

TRANSCRIPT -- 77TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

OCTOBER 1971 SESSION

NOVEMBER 13, 1971

PRESIDENT:

Senate will come to order. The Chair recognizes Senator Harris. You want to...We'll go through the prayer and the Journal and so forth a little...We need the prayer, I confess. Just, just a moment. The Chair will recognize Senator Harris.

SENATOR HARRIS:

We are in session, are we...?

PRESIDENT:

We are now in session.

SENATOR HARRIS:

All right. Now Mr. President, I just want to make clear that the question of House Bill 3636, which was under consideration yesterday, that we have a tradition, I believe the Superintendent of Public Instruction's bills before where there was one of those questions about moving through the twelve o'clock midnight matter. This bill has been on third reading. It was on second reading being considered when we were last acting yesterday, but we clearly have an understanding that the bill is now on third reading for action today when we want it to be. Now, it was on third reading yesterday.

PRESIDENT:

That is correct. That is correct.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Yeah. Okay. Fine. I just wanted to delineate that, and then I think probably, for the edification of those who are wondering about the conference in your office, that the course of action we will pursue will be to recess. We will recess until ten o'clock this morning and then proceed with other business until such time as we wish, between agreement between Senator Partee and our leadership, to take up 3636. At that point in time then we will proceed with that matter without problems of ah, so...

PRESIDENT:

That is correct. That is the clear understanding with the Chair

that when I receive word on that. The motion is...The, the motion is to recess until...For what purpose does Senator Mohr arise?

SENATOR MOHR:

Mr. President I wonder, for the record, if I'm in order in asking for a call of the roll at this time?

PRESIDENT:

Well, you're in order if you insist on it, Senator. I think we have things worked out. If we can have a motion to recess until ten tomorrow morning I think it would be better Senator. Just, just... If Senator Berning is not bringing up a matter of business, you may speak; but otherwise I think we're waiting for an important motion back here. Yes.

SENATOR BERNING:

Mr. President I would like to have the record show that I am making a formal request for a transcript of the proceedings of yesterday.

PRESIDENT:

You have that right for that transcript.

SENATOR BERNING:

Nov...November 12th.

PRESIDENT:

The...Senator Clarke of Harris or Coulson, we're ready for the motion. Senator Harris did you move to recess? Senator Groen.

SENATOR GROEN:

Do I understand that we have the right to a transcript of the proceedings of any particular day's session?

PRESIDENT:

Well, there are costs in transcribing. Now the Constitution says that we have to make a transcript and obviously, within certain cost limitations, we'll try to make transcripts available to Senators who request them; but there are practical limitations not only for Senators but for members of the press or anyone else.

SENATOR GROEN:

Well I would, I would, I would formally request, for my personal use and study, a transcript of the record of Wednesday, November 10th and yesterday, November 12th.

PRESIDENT:

Well, any citizen of the State is...has...can, can get these.

SENATOR GROEN:

Well, I'm telling the secretary I want it.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Just...All right. Will...Senator Harris is that motion made or is it...?Senator Clarke.

SENATOR CLARKE:

I'd like to question a quorum and have a roll call.

PRESIDENT:

You have that right. Just...Secretary will call the roll. For what purpose does Senator Rock arise?

SENATOR ROCK:

Mr. President. When you reconvened the Senate, I asked at that time for recognition. I did not get it. On the basis...

PRESIDENT:

Just...Senator Rock has the floor.

SENATOR ROCK:

Because I understood, and deferred out of courtesy to Senator Harris, who you told me had a motion. And that motion was to recess until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.

PRESIDENT:

Just...Senator Gilbert.

SENATOR GILBERT:

Mr. Governor, did you, when we adjourned until five minutes after twelve on the 12th day of November, inform Senator Rock that he would have the floor when we reconvened at five minutes after twelve on November

the 13th? Then by what right does he claim that he had the right for you to recognize him?

PRESIDENT:

Well...The quorum has been questioned. The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Fawell. All right. The...Senator Clarke.

SENATOR CLARKE:

I mean, I don't want to be fractious, but just for the record I'd like to have the absentees polled, so they can be on the record. So we can get a copy of the tape.

PRESIDENT:

The absentees will be polled.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Bruce, Cherry, Chew, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Hall, Hynes, Johns, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Lyons, McCarthy, Neistein, Nihill; O'Brien, Palmer, Partee, Romano, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Swinarski, Vadalabene.

PRESIDENT:

Senate, before I announce this I want to recognize Senator Mohr for making an announcement for the purpose of the record.

SENATOR MOHR:

Yes, Mr. President, for the record I'd like to show that Senator

Soper went home ill last night...a couple hours ago, due to Doctor's orders. So, if the record will show that...

PRESIDENT:

The Journal will so show. There are 29 present. There is not the presence of a quorum. Senator Clarke. Senator Clarke is recognized.

SENATOR CLARKE:

Now, Mr. President, a quorum is not present, I understand.

PRESIDENT:

That is correct.

SENATOR CLARKE:

I move we recess until ten o'clock.

PRESIDENT:

Motion to recess until ten tomorrow morning. All in favor to recess indicate by saying aye. This morning, I'm sorry. Yes, this morning. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. Motion to recess prevails. Senator Clarke, yes.

SENATOR CLARKE:

Senator Bidwill wants to announce it.

SENATOR BIDWILL:

Nine o'clock Caucus M-1. Republican Caucus.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Walker.

SENATOR WALKER:

Yes, Mr. President. I realize we've adjourned, but I ask...I made a point of parliamentary inquiry about an hour ago on Rule 26, and although we have adjourned, which I frankly don't think was a good idea, but I'm apparently in the minority, I'd like to have a ruling on this Rule 26 and I'll give you my interpretation first...

PRESIDENT:

Senator, you call me in about an hour and I'll give you a ruling on it. All right?

SENATOR WALKER:

No, I'd rather have one now in case it happens sometime in the future.

PRESIDENT:

Senate is in recess until ten tomorrow morning.

PRESIDENT:

Senate will come to order. Those not entitled to the floor, please leave the floor. Will the...I'll ask the Senators to all rise for a moment of silent prayer. Reading of the Journal. Moved by Senator Kosinski the reading of the Journal be dispensed with. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. Motion prevails. Messages from the House. Senator Clarke.

SENATOR CLARKE:

What did we just dispense with?

PRESIDENT:

Reading of the Journal. Now this is a routine thing. If there is any problem we'll...

SENATOR CLARKE:

Well, do we have a Journal?

PRESIDENT:

We don't have a Journal every day when we dispense with the reading of it.

SENATOR CLARKE:

Well, we will have a Journal, won't we?

PRESIDENT:

Eventually we will have a Journal, right.

SENATOR CLARKE:

We, we have great interest in that.

PRESIDENT:

All right. All right.

SECRETARY:

Message from the House, Mr. Selcke, Clerk. Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

Just, just a moment. If we can have your attention on these messages from the House, because we're going to have to be concurring and non-concurring and so forth, so it is important that we pay attention.

SECRETARY:

I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has adopted the following preamble and Joint Resolution in the adoption in which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate to wit: House Joint Resolution 109. It's relative to the conflict in North Ireland.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Savickas, I understand you're the sponsor of this? This is a Northern Ireland Resolution.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Well, it's O'Savickas today. It's a very non-controversial Resolution. It was passed out of the House...It was heard in committee, passed through the House unanimously; and I would move now for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 109.

PRESIDENT:

Is, is there objection to suspension...Request for the Resolution to be read. Resolution will be read.

SECRETARY:

WHEREAS, Americans of every faith and political persuasion are distressed by the bloodshed and suffering of the people of Northern Ireland; and

WHEREAS, The causes of the present conflict in Northern Ireland may be traced to discrimination in housing, employment, and political representation against a minority of the people; and

WHEREAS, The governments of the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland

have failed to end the bloodshed and suffering; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SEVENTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that we urge the Secretary of State for the United States of America to express to the government of the United Kingdom and of Northern Ireland the concern of the American people for the bloodshed and suffering of all of the people of Northern Ireland to take immediate steps to end discrimination against the minority in Northern Ireland; and that copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the Office of the Secretary of State to the Honorable William P. Rogers, Secretary of State for the United States, and to President Richard M. Nixon.

Adopted by the House, November 12, 1971.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

Mr. President, I don't know how many...and Senators, how many of you read yesterday's Tribune about how Teddy Kennedy, of bridge fame, got both his feet in the molasses by trying to be a diplomat and engage in international relations; and I think this Legislature would be equally tarred and feathered if we ever let that Resolution through.

PRESIDENT:

I gather there is objection to the suspension of the rules for the immediate consideration of it. It, it is referred to the Executive...

Senator Savickas.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Well, I would like to move, now, to suspend the rules and have a vote on it.

PRESIDENT:

Motion for the suspension of the rules for the immediate consideration of the Resolution. Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill,...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Bidwill.

SENATOR BIDWILL:

The Irish can get in trouble enough by themselves without a Lithuanian helping them out. I vote no.

SECRETARY:

...Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll,...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

In explaining my vote I'd just like to say that the peace loving Irish will straighten this out by themselves, and I vote no.

SECRETARY:

...Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell,...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

I'm ashamed of my Irish colleagues. I vote aye.

SECRETARY:

...Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Kosinski.

SENATOR KOSINSKI:

Mr. Chairman, Senators. The Polish delegation on this side of the aisle says aye.

SECRETARY:

...Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom...

PRESIDENT:

Senator McBroom.

SENATOR McBROOM:

Mr. President, members of the Senate. Senator Merritt and I were sitting here yesterday and we wanted to report to you, Mr. President, that there were some excellent speeches here yesterday and Senator Merritt and I enjoyed each and every one of them. We hope they continue today. We hope they...con...important matters such as this one and I implore you, Mr. President, to keep order today so that Senator Merritt and I can catch every word of each and every speech. And one other thing, when do we come in now tomorrow morning, Mr. President?

PRESIDENT:

The Chair will await a determination by the body on that ...

SENATOR McBROOM:

No!

PRESIDENT:

...Senator Donnewald, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

I wanted to respond to Senator McBroom's statement over there. If he wants to listen to those speeches again, we got it on tape on the sixth floor. We'll take care of him.

SECRETARY:

...McCarthy...

PRESIDENT:

Senator McCarthy.

SENATOR McCARTHY:

Mr. President, members of the Body. Keeping in mind the question of disclosure and possible conflict of interest, I would like to explain that my mother's name was Hayes, her parents were born in County Limerick. My father's parents were born in County Cork; so I do have that apparent conflict and I want to make that disclosure and vote present.

SECRETARY:

...Merritt, Mitchler...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Merritt.

SENATOR MERRITT:

Mr. President, members of the Senate. I'm certainly impressed with the high quality of such...I don't know what you would call it, coming before us. I see now that it's eleven o'clock. We're an hour late in getting started. I think we've gone through enough disgraceful maneuvers yesterday, and I think for us to take up these final hours when we have important business facing us is just absolutely absurd. I vote no.

SECRETARY:

...Mitchler, Mohr,...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Mohr.

SENATOR MOHR:

Mr. President, here we go again this morning. With all the important matters of State at hand, why, we're playing around with resolutions. From one that is 75% Irish, I appreciate Senator O'Savickas' interest here; but I think it would be more in order, Senator, if you would present a resolution that might figure out some way of resolving the problems here in the Illinois State Senate, which I think are a great deal like those of Ireland and the problems they are having over there. If you come up with a resolution that will address itself to this problem, I would be happy to support it. I vote no.

SECRETARY:

...Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien...

PRESIDENT:

Senator O'Brien.

SENATOR O'BRIEN:

Mr. President and members of the Senate. I think this is an important matter. However, I'm sorry to see that Senator Savickas didn't let me know that this was going on. Up the I.R.A., and I vote aye.

SECRETARY:

...Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene,...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Being the downstate Italian block in the Senate, I vote aye.

SECRETARY:

...Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Walker.

SENATOR WALKER:

Mr. President, I think this is a matter that, rather than be referred to the Executive Committee, should be referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which I understand is co-chaired by Senator Sours and Knuppel.

PRESIDENT:

For...Senator Savickas.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Mr. President, I haven't voted yet. I would like to remark, though, it's a shame. Again the Republican party is more interested and concerned about destroying the municipalities power to license than they are about the suffering and the discrimination against the poor people of Ireland. We've heard a lot of silly resolutions come from the other side of the aisle. They supported them, laughed about them; but we never seem to waste time when we vote on a Republican Resolution, whether it's a birthday or congratulatory...

PRESIDENT:

For what purpose does Senator Harris arise?

SENATOR HARRIS:

A point of order, Mr. President. The point of order is this. We

are on a motion to suspend the rules and we've got, and I use only the word "business" before us and I call upon the leadership of this body to move this body and meet our responsibility; and so I suggest, Mr. President, that you use this gavel to keep us on our business...not important business, just our business. Now let's get down to work.

PRESIDENT:

How does the Senator vote.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

I vote aye.

PRESIDENT:

On that question the yeas are 22, the nays are 17. The motion to suspend the rules does not prevail. Resolution is referred to the Executive Committee. Further messages from the House. Official messages from the House.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill 589 is returned with House amendment number one; and this is Senator Bruce's bill.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Yes, Mr. President and members of the body. Senate Bill 589 was amended in the House. This is a bill for social workers. What was added was...The original bill was to allow social workers to register under a grandfather clause. With an agreement with the Department of Registration and Education, Mr. Dennis Alexander, Assistant Chief Legal Advisor, an amendment was drafted which would allow social workers not to be grandfathered in, but rather allowed to take the examination that other applicants may take if they have a bachelor's degree. As I explained earlier, the reason for the bill is a time lag differential between the people who have graduated and those who were eligible to take the examination having had a certain amount of experience with the

Department. What this is doing is opening up the..., not the grand-father clause but rather allowing workers within the Department to take the examination. And I move that we concur with the amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion? The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

Yes, I'd like to ask the sponsor, please. I don't have the bill anymore in my bill book so I don't really know what the bill does; but is this licensing to be strictly a local prerogative, or what is the present status of the licensing of welfare workers? Is this under the State Department of Registration and Education?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

So far as I know, Senator Berning, we still license social workers under the Social Workers Registration Act of 1967.

PRESIDENT:

Senator...Just a moment. Is...I've been informed by one of the members of the Senate that pictures are being taken. If I may ask Senators Partee or...Has permission been given for anyone to take pictures? There has been. All right. I think it maybe is a good idea to announce to the group when that permission is given, because the Chair gets complaints from time to time. Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

Well, I don't want to belabor this, but it would appear to me that this could be legislation that we ought not to be considering under any circumstance in view of the difference of opinion, divided position, on whether or not we have anything to do with registration.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Bruce

SENATOR BRUCE:

Well, the State presently has the power to license and register social workers. I know of no legislation pending within this body that will take that power away from the State of Illinois; and no matter what legislation now pending passes, the State of Illinois will still continue to license and register social workers.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Berning, and your time is about used up, Senator.

SENATOR BERNING:

Well, Mr. President. It seems to me that we are confronted right here with a concrete example of the very gist of the entire day's business yesterday when we were debating, or at least listening to a debate on whether or not there should be any legislation...any registration continued by the State of Illinois.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Bruce. We are not on debate. We are on roll call. I'll permit Senator Bruce to go over the time limit here now, but we are going to have to continue the roll call. Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Just for Senator Berning, the State of Illinois licenses social workers. Under 3636, the bill specifically under debate, they will continue to license social workers. The question is whether or not other home rule units shall have that authority. Now whether that's granted or not, I do not know, or taken away; but right now the State licenses, under 3636 they will continue to license, social workers.

PRESIDENT:

How does Senator Berning vote?

SENATOR BERNING:

I vote no.

PRESIDENT:

Continue with the roll call.

SECRETARY:

...Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lyons.

SENATOR LYONS:

Mr. President, I vote aye; and in explaining my vote, I'd like to remark that the inquiry made by Senator Berning is typical of the abysmal depth of misunderstanding which is prevalent in this body on the question of home rule licensing. Everybody talks about home rule and very few people appear to know what it does. There is no quest...There is no attempt on the part of the home rule units, and there never was and there cannot be, I might add, under the new Constitution, any attempt to oust the State from jurisdiction over licensing. The only possibility for licensing for regulation...And I might say, with respect to some other comments made by people who purport to be well informed, that the new Constitution specifically forbids licensing for revenue purposes except as permitted by the General Assembly. In any case, the only licensing and regulation done by municipalities under the new Constitution is such as it will not interdict the power of the State to do so. The powers will be exercised concurrently or they will be exercised by the cities and villages solely in the event that the State does not decide to exercise its powers well. I make these comments because the remarks of Senator Berning, I think, show the breadth and depth of ignorance in this body on the whole subject of home rule, even though we are about to take the longest step backwards since Napoleon's retreat from Moscow in 1812.

SECRETARY:

...McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse,

Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Request for a call of the absentees.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Bidwill, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Coulson, Davidson, Fawell, Graham, Groen, Harris, Horsley, Knuepfer, Latherow, Laughlin, McBroom, Mitchler, Mohr, Newhouse, Ozinga, Soper, Walker and Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Newhouse aye. For what purpose does Senator Bruce arise?

SENATOR BRUCE:

Just to explain. If we do not concur, this will return to the House and they will not recede and a conference committee will be appointed. We have worked over the summer with the Department of Registration and Education, Mr. Dennis B. Alexander, Assistant Chief Legal Advisor. The Executive Department drafted this amendment. It meets with the approval of social workers; it meets with the approval of the Department. I know not where we can go from here except in to a conference committee which will report back this very same thing.

PRESIDENT:

On that question the yeas are 29, the nays are 12. The Senate does not concur in the House Committee...The House amendment. On page 2 of your Calendar on the Secretary's desk, I'm just going to go down the line on these Senate bills with House amendments before we move on to the... 645, Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

Yes, Mr. President and members of the Senate. Senate Bill 645 and 646 are part of a package...

PRESIDENT:

Can this be on one roll call?

SENATOR EGAN:

I'd like it to be, if I could get leave of the body.

PRESIDENT:

Is there objection? Leave is granted.

SENATOR EGAN:

644 is also a part of the package. That passed the House without any amendments. These bills, as you recall, were introduced at the request of the Illinois and Chicago Bar Associations regarding the facility of enforcement of condominium property owners who do not, at any given time, pay their prorated share of the common expenses of a condominium. This facilitates the enforcement of those common rights of all; and the amendments, particularly on Senate Bill 645, would add safeguards built in for unit owners: 30 days notice, joint action for money in possession, stay of the writ for at least 60 days to a maximum of 180 days so that the owner could be put back into possession upon payment of the amount found due by the court. The amendment on Senate Bill 646 deletes language which was felt to be superfluous; and these amendments have been agreed upon by all of the parties that were interested: the bar associations, the condominium owners and also the tenants, the...that the...whatever representation that was present for those tenants that might be in a position of being pushed out of ownership. So, I would ask, please, that we concur in the amendments.

PRESIDENT:

The motion is to concur in the House amendments to 645 and 646. Is there any discussion? The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander,

Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Collins aye. Latherow aye. Harris aye. Laughlin aye. McBroom aye. Knuepfer aye. Graham aye. Newhouse no. That's correct. On that question the yeas are 40, the nays are 1. The Senate concurs in the House amendments on 645 and 646. 938, Senator Lyons. Senator Lyons.

SENATOR LYONS:

Mr. President and members of the Senate. Senate Bill 938 is a bill that I introduced with Senator Harris.

PRESIDENT:

Just a moment. Please, Gentlemen. Let's have some order. Let's take our conferences off the floor. Proceed Senator.

SENATOR LYONS:

The bill dealt with mergers, corporate mergers, where one company, one corporation owned 99% or more of the outstanding shares of another company. The bill passed the Senate unanimously. In the House committee it was felt that some additional protections would be appropriate to protect the dissenting shareholders. The amendment that put...The amendment that was put on by the House was designed to accomplish that, and I ask for the concurrence of the Senate on the House amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Harris.

SENATOR HARRIS:

I haven't had a chance to contact everyone on this side. There is, of course, no partisanship involved here, but I am familiar with this House amendment. It's perfectly acceptable. As a matter of fact, I think a further safeguard should be concurred in.

PRESIDENT:

The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll,

Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald,
Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley,
Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin,
Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse,
Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saper-
stein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker,
Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

O'Brien aye. Smith aye. Savickas aye. On that question the yeas
are 44, the nays are 0. The Senate concurs in the House amendment. 1054,
Senator Rosander. That's Senate Bill 1054. Is that correct? The Calen-
dar does not indicate...

SENATOR ROSANDER:

Senate Bill 1054 was a bill that extended the date line to Decem-
ber 31, 1971, for those school districts who had submitted a proposal to
the electorate which had been rejected by them. This bill was passed
out of the Senate by a 46 to nothing vote. It also went over to the
House; received unanimous support, 123 to nothing; an amendment was put
on because the Act itself would be useless unless we put on the amend-
ment, the House amendment number 1, that this Act takes effect upon its
becoming law. So, I would appreciate the...that this bill...That amend-
ment would require 35 votes, as I understand it, to take effect immedia-
tely.

PRESIDENT:

That is correct. The Secretary will call the roll. We'll need
35 votes on this.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll,
Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald,
Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley,
Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin,
Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse.

Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Knuppel aye. Hall aye. McBroom aye. Horsley aye. While the Secretary is tallying that, I understand that Senator Rosander has announced that he will not be a candidate again and the Chair just wants to comment there has been no Senator who has been more orderly, more courteous to his colleagues than Senator Rosander has been here, and I personally appreciate it. On that question, the yeas are 46, the nays are 0. The Senate concurs. 1073, Senator Horsley.

SENATOR HORSLEY:

Mr. President. This bill has been amended in the House to take all of the main part of the bill out, and all that it does now is extend the term of office of the Springfield Trustees and deny them the power to levy any tax during that period of time. It passed the House unanimously without any opposition. There may have been one vote, I'm not certain, against it; but I'd appreciate your support. I've talked to Senator Rosander. This is a bill he's very vitally interested in. He's read the amendment and has approved it.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion? The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

On that question the yeas are 37, the nays are 1. The Senate concurs in the House amendment. Senator Harris...Is Senator Harris. Yes. Senator Harris, 1182 and 83. Senator Harris.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Mr. President I want to pass over those bills. I'm preparing a memorandum on that amendment to join with the copy of the amendment the House adopted. Might I have an understanding to come back to this later today?

PRESIDENT:

We'll come back to it whenever you let the Chair know.

SENATOR HARRIS:

That bill has been completely changed, or the two bills. On 1223, this is an amendment to a bill that we introduced here, a product of the Labor Laws Commission, that implements for the State agencies to administer the Federal Safety Act of 1970. This amendment was worked out between the Industrial Commission and the Department of Labor, representatives of labor and management. It's acceptable; it provides for administration and establishment of standards. I move that we concur in the House amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Motion to concur in the House amendment. Is there any discussion? The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Neistein.

SENATOR NEISTEIN:

I'm voting aye on this one; but you made mention that there's a House amendment on a bill where it's a whole new bill of a lot of pages. Is that how we work our process without changing? I know that has nothing to do with this, but I heard you say you are going to pass that and it's a whole new bill. Now, don't the Senators get a chance...

PRESIDENT:

That's another bill that he's talking about, not the one we just...

SENATOR NEISTEIN:

I understand, but I just want to bring out to Senator Harris that to vote on an entire new bill in the last hour or hours of the session, defeats our whole legislative process and our ideas and Senator Groen had such a great idea that we should have new rules and new concepts of attacking the problem, but I vote aye on this one.

SECRETARY:

...Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Palmer aye. On that question the yeas are 41, the nays are 0. The Senate concurs in the House amendments. 1297, Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

Mr. President and Senators. This amendment corrects an error in drafting of House Bill 1601 which passed this Chamber and the Legislature earlier this year and was signed into law by the Governor. The bill, House Bill 1601, provided for the proof of financial responsibility. This amendment amends the Vehicle Code and provides that proof of financial responsibility may be given by supplying a certificate of self insurance under Section 7-102, in addition to the other alternate methods. This would bring paragraph 7-102 and 8-102 and 9-102 under the same provision for the filing of financial responsibility. I move we concur.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion? The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Hynes.

SENATOR HYNES:

Mr. President, I wonder if the sponsor would yield to a question?

PRESIDENT:

He indicates he will.

SENATOR HYNES:

Senator, I don't quite understand. As I read the subject matter of this bill, it provides a \$20 registration fee for vehicles operated exclusively by fraternal, civic, and veteran's organizations. Your discussion dealt with financial responsibility and I don't understand the relationship.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

The problem is how would the American Legion Post, for example, an unincorporated voluntary association, give a financial responsibility. Now, this bill, when it was first enacted, simply provided that the American Legion or the Knights of Columbus or the Masonic Order, you name it, which has a ceremonial vehicle could make an application and for twenty years get license plates. Now the problem never arises in the city of Peoria because the police wouldn't pick up a vehicle anyway. But if it goes beyond the state line, it has to have an Illinois license plate. And this provides that any fraternal organization, such as those mentioned, the American Legion as an example only, can get a license for two years for \$20. Now that still doesn't, in the original form, provide for

financial responsibility, and this simply puts those applicants in the same category as you and I. That's all it does.

SECRETARY:

...Johns, Knuepfer...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Johns.

SENATOR JOHNS:

I don't know, gentlemen, lady and gentlemen of the Senate, but here again, when I look back upon many of the parades and many of the ceremonial cars and so forth that are used, these are put together with countless hours, and now I see this as just a way of taxing somebody else. They're giving of their time and their efforts to give a lot of enjoyment to kids and people on the streets, and here we are taking advantage of a situation, charging them money for it. Since this fee doesn't insure financial responsibility, I vote no.

