes it simpler and less expensive to proceed with the administration of cases of forceful entry and detainer. If there are any questions, I'd be happy to try and answer them."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 723 pass. All in favor will vote aye, those opposed will vote nay. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 128 aye votes, 1 nay vote, 4 voting present, House Bill 723 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of House Bills' Third Reading appear House Bill 724. The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMasters."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 724. A Bill for an Act amending an Act to create Township Government Loans Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Knox."

McMasters: "Mr. Speaker, this is a companion to an Appropriation Bill that is being heard tomorrow morning, I believe that this Bill is automatically excluded from the...a...dying on the calender until the Appropriation Bill joins it. Am I correct?"



Shea: "No sir, you are not. This Bill will die, its a substantive Bill, this Bill, under the present rules, dies on the 23rd."

McMaster: "Then if you wish, I will go ahead."

Shea: "Its up to you sir. Most...there will be objections, Mr. McMasters, he'll take it out of the record. On the order of House Bills' Third Reading appears House Bill 729."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 729. Daniels. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McMasters....er, Daniels, I'm sorry. I get ya in the wrong county and the wrong person."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 729 provides for assessment of real estate used for at least three years for open space purposes. Based on its value as open state, rather than on some alternative use. This applies to tracks of ten acres or more and when that land is converted to residential use, the taxes for the preceding three years would be reassessed and collected on the higher value. The same way that converted farm land is presently reassessed. Some assessors throughout the State are valuing land used for open space purposes at its highest and best use based upon the value of neighboring lands. Open space are a community scenic, ecological and recreational asset, and as such, they enhance the value of the entire area. They attract residential housing and they are needed more than ever as urbanization tends to surround them. Valuing the same as fully developed property would force abandonment or conversion to more profitable use. Under the Bill, open space would be valued on the basis of fair cash value estimated at the price it would bring at a fair voluntary sale for use by the buyer for open space purposes. Moreover, these recreational assets demand little in the way of municipal services and they place no burden upon school systems. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move for a favorable vote on House Bill 729."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 729 pass. The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword, on the question."

Tipsword: "Would the Gentleman yield to a question please?"

Shea: "He indicates he will."



Tipsword: "Mr. Daniels, I've been hearing from a lot of golf courses about this. What effect does this have upon golf courses in the State of Illinois?"

Daniels: "Basically, the effect that it would have in golf courses in the State of Illinois is that they would be valued at the uniform rate as open space within the definition of the Bill. This means that they would be valued as a fair cash value as that particular use. The same would apply to other areas, recreational areas, historical sites, and the like."

Tipsword: "Is open space under this any use that is not of use by habitation of industrial or agriculture?"

Daniels: "Well, its not exactly like that, but in essence, it amounts to that such as areas that would enhance national natural or scenic resources and which maintain the natural streams or waters or protect soils or wet lands and the like."

Tipsword: "And then it would also apply to private country clubs?"

Daniels: "It would."

Tipsword: "And they get a special tax rate?"

Daniels: "No, I wouldn't call it a special tax rate. What it amounts to is that exactly what is happening at the present time. They're basically valued on the fair cash value presently. And what it amounts to if you would leave them at the same and they would not be assessed at the highest and best use."

Tipsword: "Thank you sir."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I have a couple of questions of the sponsor."

Shea: "He indicates he'll yield."

Meyer: "This recreational land that we're preserving, I would presume it is public, right?"

Daniels: "No, it doesn't have to be public, Mr. Meyer. Public recreational land would be taken off the tax rolls."

Meyer: "But then, this is really designed for private recreational areas."

Daniels: "Private, semi-private or the like."

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, if I could briefly speak to the Bill, this is...if



you belong to a country club and want to lower your taxes, this is the best Bill that you'll see all season. I urge you to vote no."

Shea: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill..."

Shea: "Proceed sir."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill. When this Bill was heard in Revenue Committee, there were reservations expressed to it by all of the assessors that were there, including the representative from the Cook County Assessor's office. These reservations are based on a number of considerations. The first is that the definition of open space purposes in this Bill is very broad and it would include just about any kind of land that doesn't have any building on it. It allows the owner of the large residential estate to drop off then or more of his acres and have it ruled as open space land and he wouldn't have to pay any taxes on it and nobody would get any benefit from it except himself. It would be broad enough to allow an industrial park to ...a..to...a...it had some open space around the industry to have that tax at preferential rates. The other thing about this Bill is that there need be no public benefit received by anybody in order for the property to get preferential tax treatment. Land just needs to be sitting there idle for use solely for private purposes. This Bill is different from Representative Hirschfeld's Bill, House Bill 568, which has a much tighter definition of what open space land is, and requires that land be used for specific purposes in order to receive the preferential tax treatment. There's also another open space Bill that is now on the floor of the House, House Bill 967, which is sponsored by Representative Huffman, which is a much more tightly drafted Bill. And in that Bill, the land must be used for park or recreational purposes and a contract for a public easement must be signed before the preferential tax treatment is granted. And representatives of the Cook County assessor's office testified in Revenue Committee that that kind of a contract would be



much easier for the assessors to administer. There are presently thirteen states that give preferential tax treatment to open space land, and in those states the required...."

Shea: "Will you bring your remarks to a close sir? I've turned you back on."

Kane: "In those states the requirements are much stricter than those contained in House Bill 729. Some of the requirements in the other states are that approval of the designation of open space land, there must be approval by a unit...a general unit of local government, there must be consistency with the comprehensive land use plans, and that the land actually be used for specified purposes, and that some access by the public be provided. Inclusion of any of these requirements in House Bill 729 would make this a much better Bill, but the sponsor has refused all tightening Amendments and Mr. Hoffman's Bill is still alive, and given that fact and that this Bill is wide open to the potential of abuse, I urge a no vote."

Shea: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Would you yield for a question? Assuming that you have pasture land on the edge of the city, if you remove the cattle from that land, could you have that declared open space under this Bill?"

Daniels: "If it met with the definition of the open space terminology however, I would assume that if you wanted to have that situation, you could probably have it declared as an agricultural use."

Borchers: "I see."

Shea: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. The County of Lake has been engaged in trying to do something with the very wide spread and burgeoning growth of population in our area. All of our county board members are deeply involved in the process of trying to control population by keeping some of our open space land. I'm very pleased that a fellow legislator from a neighboring county, suffering from the exact same exposure as Lake County, Henry, Will County, and all of the surrounding counties around Chicago, has introduced this Bill. It may have some



areas that need polishing, but they can easily be polished at a later time. The most important thing is that we get this important law on the books today. All we're asking for is to give the opportunity for open spaces that we gave to agriculture a good many years ago. There will be no great tax advantage from the standpoint that the man who's trying to hide behind this, as if he sells this at a higher or better use within three years, the tax relates back. Now several of the Representatives have got major Bills, studies of similar programs, or even broader programs, such as Representative Matijevich's Bill, which has been introduced at the behalf of the County Board of Lake. I think this is a very significant Bill, it deserves your support. The counties will not lose a significant amount of land, but most important, in those urbanized counties that are growing very fast, which even include some down state counties, will assure ourselves of the beauty and protection of some open land. I urge your support of this Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this measure. I thoroughly in support of the concept. I think its in keeping with sound tax principles and I think it has a great deal of foresight in the growth and maintenance of open space areas and recreational activities in the State of Illinois. All of us know that in metropolitan areas that are growing rapidly, that economic development and residential development encroaches upon our open spaces today. Many of these are necessary for those communities to survive to provide the kind of recreational activities and facilities that often times brought those economic developments there. It seems to me that it is indeed consistent with sound taxing principles in that what we're talking about is maintaining a level of assessment for the open spaces that's being increased by the economic encroachment around it. If we're going to preserve these open space areas, if we're going to preserve recreational activities in these communities that are rapidly growing, we're going to have to get some kind...give some kind of incentive to those operators and those owners who own these open spaces. I think its consistent with sound policy,



I think its something that we have to look to in the future, I think the Bill shows a good deal of foresight and while there may be a few minor problems with the Bill, the concept is a good one, and its consistent with sound taxing policy and I would urge your support."

Shea: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels, to close."

Shea: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill has been given considerable consideration as far as the principles are set forth herein. I might mention that this Bill did come out of Revenue Committee 13 to 5 to 1. We have received a considerable bit of information dealing with it. The principle purpose is to allow for the retention of our open space areas based upon the ecological standards that those of us that are faced with the sprawling urbanization meet every single day. I suggest and encourage you to consider those factors and I request a favorable vote on House Bill 729."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 729 pass. All in favor will vote aye. Those opposed will vote nay. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Yourell, aye. On this question there are 111 ayes, 28 nays, 8 voting present. House Bill 729 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."

Bradley: "House Bill 741."

Jack O'Brien: "Representative Bradley in the Chair. House Bill 741. Flinn. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sinclair, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 741 amends the Illinois Public Aid Code to the extent that it provides that the claim of the State against the State recipients where benefit shall not apply on homestead occupied by the recipient prior to death. This is a Bill that I've had up a number of times in previous sessions of the General Assembly. Its passed the House and died in the Senate because of the...for some unknown reason, the Senate kills a lot of House Bills. I don't know of any opposition now. The Public Aid Advisory Committee on Public Aid has said to me that it is time to look into this Bill....a...the law and



change it...a...the Legislative Advisory Committee supports it...a...
and I would ask for your support."

Bradley: "Is there further discussion? If not, the question is shall
House Bill 741 pass. All those in...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr.
Greiman."

Greiman: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Greiman: "As I understand this, this really protects...a...the heirs of
recipients and not necessarily ...a...the spouse, it could be
the spouse for example, but it might be a child...a...who is adult
and who is perfectly able to take care of himself and is not a
recipient of Public Aid. Isn't that right? We preserve an estate
essentially, after we have...to be passed on to another generation,
after we have been paying Public Aid. Is that correct?"

Flinn: "To some extent, yes, but what really happens in most cases is that
the...a...once...the...the elderly couple gets on Public Aid that the
heirs do not help keep up the house and will wind up with a condemned
house by the time of the death of the people and there's nothing...no
value left in the house anyhow. And besides, since January, 1974,
the federal government through the supplemental security income
supports the blind, disabled...a...and the aged to the extent of
\$140 a month. So most of the aid comes from the federal government,
and not from the State any longer, so the federal government does not
require lien."

Greiman: "It wouldn't...it wouldn't...that particularly, wouldn't be
applicable at all. You're talking about Public Aid that is in fact
paid to these people and it seems to me that it makes a great deal of
sense...a...where you have a husband and wife, and when the husband
dies, if the wife still retains it, fine, let her stay there. But if
the husband passed away and the wife died and there are adult children
some place who are heirs, I'm not sure I can see where..justify
preserving the estate to pass down to them when they have substantial
obligations to the State of Illinois."

Flinn: "Well Representative, can you justify the fact that we've got part
of a Department in existence that costs more money to operate than they



recover."

