

1.

Doorkeeper: "All persons not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order and the Members please be in their seats. We will be lead in prayer this morning by Reverend Andrew Templeman, the Minister of the First Presbyterian Church, in Springfield."

Reverend Templeman: "Let us all unite to pray. We give thanks to You O God for another day of life, for another day beneath the kindness of Your sunshine and rain, upon this good land of rolling prairies and splashing waters. Teach us again by speaking to our hearts in these moments O God, that a nation under God is a nation under kindness... that the higher law is the law of gracious unmerited in mercy. That is Your way with us and that is what You expect us to do with one another. We confess that we do not very often follow Your higher law of kindness, but rather the eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth in mutual threats condemnation, the criminations. We all have something or confine something on one another that we can use to paralyze with fear and get what we want. Is this how You've asked us to live in society, have You abandoned us to our self righteous folly O loving Father. Come and save us, save us from the hypocrisy that points one finger but always has three more pointing back at ourselves. Save us from the grudge bearing that always remembers a couple of angry scores that need to be settled, save us from the foolishness; forget that we all are fragile creatures but that under Your way of tender loving kindness we can all in turn bless one another to maturity and even greatness. Even here in this Assembly, may it be so. O God Our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. House Bills, Third Reading.... Committee Reports."



Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Boyle , Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations II, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 21, 1976. Reports the same back the following recommendation. Do pass Senate Bill 1622 and 1938, do pass as amended Senate Bill 1935."

Speaker Redmond: "Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following preamble Joint Resolution, the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit Senate Joint Resolution #80, adopted by the Senate June 21, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has pass a Bill of the following title, passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit , Senate Bill 2000, passed by the Senate June 21, 1976, by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed a Bill of the following title, passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit , Senate Bill 1721 and 1972, passed by the Senate June 21, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles, the passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit , Senate Bills, 1630 and 1952, passed by the Senate June 21, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright,



Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of Bills with the following titles to wit , House Bill 3957, together with Amendment passed by the Senate as amended June 21, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of Bill with the following titles to wit , House Bill 3147, together with Amendment passed by the Senate as amended June 21, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of Bills with the following titles to wit , House Bills 3137, 3316, 3624, 3854, 3892 and 3913, passed by the Senate June 21, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with House in passage of the Bill with the following title to wit , House Bill 3958, passed by the Senate June 21, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bills, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1622, Emil Jones. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Aging. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1935, Hanahan. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the State Board of Education. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1938, Stone. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Board of Trustees of State University Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1952, Washington. A Bill for an



Act to revise the law in relation to medical malpractice. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1972, Wolf. A Bill for an Act authorizing Director of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities to convey certain real property in the City of Alton. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2000, Garmisa. A Bill for an Act to amend the Transportation Bond Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Reading of the Journal."

Clerk O'Brien: "The House met pursuant to adjournment Friday, June 4, 1976. The Speaker in the Chair, prayer by John O'Brien, Chief Clerk."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the reading of the Journal and to approve the Journals for June 6, which is Journal 156, the Journals for June 7, which is 157, and the Journals for June 8, which is the Journal 158. I move that that motion be adopted, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved... I have been advised by the Clerk, 156... is June 4, Representative Madigan, do you amend your motion accordingly? He does. The Gentleman has moved that the reading of the Journals these are for June 4, June 7, and June 8th being Journals 156, 157, and 158 respectively be waived and and the Journals be approved. All those in favor vote 'aye'... signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Journals have been approved. Non concurrence, Senate Bill 1621. Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House refuse to recede... and request a Conference Committee.... that's on Amendment #1, 1621."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "What is Amendment #1?"



Richmond: "Well, actually it defines some programs that change nothing in dollar amounts and I understand that there is a question in the Senate about... ethnic study of some sort that wasn't specified in the... in this particular... in the breakdown in Amendment #1, and therefore until that question is answered, did not concur with House Amendment."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The Gentleman has moved that the refuse to... will you state your motion again, Representative..."

Richmond: "The House refuse to recede on Amendment #1, to House Bill or to Senate Bill 1621, and request a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1, to Senate Bill 1621. All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the House refuses to recede to House Amendment #1, and the Conference Committee is requested. Order of non concurrence appears 1620, Representative Tipword... out of the record. Representative Tipword, for what purpose do you arise?"

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, I believe I can proceed on 1620."

Speaker Redmond: "The order is non concurrence, Senate Bill 1620."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House refuse to recede from the House Amendment #5, with which the Senate refuse to concur."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede in House Amendment #5, to Senate Bill 1620. Any discussion? All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #5."



Do you request a Conference Committee on that, Representative Tipsword?"

Tipsword: "Yes, please."

Speaker Redmond: "The Conference Committee has been requested. House Bills, Third Reading 927, Representative Leinenweber, is that argumentative? Representative Schlickman, says yes.... Is there anybody in the Chambers that desires to have a Bill called? Anybody in the Chamber that desires to have Bills recommitted to the... standing Committee? Representative Epton."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to make a motion to recommit all the Bills on Second Reading, Third Reading, Senate Bills, Third Reading, Second Reading, Consideration Postponed and all motions to the Speaker's Table or the alternative to be all Tabled."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman... Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "I object."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos, objects. The Gentleman has moved that all Bills in the order of House Bills, Second Reading, House Bills, Third Reading, Senate Bills, Third Reading, Senate Bills, Second Reading and Consideration Postponed, all motions... all matters appearing on the Speaker's Table, all matters on concurrence and concurrence consideration postponed, Conference Committee reports be recommitted to the Standing Committee. Is there any discussion? Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Will the Gentleman yield? He indicates he will... no, he indicates that he won't. Representative Maragos."

Epton: "Hold it... hold it, the Gentleman who is ask.... Mr. Speaker, I apologize. The Gentleman that asked me to



JUN 22 1916

7.

yield, does have a rather substantial hold over me and in that case I think, I change my position... I do respectfully yield. And, I answer any question that you ask in the manner you desire me to respond."

Speaker Redmond: "Has he got you by the hair..."

Epton: "That isn't hard to do. No, he hasn't got me by the hair, Sir."

Ryan: "What is the reason for this, can you tell me... what happens if this motion doesn't pass, what happens to all of these Bills and Resolution that you're so eager to tube for everybody here."

Epton: "Well, I wasn't eager, Sir. I was just trying to expedite the work of the House. I'm never eager to do anything... in this particular instance, I would suspect that if that motion passed... the public would be saved millions of dollars and we would save countless hours of boredom and conceivably we might even do something good before the House adjourns."

Ryan: "I see, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and maker of the motion. Where are the people who have these Bills on the reading in which you speak, to concur with the motion, I would be in favor but... in certain instances they're people who are very desirous to having their Bills called... somewhere along the line and then I would object."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I arise in objection of the motion because there are some of those here that we've been trying to have heard since Friday and because of the business of the House, haven't had an opportunity. There are a couple of House Revenue Bills which really, I'm not the originator of the Bills but I think they should be given an opportunity to be heard and... yesterday



we got tied up because I was ready and... just dashed in to call those Bills on Third Reading so, I ask that the motion be postponed."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion of Mr. Epton, however, I do wish to commend him for raising this issue before us and call to our attention the futility of some of our work. Yesterday and I presume today, we will continue to consider on the House floor in and Committee Bills which in reality has no chance of passage all the way to the Governor. Yet, the Committees continue to meet, they continue to post the same Bills that they have posted for two months, Mr. Speaker. Sometimes the Bills are heard... Roll Calls do not permit enough votes for their passage in Committee then they are reposted again and those of us who follow Committee action are forced to continue to review the Committees schedules and to work with Committee Bill while we're also forced to consider the Bills on the Calendar, Mr. Speaker and I think that the thrust of Mr. Epton's motion and the spirit of the motion is well taken, I think that we would be well advised to get about the business of the House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, House Bills for concurrence 3385, is the... it was amended in the Senate, one is the Partee, Amendment which we concurred in and the other one was a merit increase. The 2.5% salary reduction, I want to move to concur in these two Senate Amendments on 3385."

Speaker Redmond: "We're still on the order of Representative



Epton's motion, Representative. I will be right back to you as soon as...."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, I would be willing to hold my motion advanced until Deacon Davis, was able to proceed or any other Gentlemen or Ladies who would like to proceed and then perhaps you can come back to me in the next twenty minutes and we can renew this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, will you follow that with an Amendment to adjourn sine die."

Epton: "Yes, Sir. I would be very happy to include that in my motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have filed a motion to advance to the order of Second Reading, Senate Bill 1881, without reference to Committee it was on yesterdays Calendar but then it is not on todays Calendar and I have already talked to Representative Matijevich, because it was assigned to the Executive, they're not going to have the meeting and I have his clearence for it to be put on Second Reading and I talked to Mr. Washburn, also to Mr. Madigan, if you recall, Mike, at the last speech meeting. And, that's on the D'Arco's Bill on the Dangerous Drug Commission."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis, the Clerk advises me that your motion was discharged to Committee..."

Geo-Karis: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "... or to advance to order of Second Reading, it's in Committee so your proper motion is to discharge the Committee. That's why it doesn't appear on the Calendar."

Geo-Karis: "Well, I wonder if I can have leave of this Assembly to discharge Committee then, because it was on yesterday.... and I don't think there is any objection "



Speaker Redmond: "I would prefer that you hold that until we get a little better attention."

Geo-Karis: "Do I have to have written motion for that for discharged Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, suggest that you file a motion to discharge the Committee. We'll get it on the supplemental Calendar, Representative Geo-Karis. On the order of concurrence appears House Bill 3385, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The two Senate Amendments on here... one is the familiar Partee Amendment which... prohibits the obligating any of the money until January, of 1977, that's Amendment #1, I would move to concur. And, Amendment #2, is the merit increase 2... cut the merit increase of 2.5%. I would move to concur with both of those Amendments, #1 and 2."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The Gentleman has moved that the House concur on Senate Amendment #1 and 2, to House Bill 3385. All those in favor... Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Without asking for division of the question, Mr. Speaker, I should like leave to be recorded as 'present' on Amendment #1 and 'aye', on Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing none... Representative Harold Washington."

Washington: "Will the Sponsor yield for one question?"

Spekaer Redmond: "He will."

Davis: "Yes."

Washington: "I don't have the Amendments, Representative Davis, what's the dollar amount in Amendment #2, and what is...."

Davis: "2.5... it amounts to about ten thousand dollars in round figures. This is the cut merit increase... it



cut 2.5%... all of them were cut 2.5%... dollars."

Washington: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Gentlemen's motion for the House to concur on Senate Amendments #1 and 2, to House Bill 3385. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The record will show that Representative Schlickman, votes 'present' on Amendment #1, and 'aye' on Amendment #2. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 102 'aye', 5 'no' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2, to House Bill 3385. 3218... Representative Merlo."

Merlo: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move that the House concur with House Bill 3218. The Senate Amendment reduces the penalty provision from twice the amount of the security deposit to equal the security deposit. I ask your favorable consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The Gentleman has moved that the House concur on Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 3218. Those in favor... Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "What is the posture of the Bill now, with respect to the landlords liability... interest wise?"

Merlo: "The present posture is, when we passed this law in 1972, in the General Assembly... we made no penalty provisions, as a result the law cannot be enforced and of course we asked an opinion of the Attorney General, he did suggest in his letter of the course that, because of the non provision the company would have to be done in order for the law to be enforced and as a result, we introduced this Bill."

Schlickman: "Okay. The point being is that, the Bill as



JUN 22 1976

12.

it was amended in the House, provided for a liability of three times the interest..."

Merlo: "This was amended out...."

Schlickman: "And then it..."

Merlo: "Then it went to twice the amount and then the Senate reduced it to equal the amount of the security deposit."

Schlickman: "Okay, so that the recovery... that a tenant can receive through civil proceeding is the interest and attorney's fees, is that correct?"

Merlo: "Would be the amount if the security deposit, plus attorney fees and court costs."

Schlickman: "Okay, the security deposit, the interest and the attorney fees... and the Bill is applicable only to the City of Chicago."

Merlo: "Only to the City of Chicago... twenty-five units or more."

Schlickman: "Thank you, very much."

Merlo: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing... anything further?"

The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 3218. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Final action, 89 votes. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 100 'ayes'.. Representative Geo-Karis, 'aye'. 114 'ayes, and 6 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 3218. 3586, Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3586, is in regard to an increase in the library tax rate for the two county libraries in the State. The Bill passed out of the House without a referendum... over in the Senate an Amendment was put on for a back door referendum. I would move to concur in Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 3586."



Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Will the Sponsor yield? Representative McMasters, this allowed for a tax increase without referendum when it passed out of the House originally?"

McMaster: "Yes, and had a back door referendum put on in the Senate."

Ewing: "And, you're asking for concurrence in that?"

McMaster: "Right... concurrence."

Ewing: "How much can they increase the tax rate here?"

McMaster: "I think it goes from two cents to four cents, I believe."

Ewing: "And, it's effective all over the State..."

McMaster: "No, there's only two county library districts in the State of Illinois. Warren County and Putman County... only two."

Ewing: "I see, are they in your district?"

McMaster: "One of them is... Warren County, is. Putman County is not."

Ewing: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "No, I'm sorry."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further question... any discussion?"

The question is on the Gentleman motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 3586. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Final action, 89 votes. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 113 'aye', 9 'no' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 3586. Senate Bills, Third Reading... category of appropriations appears 1600, Representative Schraeder... out of the record. 1610, Representative Merlo. Read the Bill."

Merlo: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 16... pardon me."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1610, a Bill for an Act to provide



for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Insurance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Merlo."

Merlo: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1610 is the Appropriation Bill to the Department of Insurance, the original appropriation asked for four million, one hundred seventy-seven thousand, six hundred dollars. This was reduced in the Senate in the amount of seventy-six, five, two, one and the appropriation now being asked for is four million, one hundred and one thousand and seventy-nine dollars and I ask your favorable consideration for this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield for one question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "How does this compare with the appropriation for fiscal year '76?"

Merlo: "It's two hundred and sixty-nine thousand, nine hundred and thirteen dollars in excess of last fiscal year."

Schlickman: "Is that in one or more line items... that increase?"

Merlo: "Well, the reason of the increase actually in '75, fiscal year. There were two hundred and forty-two employees on the payroll and the budget request was cut 8.3% through the process and accordingly the budget positions were reduced to two hundred and six from two hundred and forty-two. Actually now, they're asking for additional twelve positions which was cut in the Senate to six and a half positions and of course, means an increase in the appropriation of two hundred and...."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, shall



JUN 23 1876

15.

this Bill pass. Those in favor will vote 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'... Representative Hill, pardon me."

Hill: "I wonder if Representative Merlo, would take this Bill out of the record. I would like to look at it more throughly and I just haven't had the time. I wonder if he would be so kind as to take it out, I would come over and...."

Merlo: "For you, Representative Hill, anytime."

Hill: "Thank you, very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1863, Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1547, Senate Bills, Third. Representative Kozubowski... out of the record. 1918, Representative Geo-Karis. 1918."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1918, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to tax gifts, inheritances and interest in certain cases. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The primary Sponsor in that, is Representative Michael McClain and I don't know if he's in the room or not..."

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

Maragos: "On this particular Bill, Mr. McClain, stated to me yesterday that in case this was called and he was not on the floor, he won't mind if Mrs. Geo-Karis or I, would handle the Bill for him. So, proceed."

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

Geo-Karis: "Wait just a minute, Mr. Speaker... I'm not ready..."

Speaker Redmond: "You got caught."

Geo-Karis: "This is a Bill to increase inheritances tax



exemptions from twenty thousand to forty thousand and of the Illinois State inheritance tax laws and it would amend the Illinois inheritance tax Act accordingly, it would provide for a forty thousand dollar exemption to... (unintelligible) to spouse or (unintelligible) dependents and twenty thousand to brothers and sisters, in other words, it doubles the amount and in light of the inflation cost now days, I think this is a very good Bill and I recommend its passage."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Geo-Karis: "Yes."

Mugalian: "What will the lost of revenue to the State be as the result of the passage of this Bill."

Geo-Karis: "I don't think it will be more than about two or three million dollars."

Mugalian: "Well, I think those figures are very low."

Geo-Karis: "I don't think that there is that many people that will leave so much of an estate... Representative, would be a big impact on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I was required to file a fiscal note on my Bill on the inheritance tax went through. I don't know why it was not one asked for on this Bill, I going to support it because, I think that inheritance tax, at least in the lower... smaller estates is regressive and discourages thrift and independence but as the Bill which went out of the House... which incidentally hasn't even been heard in Senate Committee yet, which it bothers me a little bit, I think we are moving this Bill along when they're not handling our Bills over there... mine's been over there for six weeks and that I think the Leadership should talk to the Senate about



the way they handle our Bills over there, that's number one. Number two, the Bill which we passed out of here with ninety-three Sponsors was limited to the surviving spouse and was limited to a maximum of four hundred dollars, in other words it went up to forty thousand dollars but just applied it to lower rates. I have a letter here from the Attorney General, which says the loss in revenue would be somewhere between one and a half and three million as high... and that in 197... it would not exceed two million dollars. Now, the Bill that we're talking about is considerably more broad in the estimate... the estimate I have on it is near seven or eight million dollars."

Geo-Karis: "I can answer that if I may, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Geo-Karis: "I was in error in answering the Representative on the other side, I have the analysis, staff analysis here... staff analysis estimates it's approximately three to four million dollars. And, I might say that the inheritance tax collections have been growing steadily so that the revenue lost from this Bill would easily be compensated for by gross and tax collections in the first year and this Bill is restricted to the immediate family because of the problems that protect in the family farms and residences."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. All along I've had some qualms about giving relief in this area, however, we have one Bill passed out... which I think is a better Bill and that's Representative Friedrich's and we should give the Governor an opportunity to even vote on this and since the other one is stalled in the Senate, we should at least get this out to have something of the Governor... after its adoption



the limitation is twelve hundred dollars, the maximum relief in any case... no matter how high the estate is. And, I..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I too, shall support this Bill but I would point out that it is really nothing more than forest. The three and four million dollar saving is nothing... the Bills that we put on the Governor's desk last time, one of which was mine... would really do something, it would save the people ten million dollars in inheritance tax but what it really does, is save them about ten million in cost... and that why the concept of the cost of board doubling of exemption is import. You give somebody a couple of dollars now, you have to go through the problem of filing all the tax return and pay an attorney to do so, then if you have real estate which most everybody does, you have to pay the real estate man to go out and appraise your home which is another fifty or a hundred dollars then you have the court cost and the Attorney General must hire somebody to look at it. These costs that we were trying to save the last in our Bill... and the Governor vetoed it last time and I suppose he'll veto this too, or maybe he'll throw the people this three millions and act like we've done something, when we haven't."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis, to close."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I urge your favorable consideration of this Bill, because our present twenty thousand dollar exemption as Representative Londrigan said, is not adequate and it would save the taxpayers a lot of money if the exemption was forty thousand dollars because in today's market, the twenty thousand dollar home is



forty thousand and it would be a good saving not only for the people of the State of Illinois and it would not be at a maximum cost of the State and I urge your favorable consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass?

All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 119 'ayes' and 4 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hanahan, on the floor? Senate Bills, Second Reading. Senate Bill 1546... out of the record. 1603, Representative Kozubowski... out of the record. 1614... out of the record. 1627, J. M. Houlihan... out of the record. Representative Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker, would a motion to suspend the proper posting rules and hear Senate Bill 1967, in Labor and Commerce tomorrow be in order?"

Speaker Redmond: "I would think so."

Hill: "I so move."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved that the rule be suspended to permit the hearing of 1967, in the Labor and Commerce Committee tomorrow. Is there any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Hill: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just like to make an announcement. Mr. Norman Lentz, from the Retirement System is available for any Member who has any question with regard to his pension program. He will be here all day today from 9 o'clock until 4, he is in Mr. Zeke Giorgi's office. This is the second time he's been here, so if you do have any questions regarding your retirement program, he is



available again... in Representative Giorgi's office."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if I could have Senate Bill 1789 and Senate 1899, 1891... referred to discharge Rules Committee and placed on the Calendar in Committee on Cities and Villages... I've got clearances of the Leadership of both sides of the aisle on this, because the Cities and Villages this will be their last meeting today and they may not have the time for it."

Speaker Redmond: "What numbers are they?"

Maragos: "Those are House Bill.... Senate Bill 1789 and Senate Bill 1891. I would like to discharge the Committee on Rules and placed in Committee on Cities and Villages.."

Speaker Redmond: "I wonder if you'll hold that motion until we get the Parliamentarian and the Chairman of the Rules... I'm a little bit uncertain to the correct procedure on this."

Maragos: "The reason is... I've had Mr. Madigan and Mr. Washburn, who are Members of the Committee at that time, they said, this motion was timely and because of the fact that Cities and Villages is the last meeting today. They wanted it out."

Speaker Redmond: "I would prefer that you hold it until we get the Parliamentarian and the Chairman of the Rules. Representative Hart."

Hart: "Well, I was going to ask... I was going to move to make the same motion with reference to House Bill 4000, so I'll.... when we get to that order, I would like to take that up too."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz. We'll be back at that when we get back to Representative Maragos. House Bills, Third Reading.... Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "Message from the Senate, by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the



House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of Bill of the following title to wit , House Bill 3834, passed by the Senate June 17, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Third Reading. On House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 927, Representative Leinenweber. Will you read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 927, a Bill for an Act in relation to the imposition and service of consecutive prison sentences. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 927, has been around quite awhile, it was up on Third Reading last spring but we did not reach it at the end of the Session, so it was placed on Interim Study and then referred back to Judiciary II Committee by the Rules Committee where for a second time it was reported out with a do pass recommendation. House Bill 927, seeks to close a notorious loophole in the unified code of corrections which was adopted in 1971, by the Legislature. The unified code of corrections states that a judge has an alternative when faced with a situation of a multiple crime offender to sentence the individual either consecutive or concurrently. Concurrently means that all sentences imposed will be served at the same time so that in effect the only sentence to be served is the most serious sentence imposed by the judge. Consecutive is supposed to mean... what it seems to imply, that the sentences must be served consecutive, that is completion of one sentence prior to the commencement of service of the second sentence. However, if you read the unified code of corrections for the serious crimes and that is those crimes for which... could meet the standard imposed in unified



code of correction for a judge to impose the sentence consecutively, that is in fact a nullity... that in circumstantial language... the sentences although appearing on the surface to be imposed consecutive are in fact to be served as one single sentence of all the instance of a single sentences, as exactly the same as if... an individual had been sentenced to concurrence sentences. Now, there was a great stir in this House and other places recently when a rather notorious individual who had received consecutive sentences was determined that he was eligible for parole after completion of nine years. This is exactly what I'm talking about.... now what House Bill 927, seeks to do and seeks to close this loophole, is to permit a judge in the proper case... and I would like to this, House Bill 927, does nothing about changing the circumstances under which a judge... in the judges discretion may impose consecutive sentences but it does provide though, that the convict who is convicted and has been sentenced to consecutive sentences must in fact complete each sentence imposed prior to the commencing service of the next consecutive sentence imposed. For example, if a person was imposed to three consecutive for three class 1, felonies... three consecutive twenty to fifty sentences, he would have to serve nine years in the first sentence before he could commence at the earliest opportunity to serve his second sentence imposed and then he would have to serve nine years on the second sentence and so on, through all of the sentences imposed. Now, again I would like to imply... I would like to impress on the House that this Bill does not change the circumstances in which a judge may impose consecutive sentences, that is left intact in the Bill it does not mandate that any judge impose consecutive



for any specific circumstances, it does not change the law in that respect. The only change in the law, is to remove a loophole which prohibits the imposition of true consecutive sentences. Now, it has received editorial support and I believe it is a good Bill, it's a needed Bill, I think that it is a needed Bill specifically from the point of view of letting the public know that when a person... when they read in the paper, a person that is sentenced to consecutive, they in fact must serve in consecutively. I think there is a breakdown in respect for the law when an individual is supposedly to be kept off the street for a lengthy period of time and in fact is eligible for parole as if the person had received concurrent sentences. So, I think as far as respect for our system of law and as far as giving our judges the appropriate discretion to impose the proper sentence in the proper case, House Bill 927, is a very important Bill and I seek your.... solicit your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Richard Speck, murdered eight nurses... I repeat, Richard Speck, murdered eight nurses and most of you joined in a Resolution petitioning the parole and pardon board not to consider his parole at this time. Now, the history of that case was this... the judge condemned Richard Speck, to death.... however, the Supreme Court during the course of this in its wisdom, determined that the death sentences was not applicable. In consequence the judge then sentenced Richard Speck, to consecutive sentences which could amount... I think to a thousand years or something like that. However, because of our unified code of corrections, Richard Speck was eligible for parole in nine years. Mr.



Leinenweber's Bill would go along with the wisdom of the court, that consecutive sentences should be imposed that man would never be eligible for parole. I ask you to support Mr. Leinenweber's Bill.

Speaker Redmond: "Any other discussion? Representative Harold Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker and Member of the House. I think that the House made a very drastic mistake in supporting the Resolution which memorialized the parole board when they were considering or rather than the question of the Speck case came before it. It smacked too much star chamber situation, I think we didn't look too good when we passed that Resolution out. But, I think Mr. Leinenweber has come up with a formula which hopefully would resolve such situations and keep us from injecting ourselves in two parole board activities in the future. There is no question but that the Speck case concerns people very greatly... I have been one of those who have strongly defended the present code of correction because I thought it was an integral unit and taken on balance, it is probably one of the finest criminal documents in the country. But, there are some short comings in this and I think Mr. Leinenweber has showed up one of those short comings with this Bill. There are certain circumstances when his Bill should come into play, when the public is greatly aroused and rightly so... when there has been due process and when all evidence indicate that a person simply should not be permitted to walk the streets and I think that this is a good Act and I support it.... but, I do not subscribe to the emotionalism which goes along with trying to tamper with the criminal code. I think that we should be very circumspect... I think that we should be very cautious, I think that we should throw out of



our minds all the emotional fervor which runs through the streets and look at this criminal code in cold hard detached terms. Because, without that we're going to foul up one of the finest criminal documents we have. This is a reasonable addendum to it and I support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think Representative Leinenweber, is to be commended for a step in the direction that has been needed for many months. As a Member of the Commission that visits and examines State Institutions, after talking to many people in the area of corrections, parole and pardon, it seems to me that we are all in agreement that we must tighten up the law. We must put these heinous criminals behind the bars and keep them there. They're those who say that the death penalty is cruel and inhuman, it seems to me that the cruel and inhuman treatment was given to those innocent victims who died by brutal assault, rape and what have you. And, all this Bill does is to put the criminal behind bars a determinate period of time so that he will serve the longest period possible, since we cannot put him to death. And, it seems to me that this is the only approach we're able to take at this time and we all... everyone of us should support this Bill... it's not possible that we can have 177 votes but I would say that we ought to have that very maximum."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? Representative Leinenweber, to close."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it has been said by the other speakers in this Bill and I would urge the support on House Bill 972."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass?"



Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Geo-Karis, to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Too long we have victimized the victim and slapped the wrist of viscious defendants and this Bill is destant to correct that to a great extent. I too commend Representative Leinenweber, I'm proud to be one of the Co-sponsors and I urge everyone to vote 'yes' because this is what we need."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 133 'aye', and 8 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3124, Representative Daniel... out of the record. Oh, Representative Daniels, I didn't see you there. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3124, was discussed yesterday at some length, it creates the Illinois patients compensation fund which will be activated at the instance of the Director of Insurance. It's an alternate method of financing in the event that the voluntary market of insurance fails in the malpractice crisis. I think that most of you understand the terms of it and I would solicit your favorable support."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3124, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to Medical Practice. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Any questions? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? All voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, Macdonald, 'aye'. On this question 113 'ayes' and no 'nays' and



the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of concurrence appears House Bill 2736, Representative Katz..... The hour of 8:58, arrived, Representative Walsh is now in the Chambers. Representative Katz.... 2736... Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Mr. Speaker, before you go to that next piece of business, could I please ask leave of the House to be recorded as 'aye', on that last Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, the Gentleman has leave to be recorded as 'aye'. 2736, Representative Katz... out of the record. 2850, Representative Schneider... Senate Bills, Third Reading. 1600, Representative Schraeder... 1600."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1600, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Revenue. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I'm holding that on the request of the Chairman on the Minority Leader of the Appropriations I, until they give me the okay, I'd take it out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. Are you ready on 1610, Representative Hill and Representative Merlo? No, that was taken out of the record. Are you ready on that now? 1650, Representative Stone... 1650... out of the record. 1863, Representative Maragos."

Clerk O'Brien: "1650..."

Speaker Redmond: "1650..."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the reason I'm holding 18...."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute, 1863... Representative Stone.... 1650, are you ready on that one? Illinois Community College Board. Out of the record. 1863,



Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I have to take it out of the record because the subject of Bill are still...."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay...."

Maragos: "And, that's why I have to wait for them."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. 1939, Representative Hanahan, in the Chamber? Out of the record. House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 3191."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3191, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the establishment, maintenance and operation of county law libraries. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz.... 3191."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3191, permits in its amended form... permits counties to continue doing what the Illinois law already permits, which is to build law libraries in the various counties and to finance it with one dollar charges, that's the present law.... one dollar charges by plaintiff and defendant. These law libraries are open not only to lawyers but to members of the public and a few of our counties are taking advantage of it. Now, there is a greatly increased cost of law books... this Bill after fifteen years increases the one dollars to two dollars, it is permissive only... and I would urge the passage of House Bill 3191, which for Cook County will permit the construction of... and the use of law libraries and not only as it currently is in the Loop area of the Civic Center but, will permit law libraries to be in the five suburban court houses that are under construction in the next few years in suburban Cook. I would urge the passage of House Bill 3191."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."



Ebbesen: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Ebbesen: "Representative Katz, what is the rationale of the emergency of this Legislation?"

Katz: "Well, the emergency made to the Legislation is, that they are running a deficit, a very substantial deficit with regards to, the cost and in Cook County, for example... they recently had to close the law library so that it was not available to anyone on Saturday and at nights... this is quite an emergency if you are summoned into court on an emergency motion, for example and you're not able to read the Illinois cases at night and is the genuine emergency that exists in Cook County. The Bill that was originally put in was one to Cook County and that is quite an emergency situation because of the continuing increasing deficit that the library is running in Cook County."

Ebbesen: "How much is the deficit?"

Katz: "The deficit... exceeds a hundred thousand dollars, I believe, I don't actually have the figures... I would be glad... they were in the Committee testimony, incidentally I think the Bill was unanimously reported out of the Committee but, in the Committee testimony the librarian of the Cook County law library did come down and did present the figures to the Committee... there is a deficit that I believe exceeds a hundred thousand dollars in the terms of the cost of the library."

Ebbesen: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson... Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates, he will."

Totten: "Harold, is it my understanding that this Bill does



two things. First of all it allows Cook County to charge a fee and it increases that fee...."

