

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-SECOND LEGISLATIVE DAY

MARCH 28, 1973

10:00 O'CLOCK A.M.

THE HONORABLE W. ROBERT BLAIR, SPEAKER

IN THE CHAIR



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

A Roll Call for attendance was taken and indicated that all were present with the exception of the following:

Representative Richard A. Carter - illness;

Representative Peter C. Granata - illness;

Representative Donald E. Griesheimer - no reason given;

Representative John F. Wall - illness.



Doorkeeper: "The House will be in order. Prayer by Mr. Carey."

Mr. Carey: "Let us pray. He who does justice shall dwell in the House of the Lord and he will live on His Holy mountain. Amen."

Rep. Capuzi: "Messages from the Senate."

Fredric B. Selcke: "A message from the Senate. A message to the House, by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of the Bill with the following title, veto of the Governor notwithstanding. House Bill 89, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Department of Transportation for certain emergency transportation operation grant. Passed the Senate March 27, 1973, by a 3/5 vote, veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. House Bill 89, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Transportation for certain emergency transportation operation grants. Passed the Senate March 27, 1973, by a 3/5 vote. Veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary."

Rep. Capuzi: "Introduction...First Reading of Bills."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 805, Pierce, amends the School Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 806, Stone, amends the Higher Education Student Assistance Law, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 807, Barry, et al., appropriates 800,276 dollars for the expense of the Illinois Legislative Council, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 808, Ron Hoffman, amends the Revenue Act, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 809, J. David Jones, appropriates 69 dollars and 50 cents to Ivan E. Wager, for World War I compensation, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 810, Calvo, amends the Revenue Act,



First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 811, Barnes, et al., amends the Vehicle Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 812, Barnes, amends the Vehicle Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 813, Philip, et al., amends the Vehicle Code, First Reading of the Bill. 814, Timothy Simms, et al., amends the Criminal Code, First Reading of the Bill. 815, Collins, et al., appropriates...reappropriates 8 million, 200 thousand from the road fund, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 816, Blair, et al., amends the Legislative Council Act, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 817, Barry, et al., amends the Illinois Vehicle Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 818, Borchers, et al., amends the Retailer's Occupation Tax, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 819, B. B. Wolfe, amends the Professional Service Corporation Act, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 820, Londrigan, et al., amends the Vehicle Code, First Reading of the Bill. 821...Who's the sponsor of these?...821 on...Call up, upstairs, and find out who it is."

Rep. Capuzi: "Larry DiPrima, be quiet please, there'll be a slight delay. Shut up, Larry."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 821, Sangmeister, amends the Library District Act, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 822, Yourell, amends the Election Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 823, Yourell, amends the Township Act, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 824, Yourell, creates an Act providing for the regulation of Marriage Counselors, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 825, Yourell, appropriates 20 thousand dollars for the Department of Registration and Education, First Reading of the Bill. 826, Waddell, et al., amends the Election Code, First Reading of the Bill. 827, Epton,



amends the Insurance Code, First Reading of the Bill. 828, Epton, adds an Article to the Illinois Insurance Code, First Reading of the Bill. 829, Bradley, amends the School Code, First Reading of the Bill. 830, Juckett, an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code, First Reading of the Bill. 831, Juckett, amends the Mental Health Code, First Reading of the Bill. 832, Juckett, amends the Civil Administrative Code, First Reading of the Bill. 833, McGah, amends the Municipal Code, First Reading of the Bill. You got any more, Chalkie?"

Rep. Capuzi: "Mr. DiPrima now moves that the House stay in recess until 10:00 a.m., this morning.

W. Robert Blair: "The House will be in order. The invocation this morning will be by Dr. Johnson."

Dr. Johnson: "Remembering, Oh, Lord, that Your mercies are new to us each day, we presume to stand in Your presence this morning and ask for a full measure of Your spirit as we face the deliberations and the decisions that will confront us, not only this day but each day of this Legislative week. Give each of us a mind intent upon faithful service and a will which is ready to conform to Your directives. Above all, give us steady reliance upon Your promise to stand by us in every need and to strengthen us for every task undertaken in Your name. We commit ourselves to Your keeping, Oh, God, as with the Psalmist, we lift our eyes to Your throne of grace and confess our help is in the name of the Lord, the Lord who made Heaven and earth. Amen."

Unknown: "Mr. Speaker, how are you?"