Greiman: "A...I'm just...I don't know about that, but I just give my own judgement on it."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, I know a family right now, or rather know a lady right now, who presently, probably in the next year or so, will die. She's pretty old. She has a house and she's on welfare and there's quite a lien against it from our Department. Her family could care less for her, they've...they never... never visit her, they just pay no attention whatsoever, they don't care if she lives or she dies. And she's not the only one in this State, I think its incredible that we, the people, who have paid for at least ten or fifteen years or thereabouts, for her care, and then we're going to allow the family to take this property, which is in rather a good street for a development and have that as the estate and they haven't contributed a bit to her question although they could well do it. I think that this is a travesty against the people of this State. We pay for it and then give it to someone else. We take care of her and...a...a...and...a...a...family caring nothing for their mother...a...have the money. Well this is ridiculous and I think we should vote this Bill down."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield?"

Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Ebbesen: "You're talking about a \$25,000 value according to this Amendment. Are you talking about assessed valuation or fair market value?"

Flinn: "Its the fair market value is what they're referring to. The Department of Public Aid had that Amendment put on saying that they were not interested in the so called three room shot gun houses and that sort of thing, but in case one were to be on Public Aid with some substantial value to the homestead, they did not see the wisdom of letting those people off the hook. And that's the purpose. I don't know of anybody that owns the property that's on Public Aid to that extent, so I did not argue with the Amendment. That's Representative



Campbell's Amendment."

Ebbesen: "My only point is I think for sake of clarity that ought to be cleared up and spelled out specifically what it is...fair market value."

Flinn: "Well, I..."

Ebbesen: "When you get it out of here if it passes."

Flinn: "I agree with you, that should be done, I didn't notice until after it got on the Bill, that it was not clear and I will do that in the Senate."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sinclair, Mr. Flinn, to close."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I think pretty well everybody understands what this situation is. And I would ask for a favorable vote."

Bradley: "The question is shall House Bill 741 pass. All those in favor will signify by voting aye. Those opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 105 ayes, 14 noes, 12 voting present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On Third Reading is House Bill 745."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 745. Kozubowski. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Civil Service Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 745 appropriates \$238,300 for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Civil Service Commission. I would urge a favorable Roll Call."

Bradley: "The question is shall House Bill 745 pass. All those in favor will signify by voting aye. Those opposed by voting no. The Clerk...have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this....there are 137 ayes, 4 noes, and none voting present and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On Third Reading appears House Bill 752."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 752. Grotberg. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to provide for privilege tax on mobile homes. Third Reading of the Bill."



Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 752 is the follow-up Bill that I referred to earlier when Mr. McMaster's Bill making mobile homes in the nature of real estate. House Bill 752 merely clears up the administrative policies of the existing mobile home tax that the County Problems Commission heard. Those of you who were on the floor a few days ago when we placed the Amendment as it is now on the Bill, probably remember the debate. I don't want to go into a lot of details except to say that throughout this State, the privilege tax has been a problem. In listening to those problems, in the administration of it across this State far and wide, we, the County Problems Committee, and the Counties and Townships and Revenue Committees put together Mr. McGrew's Bill and my Bill and the county problems concerned into this major repair Bill of the existing Act. We would hope and pray that you would let us follow the other Bill through the House should anything go wrong with that Bill or should the court, this summer, act in any manner that would not satisfy the complaint of the administration of the present Act. Its a major repair Bill to the existing mobile home privilege tax. If Mr. McMaster's Bill is passed and signed into law, it will repeal it all. For those of you out of Cook County, you might remember that Mr. Harold Katz placed upon this home rule Amendment. And I would move for the passage of this Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill that has now been amended. And as Mr. Grotberg correctly stated, that in the event the McMaster's Bill is not signed by the Governor or does not pass the Senate, this will be a good vehicle to correct the bad portions of the personal property...I mean the privilege tax on mobile homes at the present time. I think we shall allow this to be another vehicle Bill out and in case the other Bill does not stay on the real estate approach, we have this Bill, which corrects the present abuses, and has been amended and allows the home rule provisions to remain. Therefore, so I will ask for your support."

Bradley: "The question is shall House Bill 752 pass. All those in favor



will signify by voting aye. Those opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 129 ayes, no noes, 5 voting present, this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, shortly there will be distributed to each Member a list of Bills or a document that contains the digest of approximately 130 Bills. The leadership on both sides of the aisle in an attempt to expedite the passage of this calendar, in look through the calendar found that 430 Bills that came out of Committee without a dissenting vote, 119 Bills that came out of Committee with a vote of present. Out of those 560 Bills, the leadership on both sides of the aisle on consultation with either the Minority spokesman or the Committee Chairmen, went through the list and have come up with a list of approximately 130 Bills that seem to be almost non-controversial. Now its hoped that after the Members get an opportunity to look at this list that we can call them at one time and pass them on one Roll Call. If a Member has any question about the Bills, he should see the leadership on his side of the aisle. This would not be done until tomorrow, we will not attempt to have passed them. If we can move the number of Bills on this and the way we've been moving tonight, it would be the intention of the Speaker to try to get out of here by 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon and let the Members have an opportunity, at least to go home Saturday night and spend some time Sunday with their family, and to come back here about 5 o'clock Sunday evening."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from King...er...Mr. Hill."

Hill: "I wonder...I wonder if he'll yield to a question."

Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Hill: "When to you anticipate voting on this?"

Shea: "The list will be distributed to the Members this evening before they go home. It would be the intention of the leadership on both sides, hopefully tomorrow it could be done."

Hill: "Well don't you think it'd be a good idea if there's 130 Bills involved here, to at least give us until Monday or Tuesday to vote on



these things so at least we could look at them in the digest. I think this is atrocious. Give us 130 Bills and say look at them tonight and vote on them tomorrow."

Shea: "Mr. Hill, when you say look at them in the digest, each Member will be supplied with the list of a complete computer print-out of the digest. I said it was the intention of the leadership, if we find that the Members have not had an opportunity to look at them, I'm sure that could be changed."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Well...a...Mr. Majority Leader, I don't, you know, want to invade the province of the Speaker with regard to the weekend schedule, but for the people that, say, live 200 miles from Springfield, you're talking about working until 3 tomorrow, that means we get home at 7, to get back at 5, we have to leave our homes at 1 on Sunday. I don't know that there's much incentive not to work over the weekend. I just throw that out...a...as an idea."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Mann, I'll only try to answer it, I haven't got all the answers, but some of the Members thought that at least if they could get an opportunity, if we got out of here by 2 or 3, to get home with their families for dinner tomorrow night, and maybe have a chance to go with them to church on Sunday morning, they'd appreciate that. So the list will be distributed to you shortly and we can discuss that in the morning."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Majority Leader could tell us if all of the Amendments will be listed as they will be listed in the digest on Monday when it is delivered, if it is delivered?"

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

Bradley: "I couldn't either."

Skinner: "Will the Amendments that have been adopted on these Bills be listed in the print-out as they would be listed in the digest next week if and when it is delivered."

Shea: "Yes sir."

Skinner: "Thank you."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."



- Madison: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"
- Bradley: "He indicates he will."
- Madison: "Mr. Shea, what would be the position of the leadership if
a...if any one Bill on the list is objected to by any one Member?"
- Shea: "I'm sure he'll see about taking it off the list."
- Madison: "Thank you."
- Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."
- Hudson: "Well Mr. Speaker, my question of Mr. Shea, if he would respond,
would be similar."
- Bradley: "He indicates he will."
- Hudson: "Jerry, what would be the procedure, we would go to our leadership?"
- Shea: "You talk to your leadership about it. I just want to reiterate
one thing that this group of Bills started out at 560 and its now
down to 130, its those that came out of Committees without dissenting
votes and its been, both sides of the aisle have looked at it very
thoroughly. I'd like you to look at the list, that's why each Member
will have the list of Bills on his desk before he goes home tonight.
We can discuss it in the morning further."
- Hudson: "Well, my question was, does it take bipartisan agreement to
knock a Bill off of this?"
- Shea: "The leadership on either side was able to knock it off."
- Hudson: "Thank you."
- Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, do you seek recognition?"
- Ryan: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. Representative Shea, looking ahead
to the 23rd of this month, assuming that we still have some Bills
that remain on the calendar at the end of the deadline, can you tell
me what's going to happen to those Bills that are on Third Reading
that are on the calendar now?"
- Shea: "No, I think that something the leadership will probably look at
next week, Mr. Ryan."
- Ryan: "Well I think that it might be important, Mr. Shea, now if its
gonna mean, and I don't know what it means, but if its gonna mean
that we should stay here for the twenty-four hours that we're talking
about going home, and it would make the difference as to whether all



the Members got their Bills out or not, I would concur with Representative Mann that maybe we ought to stay here and try and get them out. There's not much of an incentive to go home."

Shea: "Well, I'm informed that the Speaker will meet with the Minority Leader tomorrow and go over the schedule and try to do everything to accommodate the Members in any way possible."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Bradley: "On House Bills' Third Reading appears House Bill 759."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 759. Schraeder. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act relation to alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Bill. There was no opposition in Committee, it was on the consent calendar and there was an objection made only because of the fact that he wanted to take a look at it. We put back on...what it does, it puts the hearing office in Springfield for those downstate that want to appeal their violation and suspension by the local liquor commissioner. It also makes it more reasonable as far as maintaining records for the people that need them, and I would move the adoption of the House Bill."

Bradley: "The question is shall House Bill 759 pass. All those in favor will signify by voting aye. Those opposed by voting no. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Arnell, to explain his vote."

Arnell: "No, to ask a question, Mr. Speaker, I had my light on before ...a...I would like to ask a question of the sponsor."

Bradley: "Alright."

Arnell: "Representative Schraeder, you indicate...a...the digest indicates that the section requiring an obstructive view from the street of licensed premises where liquor is consumed is going to be eliminated. Is that correct?"

Schraeder: "Yeh, it just does the same thing that you might have with an inside establishment for eating in that they have walls all around, it just does the same thing for an establishment such as that."

Arnell: "Well wasn't it originally in the law for a specific purpose to enable law enforcement officials to be able to observe the interior of the premises?"



Schraeder: "I don't know the original...a...background of the law. All I know is that most establishments now feel that they ought to be treated equally as far as places that serve food and don't, that you can go inside and take a look if you want. That's all I know, I don't know the background of it."

Arnell: "Thank you."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I had my light on and I hope that I could ask a question before the question was put, but..."

Bradley: "Go ahead and proceed with your question."

Bluthardt: "The digest is a little...lacks sufficient information for me to make a judgement. Does this Bill prohibit the sale of alcohol in the small container, that's one that is a little less than two ounces, that goes pretty good on fishing trips? Is that prohibited, the one and three quarter ounce container? Mr. Schraeder?"

Schraeder: "No, it doesn't prohibit it, it has nothing to do with it."

Bluthardt: "Well, what does the digest mean when it says that its limited to certain size containers?"

Schraeder: "There was, in the Bill, there was mention of less than an ounce, that was amended out, so that is not in there now. Its the same as the present language as far as the shot glass is concerned."

Bluthardt: "I'm not worried about the shot glass, I'm worried about that little bottle of V.O. or something, that some people like to take out when its a cold day and they're fishing."

Schraeder: "It has nothing to do with that. That wasn't changed, I didn't want to change that at all and it was not changed."

Bluthardt: "Alright. Thank you."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holeywinski."

Holeywinski: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the sponsor."