Katz: "That's correct, but you do understand that for fifteen years they have been allowed to do the fee. The only thing different about it is, that it increases it from one to two dollars... fifteen years ago they started the dollar fee and now it is two dollars and... under this Bill."

Totten: "Okay, now... I can understand that part of it. The other part of the Bill, allows Cook County to establish branches of county law libraries, is that correct?"

Katz: "Yes, that is correct."

Totten: "Where are those branches going to be?"

Katz: "Well, there's already under construction... suburban courts to meet the expanding population in suburban Cook. For example, there is the third district of the circuit court of Cook County... that is in Skokie, that takes care of all the suburb as in Skokie, that whole area. There is under construction a building... as I understand it, in southwest Cook, these are being built to provide courtroom in the suburban area so that the people in the suburban areas will not all have to go to the Loop in addition with the increasing relationship between crime and youth, it permits the problems of youth... young criminals to be dealt with in the local suburban communities."

Totten: "In these facilities that are being planned or being built, are there being made provisions for this law library?"

Katz: "Well, yes... it is intended, these are in various stages... it is intended that they will be so. Now, you should also understand that the judges who sit in these courts need law libraries too, in other words they have regular court and the judges and litigants



and the citizens would have a law library available in these courts and the lawyers in the suburban areas would have access to them. The increasing cost of law book is such that it is becoming very difficult for lawyers individually to keep well stocked libraries and so, by having these scattered over the suburban areas in the five locations, it will be possible to have the same advantages for suburban lawyers that Loop lawyers already enjoy in being able to go over and use the Civic Library."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well, I still don't think you have answered my question, Harold. A law library requires a room, most likely in a facility to books that you're talking about to provide the library in the resources that you're talking about. In those facilities that are being planned or constructed... now, is such a facility in the plan and if not, what impact is your Bill going to have on either requiring additional room or revising plans to put these facilities in."

Katz: "As I understand it, Representative Totten, and I have not been involved in the construction phase of those... it is planned that each of those courts will have libraries and each of those buildings will have libraries, it is being planned that way because really they cannot really run a court without having a library available to the judges and the lawyers and to the litigants who will be in those courts. So, they are being planned that way, this is part of a general plan to provide court services and all that goes with it, directly in the suburban areas around Cook, I think there are five of such buildings and...."

Totten: "Okay..."

Katz: "... each will have a library."



Totten: "If it is already being planned, then why do we need the Bill?"

Katz: "Well, because of the fact that there are not enough funds to pay for it, the one dollar that has been in effect.. while it has supported the big law library in the Loop area, cannot support the additional libraries. In addition, frankly... after fifteen years with the escalating cost of law books like everything else, it will no longer provide the money needed. If they don't have the money, I assume even though they had planned it they won't have it. But, it would be a great mistake not to provide the books that are an essential part of the law libraries that they hope to have in each of these five areas, if we don't pass it, I assume they won't have then but it will be a great loss."

Totten: "But, you've got two provisions in the Bill and what you've said, is okay, we're going to increase the fee I can understand why you may want to increase the fee but, if the county is already planning these buildings with the facilities in it, why do we need the second provision in the Bill that allows them to establish branches if they are already doing it."

Katz: "Well, I assume... that what they have been doing is thinking ahead, Representative Totten, and they have thought ahead... they have actually have not constructed any libraries in the suburban areas... waiting the passage of this Bill... but they have certainly thought about the fact that they will need them. These court houses are still in their primary phase, I think some havn't begun and not directly certain about the exact state of them but, all I would tell you is, that currently they only have one library, that library in Cook is in the Civic Center. There is a gradual program that will be taking place over the next decade or two



which will have the construction of court facilities in five locations in suburban Cook. It is hoped by the passage of this Bill that included within those courtrooms, will be law libraries... none currently exist but it is simply on the drawing board with the hope that with adequate financing they will be able to incorporate that in the five buildings that... in the next decade or two will be constructed in suburban Cook."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In addressing myself, at least to the suburban Cook County problem. I will tell the Members of this House that in August of this year... a new court facility will be opened in the Village of Maywood, which will service the fourth municipal district... that court house is almost ready to open with twelve new courtrooms but it does have the facilities for library but no way of putting the books in without this Bill. It's from my understanding... the ground has been broken in the southwest portion of the county, that new court house should be finished within a year and I talked to the chief judge as late as yesterday morning and he informed me that the plans were underway for a court house up in the northwest... part of the county and they should be breaking ground for that court house within a year."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner, do you still seek recognition?"

Skinner: "Yes, if the Sponsor would yield to a question."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Skinner: "I would like to know if it is not true, that the people file suits are the ones that end up picking up the cost of the library, not the lawyers, is that



correct? Is it correct that two dollars are just added on top of the court fee to subsidize the lawyers legal library."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Yes, currently one dollar under the Bill, two dollars would be added to the plaintiff cost of filing and to the first defendant who filed but, it is not a lawyers library, it's a library that's available to lawyers, judges, students, scholars, everybody in the community has access to the library."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten, bring your questioning to a close."

Totten: "Thank you. I wonder if Representative Shea, who could answer a question... if Representative Katz, would yield to him."

Katz: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Katz yields to Shea."

Katz: "Absolutely, Representative... the Majority Leader, please."

Totten: "Jerry, you indicated that these facilities were being built with provisions for a library... or one is planned. My question which Representative Katz, was trying to answer was... I can understand raising the fee... to maybe provide for the books... law books that you need in them, but why do we need the provision that allows Cook County to establish these libraries: if they are already going to be in existance."

Shea: "The law, if you read 8181... says, that the County will establish a law library. Now... what these are, are these many Civic Centers are going to have law libraries in them and rather than have anybody raise the question of... you know, can you have a law library with a branch... why not when you're passing the Bill. just make sure that you aren't going to buy another



taxpayers suit.... It gets very expensive for the people."

Speaker Redmond: "All right, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates that he will."

Friedrich: "Does this apply... this two dollar fee, apply to a case that's filed in small claims court?"

Katz: "I do not believe it is so, but honestly... do not really know the answer to your question. I think that the answer is, that it does not but I cannot tell you with absolute certainty. My suspicion is, that it would be up to the county board that establish them as to the class of cases to charge."

Friedrich: "I don't see any provision in the Bill for clasification at all. I would like to speak breify to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Friedrich: "I don't see any reason on earth why anyone going in and filing a case in small claims court should be forced to pay for a law library because you're not even required to have a lawyer in a small claims court. I know a lot of merchants and people who... and individual people who file cases in small claims court and why on earth they should have this taxed on to pay for law libraries for lawyers, I don't know."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, it's not my intention to demean the Bill in any sense but... some of this is obvious... I recommend that we discontinue debate."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Katz to close."

Katz: "House Bill 3191, will permit the continuance, in Cook



and in other counties where county boards desire to do so, a law library that have served the people of Cook, very well for fifteen years. It will increase from one to two dollars the amount that may be charged. It is entirely permissive, now with regard to the point made by Mr. Friedrich, Mr. Friedrich I will tell you that I would have no objection to an Amendment in the Senate that would exclude small claim cases because I think there is something to what you say... in view of the day, however I would like to pass the Bill and then I would be glad to meet with you and with the person from the law library and draft an appropriate Amendment but, I suspect that it is not now charged. But in any event I would be happy to agree to such of an Amendment and I would urge the continuation of the law libraries that make it possible, not only for lawyers but judges, for students, for professors, for citizens... for other people to have access to what our courts are deciding... so they understand what their rights to citizens are and I would urge support of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 100 'aye', 22 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3226, Representative Cunningham."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3226, a Bill for an Act to provide for the full amount of the salary of circuit court judges and associate judges to be paid by the State. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the



House. Without exception the counties of this State are impecunious they are even worse than that, they're destitute.. until last year only two counties, DuPage and Cook County paid a supplemental add on to the judicial salary. You will recall that last year we gave the judges of this State a cost of living increase and as a result of that increase, we burden each of the counties with an add on that averages in downstate counties of small downstate counties, about ten thousand dollars. It's seventy-five hundred dollars for each judge that resides in the county and also it is figured in on circuit judges over the district wide area. Now you passed this Bill last year, 437 passed out of the Senate easily... it reached the Governor's desk because of the financial situation then... the Governor veto the Bill, there is reason to hope that his action this time will be more favorable. The estimated cost is 1.7 million dollars, we would urge you that this is a convenient vehicle to give meaningful tax relief to segment of society that has been over looked and that's county government. I'll be happy to answer any question any of you may have about the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder, do you seek recognition?"

Schraeder: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. What is the fiscal impact to the State of Illinois when we pick up all these salaries for the 101 counties."

Cunningham: "The Governor said, last year that it was 1.7 million dollars and this is the only statewide type of office that I know of... where the salary is being presently paid part by the State and part by the local government. I should have mention earlier that the court administrator, Mr. Roy O. Gulley is strongly in support of this as are the county officers group."



Schraeder: "Well, it may be that he's in support of it but if you're talking about the fiscal responsibility of the State and of just a couple of weeks ago or a few days ago, the State couldn't pay their bill because the Comptroller said that we're down below a million dollars... a hundred million dollars in the cash flow. It seems to me this Bill is most inappropriate time and maybe a delay of one more year wouldn't hurt anything. You realize the counties are financially are in trouble too, but certainly the State of all times can't even pay their just debts without making more. I would suggest a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Leinenweber: "Representative Cunningham, do you know whether or not... or to what extent the average fine revenues in the circuit has increased since we added the add on Bill?"

Cunningham: "Representative Leinenweber, you'll remember Senator Gottschalk's reply to that question in Committee and I have checked with him since and they're not definite information from it... but the best guess or the best estimate was that there had been no substantial increase in the fine revenues, in the interim. So the hardship remains as initially. I should add there that many of the counties are not paying at the present time... not from a defiance of the law but from in-availability of the funds to pay it."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, very briefly on the Bill. I can understand the Gentleman's desire to pass this Bill. The previous speaker...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."



Leinenweber: "The previous speaker indicated the severe strain that the State itself is in, when I'm sure is far worse than any of the counties, so from the point of view of who is best able to pay this... I suspect the State is probably last in line. But more important than that... these judges perform a tremendous local function as the fund raisers for counties and I think people tend to forget this because they preside over local traffic court... they preside over local misdemeanor court and the courtroom situation where fine revenue is imposed. This fine revenue goes to the coffer of local government, I think this is a very worthwhile local function... I think that we can honestly expect at least until the State is on its fiscal feet... I think that we can honestly expect that the counties ought to willingly contribute a small percentage of the salary of these judges to go towards off-setting this... that portion of the work that they perform which directly, financially benefits local government. So, reluctantly I have to oppose this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "I join the Gentleman from Lawrence in urging the passage of this Bill. Just last week... Franklin County, where I live, announced that they spent the two hundred thousand dollar deficit for the next year. And they didn't ask for this additional burden... the counties didn't ask it when we increased the salaries of judges and imposed this additional burden on them. So, I think that if the State wants it... the State ought to pay for it. And they can pay for it as it has been indicated... many of the counties are not able to meet the obligation that we imposed on them and so they are not making the payments. And they can't do



I think that it is fair that the State does pick up the entire salary and I urge the support and adoption of House Bill 3226."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.... Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to surprise you I'm not going to make a long closing statement. It's the new Cunningham.... your constituents and mine will appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Geo-Karis, 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 92 'ayes' and 42 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3285... you better not... you better not..."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3285, Kosinski."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code of 1961. Third Reading of the Bill."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a housekeeping Bill... of no great importance except to the police departments in all the areas of the State. During the course of Conference Committees in the last Session, Chapter 38, was amended in several instances and definition of dangerous weapons was not constantly applied to all the Amendments to Chapter 38. I repeat this is a housekeeping Bill, I solicit your



'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question... The machine can't keep up with Representative Kosinski. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 139 'ayes' and no 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3322... Representative Collins... 3322."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3322, a Bill for an Act to amend the nursing homes, sheltered care homes, and homes for the aged Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3322, is a Bill that I have held for some time at the request of the Department of Public Health and the long term Health Care Association and I hope that we could work out some feasible compromise in the Bill. The Bill as I think most of you realize, is a Bill modeled after the suggestion of the proposed ordinance introduced in the Chicago City Council that would mandate automatic sprinkling systems in all nursing homes throughout the State. This Bill was occasioned by the rash of fires and loss of life involved in nursing home fires. If the Bill does raise certain serious problems for many operators of nursing homes however, I feel that it is an area where something must be done and I had hoped that we could work something out. I... we are now down to the point where I have to call the Bill, hoping to keep it alive or if I lose it so be it... but I think this is an emergency nature, it's an important enough matter to put to a Roll Call... answer some debate. The major



opposition to the Bill seems to be involved on the amount of money that will be involved in installing these systems. However, there is relief available for nursing home operators, the federal government is in a position to extend low interest loans... the insurance statistic will show that automatic sprinkling systems... over a relative short time will pay for themselves, so the cost item rather important is not insurmountable the fact that lives are being lost and the lives of people... least able to take care of themselves are being lost, I believe this Bill is of such nature that we should put it to a vote and I would hope that the House would favorably consider this Bill and move it along to the Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Yes, Mr. Speaker would the Sponsor yield?"

Representative Collins, could you tell me approximately how much money it would cost for let's say a one hundred bed nursing home to put in the sprinkler system that you're talking about."

Collins: "I don't have those figures, Bob, and this is why we are waiting to try and work something out on the matter of cost. I can tell you though as a rule of thumb, a sprinkling system such you suggest would pay for itself in about seven or eight years."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, very briefly if I may. I applaud Representative Collins for what he's trying to do for the people who are confined to these homes but, on the other hand I would remind you that... not too long ago we refused to give these private nursing homes any more help, they.... actually they're asking today. . . . they're asking the private care people to subsidize the Public Aid people and once again... we're imposing the situation on these people, it's going to cost them



more money and possibly even force some of them out of business, so at the present time, I'm sorry but I'm going to have to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners..." Representative Collins."

Collins: "If I may, I now have an answer for Representative Brinkmeier. My insurance expert, Representative Epton, informs me that a hundred bed home would require the investment of about thirty thousand dollars."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to remind the Members of the House that we had a Bill before us that was something similar to this only it provided an alternative system, either sprinklers or an alternative system that was approved by the Department of Public Health and if I remember correctly... even that Bill didn't pass. I think if you take a look at the deaths in nursing home fires here in Illinois, they occur from smoke inhalation which of course results from the fires but there are alternative systems which are less expensive than the mandatory sprinkler system that detects the smoke and issues a warning. I applaud the Sponsor for what he is attempting to do but I don't think that mandating sprinkler systems for every nursing home in the State is going to do the job... we have some that are very effective but a little older, they will go out of business rather than to install this necessary equipment. In addition we will all pay the Bill because many of the people that are housed in these nursing homes are Public Aid recipients and right now the people who operate these homes are saying that Public Aid isn't paying enough for their cost involved. Again I think that we're trying to do a good job here. but I think that there ought to be an alternative



system provided and it's not and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Directing your attention to the second page of the Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order."

Schlickman: "Line 17 through 20, there is provisions for a six month extension to be granted by the Department in the event that there is hardships. Now, do you intend that this be an absolutely one extension or could there be multiple extension by the Department?"

Collins: "Well, Representative Schlickman, I wouldn't object... I think the Bill reads that there would be one extension but I certainly wouldn't object to extending that beyond that because I do believe that there are instances where they could not comply within the period set up within the Bill. I was hoping to Amendment on that feature as I was on others... as I say, I held this Bill as long as I could hoping that we could work some of these things out."

Schlickman: "What you're saying then, that multiple extension is the Legislative intent."

Collins: "Not upon introduction but upon reflection I can see that perhaps it should be."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Polk: "Mr. Collins, we have the tours that the long term care Commission made throughout the State. We came across homes that we county homes that were actually out in the county... some of them as far as seventeen,



twenty miles away from downtown areas. It would be actually impossible for them to have the water pressure necessary to install the sprinklers as you have indicated. How would you handle the situation such as this?"

Collins: "Well, as you say... as I say it would not be impossible, it would be more expensive to extend water out to a home such as you suggest. I'm not familiar with that type of home... it just.... additional expense to bring water mains in there. Again these are the things that we were trying to consider as I held the Bill."

Polk: "Did you assume that the State would participate in extending these water mains or would this be the county responsibility."

Collins: "I never anticipated that the State would participate that is a possibility but we had not talked along those lines."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will. Don't disturb the Sponsor."

Mautino: "Representative Collins, there are some nursing homes operated by the county who in the past year or so have applied for H.U.D. grants in order to increase the water storage facility at the homes which are away from the main cities... all right, now in some cases for example, the Bureau County, they just spent two hundred and forty thousand dollars putting in larger lines and more water supply out there in other tanks. Now, would they also under your Bill be mandated to put in a sprinkler system besides?"

Collins: "I didn't understand what you said they did, other than bring water out to..."

Mautino: "They put another tank up, another water storage



tank at a cost of about two hundred and fifty thousand dollars. To help the fire hazard if there were any... but would they also have to have the sprinkler system besides the new water system."

Collins: "Yes, as you said they brought additional water out and I think the problem raised by Representative Polk, would no longer exist as far as bring the water into the sprinklers. Yes, they still would be required under my Bill."

Mautino: "Well, they did this in lieu of putting in the sprinkler system... you know, so therefore they also have to do the sprinkler system besides."

Collins: "I don't think that there is anything that can be done in lieu of sprinklers. I... for what I've seen over the years and from I've learned talking to fire officials in the City of Chicago, I firmly believe that the sprinkler system is the number one fire deterrent that we have available to us. The smoke detectors systems are fine in their place, they're in conjunction with sprinklers but if a sprinkler puts a fire out well there is going to be darn little smoke."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to address this Bill, first of all... I know that we were all saddened by the fire in Chicago which is one of the basis for the introduction of this Legislation. But I think we all are aware also that this is the fire which was set by an individual. I think that it is impossible to Legislate against all these types of human tragedy... and while we're doing so I think that we are creating other tragedies which may be just as bad as the fire. First of all we're adding cost to senior citizens for their care and if you talk to senior citizens, you know that the cost of



nursing home is one of the biggest worries which they have. In addition we're adding cost to the State of Illinois, where we must pay for our Public Aid care and in fact, if you'll check the records you'll find that nursing homes are now subsidizing the State of Illinois because we don't pay enough for the care for the people that they have on Public Aid. Finally many county homes are in deep trouble, they don't have the money to operate them... in my home county, they're running a deficit of well over a hundred thousand dollars and they're considering going out of the nursing home business... out of the nursing home business. So, there won't be these beds for these people and as the Sponsor of this measure said, we'll just run some more mains out there. I don't think he's been out in the county, you just don't run high pressure mains out to some of these county homes. I hope that we'll take a good hard look at this... we've done enough to the nursing home business, we've raised the cost... we've raised for families and patients so let's put it in perspective... let's don't throw the baby out with the wash. And, I vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This certainly is a step in the right direction. I don't know if you people realize this but, it's becoming more common for grandparents, parents to end up in these nursing homes and I would like to point out to every person in this House... man or woman, that eventually we can end up in these homes too, and I just heard the Gentleman over on the other side say... that they're going out of business... up in the area where I come from, they're driving cadillacs and the doctors are getting involved to the hilt. I think that it is a Bill that's



needed and I would suggest that you vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I will be very brief... I will say that I did support the Bill that alluded to by Representative Kempiners, that was Representative Lundy's Bill and it was a good Bill and one that I support. This Bill did not pass, I think that mine is a viable alternative to work with... to try and come up with something to solve this very serious problem. From everything that I have seen the automatic sprinkling system is the one the best detecting of fire that we have. I've heard a lot of talk about cost on the floor of the House to day, I grant you that these things can be expensive but we're talking about people who are least able to take care of themselves... we're talking about aged people, we're talking about infirmed people, we're talking about people in most cases... are in many cases immobile. I think it is important, I think that it's imperative that we keep this Bill moving and I would implore you to support House Bill 3322."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Leinenweber, to explain his vote."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to echo I believe what Representative Ewing tried to point out in his remarks and probably most elegantly was pointed out several weeks ago by Representative Craig, and that is... that this Bill perhaps is aimed at a very real



and existing problem in the metropolitan Chicago area. But it exacerbate an existing problem of much greater magnitude in the smaller downstate communities. And that is, what it is going to do financially to already strapped small nursing homes in the small communities. Now, we're talking about nursing homes of perhaps twenty-five to thirty maximum bed spaces... nursing homes in communities where the old people can actually live with... very close to their families, communicate with them, get out in the open air and go around and meet people they've known all their lives. Now, these homes are absolutely strapped, for example I can give an example right from our district in the village Peotone, the Bensville, Peotone nursing home is going out of business because of the fact that it absolutely meet the... some of these newly imposed capital expenditure requirements which are being imposed upon it which is a thrity-two bed nursing home. In order to meet existing criteria... they're going to require a capital expenditure of over one hundred thousand dollars, this would... if this Bill passes this would absolutely throw them under... this is a very well run privately... not for profit operated nursing home, they're many of them in the downstate communities they serve extremely useful purpose, they will be put out of business if we keep mandating capital expenditures that they cannot afford. So, I would urge red votes along with mine."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 65 'ayes' and 68 'no', the Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. 3366."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3366, a Bill for an Act to amend



an Act to prevent fraudulent and corrupt practices in the making or accepting of official appointments and contracts by public officers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, I move to Table House Bill 3366."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? The Gentleman has moved to Table 3366. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it... 3366, is Tabled. 3367..."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3367, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Burkett Travel Services, Inc. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3367, is a Bill that I introduced at the request of the Burkett Travel Services, a travel service in the City of St. Louis for money that was owed them by the Department of Children and Family Services for transporting wards of the State and for some reason or other the Agency was not reimbursed for these charges. These charges extend over a period of years. Is the Majority Leader on the floor? Yes... I had conversation with Representative Shea, because we... I have agreed with the Department of Family Services that since they admit that the money is owed but there is some discrepancy as to the exact total... that we were holding for an Amendment. They have not come back to me with the actual amount of money that is owed and which I will except... and as late as yesterday, I was trying to contact Representatives of the Department so I could get the Amendment. I talked to Representative Shea, at that time and agreed that if we got the Amendment, I would pull it back today..."



JUN 22 1973

51.

I don't have the Amendment... I also agreed with Representative Shea, that is we would pass the Bill out of here today... I would give them the same assurance in the Senate that we would amend the Bill to whatever amount the Department agrees is owed. It is my sincere desire there would be no controversy involving this amount. Obviously the reason that the Bill is in and the matter is not before the court of claims, is that rather than go to the expense of processing this through the court of claims, on something that is agreed by all parties... is owed, I thought that this was simpler and cleaner and I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all... Representative Schlickman... Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 93 'aye' and 4 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3430."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3430, a Bill for an Act to direct transfer of money between funds in the State Treasury. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3430, directs the transfer of funds from the State Treasury as follows; total from the General Revenue Fund, three million dollars of which... should Local Governmental Law Enforcement Officers Fund, one million, nine hundred thousand and to the Fire Protection Personnel Fund, one million one hundred thousand dollars. This was amended by the Appropriations II, Committee to reduce it by the amount left over into the fund... not to exceed one million, two hundred



thousand dollars for the Governmental Law Enforcement Officers Fund and one million dollars for the Fire Protection Personnel Fund."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 140 'ayes' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Stiehl, 'aye'. Maragos, 'aye'."



Speaker Redmond: "On the order of Resolutions. On the order of Resolutions, Representative D.L. Houlihan. Resolution 919, is that the correct one?"

D.L. Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Committee created, pursuant to House Resolution 883, has completed its assigned responsibility. It has worked intensively. It has reported excessively and it has acted unanimously. On behalf of that Committee, I move the adoption of House Resolution 919."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I have read the report of the Investigating Committee three times since it was distributed near midnight. The report is more interesting and revealing for what the Committee didn't do and what the report doesn't say, than are its contents. A Gentleman from Cook in support of the establishment of the Investigating Committee said on the floor that the respondent, the Majority Leader, probably will ask for open meetings. But the Committee relied on Robert's Rules of Order, despite the public assertion of the Gentleman from Tazewell, the Sponsor of the Resolution, amending our rules to provide for disciplinary proceedings, that Robert's Rules of Order don't apply to a legislative body. The Committee wasn't sure what it was going to uncover."

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

Berman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think the Gentleman, if I hear him correctly, is addressing the report and not the Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Confine your remarks to the Resolution, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "The report is the foundation of the Resolution. I plead with you, Mr. Speaker, that I am in order. Thank you. The Committee wasn't sure what it was going to uncover and



that it may set an unfortunate precedent. All of this, despite the great amount of publicity surrounding the matter."

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

Tipsword: "I'm sorry to interrupt but have these reports been distributed to everybody?"

Speaker Redmond: "They were available to everyone."

Tipsword: "They're not back here."

Speaker Redmond: "It was announced last night they would be available until midnight. We had at 10 or 10:15, we had a limited number. You got 'em? Get them out here and anybody who doesn't have one, make it available. We're bringing another box down, Representative Tipsword. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there is a summary of proceedings carefully spoonfeeding to us the facts the Committee thought relevant and material, after having denied to us all of the facts that were uncovered and the opportunity to determine the facts that weren't uncovered. The Committee totally disregarded the prohibition against breach of a public trust in Section 3107 of the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act. And with respect to Sections 3102, 3105, and 1306, it concluded that they were not violated but without giving any supporting discussion. The Chairman of the Committee insisted that I provide the Committee a proposed set of stipulations of facts, despite my offering of charges identified as exhibit A. Now in the report, Mr. Chairman... Mr. Speaker, Members of the Committee... Members of the House, the Committee stated that that proposed stipulation of facts was Mr. Shea's statement of facts, constituted a substantial agreement as to what had taken place. If this is so, why wasn't my proposed set of stipulations of facts along with those of the respondent contained in the report? And what conclusions of fact, i.e., interpretations or judgments as to the nature of what happened did I allege that the Committee rejected? Who specifically gave countering testimony? The report is silent again. The respondent appeared twice before the Committee. I was invited only once. The Committee report



shows that only the attorneys, one attorney in particular, specifically, for the respondent made presentations on his behalf. This Gentleman addressed himself to the contents of exhibit A which was the Committee's revision of my exhibit 1. He also presented a memo of law and a statement of fact. What did the respondent say, if anything? I offered the Committee a list of 13 witnesses. Only four were called. Importantly, one of the proposed witnesses not called had previously stated that the respondent as an attorney for the medical society did not evidence any technical skill with respect to setting up the society's insurance plan. Nor was there any evidence, according to that proposed witness, that the respondent had participated in the work other than attending two meetings with the Department of Insurance accompanied by other attorneys. And if the respondent's presence at these meetings was not necessary, according to this proposed witness, why was the respondent even at those meetings at all? And what about the Springfield attorney with whom the respondent has a close economic association? Or the Director of Public Aid, who the respondent called by telephone expressing concern as to whether or not his client's contract with the state would be terminated? These contracts were termed by the Committee as noncontroversial, in quotes; but what about their apparent illegality? A most serious matter, according to an official of the Department of Insurance. And where's the Department of Public Aid's internal audit covering these contracts? Why is it being suppressed? On the other hand, how could two persons be quoted in support of the respondent's position when they didn't even appear before the Committee? Certainly, if the respondent has knowledge and securities in insurance law matters and it's the most critical point, this should have been supported by the direct testimony of one of those two persons. I am not surprised, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that there's a Resolution of exoneration. I'm only surprised by the amount of time that was taken to arrive at this end. Six weeks in duration and I understand, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that there are a number of



you who are upset that this matter ever arose and that you want it to go away as fast as possible. And I understand, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that this Session is fast approaching adjournment and there's no need for ur... that there is a need for avoiding extraneous matters. But the truth of the matter, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, is that a Member of this House accepted a substantial compensation from a client after and before sponsoring Bills on that client's behalf and sought a state agency's approval of the client's insurance plan. Also, that individual, a Member of this House, on behalf of he and another client, sought to avoid termination by the state of contracts with his client, despite alleged illegality of the contracts and difficulty the state was having in securing quality performance. The law of this state, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, says that a Legislator shall not engage in unbecoming conduct or breach the public trust. Now I find it interesting, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that the Committee did not apparently concern itself with the reflections of one of the public members of the Conflict of Laws... Commission... Conflict of Interest Laws Commission of 1967. Made reference to it, cited it, but didn't quote it. And let me quote one thing from you... for you. Page 52, 'However, when Legislators, almost always lawyers, take money for such representation, problems arise. The danger is that since the Legislature has control over agency budgets, personnel and power, an agency may be tempted to give undue deference to a powerful Legislator who is appearing on behalf of a private client. Even if an agency does not yield to this temptation, the appearance of impropriety can damage public confidence. Or, if you will, a breach of the public trust. Compensated representation of clients before a state agency can also lead to influence peddling, whereby a lawyer-legislator tacitly or explicitly indicates that he can wield special influence over a particular department because of his position in the Legislature.' My initiating this matter was the most deliberative thing that I have done in twelve



years in Springfield. And by deliberative, I mean, without malice or bias; but with the advice and counsel of others and thorough investigation. In fact, I'm more convinced today than I was on May 3, 1976, when I offered, now tabled, House Resolution 777. In reflecting on what has transpired, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there was a quotation in the newspaper last week and I'd like to share it with you. It was spoken by President John Howard of Rockford College and appeared in the 'Chicago Tribune'. He said, 'I earnestly believe that it has been the silence of the good people much more than the yammering of fools or the persuasion of intentional evil which has converted this once predominantly lawful and beneficent nation into a moral wasteland.' That process can be reversed if enough citizens of moral conviction will raise their voices. And as I flew down yesterday, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in reading a book that my son had given to me for Father's Day, I read these quotes by Elliot Richardson. 'There is the need for integrity. To achieve and maintain a self-governing society, its citizens must feel some attachment to its free institutions and humane values and be capable of resisting any attempt to betray them.' Mr. Richardson went on, 'The abuse of power is a corrupting precedent for those who later hold it. For those who are subject to it, its continuing abuse can come to seem like the natural order of things. For both, the effect is addicting and if the abuse of power goes that far, discovering the habit may come too late to cure it.' Initially and initiating this matter was not an easy task. Suffice it to say, I did what I thought was right by all the standards to which I am committed and find acceptable. If I hadn't done what I did, I would wonder why I am here. I shall vote 'no' on House Resolution 919."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative LaFleur."

LaFleur: "Mr. Speaker, I would second the adoption of the Resolution and I would only say one thing that I think we all must realize that if we're going to self-disciplinary bodies, we must work with what we have in precedent, in law and in rules."