W. Robert Blair: "Roll Call for attendance. The gentleman from Cook, Mr.



William Walsh."

Walsh, W.: "Mr. Speaker, will the Journal show that Representatives Granata and Wall are absent because of illness and also will the records show that Representatives Holloway and Catania were absent yesterday on House business to attend the funeral of Bill Robinson."

W. Robert Blair: "Match....Committee Report."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Mr. Klosak, from Registration and Regulation, to which House Bill 37 was referred, reported the same back with recommendation, Bill do not pass. Mr. Klosak, from Registration and Regulation, to which House Bill 463 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation, the Bill do pass and rereferred to Appropriations. Mr. Klosak, from Registration and Regulation, to which House Bill 462 and 533 were referred, reported the same back with recommendation, the Bills do pass. Mr. Klosak, from Registration and Regulation, to which House Bill 707 was referred, reported the same back with amendments thereto, with the recommendation the amendments be adopted and the bills, as amended, do pass. No further Committee Reports."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Mr. Speaker, I would like the record to indicate that Representative Richard Carter is absent because of illness....and Representative DiPrima and Ike Sims was officially absent from House business yesterday, because of the attendance of former Representative Robinson's funeral."

W. Robert Blair: "All right, the Journal will so indicate. Introduction, First Reading."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 834, Kempiners, amends ...Park District Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 835, Totten, et al.,



amends the School Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 836, Brinkmeier, et al., amends the Vehicle Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 837, Craig, et al., reappropriates certain amounts to the Secretary of State, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 838, Washington, et al., amends the Vehicle Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 839, Schraeder, et al., amends the Vehicle Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 840, Washington, et al., makes appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense for the Department of Local Governmental Affairs, First Reading of the Bill. What are these, Agreed Resolutions? Who are the Sponsors? Oh, here they are."

W. Robert Blair: "Agreed Resolutions."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Resolution 146, Geo-Karis, et al., House Resolution 147, Barnes, et al., House Resolution 148, Calvo, et al., House Resolution 150, Barnes, et al., House Resolution 152, Bradley, et al., House Resolution 153, Bradley, et al., House Resolution 154, Waddell, et al."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh, W.: "These are the Agreed Resolutions, Mr. Speaker. And House Resolution 146 congratulates Ruth W. Gregory for her outstanding and unselfish service through the years to the people of Waukegan and the Waukegan Public Library which celebrates the 75th anniversary. House Resolution 147, by Representative Barnes, and many others, and I am sure that Representatives Katz, Porter and Duff join in this, and this congratulates the Huskies of Hirsch High School for the great job they did in winning the Class AA Championship last Saturday. House Resolution 148, congratulates the Basketball team of Venice



High School in their achieving first place in the Class A division. House Resolution 150 congratulates Isaac 'Ike' Jackson, of Chicago, on becoming the first black to own an Aamco franchise in Chicago, and House Resolution 152, by Representative Bradley, congratulates a great basketball team, the 'Saints' of Bloomington Central Catholic High School. And House Resolution 153 also by Representative Bradley congratulates Jimmy Crews, former basketball star of University High School in Normal, who has completed an outstanding freshman year of ball playing at Indiana University. And House Resolution 154, by Representative Waddell, congratulates the mighty 'Knights' of Kaneland, upon winning second place honors in the Class A Illinois high school basketball tournament and I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. The question is on the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. All right. House Bills, Third Reading. We'll get down there so we can get some of these Third Readings out of the way early this morning. We stopped at 69 yesterday, we'll pick up at 74 today. Mr. Ewell here? All right. Take it out."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 84, Tipword, an Act authorizing the Department of Transportation to make a flood study of the entire South Fork of the Sangamon River, Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen, this Bill is a Bill for a small appropriation of 15 thousand dollars for a flood study on the South Fork of the Sangamon River, which I understand is at flood again this morning. This Bill was passed last Session and then was



vetoed by the Governor on the understanding that there were funds in another area to provide for this study. The Department...or the Division of Water Resources said that the funds were committed and there was not funds available, so the Bill has been resubmitted. I appreciate your support on this small appropriation."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. Any further discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 84 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 130 'ayes' and no 'nays'; and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Fredric W. Selcke: "House Bill 122, Maragos, a Act to regulate the distribution, sale, and delivery of eyeglasses and so forth, Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to move, with leave of the House, to move this Bill back to Second Reading for an amendment." Leave for Second Reading for an amendment."