Bradley: "He indicates he'll yield."

Holeywinski: "Why are we mandating that the Liquor Commission have its principle office in Springfield?"

Schraeder: "I'm sorry."

Holeywinski: "I say why are we mandating that the Liquor Commission have its principle office in Springfield?"



Schraeder: "Well this basically is the main provision of the Bill. Up until the present administration, we had a central office in Springfield for any of those people that were appealing their sentences from their local liquor commissioners. Under this administration, they moved the main office, in fact, the office, to Chicago. So those downstate from even the far tip, clear down as far as you can go, have to go to Chicago for a hearing and we're establishing this that it would have to be maintained in Springfield for the convenience of the downstaters. They can have one in Chicago, but they've got to have one in Springfield as well."

Bradley: "Is there further discussion? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 94 ayes, 9 voting no, 34 voting present, and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 768. Mr. Hirschfeld."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 768. Hirschfeld. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning jurors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, during the early part of the Judiciary Committee hearing, a Bill was brought before the Committee by Representative Tim Simms, one of the Republican whips, to exempt television people from jury duty. And we did not realize at that time that newspaper people were exempted from jury duty and so that Committee suggested that I draw up a Bill removing the exemption from jury duty of persons on editorial or mechanical staff in the department of newspapers. We try and get the broad as possible....no one can think of any reason why the newspaper, at least, shouldn't be eligible for a jury duty, they could always be challenged by a lawyer and that's what this Bill does, it makes...a...it removes the exemption of newspaper people from serving on a jury and I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Washburn."

Washburn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Bradley: "He indicates he will."



Washburn: "Now as I understand this Bill, it exempts the editorial and mechanical staff of newspapers from jury duty."

Hirschfeld: "No, no sir, it does not, it removes the exemption."

Washburn: "They...they must serve on jury...well, John, do you think that that's fair that they should be both...they...they act in the capacity of judges seven days a week, do you think that they should be permitted to serve on jury?"

Hirschfeld: "I would have to quote a comment I just heard, what I'm trying to do is make them first class citizens again."

Washburn: "Thank you."

Bradley: "Is there further discussion? If not, the question is shall House Bill 768 pass. All those in favor will signify by voting aye. Those, by voting no. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 121 ayes, 4 voting no, 9 present, and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Jack O'Brien: "Representative Shea in the Chair."

Greiman: "I'm trying to follow a little ahead. Are we taking these cases...a...these Bills off of the House calendar or off of the priority of call?"

Shea: "Going right down the House calendar, sir."

Greiman: "Well, we have...we went...we skipped over 761 and 764, and 765 to get Mr. Hirschfeld's very good Bill."

Shea: "Mr. Greiman, hold on for one minute. The calendar that I have is marked in error, and its my fault, would you call House Bill 761 please?"

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 761. Greiman. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the consideration. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 761 is, I hope, a very temporary measure. By its terms, it will expire on July of 1977, so its for a two year period. And what the Bill does is to address itself to a very serious problem. In society and



economy with a 9 per cent employment, as people get fired, terminated, laid off, they lose their medical insurance, and they are told at that time, that you can take out an individual policy. When they checked the policy, they find that it is usually about 50% higher premium, and about 50% less benefit. This Bill requires that the policy benefit and the group premium be extended for a period of six months from the date of termination. It requires the employee to pay all of the premium. The employer does not, nor does the insurance company have to carry him. There are noted provisions whereby the employer gives notice to the insurance company carrier and the carrier, in turn, gives notice to the individual. And the policy is then extended for only a period of six months. As I indicated before, the Bill itself would die in two years. I would hope that the employment of our economy would be such that we would all be happy to see this Bill die in two years, that employment would be back up to the standards that we all have become use to. But I think this obviously...a...the extension of medical insurance to individuals who will be unemployed will otherwise find ourselves paying it out of Public Aid, having a great burden on the State itself. I might say to you that the Department of Insurance approved this...worked with me in developing it and at the hearing, the insurance companies only objection were not with the notion of it, not even with the risk that might be enhanced, but rather only with the additional paper work that they would be forced to get involved with. That was their only objection. And I ask that this Bill be passed out of this House. Thank you."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 761 pass. Discussion on the question? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, would the sponsor yield for questioning?"

Shea: "He indicates he will."

Madison: "Representative Greiman, I can very well understand the... the reason for the Bill, particularly as it relates to persons who are laid off because their being away from work is a situation that is not necessarily the desire of the employer, but due to economic conditions. But your Bill also includes persons that have been fired,



can you tell me why those persons should be included in this?"

Greiman: "Well, you know the point really is that it's a very temporary economic measure. Now if we have to have some kind of administrative hearing to determine whether a guy's been fired, or whether he's been laid off, what the employer's reasons were. You know the employer may say everybody is...don't come back on Monday. Well, is he fired or is he laid off? I don't know. And if the poor guy has to make that determination with a lot of red tape and get some kind of legal determination, whatnot, I think we may be frustrating the intent of the Bill. And I'm not sure that a guy not fired shouldn't be able to go on the group policy while he's looking for a new job. You know the risk is not in hand, and if he's sick, he's sick."

Madison: "Thank you."

Shea: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Stubblefield."

Stubblefield: "Would the sponsor yield for a question, please?"

Shea: "He indicates he will. Mr. Greiman."

Stubblefield: "I've only read the synopsis and not the Bill, but when it talks about providing continued coverage for the Member, are you talking about dependents also?"

Greiman: "It would be the same coverage that he had, the same quality of coverage. If he had individual coverage, he would continue that. They would not be able to cut down his insurance coverage."

Stubblefield: "But it would include the dependent?"

Greiman: "Oh yes."

Stubblefield: "Thank you."

Shea: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Representative Greiman, did I understand you that the employer would pay this full amount for six months?"

Greiman: "No, no, not at all. The individual employee pays it. Not the employer."

Neff: "The employee would pay it?"

Greiman: "Absolutely."

Neff: "Thank you."



Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Representative Greiman, who is ah... the ah... employee supposed to pay the premiums to?"

Greiman: "He's going to have to pay it directly to the carrier."

Terzich: "Not the ah... employer?"

Greiman: "Right, not the employer."

Terzich: "Well, who's going to assume the risk? The employers group insurance or the insurance carrier?"

Greiman: "The risk of what?"

Terzich: "The ah.. losses."

Greiman: "The losses will be by the carrier. They're getting a premium."

Terzich: "How are they to determine the risk or the premiums on that?"

Greiman: "Well, these policies are all determined on a per-employee premium basis. You know, you buy these policies sorta like you buy a car. Everything is an accessory and each item has a cost ah.. has a predetermined cost and ah.. they know that ah.. you know, it's \$62.43 a month for this kind of coverage. They know what the amounts are. They are computed down to the individual item and the individual insured."

Terzich: "Well, I happen to be familiar with the group insurance product and the premium rates are based upon the individual group and not the individual person that the ah.... well, the insurance companies have a binding contract and their premium rates are determined by their experienced figures on an individual basis and not on a group basis. How could they determine the premium?"

Greiman: "He was in fact, a member of the group and the group was in fact determined when he was a member of that group. What we're doing is extending his group status for a period of six months while he looks for a job. That's all."

Terzich: "I'd like to speak on the Bill."

Shea: "Proceed."

Terzich: "I happen to have some familiarity with the group insurance product and ah... many of these companies do have conversion plans. As a matter of fact, we just passed a Bill out by Representative Bradley which gave them an extension of group insurance benefits ah... as long



they were on recall. I think that this should be the concern of the individual to determine whether or not he wants to convert his insurance. Normally most employers pay the entire cost for the employee and the group insurance premium is quite substantial, that the monthly cost for just family insurance runs at approximately \$50 to \$100 a month and no employee, especially one that's been laid off, can afford such a premium of that nature and I ah.. I don't think that the Bill is operable and I don't believe that it should be another burden on the insurance industry to ah.. assume this risk, that they can purchase an individual policy that would be designed to meet their own needs and we know that each individual's needs are different."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Lucco."

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

Shea: "He indicates he'll yield."

Lucco: "Am I correct in assuming that this would cover employees of all crafts, professions, and I'm thinking particularly of school teachers?"

Greiman: "This would cover ah.. I would think, anybody that is part of a group. Yes."

Lucco: "Thank you, I support it."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman to close."

Greiman: "Well, I would just shortly make this observation; that if the man cannot afford to pay that monthly premium, he certainly cannot afford to pay the catastrophic cost of medical care today. If he should be ah.. find himself with no medical coverage while he is unemployed. The problem of the individual policy that Representative Terzich eludes to, is that the premiums are 50% more and the coverage is 50% less and there's not reason for it. The risk is not in hand. I ask you ah.. this is a temporary Bill, as I pointed out, and let's all hope that this Bill does not have to be reintroduced again ever, ever in this General Assembly. Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook moves the passage of House Bill 761. All in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 126 'aye' and 4 'nay' and 7 Members voting 'present' and House Bill 761 having received the constitutional



majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of House Bills,
Third Reading appears House Bill 779."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 779....."

Shea: "Did that get passed earlier today? Now I know why we've got it
circled on the Clerk's Calendar. House Bill 785."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 785, Garmisa. A Bill for an Act to amend the
Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill
1062 is a companion Bill to House Bill 785. I would like to have them
heard together."

Shea: "The Gentleman asks leave if he may hear House Bill 1062 at the
same time. Is there objection? Hearing none, leave is granted.
Read House Bill 1062."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1062. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act in
relation to state finance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 785 extends
to a maximum of four years. The original Bill asks for ten years and
was amended in Committee down to four. It is now two years. That
would be the period for which the Department of General Services can
lease facilities. Now leases of more than ten years, there will
be a requirement for competitive bidding and a clause in the lease
stipulating that the obligation to pay rent is subject to passage of
a suitable appropriation by the General Assembly. The present two
year limitation is burdensome to potential lessors. Most realtors
are not interested in leasing valuable office space for a term of
two years or less. This is particularly true if some alteration of
the space is needed. As a result, our options among various potential
lessors are seriously reduced by the present two year limitation.
In 1062 ah.. this Bill would merely amend the State Finance Act to
permit expenditure from appropriations for leases that would be longer
than the two years. I would ask for ah... the support of every Member
of the House on the passage of these Bills."

Shea: "The question is shall these Bill pass. The Gentleman from Adams,
Mr. McClain."

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



this is a tremendous Bill and I would like to compliment Representative Garmisa on this. As you look throughout the state and try to coordinate and organize all of our state agency offices into one regional office, ah.. we can't do it because of ah... this statutory prohibition and with this Bill now ah.. we can do it and I really compliment Representative Garmisa. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Shea: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Shea: "He indicates he will."

Skinner: "Representative Garmisa, in my county is a facility leased by General Services Administration of the State of Illinois for federal surplus property, which apparently resulted in an extended term lease. I'm not sure how many years ah.. I think it was the two ah.. that the synopsis says is the limit. This is criticized very strongly by the local Democratic Party ah.. because it just happens ah.. the corporation just happened to have ah... as a lawyer ah.. the patronage Committee Chairman of the Republic Party in McHenry, who is also the brother of the State's Attorney. I ah.. wonder if similar criticism might end up being levied against Democratic politicians in various counties if this Bill were passed and perhaps a way you could allay our fears would be to explain the bidding procedure that is set forth in this Bill. Could you do that?"