And if there is a delinquency existing in this process, I think it's our delinquency. I think it should be faced. I think we should look at it and I think we should do it alertly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe that the system under which our House conducts its business is significantly corrupt. I refer to our tradition, our atmosphere, our habits. Since habits are involuntary responses, they are performed without volition and may, therefore, not carry personal culpability. Nevertheless, we operate under conditions which involve gross, nearly continuous conflicts of interest. A conflict of interest is representation of two interests at the same time which are adverse to one another or at least, not compatible. The one master we are obliged to represent is the people of the State of Illinois. This means, if it means anything, that each of us should act and vote as we sincerely feel best serves the people and no other interests. Mr. Speaker, this standard is breached every time we trade one vote for another. If a trade is required, it means in the case of two Legislators who trade, that on both issues, one of the votes is a betrayal of the public trust. If a vote is made out of fear of a colleague's reprisal, we have served a second master. Fear is no defense. If a vote is made out of regard for the Sponsor, we have been corrupted. Friendship is not a defense. When a party line is voted, we have sold out our constituents. The people of the State of Illinois are not a political party. What a Legislator falls in line to his political bosses, when he is urged by his party factions to vote against his own sincere belief, he doesn't belong in the Legislature. There is a dereliction of duty when we are in total ignorance of a Bill's content and fail to inquire, but nevertheless, cast a Committee vote in accordance with the Chairman or Minority Spokesman. Dollars need not change hands for a vote to be corrupt. Mr. Speaker, in a sense, making a judgement in this case is an act of utmost triviality. It is like pointing out a cold sore in a leper colony. We are all, possibly, all



guilty of more serious conflicts of interest than those at issue here. This does not mean that this body has no hope of redemption, but it does acknowledge that the elimination of all conflicts of interest is impossible. This body reflects society. It cannot operate without dishonesty until all men are honest. It cannot be fearless while there is any fear in the hearts of men. Let me say and maybe it's apparent, that as I stand to speak on this question, I am afraid. Mainly, I fear that I shall be misunderstood. I fear the possible loss of goodwill from my peers. I recognize and hence, fear the possibility that I may appear holier than Thou. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there are two principal elements in this case. One is specific, it relates to the specific charges against Representative Shea. The other is general and I believe it's the controlling issue. I believe strongly, strongly enough to overcome my fears and state it, that a Legislator should not do what Mr. Shea has done. It is infinitely worse in that it was done by a Majority Leader, but I should not punish Mr. Shea. I should thank him. Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Shea is a very busy man. I feel that he did what is described in the report without reflection, without pause, without time to consider, time to undo habits, beset by many urgent, important obligations. We should thank Mr. Shea and, yes, Mr. Schlickman and the special Investigating Committee for giving us the opportunity to here and now assert a standard of future conduct. Future conduct, Mr. Speaker. We have been given time to reflect. We are asked to decide if in the future, a lawyer-legislator should represent a client before agencies of the Executive Branch, whether a Majority Leader or a Minority Leader should engage in the kind of activities that are described in the report. I believe that the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act does proscribe the kind of conduct that took place. But if it does not, I think that this body should determine that such conduct in the future should be proscribed. That, Mr. Speaker, is the controlling issue. There is one important aspect of the report of the special Committee, despite the length and the documentation



contained therein, despite the appearance of painstaking attention to detail, there is to my mind a serious problem with this. The report states under Section 3(b) that it decided, quote, 'To report completely the previously confidential matter', close quote. It states that there is now no need to be concerned about full disclosure of the evidence upon which it makes its findings and recommendations. But the three basic documents were not reproduced and made available to us. They are, one, the document entitled, 'Proposed Stipulation of Fact as Proposed by Representative Schlickman'. Two, document entitled, 'Statement of Fact', submitted by Representative Shea. And three, 'Memorandum of Law', submitted on behalf of Representative Shea. The report states that these crucial items were not identified as exhibits because, quote, 'In that relevant parts thereof were encompassed, encompassed in the findings'. In a word, these important documents were buried. In short, we who are asked to make a judgement, are denied the documents which contain the facts as presented by the two parties in interest. We are not given the three documents which make this entire case. A green vote, Mr. Speaker, would indicate that this body finds that future conduct of the kind that took place is acceptable, is acceptable. Would, that we were allowed to affirm that such conduct is not acceptable in the future, but that Representative Shea go hence without day. That is to say, that the matter be dropped as to him. I wish that were the case. I wish we could do that, but I don't believe that we have that option. My view is, Mr. Speaker, that our code of conduct is of pressing, vital importance and that the issue before us is not Mr. Shea. Our intentions are at issue, our resolve, our commitment to standards of future conduct. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, maybe this should be under the heading of personal privilege, but I think it's as relevant at least as some of the things that have been said. I would fight with all of my ability to protect the right of a Member



of this House to bring legitimate charges of misconduct against another Member. We now have rules for the procedure to do that and I worked on those rules, both to protect the people of the State of Illinois and to protect the Members of this House. I know that the Executive Committee was faced with this problem with no recent precedent and I know they agonized over the problem and tried to work it out. I also know the Select Committee worked hard on this thing and I did not envy them their job, but I recognized in the make-up of that Committee some of the outstanding Members of impeccable character in this House and I would resent any reflection on the work of that Committee because I know they worked hard. I read the report and I personally think they did a good job and I think they're background reasoning is good. We now have rules to govern any situation that would come up in the future and I couldn't believe that we didn't have rules in the first place to do that even though I'm a Member of the Rules Committee, but I'm proud of the fact that we have them. I think they've been beaten out the hard way to where they are a good set of rules. And I would suggest to you that Mr. Schlickman had his day before the press many times. He had his right to appear before the Executive Committee which he did on a number of times. He came before the Rules Committee. He had his right to appear before the Select Committee and make specific charges and I think that's his day in court. I think his remarks this morning is a reflection on the integrity of and the honesty of the Members of that Select Committee which I respect very much and I really expected him to say this morning that he did have the right to bring the charges. He appreciates the fact that the Committee did it and let it go at that. But I suggest to you that, once again, that he has used this occasion to make statements and have his picture taken again and I want to suggest that he's beating a dead horse. I think the issue has been properly handled and I really feel pretty badly about his part in this. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton."



Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I certainly had and have no desire to speak on this subject. I think it is unfortunate that Representative Shea is embroiled in a situation now which brings forth some questions of our ethics and future ethics. And since the Speaker has seen fit to allow that discussion, I have no choice but to participate. As far as the report is concerned, it speaks for itself. The Members of that Committee, likewise, are intelligent, confident men and women of integrity and they, too, can defend the report to the best of their ability if need be. I think what is important is what some of the other Gentlemen have raised. And I certainly do not question their motives. I think that all three of them speak with great sincerity, but I do disagree with many of the conclusions. And I think that they will concede that I have that right to disagree. As a matter of fact, over 200 years ago Edmund Burke stated very clearly, 'I am not down here to represent my district. I am not down here to vote my district. I am not down here to vote for the people. I am down here to vote my conscience'. My conscience is what determines how I will cast a vote on a particular Bill. If my district would like to have lynch law, that doesn't necessarily mean I must be for it. I insist upon my right to vote on any matter on which I have knowledge. I recognize I owe a duty not only to this body, but to my constituents to reveal whenever I do have an interest. I have previously indicated to you that I would be in despair if a farmer did not get up to speak on a farming Bill. I would be quite upset if a union official didn't get up and eloquently present the side of labor. If a teacher remained silent while a question of the teaching profession were being raised or if a lawyer stood mute while some question concerning justice was raised, as a matter of fact, I can't conceive of one single Bill that comes before this House and this Senate which does not in some manner or fashion, affect either me or members of my immediate family, much less members of my law firm. We have represented insurance companies for many years. We will continue to



represent insurance companies, although if I continue to initiate some of the Bills I have, we may lose some of them. But the fact remains, I intend to appear in front of the Department of Insurance. I don't kid myself I, of course, do not carry the weight that a Majority Leader or a Minority Leader or what some of the more eloquent, gifted men and women of the House may do; but I resent the inference whether it be made by the media or a Member of this body that I will go in there seeking only my self-interest. Of course, I will do the best possible job for the client. If it conflicts with the will of my constituency, I have to answer for it every two years. And more than that, if it conflicts with my conscience, I have to answer with it every day. I do not intend to be disturbed by a conflict of interest. Contrary what was said, a conflict of interest does not indicate an adversary proceeding between two clients, between two opposing viewpoints. Those of you who vote on certificate of need, hospital legislation, when is the next time you're going into the hospital? Should you remain mute? When you have your insurance premiums raised, you're a part of that procedure. Should you vote for or against the Bill? On the contrary. What Representative Shea did is something that my law firm has been trying to do. We have been trying to represent the medical society. Unfortunately, he got it away from us. Next time, we hopefully get it. The fact remains that each and every one of us, unless we are a full-time Legislator, a thought which should strike terror into the heart of every individual in the State of Illinois, must necessarily have some conflict, some more, some less. I do not think the question of Representative Shea's conduct is any longer before this House. A Resolution has been presented. It'll be up to those of us who vote on that to vote our conscience. But I do say to my colleagues and I say it respectfully, don't suggest that I don't have the integrity to appear before the Department of Insurance without promising to lower their appropriation or increase their appropriation. Don't think that when I appear before the Department of Registration



and Education that I am a crook or a knave. I resent that more than any of the charges leveled against my colleague. I hope that when you... the time comes for you to vote, you will realize that Representative Shea is a gentleman who has worked hard and long, Representative Schlickman has spent many, many hours. I sincerely believe, knowing both of them, that there was no malice in the instigation of this problem; nor was there any malice in the rebuttal, but that should be behind us. We have a report which was well done. If there was an error in judgement on the part of that Committee, unfortunately, God does not call any of us directly, I hope not. And the fact remains that we do the best job we can, but remember, our primary concern is to vote our conscience. And whenever and whatever we do, will be reflected immediately in how we live with ourselves as well as our colleagues. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes, Jane."

J.M. Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have read the entire report and I would like to say that I read it in the very analytical sense. And, up to this point, I hadn't really known that much about it. I was on the Executive Committee and I do know each Member of that Committee addressed the problem in a very, very serious manner. And I would think for those reasons and so did the six Members that were assigned to the final Committee. Now upon reading this, the people that testified, in my estimation, satisfied the three different charges that were brought by my colleague on this side of the aisle. One of the very interesting points for those of you who have not taken the time to read it, there was a Mr. Garrett that testified and he is an Insurance Code Examiner for the Illinois Department of Insurance. And I quote, 'Mr. Garrett informed the Committee that Mr. Shea's conduct was entirely correct, proper and in accordance with the appropriate role of any private attorney. That Shea made no attempt to influence the Department of Insurance or himself; and that indeed, he was unaware that Shea was even a Member of the Illinois General Assembly until he had inquired of Mr. Shea as to whether Shea ever gets to Springfield'. One of the



Legislators described Mr. Shea as powerful. I would describe him as knowledgeable. Another Legislator said he was too busy, but never too busy to be on the House at this floor doing the job that he was elected to do. The only reason that I take note of that is cause I consider myself a very dedicated Legislator. I have 100% attendance on this House floor and in Committee, so I feel that I can make judgement of this type. I rise for very selfish reasons because I also have a family as Mr. Shea does and I never want to be questioned in this particular manner. It disturbs me because I am not a lawyer. I am just a Legislator that is down here to represent her district. I think that all of us are a little bit concerned about ethics and the way that things are handled today. No one wants to walk away from here in disgrace of himself or their family. Since many people have testified before this Committee and I have read the entire thing, to me, I find it quite satisfactory. And at this point, what disturbs me is that a Member that is a Legislator on my side of the aisle, that the thought of witch-hunt even crosses my mind. I think that we are all elected and we're down here to do a job and I would wish that we would have an empathy toward one another. And when proven facts such as these that are before me in this long, long, detailed report, I wish that they would be accepted and not still questioned by a fellow Legislator on my side of the aisle where I see the only thing that has improved his personality or integrity by this is that he has improved his attendance on this House floor because also by sitting behind some of the Legislators, I notice some of the empty seats. And I would like to conclude by saying, I should hope that after today, this would be a forgotten matter. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I don't rise to speak. I just would like, if the Sponsor would yield for some questions."

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Deuster: "I read the report, too; and I would like to direct your attention to page 59, which from my point of view as a lawyer



and as a Legislator, really gets to the heart of it. And that is, this feeling, I know that perhaps some of my clients come to me knowing that I'm a State Representative and they might approach me that way. I think I'd be naive if I didn't, if I wasn't conscious of that. On the second paragraph, is this statement, it says, 'The Committee unanimously finds no evidence whatsoever that Mr. Shea was offered an economic opportunity with the intent to influence his conduct in the performance of his official duties'. The question I'd like to pose is that I generally don't feel we, Legislators, are the culprits, so to speak, in this sidereal. We're just here, we've been elected and we represent people and now the Illinois Medical Society is the one that initiated this situation. The Illinois Medical Society is the one that developed some legislation and retained an attorney. And I would like to ask you this question since your meetings were Executive Session, I guess we don't know fully; but what witnesses appeared before your Committee from the Illinois Medical Society to explain to your Committee how it was, of all the thousands of lawyers in the State of Illinois and the Chicago area perhaps, they selected the lawyer that they did? What witnesses appeared and what did they say on that?"

D.L. Houlihan: "The list of all witnesses who appeared before this Committee are stated in the report. Article 10 of the report sets out what is the unanimous decision of this Committee, a full and accurate summary of all of the relevant evidence in this case. To now take you through a point by point, step by step, isolated factual situation would do a disservice to this report and a disservice by emphasizing one particular point as against the totality of circumstances. People from the Medical Society were before the Committee. They did bring certain records at the request of the Committee. The Committee felt satisfied that the conclusion was to set forth on page 59 of the report which you have referred to..."

Deuster: "Well..."

D.L. Houlihan: "You haven't let me finish."



Deuster: "Oh, I'm sorry."

D.L. Houlihan: "Felt satisfied that that conclusion was not only justified by all of the relevant evidence that was before this Committee, it was demanded by it. And that was the determination of the Committee which was unanimous."

Deuster: "Well, I'm advised that the medical society and I may be wrong, it may be just a rumor, I don't know, that the medical society consulted a former Member of this House, George Burditt, and asked him who would be a good one to retain and that he suggested Representative, the Representative being... the subject of this inquiry, is that correct?"

D.L. Houlihan: "That is specifically stated, if you will, Mr. Deuster, and I would that in posing these questions it would make it easier if you would fully and carefully read the report. That is fully covered in part 10 of the report, the summary of facts."

Deuster: "Well, the only reason I ask this question is we're always criticized for moving things along and as one of the prior Representatives said, even to stand up and comment, everyone has a feeling of fear. You know your legislation's... you have that feeling. I don't want to apologize for standing up. Now my question is this, was Mr. Burditt brought in as a witness?"

D.L. Houlihan: "Would you please read the report, Mr. Deuster. We list the witnesses that appeared before the Committee."

Deuster: "Well, you could've answered 'yes' or 'no'. You don't have to be insolent. I'm just asking a question here."

D.L. Houlihan: "You're insulting our intelligence, Mr. Deuster, by your failure to read the report."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, for one, have read the report in full. I'm going to cast a green vote because after reading the report and knowing the integrity of the six people, three from each side, who agonized over this whole matter and still came to a unanimous conclusion. No matter what, it was still unanimous conclusion. I am satisfied that they have done their best and their results reflect their independent, conscientious thinking. I did not vote to table



Resolution 777 because I felt that the Sponsor of that Resolution should've had that right to do so if he wanted to do it. I agonized over it, but by the same time, I did feel that the Sponsor's Resolution 777 called for an outright reprimand and an outright decision of guilt without any finding. This Assembly has never had a prior record of conduct commensurate to what we have tried to do with House Resolution 9... I believe it was 902. We now have some standards by which we can go. Whatever took place in the Shea incident, took place before that Resolution was adopted. I am satisfied and I congratulate and commend the six Members of this Committee that took the time, many hours, to go through it and make what I think is a very informative report and a report which indicated to me very clearly what the course of action had been in the past, be it little or big; and at least now we have some decent guidelines to discipline ourselves. I do not feel that the person called in for Resolution 777 should be made to take the whole brunt. We are all responsible. We don't like to pay taxes, yet we vote on tax Bills. That's a conflict of interest. We, who support education, have children in public schools, support public school Bills. We have a conflict of interest. We, who represent unions and support labor Bills, we have a conflict of interest. I can go on and on and on, so we have to be honest about it. We are part-time Legislators and we give the basis and background on a very experienced and knowledge which is to help this Legislator, Legislature. And if we were full-time Legislators, I wonder if we would do any better because then we would probably be very limited in our scope. And as I say, I'd like to second this Resolution of Mr. Houlihan's, commend the Committee for doing the most ethical and the probably the most conscientious job anyone could've done, and unless you've walked in their moccasins, you cannot really reflect how they could possibly feel. And I, for one, am glad that they took the time and the patience and the effort and the knowledge to come through with this very comprehensive report."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ron Hoffman."



R.K. Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think many of the House Members here, over quite a period of time, have agonized over the situation we were forced to consider and I think for each of us, it was a period of soul searching as to our performance down here. And for the time that I have been down here, I've been very proud to serve with the Members that I have served with in the last eight years. And this General Assembly is no different. I have the highest respect for every Member on this floor and I feel that we've gotten to this point in time where we were forced to consider something. However, I feel, too, that those that were vested with this responsibility have done their job. Having inquired into the charges and have come up with a finding which is now presently on your desk and I really wonder if the process is served by agonizing over and over again that which has already been done and has been compiled in this report. Consequently, I would recommend to the Members here to consider that which has been done and cast a vote on this Resolution and get on with the business of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh. Ready for the question? Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Earlier, I'd asked a question and I had intended to make an observation. I asked the question as to why the one person who was, in my judgement, a critical person in this situation, we're really, if we're going to vote our conscience, as Representative Epton and others have suggested, we ought to have the facts and we have a report here and I, too, have the highest respect for all of the good friends, good personal friends who serve on this Committee. And I simply asked the question, why was the one person who, on behalf of the client recommended the lawyer, why was the one person not called before the Committee? And it may be that there were other witnesses who adequately covered the ground, but I think this is something we ought to have an answer on and not just a suggestion that, go read the report. I read the report and I still have the question in my mind, why was the person who recommended the selection of the attorney, in this case for the client, not brought before



the Committee?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

D.L. Houlihan: "Are you recognizing me to close, Mr. Speaker?"

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Sponsor won't yield, I'd simply say that I'm sorry that... I didn't want to ask a question that was embarrassing; I didn't want to ask a question that..."

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

Deuster: "I will. I'm compelled to vote 'no' because I think something is being covered up."

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

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, for many weeks, we've conducted some very delicate, difficult matters with a nice sense of temper and propriety. The Gentleman from Lake was asking some questions, however ineptly phrased, he had a right to a response. He was interrupted in debate. The Sponsor of the Resolution treated him, I think, in a rather brisk fashion and I believe that the Gentleman not having been given his opportunity to engage in the debate, deserves a response from and somewhat more courteous treatment from the Sponsor of the Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan, to close."

D.L. Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I speak for all of the Members of this Committee that it would, at this point, ill serve the interests of this House or the people of this state for me to now engage in a point by point refutation of Representative Schlickman or even of Representative Deuster. Our response would be that those points are covered. They are covered, I think, very completely and satisfactorily and which is evidenced by a careful reading of the report that we very long and very hard to be as complete as we could so that you would have before you all of the information, the relevant information as it was available before us. It, of course, an easy thing to criticize and criticism, of course, is not unexpected. Particularly, is it easy to criticize if the result does not equate with a Member's preordained conclusion or if the Member is denied the right not only to bring charges, but to sit as judge, jury, and prosecutor, himself. I would like to



emphasize that this has been the most deliberative thing that I and all Members of this Committee have done and one that we feel had to be addressed in a very serious and responsible fashion. We would hope that you would feel that our work, as indicated by the report that we have submitted to you, demonstrates. Let me emphasize that the results of the work of this Committee has been unanimous. Unanimous in all of its conclusions, unanimous in all of its findings, and a point of fact, unanimous on every single decision that this Committee had to make. The result that we have reported is an exoneration Resolution. Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, all of the evidence in this case demonstrates that that decision is demanded by all of the evidence in this case and I urge your support of this Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Resolution 919. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Simple majority. Have all voted who wished? Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a most difficult vote for me. I read the report, I reviewed it although I didn't receive it until midnight, last night. To me, the report is so insubstantial in its nature and the investigation so perfunctory, that I have no choice... I cannot come to a conclusion based on the report and I will vote 'present' today."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, some of us were discussing the burden of proof here. Some were saying that it's a preponderance of the evidence. Some were suggesting, as I suggest, that the standard would be guilt beyond a reasonable doubt because there's no question in my mind that if we vote 'no' on this particular Resolution, that we are consigning Mr. Shea to ultimate guilt. And on the basis of the evidence that I've seen although I have some problems with the report, I do not see here proof beyond a reasonable doubt and as one who covets civil liberties, as one who feels that in these sensitive matters, that before we stain character, before we consign to oblivion



an individual, before we make an ultimate decision and characterization of an entire career of 10 years, we must proceed with trepidation. That does not mean that I do not feel that Representative Schlickman has done a service to this House. That does not mean that I do not feel that we have to take a very, very hard look at ourselves and some of the practices which have existed and which continue to exist, but I am not, given the evidence which I have as a lawyer and a Legislator, so sanctimonious, so self-righteous that I can find here beyond a reasonable doubt, that Mr. Shea is guilty of what he has been charged of. And because I feel that in this particular instance a 'present' vote would be misunderstood, I with a very clear conscience am going to vote green on this matter."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, on some of the issues, I think we must speak our own conscience and say it as we see it. I stand here, more or less, as a protester; perhaps if I had been younger, I might have been out there for the Vietnam War. I think what we're doing by this entire procedure is dragging ourselves into a no-win war on ethics. I think we're going to enter a quagmire that will haunt us all. I think we're beginning to see even now that we're turning Member against Member, interest against interest and to the benefit of no one. I think that the course of conduct that we are pursuing is wrong. I thought we were wrong when we set up what we called, quote-unquote, 'The Rules of War', our war on ethics. I do not think that this is our providence. I think that if there's a violation of the law, it belongs to the prosecutors. I feel if there's been some political violation, then the choice belongs to the voters. But as to a man's ethics and as to his morals, I believe that is between he and his God. I think we have entered an area that we should not trespass on and as a protester to this entire ethical war, I feel consigned to vote 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

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



I got the report late and read it about one o'clock in the morning and had some problems with it. I was, thought I might vote 'present', but I really don't like a 'present' vote. I think... I had a staff guy look and found out that I guess I voted 'present' eleven times and I'm even ashamed of that since I've been down here. And I think you have to do one or another and I... the only really troubling part about it was I was somewhat troubled that Representative Burditt was not called. But then we all have our memories and I remember one of the first Bills that I introduced in the Legislature was an open dating Bill and Representative Burditt was Chairman of the Food, Drug, and Pesticides Commission. And he was compensated by the food processors. Everybody knew that around the General Assembly. He wore a white hat. In fact, I thought one of the best Legislators we had around here and a good friend of mine; but they say you ought to come in court with clean hands, not that he initiated this procedure. And so I thought well even if Burditt were called in, I don't know in my mind if that ought to be a determined factor because of my memory. But I also want to say that in this matter of conflict of interest, we are baring more and more through disclosure and through those, like Representative Epton, who rise on the floor of the House and tell their conflicts of interest. And I guess that's good, but I'm not sure what the end product is because some of you may recall on the floor of the House last Session, on a matter of a racing Bill where... it was a good racing Bill and I said on the floor of the House that there a lot of 'present' votes because Legislators were just sitting on their hands, not taking any chances. And I just wonder what the future will hold because I think that many Legislators who have knowledge on a certain subject matter are going to sit on their hands. They aren't going to vote their consciences as Representative Epton said. They're going to just sit there, wondering if what they do may not be interpreted wrongly by their constituents, by everybody. And the result will be inaction. The result will be not good programs. And I also thought about whether there was



undue influence or whether Representative Shea thought that he were hired with the probability that he would use his influence. And I said to myself, well, he introduced those Bills last Session. Surely, he would do it again whether he was compensated or not. So I don't know whether he was hired with the probability that he would use his influence because the facts were shown that even before he was hired, he did, in fact, work on these Bills. Those of us who sit by Representative Shea and know his intense interest about malpractice even before this all happened, feel that he did this in the public interest. I felt strongly about the malpractice Bills and have no, no conflict whatsoever but feeling that something ought to be done in the public interest. So, thinking about all these matters and feeling that if I did vote 'present', it surely would be misconstrued. I like Representative Mann and I'll vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Fleck."

Fleck: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this I find to be a very interesting vote due to the fact that in my own mind, I'm not too happy with the report that the Committee came up with. I'm not too happy with the entire process that we find the House going through. A Member of the House has been charged with impropriety, a conflict of interest and certain facts which the public and the Members of the House now were set forth in the original Resolution on this matter. The report is, I think in my mind, quiet on many features. They had a limited amount of time to report back to the House and I don't think they had substantial time to hold full and complete hearings. In my own mind, when you talk about a conflict of interest, when you talk about an impropriety on the part of a Member, you must look at that Member. And I looked at Representative Shea and I look at Representative Shea's twelve years down in the Legislature. Never before has anyone ever brought up this matter in regard to him; but more importantly, a conflict of interest or an impropriety suggests that something is done quietly, silently, without knowledge of others, almost conspiratorial. The one factor in this whole thing that Members who might be



voting red have not brought up, the fact that everything that Representative Shea might have been accused of, that he took a retainer to represent an insurance company was done openly and was filed on his economic statement for the Members, the press, and the world to see if they so desired. Nothing was mysterious about it, nothing behind closed doors, nothing secretive. That in its own basis, I think, shows the standard and the quality of the person who is the subject of this particular Resolution. I would imagine if it was not on the economic interest statement, that there would be a problem with this vote. As I said before, I do not like the Committee report, but to vote against the Committee report would be taken as a vote of guilt and I cannot do that either. So for the purposes of this Resolution which is directed to one Member of the House and in my own mind, I feel there has been nothing that would come close to any wrongdoing any more than myself, who has appeared before state agencies or any other Member of this House who has been a lawyer who might have clients who are involved with state problems. I cannot vote 'no' because of the report and I cannot vote for any position but to vote green and I hope that the Members of the body, I won't be here next Session, I hope that in the future whenever you get into a situation like this, you, instead of getting involved totally in the process, you first look at whether this thing was done or any future acts were done secretly, conspiratorially, where there might be a true conflict of interest and on true wrongdoing. But I think anything that is done openly by any Member, he knows ahead of time what he is doing. It's open for the world and I think in that aspect along, that a Member is subject to the call of his constituents and not the call of this body."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. It seems to me the first question that each of us must resolve in reaching this very difficult decision is against what standard we will judge the conduct of the respondent. This bothers me about the procedures which we adopted last week, for they contain no standards."



They tell us nothing about what is censurable conduct. That being the case, it seems to me the only objective standard we have is the existing code of conduct in the Governmental Ethics Act. And judging the evidence in the Committee's report against that standard, it seems to me there has not been a violation, at least not by sufficient... proven by sufficient quantity of evidence to justify the seriousness of censuring a fellow Member. I would hope, however, that my vote for this Resolution of exoneration would not be interpreted publicly as approval or as a statement that... of condemnation of Legislators representing clients for fees before state agencies or that it would be interpreted as approval of that conduct in the future by other Members. I think that's the essential dilemma that faces many of us, how to vote exoneration without appearing to condone conduct which many of us would not approve of is conduct which meets our own standards or which we believe is good for the Legislature. So I would hope my 'aye' vote would not be interpreted as approval of Legislators representing private clients for fees before state agencies or introducing Bills of major interest to clients from which they are receiving substantial fees."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as the maker of the motion which laid House Resolution 777 on the Table, as the maker of the motion which resulted in House Resolution 883 which authorized the appointment and the investigation of the Select Committee, I have some interest in House Resolution 919. At the time I made those motions, I had no idea what would be the outcome of the investigation by the Select Committee. The only further attention I paid to the matter was to assure myself on Friday following those motions that the Speaker and the Minority Leader would, in fact, appoint the investigating Committee. This was done. I have not followed their proceedings. I did not feel that it was neat that I should. However, for those of you who are saying that there is a cover-up, that there was not a thorough investigation, I would



suggest to you that you look at the make-up of that investigating Committee. Six Members of this House, six honorable men and women, three of whom are lawyers, three of whom are laypeople. It would seem to me that both under the influence of the technicalities of law and also according to the general standard such as might be reflected by laypeople, that we have an assurance here if we trust our fellow Members who were appointed to this Committee, that we should follow their lead; especially, since they came to this House with a unanimous decision. I am very sure that every Member of this House would join with all of us who have been involved in this question for the last four or five weeks since May 3, six weeks perhaps, and would agree with a statement of, 'May this cup be put away from me'. But the cup unfortunately, would not go away. We must drink of it and we are now in the process of draining the dregs of that cup. I hope that future General Assemblies and future Members of General Assemblies will look back to the action which we have taken here over the last six weeks, to the mistakes we have made, and the honorable courses of action that we have also taken and made, that they will look into their souls before they bring charges against a fellow Member, that they will ask themselves what would I have done and could be reasonably be expected to be done under like circumstances. A charge which could result in a reprimand or a censure or even expulsion, is not to be taken lightly. I am sure that all of us who are here today will certainly look a long time into our own souls before we will bring such a charge. I am satisfied with the work of the Committee. I am not a sufficient lawyer to know whether each one of the charges was met and fully brought out, but I am willing to trust the integrity of the six individual Members that made up the collective body of that investigating Committee and I am honored to vote 'aye' on House Resolution 919."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as it's very obvious, those of us who are voting red are very distinctly in the minority. Let me say from the very beginning that I commend any



Member of this House of Representatives or the whole General Assembly that one who offers an Amendment charging another one with unethical conduct or similar types of misdeeds is not to be criticized as Representative Schlickman has been criticized over these few weeks. Suffice it to say that I believe that Representative Schlickman did what, in good conscience, he had to do and I have heard him criticized because he introduced that Resolution 777. And because and as one reason for voting against the table of 777, I was concerned that the charges made would not be given a proper hearing. We adopted two other Resolutions, the one which set up the investigating Committee and I supported that because I wanted a full hearing. I think a hearing was given. In my own mind, I am not sure that the hearing was complete as it should of been, but I am not critical of the six Member Committee. They are men of integrity. They are elected by the people who feel they have integrity and I respect that, but let me say just a very little bit... things that I feel myself. I could not sit here and vote green and go home with a good conscience and go to the voters in November and say, yes, I voted my constituency. I voted my conscience. I could not do that. If no one else believes that I have integrity, I believe myself that I do have it. I wouldn't be here if I didn't. And I don't care whether there's any other red lights up there other than my own, my own red light will stay there because I don't think that necessity, that Representative Shea is on trial as much as the General Assembly and, yes, this very House of Representatives is on trial. We have consistently tried to pass strong ethics and conflict of interests law and I daresay there isn't one here that says that we have 'em today. And so the only thing that we can have is what we have in our hearts and what we feel in the way of integrity as to what we do personally. And I'm not condemning Jerry Shea on my 'no' vote, I am condemning the very foundation of our government when we have a potential conflict of interest and a potential lack of ethics. And believe me, we do have that, not only in Illinois, but throughout the whole country. It's in the very fabric of our



nation and if we don't do something pretty soon, we won't have a fabric that we can call our nation and our state. And those who will condemn me for voting red, let's say very, very pointedly, I don't care. I'm voting my convictions on what we ought to do in this House of Representatives. We ought to do something about our ethics, not about Jerry Shea's ethics. That's not the question today. The question today is what we are going to do as Members of this House of Representatives for the people we represent and if we don't do something, we don't deserve to be here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner. The time clock is on now. That's inadvertent."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I stand here to associate myself with what Representative Ewell, Representative Lundy... excuse me, Representative Ewell, Representative Lundy and Representative Schraeder has said. One of them voted 'present', one of them vote 'yes', and one of them voted 'no'. Now that's strange. I also stand here as about the second full-time Legislator to address anyone this subject and only the sixth non-lawyer, which I find equally strange. From the top of this little sheet of paper, that there's no way I can finish in a minute, is written, 'Judge not, yet lest ye, too, be judged', and I feel that way very deeply right now. My vote is not going to indicate a judgement about Representative Shea's actions, not at all. I think Representative Schraeder's..."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your remarks to a close, closing in on you."