W. Robert Blair: "Yes, all right, the gentleman now is going back...is there objection? Hearing none, take it back to Second Reading. Read the amendment."

Fredric W. Selcke: "Amendment #1, Maragos, amends House Bill 122, page 1, by deleting lines 8 through 13, and so forth."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment #1 revises this Bill to conform with the Federal Statutes regarding this area. It's just a technical amendment to see that it makes all of the specifications that are necessary so that it will be in conformity



with the Federal Legislation and I ask for your...adoption of this amendment."

W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? All right. The question is, the adoption of amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it, the amendment is adopted. Further amendments? All right. Third Reading."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 124, Griesheimer, an Act authorizing and directing the Division of Water Resource Management, Department of Transportation, to make examinations, surveys...the shore line of Lake Michigan, Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "Out of the record."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 128, Hart..."

W. Robert Blair: "He's not here. Take it out. Take...Mr. Hart's not here, take...129, 133 out...Now 134. 134."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 134, Deuster..."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from..."

Fredric B. Selcke: "...an Act to amend Section 6 of an Act to revise the law in relation to marriages, Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill to update the Illinois Marriage License Law. And it's a very good Bill, it will bring happiness and joy into the hearts of many ministers and many young couples. Actually the House Bill 134 simply provides that a marriage license issued in any Illinois county will be respected beyond the county boundaries and will be valid for a ceremony performed anywhere in the State of Illinois. As a matter of fact there may be some young couples and perhaps some members of this House...who are not lawfully wedded and don't even know it, as



a result of this grievance in the Illinois law. I think it's a good Bill. It ...The need for this law was brought to my attention by some ministers, including my own pastor who discovered the inconvenience and difficulty presented by the law. It's supported by my late county clerk. The county clerks are not opposed to it. I've examined it carefully. It provides no difficulty in record keeping. I think it's a good Bill and I'd be happy to answer any questions."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Skinner....McHenry..."

Skinner: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

W. Robert Blair: "He indicates he will."

Skinner: "Is it true that this Bill will legitimize your marriage, Representative Deuster?"

Deuster: "Would you restate your question?"

Skinner: "Is it true that passage of this Bill will legitim..legim...I can't even say it....will make your marriage ...will make your marriage valid?"

Deuster: "Well, I wish that it would be possible to place the affects of this law back into the ages...if it went back 20 years it would cover me but it's only prospective rather than retroactive."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson."

Rayson: "Mr. Speaker, I just asked the gentleman, what are the inconveniences now that...and what would this Bill do to correct them?"

Deuster: "Yes, to the gentleman from Cook County, I would indicate this, we have many communities...now, particularly in the Chicago Metropolitan area and in other parts of the state, where a community straddles the county line or is near the county line and we may have young people who are living in one county, they might be living in Barrington, working in Waukegan, and they desire to be married on the



Cook County side...or they may attend church..they cross county lines to attend church and it will simply make it a little easier for them. They don't have to go to an obscure, far away place to get the license. And the other convenience is this; I'll tell you a true..true story. A couple from Mundelein, Illinois, were attending Northwestern University in Cook. They had a lovely wedding in the Northwestern Chapel. After it was over, they went into the back room to do the paper work and pay the minister and he said, 'Oh, my goodness, this will never do.' He said, 'You've got a Lake County license and this is Cook County.' So what they had to do is they got in the car with the minister and the bridal party, they went up to a photographer's studio in Highland Park, just across the Lake County line and had the marriage ceremony performed over again. This has happened to many couples. They usually don't talk about it..because it's kind of an embarrassment, but if this Bill were passed it would be possible for young couples who may decide at the last minute to have a marriage at their grandmother's house in McHenry, or somewhere, that their license would be valid and they would not have to go out and get a second license."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. McGah."

McGah: "The sponsor yield for a question?"

W. Robert Blair: "Yes."

McGah: "Suppose you have a Cook County marriage license and the wedding is performed in Lake County, were does the minister or judge make a return of the certificate? Does it go back to Cook County or to Lake?"

Deuster: "Yes. The law would remain as it is and the return would go to



the County Clerk that issued the license. And I might say that I examined very carefully, in Lake County, how the licenses are processed, the county clerk showed me and actually they keep an...computer printout and they really don't have any record until it's sent in as to whether the marriage is performed. There doesn't seem to be any problem here."