SECRETARY:

...Knuepfer, Knuppel,...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Knuppel.

SENATOR KNUPPEL:

Is Senator Sours the sponsor of this bill?

PRESIDENT:

Yes.

SENATOR KNUPPEL:

Well, I believe I want to vote no then.

PRESIDENT:

Well, the Chair will just...Just a moment. I, I hope, meaning no disrespect to Senator Knuppel or anyone else, I hope we don't vote for or against bills because of sponsorship here. I think we are going to have to vote for or against them, particularly in the closing hours, on the merits of the bill. Proceed.

SECRETARY:

...Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer,...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

...the sponsor of this bill? I vote aye.

SECRETARY:

...Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker,...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Walker.

SENATOR WALKER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would only like to call attention to the fact that those legislators who are on a state line, as I am, and as Senator Dougherty will now be, will find this legislation quite helpful, because these units do cross the line. From Calumet City to Hammond to South Chicago, and so forth. And I think the same would apply to any other Senator whose district lies adjacent to a state line. I think it's a good bill. I'm going to vote aye. I'd like to see it receive the required number of votes. Thank you.

SECRETARY:

...Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

McBroom aye. Graham aye. Ozinga aye. Nihill no. Request for a call of the absentees. The Absentees will be called.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Coulson, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Groen, Hall, Hynes...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Hynes.

SENATOR HYNES:

Mr. President, again, I wonder if the sponsor would yield to a question? I, frankly, have not had enough time to fully grasp this amendment, but as I look at it, Senator, the financial responsibility section that you're adding is not limited to the not-for-profit, civic, fraternal organization. Is it? That's not the way I read it anyway.

SENATOR SOURS:

No. All right. Mr. President, if this is proper, I'll answer the question. It's on calling the absentees, I presume. Isn't it?

PRESIDENT:

Yes, we are calling the absentees...

SENATOR SOURS:

But, if he wants the answer, I am adequately prepared to stay here all day to tell you, if you figure the bill is worth it. Now, Senator...

PRESIDENT:

You have to confine it to less than three minutes, Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

All right. House Bill 1601, filed by Pappas, Cunningham, Friedland, North and John Jacob Wolf, earlier this year passed the House. It came to the Senate and it passed the Senate; and the Governor approved it on August 12th. That bill did this. It amended the Vehicle Code and provided that proof of financial responsibility may be giving...given by supply a certificate of self insurance under Section 7-502, in addition to other alternative methods. Now all this bill does, other than permitting a fraternal organization as such to get a license for two years, is to provide to so it's in comport with 1601. That's all the amendment does, and I don't care. It makes it a better bill. If you don't want to vote for it, I couldn't care less.

PRESIDENT:

Continue with the call of the absentees.

SENATOR HYNES:

Mr. President, I would like to be recorded as no because I do not

understand the explanation and I do not think it is accurate based upon what I see here.

SECRETARY:

...Lyons, McCarthy, Newhouse, O'Brien, Partee, Rock, Romano, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski.

PRESIDENT:

Newhouse aye. Bidwill aye. On that question the yeas are 34, the nays are 6. The Senate concurs in the House amendment. 1177. Just a moment. I'm advised, I'm advised on that last amendment that there is... it takes effect January 1st, so that we either have to have one more vote added to the roll call, or it goes back to the House with nonconcurrence. Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

I'd like to move to strike the emergency then. 30 votes is all I need on that.

PRESIDENT:

We can't do that at this point. You'll have to...What we are going to have to do...We, we have to at this point, Senator, send it back to the House with nonconcurrence and then the House will either recede or set up a conference committee and then that emergency clause can be taken off. Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

I would just as soon the bill be tabled, so that there's a record of those who wouldn't support it.

PRESIDENT:

The action by the House...the motion to table is not in order. The action by the House...by the Senate is that we do not concur in the House amendment. For what purpose does Senator Horsley arise?

SENATOR HORSLEY:

A point of inquiry, Mr. President. The amendment does not deal with the emergency clause. The amendment deals with a portion of the bill other than the emergency clause.

PRESIDENT:

That, that doesn't make any difference. If there's an emergency clause on a bill when final action is taken on any amendment...concurr nce, it requires 35 votes. So the Senate does not concur in the House amendment. 1177. Now the Calendar, incidentally, is wrong. It says 1777, it should be 1177. I'm not sure whether Senator Carpentier or Senator Walker is handling this? Senator Walker. Senator Walker is recognized.
SENATOR WALKER:

I thank you Mr. President. When House Bill 1177 went over to the House, Senate amendment number 1 was inadvertently left on the bill, and the two amendments were conflicting. I would now like to move that the Senate recede from Senate amendment number 1, which will then put the bill in the shape it passed out of here, or should have passed out of here.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion? Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns,...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Hynes.

SENATOR HYNES:

I wonder if the sponsor would yield to a question. I'm sorry, I was distracted. What does this amendment do? We do not have a copy of it, at least I do not.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Walker.

SENATOR WALKER:

Senator Hynes, House Bill 1177 repealed the Act...in its original form, repealed the Act. Senate amendment number 1 was adopted on June 21st, and I think you'll recall this conversation, or the explanation the

other day. It provided for adequate coverage. That is the amendment that should have been stricken here when amendment number 2 was put on where the verbiage was changed to provide specific amounts; and briefly, what it does, as I mentioned the other day, it makes the landlord police the premises.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Hynes.

SENATOR HYNES:

I'm familiar with the substance of the bill. I voted against it when it passed out of here. I simply want to know why it's back again. That's all.

PRESIDENT:

If the Chair could interject. I think what it was was a mistake. Amendment number 1 should have been tabled when amendment number 2 was put on. It did not happen. Continue the roll call.

SECRETARY:

...Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski...Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene,...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Senator Walker is exactly right, in when adopting amendment number 2, amendment number 1 should have been taken off. And this is what we're merely doing and putting the bill in its proper perspective. I would appreciate it if any of you fellows who haven't voted would vote aye on this, to recede.

PRESIDENT:

Harris aye. Lyons aye. Nihill aye. McCarthy aye. Collins aye. Horsley aye. Saperstein aye. Donnewald aye. Palmer aye. For what purpose does Senator Donnewald arise?

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

Do you want to announce it?

PRESIDENT:

Call the absentees.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Cherry, Chew, Davidson, Fawell, Graham, Groen, Hynes, Kusibab, Laughlin, Lyons...

PRESIDENT:

Lyons aye.

SECRETARY:

...McBroom, Newhouse, Ozinga, Partee, Rock, Romano, Smith, Soper, Sours, Walker and Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

You were one vote short, Senator, that's why I called for the absentees. Oh! Take Clarke off. Clarke. Sours aye. Weaver aye. Partee aye. On that question the yeas 36 the nays are 3. The Senate concurs in the House amendment. For what purpose does Senator Donnewald arise?

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

Yes, Mr. President, Senator Clarke requested that...what the program was for today and the Pro Tem advised that we will recess for... at 12:30 for lunch and be back at 1:30; but at 1:00 o'clock there will be an open meeting of the Ethics Commission in Room 212 and that will probably last a half hour at which time we come back into session, which would be 1:30.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Harris.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Senator Donnewald described it as the Ethics Commission. It is the conference committee on House Bill 3700.

PRESIDENT:

Incidentally, we have received a message from the House, adjourning today until January 12th. I just thought, for your information...We

hadn't gotten to that yet, but...1573, Senator Neistein.

SENATOR NEISTEIN:

In line with that adjournment resolution that we are adjourning today, I could make things a lot easier if we strike everything on the Calendar, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

1573, Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

I move that the Senate do not...As a matter of fact they did not concur in the amendment number 2...Is that right, Sir, as I understand it?

PRESIDENT:

Your motion is to refuse to recede. Is that correct?

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

I refuse to recede, yes Sir.

PRESIDENT:

All right. Motion to refuse to recede. Is there any discussion?

Senator Clarke:

SENATOR CLARKE:

I would just like to make perfectly clear and find out if we support this motion, to refuse to recede, this bill will go to a conference committee. Correct?

PRESIDENT:

That is correct.

SENATOR CLARKE:

That is where it should be, and I certainly support that motion.

PRESIDENT:

Motion to refuse to recede. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. Motion prevails. 3560. Is Senator Rock on the floor? Incidentally, on that 3560, it says with House amendment, that should be...You may. That should be, not House amendment, but Senate amendment number 2, at the bottom there. Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Yes. Mr. President and members of the Senate. Am I correct in that amendment number 1 has already been tabled? Is that correct?

PRESIDENT:

Just a moment. We'll check the bill. We don't have the bill here right now Senator, can we...Well the bill is over in the House. Senator, can you work this out with the Secretary here, and then we will get back to that very shortly.

SENATOR ROCK:

Mr. President, I'd like to interrupt. We hope that we don't recede from the amendment. We are going to ask for a conference committee, but I just wanted to make sure that it shows properly that amendment number 1 was tabled so we know that we are dealing with only one amendment. Right. All right, I am going to ask for a conference committee and then we will...

PRESIDENT:

The motion is to refuse to recede and requesting a conference committee. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. Motion prevails. We have a conference committee report. We have two conference committee reports.

SECRETARY:

We the undersigned committee of a conference...

PRESIDENT:

What is the number?

SECRETARY:

...appointed to consider the difference between the two Houses in relation to House Bill 1121. The members of the committee respectfully recommend that House Bill 1121 be adopted as amended by the Senate.

PRESIDENT:

11...Who is the Senate sponsor on that; or who's...Senator Gilbert, would you know on 1121? It has something to do with schools.

SENATOR GILBERT:

The conference committee was Hynes, Bruce, Saperstein, Laughlin and

Rosander.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Hynes, 1121, do you know who the Senate sponsor on that is? You were on the conference committee. Oh! Senator Rosander is apparently the sponsor. He is not on the floor. We will wait until he gets back on the floor. House Bill 1800 is the next one. Senator Lyons, House Bill 1800. Senator Lyons is recognized.

SENATOR LYONS:

Yes. I have the report of the conference committee which I have tendered to the Secretary and ask him to read. This is concurred in by everybody on the conference committee except the Senate Republican members. Representative...The bill provided...is the vehicle for the downstate counties to opt into the home rule provisions of the new Constitution. They would do that by electing a county chief executive. What the bill does is specify the powers and duties of the county chief executive. It's sponsored by Representatives Day, Katz, Tuerk and Telcser, so that it is not a...it is a bi-partisan bill, let me put it that way. Ah...the, there was some discussion...there has been extensive discussion, I might say, as to what precisely the powers of the county chief executive should be and when these referenda should be held. I can read, if it will please the membership, what the conference committee report does. If there is a problem about this. Does anybody want to hear it? Well, I will read it, just so we know. The conference committee removes Senate amendments 2 and 3 and makes the following changes in the bill: (1) Requires that downstate counties may become home rule counties and adopt the county executive form of government, I have underlined, only by referendum. Referenda may be declared in one...in either of two ways. (A) By resolution of the county board. (B) By petition filed by 2% of the registered voters of the county or 500 people, whichever is less. (2) Sets up two different schedules for counties to become home rule counties. One timetable applies between now and the general election next November.

The other timetable applies after next November. For counties that wish to become home rule units immediately, the report provides that the petition of resolution must be filed by February 1, 1972. In that event, the referendum for adopting the counties executive form of government will be on the ballot at the March primary. If the referendum is successful, the chief county executive will be elected at the November 1972 general election on party ballots. Nominations for county chief executive will be the county central committee of each political party and by direct petition in the case of independents. This method of nomination as well as this accelerated timetable applies only this one time; between now and next November. For petitions or resolutions filed after February 1st, the second timetable will apply. That is, in the future the referendum to become a home rule county may be held at a November general election. The election of chief county executive would be held at the general election two years after the executive home rule referendum with nominations at the primary rather than by convention. Thus, if a county does not request the referendum by this coming February 1, there will be a built-in two year delay in becoming a home rule county. If a county delays further and does not put the referendum on the ballot until next November, they would not be able to become a home rule unit until 1976. This delay could, however, be changed in future sessions of the General Assembly if a strong demand develops for the downstate counties to become home rule units more quickly than this bill would provide.

(3) The conference committee report also modifies the powers of the county chief executive. (A) It retains a statutory status as presiding officer of the county board, (B) removes his power to vote on the county board even in cases of tie, (C) retains his veto power and clarifies that he has an item veto on appropriations but no power to reduce items, and (D) lowers the vote necessary to override an executive veto from two-thirds to three-fifths. That's what the conference committee report does, and I move the adoption of the report.

PRESIDENT:

Motion for the adoption of the conference committee report. Senator Knuepfer.

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

I want to speak on this motion, if this is the appropriate time.

PRESIDENT:

This is the appropriate time.

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

You will note that there are no signatures from this side of the Senate aisle. Senator Berning and I were both members of that conference committee. We were unable to reach agreement. Senator Lyons is well aware that since the beginning of this session I have been coming to him on almost a weekly basis, almost a daily basis, asking that we discuss a proposed amendment that we had submitted in the early part of this 5-week session. I was unable to find out what the position of anybody was up until the night before last when we got a draft of the bill which essentially put it back in the same form that the House had it in, originally. There are some very substantive objections to this in my mind. In the first place, if a county does not adopt this posture until after the election in next November, then a county cannot go this route until 1976. Now, our counties are going to have to go to this route, many of them. There is a very substantial disagreement between the House and the Senate on the issue of what ought to be the posture of the county board in making this decision. This side acceded to 90% of what was requested, but we could not accede to 100%. We are presently drafting an amendment that, hopefully, will be satisfactory to both sides. I had personally hoped that we could start negotiating this about three weeks ago, instead of negotiating it starting on Friday morning. We are not in a position where I think our side in this Senate can accept these recommendations at this point in time; and I would personally hope that the members on this side of the aisle do not support this motion to concur

in the conference committee report and that a second conference committee be appointed.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

Somewhere, Mr. President and Senators, in the bogaries of this session; I, as the primary sponsor of this bill in the Senate, seem to have been forgotten. If you look in the digest, I am the Senate sponsor. I was not invited to serve on the committee, the conference committee, and, frankly, I don't care. I do believe that this should be adopted. I do not believe any county government, by simple resolution alone, by simple resolution alone, ought to have the power about which Senator Knuepfer speaks. I feel we should concur in this.

PRESIDENT:

A question to either Senator Sours or Senator Lyons. We're trying to check. Does this take effect as of July 1st or does this take effect prior to that. Do you happen to know? Either one of you? It takes effect immediately, I am advised. Senator Lyons.

SENATOR LYONS:

Well, ah...just to clarify the record. Senator Sours was the principle sponsor...Senate sponsor of this bill. How it developed that he was not on the conference committee, I do not know. I should further point out, with reference to the remarks of Senator Knuepfer, that such discussions as might have been had by the Senator with people on the conference committee, or really with anybody, would not particular appropriateness be held with me because I don't come from downstate. This bill is operative only downstate and I have never been one to prescribe for downstate what is good for downstate. That is the business of downstate members of this body and of the House. This bill has been hashed over by members of the House on both sides of the aisles for months. The conference committee report that is before us now is

the product of unanimous agreement, as I understand it, by the House members on both sides of the aisle, from downstate. Senator Sours urges its adoption in this body, and so do I, Mr. President and members.

PRESIDENT:

Secretary will call the roll. Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

Before we get to a roll call, Mr. President, I think it's rather important to reemphasize some of the provisions that are contained in this conference committee report. The provision does exist for immediate effectiveness, or implementation of this particular county executive position prior to February 1st. However, in the event that this does not occur, as I understand the conference committee report, then there is no action possible until 1974, which is for all intents and purposes four years...three years. In addition, the provision for securing nominees; which would have to be those elected on...voted on by the citizenry in the November election of '72, assuming that the selection does occur prior to February 1st; are only those that are selected by the central committee. There is no right of the citizenry to participate in any kind of a primary; and I think this contravenes the intent, the basic understanding and the basic intent, for the selection of the county executive or any other officer. And for this reason, among the others, I would respectfully suggest that this conference committee report be rejected.

PRESIDENT:

Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington...

PRESIDENT:

Just a moment. For what purpose Senator Knuppel arise?

SENATOR KNUPPEL:

Well, I was on this conference committee and I reviewed this and had it explained to me and I think it is a good report and I'd encourage everybody on this side of the aisle to vote for it.

PRESIDENT:

Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Gilbert, just a moment. Senator Gilbert.

SENATOR GILBERT:

I want to vote on this, but I don't understand it; and I would... It may be out of order, but I would like to at least clear up one thing. Senator Lyons...

PRESIDENT:

Just a moment...Just a moment. Let's...Can we break up...Senators Neistein, Senator Mathias, Senator Laughlin...Please gentlemen. Can we break up these conferences? Let's have some order. Proceed.

SENATOR GILBERT:

Senator Lyons...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lyons. The question is being directed to you.

SENATOR GILBERT:

I would like to know what are the methods by which this executive county government can be established. Is it by resolution of the county board alone? I mean is that one of the ways that they can do it, without any referendum?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lyons.

SENATOR LYONS:

No. It can be done only by referendum. Not simply by resolution of the county board alone. That was the whole idea of the conference committee report.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Gilbert. For what purpose does Senator Sours arise? We are on roll call.

SENATOR SOURS:

That I understand, Mr. President, but I think there is a misunderstanding here. Maybe I can clear up something that will save a lot of debate. As of now, as of the minute we are talking about it, Senator Knuepfer's contention would permit any county board of supervisors, by simple resolution tomorrow, to change to a home rule county. Now we did not elect our present board of supervisors in any county under that proposition they would ever have that flagrant authority. Now there is nothing wrong with a referendum because that is when the people speak. That is the plebiscite of the people. That is the reason why the contention of the good Senator Knuepfer, to me, was never contemplated when whoever voted our present boards of supervisors into office they would ever have that power. It should be by referendum, now and forever.

SECRETARY:

...Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Horsley.

SENATOR HORSLEY:

I was called to the telephone and I want to inquire as to this amendment. Can they still do this by resolution or is it only by referendum now with the amendment? That is what I want to clear up.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lyons.

SENATOR LYONS:

Under this, under this...If this thing is adopted; an aye vote means that they can only do it by referendum.

SECRETARY:

...Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

On that question the yeas are 42, the nays are none...nays are 1. The conference committee report is adopted. Senator Rosander is recognized on conference committee, on House Bill 1121. Senator Rosander.

SENATOR ROSANDER:

Yes, well I request that the Senate concur in the Senate amendment number one. This was at first rejected by...

PRESIDENT:

Well, now this is a conference...Your motion is to adopt this conference committee report.

SENATOR ROSANDER:

Adopt the conference committee report. Yes.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion? Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier...

PRESIDENT:

Just a moment...We are not getting any votes. Senator Rosander, I wonder if you can just give it a couple of sentences of explanation.

SENATOR ROSANDER:

Well, the amendment that was put on in the Senate Education Committee was one that was worked out with both sides of the aisle and the Senate committee and it was one that was really offered by Senator Laughlin and it dealt with...that the private carrier must file with the Superintendent of Public Instruction a bond assuring performance of the contract by the school bus companies; and the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall then make and enforce the rules appropriate to this Act. And the reason for this legislation was the fact that the private carrier just left the...some 400 customers high and dry without adequate transportation. They just up and left and this is to protect the people under these kind of contracts; that they do provide a performance bond, which amount will be decided upon by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

This passed out of the committee unanimously. It was also passed out by the Senate. By misinterpretation the House did not go along with it, and a conference committee was called and we refused to accede...or recede from this amendment and now they have adopted the amendment number one and now we concur with the adoption of that amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Continue the roll call. Bidwill aye.

SECRETARY:

...Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

O'Brien aye. Latherow aye. On that, that question the yeas are 41, the nays are none. The Senate accepts the conference committee report. We have another message from the House. Is Senator Laughlin here? Senator Laughlin do you wish to make a motion on this? Ah...what's the number of this? Senator Laughlin.

SENATOR LAUGHLIN:

The House refused to concur and I haven't heard anything from Representative Nowlan, so I move that we refuse to recede and establish a conference committee.

PRESIDENT:

Motion to refuse to recede and establish a conference committee. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. Senate refuses to recede. Now we are going to go back to the Democratic and Republican priority lists. We will be interrupting as we get messages from the House and conference committee reports.

House Bill 3600. Senator Mohr.

SENATOR MOHR:

Patience....Somebody told me patience was a virtue. I don't...

Mr. President and members of the Senate, House Bill 3600 is an amendment to a...or is a Bill that puts the bingo game back in the proper perspective. It would now permit five extra games at an additional fee of 50¢ a card which the organizations...

PRESIDENT:

Just, just...Please. Just a moment. Let's have some order. Senator Mohr has waited long enough. He's entitled to a little courtesy.

SENATOR MOHR:

Which...The organizations have requested this. It has been cleared with the Department of Revenue who has been policing this Act. It also would permit, for a \$50.00 fee, organizations that would be able to make applications, that would qualify, to have special permission to play five nights a week, twice a year. This would take care of your festivals in some of the small communities. It also would reduce the requirement from five years to two years that an organization must be in existence. I might add that these are national chartered organizations. This does take a three-fifths majority and I'll ask for the favorable support on both sides.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion? Senator Clarke?

SENATOR CLARKE:

Well, I'd just like to ask a question. Who...Who can...Who can do this now? Who can operate bingo games now?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Mohr.

SENATOR MOHR:

Any national chartered organization, Senator, and it, it...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Clarke.

SENATOR CLARKE:

You say any national chartered organization. I thought it was charitable organizations only could do...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Mohr.

SENATOR MOHR:

When I...When I say "chartered", I'm talking about veterans' organizations and, and they're a licensed, not-for-profit organization.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Clarke?

SENATOR CLARKE:

Now who are we not only lowering the limits for to two years, but who are we opening the door to...broadening this bill to?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Mohr.

SENATOR MOHR:

Well, if the Senator that offered the amendment to reduce it would like to speak on it, I think that would be in order, Senator. That would be Senator Graham that offered the amendment for reasons best known to him. He did explain it to me, but if you want that answer, I'd prefer that he give it to you.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Graham. You're being brought into this.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

Yes. Mr. President, I presume I am. I offered an amendment...I offered an amendment yesterday. I was not a prime supporter of bingo, but we have it. And what we have done, unless we adopt the motion that Senator Mohr is making, we're excluding, in the suburban and metropolitan areas, some clubs, fraternal organizations, whose national organizations have been in existence for a long time, but they have not been in existence up to five years. That's normal because some of those

villages are not five years old. This bill will provide that if they have been in existence two years, and they are a member of a nationally recognized fraternal organization, they may apply and receive a license. I think this is a tremendous step forward in this area and I urgently request a favorable vote.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Clarke.

SENATOR CLARKE:

Well, I'm still not quite clear as to just what specific types of groups this is extending it to, other than the time limit. I can understand that. I mean, this means that you can have civic groups...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

A, a civic group such as...if you want to call the Lions Club a civic group, yes. If they have been in existence in that locality for two years; if they have been in existence in the state and the nation for a considerably long time. This will preclude, however...I think this might be some of the fears of some, and it was some of mine. It will preclude the new fly-by-night organizations popping up overnight and applying for and getting a license because they are not part of a nationally organized fraternal organization.

PRESIDENT:

Is there further discussion? Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours; Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Thirty-five votes are required on this. Senator Groen aye. On that...O'Brien aye. On that question the yeas are 37, the nays are 1. House Bill 3600 is declared passed. Senator Vadalabene moves to reconsider. Senator Mohr moves to table. All in favor of the motion to table signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. The motion prevails. House Bill 3704. Senator Groen.

SENATOR GROEN:

Mr. President, members of the Senate. House Bill 3704...

PRESIDENT:

Just a moment. For what purpose does Senator ParTEE arise?

SENATOR PARTEE:

Well, I'd just like to inquire if this is going to be in any way controversial, because it's now 12:25 and we're going to go out at 12:30 for another meeting.

PRESIDENT:

It appeared to the Chair...

SENATOR PARTEE:

All right. Very good. Go right ahead.

PRESIDENT:

...that this would not be a controversial matter, Senator.

Senator Groen.

SENATOR GROEN:

No. I don't believe so, Senator ParTEE. This bill was given to me by Toby Barry from the House, who represents in the House the same areas that are involved here that I am interested in. The counties of Putnam, four townships in LaSalle County and in Bureau County. They want to establish a Regional Port District. They...All of the safeguards are in it. There can be no tax without a referendum and all of this sort of thing. I know of no objection to it. The people up there want it and I don't know why we shouldn't give it to them. I'd ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDENT:

~~Is there any discussion?~~ Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Collins aye. Kosinski aye. On that question the yeas are 38, the nays are none. The bill is declared passed.

Motion by Senator Partee that the Senate stands in recess until 1:30. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. The Senate stands in recess.

A F T E R R E C E S S :

PRESIDENT:

The Senate will come to order. 3642. Senator Coulson? Now if you... If...On any of these...Now we have some that are noncontroversial. If they are controversial items, do you want to wait 'til a few more get here? We can wait. What is your pref...pleasure, Senator?

SENATOR COULSON:

I don't know of any controversy, but there...there may well be some.

PRESIDENT:

You want...You want to hold off? I think there are a couple that are not cont...Thirty...

SENATOR COULSON:

I think...

PRESIDENT:

Why don't we get back to you very shortly here?

SENATOR COULSON:

I have another one I promised Senator Carroll I'd handle for him which I think is noncontroversial. That is 19, at the very top of the list. Now I understand that Senator Dougherty is better equipped than I am to explain it. It simp...It simply allows town boards to make some provision for mental health services at the town meeting if they wish to.