Skinner: "There's one thing that pops out of this report on page 62 and that is, 'The only way to find an appearance of impropriety would be to assert that lawyers who are Members of the General Assembly simply may not practice law before state agencies'. That is clearly not the law or the ethical standard. Well, Susan Sachs wrote an interesting article that pointed out that that question was first debated in 1372 in the English House of Commons and that now, the lawyers control virtually all the Legislators in the world. There are real problems when



lawyers can get business because they are Legislators, when lawyers representing clients before state agencies may exert some special interest or influence and when lawyers retained by clients affected by legislative matters can watch out for their clients' interests. I'm going to vote 'no', but it is not a vote against Representative Shea whose intellectual and political and personal attributes he has amply demonstrated while I've served with him for the last four years, but I just cannot accept that future lawyer-legislators should govern their conduct based on what was accepted in the past and what is obviously accepted here today. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've heard several sincere fears expressed here today. I'm not fearful to vote 'aye' on this Resolution, but one of the most important things that I think we all must be fearful about is our very possibility of a loss of our political system. To tell you the truth, I feel that we've lost our sense of directions and we've lost our perspective. And if any of you who are students of history, will go back and remember China, Greece, and Rome, the basic reason why those civilizations withered and died is because of the fact they the people lost faith in their government officials. Later on, they appointed watchers to watch the elected officials. Then they had to appoint watchers to watch the watchers. Then they had to appoint more watchers to watch the watchers to watch the watchers to watch the elected officials. And I simply say to you today that I hope to God that we all realize that we are not relegating the United States or the State of Illinois to the political graveyard. And I would hope that we would vote 'aye' and dispense with this once and for all. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't want to belabor this point, but I think we all recognize that this is an issue that it is, many of us feel is important to address ourselves to. Some of the newer Members of this House



JUN 22 1976

81.

probably don't realize how very, very many battles I have had on this House floor since I've been here with Representative Shea. In fact, I doubt if there is a person on this House floor who has done harder, longer, and more sincere battles with the Gentleman on so many issues that many of you know about, like home rule and merit selections, state-wide probations. Issues which we each in our own way, consider to be significant. Some might of even said those battles have been bitter. Nevertheless, I can remember in my first month in this General Assembly talking to Representative Shea about the problem of medicine and doctors. I can recall him wagering me that he had more doctors in his district than any other district in the state and that he had, in fact, that many years ago, a deep and sincere concern to represent them well. Like many others who've spoken today, I do not want my vote today to characterize my feeling about my personal ethics or my personal decisions or my personal approval or disapproval, nor do I feel that my ethics, nor any of yours must necessarily be the same as that standard by which we must hold this entire body. Precedent is always an extremely difficult thing. It seems to me that this body has been confronted with an unprecedented problem and has attempted to solve it well. I'm troubled also with the lack of time that the Committee had by which conduct its deliberations. I'm troubled that the Sponsor of the Resolution under the tensions understandable under the circumstances, in my opinion, did not give adequate response in debate. Nevertheless, the report does speak to a large extent for itself. Both personal and public growth is a long process. We may or may not be perfect or imperfect in what we do today. I also agree that Representative Schlickman should not be castigated for his sincere and profoundly difficult decision which any one of us on any other kind of situation might be called upon to make in some future time. Nevertheless, I spoke last week about the necessity for us to have a standard by which we must act. The standard which we have evolved in the short period available to us may not yet be perfect. It may our responsibility to yet make it more



perfect. And yet, I cannot reasonably say as Representative Mann said, that what we have to vote on today, the Resolution before us, can give us any confidence that we could cast a vote to find fault with a Member under an unprecedented and most serious event with all of the resultant difficulties that would fall upon that Member. I'm thoroughly aware of the issue that the Gentleman from McHenry County raised and at a later point in time, some time other than this debate, Mr. Speaker, I want to be recognized on that subject as a matter of personal privilege; but in this instance, in spite of all the difficulties and fights and arguments in principle that I have had on the floor of this chamber with the Gentleman in question, I cannot in my heart believe that the report gives us any basis other than to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, as an individual, have agonized over this decision and as all of you have observed, my vote since the board was first activated, has been 'no'. Now I've listened to every single word that's been said in this discussion and I want it very clear now that my 'no' vote is certainly not one of pointing a finger of guilt at Representative Shea, but I think the purpose for all this discussion, any discussion in debate is designed for one basic purpose and that's to arrive at an intelligent, rational decision. Now I weighed all this on balance and I'm especially swayed by the rationale of what Representative Fleck had to say and I think he expressed it very well. And for that reason, I think the correct vote under the circumstances we're voting here today, is an 'aye' vote and for that explanation, I'm going to change my vote from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 153 'aye' and 7 'no'. The Gentleman's motion prevails and the Resolution's adopted. Concurrence. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for five weeks, I've been waiting for this day. The day when I would be



freed from the shadow of accusation and the day when I would rise to address this House on the charges that were made against me. But today, my first words are those of thanks. I want to first thank this House for its deliberations and devising a fair procedure for investigating these charges. I'm thankful for these procedures succeeded in bringing out all the facts and that the baselessness of the accusation against me has now become evident. I also want to give special thanks to the Members of the special Committee. Not only were they fair, but even more important both for me and for this House, they were conscientious and thorough in their investigation. The Committee engaged in a careful and painstaking search for the facts. The Members of the Committee demonstrated that partisanship can be laid aside when the task at hand is the quest for truth. Finally, I wish to thank my family and friends. To have known my innocence, they, like I, have been impatient as day after day, some writers rendered their uninformed verdicts against me, but I want you to know that my family and friends also had faith in this House and they agreed with me what whatever agony and the cost of that weight, I should let the proper process of this House and the searchlight of truth work my vindication. I resolved to strengthen my own and help to sustain me through a period of my life which has been most trying and difficult. So much so that I know I was unable to hide from you, my colleagues, the anguish that this attack to my integrity has caused in the final year of my service in this Assembly. Now the process of the House has worked its course and the Committee of this House has called the witnesses and heard the evidence, the report sets forth in careful detail what the Committee learned. The witnesses are named, the testimony is stated, the full facts are finally on record. The facts show that as a Legislator, I have not faltered in my striving to serve the public interest. The facts show that as a lawyer, I did not use my position as a Member of this House to obtain any special favor or advantage for my private plans. Conclusion of the Committee was unanimous. I've served ten years in this House. I love this



House. I hold no value higher than the honor and dignity of this chamber. I regret for this House as much as for my family and myself the events of the last five weeks which unjustly threw a shadow across the chamber. I am thankful that the House has brought credit upon itself in this difficult matter. By its careful deliberations, every Member of the Committee discharged the duty owed this House. I knew from the beginning two things. I have known that in any forum where all the facts were disclosed that I would be vindicated, for I was certain in both my heart and my mind that I had done nothing improper. And I have known that my vindication would be meaningful if the investigation were complete and thorough. Obviously, my first concern over the last five weeks has been that my own name be cleared and that this House be spared any blemish on its integrity. I was also concerned about the larger issues. Trial by the press, as I have learned in this bitter experience, is a devastating ordeal. In public life, a man's good name is his first and foremost asset. It is also a fragile and vulnerable possession for it can be shattered without a cause by a single, unjustified charge. Nevertheless, the preservation and protection of the integrity of governmental process is of paramount importance. These goals, the duty of government to pursue and resolve charges of misconduct and the right of public officials to be free from baseless slander are difficult to reconcile under our precious system of free speech and of the freedom of the press. History teaches the balance must be struck in favor of an enlightened electorate, a free and strong press has traditionally been the bulwark against tyranny and corrupt government. I do hope, however, the the press will give equal attention to the report exonerating me as it did in publicizing the charges lodged against me. In conclusion, it is especially gratifying that you, my colleagues, now know that I have not tarnished this House or sullied the sacred obligation entrusted in me by the people of this State. I thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Order of concurrence. Concurrence. On concurrence appears House Bill 3850. 3850, on the order of concurrence.



Representative Jean Chapman. 3850... out of the record. The temporary speaker will be Representative Yourell, for a special order of business."

Speaker Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It is my particular enlighten privilege today to bring to the House of Representatives a young Lady from Oak Lawn, Illinois, who has been selected as Miss Illinois, in the U.S.A. Pageant. This young Lady, Cathy Ann Schmalen, was selected out of a group of eighty-four young Ladies... selected to receive this high honor and privilege. She competed in the U.S.A. contest in Niagra Falls, New York, just a short time ago and although still in high school... was one of the twelve finalist in the eight selected to be one of the finalist in that very important contest. And, I'm delighted and privileged and honored that an Oak Lawn resident attained such a high goal in such a young life... and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I'm delighted and privileged to present to you today, Miss Cathy Ann Schmalen, Miss Illinois for the U.S.A. Pageant. Miss Schmalen."

Miss Illinois: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen and Representative Yourell. I'm very pleased and honored to be presented before you this afternoon, I consider it a great pleasure to have been chosen as the representative of our State of Illinois in the Miss U.S.A. Pageant, for 1976, and very proud to have finished as a semi-finalist for our United States. My only wish is that more young women could come here to our Capital and have experienced what I have in the competition, which I have undergone. It was a great time in my life as this also is, thank you."

Speaker Yourell: "And, beside me on the podium of course is the second speaker, Representative Palmer."



Speaker Redmond: "On the... to give you some idea of what our program is, we will recess at 12:45, permit the Committees that are meeting... to meet at 1:30 and we will be back on the floor at 4 o'clock. We have some pass... final passage... about twelve measures since 9 o'clock this morning. On the Supplemental.... Okay, Mr. Clerk. Conference Committee..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Conference Committee announcements, the Members appointed to the Conference Committee relating to House Bill 3068, are Representative Chapman, Downs, McClain, Grotberg and Kempiners. The meeting of the Members in this Conference will be held Wednesday, June 23rd, at the hour of 8:45 o'clock A.M. in Room 122-A. Conference Committee relating to House Bill 3115 and 3116, the Members appointed to the Conference Committee are Representative Leon, Hart, Greiman, Epton and Deavers."

Speaker Redmond: "We've got another half an hour to work before we recess."

Clerk O'Brien: "The meeting of the Members of the Conference Committee will be Wednesday..."

Speaker Redmond: "Midnight is approaching."

Clerk O'Brien: "Will be Wednesday, June 23rd, at 10 o'clock A.M., in Senator McCarthy's office. Announcements are posted on the bulletin board outside the main door."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz, do you seek recognition? Just to remind you that we're... the House is in order..."

Katz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The House Rules Committee will be meeting immediately after adjournment, today in Room 122-B, to hear the Bills that have been posted. We will also be meeting tomorrow to hear other Bills that are not posted today that have been passed out of the Senate and upon which Members of the House have filed the form



JUN 28 1976

87.

for exemption under House Rule 27 (c), and under the Joint Rules. So, once again..."

Speaker Redmond: "We may not recess at 12:45. Proceed, Representative Katz."

Katz: "Yes, if you will look in your House Calendar today you'll see that the Rules Committee is scheduled to meet immediately upon the adjournment of this morning Session... and those Bills that are in there that have been posted in the... that appear in the House Calendar and are posted... those Bills will be heard today immediately after the adjournment of the morning Session. As to other Bills that have come over, if the Members will be certain to file the exemption forms with the Clerk here, those Bills will be posted today for hearings tomorrow immediately after the adjournment of the morning Session tomorrow. I hope that's all clear, those that have been posted will be heard today those that haven't been posted, if you will make sure you have filed the necessary form with the Clerk, they will be heard tomorrow in the Rules Committee immediately after the adjournment of the morning Session. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos, for what purpose do you rise? I can't see the speaker... would you please sit down."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I have an inquiry concerning... although the Rules Committee may be meeting today and tomorrow, I have a concern that if some of the Bills that are passed out or have been partially heard and are going to go in, are there going to be sub-committee to meet after they have passed out of Rules? I give an example... very prime example is because I have several motions here to discharge the Rules Committee, not because I don't want to appear



against... before them but I find out from the Chairman of the Substantive Committee to which these Bills would go as passed, are not going to meet except this afternoon... for the rest of the Session and that's my concern, Mr. Speaker and I think it's a vital Bill...."

Speaker Redmond: "If I was in your position, I would be concerned that I would like to have the Bills rule.... pass out of the Rules Committee and then assigned to a Committee because then, a motion to discharge the Substantive Committee probably would be a proper motion where as the question to whether or not a motion to discharge the Rules Committee is open to substantial debate."

Maragos: "All right, well I still have a concern that some of those things may..."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll cross that bridge when we get there. On the order of concurrence appears House Bill 3147, Representative G.L. Hoffman or Representative Schneider. G.L. Hoffman... out of the record. 3957, Representative Harold Washington... Representative Harold Washington... would you sit down, these Gentlemen between the Speaker's rostrum and the Sponsor of this... Representative Jones, Representative Kane, Representative Londrigan, Representative Boyle, Senator Ozinga, Representative Mudd, Representative... we can't see Representative Washington."

Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3957, is here from the Senate on concurrence and they're two minor Amendments in which I concur. The first Amendment changes the standards for revocation of suspension of medical licenses from what we had it, which was malpractice resulting in injury...."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you break up the caucus over there."

Washington: "The Senate amended the Bill to provide for gross



and repeated malpractice resulting in serious injury, or death and Amendment #3, to Senate Bill... to House Bill 3957, simply provides that in every case where damages for injury to the person are assessed by a jury, the verdict shall be itemized so as to reflect the monetary distribution among economic loss and non economic loss, if any. I have no objections to these two Amendments, I don't think they do any substantial harm to the Bill... it is true that we did amend the Bill down in terms of status for suspension but I think the Amendment... by the two Amendments by the Senate are helpful and Mr. Speaker, I therefore move that the House do concur in Senate Amendment 1 and 3, to House Bill 3957."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Daniels: "Representative Washington, on Amendment #1, it is my understanding that... in the original Bill sent over to the Senate, House Bill 3957... we had the language that a license could be revoked, suspended or review in the event of malpractice resulting in serious injury or death. Is that correct?"

Washington: "That's correct, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "The Senate has in their wisdom, returned the Bill to us and inserted the very language which the Amendment that we passed, strike out, is that correct?"

Washington: "No, they re-inserted the word 'gross' and put in the word 'repeated'."

Daniels: "That's on Amendment #1, now Amendment #3, would you explain to me the purpose of that Amendment as you understand it."

Washington: "Well, the Senate in its wisdom and I must say that House Bill 3957, was debated throughly in the



Senate Insurance Committee and was debated throughly almost three hours yesterday in the Senate on Third Reading. I don't recall who offered this Amendment but it simply provides that when a jury brings in its award... they should distinguish between economic and non economic loss."

Daniels: "And, the purpose of that..."

Washington: "Incidentally that was one of the recommendations of the Reparations Commission on malpractice, which we failed to insert in House Bill 3957."

Daniels: "So, Amendment #3, is recommended by the Medical Reparations Commission."

Washington: "That's correct."

Daniels: "All right."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre..."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, pardon me."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the issue of concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Yes, Sir. Thank you. First of all Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a division of the question on Amendments 1 and 3... Sir... Speaker Redmond."

Speaker Redmond: "I was volⁱting the rules here. Proceed."

Daniels: "Would those people between the Speaker and me, sit down... I can't see the Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber, that's you."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a division of the question."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."

Daniels: "Referring to Amendment #1, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would remind you that there was serious and lengthy debate regarding Amendment #1, and the question of whether or not authority should be given to the Department of Registration and Education to review



a license in the event a doctor is found guilty of malpractice, resulting in serious injury or death. I would like to refresh your memory and to point out to you that at the present time we have had returned to us, inserted the word 'gross' or 'repeated', now I would ask you... what does gross mean? Gross malpractice, how gross does it have to be before a doctor license can be reviewed for a suspension reparation or a mere censorship. I would suggest to you that it is important in this case that we rebuff the efforts of the Senate to attach Amendment #1, to this Bill and we non concur in Senate Amendment #1. And, on that regard, Mr. Speaker I've asked for a division of the question which I understand has been granted. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm sure that this comes as a surprise to the Sponsor because we have discussed this and I apologize to him for adding the element of surprise but, I arise to oppose this motion. And, the reason that I do, is because I'm not opposed to the two Amendments that the Senate put on... in fact, he... Representative Washington, very correctly represented one of these Amendments as one of the recommendations of the... Medical Malpractice Insurance Reparations Commission, which I was carrying the ball for... in the Insurance Committee and before the Judiciary Committee. The reason that I rise to oppose this... I hope that everyone will listen because we have over the past two Sessions, put out what were purport to be solutions to the medical malpractice problem... sent Legislation to the Governor which was patently unconstitutional and I'm afraid we're about to make the same mistake again. There are two



provisions in here both of which were recommended by the Commission and were adopted by the Judiciary Committee, which deal only with... medical reparation and do not extend entirely across tort system. I think for that reason they are unconstitutional, I'm referring one... to the collateral source rule that we are place... that we have placed in this Bill and secondly, the respond and discovery provision which deal only with medical malpractice cases. I think we're going to run into the same kind of constitutional problem with those two provisions that we ran into last year with Legislation that we passed. I think that the Supreme Court was correct, I think that we have to extend these measures across the entire tort system and if we don't we're going to be faced with new Legislation which is indeed unconstitutional. I don't think that Members of the Judiciary Committee, Members of the Medical Malpractice Commission or the Members of this House are opposed to extending those two propositions across the entire tort system. I think a Conference Committee should do it, I urge you to vote against this because it should go to a Conference Committee where we can clear up these constitutional defects."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter."

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would urge the Members to non concur in Amendment #1, I think that we should remember that the power of the Department to revoke, suspend or place on a probationary status under the terms of this particular section... is not mandatory but rather elective. They can do it if they deem it's proper and so when we changed the standard to malpractice resulting in serious injury or death of a patient, we did that with the understanding that the Department would still have discussion in



applying that standard and there would not be an automatic revocation or a automatic probationary status but merely we were setting the grounds under which a decision could be made. By changing it back to 'gross' or 'repeated' we are making additionally higher standards or rather lower standards... in reference to the conduct of a physician.. I think that it is going exactly the wrong direction and I think that if we would refuse to concur and send it back and if the Senate would recede, we would have done something to improve the conduct of physicans and hopefully in the long run, lower mal-practice premiums and I would urge a rejection of Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge non concurrence in Amendment #3. Now, although this one is apparently a conclusion of the Medical Reparations..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber, we're only acting on Amendment #1."

Leinenweber: "Excuse me..."

Speaker Redmond: "Division has been requested."

Leinenweber: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washington, to close."

Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I strongly urge the House to concur in Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 3957. We sent over to the Senate two Bills, 3957 and 3958, 3958 was voted out of the Senate intact and has now gone to the Governor. The Senate in its wisdom decided that two Amendments were needed on this Bill on 3957, is essentially the work product of this House it represents a good deal of work as was pointed out by several Members of the Sub-committee who spoke and some of the Members who spoke today. That was inputs. from every conceivable sorts we could think of... the



Reparations Commission, the various discipline, the Sub-committees all worked and it is still essential a work product of this House. However, the Senate when into it in some detail and they were so convinced that we had the better package that they in effect tabled practically every malpractice Bill they had but they looked at these two areas and decided, and I must say that they did it in a detached... thank you, Mr. Speaker... they did it in a detached sensible way. The law before we amended it was that... gross malpractice resulting in serious injury would be grounds for revocation. The House Judiciary Committee expanded that to say that repeated malpractice would also be grounds for revocation. That was amended further in the House to provide simply... that malpractice would be grounds for revocation, the medical association was somewhat up in arms about that, and they felt that the standard was too loose and I was somewhat trepidation about the standard myself... the Senate said, no we should proceed more guardedly and use stronger language and provide more rigid controls so that a doctor would not willy nilly... be hauled before the Supervisory Committee the Registration Education Department and made to account in every instance for what might appear to be malpractice. I concur in that... I think it's a useful standard... I think that it is a fair standard. We intend to keep an on-going hue on the whole area... quite obviously we have not solved the malpractice situation... no State has, no one even claims to have... we're all feeling our way, I think that it is a reasonable Amendment... I suggest that rather than send this back to a concurrence and all the turmoil and confusion which might well arise winding up possibly in a much more truncated Bill, a much more watered down Bill or a Bill that the House



does not want to live with.... I suggest that we go along with the Senate and concur in Amendment #1, to House Bill 3957."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 3957. All those in favor will vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Berman."

Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my 'aye' vote, the Judiciary Committee on which I do not sit...has labored long and hard on this Bill. I think that if you look at the Amendment that we are debating right now... I think it is not a very crucial issue, I'm concerned that what we are going to find, if we do not concur with the Senate... is that the labor of the entire Judiciary Committee and the debate of a 177, Members of the House and this Bill is a product of the House of Representatives... is going to go down the drain and a select number of people decide a very important issue in a Conference Committee Report. I think this subject is too important to be entirely redone, perhaps by a Conference Committee. As I said in debate, when 3957 passed out of this House... a week ago, this is not an absolute answer, in fact it's a reasonable... it's a reasonable answer because (a), the lawyers aren't happy with it (b), the doctors aren't happy with it but it is a reasonable legislative... let me correct that it's reasonable House solution to a very tough problem and I think that concurrence is called for in this situation."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 111 'aye', 30 'no' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 3957. Amendment #2... 3, pardon me."



Washington: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #3 was explained and it simply provides that in a jury award there should be itemize verdict, distinguishing between economic and non economic loss. This was one of the recommendations of the Reparations Commissions and I support it and move to concur in Amendment #3, to House Bill 3957."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I have a question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Leinenweber: "Representative Washington, assume that a jury returned a verdict distinguishing non economic from economic damage or loss in their damages, would it be possible for someone to appeal solely one or the other if they were dissatisfied with one or the other?"

Washington: "I doubt if this adds any additional appeal grounds. As you know the jury brings out a verdict with a certain dollar amount. What this Bill provides or this Amendment provides, is that there be a distinction between economic and non economic loss. What in effect it does... it's just additional burden on the jury, since there is no cap on the amount that one can recover, frankly I think it does nothing substantial to the court law."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like very briefly to address the Amendment. I would urge its non concurrence for two reasons. One, is it's an invitation for a mistrial and one is, I believe contrary to what the Sponsor indicates... it would give substantial... creates a substantial chance of error being committed by a jury. Now, the way verdicts are arrived at by a jury of course, is unknown because the... if the composite of the thoughts of twelve of our peers... done in private, however, by the more itemization or the more specialization of a verdict the greater chance that... that portion of the



the verdict that specialized or itemized will not be in conflict with the evidence introduced. I think what we'll be doing here, we will not be bringing any particular certainty to the laws courts you will be creating an uncertainty... and uncertainty intends to create more litigation... causes more expenses and the ultimate will not solve the problem it will exacerbate it. I do believe that it is a good Bill... everything else but I think this particular Amendment #3, is a bad Amendment and I urge a 'no' vote on the motion to concur on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre. Give the Gentleman order, please."

Beaupre: Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I again have no quarrel with the Amendment, I do quarrel with some of the statements that have been made in regard to concurrence of these Bills. The fact of the matter is, that the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate appointed the Members to the Insurance Reparations Commission... the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate know the people in this Chamber who have worked diligently to bring about this package which represents our best efforts toward a solution of medical malpractice problem. Now... I don't know what happened to those Amendments that were to be offered in the Senate to correct the Constitutional defects that I'm speaking about. But, we're talking about the same sort of legal proposition that was before the Supreme Court... this very year which dealt with the medical malpractice legislation that we passed in the last Session. And, the same principle applies... there are two elements of this Bill which apply only to medical malpractice cases and in order to pass the test of constitutionality it seems to me... have to



JUN 22 1976

98.

apply throughout the tort system. One is the collateral force rule which there is some controversy about... the other is indeed that this concept of avoiding filing law suits against everybody in sight by creating a new party to a suit call a respondent and discovery. Now, it seems to me that it is fruitless for us to send Legislation to the Governor which would appear to fly in the face of the State Supreme Court in regard to these matters. I suggest to you that the same people can be appointed to the Conference Committee that had been working on this problem for some time... there is no real reason why we must concur at this time and send Legislation which appears to be unconstitutional to the Governor. I think this will be a much better package if we eliminate the constitutional problem... we can do that in a Conference Committee, since the Amendments were not offered in the Senate and I would hope that you would vote against concurrence in this matter."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washington to close."

Washington: "Well, Mr. Speaker. No matter what we do... no matter what the Senate does we cannot totally and completely alay the constitutional question. It's going to follow every Bill that deals with malpractice that goes out of the Assembly so, I think it's futile to go any further... we have discussed this Bill ad infinitum here in the House and in the Senate and in our best wisdom we have concluded that what's embodied in the Bill is constitutional. Secondly, in the response of Representative Beaupre, he wishes to offer additional Amendments in a Conference Committee, I suggest to you that... that is the worst place for us to go to try to clean up a Bill. We've tried it in the past and we don't recognize the Bill when it comes back to us. Unfortunately, Mr. Beaupre comes too late he has tried



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

to put Amendments on in the House and the Senate and he was not able to. That was not our fault... we were open for Amendments, I suggest that he comes too late and not hold up this Bill for any additional Amendments. There are vehicles in the House and in the Senate which could entertain Amendments if he so desires. This is a good Amendment, it was suggested by Reparations Commission, I think the Senate has been wise in putting it on there it would give us additional statistical factor and basis, and I suggest it's a good Amendment. I ask your concurrence in Amendment #3, to House Bill 3957."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #3, to House Bill 3957. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Final action, 89 votes. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 112 'aye', 18 'no' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #3, to House Bill 3957. Announcements... Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the purpose of an announcement, Appropriations I, will be meeting on the House floor this afternoon at 1 o'clock. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Leon."

Leon: "For the purpose of an announcement, Mr. Speaker. The Committee of Financial Institutions... meeting scheduled for 2 P.M. today will be recessed until 1:30 P.M. tomorrow in Room A-1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis, on the order of motions. Appears Senate 1881... Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I cleared this with the Chairman of the Executive Committee and also with the Leadership of both sides of the House and on a motion to discharge Executive



Committee and advance to the order of Second Reading and I so, request... respectfully request affirmative..."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Katz, for what purpose do you rise?"

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, I will have to object to the allowance of the motion to discharge... to by-pass Committee. I have been told by Representative of the Illinois Mental Health Association, a very major group in the State. That they would like to be heard before a Committee to register their opposition to certain parts of the Bill and their suggestions. I think that while I understand the need for speed, I do believe that the matter ought to go to Committee to permit people to be heard with regards to the merits of the Bill and any proposals for improving it, so I would reluctantly have to object to the allowance of the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels, for what purpose do you rise? The Lady has moved to discharge the Executive Committee and advance Senate Bill 1881, to the order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day. All in favor of the motion vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. It takes 89 votes. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "The Department of Mental Health is for this Bill and I can verify that if the Gentleman from the other side would like and I did clear it with all the Leadership and Mr. Matijevich, was there too, and he can verify it with me. The appropriation for this Bill has already passed and this is Co-sponsored by Representative Getty and myself. They would appreciate an 'aye' vote so we can..."

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

Hirschfeld: "Well, Mr. Speaker... I greatly dislike opposing



this motion but this is a thirty-one page Bill and it's very far reaching because it affects the 708 board that this State has gone to great lengths to try and provide for local input in these mental areas and it also has some serious questions about the subject of confidentiality of patients' records. I just think this is a type of matter that should be brought before a Committee so that all of the various problems can be aired. I don't think that we should just pass a thirty-one page Bill to the order of Second Reading without a through Committee investigation."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "I would be very happy to hold this Bill on Second Reading and I would appreciate it if my co-sponsor of this Bill, Representative Getty... I think he's in the Chambers, he is the Sponsor of the appropriations for the Dangerous Drug Commission Bill and I certainly would be glad to hold it on Second Reading it's a time element and you can have the Bill the date you want on the floor."

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

Getty: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I thought that this was a Bill that certainly should be moved out of the Rules Committee and should get full consideration. I think that it is a very important measure, I didn't realize that this was a motion to move it to the order of Second Reading, however, it is a complicated thing but.... Representative Geo-Karis, has indicated that she would hold it on Second Reading... I think it would give the Chamber an adequate period of time to review it and I think because of its importance... we certainly should support this



motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stone. Will the Members between Representative Stone and the Chair, please be seated."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea..."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I believe that the board should remain approximately the way it is now. This is important Bill... it is very important to all of us in all of our counties and it is especially important to all of us who have 708 boards in our counties. This Bill should have a full hearing and should be in a Committee so that the matters that need correcting in the Bill, can be corrected after hearing testimony of witness. And, I think that it is imperative that this Bill do go to the Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 70 'ayes' 49 'nays' and the Lady's motion fails. Representative Griesheimer.... Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "This Bill was assigned to the Executive Committee, will the Executive Committee have a hearing on it then?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I made a firm vow to my Committee, I'm not going to have another hearing and I'm going to hold to it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I believe I requested leave of the Chair earlier to make an announcement."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Griesheimer: "Thank you...."