Garmisa: "The bidding procedures that are set forth in this Bill are the same bidding procedures that are applied under the State Purchasing Act."

Skinner: "Well, how would this differ from the procedures that were utilized in the McHenry ah.. federal surplus warehouse?"

Garmisa: "You're talking now ah.. Representative Skinner, about a federal piece of property here. This would not apply to any federal property. This is only ah... we're only talking about state owned or leased facilities."

Skinner: "Well, I realize the federal surplus warehouse is a long way from Chicago, but if ah.. it is part of state government. The federal surplus property is given to state government and then the state is



required to charge the amount of money that is costs to sell that property. Ah... such as trucks or band-aids or ah... you know, all sorts of junk that the federal government doesn't want. Now, I have a really specific question of ah... how this differs from that and ah... there was so much critizism from the local Democrats, I certainly don't want any local Democrats from any other county to have to undergo similar critizism in....."

Shea: "Are you asking questions or making statements, Sir?"

Skinner: "As usual, a combination of both, I'm afraid."

Shea: "Again, ah.. might I remind Mr. Miller that one of the lights, Sir or ah.. one of the bars are out on my side. This is House Bill 785 and House Bill 1062 that we're debating and ah.. that's what happened."

Skinner: "What I'm trying to say, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is that I really have no hang-up over the attempt to make the letting of state contracts more efficient, but perhaps a more specific answer than is available at your finger tips might be merited before we vote on the Bill."

Garmisa: "The answer to your question is yes."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook to close, Mr. Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we actually would be able to pay more favorable terms through long term leases and the security of knowing how long exactly how long the lessor can count on the building be occupied would cause more favorable terms for the state. We now negotiate over 1100 leases every two years and they all fall subject to renewal at the same time. This creates quite a burden on our Real Estate Division. Now under this Bill we could spit up the renwal dates. I ask for a favorable vote on these real good Bills."

Shea: "The question is shall these Bills pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed will vote 'nay'. Take two records, Mr. Clerk. Have all.... the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner to explain his vote."

Skinner: "More likely to explain the answer that the Gentleman gave. . Everyone remembers that he said, 'yes'. Now let's go back and repeat the question again. The question would be, 'Would local Republicans



be able to criticize local Democrats for making deals that might be abusive to...or might be favorable to friends of local Democrats, and the Gentleman said, virtually, yes."

Shea: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On these questions there are 116 ayes, 13 nays, 11 voting present, House Bill 785 and House Bill 1062 are hereby declared passed, having received the constitutional majority, are hereby declared passed. Geo-Karls wishes to vote aye on both Bills. Mr. Madison, did you have a question?"

Madison: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, its not related to this so if you want to finish, I'll ask it later."

Shea: "Mr. Walsh. On the Resolutions, the Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Fennessey."

Fennessey: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to ask leave to have the Members of the Subcommittees and the Election contest meet now in the Minority Leader's office."

Shea: "The motion is does the Gentleman have leave to have a Subcommittee of the Election Committee meet in the Minority's office...Minority Leader's office while the House is in session? Is there objection? Hearing none, leave is granted and the Subcommittee on Elections may have their meeting while the House is in session. On...the...its the intention of the Chair to go to Agreed Resolutions. There is one Resolution on the calendar that will die tonight and then, hopefully to wind up and be out of here very shortly. Now the Minority... Assistant Minority Leader, Mr. Walsh, on a question. Did you have a question, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "No sir."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, on a question."

Madison: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, is it the intention of the Chair to, after the Agreed Resolutions, to continue with Third Reading?"

Shea: "No sir."

Madison: "Thank you very much."

Shea: "We have three pieces of business and it is the intention of the Speaker to try and...my instructions were to try and wind up the session by 9 o'clock."



Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I would just like to remind the Chair that in the consideration of the Agreed List that has been passed out to us, there are two Bills on this Agreed List that we have just passed today."

Shea: "That is very possible...very early in the list."

Madison: "Yes, it is not only possible, it is true."

Shea: "Just in case there's any question, the List that was passed out to you shows a legend on it "Special User Report 88", I believe its entitled. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fary."

Fary: "Mr. Speaker, there's one Joint House Resolution that's been laying on the Clerk's desk for a couple of days, and it concerns the month of May, and I would appreciate very much if we could get rid of that this evening and send it over to the Senate."

Shea: "We will try to get it done today, sir."

Fary: "I'd like to have the Clerk read it. Thank you very much."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if it is proper at this time, I would like to put a motion."

Shea: "What is that sir?"

Barnes: "I would move at this time, and this has been cleared with the leadership on both sides of the aisle and of the Minority spokesman on the Appropriations II Committee to suspend the proper rules so that House Bill 2103 could be heard in Appropriations II on Monday. This Bill was in Committee today and it set aside and we'd like to sentence a hearing on it Monday, if I could so move, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "My understanding, the question...the Gentleman has questioned is leave to hear House Bill 2103 on the Appropriations II hearing on Monday, and waive the posting notice. Now on that question, Mr. Ryan, did you have a statement sir?"

Ryan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, yes, Mr. Barnes is right, we've agreed to do this and I would certainly hope every Member on this side of the aisle would support him."

Shea: "All those in favor will vote aye. Those opposed will vote nay. It takes 107 votes. Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this there are 135 ayes, zero nays, zero present, the motion is passed.....er... adopted. Agreed Resolutions. Mr. Madigan."



Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 277, Terzich. House Resolution 278, Younge. House Resolution 279. Hirschfeld."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Resolution 277 commends Mr. and Mrs. Nicolas Wasteena of Chicago upon the celebration of their 50th wedding anniversary. House Resolution 278 commends William Mason upon his election as the Mayor of the City of East St. Louis. And House Resolution 279 commends Mr. John Broderick upon being named as a Professor Emeritus at the University of Notre Dame Law School. I move of the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor will say aye, those opposed say nay. The ayes have it, the Resolutions are adopted. On the Clerk's desk, there is a Resolution...what's that number Mr.....Fary's Resolution."

Jack O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 51."

Shea: "House Joint Resolution 51. Would you read the Resolution?"

Jack O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 51. Fary, et al. Whereas the month of May has been proclaimed National Tavern Month and is therefore highly appropriate to pay tribute to the little jovial tavern keeper, who runs the little corner tavern keeper is a bullwark of the community's social structure, he owns property in the community, his children attend the same school with yours. They attend the same church and he supports all neighborhood functions from weddings to funerals, be it a bowling team, a boy's little league baseball team, or a Girl Scouting expedition. And whereas he always runs a clean, decent, respectable tavern where you can still lay down a five dollar bill, have a few drinks with your neighbors, talk a little politics, and still get change back, and the house will 'pop' too. And whereas it is fitting to honor the little corner tavern keeper and his fine wife, who with their bondless hospitality has solaced so many and to give him the well-merited praise and recognition he so richly deserves. Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 79th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that as an expression of our sentiment and thankfulness for all the good will he has fostered among so many people, to all the little jovial tavern owners in the State of Illinois, we offer with a symbolic



lift of our several glasses, the toast of the nation, that we have sent their sons and daughters to settle this great land of ours, the Polish will say 'Nadrovee'; the Germans will say 'Guzunheit' or 'Propstet'..."

Shea: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the House is still in session and there are several more important pieces of business. Proceed Mr. Clerk."

Jack O'Brien: "The Lithuanians will say 'Hunstrovich'; the Bohemians will say 'Nowdarln'; the Scotmen will say 'Hoot man'; the Swede will say 'Schol'; the Norwegian will say 'Schow'; the Italian will say 'Bonafona a salute'; the Jew will say 'Lacheim'; the Greek will say 'Seeyah'; the Frenchman will say 'Bonafonte'; the Spaniard will say 'Lateena'; the Armenian will say 'Kanoosa'; the Irishman will say 'Salantee'; the U. S. American will drink it and will say to all 'Cheers', 'Here's mud in your eye', 'Bottoms up', 'Down the hatch', 'Here goes', 'To your health', and be it further resolved that suitable copies of the Preamble and Resolution be tossed to the winds of hilarity."

Shea: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Fary."

Fary: "Mr. Speaker, I invite the cosponsorship of any Member who desires to place his name on this wonderful Resolution. Incidentally, the beer nuts were furnished through the courtesy of Representative Bradley, and the beer nut company in Bloomington in Bradley's district. And I move to waive the rules for immediate adoptions so that this fine Resolution may be sent over to the Senate."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the waiving...does he have leave first to waive the rules in immediate adoption. Hearing no objection, he moves for adoption. All in favor will say aye. Those opposed, nay. The ayes have it and the Resolution is adopted. On the Speaker's Table, on the order...on the Speaker's Table appears Senate Joint Resolution 38. The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Resolution provides for the extension of the unemployment compensation investigating body, a joint Committee comprised of Senators and Members of the House, and the reporting date was May 5th. I was lead to believe that this Resolution was already adopted when I spoke earlier in the day and



it would extend the life of the Committee until June 25, and I'd appreciate very much a vote on this Resolution."

Shea: "The question is shall Senate Joint Resolution 38 pass. All in favor will say aye. The opposed, nay. The ayes have it and the Resolution is adopted. On the order of Senate Bills' Second Reading appears Senate Bill 2998....on the order of House Bills' Second Reading appears House Bill 2998. The Gentleman from Cook, Houlihan, J. M."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2998 is a Bill which would provide a deficiency appropriation for the Department of Registration and Education. It makes certain transfers and makes an appropriation of an additional \$534,000 for the Department. This Bill was heard in Committee, its on Second Reading now and I believe there are no Committee Amendments."

Shea: "Read the Bill."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 2998. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Registration and Education. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Shea: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "None."

Shea: "Third Reading. On the Speaker's Table.....the Assistant Minority Leader, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well Mr. Speaker, procedurally, I think you should have asked for a suspension of the rules on that before the Bill was read."

Shea: "Well, I thought, procedurally, what I did was went to House Bills' Second Reading and then asked leave of the House if I could go out of order and hear the Bill. Perhaps, I didn't do it right sir."

Walsh: "I don't like the procedure, I'd feel a lot better about voting on those things and giving it 107 votes."

Shea: "Thank you Mr. Walsh, I'll try to remember that. On the Speaker's Table, appears House Joint Resolution for Mr. Hudson and Mr. Duester. Which of the....the Chair recognizes Mr. Duester on House Joint Resolution 4."

Duester: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think all of



the Members know what this is, the synopsis is correct, it would appoint a Joint Subcommittee of the House and Senate Executive Committees to do as the State of Virginia did and that was to conduct a thorough and comprehensive study of all of the legal ramifications of the Equality of Rights Amendment and to provide a report to the House and Senate January, 1976. I think all of us, whatever our views might be, can always use more information, whether you are for or against, I think that the subject will be with us and I would be happy to answer any questions, but I would urge the adoption of House Joint Resolution 4."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 4. Is there debate? The Lady from DuPage, Ms. Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that this is a reference to start making a comprehensive study of the pros and cons of the Equal Rights Amendment. Since this House passed this out a couple of weeks ago with a vote of 113 to 62, I would suggest that anybody who votes yes on this Resolution would be revealing that they cast that vote without doing their homework, whether they voted yes or no. So I would suggest you resoundingly defeat this proposal."