PRESIDENT:

House Bill 19. The...Is there any discussion? Senator Dougherty?

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

Mr. President and members of the Senate. Senator Coulson has said what is right. We...This bill was introduced...pre-filed in the early part of the Session. It did pass the House and run into some opposition in the Senate, and I think...I then recommitted it back to Committee for further study. And that the recommendation of the Committee on Local Government was that this bill come out Do Pass for the reason that there's a dire need for this bill because many of the townships, particularly in Cook County and maybe in other areas of the State, have already established and have these ongoing establishments that are in need. Now it means this, that the township can have a levy to support these institutions which in turn will then make them eligible for both State and Federal grants. The levy at no time will exceed...at no time, will exceed the limits...the tax limit on township governments. At no time, unless we would, within the confines of the established tax limitation for that particular township. I think it's very good legislation. I think it will help in assisting the Department of Mental Health. It will be of assistance in many areas of the State where people who are so afflicted can find help. They will have out-patient care. I have been sold on this bill from its very inception. I think it's good legislation. I would urge everybody to support Senator Coulson's proposal.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Gilbert.

SENATOR GILBERT:

Does this provide for a tax levy? Senator Dougherty, you're talking about it shall not exceed the township levy. Does this provide for a tax levy without referendum?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

As long, as long as it is within the limit of the township levy. So long as it does not exceed...It must be by a referendum. Yes.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Gilbert.

SENATOR GILBERT:

There must be a referendum?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Gilbert.

SENATOR GILBERT:

And what is the attitude of the Department of Mental Health on this. Are they supporting this legislation?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

They are supporting this legislation. Yes Sir.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Latherow.

SENATOR LATHEROW:

Senator...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

I was conferring with Senator Gilbert. He is thoroughly versed in it

and let him explain it to Senator Gilbert.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Latherow.

SENATOR LATHEROW:

Senator Dougherty, does this have anything to do with an increased taxation where there is a mental health unit within the county?

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

Well, I tell you, Sir, if there is a mental health unit within the county as we do have in Cook County, as we do have in other counties like Peoria and Winnebago, ah...it is permissive, yes, I would not deny it, it is permissive. Yes, Sir.

PRESIDENT:

Is there further discussion? Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll
Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Coulson.

SENATOR COULSON:

I wonder if it would be proper to ask if Senator Carroll could be recorded as voting aye. He was taken from here as an invalid. He was taken ill just a couple of hours ago. This is his bill, I am sure he would want to be recorded in favor of it.

PRESIDENT:

I am sure he would, but we have never permitted a Senator not present to be casting his vote and I ah...

SENATOR COULSON:

All right. Coulson aye.

SECRETARY:

...Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert,
Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel,
Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt,

Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Donnewald. Donnewald aye. I'm sorry. Proceed with the roll call.

SECRETARY:

...O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

For what purpose does Senator Groen arise?

SENATOR GROEN:

Mr. President, to ah...to the good Senator sponsoring it, I was off the floor on a phone call. Does this now carry a referendum provision, Senator Cherry?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Coulson is handling the bill. Senator.

SENATOR GROEN:

Senator Coulson does this carry a referendum?

SENATOR COULSON:

Sir?

PRESIDENT:

Can you repeat the question, Senator Groen?

SENATOR GROEN:

Does this carry a referendum provision?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Coulson.

SENATOR COULSON:

No Sir. It carries a town meeting vote provision.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Groen.

SENATOR GROEN:

Then in many of the downstate townships where we have town meetings

of 3, 4, 5 people...where they go out on the street to get someone to come in to be the town moderator, 2, 3, 4 or 5 people could establish this mental health situation and levy taxes without a referendum to establish it. Is that correct?

SENATOR COULSON:

Senator, I am really uninformed. Senator Carroll was taken ill a few hours ago and asked me if I would handle it for him and do the best I could. Now it's no...it's no epidermis off my proboscis whether this passes or not. I am just trying to help Senator Carroll. I am not informed. Senator Dougherty is, perhaps he will help you.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Knuepfer I think may provide some help.

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

Senator Groen, I think I can help you because we heard it. There is a...presently 25 cent township tax levy. That presently is the statutory rate. Many of the townships in the Cook County area, ah... because they do not have too many township functions, are only levying rates...are only actually levying rates of 4, 5 or 6 cents. Now, this would enable them...this bill would enable them to levy up to the statutory minimum of 25 cents by action of the town meeting. It is not a rate increase without referendum, but it permits them to spend additional monies without referendum. Now, am I getting the distinction across? That's essentially what the bill does.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Groen.

SENATOR GROEN:

Yes, Senator, I understand the distinction completely, and as far as I am concerned it...

PRESIDENT:

Just a moment. Let's have some...Let's have some order.

SENATOR GROEN:

It, in my judgment, would authorize downstate townships to enter

into a field...

PRESIDENT:

Just a moment. Let's...Please, gentlemen, off here on the right. We can...We have a collection back there, if...

SENATOR GROEN:

...to enter into a field in which I feel they have little or no knowledge at this point. As I say, in many, many downstate townships, mine included, and it's a sizable downstate township, ah...Pekin township, it is most unusual when we have a dozen people attend a town meeting. Now, as far as I am concerned, while they are...And my township is not levying the maximum tax it can. This simply opens an avenue...a questionable avenue, in my judgment, as to expenditure of the maximum amount...and I have no question in my mind that if they enter in this field, it will be but a very short time until that 25 cent tax maximum will be forced to be raised substantially to take care of the activities in which they will engage in this field of mental health. I think, I think Illinois has an excellent mental health program, and I don't believe that this is the type of an extension of that program that would be in the best interest of the public and I vote no.

PRESIDENT:

Is...For what purpose does Senator Horsley arise?

SENATOR HORSLEY:

I'd like to have my name removed from the roll call as not voting. I think if this matter doesn't get enough votes, it can wait until next Spring until we know more about it, but at the moment I have not heard an explanation that will gather my vote; so, for that reason, I just want to remove my name from the roll call.

PRESIDENT:

On that question...Motion to postpone consideration by Senator Coulson. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. Motion prevails. 3653, Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the body, House Bill 3653, introduced by Representatives Lester Cunningham and Thomas Hanahan, is for the express purpose of expediting the handling of the ballots at the upcoming elections where there are electronic data processing devices used for the tabulation of votes. In McHenry County, particularly, and as I understand in one or two other counties where we have mandated the use of the electronic data processing devices, the county does not possess the computers necessary to tabulate the votes. Roll call, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion? The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty,...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

I'm sorry, I was off the floor when this bill was called. I think that is more or less of an emergency nature. It happens that there is a...up in Woodstock, in McHenry County, in Woodstock, where they use electronic voting devices and the law provides that it shall be taken... the ballots shall be taken to a central counting area for counting. It so happens that the only central counting area in Woodstock is a factory who has a computer to do this work, but they are limited in their parking facilities. This bill will permit that the election authorities may transport these ballots from the polling places to a given location, and from that location they will then be transported to the central counting agency for counting. This is a...it's a measure of convenience is what it is. I would like to think that maybe we can overcome this at another time, but this particular instance, I believe this is effective legislation

to cover an emergency situation over which we have no control whatsoever and time is running out and I urge support of this bill.

SECRETARY:

...Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Hall aye. Horsley aye. Carpentier aye. Swinarski aye. On that question the yeas are 40, the nays are none. The bill is declared passed. Senator Coulson, do you want to try 3642 now?

SENATOR COULSON:

Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

And can 42 and 43 be taken on the same roll call?

SENATOR COULSON:

They must be companion bills. Yes, Sir.

PRESIDENT:

Is there objection to one roll call on both of those? Leave is granted.

SENATOR COULSON:

These two proposals, Mr. President, propose to appropriate \$27,500 for the purpose of paying part time compensation to the Chairman and members of the Fair Employment Practices Commission. The salary for the Chairman would be \$7,500, the salary for the members would be \$5,000 annually each. The jobs have become more than honorary as we add to various jurisdictions for the FEPC to observe and enforce. They are involved more and more in conciliation meetings, in review of testimony and so forth. It has become, perhaps, one-third a full time job. It is for that reason that it is proposed to give a \$7,500 annual salary to the Chairman of the FEPC and \$5,000 a year to each of the members. I

have the statistical breakdown of their cases filed, I call to your attention that we have just given them additional jurisdiction on matters of discrimination in employment with regard to sex, and that this alone has doubled their case load. It's on that basis that the proposal is made. The total cost is \$27,500.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion? Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

Several years ago, Mr. President and Senators, we predicted this would be the eventual outcome. It's \$7,500 this year, \$15,000 next year, \$25,000 four or five years from now. By that time we'll have the fullblown bureaucracy against which everybody at the time felt ought not happen. This is a bill I think we ought to defeat.

PRESIDENT:

Is there further discussion? Senator Coulson may close the debate.

SENATOR COULSON:

I have no further comment to make, Sir.

PRESIDENT:

The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom,...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lyons.

SENATOR LYONS:

Well, I think this is extremely creditable legislation. The members of the FEPC, I think, have done a magnificent job ever since the Commission was first formed; and there is an increasing workload which every

year gets to be more and more onerous. I don't think there's anything unreasonable at all in allowing them some compensation for all the effort that they put in. I vote aye and I urge the members on our side to do as well.

SECRETARY:

...McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Swinarski aye. Palmer aye. Bruce aye. How is Senator Graham recorded? You are not. Johns aye. Request for a call of the absentees. The absentees will be called.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Carroll, Chew, Clarke, Collins...

PRESIDENT:

Clarke aye.

SECRETARY:

...Davidson, Graham, Groen, Latherow, Laughlin, McBroom, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Ozinga, Rosander, Soper, Sours, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

On that question the yeas are 35, the nays are 4. The bill having received the necessary three-fifths vote is declared passed. 3...For what purpose does Senator...Motion to reconsider by Senator Hall. Motion to table by Senator Vadalabene. All in favor of the motion to table signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. Motion to table prevails. 3734. Senator Sours. Just a moment. Gentlemen. We have a...If we can call...That conference committee is apparently...Senators Laughlin, Neistein, Partee, et al. -Gentlemen, if we can get that conference committee off the floor, please, gentlemen. Senator Sours is recognized. Just a moment, please. Senator Sours wants additional order. Senators

McCarthy, Hall...Please, gentlemen. Proceed, Senator.

SENATOR SOURS:

Mr. President and Senators. I should like to refer to House Bills 3647 in the 2nd column on page 2 of the Calendar, and that is the bill of Madigan, Blair and others, and also House Bill 3734 which was the product of the House Committee on Revenue.

PRESIDENT:

Senator, are you asking for the same roll call on both?

SENATOR SOURS:

Yes, Sir.

PRESIDENT:

Is there objection? There is objection. 3734 is the bill up for immediate consideration, then.

SENATOR SOURS:

I agreed with Senator Lyons that these bills would be pulled back for amendment at a time when they had been destined and were residing in a moribund committee called a subcommittee, and on the basis of that representation and assurance to Senator Lyons, it is his attempt now and his time now to discuss this bill because I want it called back to second reading to accommodate the Senator and then we'll see where we go from there.

PRESIDENT:

3734 is brought back to second reading for purpose of amendment. Senator Lyons, do you have an amendment?

SENATOR LYONS:

Yes, I do. The amendment that I tender, Mr. President and members, has been sent up to the front. Do you need 2 more copies? Amendment number 2. All right. And I believe it's been distributed to all the members. At least it should have been. What it does, quite simply, is drop the figure \$10,000 to \$1,500 in the amended version of the bill. Now, the reason that I'm offering this amendment is because this bill,

as it presently stands, would take off the personal property tax rolls in the County of Cook some \$900,000,000. We don't think that's a very good idea in these times. I must say that the...When I say, take off the roll, that's assessed valuation. We're talking about probably \$100,000,000 in taxes. This is at the \$10,000 level...let me get this straight. No, it would take of \$600,000,000 and we're talking, therefore, of \$72,000,000 in taxes. We cannot, obviously, sustain such a loss. Indeed, no county in the State at this time can possibly absorb such a thunderous reduction in its personal property tax roll. At the \$10,000 figure, 80% of the corporate taxpayers downstate would come off the personal property tax role. Now, whether anybody thinks that that's a trivial figure or not, the ultimate fact is that most of these areas would then find themselves with their schools closing and with their municipalities being impoverished. There is in existence a vehicle to solve this problem once and for all. The bill that Senator Sours is handling here is a one-shot solution, meant to apply to the 1971 assessment year only. Were it not for the fact, we would probably oppose it, we would probably oppose it. Since that is the intention of the bill, as that is the representation of Senator Sours; rather than oppose the bill outright and move to substitute for it my own bill, which I think is a much more viable, long-term solution, what we are seeking to do today is to drop the exemption level from \$10,000 to \$1,500. Now, I had, if I can find them here, some figures in numerous... in various downstate counties. Suffice it to say, however,...I remember some of them, Iroquois, Mason, Macon, Macoupin, Madison. ...to put in a personal property tax deduction at the \$10,000 level takes 80% of the corporate taxpayers in those counties right off the roll. In Winnebago County which, as I recall, has \$135,000,000 in corporate evaluations; 80% of the corporate taxpayers would go off the roll. We are talking, therefore, about something like 5 or 6 million dollars. You all know that in these times, with the local governments in the straightened

circumstances in which they find themselves, reductions in the tax base in those amounts are simply inadmissible and cannot be tolerated. My amendment would remove from the tax rolls in Cook County some \$90,000,000. Now, that's a lot of money, but the chief reason for doing it is because many of the downstate members feel that they have some sort of commitment to the voters that sent them here to try to effect some reasonable, I say again reasonable, solution to the admittedly vexatious personal property problem. Now, a \$1,500 exemption, I think, is a reasonable exemption. A \$10,000 exemption, I think, is not. \$10,000 would wipe off the rolls in Cook County, as I mentioned before, \$600,000,000 in valuation. Practically all of it corporate, I might add. Practically all of it paid by business corporations and income producing businesses. It would accomplish something that has been sought to be accomplished for decades by the business lobbies, and which the General Assembly has always had the wisdom...which efforts the General Assembly has always had the wisdom to turn back. Only to alleviate the situation in the downstate areas, we tender this amendment calling for a \$1,500 deduction by all taxpayers from their personal property assessed valuation. I'll be happy to answer any questions that the members might have, if they have any.

PRESIDENT:

Is there further discussion? Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

Mr. President, I have noted a discrepancy in certain figures. There has been a recent press release by a candidate for Governor on page 2 of which it discredits the contention made by Senator Lyons; and I quote verbatim: "If 45% of the tax base is destroyed by the \$20,000 exemption (and we're talking in this case about a \$10,000 exemption) about \$116,000,000 has to be replaced from somewhere." Now, I think it would suffice for me to comment, not at length on this, but at least to suggest that this remedy and this relief is long overdue. We have been faced with this problem

of personal property taxation, of first priority since it became evident, in late August of this year, that the Illinois Supreme Court would not reconsider its decision which declared the elimination of the personal property tax based upon ownership. It struck down the product of the referendum that abolished the personal property tax as to human beings. The now infamous Lake Shore decision. I believe it is the responsibility of this Legislature, right here and right now, to reflect the will of the majority, lady and gentlemen, of your constituencies and mine; and the people overwhelmingly spoke on this question when the people abolished this pernicious tax. In fact, the people spoke so clearly we cannot let this mandate manifest itself unheeded. The Supreme Court decision clearly does not define the limits for a constitutionally permissible personal property tax classification which would alleviate the individual's tax burden while simultaneously retaining the tax on corporations. And, while we're on that subject, Mr. President and Senators, I know of no corporation which, in the history of time, has ever absorbed a tax. They simply pass it on to you and me and we know that. Those of you who have worked on this problem know just how complicated it really is, and in the course of deliberations we have been confronted not only with attempting to establish a constitutionally acceptable procedure but considering alternatives whose fiscal effect would be far more reaching. Many other proposals offered for your consideration would have required substantially existing taxes or the creation of new taxes. Now, here's what this bill does...and there was a Freudian slip on the part of the good Senator Lyons who refers to this as an exemption, which he, having sat as a Constitutional Delegate, knows that that is specifically prohibited. There may be no exemptions. We're talking about a deduction. Just a standard deduction from the assessed valuation of personal property. In no case...In no case would any taxpayer, human being, two legged or corporate, be entitled to more than one standard deduction. This amendatory act would take effect December 1 or upon becoming law, and

when we get it in shape will require 35 votes. It is my sincere belief that we promised the people of the State of Illinois..., and I should like to harken back, gentlemen, to that evening when the State Income Tax was passed in this Chamber. It was voted upon and supported by Senators on both sides, so I think we all have the equal responsibility; and it was represented, and I can hear it yet, by the Senators who supported the State Income Tax that this would provide for the abolition of personal property taxation. That was the first representation made by those who supported the income tax to the taxpaying public. The second representation made to the taxpaying public was when we passed the mechanical statute providing for the referendum which was supported almost to a man. We told the voters and the electorate then that here was your chance to finally get rid of the abominable tax; and they did just that and along came the Supreme Court and called to the attention of the public, as well as the Bar, that the first paragraph, the last clause of the 14th Amendment to the Federal Constitution would strike down the referendum. Now, just in case anyone here today doesn't consider this important; and I'm not quoting from the new or old testament, but here is a clipping from the Sun Times of 11/12/71. It says: Ogilvie's difficulties apparently are caused more by the establishment of a State income tax early in his administration than by any other single issue. And outside Cook County voters also mentioned the failure of Ogilvie's plan to eliminate the new...the personal property tax. That tax was not mentioned often; and so forth. Now, this is something that we propose to take back to our constituents and tell them over and over and over again that on this side of the aisle, at least, we were united to give that taxpayer relief from that abominable tax. Just in case it is considered that anybody can get by, let me tell you that this is the critical, the determinative issue in the coming election. The elimination of this abominable tax, and on this side we are prepared to support this bill and get it out and get it signed. Now, as for the

amendment proposed...of Senator Lyons. And I presume, Senator Lyons, the amendment you're talking about has to do with your theory of the taxation. Correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (Senator Rock)

Senator Lyons.

SENATOR LYONS:

That's not correct. \$1,500. Wherever your bill says \$10,000, my amendment says \$1,500. That's this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (Senator Rock)

Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

That is tokenism. As an example only, and just as an example, let us assume a farmer, though the city dweller would be in the same boat, but not quite so completely exposed, a farmer who pays a personal property tax of between \$400 and \$700. In my area, if he were credited with a deduction, and that is the word not exemption, of \$1,500, he would save \$60; and that's like handing someone a cracker when he goes to a banquet. That's tokenism. That's not relief. That's patting him on the head. The doctor gives him a pill and says go home now, this will cure your headache; and he goes home and dies.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (Senator Rock)

For what purpose does Senator Coulson arise?

SENATOR COULSON:

Mr. President, I have a point of parliamentary inquiry. The mimeographed amendment on my desk replaces \$10,000 with \$10,000.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (Senator Rock)

I think that's...I think that's the second of two that were delivered.

SENATOR COULSON:

I don't have the first amendment, then, on my desk.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (Senator Rock)

Will a Page please see that Senator Coulson gets a copy of the amendment that was numbered number 2? Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

I can conclude this. I suggest and hope that the members of this Chamber will give your personal property taxpayers...Whether they are farmers, or whether they're city denizens; they need this relief. \$1,500 is tantamount to nothing. And for that reason I would move that the amendment offered by Senator Lyons be tabled.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR ROCK)

Any further discussion? Senator Coulson.

SENATOR COULSON:

Well, I still don't have a copy of it, and I understand there are no copies available. Does anybody have that \$1,500 amendment copy?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR ROCK)

I did at my desk and everybody in my row did.

SENATOR COULSON:

Nobody around here has seen it. Okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR ROCK)

Senator Knuppel.

SENATOR KNUPPEL:

Of course, everything that each of these gentlemen say is...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR ROCK)

For what purpose does Senator Knuepfer arise?

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

On a point of order. There is a motion to table. That motion is not debatable.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR ROCK)

Well, the sponsor has the right to close debate. All right. Senator Lyons may close debate. There has been a motion to table, Senator Knuppel.

SENATOR LYONS:

Well, we have just heard several different bills discussed, and let me reply seriatim to the notions that have been set in motion around here.

First of all, with respect to the statement by a certain candidate for Governor that \$20,000 would mean 45% statewide, a statement by that candidate for Governor was that at the \$20,000 level we were talking about 45% of the tax base in Capitol Township of Sangamon County only. So it is not accurate to say that that candidate for Governor was talking about a statewide figure. Now, with respect to slips, Freudian or any other kind, let me say that the...whether or not the last speaker is familiar with it, the new Constitution says, and I'm quoting verbatim: "The General Assembly may, by law, classify personal property for purposes of taxation by valuation; abolish such taxes on any or all classes, and authorize the levy of taxes"...authorize, I hasten to add,"the levy of taxes in lieu of the taxation of personal property by valuation." It is contemplated, and it was when this section was put into the new Constitution, that the General Assembly should have unfettered, untraveled authority to classify personal property for taxation purposes; and so long as those classifications were reasonable, to abolish or diminish the tax on any or all of those classes. That was the intent. That's what the Constitution says. Why we're talking about that with respect to this particular bill or not eludes me a little bit because this is a blanket exclusion or exemption, if you please, or deduction of \$10,000 across the board. This applies, not only to the poor farmer about whom Senator Sours professes to be so sorry, nor to the poor individual who thought he was getting some relief when he voted 7 to 1 last November, and I'm familiar with that situation too, Senator Sours. This applies to business corporations, to every kind of income producing entity in the State of Illinois. This is the biggest gift in the history of America, since the Tideland Oil Decision, anyway. Here we are talking about 60,000 corporate taxpayers in Cook County only, that Senator Sours wants to make an annual gift of \$10,000 worth of assessed valuation to. That's \$1,000 a person. That is an inadmissible, inadmissible, unbelievably irresponsible notion to advance. And this is true in every county in the State of Illinois except that the gross figure isn't quite that much.

I had a bill in here which would have given the farmers real relief, so let's not speak of tokenism. My bill provided that every individual taxpayer in the State of Illinois was off the personal property tax rolls for good and all. And the only people who would be on the personal property tax rolls were those who put...who had income producing property, and the only property that would be on the roll was property for which he took a federal income tax deduction. The bill further provided that every farmer, anyone engaged in agricultural pursuits, had a \$5,000 exclusion. Now that is real relief. And how many votes did I get on that side of the aisle for that provision? Not one. And I let that bill lie on third reading for two weeks because the leadership on that side of the aisle was quoted in the newspapers as saying, "Let Lyons call his bill, he won't get one single Republican vote for it." So, if you're talking about who really is trying to give relief in the personal property area, you're talking to the wrong man. I was told not to call my bill because I can't get any votes on that side of the aisle for it. We are taking this one-shot hodgepodge, slapped together, ill-thought out, ill-conceived thing and trying to get some kind of relief just once, for one year, for the taxpaying public so we can come back here next January and pass my bill for the future. There's a bill which is constitutional because it was drawn around the Supreme Court's opinion. When the Supreme Court said that the other...that the referendum that went down...was held unconstitutional, was unconstitutional; it was held so because it sought to distinguish taxability and nontaxability on the basis of ownership, not on the basis of use. Senate Bill 1292 classifies on the basis of use. It is constitutional. And if it passes, it will afford the relief that everybody says he really wants to afford to the people who really need the relief, which are the wage earning taxpayers and the small farmers. But we can't pass that bill because we can't get any votes on the other side of the aisle, or so we're told by the leadership over there. So we take the next best thing. We take this one. And we say, all right, at the \$1,500 level we can give some measure of

relief to some...to every taxpayer. Illinois Bell, General Motors, will get as much relief under this bill as the guy down the street. But this is the only vehicle we have. This is the only bill we can pass, apparently, according to the leadership on the other side. If my amendment is tabled and this bill comes to a vote for \$10,000, I will have more to say about it. I ask that the members vote down the motion to table; and after they do that, hopefully, I will move to put amendment number 2 on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (Senator Rock)

Secretary will call the roll. The question before the body is a motion to table Senator Lyons' amendment. Those in agreement with Senator Sours will vote aye. Those in agreement with Senator Lyons will vote no. Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins,...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (Senator Rock)

Senator Clarke.

SENATOR CLARKE:

Mr. President, members of the Senate. I want to concur with Senator Sours that this is tokenism. That what the other side is doing here is saying, "We really don't want to help the people of the State of Illinois in the area of giving them relief for personal property tax, but in order to not appear in that position, we'll give them just a little bit, a token." Because they did the same thing with their bill when they slapped that \$5,000 on. It was really a bill just to say we want the status quo in Chicago; but, as an afterthought, we'll give the farmers, nobody else, but the farmers a little bit of relief. And I would just suggest that there is not any great loss in this because the companion bill provides for the State to make up the loss to the local districts and they have the money going there through the 1/12th distributive fund to do it. That money would be made up so that no school district

is going to loose, and none of the other local governments are going to be hurt. I vote aye.

SECRETARY:

...Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (Senator Rock)

Senator Donnewald.

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

Mr. President and members of the Body. This particular amendment of \$1,500 seems insignificant, but it's going to take care of more than 70% of the personal tax...personal property taxpayers individually in the State of Illinois. Commenting about the farmers, we went into this quite deeply, and we have...if we had adopted the bill of Senator Lyons with the amendment that I placed on it; it would have given relief to more than 80% of the farmers in the State of Illinois. I vote no.