Speaker Redmond: "It's a very important announcement, most important announcement that will probably be presented in this Session of the General Assembly. I can attest



to that."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on the 18th, 19th, and 20th of July, the Lake County, Waukegan Chamber of Commerce has extended an invitation to all of the Legislators in the House and in the Senate to come to Lake County again to experience our vacation wonderland in Northern Illinois. Many of you have already made your reservations but many of you also have not made your reservations and time is growing rather short, in order to assure you that you will have adequate housing at Illinois State Beach Lodge and also have a berth on board one of our salmon charter boats. For any of you who wonder what is entailed in this, that might not have gone last year I would like to run down very quickly the chronology. You will arrive in Lake County on the 18th, a Sunday afternoon between two and four o'clock... at 5:30, there will be a cocktail party welcoming all of you... and at approximately 6:30, there will be a Luau at Illinois State Beach Lodge. After the Luau at approximately 9 o'clock there will be about thirty-five crafts available so that you can go out survey shore line of Lake Michigan. The next morning you will go out at 7 A.M. on charter salmon boats and fish for that wonderful aleutian salmon which are there in great quantity, and I think the Speaker will attest to that... at 12:00 you will come back from those boats and you will clean your salmon so that we can judge them on the contest rules. There will then be a luncheon at the Waukegan Yacht Club where the prizes will be awarded for the largest and most voluminous salmon caught and I'm sure that Roscoe Cunningham, will be trying to protect his record again, although it's truly his wife's record.. That afternoon there will be a tennis tournament at Oak



Wood Tennis Club and also a Golf Tournament at a local golf course. That will be followed in the evening hopefully by a family picnic at Chain of Lakes Park and Charlie Fleck has promised to show us his old den of iniquity up there where he used to go and hide in our district. The next morning, which is Tuesday morning, you are all invited that is your entire family to Marriott World of Entertainment for a full day of fun and frolic at Marriott's World, in Gurnee, Illinois which I have to point out is in Mr. Deuster's and Mr. Pierce and Mrs. Reed's district... or they will skin me alive. Now, this is going to be a spectacular event, I hope that you all have your reservations in... we're going to have to cut off these reservations in about a week so, if you do not have them in, I would appreciate your contacting my office and also contacting the Lodge for your reservations. We will look forward to seeing you up there and I'm sure that you will have a great time."

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions. Representative Giorgi... we've got Appropriations I, at 1 o'clock. Representative Boyle, for what purpose do you rise?"

Boyle: "Well, Mr. Speaker... to set the records stright, Representative Griesheimer, is showing his partisanship. Roscoe Cunningham will be there as my mate on my boat again with his lovely wife and I will be there to protect my record."

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions. Representative Giorgi."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 916, Reed. 917, Kornowicz. 921, Geo-Karis, and Senate Joint Resolution 80."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 916, honors Donald Deuster and his wife on their marriage of almost 28 years. House Resolution 917, honors Edward J. Rampage, of



JUN 22 1976

105.

Chicago. He recently celebrated his 30th wedding anniversary. House Resolution 921 by Geo-Karis. Honors Reverend Carl Lee for 17 years as General Overseer of the Church and House Joint Resolution #80, allows the Unemployment Compensation Investigating Committee to extend their reporting date. I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Resolutions are adopted. Senate Bills First Reading.... further Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 920, Maragos. House Joint Resolution 105 Harold Washington."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on assignments. Senate Bills, First."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1630, Lauer. A Bill for an Act to amend the Alcoholism and Intoxication Treatment Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider, an announcement second only importance to that of Representative Griesheimer."

Schneider: "Being the Chief Sponsor of House Bill 3991, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move to Table that Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, 3991, is Tabled. Representative Hart."

Hart: "I want to Table 3999, I'm Chief Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Hearing no objection... what number was that again?"

Hart: "3999."

Speaker Redmond: "3999... Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Judiciary II Committee, will be meeting one hour after we recess for lunch in Room 122-B. The Rules



Committee is meeting immediately after adjournment as I announced before, in Room 122-B and also be meeting tomorrow immediately after the morning recess."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, in behalf of my colleague Representative Adeline Geo-Karis, since it solved the matter of that Senate Bill... it has no Committee to go too, I would like to have unanimous consent that Senate Bill... what's the number, Adeline? 1881... be assigned from the Executive Committee, reassigned to Judiciary I, and that Rule 18, the posting notice be waved so that the Bill... Senate Bill 1881 can be heard in Judiciary I, tomorrow at 1:30 P.M. and ask that the attendance Roll Call be used for that unanimous consent."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minority Spokesman on Judiciary I, has been consulted and the Minority Spokespersons on Executive have been consulted on this."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Representative Walsh, we had to do this so fast, we only had time to consult with the Chairman of the Committee but, I took it for granted that Representative Geo-Karis could touch base with your people."

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

Washington: "I just touch based...."

Speaker Redmond: "I can't see Representative Washington."

Washington: "I just touched base with the Minority Spokesman on Judiciary I, he concurs and we're prepared to hear it tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh.... Any objections? Hearing none... Senate Bill 1881, will be reassigned from Executive Committee, to Judiciary I, and the posting



notice is waived. Use the attendance Roll Call for the motion. Any objection? Representative Schraeder, do you desire to recess the House until 4 o'clock this afternoon."

Schraeder: "So moved."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder, so moves. Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to announce the Appropriations II, Committee will meet at 1 P.M. immediately after adjournment in Room 118."

Speaker Redmond: "4 o'clock... first order of business will be 3907, when we come back."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order and the Members please be in their seats. The House will be in recess until 4:45."

Doorkeeper: "All persons not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order and Members please be in their seats. Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Maragos, Chairman on Committee on Revenue to which the following Bill was referred. Action taken June 21, 1976. Reported the same back with the following recommendation... do not pass House Resolution 903."

Speaker Redmond: "Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representative that the Senate has acceded to the request of the House of Representatives for a First Conference Committee Report, Senate Bill 1620, action taken by the Senate June 22, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright,



Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives accede to the request of the House of Representatives for a First Conference Committee Report, Senate Bill 1621. Action taken by the Senate June 22, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of the Bill of the following title to wit House Bill 3856, passed by the Senate June 22, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of a Bill of the following title to wit House Bill 3308, together with Amendment passed by the Senate as amended June 22, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representative that the Senate has concurred with House in passage of a Bill of the following title to wit House Bill 3505, together with Amendment, passed by the Senate as amended June 22, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurred with the House in passage of the Bill with the following title to wit , House Bill 3605 together with an Amendment passed by the Senate, June 22, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representative that the Senate concurred with the House in passage of the Bill with the following title to wit , House Bill 3630, together with Amendment, passed by the Senate as Amended June



JUN 22 1976

109.

22, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurred with the House in passage of Bill with the following title to wit , House Bill 3817, together with Amendments, passed by the Senate as amended June 22, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with House in passage of the Bill with the following title to wit , House Bill 3838, together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended June 22, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurred with the House in passage of Bill of the following title to wit , House Bill 3843, together with an Amendment passed by the Senate as amended June 22, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of the Bill of the following title to with, House Bill 3858, together with Amendments passed by the Senate as amended June 22, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Second Reading. On House Bills, Second Reading is 3907."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3907, a Bill for an Act to amend the Workmens' Compensation Act. This Bill has been read a second time previously.... Amendments #1, 15 and 16, were adopted and it was held on Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, would you take this out of the record



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

temporarily."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton, take this one out of the record. Representative Epton."

Epton: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Earlier I had a motion to Table all of these Bills and I have been trying to get your eye, Mr. Speaker, for quite some time and you've studiously ignored me, you're still ignoring me, Mr. Speaker. However... Mr. Speaker, on that motion earlier this morning, I wanted you to know that I don't hold any personal animosity against you because of the manner in which you're conducting the podium in handling my motion, but I do warn you, sir, that if this dilatory tactics on the part of the Majority Party continues... I intend to repeat again... and again my motion to Table all of these Bills. Now, I don't want to... certainly threaten Mr. Giorgi, but if he doesn't get on the ball with these Workmens' Comp. Bill, I will have no alternative to request again permission to speak to Table these Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Your remarks will be Journalized. House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 3588, Representative Kane."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3588, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, I think House Bill 3588, is supposed to be held on Second Reading until there is a statement filed by the Pension Laws Commission and should appear on Second Reading rather than on Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman ask leave that House Bill 3588 be returned to the order of Second Reading and there remain until an Amendment is affixed. Any objection? Hearing none, 3588 will be returned to the order of Second Reading. 3946."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3946, a Bill for an Act to amend



the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would ask leave to return House Bill 3946, to the order of Second Reading for the purpose of some Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any objections? Hearing no objection, leave is granted, 3946 return to the order of Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Kane. Amends House Bill 3946 on page 1, line 1 and 5, and so forth."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2..."

Clerk O'Brien: "I got Amendment #1, I'm sorry."

Kane: "Okay."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Kane. Amends House Bill 3946 on page 1, line 1, by deleting in Section 2-124 and so forth."

Kane: "Amendment #1, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Removes the requirement that the social security number be on a drivers license and I would ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates that he will."

Schlickman: "Why."

Kane: "Because the Confidential Act at the federal level... you want to use the social security number for social security purposes and not for identification purposes."

Schlickman: "Are you suggesting that this is prohibited by federal Act."

Kane: "I think that this is the direction in which we are moving, however."

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



Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. It seems to me that it is a convenience to the motorist of this State to have one document on which appear... the drivers license number and their social security number, in place of carrying two documents, the drivers license and a social security card. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I'm sure that this is true for many if not most of us... we just don't carry our social security card... quite frequently we are asked for the number and it is very convenient to be able to draw out of your wallet... out of your purse, your drivers license and there upon appear the social security number. I would respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House that by having the social security number on the drivers license... a convenience is provided to the drivers of the State and therefore, oppose the adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question? Representative..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative... proceed."

Hoffman: "Do I understand correctly that you're suggesting by this Amendment that we take the social security number off of drivers licenses?"

Kane: "It would no longer be required."

Hoffman: "Would no longer be required, now what does that mean?"

Kane: "Presently on the drivers license... the social security number is included and this would remove that requirement."

Hoffman: "This would remove that requirement. Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I



too rise to speak in opposition to this Amendment. I personally find it most convenient to have my social security number on my drivers license, I don't have to fumble around and find a social security card, I don't have to waste what little mental energy I have... attempting to remember what my social security number is. It seems to me that with universities and other types of agencies going to the use of... social security numbers as identification number... makes a great deal of sense and it seems to me that this in... time in which we find ourselves in a giant step backwards and therefore, I rise in opposition in the Amendment also."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Tipsword: "Isn't it correct to continue to have the social security number upon this application would be a violation of federal law?"

Kane: "Federal law at the present time says that a person could refuse to have his social security number on his drivers license if he so requested."

Tipsword: "So to require it would be a violation then."

Kane: "Yes, if it is required there would be a conflict between federal statute and State law if it's required by State law but federal law says that a person could refuse to use it."

Tipsword: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I even spoke against this Amendment the other day but, since then I've done some checking and there is no question about it... the drivers license does not need the social security number. First of all as I understand it from the Secretary of States office, the drivers license number itself is a very



unique system of identification, telling when birthdays and sex and what have you. But, even of beyond that the very fact that we assume we were going to put on the photo of the driver of the drivers licenses... will require some additional space that's not now available. And by the removal of this mandate that the social security number be on there, it will allow that picture to portray the driver of the license and for that reason, I now support the Amendment and ask everyone to support the Secretary of State on this measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Kane: "Yes."

Schuneman: "I'm sorry, I got in on this discussion late but, what is the reasoning behind this Amendment... the requested Amendment."

Kane: "Well, at the present time under the federal statute an individual can refuse to have his social security number used on his drivers license. The State statute requires the social security number to be there and so if a person did ask to have his social security number removed or not included on his drivers license, there would be a conflict."

Schuneman: "And, would your Amendment preclude the Secretary of State from asking for this information?"

Kane: "No, all it does is just remove the requirement that the social security number appear."

Schuneman: "What indication has the Secretary of States office given you if any..."

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

Catania: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Catania: "I don't have a copy of this Bill, has it been



distributed?"

Speaker Redmond: "Would you furnish the Lady with a copy of the Bill, please."

Catania: "Has it been distributed, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, yes. Emory... Let's get Representative Catania, a copy of the Bill. Representative Deuster... we'll get back to Representative Catania. Deuster... Oh, pardon me... Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I just had one more question which I had not finished."

Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me."

Schuneman: "Have you any assurance from the Secretary of States office as to what their plans are regarding the information requested on their application?"

Kane: "The application form will still retain a blank for the social security number."

Schuneman: "All right, Mr. Speaker I would like to simply make a statement about..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, Sir."

Schuneman: "... this Amendment, I for one can remember a few years ago when the Secretary of State first asked for the social security number on drivers licenses and I assure you that the public was put to some great inconvenience at that time and... hunting up their social security numbers and being returned to their homes from the offices of notary publics and they were trying to apply for licenses. The social security number has increasingly been important... when a drivers license is used as a means of identification and I think it would be a bad form for us to simply cave into this federal requirement that we don't have to... or that we do not have the right to demand the number and I would hope that the Secretary of State would continue to ask for the number."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, this has been adequately discussed.
I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, will the main question be put. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'no'... The 'ayes' have it, Representative Kane to close."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I urge the adoption of this Amendment which would remove the requirement of social security number by on a license application and drivers licenses... to remove the conflict between the Federal Act and the State Act and I might point out that the requirement of State law was made prior to the passage of the Privacy Act at the federal level and I would ask for approval of Amendment #2.... #1."

Speaker Redmond: "The question on the Gentleman's motion, the adoption of Amendment #1. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, in urging a 'no' vote, I must say I'm holding my drivers license in my hand and about the only time I ever look at my drivers license is to refresh recollection is to what my social security number is, I know what my sex is and my age and my address and all these other things but it is a great convenience and I should think that, if this kind of Amendment had to be offered it should say that the social security number should be on the plate if available or if provided... but some language to suggest that the Legislator would like the Secretary of State to have it on the form. I think that it is a terrible Amendment and we ought to continue allowing this social security number to be on the plate and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 85 'aye',



28 'no' and the Gentlemans motion carries. The Amend-
ment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #2, Kane. Amends House Bill 3946,
page 1, line 25, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentelmen of the House.
Amendment #2, is a very simple Amendment... what it does
is add the word cancellation to the procedure as the
Secretary of State can use when a person driving under
a restricted drivers permit is convicted of additional
traffic offense. What this would do is, allow that
person to have another hearing and to... if the facts
of the case permit.... to have a second restricted
drivers permit allocated to him and I would urge the
adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield for one question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Is your Amendment #2, identical to a provision
in House Bill 3947?"

Kane: "Yes."

Schlickman: "May I make a point of order, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman who is the Sponsor
of House Bill 3946, was also the Sponsor of 3947. Now,
he attempted to discharge House Bill 3947, from Committee
but was not successful in doing so. What he's doing
by this series of Amendments, Mr. Speaker, if you will
listen... what he's doing by this series of Amendments
is engaging in an end run... doing indirectly what this
House would not give him the authority to do, directly.
And, I would respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker that
this is in violation of the spirit if not the letter of
the Rule that prohibits a member from offering something



that is identical to that which was previously had been disposed of by this House and I respectfully suggest, the motion to discharge the Committee was a disposition."

Speaker Redmond: "What Rule are you referring to Representative Schlickman?"

Schlickman: "The one in the rule book."

Speaker Redmond: "1973?"

Schlickman: "'76, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Mine says '75."

Schlickman: "How about '37... Roberts Rules popular book... newly revised '72. Rule 38 too, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, having looked at Robert's, I think that Robert's says that substantially the same and I think that this Amendment is considerably different than the Bill that was previously refused... discharged from Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "What rule are you referring to there?"

Kane: "#37, in Robert's."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's identical.... to a provision in House Bill 3947, in fact each of these Amendments from one through five are identical provisions as contained in House Bill 3947."

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

Giorgi: "Well, Mr. Speaker, there is no difference between these Amendments and the Amendments that they had for 3906 and 7, they're identical. Same thing... there is not rules objecting to this type of Amendment."

Schlickman: "He's out of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "You're out of order, Representative Giorgi. The Parliamentarian advises me that... that the refusal of the House to permit the Committee to be discharged



is not a final action on that matter... on the merits and therefore, he advises me that this is not in violation of not only the letter but the spirit of any Rule of the House or Robert's or Murphy or Schlickman, or anybody. Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, I would renew my motion to adopt Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The Gentleman.... Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would only like to add my comments in respect to the Gentleman who said that you can't put an Amendment on this Bill. This Bill in it's form can have any Amendment that any Member on this House sees fit to offer and then it's up to the Body to adopt or not to adopt."

Speaker Redmond: "Point of personal privilege well taken. The question is on the Gentleman's motion to adopt... Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane, will you yield?"

Kane: "Yes."

Schlickman: "What's the difference between cancellation and revocation?"

Kane: "It's a different legal definition of what happens to a restricted drivers permit, if a restricted drivers permit is revoked.."

Schlickman: "Okay, excuse me. Cancellation applies to a restricted drivers permit?"

Kane: "That's what this Amendment would do, right. It would add cancellation... right now on a restricted drivers permit the Secretary of State can only revoke... or suspend."

Schlickman: "I got it, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion



to adopt Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 69 'aye' and 24 'no' and the Gentlemen's motion carried and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #3, Kane. Amend House Bill 3946, page 1, line 1 and 5, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #3, clears up a problem that the Secretary of States office is trying to deal with at the present time, if a driver has three driving violations during a period and the Secretary of State receives the first record of the first conviction after he receives a record of the second and third conviction... then the Secretary of State cannot suspend for the drivers license because of three offenses. Changing the wording in the statute from the conviction on the third offense to the last conviction, the Secretary of State will be able to suspend the license for three conviction within a year."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Griesheimer, are you seeking recognition?"

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I've had my light on since the beginning of Amendment #1, and since I was never recognized and was standing up waving my hands with Amendment #1, I thought I would just leave it on to see how long it would take... and my remarks were all pointed toward Amendment #1, but since I have the floor now I would like to see if the Sponsor would yield for a question?"

Kane: "I would be happy to."



Griesheimer: "Mr. Kane, are you suggesting that the Secretary of State has no way to keep track of the first moving violation under the present system."

Kane: "No, what happens is, we have a number of different clerks in the State and reporting from those court might arise in different sequence of the actual convictions."

Griesheimer: "How is this going to help that?"

Kane: "Well, if the first conviction arrives third, the Secretary of State could suspend the license with this Amendment. Under present statutes he wouldn't be able to."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Kane, I would suggest to you that who's ever been feeding you information must undoubtedly be the same people that originally fought the five year license plates. That's categorically wrong and I've been involved in numerous situations where I have represented clients with three moving traffic violations and the first one is forwarded to the Secretary of State and placed of record then categorically as time goes on the other ones are moved down there and I have never ever heard of a situation where the first moving traffic violation gets down to Springfield, after the third unless it possible took place out of State and there was some time delay in the other State because of the mutual aid situation. But, this information and the basis of this Amendment are so fallacious that I just can't help but believe that it's another one of the Secretary's figments of imagination."

Kane: "I would reply to that.... is if they.... if a driver agrees to pay the second and third conviction but elects to fight the first one, that the disposition of that first conviction could arise considerably later than the disposition of the second and third."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Geo-Karis."



Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Sponsor, will you please explain that Amendment because I can't find it anywhere around here."

Kane: "Let me take you through it very slowly. You are arrested for driving speedily... you elect to fight that speeding conviction, that may take some time. Subsequent to that arrest, you are arrested a second and a third time for speeding... say within the next month, you elect to pay those second two, the record of the first conviction... by the time that gets to the Secretary of States office... after you fought it all the way through the courts and you are finally convicted, say eight or twelve months later. Is that the Secretary of State could not grant revoke on the basis of that kind of happening. With this Amendment you would.... he would be able to revoke your licenses."

Geo-Karis: "Well, what is to prevent the... with all the computerization you have today, you mean to say that... what you're saying that the first offense would not be timely reported to the Secretary of States office."

Kane: "No, it wouldn't clear the court system. If you elect to fight it, you could delay the final disposition of that for sometime."

Geo-Karis: "Well, but on the other hand if the party is innocent and elects to fight it and has to... and it is not his fault that the courts act any faster, you're trying to penalize that party are you not?"

Kane: "If he is innocent, you wouldn't have that third conviction so the problem would be moot."

Geo-Karis: "What do you mean, he might be innocent on that first one... that's what I'm driving at."

Kane: "Well, the first one that's what I'm talking about



JUN 22 1976

123.

if he is innocent on the one that he elects to fight, there is no problem."

Geo-Karis: "But, I don't quite understand the logic... you said the second and third time that he might be caught for speeding, is that correct... and then he will have two moving offenses."

Kane: "All the Amendment does is change the word conviction on the third offense to the date of the last conviction. It doesn't matter in which order the three violations get to the Secretary of States office, if we adopt this Amendment."

Geo-Karis: "Well, under the laws the conviction for the last offense...."

Kane: "No, it's the conviction of the third offense."

Geo-Karis: "Well, under the law the conviction of the third offense is the determining factor, isn't it?"

Kane: "Yes."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak against this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Geo-Karis: "I think as it is, we have an awful lot of power in the Secretary of States office and with all due respect the Secretary of State but, I do feel that there is nothing wrong with the law the way it is and I think by amending... amending and amending, it's going to be more confusing than ever. As it is and any of us who do any work in that line cannot find the most current rules and furthermore, as you and I both know, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House. The Secretary of State does have the power to invoke certain additional rules without benefit of Legislation. And, I think that we don't need it, I think the Amendment is superfluous."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I apologize for being in a Senate Committee hearing



but as the Republican Spokesman on motor vehicles, I have carefully reviewed everyone of the Amendments... at least through about nine or ten that the Representative from the other side of the aisle is introducing and while I would have put them all in one Amendment and left out all this rumbling discussion, he's put them so everybody can see what's coming off, it's a technical change... it keeps drunk drivers from driving. If we don't pass it, we've got more of a problem than if we do pass it."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Kane, to close."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I would urge the adoption of Amendment #3, there is a problem now because there is a six months... cut off date within which the Secretary of State must act and if there is a delay when the speeder elects to fight the first ticket and pays the second and third one, we could have a person that is convicted of speeding three times and the Secretary of State would not be able to... revoke or suspend his license and I would urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentlemen's motion to adopt Amendment #3. All those in favor of the adoption indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion is adopted."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #4, Kane. Amend House Bill 3946, on page 1, line 1, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is also a very simple Amendment, what it does is... it adds clarifying language to mean that the order of suspension or revocation of a license will be effective for six months, after entering by date of the order



and not within six months as there is some interpretation and I urge the adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question is on the Gentlemans motion for the adoption of Amendment #4. Those in favor will say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #5, Kane. Amend House Bill 3946, and so forth."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #5, has a number of provisions to it, the first one is... removes motor vehicle accidents from being carried on the abstract of a persons drivers record... the second provides on page 4, it provides that auto theft if a felony... and on page 6 and 7, it provides the Secretary of State with the authority to revoke a drivers license of any driver who displays total disregard for entered for suspending that persons license. And, on line 34, on page 7... would give the Secretary of State power to extend for one year the eligibility date of a person with respect to driving privileges if that person had a conviction entered against him during the time he was revoked. I would urge the adoption of Amendment #5."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Why does the Secretary of State want to have eliminated from an individuals abstract of driving record motor vehicle accident."

Kane: "Because those accidents would be reported and carried on the abstract regardless of result."

Schlickman: "So..."

Kane: "What happens is that it provides some prejudice as



far as insurance is concerned, those accidents reports are maintained in the Department of Transportation where they are available to anybody who wants the record but, with this Amendment it would put on a persons driving... drivers abstract only those accidents in which he was judged to be at fault."

Schlickman: "May I address myself to the Amendment, Mr.

Speaker? May I address myself to the Amendment...."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

There is a second Amendment to this Bill where by the Secretary of State is asking the House to reduce the amount of service his office is to provide to the taxpayers of this State. By one Amendment, we were asked to give him the authority to reduce the social security number on drivers license... now, we are being asked to give him the authority to eliminate from abstract of driving records, the subject of automobile accidents. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, whether or not an individual is responsible for an accident is immaterial... propensity is suggestive of fault, repetition is suggestive of fault and I think Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. We should also consider the fact that whether or not an accident is involved in related to a traffic violation, is material... we shouldn't just let the fact that a violation standing alone and not having the additional information that there was an accident. I would respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House that we resist this effort of the Secretary of State to reduce service to the taxpayers of the State and overwhelmingly defeat this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "To every issue that we have here, there are two



sides and if you'll replace the word taxpayers in the former speakers speech and instead insert the word insurance company, I think you will understand what he said, the insurance companies right now have a direct computer tie-in to the Secretary of States data bank and I have had at least one constituent come to me, who had said, my insurance is being yanked away from me because I had an accident that was not my fault.... I repeat was not my fault and the only way that the insurance company found out about this was from the Secretary of State computer bank. Now, if the insurance company wants to take the trouble to go through the manual files at the Department of Transportation and then rip your insurance away, fine but I don't think we ought to make it easy for insurance companies to take insurance away from our constituents or raise the rate by providing this direct computer access. And, therefore, I think the Amendment should be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Berman."

Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a multifacet Amendment, there is one part of it that disturbs me greatly and I think it's going to cost all of us some money. Under the present law, if a person is involved in a accident... if your car... your car is fixed under the collision coverage of your policy, then your insurance company turns around and chases and sues the wrong-doer for the damage. Even if they can't collect on that judgment, under the present law the wrong-doer, the person that crashed into your car cannot get his license renewed so long as that judgment remains unpaid. Out of this Amendment would eliminate that requirement so that after seven years that wrong-doer, the judgment debtor would not have.... would be able to get his license back even though he never paid your insurance



company for the damage that was done to your car. Now, some people may say after seven years you ought to let them off the hook, but I point out to you that many times these are totally irresponsible people that have crashed into your car, they didn't have insurance they aren't many times even able to be located. I don't think we should let them off the hook. If they damage your car, they ought to be able to pay for that judgment, now part of the rationale of this Amendment theoretically... is that you can't find the plaintiff or the plaintiff's lawyer. So, that's nonsense because all the judgment debtor has to do is go into the clerk of the court and post the amount of that judgment and get a release for it. He doesn't have to find anybody if the plaintiff has disappeared. But, I would urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment because otherwise, your collision coverage is going to increase because you're going to let the person that crashes into your car, the judgment debtors get their licenses back without paying for the damage that they have incurred."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the main question be put? All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Kane to close."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think that this Amendment has been debated fully in reply to the last speaker, I would simple note that you could renew that judgment after seven years, very simple procedure going into court and renewing it for another seven years and so I would urge the adoption of Amendment #5."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #5. All in favor say 'aye', opposed



'no'. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? On this question there are 28 'ayes'..... Take the record. On this question there are 29 'ayes'..... 31 'ayes', 88 'no', the motion fails. Any further Amendments? Third Reading. I would like to make an announcement, I understand that the II Appropriations Committee has finally agreed and they want to have a picnic tonight starting at 10 o'clock out at the Lincoln Park Pavilion and Representative Merlo, and some group that he has want to have some kind of a doings at 7 o'clock. We've moved exactly fourteen things in final passage... I'm going to send the omnibus Ted Lechowicz down to reason with you people. House Bills, Third Reading 3491..... Taylor and Pouncey to help him. Representative Katz."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 3491, a Bill for an Act in relation to tax upon persons engaged in business of removing or extracting coal etc. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Sponsor of that Bill and the Speaker, the Rules Committee of the House met today and did consider a number of the matters that were posted today. Now, in light of the fact that everybody is anxious to move ahead quickly... the Rules Committee will be meeting tomorrow, immediately after the morning Session. If there are Members here who had Senate Bills that they want the Rules Committee to hear, that Member should be sure to go up to the Clerk in front of the Chamber here and get the form that you fill out in order to have the Bill cleared by the Rules Committee for hearing by the House. Now, if that is done right now... we will still have time to get it posted tonight and in the morning and you will be able to have your Bill heard tomorrow when we break for the morning Session."



So, please be sure if you are a House Sponsor of Senate Bills... that you immediately go down to the Clerk, get the form filled out and you'll be able to have your Bill.... your Senate Bill heard tomorrow, immediately after the recess of the morning Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ralph Dunn, on 3491."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, House Bill 3491 has been on Second Reading for quite awhile and then on Third Reading... its been amended to where now it is a different Bill than the Bill that came out of the Revenue Committee about three or four weeks ago. It's still a coal severance tax, the only difference now is that the Bill in the shape that it is now, causes no cost to the State nor to the people of the State of Illinois. This is what Maurice Scott, I think taxpayers federation would call a good Bill, it's like a tax on hair oil to a bald headed man. It doesn't really cost anything to the people of the State of Illinois to put the 1% severance tax on coal that's mined in Illinois and leaves the State. The Bill is amended to where, I want to repeat again, it is not a cost to the taxpayers of the State nor to the people of the State... nor will it increase any utilities bills in the State of Illinois. I have amended the Bill and with the help of Representative Dick Hart and Representative Clyde Choate and the other Co-sponsor of the Bill. We have the Bill now where we think it's a good Bill and I would urge an 'aye' vote and hope that you would help me pass this Bill over to the Senate. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I join Representative Dunn, in urging the Body to support and pass House Bill 3491. We are already receiving... the counties are, 1% tax



on coal that's mined and sold within the State of Illinois but the whim of the market or whatever, it provided some real inequities in some of the counties where most of the coal is actually sold to outside of the State. And, they're not receiving the benefit that they should be receiving from the mining of the coal in these counties. So, in order to provide a more equity to the counties where coal is mined and there are many of them of course in my area, to come up with the idea of 1% across the board tax which would be paid to the county and which would be very much help in deferring the expenses of those counties where the coal is mined. So, I think Representative Dunn has got an excellent solution to the problem... the inequities that exist in the present 1% tax and I urge the support of it, I know that the coal companies do not object to it and I urge that we pass it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. My law firm represents companies which have oil leases..... coal leases, and coal interest in southern Illinois, at the proper time I will vote my conscience."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Yes, would the Gentleman... the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Katz: "In its present form how much of the tax will the State of Illinois get on the coal that is mined?"

Dunn: "There would be no income to the State of Illinois on the coal that's mined... they presently get sales tax on coal that's mined and sold within the State but the State now gets nothing from coal that is shipped out of the State and it would remain the same, Representative Katz."

Katz: "Well, with regards to sales tax, the State gets the



bulk of the money... why should not the State, which is so hard pressed financially get a good part of the money from the tax on the mining of coal as it does for the selling of merchandise and everything else in the other counties of the State."

Dunn: "The State does not get sales tax on any.... or any tax on products that are sold..... manufactured or produced in the State and shipped out of the State and this is the only problem that we've tried to attack in this Bill now, the coal that leaves the State. Because of the tax that no matter how much or how small you raise coal in the State of Illinois you do influence the cost of utility rates and we didn't want to do this, it wasn't acceptable so we only tried to attack with this Bill the coal that leaves the State. And, for that reason it go back to the county where it's mined as a one cent sales tax does now."

Katz: "Well, so that of the amount of the tax all of it for coal going out of the State, all of it will go to the county and nothing will go to the State of Illinois."

Dunn: "Yes, Sir."

Katz: "Well, I would say that I have great doubts about that it seems to me that the State of Illinois is in desparate financial stress and it does seem to me that the problems of the State should have some consideration, the other taxes that are raised in Illinois... the State does share in those taxes and in the taxes that are raised in Cook County for example, the State takes the major portion of the sales tax money and I do believe that a more equitable formula would be for the State to take for its desparate financial situation some of that money even though I would not object to the county also having some of it but the arrangement under which it all goes to the county and none to the State does seem to me to



be a little inequitable and not responsive to the problems to the State and to our role as being Members of State Legislature where I think we do have a serious problem of balancing the budget of the State."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put... Representative Meyers."