Shea: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Chapman. What? Mr. Lechowicz. Mr. Lechowicz on a point of order."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe that that item should not be part of the agenda at this time, this evening, because that Resolution was adopted by this House overwhelmingly and in turn, to have a item that is still be considered in the Senate and now we're moving on this type of a Resolution, I believe is out of order."

Shea: "Mr. Lechowicz, on the calendar appears, on the Speaker's Table House Joint Resolution 4. It expires, as I read it, 5-17, which is tomorrow. I've been requested to hear it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan. Mr. Speaker, we all know the issue that is involved here, we've heard much to much of it, I move that the motion of Mr. Duester be laid on the table, non-debateable. Non-debateable motion, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "The motion is that the motion to adopt, of Mr. Duester's, lay



on the table. That is a non-debateable motion. On that question, the Assist...er, the Minority Leader, Mr. Washburn, did you wish to be recognized sir?"

Washburn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that Representative Duester should have the opportunity to present his case on House Joint Resolution #4, as he had stated, it expires tomorrow. I would certainly hope that this House, even though we've been moving at a quite a rapid pace in a ramrod fashion, everyone's going to have an opportunity to have their legislation heard, and heard properly, and I don't think this should be any exception regardless of what the subject matter might be. Whether it be good or bad, this Resolution or any piece of legislation, the legislator should have the opportunity to have it heard and have it heard properly."

Shea: "Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Washburn wants to listen in deference to Mr. Washburn, I'll withdraw my motion."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz. He's raising a point of order."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, its always been the prerogative of this House..."

Shea: "I'll recognize the Members one at a time, and we'll have some order in the chamber. Now Mr. Lechowicz on a point of order."

Lechowicz: "My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that I believe that the motion is in order and its always been the courtesy of this House that the sponsor of his Resolution or whether it be a Bill, have the opportunity to close. And I believe, Bud, that that should be... that is in order and I'd like to renew the motion."

Shea: "Your motion is what, Mr. Lechowicz?"

Lechowicz: "Lay on the table."

Shea: "The Gentleman makes the motion to lay on the table the Gentleman's motion to adopt. Its a non-debateable motion. The motion is non-debateable. The Assistant Minority Leader, Mr. Walsh, on a point of order."

Walsh: "Well Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, and Ms. Geo-Karis, in addition to this being cruel and inhuman treatment and something that shouldn't be done to any sponsor in this House,



I submit to you that this motion is out of order because the motion has the same effect as the motion to adopt. The Roll Call would simply be reversed and the affect of this is simply to confuse the issue to the Members and to confuse the public in examining the Roll Call to determine how their legislator voted. So I suggest to you that the motion is out of order and it should be withdrawn, or the Chair if the sponsor...or the maker of the motion insists on it, the Chair should rule it out of order."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matejevich, on a point of order."

Matjevich: "Well I guess the Assistant Minority Leader, I don't know how true it is, a point of order, but he definitely is out of order. The motion is proper under the rules, under Rule 65, it allows the motion to be laid on the table. I agree with the Minority Leader, Bud Washburn, that courtesy dictates that Representative Duester ought to close. We have always done that and I agree with that, but the motion to lay on the table is in order and I believe Representative Walsh knows that."

Shea: "The Gentleman from...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff, on a point of order."

Duff: "Well Mr. Speaker, you recognized Representative Lechowicz on a point of order and he rose on a point of order, but made a motion. Now it seems to me that that would be out of order."

Shea: "The...the Gentle...the motion is in order, he's made it. The Gentleman from Cook, or from Lake, Mr. Duester, to close, unless one of the other flashing lights I see wants to raise a point of order. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. In all fairness, I withdraw."

Shea: "Mr...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, withdraws. Now back on the motion to adopt and on that question, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll move the previous question."

Shea: "The question is shall the main question now be put. All those in favor will say aye. Those opposed will say no. The ayes have it and the main question is now put and who do we wish to close, Mr. Duester or Mr. Hudson? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Duester, or Mr. Hudson."



Hudson: "Mr. Speaker, I will yield to Mr. Duester for the purpose of closing, but I hope that as one of the co-sponsors of this Bill, I will have a chance, at least, to explain my vote. Is that in order?"

Shea: "I will recognize you for that purpose."

Hudson: "Thank you."

Shea: "Mr. Duester to close."

Duester: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think all of us are humble enough to realize that on contraversial and emotional subjects, there are always two sides. I suppose, as one who has been opposed to this proposition, my greatest fears probably woudn't come to pass, but to those proponents who look that this is heaven coming along, perhaps, it won't be that way either. But I think all of us can use some additional information. The State of Virginia did this and what we would have is, next year, whether the Senate rejects this as they seem inclined to do, or whether they adopt it, it will be a concern and a subject to all of us and we want to conscienciously be able to explain our positions whatever they be with documentation and with a deliberative piece that would be the report of this Joint House and and Senate Executive Subcommittee. I urge the adoption of this Resolution. I think it's responsible and I think it will provide us with a factual foundation, which is what the General Assembly is all about, and I urge your aye vote and I thank you for it."

Shea: "The question is shall House Joint Resolution 4 pass. All those in favor will say aye. Those opposed will say nay. All those in favor will say aye....to pass. All those in favor say aye to pass. Those opposed say nay. In the opinion of the Chair, its to close to call and the Chair will ask for a Roll Call. All those in favor will vote aye. Those opposed will vote nay. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson, to explain his vote."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker, I shall attempt to be brief. I don't understand what anyone, either proponents or opponents has to fear from a continuing study of this matter, which is vital to us. Whether or not we have acted here in the House seems to me to be beside the point. The Senate has yet to act, the matter, whether it is passed



or rejected by the Illinois Legislature, will continue to be with us. And it would seem to me we have nothing to fear from continued information, hard, factual information on which to base future judgements relevant to this matter. So I do urge you, my colleagues, to get on some green lights and support a continuing study of this matter which can so vitally effect everyone of us in the State of Illinois and across the country."

Shea: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Duester."

Duester: "Yes, I hope the Members will understand that when we are amending the Constitution of our Nation, it is a very serious subject, and I hope you will understand that when I request a verification of the negative."

Shea: "On this question, there are 53 ayes, 79 nays, and 1 voting present, on this question, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Duester."

Duester: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain something to the Members before I make a further motion and that is that I think all of you should understand that Representative Hudson and I have been asking to have this matter heard at a reasonable time for, I believe, at least a week and a half. And I think, as you know, we're interested in the subject of equality of rights. And I must say when the proponents asked for theirs to be heard, it was set just 'snap' like that. So I do apologize that this has had to come up at this time, but because it does not expire until tomorrow, and because there are Members who are not here, and because I think the Constitution of the United States is a very important document and a very serious one, I would ask out of respect to your time and to the subject that is in balance here, that this be placed on the order of postponed consideration."

Shea: "Postponed consideration. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan. Death Resolutions."

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 276. Daniel. With respect to the memory of Mr. Robert Martin."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Death Resolution."



All in favor say aye. Those opposed say nay. The ayes have it.
Now the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "I move, Mr. Speaker, that the House recess for five minutes
and then adjourn until 10:15 tomorrow morning."

Shea: "You've heard the motion, all in favor say aye. Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of an announcement, I
would hope that the Members of Appropriations Committee I would
meet in Room 114 at 8:30 in the morning as posted. And the Members
of Appropriations II would meet in Room 118 at 8:30 in the morning
as posted. Thank you very much."

Shea: "We have several more announcements. Mr. Ryan, the Gentleman
from Kankakee, the House is only in recess so we're still here.
Go ahead sir."

Ryan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Lechowicz, did you say the
Appropriations II meeting at 8:30 in the morning?"

Shea: "Back to Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "It is my understanding that it is Subcommittee meeting
of Appropriations II."

Ryan: "Subcommittee, not the whole Committee."

Lechowicz: "But the whole Committee of Appropriations I."

Shea: "Back to Mr. Ryan. Are there any further debates, discussions,
announcements? Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to announce that the Revenue Committee
is in a recessed meeting from last Tuesday morning and those of
you who have a constitutional amendment dealing with the Revenue
Article, please be there...those who are proponents or opponents
for those Resolutions, please be there tomorrow. We're meeting
at 8:15-8:30 in the morning, first thing, we'll be out by 9:30 we
hope."

Shea: "Where are you meeting, Mr. Maragos?"

Maragos: "In Room 118."

Shea: "Now where is Appropriations II Subcommittee meeting?"

Maragos: "They have moved to another meeting, they've been so notified."

Shea: "Are there any further announcements, motions, meetings? Mr.
Clerk?"

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bills First Reading."



Shea: "Senate Bills' First Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 594. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act providing for ratification or for ratifying into law the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitary Compact. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 597. A Bill for an Act to vacate land located in Jackson County. First Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "Committee Reports."

Jack O'Brien: "Mr. Lechowicz from the Committee on Appropriations I to which House Bill 1382 was referred, recommended that the Bill be assigned to Interim Study Calendar. Mr. Lechowicz from the Committee on Appropriations I to which Senate Bill 59 and 226 were referred, reported the same back with the recommendations that the Bills do pass. Mr. Lechowicz from the Committee on Appropriations I to which House Bills 1056, 1278, and 1588 were referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bills do pass. Mr. Lechowicz from the Committee on Appropriations I to which Senate Bill 426 was referred, reported the same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation that the Amendments be adopted and the Bills as amended do pass. Mr. Lechowicz from the Committee on Appropriations I to which House Bill 2701 was referred, reported same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation that the Amendments be adopted and the Bills, as amended, do pass. Mr. Lechowicz from the Committee on Appropriations I to which House Bill 1126, 1510, and 2056 were referred, reported the same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation that the Amendments be adopted and the Bill as amended do pass. Mr. Lechowicz from the Committee on Appropriations I to which Senate Bill 324, 385, and 431 were referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bills do pass. Mr. Matijevich from the Committee on Executive to which Senate Bill 272 was referred, reported same back the recommendation that the Bill do pass. Mr. Matijevich from Executive Committee, to which House Resolution 193 was referred reported same back with the recommendation that the Resolution be adopted. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee to which House Resolution 203 was referred, reported same back with the



recommendation that the Resolution be adopted. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee to which House Resolution 215 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Resolution be adopted. Mr. Matijevich from Executive Committee to which House Resolution 151 was referred, reported same back with the recommendation that the Resolution not be adopted. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee to which House Resolution 183 was referred, reported the same back with recommendation that the Resolution not be adopted. Mr. Matijevich from Executive Committee to which House Resolution 200 was referred, reported same back with the recommendation that the Resolution not be adopted. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee to which House Resolution 230 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Resolution not be adopted. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee to which House Resolution 189 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Resolution be adopted. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee to which House Resolution 128 was referred, reported same back with the recommendation that the Resolution be adopted. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee to which House Joint Resolution 29 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Resolution be adopted. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee to which House Joint Resolution 39 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Resolution be adopted. Mr. Matijevich from Executive Committee to which House Joint Resolution 43 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Resolution be adopted. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee to which House Resolution 45 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Resolution be adopted. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee to which House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #6 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation the Resolution do pass. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee to which House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #7 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the



Resolution do pass. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee to which House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #9 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Resolution do pass. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee to which House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #29 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Resolution do pass. Mr. Matijevich from Executive Committee to which House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #1 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Resolution do not pass. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee, to which House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #2 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Resolution do not pass. Mr. Matijevich from Executive Committee, to which House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #3 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Resolution do not pass. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee to which House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #4 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Resolution do not pass. Mr. Matijevich from Executive Committee to which House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #5 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Resolution do not pass. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee to which House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #19 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bill do not pass. No further Committee Reports."