SECRETARY:

Donnewald...or Dougherty, Egan...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (Senator Rock)

Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

Mr. President and members of the Senate. Since January I've sat, like you have, and listened to many bills be voted down because there was not enough money in the State Treasury. I'll cite a few examples. One bill that I introduced, that I sponsored in behalf of...it was a House Bill that I sponsored in the Senate, would appropriate a million and a half dollars to the Chicago Municipal Tuberculosis Sanitarium on the Northwest Side of the City of Chicago. Money that is vitally needed by the Chicago Municipal Tuberculosis Sanitarium. That bill still sits on the Calendar without one Republican vote to help pass it. There was a bill companion to that to provide for money for the same Sanitarium for the previous year, money which had historically been given year after year. The reason that the bill didn't pass, because it didn't get one Republican vote. The reason it did not get one

Republican vote was because the Governor said that there's not enough money in the State Treasury. That's one example. Another example is funds for Higher Education. The reason that was given was because there was not enough money in the State Treasury. There is another example. The example of money which we requested to avoid the closing of the Chicago schools for 12 days next month. The reason was that there was not enough money in the State Treasury. Now, we want to carve out of the same State Treasury additional funds. We want to take away from that same State Treasury more funds. This is a sheepskin. I vote no on a motion to table.

SECRETARY:

...Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (Senator Rock)

Senator Knuppel.

SENATOR KNUPPEL:

Of course a great deal of what each of these gentlemen said is true. This is a one shot proposition in which they are attempting to solve a problem that's so complex that I asked for a bill to be drawn in July, I think I was the first Senator in this Body to ask for a bill to be drawn by the Legislative Reference Bureau, which would take into consideration and accelerate the provision of the 1970 Constitution. To this day I have not received that bill. I have talked to the people in the Legislative Reference Bureau who say it's highly technical, it's over 60 pages long, and it's still in the process of being drafted. That's just how complicated it's going to be to abolish personal property tax and to ultimately meet the mandate of the 1970 Constitution. I don't agree with either approach to this matter and the method in which it is being carried forth. The Constitution says any deduction shall be reasonable. I think that by not replacing, not replacing any of the lost revenue; the, the present bill we're considering runs the risk of being held again unconstitutional because of its size or the size of this

deduction. I nevertheless feel that a seven to one vote to abolish personal property taxes was a mandate for us to spend a great deal more time than we have spent in debate and consideration of this problem. We are not meeting the mandate of, of the responsibility which has been conferred upon us. This is one of the matters I spoke of last night, that I spoke of in the filibuster, and it was a filibuster that was conducted with respect to open rating. We have not met the responsibility placed upon us in this the Fall Session of the 77th General Assembly by the decision of the Supreme Court, and this bill does not meet that responsibility. It gives us something politically to go back to our constituents with, as the good Senator from Peoria has said, and said we have tried but we have not tried hard enough. We have not really met the mandate. Now, I will not vote for a motion to table. I think that we are going to be remiss if we leave here today and don't return until January, and then only momentarily, and then to return again late in March; we will not have met our responsibility in the light of the circumstances in which we stand. This is the most important problem. This is, as Senator Sours has said, the one that concerns the people of the State of Illinois the most; and certainly no motion to table ought to be voted for at this time, even if it means we stay here for another week or ten days. This is a problem that we should address ourselves to and I, therefore, vote no.

SECRETARY:

...Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (Senator Rock)

Senator Latherow.

SENATOR LATHEROW:

Mr. President and members of the Senate. Since last election when we might say, through some particular maneuver later on, the people of the State of Illinois really became hoodwinked over the possible election when they thought they had forever removed the personal property tax. We now come to the position where we have a chance to give them something

for what they may be having to swallow. I wonder sometimes how we can be in the area that I come from when we say that we assess the personal property and then we say that the treasurer must collect the personal property. I feel like, at times, that possibly on occasions we might go home and tell the assessor, "Why don't you just forget it this year?", or tell the treasurer, "Why don't you just forget it this year?" But most of those people feel a responsibility toward local governments and so forth, and they do want to pay what they feel like they should regardless of their ability to earn. And I think this is one step to answer the question that's asked me and probably every other person as they return home, "What are you going to do to help us on the personal property tax situation?" And I think that this is just one short step to show some reasonable reason why we can do that and should do it, and I vote that this motion lie upon the table. I vote aye.

SECRETARY:

...Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (Senator Rock)

Senator Merritt.

SENATOR MERRITT:

Mr. President. First...and members of the Senate. First of all, right off, I want you to know that I am in the same position as Senator Latherow, coming from a rural area, and I think our farmers have about had it. They're not only in a bad price squeeze this year, not even in some instances making hardly a poverty standard of living. Now you take just an average small farmer. I'm not even going to talk about a larger economic unit; let's get down to something that we can talk about: A 160 acre farm. If the stiff is lucky enough he might get \$16,000 worth of grain off of it. Let's say his machinery is considerably run down. One combine today could cost \$20,000, but let's say the total of that machinery was \$20,000. Say that he has no livestock. Right alone in those two items you have \$36,000 worth of value. Then you equalize that and you get it down to about \$18,000. Now, even under Senator

Lyons' proposal, and you're going to dangle out a little \$5,000 deduction from him, and then you're going to pour salt in the wound and add insult to injury all the further and say, "No! We're only going to give him \$1,500." Well, I'm telling you they have about had it down there in the country and I want 'em to know who's doing it to 'em. This is one of the most important things we should have done in this Session. To have addressed ourselves to the elimination of this personal property tax. They've waited far too long and I vote aye to table.

SECRETARY:

...Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (Senator Rock)

Senator Partee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

The subject of taxes, Mr. President, always excites a lot of people. Taxes are an anathema to most of us. Most of us would like to just have all of the government services that are available without paying any taxes. Well, what surprises me, I guess it really doesn't surprise me, but what nettles me the most are those who would take away and give to the taxpayers, who at the same time would not try to help raise the necessary funds. Now the gentleman who has this bill today didn't vote for the income tax, knowing that the State sorely needed money, knowing that the Bureau of the Budget says that as we are presently constituted they expect this State to be minus forty million dollars at the end of this fiscal year. How can you, under those circumstances, curry the favor and sycophantically say to taxpayers, "We're going to give you all the breaks in the world," knowing that there isn't the money in the State Treasury to make up these losses. It's ridiculous, it's childish. You say we're dangling a little something. Something is better than nothing. And these projections about this minus forty million dollars is based, and I am unhappily reminding you, on a lagging economy. On the large, increasingly high unemployment rolls. I vote no.

SECRETARY:

...Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper,
Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (Senator Rock)

Request for a call of the absentees. The absentees will be called.
Secretary will call the absentees.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Bidwill, Carroll, Chew, Mitchler, Mohr, Ozinga,
Soper, Sours...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

I think we probably better discuss a few of the illusions. Just
for the record, Senator Lyons, this amendment you have, ah, to decrease
it to \$1,500 dollars, also strikes the revenue replacement provision.
Are you aware of that?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lyons.

SENATOR LYONS:

Yes, I am.

SENATOR SOURS:

All right. Now...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lyons.

SENATOR LYONS:

Can we wait 'til we get the results of the motion to table before we
start talking about the amendment?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

Now, you averted to your magnum opus, Senate Bill 1292. And I
would like to call to your attention that, parading it as the answer

to all of our problems, you were talking about Section 6 in that bill which refers only to government property and that of charitable organizations. That bill, if it had any virtue, would have to be tied in with Section 5. Now, we're talking about this being ridiculous, Senator Partee, I have in front of me what purports to be some of...a photo copy of some of the official records of the assessor's office of Cook County. Let me tell you what they do up there, when I hear all of these great protestations, because this is important in this bill.

PRESIDENT:

The motion...Point of order is that the motion before the body is the motion to table the amendment. The Senator will confine himself to that. We are also on roll call.

SENATOR SOURS:

Yes. Yes, and this is by way of explanation why this should be tabled, because if this bill does not become the law, then such corporations such as the ABC Electrotype; the claim was nine thousand thirty-one dollars, the judgment was three hundred and eighty-six dollars. That's the amount of the tax. The Abolition Products; the claim was seven thousand four hundred, settled for thirteen hundred seventy-nine dollars. Then we have the Accurate Casting Products seventy-nine hundred dollars, settled for twenty-one hundred dollars. The Ace Foundry, fifteen thousand reduced to six hundred ninety-two. The Ace Lumber, twenty-eight thousand. When I see matters like this in the county where it is alleged it will not be able to survive, I feel like vomiting. I vote aye.

PRESIDENT:

On that question the yeas are 21, the nays are 26. The motion to table does not prevail. Is it...Senator Lyons.

SENATOR LYONS:

Mr. President, I move the adoption of amendment number 2 again.

PRESIDENT:

The motion is for the adoption of amendment number 2. Is it

acceptable to reverse the roll call on this. It is not acceptable.

Senator Knuppel.

SENATOR KNUPPTEL:

No. In this instance, as I said before, neither of these bills adequately address themselves to the problems of the State of Illinois. A fifteen hundred dollar exemption or deduction is inadequate. The ten thousand dollar deduction and that system that had been set up doesn't address itself to reasonableness and neither does it address itself to replacement. In a state where there is to be forty million dollar deficit, where we can't meet the needs of education, where we can't meet the clear mandate of the Constitution that the state shall be primarily responsible for education, where we can't abolish the sales tax on food and drugs under, under ah, Senate Bills 117, 118, 119 and 120; we certainly can't afford to lose this revenue. Now, I'm not saying that we can cut taxes; and nobody in this body, I think, can stand here and be irresponsible enough to say that we can take off so many taxes without replacing them. This is a ploy directed to the voting public and their constituency. We have to start here and now to reconstruct our entire thinking about how we raise revenue in the State of Illinois. We have to talk about a graduated income tax for educational purposes in accordance with the resolution and the amendment which I proposed in this body. We have to talk, if we take off the ten thousand dollar deduction, how and where we can more fairly replace that tax.

PRESIDENT:

Just, just, ... For what purpose does Senator Clarke arise?

SENATOR CLARKE:

What order of business are we on?

PRESIDENT:

We are on the order of the adoption of amendment number 2

SENATOR CLARKE:

Well, are we calling the roll?

PRESIDENT:

No, we are not.

SENATOR CLARKE:

Well, then what is this speech about?

PRESIDENT:

This...We are on debate on the amendment.

SENATOR CLARKE:

Debate.

PRESIDENT:

Debate on the amendment.

SENATOR CLARKE:

Debate is all over.

PRESIDENT:

No. The motion was to lay on the table. That motion was defeated. We then revert to the amendment. The amendment is now before the body and the Chair asked whether we couldn't simply reverse the roll call and there was objection to that and Senator Knuppel indicated that he wanted to debate it and he has that right and Senator Knuppel is recognized.

SENATOR KNUPPEL:

Well, I understand what I'm being told and I appreciate all that. I still feel very strongly that this body, both sides, have come here with two bills that have not been adequately considered, that we have not taken the time that is necessary; and I'm asking everyone in this body, not just me to reconsider and change my vote, but everybody to reconsider where we stand in the light of time and history with respect to reorienting our tax situation. Now I personally cannot vote for the fifteen hundred dollar exemption; and I, I will when the vote comes, and I do want a roll call on it, I will vote no.

PRESIDENT:

The...Is it acceptable Senator Knuppel, if you are recorded in the negative and then the vote is 25 to 22. Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

This being my bill, I'd like to make a few comments before we put this miserable amendment on it.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Sours is recognized.

SENATOR SOURS:

I've heard what goes on today. It's quite evident that the other side of this Chamber just doesn't want to give, now...and I'm not worried about next year because that is just pie in the sky. They don't want to give relief now or in the future. They've got a great thing going for them, but let me tell you, gentlemen; if I campaign, and I propose to, I'm going to tell this story over and over again and lay it right at the threshold where it belongs, because we've seen it here today. You want to give the poor taxpayer some personal property taxation relief, and what do you do? You hand them a crumb. You tell me that's candor. I'm going to devote a campaign to this and I hope they send the rascals home empty handed.

PRESIDENT:

Is there objection to the 25 - 22? On that question the amendment is adopted by a vote of 25 yeas and 22 nays. Are there further amendments? The bill is returned to third reading. Senator...For what purpose does Senator Weaver arise?

SENATOR WEAVER:

Mr. President, I would just like to announce that with seven and a half minutes yet to be played, Illinois leads Wisconsin 35 to 27.

PRESIDENT:

Does someone have...We need intervening...Yes. We need intervening business. Can we go to the conference committee report? On House Bill 245. Senator Laughlin is recognized.

SENATOR LAUGHLIN:

Mr. President, members of the Senate. This is the report of the conference committee appointed to consider the question of an implied

consent law. As you may recall, it is the second conference committee, and I'm pleased to report, first of all, that nine of the ten members of the committee have signed it, and that the tenth member, Senator Chew, is not available because of illness. And so, we can say that this is a bi-partisan effort. I want first of all...and I don't intend to take much time if you don't mind, because I'm pretty tired. First of all I want to pay tribute to the members of the conference committee who all participated, made suggestions, many of which I think were good; and of course with many things like this, I doubt that anybody has the bill just the way he would like it. And frankly I want to thank the press of the State of Illinois for the editorial support which almost uniformly and constantly helped advise the populous of the importance of this subject. I don't like to go into great detail. I'd rather try and make some comments in general that I think are significant. You will recall that one of the House amendments said that the implied consent law should apply only when there was a collision. This was discussed in the conference committee and on a close vote it was decided that that provision should not be contained in this law and it is not. Another House amendment, which had been approved, stated that if a person was acquitted or the charge was dismissed of driving under the influence, then the suspension would be lifted or, if it hadn't commenced, could not take place under the implied consent law. This was discussed in the conference committee. A vote was taken. It was close, and that provision is not in this law. Another important matter was the question of whether or not the mandatory revocation of a driver's license after a conviction for driving under the influence of intoxicating liquor should remain, or whether the judge should be given discretionary powers. On another close vote in the conference committee, it was determined that the present law should be retained so there is no change in that respect. Another significant change is that this bill provides for the use of machines which test and automatically print out the results. I'm

not sure how much the machines cost. I'm satisfied from the knowledge that I've gained that they are better than machines presently being used and I think it is important to the citizenry that if they're going to consent to this law...consent to the taking of a breath test, the best machine available should be...All right. I could go into other things. There are...One last think I'll mention, which I think is significant: Under Senate Bill 55, for example, and the other bills, the matter of whether or not there had been a refusal with all the warning, notice, and so forth, was to be determined by a hearing officer of the Secretary of State. And I think very wisely the conference committee unanimously agreed that this hearing should take place in the court. So that I, like anybody, have mixed feelings about this bill, but I think it's a good bill. And as you know, I sponsored by far the toughest bill that ever passed here, and I can live with this bill. I don't know what two years, four years will show. One other provision I'll mention to you; this bill contains a novel provision, and that is that if you agree to take the test you do it in writing and you're required to take two tests at least 15 minutes apart. How this will work out ultimately, I don't know. I would earnestly and sincerely solicit your support. I have been living with this thing for four or six years and I ask your support for what I think is a good conference committee report.

PRESIDENT:

Is there further discussion? Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Groen.

SENATOR GROEN:

Mr. President, I...I simply can't understand this. Every state in the Union has this, but Illinois. We need this; there is no question

about it. I would ask every member of this body to consider their silence, to consider their no vote if they are voting no, and support this conference committee report. I vote aye.

SECRETARY:

...Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuapfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Neistein.

SENATOR NEISTEIN:

Mr. President and members of the Senate. I endorse all that Senator Laughlin has said. The conference committee worked hard and long, and I want to compliment Senator Laughlin and State Representative Howard Carroll in the House who worked 24 hours a day to whip this in shape. Senator Swinarski, Senator Chew, Senator Fawell, Representative Redmond and all the rest of the committee. In this business, a word is the only asset a politician has, and I never go back on my word. I have never violated it. That's the only asset a person in politics has. I heard the T.V. report a few days ago of the Chief Executive of our State, Governor Ogilvie, in which he made a T.V. broadcast. He said implied consent, I don't know where it's going because Senator Neistein is holding it up, but I want you to know that was never the case and I think he knew it was never the case. Because maybe...I know I've known him for many years and he knows me...I thought he knew me...and he knew that Senator Partee, the President pro tem, who is the one that should get the most credit, I think, in having this measure pass this body. He should have known that the men on this side of the aisle are statesmen. That the welfare of all the people of the State of Illinois is what comes first, not partisanship, but statesmanship. Illinois stood to lose \$40 million from the road program. The Secretary of Transportation, John Volpe, announced that Illinois needed the implied consent law. And when Senator Laughlin says how hard we worked in committee and the

compromises that were offered; I told Senator Laughlin at the conference committee, "You remind me of the compromise that you're offering like Senator Swanson and Rich Mathias, you give a straw hat for an overcoat." And I told him the story that George W. Pullman, who built the Pullman cars and set up a new city and clearing, and he wanted to bring a new horizon to the southern part of Cook County and he engaged a sensational architect in New York by the name of George Baker, I think was his name; and George Pullman sat down with George Baker and he said, "I want you to build the greatest area here, housing, factory, etc. and plan it." Now George Baker was a very haughty and egotistical man, and when he had finished the project he went to George Pullman and he said to George Pullman, "What are we going to name this area in this city?" And George Pullman told George Baker, "You know you're right, we ought to compromise. We'll use each of our names. We'll call this the George Pullman area." And that's the kind of compromise that Senator Laughlin and Senator Swanson, Rich Mathias and the rest offered. Now, it was never the position of the Democrats to hold back implied consent. There never was a party position. There was just a question of what bill would pass this Chamber, and what bill or law would be beneficial to all the people of the entire State. The members on this side didn't get up and say that the boundary of the State ends at the boundary line of Cook County. The members of this committee, the Democratic members and especially the President pro tem, Cecil Partee, who gets the lion's share of the credit, in my estimation, for having this bill pass this Chamber. He didn't say, "Well, it ends at Cook County and we're not going to take care of all the people of Illinois and we're not going to level charges that Mayor Daley was on the telephone or you didn't hear from him or you did hear from him.", but the members on this side of the aisle measured up to their task. They had to face this problem of the implied consent and I'm happy to say that, through the Herculean efforts of Senator Partee and Senator Swinarski, who while not being a lawyer studied all the law books, I think, by the time he was done with this

conference committee...He can go apply for his law degree. That we
came out with a bill that I say may not be perfect, but I think under
the circumstances, under all the philosophies, all the ideologies, that
it's a bill that will protect all the people of the entire State of
Illinois. And again my dear Governor, if you're listening on the
squawk box downstairs, Senator Neistein didn't block this bill.

Senator Neistein passed this bill with the aid of all the other Senators
here and especially with the aid of the President pro tem, Cecil Partee;
and I'm pleased to vote aye, and I urge all the members on this side
of the aisle to vote aye.

SECRETARY:

...Newhouse...

PRESIDENT:

Continue the roll call.

SECRETARY:

...Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Nihill:

SENATOR NIHILL:

Mr. President and Senators. As you know, Senator Laughlin, that
I opposed this bill many, many times. I can live with this at the
present time. I'm one of the tea totalers in here as I haven't taken a
drink prior to five or six years ago. There's some things in this bill
that I don't like, but I can live with it. I don't want to see nobody
on the highways splattering a car out with five or six young children
in it, the father and mother, and lose their lives. I want to ask one
question though. In paragraph rather number five, that he will receive
a duplicate copy...a duplicate original copy of the results at such time
the test which he's submitted at the request of the police. At what time
can he get these results?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Laughlin.

SENATOR LAUGHLIN:

-- I would assume that if this is an automatic testing device that he can get it almost instantaneously or he can get it later.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Nihill.

SENATOR NIHILL:

Well, what time can his attorney get it them?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Laughlin.

SENATOR LAUGHLIN:

Under the bill the man has 90 minutes in which to contact his attorney, and his attorney can get it as soon as he gets to where the man is or he can get it subsequent to that time.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Nihill.

SENATOR NIHILL:

Don't you think the word "at once" should be put in there?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Laughlin.

SENATOR LAUGHLIN:

Senator Neistein, with all due respect, I...I beg your pardon. I am that tired. Senator Nihill, at this point in time, with the work that has been done, you are looking, frankly, at the seventh draft of the conference committee report, I don't want one change, Sir.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Nihill.

SENATOR NIHILL:

I vote aye.

SECRETARY:

...Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Cherry.

SENATOR CHERRY:

Mr. President and members of the Senate. I withheld my vote on the first roll call because I know of the, I am sure, unintentional remark that the Governor made about our distinguished colleague, Senator Neistein; but after the explanation and knowing how hard and how difficult it was to finally get a bill that is satisfactory, and I think that will resolve itself to the best interests of the people of Illinois and will protect the people on our streets, I vote aye.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Egan.

SENATOR EGAN:

Mr. President and members of the Senate. I think that Senator Laughlin, all of the members of the conference committee are to be commended for their attempts to hammer out some satisfactory...some satisfactory result of all of the ideas that have been incorporated into this bill. I do submit, however, that we would not have an implied consent agreement unless the federal government threatened to withhold funds from Illinois unless we passed this bill. And that comes as interesting enough to me because, albeit Illinois is the last state which does not have an implied consent law, one does not exist in the District of Columbia. I'd certainly like to hear the arguments propounded in Congress and in the Senate of the United States and see if they'll pass one for the District of Columbia. Senator Laughlin, in due respect for all of the efforts that you have made and put forth in this bill, my objection persists the same as it has from the beginning. You're fully aware that I am not one who is shying from the efforts of prosecutors. I have sponsored legislation to try to help prosecution in the State of Illinois. I have lobbied and passed one of the most controversial tough criminal bills in the 76th General Assembly entitled the eavesdropping bill. And so...which you did handle similar, Senator Laughlin, in the Senate. So.

you know my efforts in behalf of law enforcement . But I do want to submit that I think that our system of jurisprudence and also...of criminal jurisprudence, in particular, in this United States and in the State of Illinois, is the finest in the world and is the finest in the history of the world. I have a great deal of confidence in that system. The objection that I have is the little black box into which you breath when a policeman stops you, and in determining your guilt or innocence that little machine is sacrosanct. That's my objection. I've seen that abused. I've seen that machine used to abuse our system or jurisprudence. In my experience, it will not decrease deaths on the highway. It will not decrease accidents. It has not in other states, and it will not in Illinois. I prefer an increased minimum sentence for convicted drivers of under the influence. I would take that route, Senator Laughlin, rather than this. I only say that I vote no. I hope, perhaps, you are right.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Horsley.

SENATOR HORSLEY:

How am I recorded?

PRESIDENT:

You are not.

SENATOR HORSLEY:

I desire to be recorded aye.

PRESIDENT:

Horsley will be...Senator Horsley will be recorded aye. Senator Romano.

SENATOR ROMANO:

Would Senator Neistein yield to a question?

PRESIDENT:

He indicates he will.

SENATOR ROMANO:

I have great respect for Senator Neistein and his staff, and I haven't heard how Walter of his staff feels about this bill and I'd like

an expression from Walter on this.

SENATOR NEISTEIN:

Senator Romano, long before the seven drafts were made, Walter, of my staff, was consulted many, many times. As a matter of fact, he's helped me immeasurably.

PRESIDENT:

Romano aye. Senator Dougherty, you wish...all right. Senator Knuppel. Bruce aye. Senator Knuppel.

SENATOR KNUPPEL:

Mr. Chairman, I know how long and how diligently Senator Laughlin has fought to have a statute on implied consent adopted by the State of Illinois, and I know how hard that Senator Neistein and Senator Partee have worked on this. There has never been any doubt about where John Knuppel's vote was with respect to implied consent. This was determined, as I have said, 48 years ago, and I vote aye.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Hynes.

SENATOR HYNES:

Mr. President and members of the Senate. I do not believe that I'm recorded. I supported the original bill and I will support the conference committee report; and I would like to be recorded as aye. One point that I would raise, however, which I think we are going to have to consider when we return in the Spring, and it is simply this. The relationship between the implied consent law that we are now passing and the no fault insurance coverage which was imposed on the people of the State of Illinois in the last Session. It may be, Senator Laughlin, and I see that the problem has been handled, but it did not come to my knowledge that it had been. In the no fault statute, there is an exclusion of coverage for any person who is found to be intoxicated. The exclusion is not limited to a situation in which a person is adjudged either criminally or civilly to have been intoxicated. The standard of proof in a civil proceeding would be much less than that of a criminal proceeding,

so that I think the interrelationship between these two statutes will have to be carefully considered when we return. I vote aye.

PRESIDENT:

On that question the yeas are 39, the nays are 1. The bill is declared passed. 3734, Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

Mr. President and Senators. In view of the recent amendment to 3647, I'm going to leave both of those bills on the Calendar with this little anecdote. As a fitting memorial to the positive inaction and the duplicity, the story of the young boy whose mother sent him to the grocery store to get a loaf of bread. He forgot what he went to get, and later he was elected to the Illinois State Senate by the Chicago machine. They are going to stay right where they are, gentlemen, as a fitting memorial and it's going to be a sore thumb. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT:

For what purpose does Senator Lyons arise.

SENATOR LYONS:

Well, if the Senator has no intention of calling the bill, I'd like to call mine.

PRESIDENT:

You're talking about Senate Bill 1292. Is this...Senator Partee, is it okay to go ahead on Senate Bill 1292 next then?

SENATOR PARTEE:

Yes, I would hope, though, that we don't get involved in extensive debate about it. We've just debated the subject already and everybody... You could tell us what it does and we could take a roll call. One way or the other.