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge there has only been one question that has been asked on this and I think that sort of unfair."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has the right to move the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put. All those in favor vote 'aye'... say 'aye' rather.... all those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 100 'ayes', 16 'no'. Representative Ralph Dunn, to close."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would urge that you would vote an 'aye' vote on this... as I tried to explain in my remarks, the Bill originally had some money in it for State government but if you have money for State government you just inevitably raise the cost of utilities or the cost of... to the taxpayers of the State of Illinois. We now have a 1% sales tax.... thank you. We have a 1% sales tax now that goes to the counties on all this coal that's sold and mined.... and sold in Illinois but we have no tax, I repeat there are no tax and no income to the State of Illinois nor do any of the counties of the State of Illinois from coal that's sold out of the State. So, this puts the 1%, the same 1% that is on the sales tax on all the coal that's mined



in the State of Illinois. There is no cost to the State nor to the taxpayers of the State of Illinois, income from out of State. I would urge an 'aye' 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? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question.... Representative Meyers, pardon me. Representative Meyers."

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, I... this is a tax that has far reaching implications on all of the people of the State of Illinois especially those in my metropolitan areas who burn Illinois coal and I really think that it is grossly unfair... that questions weren't being permitted to ask and even I couldn't even record my 'no' vote. Would you please record me as 'no', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'no'. On this question there are 116 'ayes' and 19 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3533."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 3533, a Bill for an Act to amend Section 13.1 of the Capital Development Board Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Mr. Speaker, could that be taken out for just a few minutes."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. 3534... out of the record. 3545, Representative Washington... Representative Rayson.... who is it, Holewinski?"

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 3545, a Bill for an Act to date and specify powers and duties of Commission Study License, etc. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen



of the House. House Bill 3545, was reported out of the House Judiciary Committee I...."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It had actually been offered originally by Representative Houlihan, as a way of addressing the question of medical licensing and where that function properly lies, any changes that might be advisable in that area. The Amendment provides for a one year study Commission to study their problem, make recommendations to the General Assembly. Would be happy to answer any questions, it is not a very complicated Bill and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those... Representative.... who's yelling? Representative Walsh, you didn't turn on your buzzer."

Walsh: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Apparently the Amendment is the Bill in this instance and we're talking about a study Committee to deal with the question of licensing, the licensing of doctors... we discussed at some length a Bill which would have changed licensing.... the licensing of doctors from the Department of Registration and Education and place that in the Department of Public Health and we... I think wisely defeated that Bill. Now, I don't see any reason, Mr. Speaker, why we should establish a Commission and spend money and I don't know what the appropriation is, and I might ask the Gentleman if he in his closing remarks, would tell us what the companion appropriation is for this Bill and what the status of that appropriation Bill is, but I see no reason why if the appropriation is alive we should enact this enabling legislation and if the



appropriation Bill is dead, why it is absolute nonsense for us to pass this Bill. I would urge a 'no' vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3959, as you recall.... brought into the Public Health Department all licensing of and regulation of public health providers and it also provided for a study group and I can understand why there would have been some hesitation about it, some people said, well you're putting the cart before the horse and others said, well we're opposed to that at this time and that the... may we have some order, Mr. Speaker..."

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

Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And the reason that Bill was offered was because, many people felt that the level of health delivery service in this State had reached the low point and something had to be done to jack it up. I don't know if anyone disagrees with that concept although you did disagree with that... the licensing and regulation of these various discipline should have been brought under the Public Health Department. However, to turn around and say that we don't need to study the problem, seems to me presuppose that you have an answer to it. I've heard a lot of debate in the whole medical malpractice field stretching over the last year and a half and I don't know anyone be it lawyer, doctor, hospital official, insurance care official, I haven't found anyone who has an answer to this problem. We have reiterated time and time again on this floor that we are searching for an answer to try to do two or three things, one to make certain that the level of service given to people in the medical health field, is as high and efficient as conceivable and two, that



it be done at the lowest possible cost. This Bill is just a simple step in the direction finding out whether or not the State of Illinois has gotten together with any one agency, the expertise... the commitment, the knowledge ect., in order to make certain there is adequate supervision over these various health providers... there is much reason to believe that we haven't gotten it.

It is very noisy, Mr. Speaker, right around my desk too.

Speaker Redmond: "I can't see... who's speaking, I can't see.

Representative Lucco, Representative Lechowicz."

Washington: "I'm amazed that the Minority Leader would oppose a Study Commission to try to find out whether or not the State of Illinois is doing its basic and fundamental job of protecting the people by adequately supervising the whole medical health service delivery question. I'm simply amazed... I would assume that the headlines in the papers brood about day by day, across the city, across the land to the effect that malpractice is growing... would alert anybody to the question of whether or not the State of Illinois is doing your job. You talk about the question of money... I submit to you that the people who need doctors are not concerned about that question, they want the best health delivery service they can get. I submit to you that when we have 3959, before us... many Members of the House came up and said, why not drop that part which brings these all under one agency and simply study the problem for a year or six months or whatever time is necessary, come back to the General Assembly but no presupervisions and give them their best input... that's all this Bill is doing, Mr. Minority Leader. I suggest that you reconsider your position, I suggest that we forget the fact that there is a agency in the State that lobbied hard against House Bill 3959 and I suggest that the thing



that we should do... is pass this Bill, get the best people that we can to look into every agency in State government that deals with the regulation and licensing of health services. I submit to you that we have a responsibility and if we don't do that... don't come and scream about the price of medical malpractice insurance don't be 'B.S.' the doctors that you're trying to do something for them because you haven't done your fundamental job and that is to protect the people. This is a good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. If anything can be said with certainty, it is that the health care situation in Illinois is a total mess. I can't think of any situation which requires more intensive study and investigation than that of the health care field. I don't think that we are utilizing our health care providers properly, I don't think that we are licensing our health care providers properly, I don't think we are properly utilizing the many different professions which are involved in health care. I do not think that we are utilizing the many professions involved in the mental health field, I think that health care is too high... it's too high for the working poor it's terrible for the poor and for those who are affluent it is very, very fragmented, in short Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have to start and resolve to take a new fresh look at the whole field here in Illinois and until we do that, no one... I repeat no one can say with confidence that any one measure will alleviate either the malpractice situation or many of the other problems with impact on health care in Illinois and I certainly urge support for House Bill 3545."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."



Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Perhaps we ought to look at what is... one of the big problems in malpractice is an item called patients' safety, and I think that this Commission can or will address itself to that facet of the malpractice problem. We decided as a Body, not to put the health care providers in a single agency under the Department of Health but all this asks is that Members of this Body and that Body across the rotunda, look and see if it is a feasible way to address the malpractice crisis within the State of Illinois. I ask you... to look at this Bill and I commend it to you, I think that it is a good piece of Legislation, I think it will at least give us the opportunity to look at another facet of malpractice."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Kempiners: "Harold... if I remember correctly in the 77th General Assembly, Representative Katz sponsored a Bill and I believe the number was House Bill 845 or something like that, that created a health care Commission. Do you remember that particular piece of Legislation?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's too young."

Kempiners: "He's too young, well I'm younger than he is, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "You're too young."

Kempiners: "Well, if I might remind the Members of this Body who were here in the 77th General Assembly, there was created a health care Commission, I don't know if that was its name but it was basically designed to look into the whole spectrum of health care delivery and it didn't report in time for the 78th General Assembly and I'm



sure there are Members here who got very involved in that particular Commission and the Legislative products of it. It wasn't too successful if I remember correctly and this makes me wonder, there is an old saying, the more things change... the more they remain the same. Are we going to duplicate the efforts of the Commission which was created four or five years ago only to have the same Legislative product which didn't make it through the Legislature and spend the money and the time and the effort which we can no longer afford, especially the money part of it, for a product that isn't going to be produced. I ask that question of Mr. Washington, not because I wanted to be sarcastic, it's just that I wanted to remind the Members of this Body that we have done this before. We are duplicating to the best of my knowledge... something that was done two or four years ago and I don't think we ought to do it when we can least afford."

Holewinski: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Mr. Speaker, I'm handling the Bill for the Judiciary Committee, I would like to reply to Representative Kempiners and maybe answer his question and that I was not here at the time that that Sub-commission took place several years ago, however, I am familiar at least slightly familiar with its work. My recollection is, that the scope of their study was limited to licensing within the Department... as it now exists. The scope of this proposal now... it goes much further, it goes into the questions of patients' safety within institutions the performance of the profession and facilities, the question of incorporations of all licensing into the single agency, not naming a specific agency. It allows for a broad participation of outside interest, it pro-



vides for the evaluation of our experiences in licensing those are things that was not covered in that prior Commission."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, when this Bill was amended on Second Reading, and it was moved rather briskly to Third, I filed with the Clerk a fiscal statement and also went up to Representative Washington, at that time who was the Sponsor of the Bill at that time, and asked him what the fiscal implications would be and I would like to know at this time, what fiscal implications what new fiscal implications are covered in House Bill 3545, as amended."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a copy of a fiscal note that was provided by the Bureau of the budget and it estimates one hundred fifty thousand dollars. I think that is an extremely... I'm being honest with you in giving you that figure, I think it is an extremely high figure in that this current Commission has taken out the provisions for reimbursing or rather for paying public Members and only covers reimbursement. I've looked at several other Commissions that operate in the State now, that operate for a lot less there is a definite period of operation for this one and I would suspect that any appropriation would be considerably less than what B.O.B. estimates."

Lechowicz: "Based on that comment, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak against House Bill 3545 as amended and I would like to point out to the Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that House Bill 3545 as amended is one half of House Bill 3959, which was defeated in this Chamber. House Bill 3545 still provides the compensation of a hundred dollars a day for the Membership of the Committee...



no, I'm sorry... I believe that you just pointed out that it does not provide for compensation of public members. But, it still provides a total expenditure of possible a hundred and fifty thousand dollars of General Revenue Funds of this State at this time. And, it also provides the hiring practices of the Commission as far as setting the salaries of the Executive Director and normal people assigned to the Commission. I believe that one half of House Bill 3959, is as bad as is contained in House Bill 3545 and it should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support Representative Washington and those who are proposing this Bill. And, I do so on some rather specific grounds... let me suggest to you that one of the facts that the medical malpractice Commissions which we created last year to study this problem found out, was indeed that there was very little data in the State of Illinois and I'm talking about two propositions number one, peer review among physicians, there was no central areas to gather information and data in regards to malpractice and malpractice problems, secondly in the area of other health care providers such as hospital associations, that there was indeed no way that we could gather information in regard to malpractice. Now, I will reiterate what I said yesterday or last Friday when we were considering the other... and that is that there is indeed a great deal of medical malpractice in this State. Let me suggest to you for instance that since 1973, the number of malpractice cases filed in Illinois have increased threefold and that the insurance carriers who have insured the Illinois Medical Society will tell you that less than 2% of those cases are... that were filed are serious or nuisance claims. There is in-



deed an increase in malpractice in this State and if we're going to deal with it, we are going to have to deal with it in the health care provider profession. We must do that, it seems to me by providing the tools necessary to determine the problem and to look for solutions in it. I think this is not another Study Commission, I've always been opposed to creating Commissions and Committees to study and study and never coming out with any results. So, let me suggest to you that we're talking about a situation in this State where there is very little information, very little data... we need to set up agencies and make recommendations for peer review and for the collection of data in the State so that we can more carefully deal with the problem. This is a good Bill and it should be passed and I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber.... Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm very happy to join in with those people calling for your support of this Legislation for the creation of the Study Commission on medical malpractice. Some of the efforts of those of us who serve on Sub-committee of medical malpractice have been frustrated due to the lack of detail and the lack of statistics in dealing with the medical malpractice crisis. Now, I have, like you have, read many of the articles that have appeared in the papers and I have, like you have, feel that some of the editorials have been unfair to the Members of this Body, due to the fact that they have called in certain instances for the enactment of further Legislation. But, I say to you, that I stand proud as a Member of this Legislature for the work that we have done in the malpractice field. This morning we passed out an alternative



funding program and we've also passed out many corrections to the existing law. Now, I think that to carry on this good direction that we've taken the malpractice Legislation in, we should create this Study Commission. I urge your support for it, I think it is worthwhile Legislation and necessary to the people of the State of Illinois in an effort to resolve this crisis and I urge your 'aye' vote for it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the main question be put? All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Representative Holewinski, to close."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Several weeks ago, I had surmised that Bill that some viewed as somewhat a dramatic change in medical licensing and many Members spoke to me and suggested that a more appropriate way to go and more cautious way to go, was to study and.... to study the problem and come up with an effective way of dealing with not only the questions of medical licensing but with expanding that study and studying of patients safety and quality of care problem. This Bill does exactly that, it sets up a Study Commission that expires in one year, to take a look at these problems. In the past few weeks... really last year and this year we passed Bills to address a legal relationship in the parties in the malpractice problem but we have done reality little to address the plight of patients of those people who are being injured through negligence in the medical profession. This Bill is an effort to study that problem, to come up with a resolution of the issues in medical licensing, to address the questions



of patients safety and I would ask your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass?

Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Holewinski, for what purpose do you rise?"

Holewinski: "Well, Mr. Speaker, to explain my vote. In that

I can't really see why we should have any reservation of pursuing the study of this nature, very little as I said, has been done in the area of taking a look at questions of the quality of care..."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question... Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I've been... I want to verify the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay... open it up again. Have all voted who wished? Wait a minute..."

Lechowicz: "No money provided in any Bill for this Commission and it is wrong... and I..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe, should be recorded as 'aye'. Representative... I want another Roll Call here, yes. Open the book."

Clerk Selcke: "Oh, you want... we're going to dump this Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Dump this Roll Call. The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We had a valid Roll Call there of 90 some votes, if Representative Lechowicz is going to run the House, you should give him the gavel. Last week we made a mistake... we made a mistake when we turned down the wise counsel of Representative Holewinski. Beaupre



and Washington, on that 3959... I went home and talked to the doctors and they say that the present director is doing abominable job in regard to regulating the doctors. Any of you who feel at the present time that the medical profession is meeting its responsibilities to the public should be voting red, but if you recognize that the great majority of the public does, that there is something wrong, it needs to be investigated for the benefit and well being of all the citizens of Illinois... now is the chance to vote green. I urge you to do so, your constituents will appreciate it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I don't know what the significance of it is, but I notice all the proponents of this Bill are lawyers... now whether they are trying to attract the attention that the malpractice suits are brought by lawyers and we can solve it all by an investigation of the Department of Health, I don't know... but there seems to be some connection there because this is the same group, the other day that wanted to change it. Representative Mann, said that health care in Illinois is a mess. I want to point out to you that it was not a mess four years ago, if the ship is off course... let's get a new captain."

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

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would say the ships off course but the ship is off course nationally, across this nation we've got the same problems in addressing quality of care. I think that it is only appropriate that Illinois take a leadership roll in addressing this problem and taking a look at the quality of care that is provided the people who are patients in hospitals



throughout this State and taking a look at the questions of safety engineering throughout this State and making recommendations so that the General Assembly can consider those recommendations next year and I would ask for a little more green lights on the board."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Once again we've heard a remark which is utterly without foundation, once again a Member of this Assembly has decided that lawyers are of the class or neither intelligent or venal or corrupt or inept whatever the excuse is... the Ladies and Gentlemen of this House should know, again and again and again, and we'll stay here throughout the entire year if you like, to know that lawyers stand up and are divided on many issues. Now, if you think butchers should discuss the question of malpractice, so be it... if you think that a haberdasher knows more about the field, fine and dandy. But, no lawyer worth his licenses is going to sit still when a question of this nature or any question affecting the public welfare comes up. Somebody hasn't been doing his homework, if the good Gentleman and the rest of my colleagues would notice, as I said before, on all union matters... the union officials or the union members vote as a class. On all Bills affecting the teaching profession, the teachers all vote without exception. On all matters affecting agriculture... the farmers are always in agreement but matters affecting the law, or the legal profession, the lawyers are time and again are divided. You may recall that I passed a Resolution, thanks to this House, would censure the Chicago Bar Association and the Illinois State Bar Association with their failure in disciplining the legal profession. Those of you who are unable to argue



or pass a Bill on its merits, should remain seated... if you have a closing argument advance it, but don't defile a profession which has sought here year in and year out, at great personal sacrifice if you will... to do not what they consider justifiable. And, now to the question itself, I have refrained from entering into this discussion for quite some time but, the fact remains that this great vaunted Commission that we appointed some time ago, with Members of the industry, doctors, lawyers, hospital providers and what have you, spent many many hours in this study, not once did they call upon a Member of the Insurance Study Commission which has only been studying this problem for four years, so don't tell me that we don't have records on it. We've got voluminous records but not one of the Ladies and Gentlemen in this House... only the Department of Insurance... only in the medical profession... only in the legal profession... only the insurance industry has asked to see it and anybody that states to the contrary, is as usual is inserting something that is not correct. And, I don't even get excited about these things, you should see me when I get annoyed.... the fact remains that this Commission could have very easily called upon us and asked for those figures and we would have told you that the insurance industry doesn't have them either. As a matter of fact, they have fought... I'm sorry if I bore my colleagues, I have no desire to prolong it... you may... as always are perfectly free to vote as you wish but I suggest if you would like to avoid hearing me, that you do so without slandering the legal profession."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think that the Membership knows me, as I would never slander anyone nor do I intend to. The question here is the creation of a new Commission and a possible expense



of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars which never went to Committee. It's the normal practice in this General Assembly and anyone who is on a Commission can well attest to the fact, that when a new Commission is created... we're fortunate if they give an expense of twenty thousand dollars. It was pointed out by the Sponsor that none of the public members are going to be reimbursed, I do not know... how this money is going to be expended and for what purpose. Now, if you want to be on record as creating a new Commission and an expenditure of a hundred and fifty thousand dollars out of General Revenue, so be it. Without ever going to Committee, without... and there isn't one dollar in this Bill and I rest assured that there will not be one dollar in the omnibus appropriation Bill for this purpose or I'll Table the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Beaupre: "While the previous speaker... as indicated by Representative Epton, made a remark in regard to legal profession that I would like to address."

Speaker Redmond: "Since you wasn't in debate, proceed."

Beaupre: "Let me suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if you look at the record of the medical malpractice Commission that those Members who were appointed by the Speaker and the President of the Senate, included several lawyers. I think that the record will show that the two that were most active were Representative Berman and myself. Let me also point out to you that that Bill which created the Commission appropriated from the JUA fund, a hundred dollars per diem, per day for the public members. But, let me also suggest to you that Members of the General Assembly do not get paid for carrying out Legislative



duties as service on a Commission and yet, there were lawyers who were Members of the General Assembly who served on that Commission, sacrificing their time when we were indeed not in Session in Springfield, probably at a rate of somewhere between forty and sixty dollars an hour, many of us spent twenty-six weeks attending those meetings with no regard for personal gains other than to deal with the problem of malpractice in this State. And, I think that truly an affront to those of us who have given our time and served to suggest that our motives are anything but... to serve the interest of our constituents and the people of this State, when we do so, in fact... that great financial sacrifice and I would hope that we would look much more carefully on how people vote and what their conduct is in the General Assembly before we castigate professions or groups on a general basis."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. When this medical malpractice crisis first arose, I was hesitant to admit that there was a crisis and speaking for one of the lawyers in the House, myself... I will say that I have opposed many of these Bills that have been brought up because I felt that they have cut the rights of minors they want to limit the statute, they have wanted to limit the liability of the doctors and so now, I do admit there is a problem and I think that the way you solve problems is by checking into the facts and getting information and the best knowledge from other States and this Committee has been working here in the last few months has gotten additional information and facts and I think study is needed, even though I have opposed many of these measurers, I feel that we have to become enlightened. we have to do what we can on these problems



to work at them and I don't know how we can ever solve the problems that we don't study and look into them, now we have many Study Commissions... I feel that this would certainly be most beneficial and that's why I'm voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I think that we have spoke enough on this subject and let us move on and get other Bills to consider."

Speaker Redmond: "Last one, Representative Mann."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker... looking at that board, I'm a little surprised at the large number of red lights and I'll tell you why. There is nothing contained in this Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Kempiners: "Is there a rule that states that a Members who participated in debate cannot explain his vote?"

Speaker Redmond: "Not quiet that broad, if he's the Sponsor he may."

Kempiners: "Is Mr. Mann, a Sponsor of this Legislation?"

Speaker Redmond: "Are you the Sponsor, Representative Mann?"

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kempiners.... feels that strongly about it, I will sit down."

Kempiners: "I'm just trying to save the time of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 86 'ayes', 51 'no'... Representative Holenwinski."

Holenwinski: "Poll the absentees, please."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk, poll the absentees."

Clerk Selcke: "Berman, Brandt, Capuzi, Craig, DiPrima, Giglio, Fleck, Dave Jones, Kornowicz, Leon, Madison, McGrew, Rayson, Rose, Stearney, Terzich, Wall, White."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison, 'aye'. Representative Holewinski."

Holenwinski: "Mr. Speaker, I would like leave to place this on postponed consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed consideration. Representative Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Washington: "As I interpret a point of personal privilege, if the integrity of a Member of the House has been impunged. then any Member of the House has a right to rise. Now, this was a serious Bill, seriously discussed and I for one take no umbrage with anyone who disagrees with a Bill. They have that perfect right, as a matter of fact, if they disagree with it and didn't vote contrary to it they would be wrong. But, when a Member can stand up on the House floor and threaten this Body that he... in his all mighty wisdom, is going to exercise some muscle which I haven't seen to tube a Bill namely the omnibus Bill, because he didn't like what was transpiring... I think we have gone pretty far down the drain. It makes no sense to me at all... that we should tolerate that kind of a discussion. Nobody owns this State... nobody owns the omnibus Bill... nobody owns the appropriation process, we are here representing people own every stich of it, every penny of it and if anybody stands up on this House floor and in his personal peace, because things are not going the way he wants them to go, suggest to us that he's going to resort to blackmail by tabling one our Bills and when they go into the tube they belong to us, then I think he should be chastised. I resent it... and I think every Member of this House should resent it and



I think we should cut out that folderol in that place. If we have to divorce personalities from appropriation Bills then we will do it, but I for one... am not going to tolerate that kind of blackmailing threats."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, may I point out to this General Assembly that.... what I point out was absolutely correct, it is an appropriation matter... there is not an appropriation Bill to substantiate House Bill 3545, and I pointed out that I for one would not accept Amendment to an omnibus Bill because, the omnibus Bill contained appropriation matters for existing Commissions and it was for this reason... I wanted to point it out, I'm sorry Representative Washington, if you took it in a different vein, but I just wanted to point out the omnibus appropriation Bill is an appropriation Bill for existing Commissions and Amendment to that Bill for a new Commission without a hearing would be improper."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, I'm a part-time lawyer and I'm always grievously wounded when my more sensitive brethren are attacked here on the floor by charges that are probably well intentioned. The thought occurs to me that many of the non lawyer Members of this House have an inferiority complex and the Speaker could cure that incentive... the Speaker could cure that...."

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

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I don't believe we have anything in front of us right now... what we are just rolling over, I think it seems to me that the Gentleman...."

Speaker Redmond: "Your point is well taken. Your point is well taken. 3604... 3553, Representative Williams,



pardon me."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 3553, an Act making appropriation to the Emergency Service and Disaster Agency. Third Reading of the Bill."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3553, appropriates the Emergency Service and Disaster Agency for the purpose of the emergency that might result from tornados, severe storm, explosions or what have you. One million dollars from General Revenue Fund, one million dollars from the Road Fund these funds cannot be expended until the purpose and amount have been approved by the Governor and it also, any appropriations shall remain available for obligation and..... until June 30th, 1977. I feel that this Legislation actually begins to bridge a gap for the obligation that our State government has in time of a disaster, whether that disaster be.... a tornado, explosion, floods or some other natural or man-made catastrophe, I think it behooves our State to have a larger larder in the event that we do not get the funds through federal government. I would ask at this time that I receive the support of the House for 3553."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer. Ted Meyer."

Meyer: "Question to the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Meyer: "Is this a supplemental for Representative Yourell's one million dollar in the mines and minerals?"

Williams: "I have been joined actually by several Representatives now from the House, Representative Yourell, Representative Barnes and it is not really a supplemental, the other Bill is still in Conference Committee and we should have the two vehicles going."

Meyer: "Are we appropriating two million dollars then or is Representative Yourell, going to Table his Amendment?"



Williams: "Well, I think in the event we'll let the Governor make a decision and we'll let both Bills get there. It will be one or the other."

Meyer: "Well, fine thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110 'ayes', 23 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Ewell, 'aye'. 3604, Representative White, 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 3604...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane, on the floor? Out of the record. 3610."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 3610, an Act making appropriations to the Secretary of State. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative E.M. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you, very much. Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the House if we could hear House Bill 3610, House Bill 3611 and House Bill 3612, concurrently. Also in this packet which is on supplemental Calendar #II, I believe... is House Bill 3609, and I would like to discuss them all, since they all are inter-related and if possible we could either take one Roll Call or vote them individually."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections..."

Clerk Selcke: "11 and 12."

Speaker Redmond: "3610, 3611, 3612 and 3609, will you read all of those."

Clerk Selcke: "3609, a Bill for an Act amending Section 8, of the Illinois Library System Act. Third Reading of the Bill. 3611, an Act relating to Library and media services



in elementary and secondary schools. Third Reading of the Bill. 3612, an Act to amend Section 8, and to add Section 8.1 of the Illinois Library System Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Barnes: "Thank you, very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Starting with House Bill 3609, this Bill it revised the present funding formula for the eighteen public libraries systems in Illinois. The Library System Act, enacted in 1965, was conceived with the understanding that funding would be increased every third year and 1975 and 1976, represents a third intervening year for the funding increase. At the suggestion of the Secretary of State and other Legislators the effective date for the increase has been moved back by this particular piece of Legislation until July 1, 1977. This House Bill 3609, carries no increase of cost to the State for the year 1977. We accomplished this by an Amendment which was added to this Bill and by decreasing the appropriations in the Appropriations Committee, when the Bill was heard in Appropriations II. House Bill 3610, is the appropriation to pay for the increases within House Bill 3609, this is the one that was in Appropriations II, the original funding requested was 4.5 million... this was reduced to four hundred and forty-seven thousand, eight hundred and eighty-five dollars for the simple reason that I had indicated that the effective date was changed and it was not necessary for other addition in funding for this program. House Bill 3611, enacts a new category of assistance to our local public school districts that is sorely needed for many years in forms of grants to develop and improve libraries media services. House Bill 3612, is a propose nearly identical to House Bill 449, of last year which easily passed the House but



ran into problems in the Senate. This is one of the major recommendations that Representative Ralph Dunn, Sub-committee on Liability and Financing in fiscal... in the year 1974, basically House Bill 3612, support increases that are now restricted to minor equalization programs of State support by local libraries... public libraries. Few Illinois libraries have been the recipient of federal revenue sharing dollars and in order to provide additional funding from sources other than the local property tax grant, by population served by local libraries we must... this Legislation will feel that need. The net effect of House Bill 990, was a thirty-three and one third assessment level over the next few years will serve to reduce the amount of money that can be devoted to public libraries even though making a greater local effort. House Bill 3612, will enable public libraries to continue maintaining the current level of library services. I would solicit the support of the House on House Bill 3609, House Bill 3610, House Bill 3611 and House Bill 3612."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Anderson: "Seeing what 3610, does then... it really fully funds the old formula that was cut last year, is that correct?"

Barnes: "That is correct."

Anderson: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Deuster: "As I understand it... Representative Barnes, this will... these Bills will establish a grant system so that libraries can apply for a grant, is that correct?"

Barnes: "Basically, the intent of package totally together



that would be a pretty well correct assessment."

Deuster: "And, I understand there is an authorization of one million dollars to be spread out among the various libraries that apply, is that correct?"

Barnes: "In the overall program yes, but as I said, House Bill 3609 changed the effective date of the overall program until July 1, 1977. That would be correct after 1977."

Deuster: "I see, how many libraries in Illinois?"

Barnes: "That's a good question, I believe there are eighteen that this addresses itself too. Eighteen public library system."

Deuster: "Well, there are eighteen systems, how many libraries... would the grants be given to the systems or to the individual libraries?"

Barnes: "The system, library system."

Deuster: "All right, then the eighteen... the one million would be divided up among the eighteen."

Barnes: "Systems now. This is the eighteen library systems, this is not individual libraries there are many many libraries under the same system."

Deuster: "Well, the synopsis suggest that it be the development of library media programs at all levels... is that inaccurate then?"

Barnes: "No, that would not be inaccurate. The answer to your question, as I say, that eighteen... this addresses itself to the funding formula for eighteen public libraries systems in Illinois. Now, individual libraries... I'm not really certain how many there are, they're many under each individual system but, we're talking about the eighteen systems as set out by the statute."

Deuster: "Well no, we're...."

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

Deuster: "All right, I will. House Bill 3612, provides for



a million dollars of grants to public libraries and I would like to know what the average grant would be, I don't think there is enough money to spread out... that's what I'm getting..."

Barnes: "Well, Representative, as I indicated... there are eighteen systems, like for instance in the southern part of the State, and I'm not sure about other counties but, in the southern part of the State, one system may include five or six counties. How many libraries are in those counties, I just have no idea. What this proposal will do... is fully fund the formula as it is presently now constituted, then we will come back in fiscal 1978, when the other portion of this Bill will become effective and appropriate for the money at that particular time which will initiate the total program. But, there is no necessity for that now since only the portion that we are addressing ourselves to, it's the current portion and these Bills would fully fund the current portion. As a matter of fact, the overall... total, bottom line total with this additional money in it, to fully fund the formula now would, I believe approximately nine million, three hundred thousand."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing... Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wondered if the Sponsor would yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Ewing: "Is there any increase in local taxes included in any of these Bills?"

Barnes: "No."

Ewing: "Not in 3612?"

Barnes: "No."

Ewing: "What will be the total cost to the State of Illinois... these Bills?"



Barnes: "The total cost as I told you before, the total cost in this fiscal year will be the appropriation that is embodied in House Bill 3610, which is four hundred and forty-seven thousand, eight hundred and eighty-five dollars which will.... added to... already appropriated funds... fully fund the library funding system. We have already passed that out and the Secretary of States Bill and this additional four hundred thousand will bring that to full funding which will be accumulate total of nine million, three hundred and seventeen thousand."

Ewing: "We are increasing our obligation through for the funding of these with the passage of this package?"

Barnes: "We're not increasing our obligation as such, as I explained again. We've already passed out in the Secretary of States Bill, the funding mechanism for the library system. The only thing that we're adding here, is four hundred and forty-seven thousand, eight hundred and eighty-five dollars to fully fund the formula this year."

Ewing: "But, I mean with House Bill 3612, we're not getting any future obligation for additional funding?"

Barnes: "No."

Ewing: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. Representative Barnes, to close."