Shea: "Any further business?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further business."



INDEX
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
May 16, 1975



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

INDEX
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

May 16, 1975

TIME	SPEAKER	DESCRIPTION
10:48	Speaker Redmond	House in order
10:48	Reverend Krueger	Prayer
	Speaker Redmond	Roll Call
10:50	Jack O'Brien	Message from Senate
10:51	Speaker Redmond	House at ease for 10 minutes
11:12	Speaker Redmond	House in order - Introduction First Reading
11:12	Jack O'Brien	House Bills First Reading
	Shea	HB 3016 - leave to suspend rule for Second Reading
	Speaker Redmond	
	Washburn	
11:15	Shea	
	Speaker Redmond	HB 598 Third Reading
	Jack O'Brien	HB 779 Third Reading
	Speaker Redmond	
11:16	Willer	
	Speaker Redmond	HB 779 passed
	Jack O'Brien	HB 838 Third Reading
	Speaker Redmond	
11:18	McGrew	Sponsor
	Speaker Redmond	HB 838
11:18	Berman	
11:20	Speaker Redmond	
11:20	McGrew	



11:21	Speaker Redmond	HB 838 lost
	Jack O'Brien	HB 555 LaFleur Second Reading no Committee Amendments
	Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
	LaFleur	Leave to return to Committee for interim study
	Speaker Redmond	Leave
11:23	Jack O'Brien	HB 620 Second Reading - read previous Amendment #1 adopted - Amendment #2
	Speaker Redmond	
11:23	Hart	Leave to withdraw #2
	Jack O'Brien	Amendment #3
	Speaker Redmond	
11:23	Jaffe	Amendment #3
	Speaker Redmond	
	Shea)	
11:25	Jaffe)	
	Speaker Redmond	Amendment #3 HB 620 adopted
	Jack O'Brien	Amendment #4
11:25	Campbell	Withdraw
	Speaker Redmond	Leave
	Jack O'Brien	Amendment #5
	Speaker Redmond	Amendment #5 HB 620 adopted - Third Reading
11:27	Jack O'Brien	HB 1136 Second Reading - read previous
	Speaker Redmond	
	Rigney	Amendment #3
	Speaker Redmond	
	Hart	



	Speaker Redmond	
11:28	Hanahan	
	Speaker Redmond	Amendment #3 adopted Third Reading
11:29	Jack O'Brien	HB 680
	Speaker Redmond	
11:29	Skinner	
	Speaker Redmond	
11:30	Berman	Inquiry
11:30	Skinner	
	?	Introduction
	Jack O'Brien	HB 1064
	Speaker Redmond	
11:33	Jack O'Brien	HB 1167 Second Reading
	Speaker Redmond	
	Marovitz	Request for fiscal note - has been filed
	Jack O'Brien	Amendment #2
	Marovitz	
	Speaker Redmond	Amendment #2 adopted
11:35	Jack O'Brien	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Garmisa	Amendment #1 adopted
11:35	Jack O'Brien	Amendment #2
	Speaker Redmond	
	Garmisa	Amendment #2 - like to table
11:36	Speaker Redmond	Amendment #2 tabled
	Jack O'Brien	Amendment #3
11:36	Speaker Redmond	



	Garmisa	Leave to table #3
	Jack O'Brien	Amendment #4 - Garmisa
	Garmisa	Amendment #4
11:37	Speaker Redmond	Amendment #4 adopted
	Jack O'Brien	Amendment #5
11:38	Leinenweber	Amendment #5
	Speaker Redmond	Amendment #5 adopted Third Reading
11:38	Jack O'Brien	HB 1938 Second Reading - read previously - Amendment #1
11:39	Deavers	Amendment #1
	Speaker Redmond	Amendment #2 adopted
	Shea	
11:40	Deavers)	1955 is Keller's Bill
	Shea)	
	Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
	Jack O'Brien	HB 2347 Second Reading 1 Committee Amendment
	Speaker Redmond	
11:42	Pierce	Amendment #1
	Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted
11:43	Schuneman)	Question
	Pierce)	Discussion
	Speaker Redmond	
	Jack O'Brien	Amendment #3
11:44	Schuneman	
11:45	Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted
	Jack O'Brien	Amendment #4
	Pierce	Amendment #4



11:45	Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted
	Jack O'Brien	Amendment #5
	Speaker Redmond	
11:45	McPartlin	
	Speaker Redmond	
11:47	Pierce	
	Speaker Redmond	
11:49	McPartlin	
	Speaker Redmond	
11:50	Schuneman	Oppose
11:52	Speaker Redmond	Amendment #5
11:52	Pierce	
	Speaker Redmond	
11:53	Skinner	
11:55	Speaker Redmond	
11:56	Skinner	Verify Roll Call
	Jack O'Brien	
	Speaker Redmond	
11:57	McCourt	
	Speaker Redmond	
11:58	Anderson	Change to 'no'
	Speaker Redmond	
	Daniels	'No'
	Speaker Redmond	
11:59	DiPrima	
	Speaker Redmond	
12:00	Lucco	



	Speaker Redmond	
12:01	Bluthardt	
	Speaker Redmond	
12:01	Brinkmeier	
	Speaker Redmond	
12:02	Merlo	Vote 'aye'
	Speaker Redmond	
	Jack O'Brien	
	Marovitz	'No'
12:03	Speaker	
12:03	Maragos	'Present'
	Jack O'Brien	
12:03	Speaker Redmond	
12:03	Palmer	'No'
	Speaker Redmond	
12:03	Duff	'No'
	Speaker Redmond	Amendment fails Third Reading
12:03	Jack O'Brien	HB 2832 Second Reading - hold for fiscal note now filed
	Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
12:05	Jack O'Brien	HB 160 Third Reading
	Speaker Redmond	
	Borchers	Sponsor
	Speaker Redmond	
12:08	Mann)	
	Borchers)	
	Speaker Redmond)	
12:10	Mann	Address the Bill



	Speaker Redmond	
12:10	Borchers	
12:12	Speaker Redmond	HB 160 passed
	Jack O'Brien	
	Friedrich	HB 522 to Second for Amendment
12:13	Speaker Redmond	Leave
	Friedrich	Amendment #2
12:13	Fred Selcke	
12:13	Friedrich	
	Speaker Redmond	
12:13	Washington	
12:13	Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted
	Friedrich	
	Speaker Redmond	Return to postponed consideration
12:16	Hirschfeld	
12:16	Griesheimer	
12:18	Speaker Redmond	HB 644
12:19	Giorgi	Explains vote
	Speaker Redmond	
12:20	Porter	
	Speaker Redmond	
12:21	Washington	
	Speaker Redmond	
12:22	Geo-Karis	
	Speaker Redmond	
12:23	Londrigan	
	Speaker Redmond	



12:33	Shea	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Fennessey	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Jack O'Brien	
	Lundy	
	Speaker Redmond	
12:35	Washington	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Pierce	
	Speaker Redmond	
12:35	Hill	
	Ryan	
	Speaker Redmond	
12:35	Matijeovich	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Laurino	New Roll Call
12:36	Speaker Redmond	
12:36	Ryan	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Giorgi	
12:38	Speaker Redmond	
12:38	Davis	Personal privilege
	Speaker Redmond	HB 644 lost
	Jack O'Brien	HB 718
	?	HB 719
12:59	Hill	SB 23



	Speaker Redmond	
1:00	Skinner	
	Speaker Redmond	
1:02	Garmisa	
	Speaker Redmond	
1:05	Madison	Move previous question
	Speaker Redmond	
1:05	Downs	
	Speaker Redmond	
1:08	Schoeberlein	
	Speaker Redmond	
1:10	Madison	Move previous question
	Speaker Redmond	
1:10	Washburn	
	Speaker Redmond	SB 23
1:11	Hirschfeld	
	Speaker Redmond	
1:12	Duff	
	Speaker Redmond	
1:13	Gaines	
1:14	Skinner	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Simms	
1:14	Speaker Redmond	
1:15	Simms	Holy Rosary from North Chicago
	Speaker Redmond	
1:15	LaFleur	



	Speaker Redmond	
1:15	Hill	Verification
	Speaker Redmond	
1:16	Brinkmeier	'Aye'
	Speaker Redmond	
	Jack O'Brien	Affirmative Roll Call
	Speaker Redmond	
	Ryan	Poll absentees
	Speaker Redmond	
1:17	Skinner	Parliamentary inquiry
	Speaker Redmond	
	Skinner	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Jack O'Brien	Poll absentees & verify
1:27	Speaker Redmond	
	D'Arco	Vote me 'aye'
	Jack O'Brien	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Hill	
	Speaker Redmond	
1:29	Grotberg	Motion to reconsider
	Speaker Redmond	Motion fails
1:30	Ebbesen	
	Speaker Redmond	
1:33	Fennessey	Withdraw my objection
	Speaker Redmond	
1:33	Brinkmeier	
	Speaker Redmond	



1:35	Tipsword	
	Speaker Redmond	
1:37	Ebbesen	
	Speaker Redmond	HB 110 passed
1:37	Hirschfeld	Point of order
	Speaker Redmond	
1:38	Giorgi	
	Speaker Redmond	Consideration postponed
1:40	Deuster	Leave to bring back to Second for Amendment
	Speaker Redmond	Leave
1:40	Jack O'Brien	Amendment #4 - HB 14
	Deuster	
1:41	Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted - Third
	Shea	HB 3016 - leave to take to Second
	Speaker Redmond	Leave
1:42	Shea	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Giorgi	
	Speaker Redmond	
1:42	Tipsword	
	Speaker Redmond	
1:44	Tuerk)	Question
	Shea)	
1:46	Speaker Redmond	
	Schraeder	
	Speaker Redmond	
1:48	Dunn, R.	