PRESIDENT:

Senate Bill 1292, Senator Lyons.

SENATOR LYONS:

Well, Senate Bill...

PRESIDENT:

Just, Just a moment. For what purpose does Senator Clarke arise.

SENATOR CLARKE:

I just want to make sure, Mr. President, that this is their next bill on the call rather than in place of Hudson Sour's bill.

PRESIDENT:

You...Senator Clarke's point is well taken. The next bill...next bill should be the Republican bill. Senator Clarke. Pardon. Well, that was a conference committee. We're not counting conference committees here, so that, Senator Clarke your bill would be next, 3680, if you wish...Senator ParTEE.

SENATOR PARTEE:

Well, if you want to call a Republican bill, I have George Burditt's bill, Representative Burditt's bill.

PRESIDENT:

Well, in fairness, it's a Republican bill, but it's on your list and so I'm alternating lists. 3680, Senator Clarke.

SENATOR CLARKE:

Mr. President, this is the highway billboard bill that Senator Dougherty asked me to hold up last night, or yesterday afternoon, while they checked it out, and then we got distracted in some other business that took us quite awhile. Fundamentally, it's a fairly complicated bill that is aimed at meeting the federal standards so that the State of Illinois will not lose some \$32,000,000 in federal grants, and I would ask for your support.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

Mr. President and members of the Senate. What Senator Clarke says is true. He called the bill early last evening. I asked him to hold it up. I did not think it was going to be held up as long as it has. It is a good bill and I urge the support of this bill.

PRESIDENT:

The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Harris aye. Saperstein aye. Nihill aye. Bruce no. Hynes aye. Johns no. McBroom aye. Lyons aye. On that question the yeas are 33, the nays are 1. The bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 1292, Senator Lyons.

SENATOR LYONS:

Before we get to that, Mr. President, I'd like...having voted on the prevailing side, I'd like to move that the vote by which amendment number 2 to House Bill 3734 was adopted.

PRESIDENT:

Be reconsidered...Motion by Senator Partee to table. All in favor of the motion to table signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. Motion to table prevails. Senate Bill 1292.

SENATOR LYONS:

Senate Bill 1292, Mr. President and members of the Senate, in its amended form, does this: It abolishes the tax on personal property. I repeat, it abolishes the tax on personal property except for certain enumerated classes. Those classes are: property...And the distinction is as to the nature of the property, not the person who owns it, legal person or natural person. The distinction is as to the nature of the property and not who owns it, which is what the Supreme Court has

told us is the kind of law that must be drawn. It abolishes the tax on personal property except for income producing property as that term is applied under the provisions of the Federal Income Tax Code of 1954. So, what it does is exactly what the amendment which was adopted by the voters last Fall sought to do; which was to take the tax once and for all off individuals in their own private estates. It does not...I repeat, it does not abolish the tax on income producing property, corporations and so forth. It takes it off individuals...It has the effect of taking it off individuals; really it takes it off non-income producing property. Another thing that this bill does, however, with respect to the income producing property which is used in agriculture, there is a \$5,000 deduction of that property; so that the first \$5,000 that any farmer has in personal property is excluded from the roll. I am told that this produces a tax saving, for want of a better term, in the typical downstate community of \$300 per farmer. We did this because the, the amendment that was offered to the voters last Fall was meant to take the tax off individuals, specifically wage earners, in their own private estate. Really, when you think about it, the small farmer is just as much a wage earner as anybody else does even though his personal property technically does produce income for federal income tax purposes. He gets up early in the morning and he works till at night half of the time. He doesn't make that much money. He could be considered a wage earner just like anyone else can. This amendment, therefore, is designed to give relief to the little guy who was supposed to get it when the Constitutional amendment passed seven to one last Fall. We think that the bill is constitutional in every respect. And we ask the support of the membership for this bill.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Coulson.

SENATOR COULSON:

I would like to raise a question about this, particularly with

reference to intangible income producing property such as stocks and bonds. I think we are all aware that it is the tradition in Illinois to simply not report this. I've only known one taxpayer in my whole experience who listed her savings account bank balance as personal property and paid a rate of 3.8 on an asset which was only producing interest of 3.5. Now whenever you exempt personal property except income producing property, it seems to me you are going to require the assessor and require each of us to tabulate all of this stock and bonds; and instead of taking a tax from people, you're going to find many a taxpayer who owns one car and a household of furniture and \$30,000 in stocks backpaying a personal property tax five times what he used to pay. Is it contemplated that somehow we're going to believe that...or suggest to the assessors, in addition to what is stated in the bill, shut your eyes about this intangible income producing stocks and bonds; or how do we face that directly?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lyons.

SENATOR LYONS:

Well, let me say this, Senator Coulson, I assumed...Well, let me put it a different way. When I said income producing property, I meant the income producing property that's listed in the bill. That is, what I really meant to say was business property. In other words, the property that a person owns in his own private estate comes off the roll, in the first sentence of this bill, and nothing following below puts it back on. Stocks, bonds, cash; therefore, are not taxable. It is income producing business property, therefore, as that term is applied under the Federal Income Tax Code, which would be on the roll if this bill becomes the law. The property that an individual owns in his own private estate even though technically, it does produce some income, cash and a savings account, for instance, is not on the roll and is not contemplated to be placed on the roll. It is taken, as a matter of fact, off the roll by this bill.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Clarke.

SENATOR CLARKE:

Mr. President, I would like to speak to this bill, because I think that this bill clearly reveals...and the explanation of it clearly reveals the interest of the other side in the citizens of this State and in their commitments to those citizens. This bill in effect provides that we will continue the same kind of treatment in the City of Chicago that now prevails. Do you know that in the City of Chicago they don't even send out forms to individuals. So they're not worrying about the personal property tax on individuals. They don't send them out. They, as an afterthought, as I pointed out, gave a \$5,000 sop to the farmers downstate. Well, is everyone downstate a farmer? Let me point out that the tremendous speech, the bleeding heart speech on the previous bill about the loss of revenue for the City of Chicago was...in Cook County was quickly glossed over despite the fact that another Senator from downstate said 80% of the farmers will be exempted. How's that revenue to be made up? There's no explanation. Let me just point out that various facts were related as to specific assessments and the collections which were far short in Cook County; and it is a fact that is on the record that there are two former members of the Assessor's Office in Cook County that are on their way to the federal penitentiary right now for just that type of practice, and that is in the record. It's a fact. I would just suggest that this bill...

PRESIDENT:

Just...For what purpose does Senator Nihill arise?

SENATOR NIHILL:

Point of a privilege. They're going to the penitentiary until they're convicted. They've got a right to go to trial and heard by a judge, court or jury. They're not convicted. They're not on the way to the penitentiary under no circumstances.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Clarke will confine himself to the bill at hand. Senator Clarke.

SENATOR CLARKE:

The bill at hand relates to the assessment of personal property and one of those men has been convicted and is on his way. His name is Armento, incidentally. I would just say that this bill reflects not the State of Illinois, not for the citizens of Illinois; but for the City of Chicago. And they're looking out for their own, you can bet. And we're going to let the people of the State of Illinois know that it was your side that filibustered a personal property tax bill to death yesterday that could have given relief to everybody in the State of Illinois. I urge the people on this side to vote no.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lyons may close the debate.

SENATOR LYONS:

Well, I believe that the application of the Federal Income Tax Code is the same downstate as it is in Cook County. Therefore, when individuals are taken, under the provisions of this bill, off the personal property tax rolls in Cook County, they are taken off the personal property tax rolls downstate. That would be completely clear to anybody who would have taken the trouble to read the bill. Apparently not too many people have. Now, whether or not individuals have been on the roll in Chicago or Cook County up until now is really off the point. Although, I noticed in the Chicago Tribune today that in the City, where personal property is supposed to be such a nullity, \$84,000,000 is going to be used next year as part of the corporate levy on personal property. The individuals downstate will be taken off the personal property tax rolls by this bill just as much as the individuals in Cook County will be taken off the rolls; and when the people voted to take... to abolish the personal property tax last November, they were abolishing it on individuals. That's what the thing said. Nobody voted last

November to take it off Illinois Bell or General Motors or U. S. Steel or Republic Steel or anybody else. Just off individuals. This bill takes the personal property tax off individuals; upstate, downstate, across state, inside out state. They're off. That's what everybody says that they want to do. Let's see how many of you vote to do it.

PRESIDENT:

The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

I'd just like to comment that under the old Constitution, under which we lived for a hundred years and under which it said that all property shall be taxed equally, I had, during the time that I can remember being associated with county and township government innumerable people move into my area from Chicago astounded that they had to pay personal property tax in Lake County and said, and I quote, "We never paid it in Chicago." Now, that was the constitutional requirement. I wonder what the new Constitution does really mean, and I must admit to an abysmal misunderstanding of this dismal document. I vote no.

SECRETARY:

...Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Coulson.

SENATOR COULSON:

Just briefly, Senator Lyons, I don't want to quarrel with you, but I just can't be satisfied with the answer given. I have read the bill. It depends on interpretations of the Internal Revenue Code, and if I may take a chapter from Senator Knuppel's or is it Knuppel, I forget, I get that mixed up, book and trace his biography. I am, as fairly as

can be designated, a stock speculator. I abandoned the practice of law when I came into this Legislature. I don't practice law at all to avoid conflicts of interest. I play the stock market, frankly, and I've sent my children through college by doing that. I started out with my army mustering out pay. I don't start out at the age of scarlet fever and diarrhea as you did, Sir, but I'll skip that part of my biography. All right, under the federal regulations, I am holding all of my stocks for profit, for investment. I would have to pay a personal property tax on that whole thing. You're not doing me any favor by exempting everything I've got except that. This is a terrifying prospect for a person in my position. So, I do have that conflict of interest, that I would be paying a personal property tax more than my annual earnings on some good years in the market, because selling the market short, playing the grain market, some of these things are literally within the terms of the Revenue Code. And I simply can't accept your explanation that I could cheat and that the assessor would say, "Oh, go ahead and forget about that. We're not interested." I'm not going to be at the mercy of the assessor that way. So, I have to vote no.

SECRETARY:

...Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Knuppel.

SENATOR KNUPPEL:

I can't support this bill, I'm sorry to say, because first of all, I think, I'd like to see the farmers get this \$5,000 exemption, but I don't think that this kind of classification can hold up where stock in trade of a man whose running a business and an inventory has to pay on it and the farmer doesn't. I think we'd be right back in the courts. I think this is as poorly drafted as the other legislation. I don't see why property that produces income should both, first of all, bear the burden of an income tax and then turn around and bear the burden of

a personal property tax. This is comparable to the Nixon policy of high interest rates where, as I said before, you're separating all the roosters from the capons. You're putting an intolerable burden on the man who owns property to produce income to employ other people. You're going to break the whole economy down with high interest rates and high tax rates; all of it falling on the roosters and none of it on the capons. The people won't invest their money to expand their facilities. Corporations won't expand theirs and where you think you're helping the laboring man, in the end, there'll be no jobs for him. That's why we have so many people on welfare. That's why we have so many people unemployed, and I say that none of the approaches that have been taken here...and this is unfortunate. I don't know why, but none of the approaches that have been taken have really addressed themselves to the problems created by the vote of the people in November of last year and the new Constitution. Now in Section 5 of Article 9, it says that none of the lost personal personal property tax will be taken by raising the ad valorem levy on real estate. Now, where is it going to come from. This money has to come from some place. Now, we're either going to have to do it in some form of a statewide tax on personal property...and that means that the personal property then which is taxed will have to pay the burden for that which is exempted. We don't gain anything. We just move it around in the same tub. We put it on the east side of the tub instead of the west side of the tub. We don't gain anything. None of this legislation really and surely has addressed itself to the problem we have; and I don't see how we can responsibly go out of here without doing something, but that appears to be what we are going to do.

I vote no.

SECRETARY:

...Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lyons.

SENATOR LYONS:

I just like to say in explaining my vote, which is in the affirmative, aye, that I think that Senator Coulson either doesn't know what this bill did or didn't know what the, what the Constitutional Amendment that was passed by the voters last Fall did. If it is a terrifying concept to take off the roll various intangible personal property, this General Assembly was not very terrified when it passed by a vote of over two-thirds the Constitutional Amendment that went on the ballot. If it's terrifying now, it was just as terrifying then and I don't recall then anybody saying much about it. Everybody was standing in line to vote aye on the matter because they thought that the people wanted to get off the roll. That's all that this bill does, and this bill does not take anything off the roll that was not taken off under the provisions of the Constitutional Amendment that was passed last November, whether it was terrifying or not. I vote aye.

SECRETARY:

...McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Merritt.

SENATOR MERRITT:

Mr. President and members of the Senate. I know the hour is getting late. I talked once on the other bill, 3734 I believe, that would have given just barely token relief to certainly the good farmers in my area. I can't see that this is going to accomplish anything but just plain old dangle something in front of their face again; and in the case that I mentioned to you awhile ago, and this would be a very small farmer, he's going to pay at least \$900. You're going to give him \$250 back, and then at the same time rob your county treasury with no replacement for monies to go back to the local taxing districts. Now, I just want to remind many of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle who represent similarly districts like mine, the rural district, these farmers are really solid people. In my opinion, they're the salt of the earth, and

barely hanging on in an economy...in a price squeeze they find themselves in now. And you don't find them rabble-rousers at meetings. You find them reasonable, decent people. But believe you me, those that come from districts like I do, and you know who you are, you just face them after this and they'll do a lot of silent maneuvering by next election time and you'll see it in the voting. I vote no.

SECRETARY:

...Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Horsley.

SENATOR HORSLEY:

I've listened to this with a great deal of interest and I've studied it and I don't want it to appear in the record that I have escaped my responsibility by not voting; so I might as well vote no because that's the way I feel about what's going here, and I want to be recorded no.

PRESIDENT:

Sours no. Senator Lyons.

SENATOR LYONS:

Would you call the absentees, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

Call the absentees.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Bidwill, Carpentier, Carroll, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Davidson, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Harris, Knuepfer, Latherow, Laughlin, McBroom, Mitchler, Mohr, Ozinga, Soper, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Clarke no. Is Senator Cherry recorded? Cherry aye. On that question the yeas are 25, the nays are 13. 1 present. The bill is declared lost. On...Senator Bruce is handling House Bill 3674 for.

Senator Laughlin and House Bill 3...Excuse me. Before we go to that, I promised Senator Harris that we would go to concurrence in House amendments to Senate Bills 1182 and 1183. Senator Harris.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Mr. President, this message came over a couple of days ago and I didn't have a chance to check through this amendment. I have done so. I assure everyone here that this bill now deals entirely with new subject matter. The bill as introduced has been stripped in its entirety. There are 4 provisions that now will go into the law. Same action on both bills. Provides by law 3 present procedures by rule of the board. It requires that any group seeking to register with the board must give the names and addresses of anyone holding a beneficial interest in the license seeking to register. Any...Second, any 25% change in ownership of the licensee corporation must be approved by the Racing Board. Campaign contributions by the racing licensees will be prohibited by law. This is done by rule today. The fourth item, anyone owning 5% or more of any organization doing business with any licensed...any licensee, by the Board, will be required to register their identity with the Board. These are just reform bills, nothing dealing with the original subject matter of the bills. I move to concur in the amendments.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Knuppel.

SENATOR KNUPPEL:

These bills received quite a good deal of heat when they came through here before. We've had a long session here today and...in fact, all week, and I, personally, have no objections if these bills do what the Senator says they do; but I'm very skeptical of...All right. I'd like to see the bills...

PRESIDENT:

Just a moment. Just a moment. One person at a time. Senator Knuppel has the floor.

SENATOR KNUPPEL:

And the Senator knows how I feel about these bills and I'd like to see them...since they're completely rewritten, he says, I'd see them go to committee and be heard. I mean, I just don't particularly care for bringing these things back here saying they're completely new bills. We don't have time to examine them when we haven't had time to address ourselves to many other important things. And I, personally...I've not even seen these. I asked for them just this moment, what these amendments do. I haven't had a chance to read them; and I, I feel since it's completely new bill...And I may not be opposed to them at all when I've had time to read them and study them. I think they should go to committee.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Partee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

Just in the interest, if I can, of moving things along. We have seen these amendments, our staff has checked them, we've looked at them and it does not change the subject matter under consideration, I know there's some hostility basically to the bills, themselves. But the amendments simply codify rules which are now in existence by the commission...the department or whatever it is; the entity involved. Now, that's all they do. These amendments simply are really an ethics kind of consideration. That's all they are.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Harris.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Well, Mr. President, I took the amendments over to Senator Partee after we were on the motion...or the order of concurrence this morning. It was several hours ago. His staff thoroughly checked them. And that was one of the reasons I asked for the delay this morning was so that they could be reassured that these amendments did precisely did what I have represented them to be. Now, these bills do have an immediate

effect clause on them. They require 35 votes. I think these amendments to these Acts are sound, and I will press the motion to concur in the House amendments to 1182 and 1183.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Gilbert. Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Knuppel.

SENATOR KNUPPEL:

Surely all who watch us must be appalled. Nobody's had a chance to read these, even. Maybe Harris and Partee. I just can't come here into this body and legislate by hearsay. I, I, I think it's hideous. These, these bills...We were told what they did before and they surely didn't do what they were represented to do before, and I still adhere to the statements that I made at that time. I have no way of knowing. I may not have anything against the bills. I don't see how anybody can look with favor upon the method of legislation where we have to stand here and be told by someone who tried to put a bill through here before that wasn't what it was supposed to be, and now we're told it's all right and I'm supposed to stand here and vote for it. I just can't understand these other Legislators who would vote for bills based purely on hearsay or being told by somebody that it's a good bill. I vote no.

SECRETARY:

...Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Request for a call of the absentees. The absentees will be called.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Bidwill, Carpentier, Carroll, Chew, Davidson, Fawell, Hall, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Newhouse, Nihill, Ozinga, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarksi, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

On that question the yeas are 27; the nays are 1, 2 present. The Senate does not concur in the House amendments. Senator Bruce is handling 3674 for Senator Laughlin and 3623 and 3624 are related to the same subject which are Senator Bruce's bills. Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Yes, now, there's amendment to each of the three bills. I'd like to have permission of the body to move them all back one at a time and we'll adopt them.

PRESIDENT:

There are amendments to all three and I understand that the amendments are similar. Is that correct, Senator Bruce?

SENATOR BRUCE:

That is correct!

PRESIDENT:

Can you explain the amendments and then we'll adopt them all in one roll call.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Let's just explain them one at a time. On 3674, the amendment relates to where judicial officers will appear on the Primary ballot. It changes it so that they appear after county officers and before city officials. I move its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. The amendment is adopted. Third reading.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Alright. On 3623 there are two changes. One is to change the number of petition signers you need. In the Hart bill there was 200, we've added . . . changed that to 500 to make it parallel to the Lindberg bill. It also changes the same thing by making judicial officers after county and before city.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion? All . . . Senator Sours.

SENATOR SOURS:

Now, the number of signers, Mr. President, to what office are we talking about . . . are we referring?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Yes. We are talking about the election of judicial officers. That is the judges, Senator. I move its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. The amendment is adopted. Third reading. 3624, Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

... amendments adopted, John.

PRESIDENT:

We're getting all the amendments then we will have the bills.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Alright. Amendment number one to House bill ...no...there is an amendment to 3624...House Bill 3624, Senator Horsley. Amendment number one. It changes and makes, inserts two changes in the bill. 1. To make sure that circuit judges who are appointed will also be covered by the primaries- when they stand for election. Also the reference bureau made an error and left out counties between 45,000, but less than 60,000. So it reinserts that language. There was no intention to take that out of the bill. I move its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

Is there objection? All in favor signify by saying aye.
Contrary minded. The amendment is adopted. Is there objection to having the same roll call on all three bills? Leave is granted. The--the matter before the body now is the passage of the three bills. Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Yes. 3674...

PRESIDENT:

We're on all three bills on one passage.

SENATOR BRUCE:

That's right. If I can just explain them briefly...

PRESIDENT:

Alright.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Ah, 3674 relates to a judge filing for retention. Under the new Constitution they must file with not more than...not less than six months before they stand for election. This creates a problem that the Constitutional Convention has left us with, in that a judge could fail to file for retention until after the time for primary had occurred. If he did so, that position would be filled by appointment. It was not the intention in the earlier section of the Constitution which said they could be elected either by primary or petition. The bill merely states that they must file with the Secretary of State seven days before the Primary date for filing for Primaries their intention to stand for re-election. On 3623 and 3624. They relate to election in the primary of judges. The Constitution says it may be by either Primary or petition. The election laws ... election code is changed to include judges in the Primary. We also, as mentioned in both the amendment and in the Lindberg bill, 3674, that they will require 500 petition signers to get on the Primary

ballot. On 3624, it preserves the current procedure and makes sure ... and makes clear that any associate judge who has become a circuit judge because of the new Constitution, and is elected or appointed, will be elected at the next election from the county in which he was elected or appointed rather than the circuit as it is done for circuit judges.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Gilbert.

SENATOR GILBERT:

Ah...Senator Laughlin had to leave. He asked me to speak in behalf of these bills and he arranged with Senator Bruce to handle them. I have had great interest in these bills because of some of the problems that developed down in our area. I urge all of you to support them. They are necessary; they are good law.

PRESIDENT:

The Secretary will call the roll. These bills require 35 votes.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Knuppel.

SENATOR KNUPPEL:

I don't think this solves all the problems, but I think it discriminates against those men who were circuit judges and had to run over the entire circuit, and apparently still do have to run over the entire circuit, as opposed to associate circuit judges; and now

we have the salaries fixed at the same level. Now, I'm not a great ... you know, the judges aren't a great favorite of mine, but I do believe in fairness, and it costs a great deal more for someone who has to be elected as circuit judge from a circuit of a couple of hundred thousand people to campaign than it does an associate circuit judge. It seems to me that when we get back there we are either going to have to do some changing or we are going to have to change some salaries again so that it is fair between the people who have to run over the whole circuit and those who don't. I think it is an improvement and I am going to vote aye.

PRESIDENT:

On that question the yeas are 38; the nays are none. The bills are declared passed. 206, Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Mr. President and members of the Senate. 206 is a companion bill to 205 passed by the Senate and deliberated. And deletes the State prohibition. The reason why we need 206 because this prohibition appeared in two separate sections in the statute. One in the election code and one in the alcohol liquor. Now, ah, I ask for a favorable roll call on this. All objections have been removed to this.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Partee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

On this one we do ... there is a need for 35 votes and I would certainly hope that we could get them. It would look ridiculous if we passed one bill that relates to a single subject matter, pass one that amends one section of the statute and not pass the other that amends the second section of the statute. I talked to Senator Clarke and Coulson and I would appreciate a vote here so we can get this straightened out.

PRESIDENT:

Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Knuppel aye. Newhouse aye. Hynes aye. Nihill aye. Coulson aye. Palmer aye. Bruce no. Call the absentees.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Bidwill, Carpentier, Carroll, Chew, Davidson, Fawell, Groen, Harris, Knuepfer, Latherow, Laughlin, Merritt, Mohr, Ozinga, Savickas, Soper, Sours, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Bruce.

SENATOR BRUCE:

How am I recorded, Mr. Secretary?

PRESIDENT:

You are recorded in the negative.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Would you change my no to aye, please.

PRESIDENT:

Bruce aye. On that question the yeas are 36; the nays are 2. The bill is declared passed. Is Senator Latherow on the floor? Senator Graham, 3571. Pardon. What ... 3571.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

That's--that's the Cook County Board of--

PRESIDENT:

That is the--

SENATOR GRAHAM:

...Court release bill.

PRESIDENT:

No. That is the Revenue Act to provide homestead exemption.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

Oh! Yes. My House sponsor put 3671 on the ... That's right. This bill grants the homestead exemption to residents of cooperative apartments. At the present time owners of condominium units, who over 65 years of age, qualify for the 15 thou...15 hundred homestead exemption. However, cooperative apartment residents, because they do not own their units--

PRESIDENT:

Just a moment. For what purpose Senator Coulson arise?

SENATOR COULSON:

A point of parliamentary procedure. I am sorry to interrupt you, Senator Graham, but I have just learned that the House has refused to adjourn tonight. They are not passing the adjournment resolution. Now, we still have to act upon at least one bill on our staggered terms proposal, which is extremely important to us Senators, and we're just barely with one vote to spare so I would urge every member to stay here and don't assume we are quitting tonight because the House has not adopted the adjournment resolution.

PRESIDENT:

Yes. And if ... Senator Graham, if you will forgive the Chair, I promised to take up two conference committee reports before the next bill. So we will get to...back to you in just a moment. We have some conference committee reports and some reports from the--

SECRETARY:

This is on House Bill 2899.

PRESIDENT:

2899. Who is the ... it's a conference committee report.

SECRETARY:

The committee was Knuepfer, Romano, Donnewald.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Donnewald, is this your--

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

Yes, Mr. President, what that does, it merely makes it...puts the emergency clause on it requiring the immediate action on it. That's all that it does.

PRESIDENT:

2899, conference committee report adds the emergency clause.

That means we need 35 votes. The Secretary will call the roll call.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

O'Brien aye. Vadalabene aye. Palmer aye. Hynes aye. Bruce aye. Nihill aye. Collins aye. Horsley aye. On that question the yeas are 35; the nays are none. The conference committee report is accepted. We have another conference committee report.

SECRETARY:

It is on House Bill 3560. Senator Rock.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Yes. Mr. President. This is the bill which fixes the number of signatures that are required on our own nominating petitions. We had...we had amended it to take off the maximum and to increase the minimum. The people in the House did not like the size of the minimum so we have now reduced the minimum. The number of signatures that we as Senators will require on our nominating petitions has been reduced to 300. The congressmen have been reduced to 600. And I would add that this takes 35 votes and it will be effective immediately.