Barnes: "Thank you, very much. Mr. Speaker, I would only solicit an 'aye' vote on, I think a very outstanding package. I know Representative Ralph Dunn and his Committee that worked extremely... extremely hard on



161.

this total package... what we're trying to do here is bring some parity to our public library system in the State that has not had additional attention given to them, I think the proposal here will simply try to bring in line the necessary funding aspects and the necessary program to keep our people young and old abreast to the necessary research data that library systems office and I would simply solicit an 'aye' vote for these four excellent pieces of Legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall these Bills pass?"

Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'... Representative Gene Hoffman, to explain his vote."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

This is a good example of the new program which is going to cost us sufficient money in 19.... or FY-78. Many of us are going to be here then, many of us are going to be responsible for funding this program. This is a new program with the exception of the supplemental and I don't believe that we can commit ourselves to kind of expenditure in the future when we can't even meet our commitments to general state aid to the schools and for that reason, I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 134 'ayes', 16 'no', these Bills having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3652, Representative Stiehl."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 3652, a Bill for an Act which require certain certifications in relation to State vouchers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3652, amends the State Finance Act to specify funds of certification of State vouchers.



And, it provides that the penalty for knowingly falsifying a voucher, is a business offense subject to a fine of up to twenty-five hundred dollars. This is a very important Bill, it is a major step towards to assuring fiscal responsibility and guarding against the misuse of State Funds..."

Speaker Redmond: "3612, should be on the board... 3652."

Stiehl: "This Bill designed to give meaning to the Legislative appropriation process and insure that employees are actually working in the position for which they are being paid... in this case of State vendors. this will implore that the goods and the services has been delivered to the State in accordance with the contractual agreements. This is a Legislative Audit Commission Bill, submitted in accordance with the recommendation of the Auditor General. It has the unanimous endorsement of the Commission and the strong endorsement of the Secretary of State, the State Treasurer and the State Comptroller and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I said before, it is an important step in safeguarding the misure of State funds and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 141 'aye', 4 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3653, Representative Stiehl."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 3653, an Act authorizing temporary interagency transfers of State employees. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3653, amends the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois in the personnel code. It permits



an employee of one department to be assigned at the request of another department to render service for the requesting department under a temporary transfer for no more than 90 days, with one 90 day extension available. During this transfer the employee will be retained and accrue seniority in the department for which he was a permanent employee, but he shall be paid through the payroll and the appropriation of the department for which he is rendering services. This Bill is basically a companion Bill to House Bill 3652, it provides a method to enable department head to assign personnel as needed to meet the demands of government but at the same time, it will provide accountability on where individuals are and from what appropriation they are being paid. I would ask for an 'aye' vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any questions? Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield to a question or so?"

Speaker Redmond: "She will."

Lechowicz: "Mrs. Stiehl, would you inform me as far as who is supposed to be notified under this Bill when a person is assigned to another department."

Stiehl: "The office of the Comptroller."

Lechowicz: "And, in turn the department spokesman inform them or the department of personnel?"

Stiehl: "No, actually the department issuing the payroll voucher will inform the Comptroller, that this employee is on temporary assignment and being paid from the appropriation of their department."

Lechowicz: "And, at the.... I can see it working effectively for a very selected officials but there... I believe twenty-two code agencies and a number of department in State government.... now would each respected department



head be responsible for notification to the Comptroller office?"

Stiehl: "The supervisor of the the person that is making out the payroll voucher, will certify that this employee is there on temporary transfer and he is being paid from the appropriation."

Lechowicz: "Now, you used to sit on the Appropriation Committee and it was pointed out in Committee a number of times that people are assigned to a department... be quite specific in the area of the information services division which is primarily in the Department of General Services but, like in D.O.T., they may have three or four people working in the same function and they are assigned to that department, now... upon your Bill General Services would have to inform the Comptroller that there are three people in D.O.T., performing that service and there would be a maximum extension of 80 days, and then upon another request addition 80 days, is that correct?"

Stiehl: "I'm not sure, Representative Lechowicz, if I understand your question. But, if these people..."

Lechowicz: "The question is Mrs. Stiehl..."

Stiehl: "... that are doing this work for D.O.T., are actually working for the D.O.T. and their position are there in D.O.T., there is no reason why they would have to notify the Comptroller."

Lechowicz: "I gave you a specific example, which caused quite a bit of concern in this House floor, last year... in reference to the area that is contained within the General Services budget. The Illinois Information Service, now the Illinois Information Service its primary responsibility is contained within the Department of General Revenue... General Services and I think we allocate approximately two hundred thousand dollars



for that function but in D.O.T., they may have three or four positions that service in that capacity, would this Bill give them a maximum of 180 days to service the Illinois Information Services section of General Services in their respective departments?"

Stiehl: "Are you speaking of the unfunded agencies?"

Lechowicz: "No ma'am, I'm not. The Illinois Information Services was funded in General Services last year."

Stiehl: "Well, then if they were funded in General Services and that was part of the appropriation that went in there, there would be no problem. What we're trying to correct and what we're trying to alleviate is.. that current practice when agency actually appropriates some of its money to another agency, and impairing the integrity of the appropriation process. This Bill would prohibit that type of subterfuge and it would assure that the expenditure per activity were kept within the bounds originally established by the Legislature."

Lechowicz: "Would the only person to be notified would be the Comptroller office?"

Stiehl: "Only in the case of a transfer.... if a temporary transfer."

Lechowicz: "And, not the Department of Personnel."

Stiehl: "The Department of personnel would have already located the transfer."

Lechowicz: "Unfortunately that was not the case. I have no further questions, thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, but my question has been answered. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "She will."

Schraeder: "Representative, if there are three clerical



employees in D.O.T., and that department wishes to transfer them to corrections, who makes the termination and what precaution are they that the youngest senior person would be the one transferred and what would be the pay scale of that person transferred?"

Stiehl: "That would have nothing to do with this Bill.

Actually what would happen... if the Department of Corrections needed three employees from the Department of Transportation, they would request that from the department head, if this were agreeable they would then be transferred to the Department of Correction. Now... the determination of who would be transferred would be up to the Department of Corrections and the Department of Transportation, this Bill would not deal with it at all.... all it's trying to do is to get rid of the ghost payroller that we had a couple of years ago."

Schraeder: "I'm not talking about ghost payrollers, I'm talking about three employees... one may have fifteen years, one may have ten years and one may have five years with D.O.T., if Corrections wanted one employee, who decides which of those three would go?"

Stiehl: "Well, this Legislation has nothing to do with that Representative..."

Schraeder: "That's what I'm fearful , then you're saying that it is very possible that a fifteen year employee in D.O.T., might transferred to Corrections and some five or ten year employee remain in D.O.T."

Stiehl: "It could be right now, they could be transferred there right now and not and not just temporary, this trying to put some restraint on them, they could be transferred right there permanently for six months, six years... anytime."

Schraeder: "All right, what salary would they make if they are transferred?"

Stiehl: "They make their same salary."



Schraeder: "Then you're saying, that if we send someone.... in D.O.T. is making six hundred dollars a month and go to corrections and that salary scale there is five hundred dollars a month, that transfer is going to get over the...."

Stiehl: "No, he's going to get his same salary because he's only on a temporary transfer."

Schraeder: "All right, what happens after the 90 days, he goes back to his own department or can he be retransferred to another department?"

Stiehl: "He goes back to his own department."

Schraeder: "For one day, can he be retransferred after one or two days?"

Speaker Redmond: "Please bring the remarks to a close."

Stiehl: "There is a 90 day extension, Representative Schraeder. Then he must be returned under his permanent position."

Schraeder: "What about the Department of Transportation employee that is wanted in Corrections but he transferred from Peoria, to Chicago or vice versa, is there any provision against that?"

Stiehl: "It can only be for 180 days."

Schraeder: "I don't care, a 180 days... that's 60 miles away... can that be possible?"

Stiehl: "Right now, under the present existing statutes they could transfer that employee permanently... so this is a vast improvement."

Speaker Redmond: "Please bring your questions to a close, Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "I will by just saying, that I think there is a lot of loop holes in this particular piece of Legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put?"



All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it... Representative Stiehl, to close."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What this Bill is attempting to do, is to close the loopholes that presently exist. Under the present system an agency can appropriate their funds to any other agency and transfer people for one year, two years or six years, what we're trying to do is, bring some order out of this process and to guard against the mystery payrollers that we saw in various departments, just a few years ago. This will give meaning to our appropriations process and it is a further step in fiscal responsibility and accountability for State employees... it assures that they actually in the position in doing the work for which they are being paid and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? all those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 119.... 125 'aye', 11 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3798."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3798, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Downs."

Downs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The district that I represent as well as many others... has had arson which are of increasing concern and in many of these districts and in ours, there were a series of public meetings which Members of the law enforcement agencies answered questions of the public and the whole question of arson was examined. In the course of these hearings and in correspondance between myself and the superintend-



ant of the Chicago Police Department... it was determined then it was passed on to me that one of the frustrations of law enforcement was difficulty in prosecutions under the present arson statute in that, it did not specifically prohibit the burning of your own property. . . It covered the offense of arson by referring to burning the property of another... and if you were burning your own property it had to be with intent to defraud an insurer and that has presented a difficulty of both proof and the process of cooperation between law enforcement prosecuting agencies and the insurance companies. And, that effect has been that the police have felt handcuffed in their ability to conduct an investigation which would lead to a prosecution of individuals that they believe that they had burned their own property.... presumably to defraud an insurer but in any event have the cause... a serious problem in business areas, threatening life and other property and it was their suggestion that the arson statutes be modified to cover the situation of burning your own property where it creates an imminent danger to the life or property of another and the substantive change in the arson statute is contained in the Amendment which was adopted yesterday, which clarified the original Bill as drafted and I would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 3798, is there question? The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

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

Speaker Shea: "He indicates that he will, Sir."

Dunn: "Under what circumstances can the owner of property burn his property, if this Bill becomes law?"

Downs: "Under... well, setting aside there may be other laws on the books, pollution laws or nuisance laws or something..."



any other circumstances except... where it is property worth more than a hundred and fifty dollars and creates an imminent danger to the life or property of another."

Dunn: "So, if I have a shed on the back of my lot, it blows down and it's two hundred dollars worth of lumber in it, I can't burn it up... is that right?"

Downs: "Yes, you can because that would not create an imminent danger to the life or property of another."

Speaker Shea: "Is there further debate? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer."

Palmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question has been answered."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Houlihan, D.L."

Houlihan: "I have a question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Shea: "He indicates that he will yield."

Houlihan: "Representative Downs, I'm not clear if I understood your explanation. Would the change in the statute of the arson statute that this Bill proposes ... would that delete the requirement that an element of arson where you are burning your own property ... are you deleting the requirement that that burning must be done with an intent to defraud an insurance carrier?"

Downs: "No, it preserves all of the other prohibition of the present arson statute, it only adds this reference to burning of your own property of value of one fifty or more or creating of imminent danger."

Houlihan: "No further questions."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you. Will the Gentleman yield for question?"

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Greiman: "All right. I notice in the original Bill, Mr. Downs, that one can be guilty of arson for failing to reply to inquiries of a law enforcement agency... which would, I suspect probably violate the fifth Amendment



rights under the federal constitution as well as curious failure to respond becomes arson, is that... you know, still in the Bill?"

Downs: "No, that was deleted in the Amendment.... that was one of the provisions that were contained in the Bill as originally drafted which is of course objectional."

Greiman: "Well, has all of that been taken out at this point?"

Downs: "That paragraph was deleted entirely."

Greiman: "So, there is nothing any longer...."

Downs: "Nothing whatsoever about that."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Mr. Schisler."

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

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and Mr. Downs, to close."

Downs: "Thank you. I request a favorable vote on this Bill which proposes what has become increasing a loophole in the arson law, particularly in our cities. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Downs, moves for the passage of House Bill 3798, the question is, shall House Bill 3798, pass? All those 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. Shea, 'aye'. On this question there are 138 'ayes', 9 'nays', 3 Members voting 'present', House Bill 3798, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 3810, and on that question the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3810, a Bill for an Act to amend



the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

House Bill 3810, calls for the appointment of a special election judge to count the retention ballots in the judicial elections. This particular Bill was amended after it was discussed with both the... well, the Minority Party, that it would not include the election of judges, just the retention of judges... where there are fifteen or more candidates... I'm sorry, fifteen or more judges that are being retained. Now, of course in the upcoming election there is going to be a... many of the judges to be retained and election judges that will be placed on a... the machine, however, there will still be, and particularly in Cook County, some judges which will not be left on a machine and that is why this Bill is being sponsored and also, this particular system was adopted in 1972, and it worked very expediently very well for all of the... not only the Democratic but the Republican precincts throughout my district and I don't believe there is any opposition from... on this particular matter. I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 3810, pass?"

All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Collins, 'aye'. Shea, 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 156 'ayes, 21... 156 'ayes', no 'nays', no 'present'... House Bill 3810, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 3848, and on that the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3848, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House.

House Bill 3848, passed the elementary and secondary education Committee on a unanimous vote... or 20 to 1, rather... what it does is eliminate the mandatory roll back provided in the resource equalizer formula that has hurt high school districts and a few elementary school districts around the State. Now, on Second Reading, on the floor... two Amendments were added by my colleagues that I opposed but, I can live with those Amendments... neither of them are bad Amendments they... we wanted to keep this as a pure roll back Bill because the roll back elimination... the elimination of the the mandatory roll back does not cost the State any money whatsoever, both Amendments are encompassed pretty well in Bills that were passed out previously by the House, especially Representative Jaffe's 3815, what they do is include transportation tax in the operating tax rate and lower the both unit and elementary districts the qualifying rates to fully participate in the resource equalizer formula. Those aren't bad concepts, I opposed them when offered by Representative Kane and McClain, because they... what I felt... took away from the purity of the mandatory roll back elimination Bill, House Bill 3848, which Representative Berman, originally introduced. That Bill would not have cost the State any money as the Bill is amended, it would cost money but not as much as the Bill we previously passed out. Therefore, in order to keep this vehicle alive, to eliminate the mandatory roll back on the tax rate under the resource equalizer formula which is needed very badly by high school districts throughout the State, even a few elementary districts, I urge that we pass House Bill 3848, to keep this vehicle alive in the Senate as a potential method of eliminating the roll back, should the other Bill that we previously



passed run into some difficulty."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 3848, pass?

All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Chapman, 'aye'. Shea, 'aye'. 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 94 'ayes', 27 'nays', 16 Members voting 'present'. House Bill 3848, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Add Totten as 'aye'. Collins, 'aye'. Mann, 'aye'. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 3901, and on that question the Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3901, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think this would qualify as one of those merely Bills because it's a clarifying Amendment to the Civil Administrative Code, actually it clarifies for the next Governor and for his appointees the procedures to qualify for offices created under the code. The statute currently requires such officers to... execute an oath and give a bond prior to the commencement of their duties... while the statute and bond requirements must be filed with the Secretary of State... there is only an implication as to when the commencement of duties can take place. Under proposed Committee Bill 3901, the Amendment would make the filing date, the date upon which newly appointed officers could commence their duties and would create a clear record as to the date of the office assumed and the date when the Comptroller could commence paying those officers. The current language of statute has



resulted in differing interpretation as to the date of commencement of duties and this brings about uncertainty as to when payment should commence. This is merely a clarifying Amendment to the present Civil Administrative Code and I would solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 3901, pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. It takes 89 votes. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Shea, 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 149 'ayes', no 'nays', 2 Members voting 'present'... Domico, 'aye'. Leinenweber, 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 3903, and on that the Gentleman from Tazewell, Luft."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3903, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Court of Claims. Third Reading of the Bill."

Luft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3903, amends the appropriations for the Court of Claims by six hundred and eighty-seven thousand dollars, that's for fiscal year '75... I mean '76. It increases the total appropriation for payments of a ward by the court to one million, five hundred and thirty-seven thousand dollars. These wards are authorized under Section 24, their claims arising as a result of lapse of appropriation... ordinary bills and expenses of the various departments, police and firemen's death benefits, reclaims replacement of lost warrant in any other claims under a thousand dollars in nature. I would ask at this time for a favorable Roll Call."



Speaker Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 3903 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. This takes 89 votes. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Shea 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 152 'ayes', 3 'nays', 1 Member voting 'present'. House Bill 3903 having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 3932."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3932. A Bill for an Act to authorize the creation of businesses to operate Policy-Number Games. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, even though that this is a Committee Bill, Committee of Revenue Bill, I think the original Sponsor of the concept and the man who's in charge of the Commission and who wrote a piece and is better qualified to speak on this Bill and therefore, I yield to Representative Caldwell."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Maragos. House Bill 3932 is a proposal for the legalization of the policy-numbers game. The Policy-Numbers Game Study Committee consisted of 10 Members of the Illinois House of Representatives and was formed in the 78th General Assembly. The Members of that Committee consisted of myself, as Chairman; Representative Holloway, as Vice-Chairman; Representative Harold Washington, as Secretary; Representative Louis Capuzi; Representative Bob Dunne; Representative John Fary; Representative Zeke Giorgi; Representative Ron Hoffman; Representative Roger McAuliffe; and Representative Ike Sims. Some of those Members who left the Assembly were later replaced by other Members. If I can have your attention, I will be as brief as possible. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But the purpose of the Commission and the study was to make a.... of the Commission was to make a thorough study of policy-numbers game



to determine the feasibility and the desirability of legalizing, regulating and taxing its operation. We were to consider the socioeconomic, legal, ethical and financial aspects of the subject as well as the possibility of an additional source of state revenue. House Bill 3932 is the culmination of our efforts. The origin of the policy game has never been authenticated. Most authorities agree that it was first known in the West Indies and was brought to New Orleans toward the end of the Civil War. Policy is a game of chance, a private lottery in which people bet from five cents to larger amounts of money that the numbers they choose will be among the numbers drawn in the game held twice a day, six days a week. Policy is a poor man's lottery. It is played in Chicago, Rockford, East St. Louis, Robbins, Harvey, Evanston, and other areas of our cities and towns where the poorest members of our society live. To quote one of our witnesses who appeared before the Committee and I quote, 'People in the black communities believe that it is worth spending a nickel or a dime as an investment toward a barrel full of hope'. Policy offers a positive expectation that one could be lifted out of the most sordid entrapment of life in the ghetto. Our witness went on to say, 'I was born on the south side of Chicago at 42nd and St. Lawrence Ave. I remember very well as one of seven children in a family plagued by frequent spells of unemployment and encounters with the public welfare system, how things were in the 43rd block of St. Lawrence where residents ranged in economic status from families as poor as ours to those whose financial means could have afforded them residences on North Lake Shore Drive. I recall the celebrations and holidays which became more pleasantly memorable because my father had a gig which hit or something good had happened to boost our sagging financial posture. Terms such as three way side and flat, saddles, one or two legged book were all related to the locally ensconced policy wheel. A number of people who lived in my block were employed by policy wheels. Neighbors occupied positions as riders, runners, collectors and bookkeepers. There were no raised eyebrows. It was quite respectable to be the



dispenser of good tidings and to play some role in an endeavor which offered to the vast majority of my neighbors some reason for a positive expectation which could lift one out of the most sordid entrapments of life in the ghetto. It held out the possibility for home or business ownership, education for children beyond high school, vacations and other amenities which could somehow blunt the economic pain that came with being black in Chicago'. This is a good representation of the black community's attitude toward the policy game, but policy is more than this. Policy is a business, a multimillion dollar, illegal business. There are highly organized networks of people connected with policy wheels. The business makes its large profits by volume of bets it takes in. It is difficult to know amounts of money handled by policy wheels as the owners do not publish profit and loss statements, but from the records and evidences of arrests in Chicago, we have estimated the following. There are 23 active policy wheels operating in Chicago; five are large, eighteen are small. These wheels are grossing over \$20,000,000 a year in Chicago. This \$20,000,000 is coming from the second, third, tenth, eleventh, thirteenth and fifteenth police districts on Chicago's south and west side. There are 3,800 individuals engaged in the operations in the City of Chicago. The net profit for a large policy wheel in Chicago is \$25,000 per week. The Illinois State Lottery has not cut down on the play of policy. They are different markets. Raids on policy wheels by the Chicago Police Department account for half of all the gambling raids made in Chicago. In 1973, for instance, there were 2,573 gambling raids in Chicago. 1,241 of these raids were made on policy wheels. The economy of the black community is not balanced. More money is leaving our community than is being brought into our community. It is not a balanced economy because we do have the availability of industrial and commercial enterprises in our community. The legalization, legalizing of policy is trying to get the economic dollar back into the black communities. We could from the policy dollars that have left our community, have built two or three hospitals. In a community, money must flow like it's



electricity through a circuit and must go around and return again without a break in the circuit. We have tens of millions of dollars that are flowing in the black community. No one is paying taxes on this money, nor is this money being warehoused in any banks. It is staying in the icebox, as we say. It is not drawing any interest, nor being reloaned or recycled for the legitimate good of the community. We need this money to flow, to be recycled in order to rejuvenate some of the businesses which need money in our black communities. Policy is strictly another business venture. We must begin where we are. Policy would offer additional avenues in our community for which there are very few for young people to understand the whole mechanism of business, accounting and market analysis. It would employ people and give them experience in these skills. The moral stigma is relative. We believe that the moral thing is to help the individual learn to live within his community and live with himself. The final point I wish to make is how our Bill was written. We drafted it in the tightest possible manner. Sam Young, currently a candidate for Congress, the former Assistant Secretary of State and Securities Commissioner of our State, drafted this proposal with as tight regulations for capital, reporting, disclosure, and audit as there are in our present securities laws. Our Bill is, in fact, patterned after the 1953 Securities Law which Mr. Young drafted. We believe that our Bill is well thought out and with sufficient protection and checks incorporated into it to protect all citizens. We believe that the revenue generated by the 10% tax imposed in this Bill would net the state from seven to ten million dollars annually. In conclusion, I want to thank Superintendent Rochford of the Chicago Police Department, I want to thank the Internal Revenue Service in Chicago, I want to thank the F.B.I., I want to thank the Speaker of this House, the previous Speaker, you, my colleagues, and I say a special tribute to Mrs. Margaret Eldredge who was assigned by the Democratic staff to work with me as the coordinator of this Committee. She went to New York during the investigation and she went to Washington and we had people come



out and testify before our Committee. We are proud to report to you that we did a thorough job. We had only \$5,000, so all of the Members who served, the original Members and those who succeeded those who left, did a thorough job of dedication, mostly at their own expense and Speaker Redmond and his staff have been very cooperative and we are proud to report that our report which we only could afford 5,000 copies, have been distributed to you, our colleagues, and is in demand all over this country and as far away as Hawaii. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have a very sound proposal here. It's a practical proposal and I would, at this time, want to yield to my colleagues, Representative Zeke Giorgi, who may make a statement regarding it or Representative Harold Washington and we have other Members of the Committee whom I would like to just add brief addendum to my testimony here. And after that, Mr. Speaker, we'll be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 3932 pass. All those in... All those in favor... Some people, I guess, want to ask questions on this Bill. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Would the speaker yield for a couple questions? Representative Caldwell, under your Bill is there any preclusions that who may not be licensed as a vendor to run a policy game?"

Caldwell: "Yes, Mr. Simms. As I indicated, this Bill was very carefully drawn. We have provisions in there where people who have been convicted or indicted for crimes cannot participate. We... the standards which will be set up originally designed for one department, but now it's directed to the Department of Revenue. It would... the people would be very carefully screened."

Simms: "My next question, Representative Caldwell, you indicated and I didn't get the figure entirely. How much money approximately is being spent annually in Chicago on the policy games at the present time?"

Caldwell: "Let me indicate to you we had the Deputy Superintendent of Police Mitchell Ware and his deputy testify and they were able to identify 23. I can say to you as one who has witnessed



this gambling scheme since I was kindergartener that that is a very low estimate, but these were operations that... with which the police department was acquainted. And let me also add that East St. Louis which is the second largest... contains the second largest black community, policy down there is rampant, has been for years, still is. And we were even unable to hold hearings there because so many of the people were indicted and our advisors felt that we shouldn't come down there. My point is that we could relieve law enforcement agency personnel across this state to... from watching gambling such as policy which I consider nonviolent and allow them to go about the job of enforcing the law on crime which is so rampant throughout our state and throughout the world."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, addressing myself to the merits of the Bill, I have the highest regard for the Sponsor of this legislation cause I think he's a very capable, a very effective Legislator. But I can think of no legislation which is pending before the Illinois House of Representatives that will do any more to destroy the moral decay of our state than this particular legislation. I sincerely believe that when the Illinois Lottery was passed, we were told that by the passage of the lottery Bill that it would virtually eliminate illegal gambling activity in the State of Illinois. And tonight, the Sponsor of the Bill has admitted that the gambling continues in Chicago of the testimony by the Deputy Superintendent, but I think beyond the aspects of further legalization of gambling it reflects upon the morality of a state or of a society when we continue to legalize this type of activity in the State of Illinois. I feel very affirmatively that this reflects and teaches the young people that you can get something out of life for nothing. And basically, gambling is a tax on the poor. The tax that they can least afford to pay and if we want to continue down the road to legalized gambling in Illinois and off-track betting and slot machines, this is just a step in the right direction. But I feel that the Legislature, as reflected by the people and the citizens of Illinois, do not want more legalized gambling.



If anything, they want less; and I urge that House Bill 3932 be overwhelmingly defeated as a message that Illinois does not need any more legalized gambling."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise... Lewis Caldwell was my seatmate for some terms and I think one of the gratifications I've had in sitting in this General Assembly was when Lewis Caldwell was my seatmate, learning about Lewis Caldwell and his background and I've said that many times that what we all learn from the General Assembly is a diverse population that we have in the General Assembly and that's one of the reasons that I have said many times that I don't think that the House ought to be reduced in numbers, that I've learned so much, even though I come from an area that is 50% black, I learned so much sitting next to Lewis Caldwell. I so learned so much sitting next to Eugenia Chapman. I learned so much sitting next to Bob Craig, a farmer. And I had a gratification of reading Lewis Caldwell's book on the policy numbers. Here's a Gentleman who is very sincere. Now I want to tell you if you want to be a hypocrite, vote against this Bill. But you know, somebody mentioned the fact when we had that Resolution today about the House of Commons and way back four hundred years ago, they had gambling then. And let me tell you that you are not going to erase the policy numbers. Lewis Caldwell hit it on the nail, he hit it on the head when we said the policy numbers is the poor man's lottery. You know, when you're poor, there are some things you can't do and there's some things you can do, but you got to have some enjoyment in life and maybe the only enjoyment you may have is laying that fifty cents down on a numbers policy. You can't take that away from anybody. I don't care how you legislate, whether you say you're going to moral or not, don't tell me you're going to be moral. You're not going to be moral, you're just going to hide something and throw it under the rug. And let me tell ya! by legalizing it, you're going to have at 10% which is going to go the state and you're going to make it legal. You're going to



eliminate from the policy numbers, those who are taking advantage of the poor and that's really what we want to do and you're going to give the state a, quote, and I hate to put it in that name, but 'a piece of the action' because that's all that Lewis Caldwell is trying to do. If you believe in the lottery and it has gained some benefit in the State of Illinois, then you ought to believe in the policy numbers. And I've agonized over this because I know what your image might be; that you're trying to be, quote, 'one who is trying to promote gambling interests'. Really you're not doing that. You're not going to stop what's being done right now and you're going to say the state's going to be involved in it, the state's going to benefit from it, and you going to, you know, really... if it weren't for the fact that blacks were involved in policy, we'd have passed the policy first and then the lottery second. But only because blacks are involved in policy games, now it comes second. And it ought to have been in tandem with the lottery games, so I urge the Members of the General Assembly, be honest. Don't be hypocrites. Vote for House Bill 3932."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill as I rose in opposition to the legalization of Bingo. But before I get into the subject matter here, I want to say first of all that I, too, have the greatest respect for the Sponsor of this Bill. He is a man of integrity and he is a man, to the best of my knowledge, that is absolutely sincere in his belief that this Bill will be to the advantage of his people and to the advantage of the people throughout the State of Illinois. I, on the other hand, respectfully disagree. It would seem to me that what we're doing here is continuing down the path of making everything right by making nothing wrong. And I think we did this when we got into the Bingo. We got into it in this area. In other words, as we begin to liberalize our laws, remove our standards, then nothing truly becomes wrong because the standards have been removed. As you remove the prohibitions, of course, things become



legal. I think this is the wrong direction. I think legalizing policy is bad policy for the State of Illinois and I repeat my assertion that I think legalizing policy is bad policy for the State of Illinois and the fact that there are those who demand this, is not in itself, I believe, sufficient reason to yield to such a demand. The income off of this Bill will be minimal, even with a lottery, we realize about \$50,000,000 roughly net to the State of Illinois which is 1% or something less than 1% of the total state revenues. This will do nothing for our financial situation, nothing whatsoever. The premise seems to be that legalizing and taxing policy and numbers is the same as legalizing and taxing Bingo. That's okay, so why not do it here? I believe the premise is faulty on a couple of counts. Bingo if it's to be justified at all, is to be conducted by charitable and civic organizations for fund raising. Policy and number operators may be for profit corporation. That's number one point, they may be for profit corporations. Number two, those who had traditionally conducted Bingo games before the ban and who have always done it without money involvement were and are generally law-abiding types. Policy and numbers operators may be leeches and they may be hoodlums and the game is never played without money involvement. And especially because of point two, it is unlikely that very many businesses would apply for a license at \$1,200 per year or subject themselves to taxation, 10% of gross receipts, payable daily. It would much more lubricative for policy and number operators to continue operating outside the law. Therefore, Representative Caldwell's very laudible motive and highly honorable motive of controlling the businesses which are taking advantage of his people is probably futile under this Bill. The only remedy he should seek, the only remedy he should seek is more effective law enforcement against the operator. The apparatus established under the Bill to control the operators would be extremely expensive in terms of personnel. Even if no one applied to a license, some of this expense would have to be incurred if the Bill worked and it would require a vast new bureaucracy. Ladies and Gentlemen, I say to you in all the



sincerity that I have that I think we are once again starting down the path for the State of Illinois that is wrong. I believe it is wrong morally. I believe it is wrong ethically. It makes very little business sense and I would, my colleagues, urge you to think long and hard before you cast a green light for this Bill which in my opinion, will do nothing whatsoever for the State of Illinois and should be defeated."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, this matter's been adequately discussed.

I move the previous question."

Speaker Shea: "The question is shall the main question be put. All those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington, to close."

Washington: "Thank you..."

Speaker Shea: "I assume that's what Mr. Caldwell wants."