	Speaker Redmond	
1:50	Leinenweber	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Stone	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Skinner	
	Speaker Redmond	
1:52	McClain	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Washington)	Question
1:54	Shea)	
	Speaker Redmond	
1:56	Hill	
	Speaker Redmond	
1:59	Winchester)	Yield?
	Shea)	
	Speaker Redmond	
2:00	Geo-Karis	
2:00	Winchester	
	speaker Redmond	
2:01	Geo-Karis	
	Speaker Redmond	
2:03	Kosinski	
	Speaker Redmond	
2:03	Walsh	
	Speaker Redmond	
2:05	Hanahan	



	Speaker Redmond	
2:07	Giorgi	
	Speaker Redmond	
2:08	Ewell	
	Speaker Redmond	HB
2:10	Catania	Bill been printed
	Speaker Redmond	Motion is adopted
2:11	Friedrich	HB 522
	Speaker Redmond	
2:11	Washington	
	Speaker Redmond	Suspend rules
	Barnes	
2:14	Speaker Redmond	
	Fred Selcke	HB 598 Third Reading
	Speaker Redmond	
2:15	Hoffman	
2:16	Lundy)	Yield?
2:16	Hoffman)	Discussion
	Speaker Redmond	
	Brunmet)	
	Speaker Redmond)	
2:16	Hoffman)	
2:18	Speaker Redmond	HB 598 passed
	Fred Selcke	HB 70
	Speaker Redmond	
2:19	Duff	
	Speaker Redmond	



2:20	Leinenweber	
	Speaker Redmond	
2:21	Beaupre	
2:22	Speaker Redmond	HB 70 passed
2:23	Fred Selcke	HB 72 Third Reading
	Speaker Redmond	
2:24	Duff	
2:25	Speaker Redmond	HB 72 passed
2:26	Washburn	Introduction
	Speaker Redmond	
2:27	Porter	
	Fred Selcke	HB 74
2:27	Duff	Sponsor
	Speaker Redmond	
	Kosinski)	Yield?
	Speaker Redmond)	
2:29	Duff)	
2:30	Palmer	Yield?
2:30	Duff)	
2:31	Speaker Redmond)	
2:31	Cunningham	Yield?
2:31	Duff	
	Speaker Redmond	
2:34	Meyer	
	Speaker Redmond	
2:35	Cunningham	
	Speaker Redmond	



2:37	Meyer)	
2:38	Duff)	
2:38	Bradley	Point of order
	Speaker Redmond	
2:38	Lechowicz	
	Speaker Redmond	
2:40	Washington	
	Speaker Redmond	
2:41	Duff	
2:43	Speaker Redmond	HB 74
2:43	Lundy	
	Speaker Redmond	
2:45	Huff	
	Speaker Redmond	
2:46	Geo-Karis	
2:46	Speaker Redmond	HB 74
	Duff	To postponed consideration
2:47	Hirschfeld	
	Speaker Redmond	Recess
4:04	Speaker Redmond	Committee Reports
	Fred Selcke	HB 164 Third Reading
	Speaker Redmond	
4:08	Grotberg	Sponsor
4:10	Speaker Redmond	HB 164
4:11	Peters	
4:12	Fred Selcke	HB 170
4:12	Geo-Karis	Sponsor



	Speaker Redmond	
4:13	Borchers	
	Speaker Redmond	
4:14	Dunn, J.	
4:14	Geo-Karis	
	Speaker Redmond	HB 170 passed
4:15	Fred Selcke	HB 175
	Speaker Redmond	
4:16	Kosinski	Hear Companion Bill 176
	Speaker Redmond	Leave
	Fred Selcke	HB 176
4:16	Kosinski	Sponsor
	Speaker Redmond	
	Calvo)	Yield?
4:18	Kosinski)	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Beaupre	Yield?
4:18	Kosinski	
	Duff)	Yield?
4:20	Kosinski)	
	Shea in Chair	
4:26	Stone	Point of order
4:27	Shea	HB 175 & 176 passed
	Fred Selcke	HB 229
	Shea	
4:28	Calvo	
	Shea	



4:29	McMaster)	Yield?
	Shea)	
4:29	Calvo)	
	Shea	
4:34	Madison	
	Shea	
4:34	McMaster	
	Shea	
4:35	Calvo	
4:35	Shea	HB 229 passed
	Fred Selcke	HB 237
	Brinkmeier	Leave to hear 236 & 237
	Shea	Leave
4:37	Fred Selcke	HB 236
4:37	Brinkmeier	HB 236 & 237
4:38	Shea	HB 236 & 237 passed
4:39	Schraeder	
	Shea	
4:40	Fred Selcke	HB 337
	Fred Selcke	HB 338 Third Reading
	Shea	
4:40	Mugalian	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Lechowicz	
4:42	Shea	
4:43	Meyer	
	Shea	



4:43	Peters	Point of order
	Shea	
4:44	Caldwell	Point of order
	Shea	
4:45	Mugalian	HB 338 out of order
4:45	Shea	Take out
4:45	Schraeder	
4:46	Shea	
4:46	Fred Selcke	HB 395
	Shea	
4:47	Cunningham	Sponsor
	Shea	
4:48	Madigan	
	Shea	
4:48	Lechowicz	
	Shea	
4:48	Cunningham	
	Shea	
4:49	Schraeder	
	Shea	
4:50	Cunningham	
	Shea	
4:50	Beaupre	
	Shea	
4:51	Skinner	
	Shea	
4:52	Ewell	



4:53	Cunningham	
	Shea	
4:53	Ewell	
	Shea	
4:54	Cunningham	Take 395 out of record
	Shea	
4:55	Fred Selcke	HB 414 Third Reading
4:55	Shea	
4:55	Kane	Parliamentary inquiry
	Shea	
4:55	Cunningham	
	Lechowicz	Point of order
	Shea	
	Cunningham	
	Shea	HB 439 take out of record
4:56	Fred Selcke	HB 437
4:56	Cunningham	Explains the Bill - Sponsor
	Shea	HB 437
	Ewell	Question of Sponsor
	Shea	
	Cunningham	
	Shea	
	Cunningham	
	Shea	Leave to hear both Bills
	Fred Selcke	596 & 437 - Bills will be heard together
	Cunningham	
	Shea	



Lechowicz)	Discussion on appropriations
Cunningham)	
Shea	
Barnes	Fiscal impact of this Bill
Shea	
Leinenweber	Question
Shea	Yields
Leinenweber)	Question of Sponsor
Cunningham)	In response & discussion
Shea	Vote
Ewell	Explains his vote
Shea	
Skinner	Explains his vote
Shea	
Bradley	Verification & poll of absentees
Shea	
5:07 Londrigan	
Shea	
Boyle	Change to 'no'
Shea	Poll absentees
Stubblefield	'Aye'
Shea	
Fred Selcke	
Shea	
Beaupre	
Fred Selcke	
Shea	



Daniels	Changes vote
Shea	
Fred Selcke	Verification
Shea	
Ewell	Votes 'aye'
Shea	Changing of votes
Bradley	
Shea	Calls the vote - HB 437 & 596 passed
Cunningham	Re-election
Shea	
Fred Selcke	498 Third Reading
Shea	
Jaffe	Explains the Bill - Sponsor
Shea	Vote - passed
Fred Selcke	540 Third Reading
Shea	
D'Arco	Explains the Bill - Sponsor
Shea	
Leinenweber	Question of Sponsor
D'Arco	
Shea	Unauthorized people on floor
Leinenweber	Opposes the Bill
Shea	
Hudson	Question of Sponsor
D'Arco	In response
Shea	Vote
D'Arco	To close & explain his vote



Shea	Recognition of Representative
Leinenweber	Explains his vote
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Greiman	Explains his vote
Shea	
Dunn	Explains his vote
Shea	Take the record - passed
Leinenweber	Verification
Shea	Poll of absentees by D'Arco
Kane	Change to 'aye'
Shea	Changing of votes
Leinenweber	Concedes
Shea	
Madison	
Shea	HB 504 passed
Fred Selcke	505 Third Reading
Shea	
Hoffman, R.K.	Explains the Bill - Sponsor
Shea	
Leinenweber)	Question of Sponsor
Hoffman, R.K.)	Discussion
Shea	
Leinenweber	Speaks on the Bill
Shea	
Brinkmeier	Question
Hoffman, R.K.	
Shea	



	Deuster	Speaks in support of the Bill
	Shea	
	Stone	Opposes the Bill
	Shea	
	Deavers	Moves previous question
	Shea	So moved
	Hoffman, R.K.	To close
	Shea	Vote
5:40	Shea	HB 505 passed
5:40	Fred Selcke	HB 554
	Shea	
5:41	LaFleur	Sponsor
	Shea	HB 554 passed
	Fred Selcke	HB 559
5:42	Fred Selcke	HB 569
	Shea	
5:43	McMaster	Sponsor
	Shea	
5:43	Hudson	Point of parliamentary inquiry
5:43	McMaster	
	Shea	
	Palmer	
5:45	McMaster	
	Shea	
5:45	Palmer	
	Shea	
5:45	Huff	



5:45	McMaster	
	Shea	
5:46	Grotberg	
	Shea	
5:48	Kozubowski	Move Previous Question
5:48	Shea	
	Greiman	
	Shea	
5:49	McMaster	
	Shea	HB 569...Passed
	Fred Selcke	HB 574, Third Reading
5:50	Washington	
	Shea	
5:52	Lechowicz	
5:53	Shea	HB 574...Passed
5:53	Fred Selcke	HB 583
5:54	Leinenweber	
	Shea	HB 583
5:55	Geo-Karis	
	Huff)	Yield
)	
5:56	Leinenweber)	Discussion
	Shea	
5:57	Matijevich)	Yield
)	
	Linenweber)	Discussion
5:57	Shea	HB 583
	Fred Selcke	HB 607, Third Reading
5:58	Sangmeister	



6:00

Shea		
Duff)	Question
Sangmeister)	
Shea		HB 607...Passed
Fred Selcke		HB 612
Lundy		Explains HB 612
hea		
Grotberg		Supports the Bill
Shea		HB 612...Passed
Fred Selcke		HB 616, Third Reading
Shea		HB 616
Madigan		Explains the Bill
Shea		
Hirschfeld		Appropriation Bill
Madigan		
Shea		
Madison		
Shea		
Madison		HB 616, Question
Madigan		Response
Shea		
Walsh		Opposes the Bill
Shea		
Tipsword		Question
Shea		Yields
Tipsword)	Question
Madigan)	Response and Discussion



Shea	
Totten	Opposes the Bill
Shea	
Stone	
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Gaines) Question of Sponsor
)
Madigan) Discussion
Shea	
Campbell	Opposes the Bill
Shea	HB 616
Borchers	Moves Previous Question
Shea	So moved, Vote, Bill lost
Jack O'Brien	HB 618, Third Reading
Shea	
Ewell	Explains the Bill, Sponsor
Shea	
Matijevecich	
Shea	"Can we have some order?"
Matijevecich	Continues in discussion
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Hirschfeld	Opposes the Bill
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Greiman	Opposes the Bill
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Gaines	Supports the Bill
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Davis	Opposes the Bill



Shea	
Anderson	Moves Previous Question
Shea	So moved
Ewell	HB 618, To close
Shea	HB 618..Vote, take the record..Lost.
Jack O'Brien	HB 625
Shea	
Yourell	Error in Bill (# 618 not 616)
Shea	
Jack O'Brien	HB 625, Third Reading
Shea	
Birchler	Explains the Bill, Sponsor
Shea	
Leinenweber	Question of Sponsor
Birchler	
Shea	Vote- take the record-- Passed
Jack O'Brien	HB 647, Third Reading
Shea	HB 647
Mautino	Explains the Bill, Sponsor
Shea	Vote
Bradley	Question, Fiscal impact
Shea	Bill 647...Passed
Jack O'Brien	HB 658, Third Reading
Shea	HB 658
Griesheimer	Explains the Bill, Sponsor
Shea	Vote--Take the Record--Passed
Jack O'Brien	HB 666, Third Reading