PRESIDENT:

Motion for the adoption of the conference committee report.

Secretary will...Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons--

PRESIDENT:

Horsley aye.

SECRETARY:

... McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Nihill aye. On that question the yeas are 35; the nays are none. The conference committee report is accepted. We have messages from

the House. Senator Donnewald.

SECRETARY:

Senate Bill Number 1280. Senator Donnewald's bill.

PRESIDENT:

Senate Bill 1280.

SECRETARY:

And it's on ... it's House Amendment number one. This is the bill that is the effective date.

PRESIDENT:

Senate Bill 1280.

SECRETARY:

1280.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Donnewald.

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

That's where the candidate for Governor and Lieutenant Governor run independently. The amendment on that, I believe, ah ... wait a minute.

PRESIDENT:

The ... I am advised by the Secretary the amendment puts an effective date on the bill.

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

Right.

PRESIDENT:

So it requires 35 votes.

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

It requires 35 votes. That is correct.

PRESIDENT:

Will the members be in their seats, please. Secretary will call the roll.

PRESIDENT:

Just a moment. Senator Donnewald, I am advised this is a different bill than the one you described. Senator Donnewald.

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

I have looked it up. It's the treasure's bill. They failed to ... when they drafted the bill they failed to put the emergency clause on it. It was attached in the House and came over here for concurrence.

PRESIDENT:

Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley.

PRESIDENT:

Just a moment. The Secretary cannot hear. Let's have some order. Gentlemen.

SECRETARY:

... Horsley...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Horsley.

SENATOR HORSLEY:

I want to make sure what we're doing here. This was explained as the Lieutenant Governor and Governor deal.

PRESIDENT:

He changed it later, Senator. Senator Donnewald.

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

Senator, I will repeat that. This is the bill where he has a facsimile as a signature on the ah ... on the highway bond issue. He has many, many times to write his name and he says he doesn't have time to do it. This is what it does. We voted it out here 40 some odd to nothing, and all this does is expedite ... make it ... we have to have the 35 votes.

PRESIDENT:

Just a moment. Senator Graham is absolutely right. Will the members be in their seats. Those not entitled to the floor, please leave the floor. Sargeant-at-arms enforce the rules. Senator Donnewald, Senator Graham would like to have that explanation repeated. We're going to try and do that. Senator Horsley.

SENATOR HORSLEY:

Senator Donnewald, I voted for this bill before because I believe in the concept. Now, what did the House amendment do?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Donnewald.

SENATOR HORSLEY:

I think that's what we need to know so we know what we are voting on.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Donnewald.

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

The effective date is all it does. It was passed needing only 30 votes, but they actually need 35 to make it effective immediately.

SECRETARY:

... Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroon, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Groen aye. Knuepfer aye. On that question the yeas are 36; the nays are none. The Senate concurs in the House amendment. Senator Graham is recognized in connection with House Bill 3571 Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

Thank you, Mr. President. We're back to this exemption bill that would apply to residents 65 years and older living in condominiums.

House Bill ... House Bill 3571. It was amended to say this gentlemen. In case the land improve with an apartment building owned and operated as a cooperative, the maximum reduction for the value of such real property, as equalized by the Department of Local Government Affairs, shall be limited by a \$1,500 multiplied by the number of apartments occupied by a person 65 years of age or older who is liable by contract with the owner or owners of record for paying real estate taxes on the property and is an owner of record of a legal or equitable interest in the co-operative apartment building other than a lease hold interest.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Neistein.

SENATOR NEISTEIN:

I want to apologize to Senator Graham. I wasn't paying that close of attention. Would you repeat that again and enunciate more clearly and distinctly, please.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

Senator Neistein, I would love to.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Neistein.

SENATOR NEISTEIN:

He can explain it to me after the session. It's all right; and I'll endorse his position on this bill. Is this the same bill we passed once before?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

This, Senator Neistein, as I understand it. This is sent over by Representative Glass. This extends the homestead coverage beyond

what we passed before to cover the people who are in condominiums.

PRESIDENT:

Is there further discussion? Senator Horsley.

SENATOR HORSLEY:

I want to ask if this was amended in the House.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Graham.

SENATOR HORSLEY:

I merely want to ask this question, Senator, and I apologize for doing it publicly because we're moving too fast. The way the original bill is drafted you could have a \$3,000 exemption if you had a husband and wife who are over 65 living in this property. Now, has that been changed or is that still in the bill or what has been done by amendment?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

This has been changed, as I understand the figures here, to \$1,500. This affects only co-ops, condominiums at \$1,500 multiplied by the number of apartments occupied by a person 65 years of age or older who is liable by contract with the owner or owners of record for paying real estate taxes on the property, and is an owner of record of a legal and equitable interest in the co-operative apartment building other than lease hold interest. And, Mr. President and members of the Senate, this amendment was requested and drafted by Dale Yung of the Department of Local Governmental Affairs; in his opinion, makes the bill technically correct and workable.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Horsley.

SENATOR HORSLEY:

Well, Mr. President, with all due respect for my colleague, this amendment, then, does not change the concept of the bill and

you have got a fatal defect in the bill. I don't care. What you have done, in effect, is give a \$3,000 exemption to a married couple under this bill if they are both over 65...Where do you find that? In the amendment. Well that was my question and that's why I want to make sure.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

What I am trying to straighten my legal eagle out on. I've been practicing law without a license all day, he's been practicing with a license. He is of the opinion that we allow a \$3,000 exemption on these apartments; but it allows, under the \$1,500 per person homestead exemption. This specifically says it will be \$1,500 per apartment and would not allow \$3,000.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Horsley, does that ... because ... I--I think, Senator, because of the shortness of numbers if ..., we better bypass that bill.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Lyons, you have something on the consent calendar while we're --

SENATOR LYONS:

Yes I do, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

You mean the resolution there.

SENATOR LYONS:

And I think it is singularly free of--of ah ... its controversy.

PRESIDENT:

On the consent calendar..., is there objection? If you'll look at the consent calendar, is there objection to the adoption of all of the resolutions on the consent calendar? Is there objection? Resolutions are adopted. Senator Horsley?

SENATOR HORSLEY:

I haven't had time in the last few minutes to check it, but I want to make sure that includes the one about our good friend, J. D. Myers. Would you ... let me know if it does?

PRESIDENT:

The ... On the consent calendar? Well, it includes all of those on the consent calendar, but I don't see anyone ... It does. Alright. I am advised that it does. 35 ... Senator Groen.

SENATOR GROEN:

Are we on the order of resolutions or just those on the consent calendar?

PRESIDENT:

We're going down ... we're alternating on the list that has been provided by the leadership and I was trying to have some intervening business to see if they could get something worked out there. Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

Mr. President. I'm afraid I know what's going to happen here, and I presume I can do nothing else but let it happen. Under the amendment we adopted, Senator Horsley feels, instead of saying a person per apartment, thinks it should be a person or persons. Now, if he is technically right, then, it would mean that in order to pass this bill for ... and this is really one that Senator Arrington has a great interest in. To pass this bill, then, we would have to pass us temporarily for this time so we don't hold up the body, then bring it back to second reading later on, amend it and get in the shape that Horsley doesn't object to. May we do that?

PRESIDENT:

I think that's the sensible procedure. Senator, on 3577, is also on your list there?

SENATOR GRAHAM:

Yes, I hope I'm talking about the right bill now. Mr. President and members of the Senate. House Bill 35 77--

PRESIDENT:

Just a moment, please. Gentlemen--

SENATOR GROEN:

You know, I feel like asking for a roll call and not even explaining the bill.

PRESIDENT:

Just a moment. We want at least a couple of sentences, but first we are going to ask Senators Neistein, Knuppel and Clarke. Senator Swinarski, Bruce and O'Brien. Senators Hynes, Senator Cadi-gan, et. al., please. Just ... Senator Graham you have the floor. For what purpose does Senator Neistein arise?

SENATOR NEISTEIN::

House Representative member, Mike Madigan, has just informed me, in deference to Senator Weaver, Notre Dame 21, Tulane 7.

PRESIDENT:

How did ... how did Brandeis do, Senator Neistein?

SENATOR NEISTEIN:

Israel bond sales are up, I am pleased to report.

PRESIDENT:

3577, Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

I'm glad I went to Hard Knocks. They don't have a football team. House Bill 3577 is a bill dealing with a very sensitive and critical Act that this Legislature seen fit wisely to adopt in 1967, known as the Work Releases Amendment for Misdemeanants. Since then, we have assumed that the program was working well at the Cook County level, but a month or two ago we learned otherwise when we read the paper, The Chicago Daily News, September 30th, 1971. "Freed Prisoner

Held on Hit and Run". We began to feel then that there was a need to do something with this work release program as it applies to these people. We since then have... The House sponsor of this bill, Representative Schlickman, worked with the Cook County officials, including the Democrat people in the House, that's presented an amendment to the bill, which we adopted over here that says: When a prisoner who is serving a work release sentence violates any provision contained in the order of the court or breaches discipline or jail regulation so as to have him suspended from the program as provided by Section 4 of this Act, the supervising authorities shall immediately notify the court in writing of the suspension, including the cause thereof, length of suspension and any recommendation as to the removal of the prisoner from the program ordered by the court. This amendment, I might say, was worked out with the Cook County Jail. Warden Winston Moore agrees with this amendment, so I am told. I personally believe that this will be helpful in strengthening our work release program before it is destroyed prior to the time that it really gets going and I ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Savickas.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

Mr. President, would the sponsor yield to a question?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Graham indicates he will.

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

I don't have the bill in my book, but it says "amended" and it says "authorizes responsible authority to suspend prisoner work release for three days without direction of the court". What is a responsible authority here?

SENATOR GRAHAM:

The res ... Where are you reading, Senata ... Senator?

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

I'm reading from the synopsis on, on the calendar.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

I think before ... I think before you ... make a good analysis of this, Senator Savickas, and I appreciate your interest, it's important that you read the amendments. This amendment, as I just read, is an amendment ... I submitted to you. I'm sorry you don't have it. Here it is ... an amendment submitted by the Cook County Jail, in this regard; and the people involved in the work release program is the Circuit Court of Cook County and the Cook County Jail Warden. They are the ones who indicate by submission of the facts, familiarity with the prisoner, whether he is or is not a like subject ... commendable subject for the work release program. This only says that the sentencing judge have a pre-sentence... Let me get the correct language.

PRESIDENT:

Is there further discussion? Oh! Excuse me.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

One amendment that was put on says "By order of the Court, the Administrator of the County Jail, House of Corrections, or Work House in which the prisoner is to be incarcerated, shall be responsible for supervising"... There is your supervising resp ... ah, responsible people. "For supervising activities of the prisoner while he is on such work release. When the prisoner who is serving a work release sentence violates any provision contained herein, then the sentencing court has a pre-sentence notification that he has violated the work release" ... and he goes back in the jug.

PRESIDENT:

Secretary will call the roll. I understand there is an emergency clause ... or it takes effect immediately.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kos ... Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Erien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Ca ... Request for call of the absentees.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Bidwill, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Collins, Davidson, Fawell, Gilbert, Knuppel.

PRESIDENT:

Knuppel aye.

SECRETARY:

... Latherow, Laughlin, Mitchler, Mohr, Newhouse, Ozinga, Savickas, Soper, Sours, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Cherry aye. On that question the yeas are 36; the nays are none. The bill having received the necessary three-fifths majority, is declared passed. 3037, Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Thank you Mr. President and members of the Senate. House Bill 3037 is similar to the present statute which appropriated \$5,000 to the Northeastern Planning Commission in that it creates a Legislative Advisory Commission in Southern Illinois to the Southwestern Illinois Metropolitan Planning Commission known as SWIMPAC. The only difference between that and the Northeastern Planning Commission is that this is in the amount of \$2,500, and I would appreciate a favorable vote.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Neistein.

SENATOR NEISTEIN:

Senator does this apply to Cook County or does it only cover your area?

SENATOR VADALABENE:

This oo ... this is identical to the Northeastern Planning Commission which already is on the statutes and now we want to create one for the Southwestern part of the State of Illinois. You already have it in the Northwestern part of the State of Illinois.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Neistein.

SENATOR NEISTEIN:

But Senator, you're not answering my question. This is only for your area. Is that right? Or the southern area, I won't say yours. I'm not fighting you on this bill. I want to join you because there's nothing I'd like to do better than to help my colleagues, because their area is my area and I hope they feel that mine is theirs too. I urge everybody to support this bill.

PRESIDENT:

Is there further discussion? Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke ...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Clarke.

SENATOR CLARKE:

Mr. President, I'd like to urge Senator Neistein to reconsider his urging and make a motion to adjourn sine die. I think we got too many advisory commissions all over this State, and all other types of commissions, and we ought to be weeding these out and trying

to simplify government, and I urge the people to withhold their votes.

I vote no.

SECRETARY:

... Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohrs, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene...

PRESIDENT:

O'Brien aye.

SECRETARY:

... Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Hall aye. Vadalabene aye. Senator Vadalabene may explain his vote.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes, Senator Clarke, would you object to repealing the North-eastern Planning Advisory Commission that's now already in existence? I remember voting for that commission. Senator Knuepfer, is that right? I know it, I say you remember that one. SWIMPAC.

PRESIDENT:

On that question the yeas are 26; the nays are 3. The bill is declared defeated. 2646, Senator Knuepfer.

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

I'd ask leave to bring this back to second reading for the purpose of putting the Neistein and the Hynes amendments on. There's amendments number one and number two.

PRESIDENT:

2646 is brought back to second reading for purpose of amendment. You are ... can you explain the amendment, please?

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

Yea. The one amendment eliminates one of the provisions of the bill that Senator Neistein objected to, ah, and the second one tightens up the language to make sure that the rules and regulations are to be promulgated by the Department of Registration and Education.

PRESIDENT:

Is--is there any discussion of the amendments? Senator O'Brien.

SENATOR O'BRIEN:

I'd like to see a copy of the amendment, if I can.

PRESIDENT:

Senator, Senator Knuepfer.

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

They have been distributed. I will get you another copy, Senator. They were distributed yesterday.

PRESIDENT:

Is there further discussion of the amendments? We, we'll have intervening business before we pass on the bill itself anyway. All in favor of the adoption of the amendments indicate by saying aye. Contrary minded. Amendments are adopted. We'll get back to you, then, shortly, Senator Knuepfer. Senator Hynes, 3625. Is Senator Hynes on the floor? Yes. Senator Hynes.

SENATOR HYNES:

Mr. President and members of the Senate. 3625 is presently on third reading. I'd ask unanimous consent to bring it back to second reading for purpose of amendment.

PRESIDENT:

3625 is brought back to second reading for purpose of amendment. Can you explain the amendment, Senator?

SENATOR HYNES:

This bill clarifies election procedures and particularly registration procedures for voters. We're all aware of the, the problems

that have developed with respect to registration of the newly enfranchised 18 year old voters. This is an attempt to clarify the registration procedure, to spell out very clearly for the registrars what action they may take when they are requested to register a prospective voter. This amendment is really a housekeeping amendment. It relates to the section dealing with the Board of Election Commissioners and brings it into line with all of the other Sections, namely those dealing with counties over 500,000, under 500,000, and I would move the adoption of the amendment. I do not believe there is any controversy with respect to this amendment.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion of the amendment? All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. The amendment is adopted. 2646, Senator Knuepfer. Just, just ... Oh! An additional amendment on 3625. Senator Graham has offers an amendment to 3625. Can you explain your amendment, Senator?

SENATOR GRAHAM:

Yes, yes I can very briefly, I hope. I have conferred with Senator Hynes on this and he knows I'm going to introduce it. During the past week I circulated to all of you gentlemen a copy of a court decision by U.S. District Court, New Haven, Connecticut. They were making a decision relative to the challenges that have been made to the various registrars as to the questions or difference in questions that were being asked the proposed registrants regarding their legality to register as voters. We took this New Haven decision and incorporated it into an amendment which sets forth the types of questions that will be asked not only 18 to 21 year old voters, but will be asked of everyone requesting to be listed as a registered voter in a community. This eliminates the objections, and rightfully so, that so many have lodged against the registering authorities because of the lack of uniformity, the lack of any real coordination, as to the type or number of questions

asked, varying tremendously from one area to another. This has placed the students, if you please, in a position of feeling that they are discriminated against, and in some areas perhaps they are, because they're asking them different questions. This, it seems to me, will do two things. It will set up a uniform policy for the asking of questions for someone applying to be considered a registered voter in a particular locality; and it will, above all, take off of the shoulders of the registering authority the burden of the proof as to whether or not the proposed registrant is to be legally registered. Mr. President and members of the Senate, if we could compare this to one applying for a drivers license--

PRESIDENT:

Just a moment. Senator Graham is entitled to be heard.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

When a young person or an old one in Illinois goes to apply for a drivers license, it is his ... the burden of the proof is upon that applicant to prove that he can drive. It is not upon the Secretary of State. Neither should it be upon a County Clerk to prove whether or not someone should be eligible to be registered as a voter in that county. I ... We have been in constant contact with the committee at Champaign Urbana that have a deep interest in this problem. We have talked with them at great length, our staff has, regarding this amendment. They support the philosophy embodied in amendment number two offered by me to House Bill 3625. I think it will be an unfortunate circumstance if we do not give this type of legislation a chance to operate rather than to consider the embodiment in the bill as it now stands with the old affidavit type proposal which hasn't worked, doesn't work, won't work; and I'm telling you gentlemen, lady and gentlemen of this Senate, if we don't do something, in closing, sometime, someone will be materially affected by the operation of government constructed by the votes of a gypsy type population. I think we owe it to ourselves to find out

where they live, why they should register, and where they're going to live or where they're going to be and what is their permanent residence; and I think that amendment number two to House Bill 3625 does that and I move for its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Hynes.

SENATOR HYNES:

Mr. President and members of the Senate. I oppose amendment number two and I do so for several reasons. In general, I think it threatens to throw us back into the situation we are trying to avoid. The bill as originally passed by the House of Representatives, after several amendments, after several conferences, represents a bi-partisan approach to this problem. It had support of Republicans and Democrats in the House, it was passed overwhelmingly. It simplifies the registration procedure and at the same time maintains the necessary safeguards. It requires a sworn statement by the applicant as to his residency, as to his intention to remain a resident; and once that has been done and certain basic information has been given as to address and so on, the registrar must then register the applicant. There is also a provision for a challenge once the registration has been accomplished; if, in the opinion of the registrar, there is a sufficient basis for that challenge. With respect to the amendment, the questions which are asked, which are set forth in this amendment are, for the most part, already included in the form prescribed in the statute and reaffirmed in this legislation. Nearly every question is covered presently in the form. Those that are not, in my judgement, are either irrelevant to the question of registration or unnecessary. This amendment has been drafted on the basis of a district court decision from a United States District Court in Connecticut. In that regard, I might point out that that is one district court reviewing a local statute in that jurisdiction. If we lock into the statute the statements of the

court in that decision, where are we if that decision is modified on appeal or if a district court or a court of appeals in our area should come up with another approach. I think the statute as amended in House Bill 3625 is a reasonable approach. I think it provides the necessary protection and I think it gives persons the right to be registered. It protects the franchise that has been granted. Other problems are going to arise if we adopt this amendment. All of the existing forms are going to have to be discarded. An entirely new form is going to have to be made up listing all of these questions because it is going to be necessary to record the answers if they are going to have any meaning. Furthermore, the very language of the amendment causes me problems when it speaks about the registrar shall satisfy himself. That smacks of a subjective approach which is precisely what we are trying to avoid. We are simply trying to give to each and every resident of this State his right. Namely to be registered to vote, and I oppose this amendment and would urge all on this side to do the same.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Is there further debate? Those in favor of the adoption of the amendment will signify by saying aye. Those opposed. The no's have it. Alright, we will give you a roll call. The Secretary will call the roll. The motion is those in favor of the adoption of amendment number two to House Bill 3625 shall vote in the affirmative; those opposed shall vote in the negative.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham ...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

Just briefly, and I am tired too, gentlemen. To correct a couple

of statements made by a legal professor from Chicago, Senator Hynes, whom I respect greatly. Walter Oblinger, who represents the County Clerk Association of Illinois as their attorney, and has for quite a while, says that the allegation that the forms would have to be changed just isn't true. And, I am amazed too, and you were not here then, Senator Hynes, when I heard the big hue cry about the really unusefulness of a loyalty oath or an affidavit regarding the communist party a long time ago. I say to you that a signed affidavit submitted to a county clerk by an irresponsible person, and we have some, isn't worth the paper it is written on; but the county clerk or the registering authority by asking these questions can assure himself and his office that he is sworn to uphold, beyond any reasonable doubt whether this applicant is or is not a legal resident voter of that area, and I seriously hope that you reconsider your position on this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Secretary will continue the roll.

SECRETARY:

... Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Horsley.

SENATOR HORSLEY:

You know, it's rather an unusual thing, Mr. President, when we have people who talk about the courts and they talk about the law of the land. The courts have already upheld the amendment that Senator Graham has introduced. The courts have said these are legitimate questions. Now I don't understand why you are going to say to the court, We don't buy what you say to us. We're going to ignore what the courts of the land have said. I think this is a terrible situation we are getting into because there has been case law already where this matter has been spelled out. The amendment which Senator Graham

has proposed is identical with the opinion of the court and follows what the court says they have the right to do; and yet you say that you don't agree with the court; therefore, you are not going to vote for it. Now I don't know where we are, I think we are in an exercise of futility here. Frankly, I think we ought to go home and let this matter lay over 'til next February or March, together with everything else on this Calendar. We don't even have a quorum here if we want to question it, and I think it is ridiculous in the eyes of the public of the State of Illinois for us to be conducting business here on important matters when everybody has gone home. I would like to be home too, but in my 25 years here I have never gone home before the whistle blew, except one time, and that I don't care to get into because it was something I wasn't proud of that was happening and I walked out and I said if you want me, send the State Police after me. Well, I apologize to Senator Knuppel for the way Sours has treated him, calling him Lockjaw. I think that has been wrong. I would like to change that to Loosejaw. And I think that is more apropro than Lockjaw. And if any of you people want to know why ... if any of you people want to know why ...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator, you have 3 1/2 seconds. Would you conclude your remarks.

SENATOR HORSLEY:

If anybody wants to know why I call him Loosejaw, you just simply talk to me and tell me why he called me at 10 minutes of six this morning and got me out of bed ...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Horsley ... Senator Neistein for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR NEISTEIN:

Well, I wanted to ask a few questions. Number one: This bill

we're considering, has it got an emergency clause on it? Mr.

Secretary?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

The next amendment will consider that, Senator.

SENATOR NEISTEIN:

Which amendment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

The next amendment coming up. Number three.

SENATOR NEISTEIN:

You see usually ... I'm not finished yet. Usually Senator Horsley is wrong. Most of the time he is mistaken, but today he happens to say what is right. We ought to go home. It has been a long day. I haven't had breakfast or lunch and ah,... I think we ought to conclude our business and the bills that we're entertaining ... Mr. President, you can exhibit initiative, integrity, and independence, if you'll listen to me. The bills we're entertaining now should have been killed six months ago, and I don't know why they were left on the Calendar.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

The clerk will continue the roll.

SECRETARY:

... Harris, Horsley ...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator, you just explained your vote.

SENATOR HORSLEY:

Well, you just called my name.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

I didn't, the clerk did; but you explained your vote. How do you vote?

SENATOR HORSLEY:

Well, if he just called my name, I have a right to explain my vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Well, we are not allowed to vote twice.

SENATOR HORSLEY:

Isn't that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Secretary will continue the roll.

SECRETARY:

... Hynes, Johns ...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Lyons. Senator Hynes rather.

SENATOR HYNES:

Mr. President, members of the Senate. With respect to Senator
Horsley's comments, I think I pointed out initially that a district
court in Connecticut had said that under the circumstances of the
Connecticut statute that these questions were permissible. I also
pointed out that substantially all of these questions are included
in the existing form which is incorporated in the stat ... in the
bill which we now propose to pass unamended. And, furthermore, those
questions which are not included, I do not think are relevant to the
situation here in Illinois under our statute; nor, was the language
to the satisfaction of the registrar ... compliance to the satisfac-
tion of the registrar included in the Connecticut decision. One
other point I might make, we have, we know, I think all of us, that
most of the problems have come out of one county in this State. And
I might point out that when reapportionment was brought about, the
senatorial district in that area included within the population the
students at the University of Illinois, so that for purposes of re-
presentation, the students were counted; for purposes of motor fuel
distribution, the students are counted; for purposes of sales tax
distribution, they are counted; and for purposes of the distributive
share of the income tax they are counted; and they, therefore, should
be eligible to register. I vote no.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

For what purpose does Senator Graham arise?

SENATOR GRAHAM:

A point of order. Senator Hynes this amendment is not to prohibit students from registering. Let's don 't miscontrue the facts. This is setting up the guidelines that we ask some questions for registering, not to prohibit them. Let's get it straight.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Just a moment. We've got ... We're on roll call and we must continue the roll. Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

... Kruepfer, Knuppel ...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Knuppel.