Washington: "Yes, he consented to let me close, very briefly. If I understand the previous speaker, what he was saying was that it's perfectly all right for the General Assembly to legalize gambling if it's conducted by a church, but it's not all right to legalize gambling if ordinary laymen want to do it. That's a very strange switch. The citadel of morality shall be permitted to gamble, but people can't. Also was pointed out by one of the previous speakers that in a discussion when we passed lottery, indications were made that if it were passed, people would stop gambling. I don't recall any such dialogue here, none whatsoever. As a matter of fact, the main reason given for the advancement of lottery was that it would bring some money into the coffers of the state and would permit people to do legally that which they have been doing illegally. And the same is true with this. This Bill wasn't put together willy-nilly or out of the... just simple caprice of Mr. Caldwell. He plumbed the communities in the City of Chicago and East St. Louis and Rockford and he found out from an overwhelming poll that people supported the legalization of the policy numbers game. Even many who didn't play it, saw nothing untoward in legalizing it. And what he's done here is put together a Bill



which, frankly, is as tight as one could possibly make it. There are provisions for the absolute control of the entrance of the licensees in this business. If one has been convicted of a criminal matter involving fraud, he is ineligible to receive a license. It provides for an annual license fee of \$1,200. It provides for 10% of the gross receipts to be paid into the coffers of this state; not every week, not every month or every year, but every five days 10% of the gross must be paid. It provides for banking mechanisms under the control of the Department of Revenue. It provides for a single entry bookkeeping system. It provides for periodic checks that a perspective be maintained in the Department of Revenue. It provides further that any advertising must be screened by the department. It provides subpoena powers for the department to go in if they wish. It permits the department to freeze all funds if they feel that the funds are becoming fairly close and not able to pay out. In short, what has been put together here is an absolute safeguard or more or less a failsafe against anyone defrauding the public or defrauding the state. Let me conclude by saying this, we cannot control the gambling propensities of the people of this state. Pari-mutual betting, Bingo and lottery are testimony to the fact that we can't do it. We can do several things with this one Bill. One, we legitimize an area of entrepreneurship which all my lifetime has existed illegally. Two, we can put anywhere from 5,000 to 10,000 people to work, gainfully employed. Three, we can run out of this business the so-called syndicated criminals who are coming into our community and getting fat and taking this money out and spending it somewhere else. And last but not least and I say this in all honesty and sincerity and kindness, we can take the long arm of graft of the police out of the gambling business in Chicago with the passage of this Bill. And if you did nothing else but that, it would worth the while. You're not giving the people who want to play policy anything. They're going to play it whether you like it or not. Whether you like or not, they're going to play policy, they're going to play it every day. What we're saying is, legitimize it,



open it up, control it, let the state get the benefit of anywhere from six to ten million dollars per year. I think it's an excellent Bill. It's a well worked-out Bill. It has the endorsement of many, many people throughout the state. It's a good Bill and at this late date if anyone says we can't support the policy game for reasons of morality, I think they've missed the whole tone and temper throughout this country within the last five years. I urge you to support House Bill 3932."

Speaker Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 3932 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines, to explain his vote."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as Lewis Caldwell has mentioned, the policy game is an institution in the black community. Number two, many of them would rather pay a franchise fee to the state than to certain other elements of white folk. The revenue may not be as economical as many people envision the other gambling benefits, but every little bit helps. Now if you want to apply that to the benefits as there are from my district, I'd be happy to take that benefit and use it my district since most of you don't want any of that money. What I'm saying is, that when you have gambling situation already in the state, horses, Bingo, and state run lottery where people who have plenty of money, then I think it's a farce to claim any... (microphone turned off)"

Speaker Shea: "Bring your remarks to a close will you, sir?"

Gaines: "To claim any moral indignations when someone proposes a gambling scheme where a person with modest income can afford. So I'm saying is, all that we're asking is that a plan for gambling be devised so the state can benefit from it and the little people can participate also. I ask for a green vote."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer, to explain his vote."

Palmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My light has been on since the time of asking for asking of questions. I didn't get to ask those questions, but perhaps someone in the explanation of their



votes can answer some of the questions that I had in mind. I see that there's a fiscal note that might be applicable. I'd like to know how much money it costs to get the policy game going. I'd like to know also whether or not the F.B.I., Superintendent Rochford, and the other persons mentioned by Mr. Caldwell, whether or not they endorse the Bill. I'd like to know how many persons are needed to operate this policy game, how much will it, in terms of persons and dollars, for administration, for investigation and for enforcement. I'd like to know what the projected take might be from this. Also, what assurance will the passage of this Bill cut down on illegal policy operations."

Speaker Shea: "Will you bring your remarks to a close, sir?"

Palmer: "I will, sir. I'd also like to know what the position of the policy operators might be on this and whether or not there's any limitation on the number of persons that might be licensed to do this kind of work. I have all the respect in the world for Representative Caldwell and I agree that it's probably a problem in the black belt, but let me tell you something else. This Bill extends all over the State of Illinois and on that basis, I don't know that it would worthwhile in a lot of those areas. I'm going to vote 'no' on it because I don't believe that government should be involved in these kinds of operations. I don't believe it's good economically, politically, or any other way. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr, Mann, to explain his vote."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm not referring to any particular Member, but I have heard some rather surprising concern expressed for the poor people of the State of Illinois and I would suggest that there are many other ways to help the poor than try to regulate their behavior from outside of the areas from which they live. I think that Representative Caldwell has studied this matter. He's aware of the historical basis for this particular pursuit. He knows the people involved and what's involved. He would do nothing to jeopardize the people



in his constituency and the people in the community in which he and his friends live. And I would urge you to rely on Representative Caldwell's advice here and counsel and vote 'aye'."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain."

Skinner: "I'd like to give five quick reasons for voting for this Bill. Number one, revenue to the state and those of you who vote for the inheritance tax relief Bill this morning, ought to be thinking about that because we got to find about \$6,000,000 someplace. Number two, eliminating the double standard. Lottery is the white policy. Number three, creating a stronger black economic community. Number four, helping the Chicago Police Department do something other than making half of their arrests on policy and all the implications that has. Perhaps we can do what the Representative from Winnebago said and help destroy moral decay with this Bill. Number five, a role model for the black community as John Campeor said in his 'Chicago Daily News article of 6/16, not talking about policy but he said, 'Black people's esteem is so shaky that they're willing to settle the score with a gun'. There's a paucity of role models. In the movies, black kids see only pimps and hustlers, people living on the borderline of legality. Well, this is going to create a positive role model in the black...(microphone turned off)"

Speaker Shea: "Will you bring your remarks to a close, sir?"

Skinner: "Yes, sir. That, I believe, that young black people will be able to relate to. They relate to those people now and if you can't stamp it out, it seems to me you ought to make it legal."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, to explain his vote."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You know, it's interesting, Mr. Speaker, as I look at the number of 'no' votes up there, I'm inclined to help a lot of people out of their dilemma by introducing a Bill in this Session that would do away with pari-mutual betting at the racetrack and based on the votes that



we have up there... based on the number of 'no' votes, I see a couple with the 'aye' votes, I think the Bill ought to sail out of here, but it won't because when the special interest in the racetrack industry come down so hard on you, those 'no' votes would still be 'no' votes on a Bill to do away with pari-mutual betting. Who's kidding who? Policy is a fact of life, it's a reality and I think that this Bill ought to pass and that policy ought to be legalized. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos, to explain his vote."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, the main issue here is really not policy, but revenue. For 100 years, policy has been existing in the State of Illinois and throughout the country, as Mr. Caldwell has given an historical background. The only thing we are trying to do here is take this illicit money from the people who are operating illegally and put it in the coffers of the State of Illinois to further educate children and to do other good things we want to do for the citizen. We have it in mutual betting now, we have it in Bingo, we have it in the lottery. Why we can't we have it in policy? Because the people who bet in the policy games do not partake in the lottery. It's been proven through the testimony in the Revenue Committee. We ask, therefore, that you give us 89 votes minimum so we can bring this forth as a policy decision of the State of Illinois that we support policy."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Lucco."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Bill. I've had difficulty over the years to distinguish between the semantics of speculation and gambling. Those of us or those of you, shall I say, who buy A.T.&T., General Motors, etc., I would say in my terminology that is gambling also. And I certainly would like to see some more green lights."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that those that argue today that say if you can't stamp it out, you ought



to legalize it, could say the same thing for prostitution, murder, rape and just about anything else you'd like to name. It's a very poor argument. It's not the answer at all. Now, I think it's a mistake to legalize things just because you can't stamp them out. I didn't support Bingo which almost cost me excommunication from the Catholic Church; I didn't support the lottery although they said it was going to help the school system which it wasn't used for that, of course; I'm not going to support this Bill and I think the biggest problem with the Bill is you talk about revenue producing, it's a hell of a way to run your government to have to have used gambling to do it. We ought to face up to the problem, either raise the income tax or cut down spending, but don't try and run the government of the State of Illinois on legalized gambling."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, it's very interesting to watch the moralists from outside the community attempt to tell people who live in the community how to run it. Every time we listen to you, you tell us about your problems and we respond. You tell us about your bridges, your roads, your dams, how narrow they are and we respond. There's not a single Member who lives within the black community who happens to be voting against this particular Bill. Now I suggest to you that policy is, in essence, a game of hope. It's a game of people who have little money and they place just a little money with the hope that somehow the numbers will roll around and they will be able to collect the \$50 that they've been unable to collect in terms of finding additional jobs and additional employment and additional gifts. Now it's very easy to watch those of you from outside the community tell us and insist these are the moral standards for you. I suggest you're wrong. When we cry out to you that it costs us fifty cents to even get a signature to currency exchange, the lobbies get so strong down here that the Bills die. Now when we're trying to do a little something and suggest that we ought to know a little bit about our problems, I think it's time that you heeded and that the people



from without the community quit applying a double standard and simply give us a shot at the things which we think or the way that we think it ought to go. And I suggest you Gentlemen examine your consciences."

Speaker Shea: "The Lady from St. Clair, Ms. Younge, to explain her vote."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am voting 'aye' I believe it's a simple matter of fairness. Fairness in that we have taken away the guilt of illegality of a person who wants to play Bingo or wants to buy a chance at the lottery. And I think that the black community is entitled to this state to take away the illegality of policy. It is not considered a crime in black community and I think that because we have legalized policy and lottery, I believe that since...we're dealing with a group of people who don't have two dollars to go to the racetrack, who can't make a \$5 bet, but who can pay fifty cents on a policy game. I believe that equality of opportunity would have us vote 'yes' for this Bill. I believe that one of the most pressing problems of this state is how we are going to avoid...(microphone turned off)"

Speaker Shea: "Will you bring your remarks to a close, please?"

Younge: "...how are we going to avoid a tax increase. I believe that this Bill is the first step toward bringing in some \$7,000,000 and that if the next step is taken in later General Assemblies of the state running the policy game, it could bring as much as 40 to \$50,000,000 income. It is the dollar climb in the black community, it would serve to develop the community economically and for those reasons, I think that we ought to be voting 'yes'."

Speaker Shea: "The Lady from Lake, Ms. Geo-Karis, to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've been thinking and thinking and I think we've been hypocritical long enough. I never thought I'd be voting for a policy-number Bill, but I voted for the first lottery Bill which gave half of the funds to the general treas... for the... to the Common



School Fund. That's not the one that passed. That was the Giorgi Bill. I didn't vote for the second one because I thought wasn't fair, but then we're not being fair to a certain minority either because if they can afford the little amounts for the policy game and I don't even know what it is, but I think it will bring about \$70,000,000 worth of revenue to the State of Illinois and I'm not going to vote for a tax increase. I think we should stop being hypocritical about it and vote for it."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff, to explain his vote."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I had no intentions of saying anything on this Bill, but I think I'd like to for this reason. I voted against the lottery. I voted against the Bingo. I don't vote on racetrack Bills. But...(microphone turned off)"

Speaker Shea: "Proceed, sir. I didn't hit the timer."

Duff: "But I think that in a certain sense we are hypocritical.

I think in a certain sense, we're expressing a degree of middle class morality and I stand and believe that that's a good thing except when it's misused. I really think that there is a disrespect formed in those parts of the community where an activity goes on constantly and forever and is a part of everyday life, which the law calls illegal and which the community continues to exercise with growing disrespect for the law which cannot understand the need, cannot understand the community, and cannot enforce the sanction. I am very reluctant in many ways because I oppose the state being involved in gambling in any way, shape or form; but it is only consistent to give the communities who are interested in this activity...(microphone turned off)"

Speaker Shea: "Please bring you remarks to a close, sir."

Duff: "The votes that this body has given to the lottery and to Bingo. The simple fact that I could go the Bingo games at the Catholic Church when I was a little boy and the simple fact that we heard in our small town community over the years that the numbers was a way the poor were ripped off and then to



hear an articulate Gentleman like Representative Caldwell, stand up on this floor and give me some of the same kinds of emotions from his childhood that I could relate to the church activities of my childhood, makes me think perhaps we ought to rethink, be consistent and give him his vote."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wished?" The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell, to explain his vote."

Caldwell: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I want to express my sincere appreciation for all of the votes pro and con that are on the board. I respect everyone's view. I'm...(microphone turned off)"

Speaker Shea: "Go ahead, sir."

Caldwell: "I wanted to say to Representative Palmer that we haven't rushed this business at all. We are attempting to do a job of education. This report, Representative Palmer, I'm hoping that those of you who haven't read it and, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to ask to put it on postponed consideration, if you will, because I, frankly, believe that many of the Representatives since last June... we just want to emphasize this fact. The people who are engaged in this business, they want it legalized, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. We have held many Executive Sessions and the people who are engaged in it are urging us to do just what we are attempting to do. We have...(microphone turned off)"

Speaker Shea: "Bring your remarks to a close, will you please, sir?"

Caldwell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but I'm in a position to privately answer any questions. We have nothing to hide. We have thoroughly researched this subject and we believe that we are expressing the tenor of the majority of the people who believe that it can be an asset to the citizens of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate, to explain his vote."

Choate: "Just a very brief explanation that I made to my long-time and dear friend, Ray Ewell. When it hits 88, I'm going to make the 89th one for Ray Ewell."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished?"



The Lady from DuPage, Ms. Dyer, to explain her vote."

Dyer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, like many of the previous speakers, I did not vote 'yes' for the lottery. I did not vote 'yes' for Bingo. I was leery about it, but since those exist legally, I think it's only fair that we legalize this operation. I think it's hypocritical not to. I think, also, there's the element of control. I think we could remove some of the exploitation and violence that now occurs in connection with this game if the state has some control. Finally, if the policemen don't have to be chasing people about the numbers racket, they could maybe then keep the streets a little...(microphone turned off)"

Speaker Shea: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Dyer: "Yes, I'm thinking that if the police don't have to... if this game is made legal, then the police can concentrate on the crimes like muggings and shootings and actual violence. So I am casting a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 87 'aye' votes, 76 'no' votes and the Gentleman wants it on postponed consideration. You want to poll the absentees? I'm sorry, sir."

Caldwell: "If you please."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Clerk, poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Boyle, Gerald Bradley, Capuzi, Craig, Fleck, Ron Hoffman, J.D. Jones, Rayson, Rose, and Wall."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Caldwell, you want this Bill on postponed consideration?"

Caldwell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that several Members who probably will vote for it are absent at a meeting and a dinner, I'd appreciate having it placed on postponed consideration."

Speaker Shea: "Postponed consideration. When the Chair returns to Third Reading tomorrow, the Chair will start with House Bill 3933. On the order of concurrences or we've got a nonconcurrency, as I understand it here. Mr. Richmond, is that a



nonconcurrency? Concurrence right... on Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1604, the Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to move to adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1604, which set out the two million dollars... if you recall, under the Department of Mines and Minerals that was put in a few days ago for the purpose of emergency funds and tornado stricken area. This puts that in this particular budget but also, it appropriate... it give authority to appropriate funds to emergency service in disaster relief... or disaster agency for disaster relief."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond, moves that the House do concur in the Conference Committee Report #1. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? This takes 89 votes. 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 111 'ayes', 1 'nay', 8 Members voting 'present' and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report with regards to Senate Bill 1604. On the order of Concurrences appears 3308, Lechowicz, he isn't here... 3505, Mr. Birchler... are we ready on 3505? Turn Mr. Birchler, on please."

Birchler: "Mr. Speaker, I have never heard what those Amendments are that were put on in the Senate, I would like to have a copy of those.... or know what they are, at least.

Speaker Shea: "They're on your desk, will take this out of the record for a little bit. On the order of Agreed Resolutions, Mr. Madigan. Mr. Duff, for what purpose do you arise?"

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry but we just had a con-



JUN 22 1976

197.

currence motion on 1604... I'm sorry we've found it.

Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "Was an adoption of a Conference Committee Report. Mr. Madigan, on the Agreed Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 918, Shea. House Resolution 922, Leon. 923, Polk. 924, Friedland and 925, Meyer."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker Resolution 918, directs the House Judiciary I, Committee to establish a Sub-committee to investigate the cost of automobile repairs. Resolution 922, congratulates Mr. Chester Wikorski. Resolution 923, congratulates the members of the Navy 157 operating base in Palermo, Sicily. Resolution 924, congratulates the Troop 20, of the Boy Scouts of America in Elgin and Resolution 925, congratulates Mr. Steve Schickel, for his work as a master of ceremony at the German American dinner and I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan has moved for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Is there questions? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, was that Agreed Resolution to organize a Committee to investigate automobile..."

Speaker Shea: "I don't know, what's the Resolution, Mr. Madigan?"

Telcser: "I'm all for it but, is it going to spend money... does it take a vote to..."

Madigan: "Mr. Telcser, this Resolution directs the House Judiciary I, Committee to form a Subcommittee of three Members of the Majority and two Members of the Minority to investigate allegations concerning the cost of automobile repairs and possible fraud deception and misrepresentation in regard to those repairs."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Telcser, do you object to that Bill or that Resolution?"

Telcser: "No, I'm not going to object."



Speaker Shea: "Is there objection? Take that one out of the Agreed Resolution.... well, is there objection? Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, was Representative Telcser's questions answered, is there going to be money spent... why is this on the Agreed list?"

Speaker Shea: "Take it off the Agreed list. Is there question other than that, on the Agreed list? The question is, shall the Agreed Resolutions be adopted. All those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Are there any motions... further Resolutions, I'm sorry."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 918, Shea."

Speaker Shea: "Speaker's Table. It would be the intention of the Chair... to take any of the motions that are required for the operation of the House tomorrow, but if it's with regard to posting for tomorrow afternoon, where somebody seeks to waive the rules... we can do that... I'm just informed by the Parliamentarian that since tomorrow starts the last week that there will be no requirement for posting and that the Committee may post without the requisite six and a half days notice. So, that if the Chairman of the appropriate Committees want to hear the Bills, all they have to do is post them and report tomorrow... tomorrow that they are posted and that they are going to have a Committee meeting. Now, are there any other further motions that are necessary for the operation of the House. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the appropriate rule be suspended to discharge the Rules Committee and have House Bill 3998, assigned to Revenue Committee this motion has been cleared on both sides of the aisle, I believe there is no objection to it and I would ask



leave of the House to have that accomplished."

Speaker Shea: "Is there objection, Mr. Katz. Turn Mr. Katz, on."

Katz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman is seeking to vary a Joint Rule and that is not an appropriate motion. The House does not have the power to vary the Joint Rule and I would object to the motion."

Speaker Shea: "Well, Mr. Katz, it is in the opinion of the Chair that if there was unanimous consent of the House that that would tantamount to accepting...."

Katz: "I'm not..."

Speaker Shea: "... if there is objection, we cannot proceed. If we have... if we have unanimous consent, Mr. Walsh, it means that all the Members agree.... well, Mr. Walsh, you and I look at the rules differently but, I would presume that if there was unanimous consent, we could do it... there is an objection so.... we cannot do it. Are there further.... for what purpose does the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. LaFleur, rise?"

LaFleur: "For a purpose of a motion, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Shea: "Is there one on file, Sir?"

LaFleur: "There is."

Speaker Shea: "Read the motion."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pursuant to Rules 66 (a), I move to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of Senate Bill 1994 and advance to the order of Second Reading."

LaFleur: "Mr. Speaker, that is an error. I would like to amend that to suspend the appropriate rule to... on the assignment of Bills, it is an appropriation so it is assigned to the Appropriation Committee."

Speaker Shea: "Where is the Bill now, in the assignment of Bills Committee?"

LaFleur: "It is in appropriations, I believe. I'm told that



it is in appropriations."

Speaker Shea: "You want to discharge the Committee on Appropriations and place it on the Calendar in the order of Senate Bills, Second Reading, First Legislative Day."

LaFleur: "Correct."

Speaker Shea: "Is there objection? Why don't you explain the Bill."

LaFleur: "Mr. Speaker, the Bill comes from the Senate where it passed 49 to 0, it is a Bill that replaces a lost check. The need for this, is that the Environmental Protection Agency issued a check of two hundred and twenty-seven thousand, two hundred dollars to the Downers Grove Sanitary District. The check was lost in the mail... payment of the check has been stopped, the money has escheated from the Environmental Protection Agency Fund to the escheat fund, the money would be spent out of the escheat fund... this is the procedure that was approved by the Court of Claims because even if it did go to the Court of Claims, it would be necessary for it to come back for an appropriation from the House. We believe that there is an appropriate way of handling this Bill and it's not only the way of expediently handling it, but I think that it is a correct method."

Speaker Shea: "You have cleared it with the Leadership on both sides, Sir."

LaFleur: "Both sides, yes, Sir."

Speaker Shea: "All right, now the Gentleman moves..."

LaFleur: "And Appropriation Committee also."

Speaker Shea: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, arise?"

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm reading my Digest... either the Digest is all screwed up or LaFleur, is. I've got



Senate Bill 1994, in the Digest has having Representative Schneider, the House Sponsor and a Bill relating to appropriating.... Yeah, I've got Senate Bill 1994... appropriating two hundred and twenty-seven thousand from the anti-pollution bond fund. Somebody is all messed up and I don't know if the Digest has been... right lately."

LaFleur: "Well, I don't know if Representative Schneider, is on the floor or not, but I went to the Clerk to pick this up and they hadn't had it up there yet."

Matijevich: "Is that Representative Philip's Bill."

LaFleur: "Who?"

Matijevich: "Representaitve Philip's."

LaFleur: "Yes, Philip's and I know that Representative Schneider agreed with me handling it and also at one time Representative Hudson..."

Matijevich: "Well, the Bill according to the Digest, is nothing near what you said it was."

LaFleur: "Well, I will explain it again Representative Matijevich. There was a check issued to the Downers Grove Sanitary District from the Environmental Protection Agency."

Matijevich: "You're right, I didn't get the amount."

LaFleur: "All right, thank you."

Matijevich: "I'm sorry, Leo."

Speaker Shea: "All right, the Gentleman has moved to place the Bill on the order of Senate Bills, Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Is there objection? Hearing none we'll use the attendance Roll Call, minus Mr. Katz's name. Now, is there any other motions.... All right, Mr. Hart, for what purpose do you arise?"

Hart: "Well, I have a motion on the Calendar to discharge the Committee on Rules on House Bill 4000, and to have it heard in Labor and Commerce Committee tomorrow. The



Chairman of the Committee has agreed to hear it and I would ask leave of the House..."

Speaker Shea: "Is there objection? Mr. Katz, objects."

Hart: "Well, I just... I would just advise Mr. Katz, that he gives me no alternate but to file an alternative motion to discharge not only rules but also to put it on Second Reading which I do not want to do. I would like Labor and Commerce to hear this Bill tomorrow as which the Chairman of the Committee has agreed to do."

Speaker Shea: "Well, Mr. Hart, I afraid the problem arises as Mr. Walsh, so aptly put... that they don't change Bill from Bill to Bill.... that because it is a joint rule that requires it to go to Rules Committee. And, unless there is unanimous consent, it has been consistantly the ruling of the Chair that without unanimous constant we cannot waive that provision of the rule."

Hart: "I'm not arguing with the Chair but, Mr. Partee and Company are not watching Mr. Katz tonight, I'm asking him to waive... withdraw his objection."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Katz..."

Katz: "I consistantly taken the position for other Members and the same applies to Mr. Hart... that the rules are made to be enforced and I will not withdraw my objection."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Katz, do you think that it might be possible for some of these... would appear to be emergency matters, to take them up in rules and perhaps..."

Katz: "Well..."

Speaker Shea: "Can I finish, Sir."

Katz: "I'm sorry, Sir."

Speaker Shea: "Perhaps... if we could meet with the Majority... or I mean the Minority Leader, perhaps we could arrange to have a short rules Committee meeting at 8:15 or 8:30."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, we already have a meeting posted for



tomorrow as announced earlier today, it will be held immediately after the morning Session and has been announced and posted."

Speaker Shea: "Well, we don't have any problems with posting Mr.... Technical problem.... away from final day of the Session but what appears to be the problem, is that there are some Committees scheduled for tomorrow afternoon that the Gentleman thinks these Bills should be heard in, so all I'm asking is that you meet with the Minority Leader and see if there might be some accommodation."

Hart: "I would always be glad to meet with them but Rules did meet today and did report out a number of Bills. I will be glad to meet with them right now."

Speaker Shea: "Are there any other motions for... all right, Mr. Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to have Senate Bill 1719, placed on the order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day... the Bill is the Financial Institution Committee, it is identical to House Bill previously passed and a hearing by the Committee, I don't think that it would serve a useful purpose."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman ask leave to discharge the Committee on Financial Institutions and place on the order of Senate Bills, Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Is there objection? Mr. Hill, objects. It takes a hundred and eight-nine votes. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay', it takes 89 votes. Mr. Hill, to explain his vote."

Hill: "I just wanted to say that if it gets up to 89, I'm going to ask for a verification."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter, to explain his vote."

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the Philadelphia plan that provides a



floating interest rate at 2½ point above the market for bonds that the House passed just last week and I would hope that it seems sensible to you, it does to me, that this Bill not go to Committee would come out for consideration. It's a Bill that got over a hundred votes when it was considered in the House, it is a solution to the usury problem on a long term basis and I would hope that you see fit to by-pass Committee and have the Bill come directly to the floor for consideration."

Speaker Shea: "Might I suggest... if Mr. Porter, if you renew the motion tomorrow and it's not... if you don't get leave... perhaps you can talk to the Chairman of the Committee because he can just announce that he's going to have the Committee meeting and there is no posting requirement because we're within the last week of the Session. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leon."

Leon: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have a meeting scheduled tomorrow afternoon at 1:30, in Room A-1 of the Financial Committee. I believe the Committee will meet and I expect to see Mr. Porter there to procede with his Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "Okay, take the motion out of the record. Are there any other motions for the... all right, Mr. Hoffman, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Realative to the motion filed on Senate Bill 887."

Speaker Shea: "Read the motion."

Clerk O'Brien: "To take from the Table and place on the Calendar under the order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day."

Speaker Shea: "All right, that requires 107 votes, Mr. Hoffman. Do you want to tell the Members what 887, is."

Hoffman: "Yes, briefly, this pertains to Park District



Legislation, relative to the consolidation of Park Districts. It came from the Senate with only two dissenting votes, it came into the City and Villages Committee where there were questions raised regarding the language. We agreed at that time that those that were concerned with it, Representative Grotberg, Representative Kempiners, and myself... that we would work out the language and amend it accordingly. However, we did run out of time and consequently when we did return it was the Bill, Senate Bill 887, appeared in Rules Committee. At the time that we were working..."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman asks leave to take the Bill from the Table and place on the order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Is there objection? Hearing none, we'll use the attendance Roll Call minus Mr. Katz name. Now, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. I have an announcement, the announcement pursuant to the ruling that the Speaker had made concerning the last week of posting... the announcement is, that the House Appropriation Committee II, will hear tomorrow at 1 P.M., in Room 118, Senate Bill 1581, which is the scholarship Commission supplemental and Senate Bill 1994, which is a supplemental for the Comptroller, those two Bills will be heard tomorrow afternoon at 1 P.M. in Room 118, in Appropriations II."

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

Kucharski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the order of motions appears House Resolution 897, to discharge the Executive Committee and advance to the order of the Speaker's Table."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman asks the House to discharge the Committee on Executive which the Gentleman from Lake,



JUN 22 1933

206.

Mr. Matijevich, says does not meet again and take from that Committee and place on the Speaker's Table. Is there objection? Hearing.... House Resolution 897, will come from the Committee on Executive and placed on the Speaker's Table and that motion is adopted and the attendance Roll Call, minus Mr. Katz names. Mr. Daniels, for what purpose do you arise?"

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. In order to help you clear your Calendar on the order of motions, I hereby move that we Table motions on House Bill 3167, House Bill 3204, which the motion to discharge the Judiciary Committee for immediate hearing on the Capital Punishment Bill, we are anxiously awaiting the Supreme Court ruling on capital punishment and as soon as that comes out, then we will be in a position to move on these Bills."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman withdraws his motion. Mr. Yourell, for what purpose do you arise?"

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Members of the Counties and Townships Committee, there will be a meeting tomorrow in Room M-2, which is in the south end of the State Office Building on the second floor, to consider Senate Bill 1560, that meeting will be held at 1:30 and each member of the Committee will receive a written notice of the meeting."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Garmisa, do you have an announcement?"

Garmisa: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would ask to suspend the appropriate rules to hear Senate Bill...."

Speaker Shea: "You don't have to suspend the rules, Mr. Garmisa, if you're going to hear a Bill in Committee tomorrow. All you do is announce tomorrow from the floor of the House when you're going to have the Committee meeting."

Garmisa: "I wanted these to go into rules, Senate Bills 1750



and 2000, to be sent into Rules Committee so we can hear them in rules tomorrow."

Speaker Shea: "They're in rules now."

Garmisa: "They are in rules now?"

Speaker Shea: "Yes, Sir."

Garmisa: "Well, Mr...."

Speaker Shea: "The Chairman of Rules will object and he's right behind you. Now, for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff, arise?"

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the order of motions is House Bill 3769. I would like to table that Bill at this time."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman moves to table House Bill 3769... the motion or the Bill?"

Huff: "The Bill."

Speaker Shea: "Moves to table the Bill, is there objection? Hearing none, the Bill is tabled. Now, Mr. Palmer, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Palmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will you be getting to the order of.... on the Speaker's Table for any of those?"

Speaker Shea: "Sir, I'm attempting to get to the order of dinner."

Palmer: "All right."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Tuerk, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise to withdraw the motion on the Calendar relative to Senate Bill 1945, there are two motions on the Calendar."

Speaker Shea: "Leave. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis, the Assistant Majority Leader, now moves that the House stands adjourned until 9 A.M., but he asks also for the Clerk to have five minutes to take care of ministerial duties. All in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'nay', in the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it."

Clerk O'Brien: "Committee Reports. Representative Lechowicz,



Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I, which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 22, 1976. Reported the same back with the following recommendation, do pass Senate Bill 1941, 1962 and 1970, do pass as amended, Senate Bill 1742 and 1936. Representative Boyle, Chairman of the Committee of Appropriations II, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 22, 1976. Reported the same back with the following recommendations, do pass House Bill 3989, do pass as amended Senate Bill 1625 and 1795. Representative Mann, Chairman of the Committee on Higher Education which the following Bill was referred, action taken June 17, 1976. Reported the same back with the following recommendation, do not pass House Bill 3926. Senate Bill, First Reading. Senate Bill 1721, McGrew. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. No further business and the House stands adjourned."