Shea		Recognition of Representative
Hoffman, R. K.		Supports the Bill
Shea		
Palmer		Question, "Was Bill Amended?"
Yourell		"NO"
Shea		"NO"
Palmer)	Discussion
Yourell)	
)	
Bradley in the Chair		
Bradley		
Kempiners		Question
Bradley		Yields
Kempiners		HB 679...Question asked
Yourell		Response
Bradley		Recognition of Representative
Maragos		Supports
Bradley		Recognition of Representative
Totten		Question
Bradley		Indicates he will
Totten)	Question asked
Yourell)	
Yourell)	Response
Totten		Addresses question to Rep. Maragos
Bradley		
Maragos		Responds to Totten
Totten		
Shea back in Chair		
Dunn		



Shea	Recognition of Representative
VanDuyne	Explains HB 666, Sponsor
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Collins	Speaks on the Bill
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Kempiners	Discussion on the Bill
Shea	Unauthorized people on floor.
VanDuyne	To close
Shea	Vote
Palmer	Explains vote
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Byers	Explains his vote
Shea	Recognition of Representative
VanDuyne	Explains his vote
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Mudd	Explains his vote
Shea	Postpone Consideration
Jack O'Brien	HB 674, Third Reading
Shea	HB 674
Tipsword	Explains the Bill
Shea	Bill Passed
Jack O'Brien	HB 675, Third Reading
Shea	Take out of Record
Jack O'Brien	HB 679, Third Reading
Yourell	HB 679, Explains the Bill, Sponsor
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Schraeder	Opposes the Bill



Shea	
Houlihan, D.	Moves Previous Question
Shea	
Totten	
Shea	
?? (maybe Dunn)	Answers to Totten
Totten	HB 679
?	
Totten	
?	
Shea	Previous Question, So moved Vote on Bill
Schraeder	Explains his vote
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Tipsword	Explains his vote
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Friedrich	Explain his vote "nay"
Shea	Take the Record, Bill Passed
Shea	HB 687..Took out of record
Jack O'Brien	HB 690, Third Reading
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Yourell	Explains the Bill, Sponsor
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Waddell	Supports the Bill
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Sollins	Rise in Opposition
Shea	
Huff	Moves Previous Question



Shea	So moved
Yourell	To close
Shea	Vote on HB 690
Borchers	Explains his vote
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Mann	To explain his vote
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Miller	To explain his vote
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Caldwell	Explain his vote "Nay"
Shea	"Hurry up, Mr. Caldwell"
Caldwell	Continues Discussion
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Davis	Explain his vote "Nay"
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Randolph	Explains his vote "Nay"
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Duff	Explain his vote
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Madigan	Questions the Explanation of Vote.
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Walsh	Green lights when people are not here!!!!
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Duff	Tries once again to explain his vote.
Shea	
Duff	One more time!!! Votes "yes"



Shea		
Collins		Explains his vote
Shea		Take the Record...Passed
Mann		Point of Personal Privilege
Shea		HB 693
Jack O'Brien		HB 693, Third Reading
Shea		
Mudd		Explains the Bill, Sponsor
Shea		Vote
Lechowicz		Question
Shea		Indicates he will
Lechowicz)	Question asked
Mudd)	Response and Discussion
Shea		Take the Record...Passed
Jack O'Brien		HB 714, Third REading
Shea		HB 714, Recognition of Representative
Craig		Explains the Bill, Sponsor
Shea		Vote--Take the Record--Passed
Jack O'Brien		HB 723, Third Reading
Shea		HB 723
Mugalian		Explains the Bill, Sponsor
Shea		Vote--Take the Record--Passed
Jack O'Brien		HB 724, Third Reading
Shea		HB 724
McMaster		Explains the Bill, Sponsor
Shea		
McMaster		
Shea		It's up to you...Take out of Record



Jack O'Brien	HB 729, Third Reading
Shea	HB 729
Daniels	Explains the Bill, Sponsor
Shea	HB 729
Tipsword)	Question
)	
Daniels)	Discussion
Shea	
Meyer	Question of Sponsor
Daniels	H 729
Meyer	Speaks to the Bill
Shea	
Kane	Opposition
Shea	"Proceed, Sir"
Kane	Continues Discussion
Shea	"Bring your remarks to a close"
Kane	Continued
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Borchers	Question
Daniels	Response
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Griesheimer	Speaks on the Bill
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Beaupre	Supports the Bill
Shea	
Daniels	To close
Shea	Vote--Take the Record--Passed



Bradley in Chair

Bradley	HB 741
Jack O'Brien	HB 741, Third Reading
Bradley	
Flynn	HB 741, Explains the Bill, Sponsor
Bradley	
Greiman	Question
Bradley	Yields
Greiman)	Question asked
Flynn)	Answer and Discussion
Bradley	
Borchers	Opposes
Bradley	
Ebbesen	Question
Bradley	Yields
Ebbesen)	Question asked
Flynn)	Answer and Discussion
Bradley	
Flynn	To close
Bradley	Vote--ake the record--Passed
Jack O'Brien	HB 745, Third Reading
Bradley	
Kozubowski	Explains his Bill, Sponsor
Bradley	Vote--Take the Record--Passed
Jack O'Brien	HB 752, Third Reading
Bradley	
Grotberg	Explains his Bill



Bradley	
Maragos	Supports HB 752
Bradley	Vote--Take the Record--Passed
Shea	Distribution of Digest of Bills
Bradley	
Hill	
Bradley	
Shea	Discussion on Distribution list
Hill	
Shea	Computer Print Out
Bradley	
Mann	
Shea	
Bradley	
Skinner	Question on Amendments of Digest
Shea	Couldn't hear the Question
Skinner	
Shea	
Bradley	Discussion on Digest Distribution
Madison	do
Bradley	do
Madison	do
Shea	do
Bradley	do
Hudson	do
Shea	do
Hudson	do



Shea	Discussion on Digest Distribution
Bradley	do
Ryan	do
Shea	do
Shea	do
Bradley	HB 759
Jack O'Brien	HB 759, Third Reading
Bradley	
Schraeder	Explains his Bill, Sponsor
Bradley	Vote
Arnell)	Question
)	
Schraeder)	Discussion and Response
Bradley	
Bluthardt	Question
Bradley	Proceed with Question
Bluthardt)	Question asked
)	
Schraeder)	Discussion
Bradley	
Holewinski	Question
Schraeder	Discussion on Bill
Bradley	All voted who wish?...Passed
Jack O'Brien	HB 768, Third Reading
Bradley	Recognition of Representative
Hirschfeld	Explains the Bill...Sponsor
Bradley	
Washburn	
Bradley	Yields



Washburn)	Question asked
Hirschfeld)	Discussion HB 768
Bradley	Vote--Take the Record--Passed
Shea in the Chair	
Greiman	Question of Chair
Shea	
Greiman	Discussion on House Calendar
Shea	HB 761
Jack O'Brien	HB 761, Third Reading
Shea	
Greiman	Explains the Bill, Sponsor
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Madison	Question?
Shea	Yields
Madison	Question asked
Greiman	Response and Discussion
Madison	Thank you
Shea	
Stubblefield)	Question asked
Greiman)	Discussion
Shea	Recognition of Representative
Neff)	Question asked
Greiman)	
Shea	
Terzich	Question
Greiman)	Discussion
Terzich)	Speaks on HB 761.



Shea	Recognition of Representative
Lucco	Question of the Sponsor
Greiman	
Shea	
Greiman	To close
Shea	Vote--Take the Record--Passed
Jack O'Brien	HB 779...Already passed
Shea	HB 785
Jack O'Brien	HB 785, Third Reading
Garmisa	HB 785, Hear 1062 with 785, Leave
Shea	Leave granted
Jack O'Brien	HB 1062, Third Reading
Shea	
Garmisa	HB 785 and 1062, Explains, Sponsor
Shea	
McClain	Supports the Bill
Shea	
Skinner	
Shea	Yields
Skinner	Question asked
Garmisa	Discussion
Skinner	
Garmisa	Federal Property
Skinner	
Shea	Stick to Questions only
Skinner	
Shea	



Skinner	
Garmisa	"Answer is Yes"
Shea	
Garmisa	To close
Shea	Vote...Two records
Skinner	Explain his vote
Shea	Take the Record...Passed
Madison	
Shea	Resolutions
Fennessey	Asks leave for Subcommittee Meeting of Elections
Shea	Leave granted
Walsh	No, Sir
Shea	
Madison	
Shea	
Madison	
Shea	
Madison	"Reminds the Chair..."
Shea	
Madison	"Not only possible, it is true"
Shea	
Fary	House Joint Resolution
Shea	
Fary	
Shea	
Barnes	



Shea	
Barnes	Moves to suspend Rules #2103 in Appropriations II
Shea	
Ryan	Vote...need 107, Motion adopted Passed
Jack O'Brien	Agreed Resolution #277, 278, 279.
Madigan	Explains the Resolutions
Shea	Resolutions adopted
Jack O'Brien	House Joint Resolution #51 read
Shea	
Jack O'Brien	Continues the reading
Shea	
Fary	Move to waive the rules
Shea	Leave granted, Resolution adopted
Hill	Senate Joint Resolution #38 Explained
Shea	Senate Joint Resolution #38 adopted
Shea	HB 2998
Houlihan	HB 2998, Explains the Bill
Jack O'Brien	HB 2998, Second Reading No Committee Amendments
Shea	HB 2998... Third Reading



Walsh	Procedural Question
Shea	Explains his Procedure
Walsh	
Shea	House Joint Resolution #4
Deuster	Explains the House Joint Res. #4
Shea	
Dyer	Discussion
Shea	
Lechowicz	Point of Order
Shea	
Madigan	Discussion on Resolution #4 Move to lay on Table
Shea	
Washburn	
Shea	
Madigan	Withdraws his motion
Shea	
Lechowicz	Point of order..Moves to Lay on Table
Shea	
Walsh	"Cruel and inhuman treatment"
Shea	
Matijevich	Point of order, Walsh out of order.
Shea	
Duff	Point of order
Shea	
Lechowicz	Withdraws his motion
Shea	
Totten	Moves Previous Question



Shea	So moved
Hudson	Yields to Deuster to close
Shea	
Deuster	To close
Shea	Vote
Hudson	To explain his vote
Shea	Take the record
Deuster	Requests verification of negative
Shea	House Joint Resolution #4
Deuster	Speaks again on Resolution Postpone consideration
Shea	Death Resolutions
Jack O'Brien	Reading of Resolutions
Shea	Resolution adopted
Madigan	Move to recess for five minutes and then adjourn
Shea	
Lechowicz	Announcement
Shea	
Ryan	
Shea	
Lechowicz	
Shea	
Maragos	Announcement
Shea	
Maragos	Room 118
Shea	
Jack O'Brien	Senate Bills First Reading



Shea

Jack O'Brien

Committee Reports

Adjourned.....