SENATOR KNUPPEL:

First of all, a little bit on personal privilege. I want to apologize to Senator Horsley. I generally restrain myself, and I tried very desperately to this morning, until six o'clock. I'm sorry I called him ten minutes early. And ... but, I left here last night because of my health about 12 o'clock; and, you know, he has always been the emissary of light and kindness and I had to know what time to get back here this morning, and so I called him for information. He was very kind and I thanked him, but I didn't know, you know, I gotta apologize. And I want to thank him again, twice, I want to thank him for giving me the name for the first stud colt that I'll have born next ... foaled next spring because Senator Sours gave me the name for one of them, Senator Lockjaw, and now he's been kind enough to name the first stud colt that will be foaled next spring, Senator Loosejaw. I want to vote no on this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Secretary will continue the roll.

SECRETARY:

... Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom,
McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien,
Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock ...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Partee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

I just wanted to state, inasmuch as we do have recording of our session, that Senator Horsley was in error when he said we do not have a quorum. I would not like for a lawyer to pick up this transcript a year or two years from now and challenge the constitutionality of some of our actions subsequent to that statement. So I am saying for that record that we do in fact have a quorum and that that statement was in error. I vote no.

SECRETARY:

... Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper,
Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Vadalabene no. Cherry no. For what purpose does Senator Horsley arise?

SENATOR HORSLEY:

With all the confusion here, I want to know how I'm recorded.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

How is Senator Horsley recorded.

SECRETARY:

He isn't.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

He's not recorded.

SENATOR HORSLEY:

I was afraid of that because I voted twice, and I don't know how it didn't get there, but I think we have a little interference between

here and Mr. Wright, the Secretary, because I want to be recorded in favor of this amendment. And I want to explain my vote since I'm not recorded. I have that right, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

You have three minutes to explain ... Senator you explained your vote one time. The yeas are 9; the nays are 24. The amendment fails.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Hynes.

SENATOR HYNES:

I move to reconsider.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Hynes moves to reconsider the vote. Senator Rock moves to lie that on the table. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed no. The yeas have it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Clarke.

SENATOR CLARKE:

On a point of personal privilege. I'd just like to relate a conversation that took place at my desk this morning. Your good friend, Mr. Knuppel, came over and asked me why I wasn't still staying at the Travelodge which is listed in the little booklet. He said, You've moved, haven't you? And I said, Yes, why? And he said, I called you at six o'clock and couldn't get you. And I suggested to him that I have an unlisted phone number at home just to stop those kind of nuisance calls. I think this is a serious matter, however, he called Senator Walker and got Representative Palmer his ... Walker wasn't home, got Palmer out of bed, I think that this is more than just a joking matter, and I would just like to suggest that if there is no way to discipline this gentlemen, we can do it on this side. Next year we will just withhold all votes on every bill that he has. That will make him about the least effective Senator here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Just a moment. I've been asked to announce that License Number N, as in Nancy, R 7499, a blue pontiac, is blocking the driveway downstairs and no cars can proceed. It is a Firebird 550. Amendment number three. For what purpose does Senator Horsley arise?

SENATOR HORSLEY:

Point of personal privilege. I did not know that Senator Clarke had received that phone call when he did, previous to the time I did to wake me up. And I want to say to this gentlemen here ... I don't know what's wrong with him, I don't know. You guys will have to figure that out. I frankly, feel sorry for a man who will pull a trick like that on people who are so tired and worn out, who have been here all night, and to wake them up in the middle of the night on a silly matter like that. Now, I think it's time that we took notice of the fact that we have a gentleman among our midst ... and I use the word gentleman advisedly because here in the Senate we are supposed to use that word, although, I don't agree with it, I don't subscribe to it, but when a man wakes my wife and my family up at that hour of the morning being facetious I think there is something wrong with the man and you better take him in and have him examined before he runs again.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

We'll now consider Amendment number three. Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

Mr. President, I f I could get you to get Homer and Jethrow, the two warring lawyers, to go out in the alley and do their alley fighting, we could get a hell of a lot of work done around here, and I move to table Amendment number three.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Motion to table amendment number three. That is an emergency clause, Senator Rock. All those ... You want to withdraw the motion, is that right, Senator? ... or the amendment? The amendment is with-

drawn. For what purpose does Senator Cherry arise?

SENATOR CHERRY:

Just to say I'll bet on Senator Kruppel.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

For what purpose does Senator Neistein arise?

SENATOR NEISTEIN:

I wanted to ask Senator Clarke, where was my buddy, Senator Walker, at ten to six this morning?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Clarke.

SENATOR CLARKE:

Senator Walker has his moving van, as you know. Yes. He has one of those traveling omnibuses.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

House Bill 3625 has been advanced back to the order of third reading. The next bill is House Bill 2646. Senator Knuepfer.

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

This is the bill that I just ... This is the bill that I just put the amendments on requested by Senators Neistein and Hynes. It is a dental practice Act. It is supported by the American Dental Association, the Illinois State Dental Society, the hygenists. Many of you have had some conversation with one of the ... a young lady who is one of the hygenists in behalf of this bill. It does two things, one of the clauses was stricken. It simply permits students, students, rather, those who are practicing dentists in another state and studying specialty training in a ... in dental health, to practice for one year while they are in training in this State; and, as well, it permits the use of dental assistants. I will be happy to explain the bill in any further detail. I think you know all about it. I would appreciate a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Is there further debate? Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill ...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Nihill.

SECRETARY:

... O'Brien ...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator O'Brien.

SENATOR O'BRIEN:

Mr. Chairman, I had grave reservations about this bill, but I checked with my dentist in Chicago and he said it is a good bill. I vote aye.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Secretary will continue the roll.

SECRETARY:

... Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano ...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DONNEWALD)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Mr. President, members of the Senate. A little earlier this morning the presiding officer of the Senate admonished members of the Senate from voting for or against something because of its sponsor. Representative Matijevich came into the Committee on Local Government and assured the Democratic members that a certain original House sponsor had withdrawn his sponsorship, and on that basis I will vote aye.

SECRETARY:

... Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Hynes aye. Nihill aye. Donnewald aye. McCarthy aye. Bruce aye. Knuppel aye. Knuepfer aye. Request for a call of the absentees.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Bidwill, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Davidson, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Harris, Horsley, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Newhouse, Ozinga, Palmer, Romano, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Walker and Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Groen aye. Is Senator Merritt recorded? On that question ... Motion to postpone consideration. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. Motion prevails. 3625, Senator Hynes. Just... Pardon. For what purpose does Senator Hynes... Senator Neistein arise?

SENATOR NEISTEIN:

How long is that going to be postponed?

PRESIDENT:

It is up to the sponsor. Senator Hynes.

SENATOR HYNES:

Mr. President and members of the Senate.

PRESIDENT:

This is House Bill 3625.

SENATOR HYNES:

House Bill 3625 clarifies registration procedures throughout the State. It makes them uniform ... makes them uniform, requires any applicant for registration ...

PRESIDENT:

Just a moment, please. Will the members be in their seats.

Let's have some order. Hopefully we are not going to be here too long, but the sooner we get ... Senator Neistein, I wish I knew. Members be in their seats. Proceed Senator Hynes.

SENATOR HYNES:

House Bill 3625 clarifies registration procedures, requires an applicant for registration to file an affidavit verifying that he is indeed a resident for voting purposes in the area in which he seeks to vote. It also requires him to affirm the truth of certain other representations of fact, as to address, age, so on and so forth. It requires the registrar to accept the registration once this has been done. I think it is desirable legislation and I would urge your favorable support.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

Mr. President, there isn't any use to debate this at any great length. I have said previously, when we failed in my amendment, that this bill materially doesn't do anything different than it does now. There is no provision in here to set up any guidelines other than a weak affidavit for the registrar to determine whether a proposed registrant lives, or should live, or should be legally entitled to vote in that community, there is nothing in that bill that will do that now as the result of the defeat of the amendment. And I am surprised that the gentleman from the other side of the aisle keeps referring to this as a student voting bill. I would much prefer to it as a 18 to 21 year old voting bill. Everybody under 21 isn't a student in a university that wants to vote in the next election. And in closing, I remind you again that the students at the University of Illinois so concerned about this without the amendment offered by me a little while ago, are not in the least bit concerned and I suggest that the gentlemen on my side of the aisle either vote no or withhold their votes in the passage

of this bill.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Horsley.

SENATOR HORSLEY:

Mr. President. I would echo what Senator Graham has said. The gentlemen standing here by me have researched this matter, they have talked to the students of the U. of I. They are very much in favor of this amendment. If you fail to pass it, they don't understand it. They are going to blame you for it. I would say without this amendment this bill should be defeated, and I would ask that not a single vote on this side of the aisle be given in favor of this bill. Now, the time has come when I think people are fed up with so called radical government in Illinois by the movement of students to take over certain cities in Illinois; and if you want to take that onus on your shoulders, let's make it strictly a Democratic burden that you're taking on. You're telling the people of the State of Illinois you're in favor of these students taking over Carbondale, Champaign, Macomb, DeKalb, Charleston. Let's put the chips where they belong. Let everybody put the blame where it belongs. But I think as far as we are concerned on this side. Let's vote no and let the people know where we stand on this issue.

PRESIDENT:

Senator McBroom.

SENATOR MCBROOM:

Previous question.

PRESIDENT:

Motion for the previous question. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. Motion prevails. Senator Hynes may close the debate.

SENATOR HYNES:

I do not want to delay this, but I would simply say that this bill applies equally to 18 year olds and 88 year olds. It is an attempt to

set up a uniform system for registering voters. The affidavit, I think, will be an effective means of culling out those who are not entitled to vote. And it will at the same time guarantee that those persons who are entitled will be given that right, and I urge your favorable support.

PRESIDENT:

Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham ...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

Just very briefly. The sponsor of the defeated amendment didn't offer the amendment to curtail student voting. I don't want to curtail it now. I don't want to curtail their registration. All I want to do ... All I wanted to do was to establish legally once and for all, where do they actually live and from which residence are they entitled to vote. And this amendment would have cleared the air because a student, in answering the questions propounded by the amendment, would have clearly defined to the registrar what his residence was; and it is an unfortunate thing that this bill is misunderstood as being directed toward student registration when, I said before, it isn't because everyone is not a student that is under 21 and I vote no.

SECRETARY:

Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

-- Swinarski aye. Johns aye. Request for a call of the absentees.
The absentees will be called.

SECRETARY:

Arrington...

PRESIDENT:

Motion to postpone consideration. All in favor signify by saying
aye. Contrary minded. Motion to postpone consideration prevails.
Senator Graham, 3571. Are you ready on that now? 3571 is brought back
to second reading for purpose of amendment. Senator Graham, can you
explain the amendment?

GRAHAM:

Yes, I think, I think, ah ... Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

It is important that we move to table amendment number one and
offer amendment number two.

PRESIDENT:

Motion to reconsider the vote by which amendment number one was
adopted. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. The...
Motion to table amendment number one. All in favor signify by saying
aye. Contrary minded. Motion prevails. Senator Graham offers amend-
ment number two.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

Now, amendment number two clears up what, I think, was a definite
error in the draftsmanship of it; that it would allow the homestead
exemption to be extended to an apartment, not to two people living in
an apartment, as such in cooperative apartments, and I move its adoption.

PRESIDENT:

Motion for the adoption. Is there any discussion? All in favor

~~signify by saying aye.~~ Contrary minded. The amendment is adopted.

Third reading. We'll get back to it shortly, Senator. 3707, Senator Johns.

SENATOR JOHNS:

Lady and gentlemen of the Senate. This particular bill will mean a great deal to the soil and water conservation districts. For more than 30 years the soil and water conservations districts of Illinois have been working together for the conservation of soil, water, forest, wildlife, and related natural resources. Without giving you a long dissertation, let me briefly say that the whole essence of this bill is so that the soil and water conservation districts ... I could give you a lot of details about the bill, but the main thrust of it is to permit them to borrow FHA money at low interest loans, and only through a referendum will this be implemented and this would save the districts a great deal of money. Now I can go into any detail with you that you'd like, but that is the main essence of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR ROCK)

Any discussion? House Bill 3707. Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR ROCK)

Lyons aye. Donnewald aye. McBroom aye. Request for a call of the absentees. The absentees will be called. Can we have some order so the secretary can hear, please.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Course, Davidson, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Horsley, Hynes, Johns ...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR ROCK)

Senator Johns.

SENATOR JOHNS:

I'd like to go into it just a little more explanation of this bill, if I may, for the simple reason this is not a bill that is going to cost anyone any money and there's no appropriation. The only time that there is going to be a cost is when the people of a certain district decide that the project is worthwhile and they want to vote for it, and then when they do vote for it, the main thrust, again, is that it would be permissible by the FHA to borrow this money at low interest. We've got 73,000 land owners in the State of Illinois. They're cooperative, they do everything they can to preserve the soil, to promote wild-life growth, and related natural resources. These are good people. So, therefore, Mr. President, I'd like to vote aye and I would appreciate any vote upon this matter. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR ROCK)

Continue the roll call.

SECRETARY:

... Knuepfer, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, Mohr, Newhouse, Ozinga, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR ROCK)

For what purpose does Senator Groen arise?

SENATOR GROEN:

I'll vote aye.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR ROCK)

Please record Senator Groen as aye. On that question the yeas are 33; the nays are 1. The bill is declared passed. Senator Kosinski moves to reconsider. Senator Johns moves to table. All in favor say

aye. The motion carries. House Bill 3571, Senator Graham. Senator...
For what purpose does Senator Horsley arise?

SENATOR HORSLEY:

Mr. President I rise to a point of personal privilege here. It is now Saturday night. It is now 6:15 p.m. We've been here a long, hard day. I would point out, I took the matter up today with the Reference Bureau and apparently every bill that is now on the Calendar, every bill in committee will be here come January, unless somebody makes a motion to table or strike bills. Now, we will start remembering bills in January when you introduce a new bill it will take the next consecutive Senate bill or House Bill number. Now, like Congress does where they have a two year period, so that we have no problem here of many of these unimportant matters that we are killing ourselves over. We've had at least two or three of our members go to the hospitals, are quite ill. Many of us have important matters to attend to. This can be handled in January, February or March when we come back. Now, if we were going to lose any advantage, I would not be saying that, but I was requested today, as Chairman of the Legislative Reference Bureau, to take this up and see where we stood, and we stand exactly where we would otherwise stand if we had adjourned for a weekend. In other words if we adjourned tonight until the first Wednesday in January, we lose absolutely nothing, except for any emergency bill that you want to make effective for that period. So every bill is still in committee, every bill is still on the Calendar exactly when we walk out of here. The Calendar will be reprinted exactly as though we left here for a weekend. Now I appeal to you that I think we are all being just a little bit on the side where we should wonder what we are doing. Now in January I don't know how long we'll be here, that's up to the Leadership, not up to me, but that will not hurt anything because if we adjourn then until March when we have the Governor's budget message, everything will still be there to be voted upon. I earnestly implore you, let's go home. I think we've got all the important things out of the way and I think the

time has come when we ought to go home, reflect a little bit, come back in January and February, March, get back on the State's business then.

PRESIDENT:

The... As of right now we do not have an adjournment resolution from the House and there is none, none has been initiated on this side, to my knowledge. 3571, Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

Mr. President, we've discussed this thoroughly and we have the amended amendment on it now so that this extends the Homestead Exemption Act to condominium owners. I urge a favorable roll call and after the roll call when I get two aye votes from Senator Knuppel and Horsley, maybe they'll go out and rest 'cause last night Senator Knuppel was tired and tonight Horsley's tired, maybe tomorrow we'll all be tired, so let's pass this bill, please.

PRESIDENT:

Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen ...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Groen.

SENATOR GROEN:

Mr. President. I agree with Senator Horsley completely. And I want to announce that this is the last bill I am going to vote upon except for concurrence in matters that come back from the House. I vote aye.

PRESIDENT:

Before Senator Groen goes too far, the next bill I have on my list is one of his.

SECRETARY:

... Hall, Harris, Horsley ...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Horsley.

SENATOR HORSLEY:

I don't understand why some of the members haven't voted on this bill. We tightened this bill up by this amendment and I hope I didn't hurt the Senator's bill. But what you are doing is you're giving people who have a condominium the same homestead exemption that you give anybody who owns their home, and you have thousands of them in Chicago who need this bill. We don't have many of them here. This bill would tighten it up to say you don't have more than 1500 because there are two people. That was the amendment. But the Senator has a good bill and I think you should pass his bill to give your people the right to this exemption on a condominium where you have an interest in an apartment building where there are several other people who live there. I vote aye.

SECRETARY:

... Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons ...

PRESIDENT:

Senator... Senator Lyons.

SENATOR LYONS:

Well, in response to those people who keep on saying that they want to go home, everybody does; but we are not wasting time, we are waiting for some messages that are coming over from the House on matters of absolute necessity that have to be passed. I refer to the State Electoral Board, to the staggered terms for Senators. How are we going to know whether we are going to run for two years or four years until that message comes back from the House. Nobody is engaging in dilatory tactics. I vote aye.

SECRETARY:

... McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

O'Brien aye. Clarke aye. Mitchler aye. Neistein aye. McBroom aye. This does not have an emergency clause on it, does it? Okay. On that question the yeas are 30 ... Merritt aye? Merritt aye. On that question the yeas are 34; the nays are none. The bill is declared passed. We have some messages from the House and some conference committee reports. Senate Bill 1224. Senator Donnewald is the sponsor. Senator Donnewald.

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

Yes, Mr. President, 1224 is a constitutional implementation bill concerning the Governor and Lieutenant Governor: What they did over in the House, they made it effective immediately, requiring 35 votes. The bill originally didn't have that clause in it.

PRESIDENT:

It ... Senator Donnewald.

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

The bill, of course, as originally sent over, with the exception of the emergency, allows the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor to run independently of each other.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Knuepfer.

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

... in the Primary.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Knuepfer.

SENATOR KNUEFFER:

The House didn't change that provision about the independent running? Okay. Then I would suggest we vote aye.

PRESIDENT:

Is... Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

May I ask the gentleman from Breese one question? Senators Dougherty or Donnewald. This bill now, as you are recommending we concur, allows for the Governor and Lieutenant Governor to run separately in the Primary, period. Let's pass it real quick and get this one out of the way.

PRESIDENT:

| Senator Donnewald.

SENATOR DONNEWALD:

That ... The only thing that this concurrence is about is the emergency measure. That's all.

PRESIDENT:

Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McEroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Hynes aye. Senator Groen.

SENATOR GROEN:

Mr. President, in explaining my vote to Senator Lyons, I have

never left a session of this General Assembly before its final gavel in my life and I am not doing it now. This is a concurrence, this is what we ought to be doing, and the only thing we ought to be doing now, and I vote aye.

PRESIDENT:

On that question the yeas are 36; the nays are none. The Senate concurs in the House amendment. Motion to reconsider by Senator Rock. Motion to table by Senator Dougherty. All in favor of the motion to table signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. Motion prevails.

SECRETARY:

Senate bill 589, the House refuses to recede.

PRESIDENT:

Who is the sponsor of Senate Bill 589? Senator Bruce. Senator Bruce is recognized.

SENATOR BRUCE:

Yes. We now have a conference committee report on 589. Senator Berning mentioned this morning that a semicolon was misplaced and the conference committee report has accepted the amendment of the House. Without the semicolon it makes it clear that you can only take the examination if you have the experience. This meets with the approval of the Department Registration and Education, the House committee. They worked it out over the summer with the social workers. I know no reason, I move the adoption of the conference committee report.

PRESIDENT:

Just a minute. Yes. Just a second. First, we just have the motion ... the notice from the House that they refuse to recede. The motion is to accede to the House request for a conference committee, even though you have the conference committee report.

SENATOR BRUCE:

... Accede to that request.

PRESIDENT:

Alright. Motion to accede to their request. All in favor signify

by saying aye. Contrary minded. Motion prevails. Now we will take some intervening business and then get the conference committee report. Senator Dougherty is recognized for House Bill 2615.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

Yes, Mr. President and members of the Senate. House Bill 2615 was originally introduced in the House some months ago and it is over here on the order of third reading and this bill was being held by myself as a sort of a safety measure in order to insure the passage of the State Electoral Board bills as we are required to do by the Constitution. This house, some days ... few days ago, passed Senate Bill 1296, sponsored by myself and Senator Graham and the Election Laws Study Commission. Word has reached me that the bill is in some trouble in the House. I don't know what it is. I just know that there's been some trouble, due to an amendment, I understand. However, I am now offering two amendments to House Bill 2615. Both amendments, in effect, bring this bill into exact conformity with Senate Bill 1296. These two amendments make this bill precisely the same as 1296, a Senate bill that was passed out of here 49 to 0. Now, I think that there is something wrong over there and this is another chance for them to retrieve the reputation they should have in the passage of this bill. This is a completely new bill. Senator Graham joins with me, I'm quite sure, in asking acceptance of these two amendments to House Bill 2615; and I call it back to the order of second reading for the purpose of amendment, then put it back on third and pass it immediately. It's vitally necessary.

PRESIDENT:

2615 is brought to second reading for purpose of amendment. Senator Dougherty offers amendments number one and two. Senator Graham, I gather there is no problem on these amendments. Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

Mr. President, I only have the one problem. I have never been a great favorite of the name of Katz on any bill, but I have been a great favorite of our abilities as a Legislature to indicate what we think is good for the people with regard to the conduct of elections. We sent over, in Senate Bill 1296, what we thought was a product of a bi-partisan approach to establishing the State Board of Elections that we could pass. Certainly embodied within this 65 page bill there were some rooms for argument, and there was a lot of compromise, four or five months of it. Now, I am led to understand that one of the objections to 1296, and it will be embodied in this amendment, and I haven't read it and I'm taking the word of my trusted friend, Daniel Dougherty, when he says that this puts this bill in the same shape as ours, but the Constitutional Convention mandated that we set up ... set up a State Board of Elections. If we don't, I'm sure that the world is not going to come to an end, but somewhere along the line we have to face it. But, one of the objections that was given to me in our original bill was that we're allowing the Chicago Board of Election Commissioners to issue their instruction manual. Now, ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, no one here on the Republican side of the aisle has had more friendly and unfriendly discussions with Stanley Kusper than John Graham; but I say if that is the only objection, it is wrong because I firmly believe as I stand here, and I don't intend to pay tribute to anyone that doesn't deserve it, that the instruction manual in question is considered by the election authorities of the United States as one of the very finest. If that's the only objection, it is illfounded. I think Senator Dougherty feels badly about this and he's attempting to assert his feeling in this. I feel badly, too. I am not sure that this is going to prove anything, Senator. I'm not sure it's going to pass. I'm not sure the world is going to come to an end if it doesn't pass. I'm not sure it will come to an end if it does

pass, but I think it reflects the desire of this General Assembly to set up a State Board of Elections as mandated by the Constitutional Convention of which Senator Knuppel was a member.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Groen.

SENATOR GROEN:

Senator Graham, did I understand you to say that the Senate passed a bill and sent it to the House.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

Yes ... yes, we did. Quite some time ago. Unanimously.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Groen.

SENATOR GROEN:

What happened to that bill?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

I wish I knew. It's still over there. It's been in and out of committee, it's been conferred by and with and cussed by, caused a tremendous amount of disturbance, had bipartisan support. It's one of those things that they can't seem to agree upon, the House of Representatives, and I'm not a member of that body. I really can't tell you more than that.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Groen.

SENATOR GROEN:

Well, now, this is a bill that's still on the Calendar that was introduced in April and wasn't acted upon until today, and do I understand, Senator Dougherty, that we are now amending this bill to conform to the provisions of the bill we sent to the House.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Dougherty. Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

Precisely right. That's right, Sir.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Groen.

SENATOR GROEN:

Well, Mr. President ... did you say me or him?

PRESIDENT:

Yes, Senator Groen.

SENATOR GROEN:

Mr. President, this is a travesty on the system. It just shows how inefficient we operate. Here we are. Now, we're going to send a bill back to the House that we're going ... over to the House that we're going to send back, with amendments, that they're going to have to sit around and wait to concur in the amendments we send over. It's just ridiculous.

PRESIDENT:

The question is the adoption of the amendments. All in favor of the adoption of the amendments signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. The amendments are adopted. We have some more messages from the House, here. Senator Harris. Senator Harris, on 1182 and 83 we have a message from the House that they have refused to recede. Motion that ... to ... we ... The motion is to accede to their request and set up a conference committee. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. Motion prevails. Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

Mr. President, I have ... I mentioned to you just a little while ago, House Bill 2485.

PRESIDENT:

Just, just a second now. Before we get to that, now we have a ...

the ... Alright. We have the conference committee report on 589.

Senator Bruce is recognized.

SENATOR BRUCE:

I explained this a moment ago. Senator Berning caught an error. A semicolon was put in to make the amendment have meaning that was not intended. We removed the semicolon, redrafted it partially to make it clear that we're only going to allow those who have the experience the right to take an examination for social worker if they've had three of the past five years of active work in social work and they apply before December 31, 1972. The bill passed 141 to 7 and has the approval of the ... of the legal counsel for the Department and with the Registration and Miscellaneous Committee Chairman in the House. They've worked very closely and tried to get an amendment that does what the social workers would like to do. I move the adoption. I think both Senator Berning and Senator Knuepfer served on the conference committee.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Berning.

SENATOR BERNING:

Yes, Mr. President and members of the body, the bill now is in passable condition. I would recommend that everyone support the measure.

PRESIDENT:

Is this ... does this take 35 votes, Senator?

SENATOR BRUCE:

Yes, it does.

PRESIDENT:

The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley,

Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarksi, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Cherry aye. Kusibab aye. Egan aye. Partee aye. Request for the call of the absentees. The absentees will be called.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Bidwill, Carpentier, Carroll, Chew, Collins, Coulson, Davidson, Fawell, Gilbert, Latherow, Laughlin, McCarthy, Mitchler, Mohr, Newhouse, Ozinga, Smith, Soper, Sours, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

On that question the yeas are 36; the nays are none. The Senate concurs in the conference committee report. Senator Dougherty, are you ready on 2615 now?