McGah: "Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "Further discussion? The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, to close."

Deuster: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a Lake County marriage license which is probably similar to licenses all around the state, and at the top of the license it says, 'Good in Lake County only.' Passage of this law will delete that slogan from your marriage licenses and facilitate the uniting in happy wedlock of young couples and it will make life a little simpler for ministers. And in closing I would like to say that marriage is a great institution and no American family should be without it."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. The question is, shall House Bill 134 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. The gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, if I may ask the sponsor a question? Is this your first Bill?"

Deuster: "In response to your question, I am pleased to indicate that 'yes' this is my first Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wish? Campbell, 'aye'. Skinner, 'aye'. Grotberg wants to talk. Turn him on."

Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, would the



sponsor yield....No, it's too late. I'd like to explain my vote. I missed the debate, but I've had so much correspondence from county clerks on this issue, I just wanted to explain my 'no' vote, as green as it is, Mr. Deuster, up there. Thank you very much."

W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record.

On this question there are 116 'ayes', and 23 'nays', this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 137, Hart..."

W. Robert Blair: "Wait. Hart was off the floor....the Reference Bureau, so let's go back to his 129. He wants to take that back to second."

Back to 129, and the gentleman...No, he doesn't want 128 called, he wants 129 and he wants to take it back to second....for."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 129, Hart, ..."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "I'd like leave of the House to take this Bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of an amendment."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. Is there objection? Hearing none, it will be taken back for purpose of an amendment."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment #3, Hart, amends..."

Hart: "Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which House...Amendment #2, to House Bill 129 was adopted. I wish to table that Amendment #2."

W. Robert Blair: "Yeah. I think we can do that rather than voting to reconsider....All those in favor of the gentleman's motion to table Amendment #2....say 'aye'....opposed 'no'...The 'ayes' have it, the amendment is tabled. Are there further amendments?"

All right. Amendment #3. Amendment #3 reincorporates the provisions
Amendment #2 and also incorporates a line from Amendment #1 which

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

was also previously tabled, but which portion would have been incorporated in Amendment #2. So, with Amendment #3, we are picking up the best parts of Amendment #1 and 2. I move for the adoption... of such amendment."

W. Robert Blair: "The question is on the adoption of amendment...Discussion?"

All those in favor say 'aye'....opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments?

Third Reading. He wants 133 called."

Fredric B. Seicke: "House Bill 133, Hart, an Act to amend Section 3 of an Act in relation to the joint election of a State's Attorney, and so forth, Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 133 simply provides that in the event two or more counties go together and agree to elect a joint State's Attorney, that the state would continue to pay, to those counties, the same amount of money that it now pays to each of them, toward the salaries of the State's Attorney. The limit on this would be that the amount that the state would pay would not exceed the maximum amount ...amount of the salaries fixed for the State's Attorney, in the accumulated population for the counties involved. This is in the nature of implementation of the Constitution. It's been approved and endorsed by the State's Attorney's Association and I believe that it's good legislation and would encourage the combining of two or more counties for the election of a joint State's Attorney. My Cosponsor on this Bill, Roscoe Cunningham, of Lawrence County, is a former State's Attorney and he advises me that the State's Attorney's Association has endorsed this Bill. We would appreciate the support of the



House on this legislation."

W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? All right. The question is, shall House Bill 133 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Totten 'aye'. Take the record. Douglas 'aye'. Waddell 'aye'. 138 'aye', no 'nays', this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. ..."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 137, Hart..."

W. Robert Blair: "Wait a minute...For what purpose...the gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, rise?"

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, is this the right time to move to add my great and good friend, Representative Hart, as the Cosponsor of House Bill 20. He passes Bills so easily. I haven't cleared the appointment with him but do we need leave of the body to do so?"

W. Robert Blair: "The answer of your first question is 'no'. The gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Gibbs."

Gibbs: "Aye'.

W. Robert Blair: "Gibbs, 'aye'. We'll catch you on motions, Mr. Cunningham."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 137, an Act to amend Sections 22 and 26 of an Act to create the White County Port District, and so forth, Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. Two or three years ago Representative Stedelin and I and others who represented White County passed a Bill creating the White County Port Authority. Unfortunately, in the terminology of the Bill there was reference in one part to a nine member board and another part to a three member board. For this reason Governor Ogilvie has...did not



appoint any board members because of the question of whether or not there would be a three member or a nine member board. The purpose of this legislation merely is to clear up this by making consistant throughout the Act, that the number of the board, of the White County Port Authority, will be three. I request the affirmative vote of the House on this amendment to the present statute."