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

I'm ready for that, yes Sir.

PRESIDENT:

2615, Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

As was explained before to the members of the Senate, Senator Graham and myself and the staff worked exceedingly hard for months on Senate Bill 1296. Now, I'll explain the reason for these bills being delayed. These other bills. In all there were six bills pertaining to State Electoral Board; and all the time that we were drafting 1296, we made a study of these other bills and we incorporated in 1296 that which we thought were the best features of all of the bills. We did ... We kept one bill alive for the simple reason that something might happen and that is the reason we kept it alive until this moment. I've asked to have it amended. The Senate has agreed. Now, I ask for a favorable

roll call in order that it might get over to the House.

PRESIDENT:

Does this require 35 votes?

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

No sir, it does not.

PRESIDENT:

Is there further discussion? Senator Groen.

SENATOR GROEN:

Mr. President, it's utterly ridiculous for us to send an amended bill over there that we're going to have to wait to see what happens to when they've already got an identical bill over there that they could pass and it would be settled and I'm gonna vote no.

PRESIDENT:

The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene ...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

This bill does require 35 votes.

PRESIDENT:

You wish a call of the absentees.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

Yes, I do.

PRESIDENT:

The absentees will be called.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Bidwill, Carpentier, Carroll; Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Davidson, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Latherow, Laughlin, Mc-Broom, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Newhouse, Ozinga, Rosander, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Clarke aye. On that question the yeas are 26; the nays are none. The bill having failed to receive the necessary three-fifths majority is declared defeated. Senator Groen, I understand that 2778, that is on the Calendar, actually passed. Is that ... where's Senator Groen? Is that correct? 2778.

SENATOR GROEN:

Well, Mr. President, I thought that it had. The Secretary advises me that it did not. Now, it's not that earth-shaking a bill as I said when I first tried to get it passed and it was amended. It does have an amendment. It would have to go over to the House with the amendment on it and have the House act on the concurrence or the rejection of the amendment, and I am perfectly willing to have it stay on the Calendar so that they don't have to wait over there for us as we are apparently waiting for them.

PRESIDENT:

You're ... you're ... You prefer just to leave it on the Calendar, Senator? Alright. Are, are there other ... Senator Clarke? We need a resolution at this point in time, Senator, in order to adjourn. Senator Clarke, I'm at the end of the list of Republican bills that have been requested here. Yes.

SENATOR GROEN:

Is there anything to prevent the Senate preparing an adjournment resolution and sending it over to the House; and, if not, why in the

devil haven't we done it?

PRESIDENT:

Not a thing to prevent us from doing it. Just ... Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

Senator Groen, we're now in the process of preparing an adjournment resolution. Now, I have another bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

Well, just a second. It's the Republican's turn to have a bill, only I think I'm out of bills on their side, where the sponsor is present. Senator Clarke. Senator Partee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

I heard on the box if there was any reason why we should not send an adjournment resolution to the House; and, if so, why we haven't done it. There is a reason. There are a couple of pieces of legislation which aren't being called over there. I think we're on the way to solving it and I suspect they will be sending the resolution shortly.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Groen.

SENATOR GROEN:

Well, Senator Partee, is there any reason why an adjournment resolution prepared by us and sent over them ... over there can't sit over there and wait until such time as they take that action?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Partee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

Yes, there is a reason.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Groen.

SENATOR GROEN:

I would like to know what it is.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Partee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

One of ... one of the bills over there relates to the State Electoral Board and here has been some conversation that we can resolve that issue plus one other one, and I'm just waiting until such time as we are in a posture where we can reach some accord and I think we're very close to that point and then we'll send the resolution right over then.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Groen.

SENATOR GROEN:

Is this an emergency nature? Does it carry an emergency clause on it? Can't it wait until January?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Partee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

No, for me it can't wait.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Groen.

SENATOR GROEN:

Well, Senator, maybe it can't for you, but maybe it's time that you consider 57 other people in this body.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Clarke, do you have any measure ... Senator Clarke, do you have any measure you wish to call on your side of the aisle?
Senator Knuepfer.

SENATOR KNUEPFER:

This certainly isn't earthshaking if it doesn't pass today. I didn't even put it on the list. Senate ... House Bill, rather, 1049, and all it does is require the Supervisor of Assessments to maintain

property record cards and make sure that those records are open. It passed out of the Local Government Committee without a dissenting vote. I can explain it further if you want, but its a simple bill as that.

PRESIDENT:

Is there any discussion? The Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Ejan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Rosander no. Hynes aye. Lyons aye. Course aye. Merritt aye. Coulson aye. Request for a call of the absentees: The absentees will be called.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Collins, Davidson, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Horsley, Knuepfer, Latherow, Laughlin, Mitchler, Mohr, Newhouse, Ozinga, Palmer, Romano ...

PRESIDENT:

Romano aye.

SECRETARY:

... Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

On that question the yeas are 30; the nays are 1. The bill having received a constitutional majority is declared passed. Senator

Dougherty. You wish to call 493 or ...?

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

That's another bill here that's of vital importance every member on this floor. This is a bill that provides for the manner in which our names will be placed on the ballot; and it provides that the names of all incumbents will be number one, and if there is more than one incumbent, it will be listed in the order of length of service or in seniority. If the seniority is the same, the position will be determined by lot conducted by the State Electoral Board; and then after the incumbents have been listed, all those candidates who have never served in the House, in neither House, they will ...and seeking nomination, the non-incumbents shall be listed by a drawing of lot. And this requires 35 votes. It provides ... takes care of everyone of us. It's up or down.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Hynes.

SENATOR HYNES:

I would suggest that we do not have enough votes in the Chamber to pass this bill; and since I would like to know whether I'm going to run for two years or four years, I move, pursuant to Rule 26, that the Sergeant at Arms be instructed to find some of the missing members.

PRESIDENT:

The Sergeant at Arms is instructed to try and bring in some members. Ring the bell, Sweeney. Senator Clarke.

SENATOR CLARKE:

Mr. President, on a point of procedure ... point of personal privilege. You seem much more concerned today with the missing members than you did last night.

PRESIDENT:

Were there some missing last night, Senator? 2485. Is there any discussion? Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry, Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse, Nihill, O'Brien, Ozinga, Palmer, Partee, Rock, Romano, Rosander, Saperstein, Savickas, Smith, Soper, Sours, Swinarski, Vadalabene, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

Request for a call of the absentees. The absentees will be called.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Bidwill, Carpentier, Carroll, Chew, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Fawell, Gilbert ...

PRESIDENT:

Course aye.

SECRETARY:

... Horsley, Latherow, Laughlin, Mitchler, Mohr, Newhouse, Ozinga, Soper, Sours, Walker, Weaver.

PRESIDENT:

On that question the yeas are 35; the nays are 1. The bill having received the necessary three-fifths majority is declared passed. Senator O'Brien moves to reconsider. Senator Dougherty moves to table. All in favor of the motion to table signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. Motion to table prevails. For what purpose does Senator Dougherty arise?

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

I've been very patient all afternoon, for a couple of days, as a matter of fact, to call a very controversial bill. In a matter of conscience, I have to call it, I'm not doing it because of any ...

PRESIDENT:

Well, before you call that, I think the Republicans are entitled to call the next bill if they wish to. It's their turn. Just a moment, we're ... They're consulting over here. Senator Clarke. Senator Clarke.

SENATOR CLARKE:

Mr. President, I'd like to call House Bill 2907.

PRESIDENT:

House Bill 2907. If you are serious, you may proceed.

SENATOR CLARKE:

I really think the Pro Tem ought to be paying more attention. Really, seriously, I'd like to call House Bill 2267.

PRESIDENT:

House Bill 2267. For what purpose does Senator Partee arise?

SENATOR PARTEE:

I was talking to someone. Were you calling the Scenic Rivers bill, sir? Oh, it wasn't? Well, you know they said we were trying to kill it, so we wanted to give you some votes for it, you know. Oh, I'm sorry.

PRESIDENT:

2267. Senator ... You do not want to call 2267? Senator Dougherty. I guess we're going to revert ... For what purpose does Senator Coulson arise?

SENATOR COULSON:

I have a motion or a bit of activity. I understand the House has passed the adjournment resolution. Could that be our next priority ... order of business when it becomes our turn to have a matter acted upon?

PRESIDENT:

Well, it can be a matter of business, I assume, very shortly. Senator Partee.

SENATOR PARTEE:

Not at this moment. Just one moment, sir.

PRESIDENT:

Alright. For what purpose does Senator O'Brien arise?

SENATOR O'BRIEN:

I'd like to ask ... or make a suggestion to Senator Clarke. I have a Republican sponsored bill here. House Bill 2323, the Life Sciences bill by Brian Duff. It's kind of a progressive bill and if you'd like to ... Okay. Fine.

PRESIDENT:

Is there ... ? We have some resolutions here, I'm advised.

Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

I repeat my request to have this bill heard. Everybody ... there's a complete lack of courtesy on the part of everybody, including the President Pro Tem and the President.

PRESIDENT:

493.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

1398.

PRESIDENT:

1398?

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

That's right.

PRESIDENT:

1398. Senator Graham.

SENATOR GRAHAM:

Perhaps Senator Dougherty knows. I have some amendments or an amendment which I would like to present to 1398, and in that event I can't do it when it's on third reading, can I? Would you move it back, Senator?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

I still have control of the bill and my proposal is to call back House Bill 1398 for the purpose of offering an amendment. This courtesy was refused me the other day.

PRESIDENT:

1398. Senator McBroom.

SENATOR MCBROOM:

Mr. President, I apologize to Senator Dougherty the other day for objecting. This is a highly controversial bill. I still object to the bill being called back to second reading. I want to state to the membership that I do appreciate the fact that Senator Dougherty told me not once but twice that he was going to call this bill today and, as a matter of fact, told me to stay on the floor, that he thought he was going to call it about an hour ago, and I do appreciate that, Senator Dougherty, but I think this is a bad bill. I would expect ... I think some of you know that earlier in the Session that I had hired Senator Neistein as my lawyer. I found that we had voted opposite on many, many measures. I fired him and hired Senator Soper, but Senator Soper has gone home and I am reinstating Senator Neistein. He'll have the same retainers he had earlier in the Session. Yesterday he talked about bills that were garbage and bills that were killed three and four times, so I would expect his vigorous support on my stand on this and join me in objection. I've talked to Senator Nihill. He told me that this does not affect the 11th Ward and that I would receive total support from him, and I do object.

PRESIDENT:

Well, Senator Dougherty has the right to pull the bill back. For what purpose does Senator ParTEE arise?

SENATOR PARTEE:

I just want Senator McBroom to know that he's in safe hands when he's with Senator Neistein.

PRESIDENT:

For what purpose does Senator Groen arise?

SENATOR GROEN:

I rise to make a motion. And I move that the Senate stand in recess until the adjournment resolution is received from the House which has now passed the House.

PRESIDENT:

We're ... we're going to be concluding things in just a few minutes, Senator, if you want to withhold that. We're just about on the verge of things and ... Senator Dougherty, if you want to pull yours back and then I think ...

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

Well, I'd like to pull it back and to amend it, then call the bill without any further amendments. I know it's not going to be carried because it has to have at least 35 votes. I would just like to dispose of the bill in a proper manner and let the record show that.

PRESIDENT:

Senator McBroom.

SENATOR MCBROOM:

I ask Senator Dougherty a question. If I withdraw my objections, Senator Dougherty, will you assure me that you don't move to remove the emergency clause?

PRESIDENT:

Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

One moment. Let me think about it for a second. Well, remember this, I would like ... You're all laughing but this is not my bill. This is a Republican bill that was given to me to handle. I think you all know that because this Senator McBroom would not prove faithful, as I have, to the trust imposed on me. Senator, you asked me to strike the emergency clause. Is that what you? ... I will.

PRESIDENT:

Senator McBroom.

SENATOR McBROOM:

I—I hesitate, Mr. President. I apologize to the membership to take their time. This is go.... If we go into this bill, it's going to take a lot of time, and I don't believe the bill is going to pass. Senator Dougherty says it's a Republican bill. Well, I find myself in disagreement with some members of my party quite often and I presume that you do, Senator Dougherty. And I don't think the bill can pass. I have enunciated the reasons that I think it's a bad bill, and I think it's going to take a lot of time if we go into this. I think Mr. Wright has got either six or seven amendments if we go into this that I will want heard. I'll want a roll call on them, verification of the roll call, and so on.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Partee is recognized.

SENATOR PARTEE:

Mr. President. I think I owe the members of this body an explanation. Because the members of this body have worked hard and long and diligently, and I know what the physical posture and position of everybody here is. We're tired. We're all tired. I'm distressed about what's happening to two bills in the House. Two bills which, in my opinion, should not be used and utilized for partisan purposes. One is the vacancy bill. I wasn't a member of the Constitutional Convention. And I didn't know what methodology would be set forth for replacing members. But I thought it was intelligent of the Constitutional Convention to set up a modus operandi for us to follow when a member unfortunately died or left office. I think the philosophy of continuing with a full membership is an excellent and salutary one. The Constitutional Convention provided that when a member died or left this body, there would be a method by which he could be replaced. We passed leg-

isolation in the first Session by which this could be done. Not a Democratic bill; not a Republican bill, but two bills. A Democratic sponsored bill and a Republican sponsored bill. Each of which would have served the purpose intended by the Constitutional Convention. The Governor vetoed both those bills after having said that he was going to sign one or the other. But the people in Jersey County and in Calhoun County and in Macoupin County and in part of Madison County and in part of St. Clair County are without a representative here. They are without a Senator to articulate their positions and to vouchsafe their interest in the government of our State. It's distressful to me that that large number of people would be without representation. We made our point about it once and we thought we'd just leave it alone, but then when we passed, after this session of the Legislature when there's a little, just a little time left for whoever succeeds my dear friend, Bill Lyons, to come and take that seat or whatever other seat of his choice, we thought that we'd try again. We tried to pass a bill for vacancy fulfillment. We passed one and it went to the House, and now I am told: Well, the principal sponsor of this bill won't call it. Can one man determine that 204,000 people will be without representation? I think there's something wrong with a government; there is something wrong with a system that will permit one man to disenfranchise so many. I know something about disenfranchisement. I think I told you once that one of my uncles went into vote and they asked him to tell them about the Constitution; and when he told them about it they asked him how many bubbles are there in a bar of soap. Something to say to disenfranchise, and I'm extremely sensitive to anybody who would disenfranchise people. The Governor, in the first instance having vetoed these bills, it would seem to me would be very interested in seeing, at least, that these people had some representation for the remainder of this session. But we get just an opposite reaction. It's

wrong; it's foul; it's ribald; and it's something we shouldn't stand for. There's another bill over there, the State Electoral Bill. And I know something about this State Election's Commission, the Commission which I served on when I was in the House and in the Senate. And we passed a bill, a bi-partisan bill written by lawyers representing both political parties. A bill which has been worked on for almost two years. A bill sponsored in the main in the Senate by Senator Graham and by Senator Dougherty. Both of whom have given countless hours and channelized their energies and efforts toward making a good, workable, non-partisan bill. We passed that bill out of the Senate, and it lay languishing now in the House of Representatives. And the sponsor of that bill won't call it. Well, maybe he shouldn't call it if that's the way he wants to do it, but maybe somebody will find themselves in a court room very shortly and maybe in that court room action there will be a request made to defer the Primary date from March 21st to a date after we have passed a bill for a State Electoral Board. You can't very well have an election without a State Electoral Board, and I just don't understand the kind of maniacal maneuverings that are going on with reference to basic, fundamental things. We all are politicians or persons who engage in the science of government, but I think there comes a time, Mr. President, where the rights of people outweigh and preponderate our small, petty approaches to life. There is an adjournment resolution down there called House Joint Resolution 110, and when we react to that resolution this will all be over. And I, for one, Mr. President, am going to wait a little while to see if they'll give people that to which they are entitled.

PRESIDENT:

1398, Senator Dougherty.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

To hold ... to withdraw ... to pull back House Bill 1398 from the order of third reading to second reading for the purpose of offer-

ing an amendment. The amendment, I believe, is on the Clerk's desk where it has reposed since yesterday. I now call the amendment.

PRESIDENT:

1398 is pulled back. Senator Clarke.

SENATOR CLARKE:

Mr. President, on a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDENT:

Senator Clarke is recognized.

SENATOR CLARKE:

I want to speak to the issue that was raised. We were out of order then, and we're out of order now. I do not know about the con-
niving and the negotiations going on on these particular issues, but I would like to say a few words in reply to that fine speech of the President Pro Tem regarding equity and fairness and representation. There were 58 members elected to this House last year, an even division, 29 to 29, with a presiding officer of the other party. For a good many years we have had a Commission on State Government that has raised this Legislature, in a national survey, to the position of number three. And I would guess that the results of this body have probably diminished that standing to a good deal less than number three because one of the benefits, one of the benefits of the legislative process has to be, and one of the devices has to be a strong committee system. 29 to 29, and what kind of a division did we get to represent our people? Nine to six, eight to five, so that we could get the kind of treatment that we got in the Executive Committee the other night where confirmations were arbitrarily withheld, where we have no voice in what happens until it gets out on the floor, and our representation, our constituency is diminished by that action, and this legislative process is diminished by those arbitrary and machine tactics. Now let me go a little further: You talk about representation, but who was it that held the sword over the heads of two of our members for a full six months this year, challenging the will of the electorate in their districts and threatening, if you had had the votes, to throw them out and replace them.

The only thing that you respect is strength and force, and power because that's the only thing you know in Cook County. And we, in that case, had to take some very drastic action, which we did, and I had pleas from some of the top businessmen, from some of the top leaders in Cook County: Please pass this bill and that bill. And we told them very frankly: We'll pass them when that sword is removed. And if you had had the votes, those men would not be sitting in this body today, in my firm opinion. You talk about representation, I think that you should start looking into your own hearts and your own souls in terms of the kind of spectacle and the kind of legislative process that we are engaging in here with an even division and what kind of representation we are giving, unless or until we finally only have the power to withhold and thereby stop some bad legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR ROCK)

For what purpose does Senator Knuppel arise?

SENATOR KNUPPEL:

One of personal privilege. I was a member of that Election Subcommittee that heard the Election contest; and that was heard fairly, the vote was fairly returned and nobody, absolutely nobody, told me how to vote and nobody could have, and Senator Clarke knows that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR ROCK)

Senator Dougherty is recognized.

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

I move the adoption of amendment number one to House Bill 1398.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR ROCK)

Senator Dougherty moves the adoption of amendment number one. All in favor say aye. Amendment number one is adopted. Any further amendments? Are there any further amendments? Senator Harris.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which that amendment was adopted so that it can get before

us and explained. Now a legitimate question said what does the amendment do and you moved on. Now, Mr. President, let us be reasonable and sensible. I put the motion to reconsider.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR ROCK)

Senator Dougherty will you explain the amendment?

SENATOR DOUGHERTY:

Yes, certainly. I think it's very well understood, but here's what it does in essence. Senator, I'll be very happy to tell you what the amendment does. If you will recall in 1969 we passed some legislation setting up the manner in which Election Boards would be reappointed. There are two sets of bills offered to the Governor. One set of bills would have done precisely what we are attempting to do by virtue of this amendment; and another set of bills were prepared by the County and Township Affairs Committee in the House, which set up the present modus operandi. When it became apparent to the members of that committee that they're inflicting a severe financial hardship on the 84 township counties of the State of Illinois, going to cost some \$6,500,000, plus tying up the election machinery for 84 days, plus thus depriving people of the right to register, and actually, in the voting machine counties, depriving them of the right to cast their vote. They asked me to handle this bill because they had, ah, shall we say, suggested to the Governor that he sign our bills when ... as a matter of fact, he should have signed the set he vetoed. This is just an attempt to correct an error that was made. The Governor was badly persuaded. And in essence what this bill does now, Senator, it provides that the nomination for the members of the County Boards of the 84 township counties of Illinois will be nominated on the Primary election of March 21st and that subsequently those who were nominated will be placed on the ballot ... will be elected in the election ... the general election of November. It ... Thus ... The other bills that are presently on the docket provide for a Primary in February and

an election in April. Four elections, four elections costing over \$6,500,000 of wasted money, wasted effort, and the administrators are in a ... are frustrated in the manner in which we conduct these elections. This is an honest attempt on my part to do this. I have had these bills up several times and I was going to let them languish in defeat because I couldn't care less, but I was approached by members of the county boards of many counties within the State, by a Republican chairman yesterday, and several other Republican county chairmen asking me to pass these bills. I have many, many resolutions from county boards. This is not the labor of love, I assure you. It's just an attempt to bring a little order out of chaos. That's it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR ROCK)

Senator McBroom. Well that's ... Well, I thought we've already done that because he's now explaining the ... Oh, fine. I beg your ... I beg your pardon. He moved to table your motion to reconsider, so we will have a roll call on the motion to table. Those in agreement with Senator Dougherty will vote in the affirmative; those in agreement with Senator Harris will vote in the negative. Secretary will call the roll.

SECRETARY:

Arrington, Baltz, Berning, Bidwill, Bruce, Carpentier, Carroll, Cherry...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Cherry votes aye.

SECRETARY:

... Chew, Clarke, Collins, Coulson, Course, Davidson, Donnewald, Dougherty, Egan, Fawell, Gilbert, Graham, Groen, Hall, Harris, Horsley, Hynes, Johns, Knuepfer ... Knuepfer, Knuppel, Kosinski, Kusibab, Latherow, Laughlin, Lyons, McBroom, McCarthy, Merritt, Mitchler ...

PRESIDENT:

Senator McBroom.

SENATOR MCBROOM:

Well, again, I will start off with an apology. I don't want to belabor this point any longer, Senator Dougherty, but I wish that you'd asked some of the House people who are apparently interested in this ... indicate to them how much time this particular measure will take. I don't ... I don't believe the votes are here for it. I don't know what the point is in proceeding. I would like to just comment about the money that has been mentioned, that's been mentioned frequently. Nobody ... These House members that seem to know so much about it on both sides of the aisle, I wish they'd submit to me some documentation. I am a little amused about the comments about the cost. Senator Davidson and I, several months ago last Spring, were concerned about cost on voting machines and these were foisted upon us downstate where they're not needed and not wanted. So the argument on cost doesn't impress me one iota. I vote no.

SECRETARY:

... Merritt, Mitchler, Mohr, Neistein, Newhouse ...

PRESIDENT:

Senator Neistein.

SENATOR NEISTEIN:

In explaining my vote, I promised Senator Harris, I think, and Senator Clarke and Senator Coulson a book, and I'm sorry I didn't have the book down here yet, and it's by Vince Lombardi, that great figure. And he taught all the students and he taught them the character ... he built their characters, and those that ran roughshod ... he was with the seven sticks of granite in Fordham and they pulverized everybody, but they didn't know how to accept defeat. And so I promised you the book before, after running roughshod after all these years and now you're tasting a little of the reverse or adverse conditions. You've got to learn gracefully how to accept it and not to get upset because ...

PRESIDENT:

If the Chair may interrupt the roll ... For what purpose does Senator Harris arise?

SENATOR HARRIS:

On a point of personal privilege which you recognized repeatedly under circumstances like this yesterday, and I just want to point out that I would not have been on my feet. This has nothing to do with riding roughshod Senator Neistein. A very complex amendment was adopted here with a single explanation, I move to adopt number one. And a reasonable request for explanation was made and it was ignored and so I got to that point. This has nothing to do with riding roughshod. This was a procedure to get an amendment of great complexity explained and nothing more, and I don't want that impression made.

PRESIDENT:

Just, just a moment.

SENATOR HARRIS:

... that were involved with riding roughshod, and that ends my point of personal privilege. There has been such flagrant uses of description here in the last couple of days, I am just making my point clear. That is all, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT:

Just, just a moment. We're about ... we're going to settle all of this in just a moment. Senator Partee is recognized.

SENATOR PARTEE:

Mr. President and members of the Senate. A careful assessment of the number of people here and the number of people who would be likely to vote for the bill under consideration leads me, in conjunction with a conversation I just had a few moments ago with Speaker Blair, to make the kind of motion I am going to make. Speaker Blair told me that Representative Phil Collins was the principal sponsor for the

handling of the two bills involved that I spoke about a few minutes ago, and that he refuses to call them. On that basis, and our rules being what they are with reference to the control of a bill by the person handling it, I am going to make a motion. I only hate for Representative Collins that he is in that kind of position. He is a, basically, a decent person. He, of course, is following the position of his leader. I would hope that it would not be injurious to him in later life. But I am only going to say that we know now that these bills are not going to be called and it does not serve any useful purpose to wait. I am going to ask, Mr. President, that the Senate now adopt House Joint Resolution 110 which is the adjournment resolution adjourning us to January 12, 1972, at 12:00 noon.

PRESIDENT:

For what purpose does Senator Groen arise?

SENATOR GROEN:

I am just wondering what happens to the resolutions that have been introduced. Might they be at least accepted by the Secretary and placed in the Committee on Executive.

PRESIDENT:

Is it acceptable that the resolutions here that are congratulatory will be shown as adopted? Are there any that are noncongratulatory? There is one... If there is one that is not congratulatory, it will be referred to the Executive Committee. The motion is to adopt ... Senator Merritt.

SENATOR MERRITT:

Do I understand in those congratulatory also the death resolutions will be included?

PRESIDENT:

That's right. That will be included. Motion to adopt the adjournment resolution. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. Senate stands adjourned.