W. Robert Blair: "Further discussion? The gentleman care to close? All right. The question is, shall House Bill 137 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 136 'ayes', 2 'nays'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

J. F. O'Brien: "House Bill 138, Londrigan, a Bill for an Act in relation to administrative rules and procedures, Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, may we have leave to consider the two Bills together?"

W. Robert Blair: "What is the other Bill? What's the other number?"

Londrigan: "It amends the administrative rule where ...where...139...."

W. Robert Blair: "139...?"

Londrigan: "Right."

W. Robert Blair: "You're asking for...All right. The gentleman is asking for leave to have 139 heard at the same time as 138. Is there objection? Hearing none, the Clerk will read 139."

J. F. O'Brien: "House Bill 139, a Bill for an Act to add Section 8 to an Act concerning administrative rules, Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan."



Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, this is the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. It is a uniform Act codifying the procedure and rules in one place. Now, in our statute, in over 150 different Acts and Sections we have four or five paragraphs setting out each individual hearing procedure. This Act will place this in one place and then will strike all of these many...many paragraphs throughout the Acts and will clean up all of the languages of these Acts. It is supported by the Illinois Bar Association and what it will do it will make it easy for everyone to see what the rules and regulations are in all of our licensing procedures and all other administrative procedures. It will also place in one place, the Secretary of State, the rules of each agency. This will be a tremendous help. It sailed through the House before and I ask for your support again."

W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman."

Berman: "Will the sponsor yield?"

W. Robert Blair: "Yes."

Berman: "Jim, is this merely sort of a recording Act, or does it set forth substantive guidelines for procedures?"

Londrigan: "It sets forth all of the hearing procedures which will now be found, if this is passed, in one Act....rather than is now the case in well over 150 different places."

Berman: "We passed this Bill previously. What happened to it? Do you recall?"

Londrigan: "It got to the Governor's Office and ...it sailed through the House and Senate, got to the Governor's Office and he vetoed it saying it needed additional study. I asked him why he vetoed it and he said he thought some agency, the Department...of Family Services,



thought they couldn't live with it, he wasn't sure. This has been studied and proposed for now..approximately ten years and as I said the Bar Association and most people in general do support this plan. I know of no organized opposition to it."

Berman: "Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add my voice in support of this Bill. This is a measure that's long overdue and I think that it is something that will assist everyone who has to deal with any part of the administrative bureaucracy of the state. I would urge a 'yes' vote on these two House Bills."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Joliet, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Londrigan: "Yes."

W. Robert Blair: "Proceed."

Leinenweber: "Representative Londrigan, do I understand this then, any state agency board or other state department where the statute specifically, at the present time, sets forth a administrative procedure, that this will supplement...er..that this will ...this Act will repeal that?"

Londrigan: "Not exactly. What ...We will pass this Act, then we will go through each Act individually and make it apply to this administrative procedure. There are several agencies, possibly the Illinois Commerce Commission and the Industrial Commission who will not want to come under this Act and that's why we're doing it in this manner. If we pass this Act here today it will not be enforced at all until we come back with each individual Act."

Leinenweber: "I see. But then in the future, when we draft laws creating Commissions, Departments or Agencies, the Act creating the Department will merely refer to the Administrative Procedure Act, as it



now refers to Administrative Review. Is that correct?"

Londrigan: "Exactly."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Londrigan: "I would add my support to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

W. Robert Blair: "Further discussion? The gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I would like to add my support to Mr. Londrigan's Bill. I had the opportunity to work in an administrative agency of this state government for over five years. As a lawyer, I know that this is one of the most expanding bodies and fields in the area of law. It's one in which those who proceed must proceed very cautiously if they are to achieve due process....for their clients...in that....nearly every administrative agency in this state has different rules and regulations. This is a very important piece of legislation. It's one that everyone in this House should support so that we can provide due process in behalf of those who are appearing before agencies and I'd ask your support on the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. Further discussion? All right, the question is...Would you care to close, Mr. Londrigan?...All right. The question is, shall these two Bills pass, House Bill 138 and 139? All those in favor will vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Clerk will take two Roll Calls. Have all voted who wish? All right. The Clerk will take the record. Mann 'aye'. Capuzi 'aye'. Geo-Karis 'aye'. Philip 'no'....'aye'. Pretty close, I can't tell. Dyer 'aye'. Schneider 'aye'. Springer 'aye'. Huskey 'aye'. Ewell 'aye'. Skinner 'aye'. Is that everybody? 147 'aye'...no 'nays'.



Each of these two Bills having received their Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 140, Kosinski, an Act to amend Section 203 of the Illinois Income Tax Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, it was found that the State of Illinois has in essence been guilty of double taxation; this in the area of alimony and separate maintenance payments. Presently, a person making such payments cannot use his spouse as a dependent and cannot take deductions from his state income tax for such payments. This Bill will make the State of Illinois conform with federal tax procedures. There was no opposition in Committee. One Amendment was added by the Department of Revenue, was nonsubstantive, merely to clarify language. It passed the Revenue Committee 18 to nothing. I ask for your support with an 'aye' vote to correct this injustice. Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? All right. The question is, shall House Bill 140 pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', and opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, ... Mr. Grotberg 'aye'. Mr. Mugalian 'aye'. Ms. Geo-Karis 'aye'. Mr. Molloy 'aye'. Mr. Pierce 'aye'. Mr. Gibbs 'aye'. Piotrowicz 'aye'. LaFleur 'aye'. Polk 'aye'. All right. Let's take another Roll Call. The Clerk is lost. All those in favor of House Bill 140 please vote 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. This is a new Roll Call. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 139 'ayes' and one 'nay'....and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Dunn. R. L. Dunn 'aye'....on this Roll Call."



Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 149, Epton. A bill for 'An Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code'. Third reading of the bill."

Rep. Capuzi: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton is recognized."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a bill that's had considerable discussion on the floor of the House and in the past several years. It's a bill which in the past, I have resisted. I have argued against what this bill reports to do on three previous occasions. You may recall, Representative Collins attempted to pass this bill previously and at that time I pointed out to the House, the danger of limiting the insurance markets in the City of Chicago. For the past four years, the Illinois Insurance Study Commission has been working on this problem with the industry. The insurance industry has been reluctant to make any change. Obviously, they have no desire to limit their profit in any way. I am happy to tell you, however, that as a result of our discussions with individual insurance companies, the one thing that we were afraid of in the past, is no longer a threat. The possibility that some insurance carriers will refuse to write in the inner city. Now, I should call to the attention of everyone involved, that this does not create any new situation. It simply returns the City of Chicago to the situation it was in 1970. In 1970, one brilliant insurance company in its great wisdom, saw fit to divide the City of Chicago into four categories. They arbitrarily divided the City of Chicago in these four areas



raising the rates of many people in the Inner City. Thereafter, a second great carrier followed their lead and, really nearly, the rest of the insurance industry, without rhyme or reason, proceeded to do likewise. This bill rectifies a situation which never should have come to pass. It simply returns the City of Chicago to one geographic zone for insurance rating purposes, and I respectfully urge the Members of the House to vote to rectify a situation which does grievous harm to many residents of the Inner City. Thank you."

Rep. Capuzi: "All right, is there discussion. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber is recognized."

Leinenweber: "Will the Gentleman from Cook yeild to a question?"

Rep. Capuzi: "He indicates he will. Proceed, sir."

Leinenweber: "Representative Epton, would the effect of this bill be to raise the insurance rates of those drivers outside of the City of Chicago?"

Epton: "It will have no effect whatsoever on any rates outside of the City of Chicago, and in all probability, will not effect the rates... will not raise the rates in the Inner City."

Rep. Capuzi: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dunn."

Dunne: "A question for the sponsor. Bernie, did I understand you to say just now, that insurance companies support this bill."

Epton: "No, I didn't say that at all. As a matter of fact, they have resisted this bill on each and every occasion."



Dunne: "Oh, I thought you said that ah, this year that they had changed."

Epton: "No, what I did say was that in the past the insurance industry has threatened that if this bill passed, they would not write any insurance for the Inner City. In the last four years... last three years, since 1970, as a result of our discussions, which haven't been to friendly, they have indicated that even if this bill should pass they would continue to write and very simply, I should add, they found this very profitable."

Dunne: "You're suggesting... you're saying then, that if we have one common rate for the City of Chicago, by law, that you have the assurance of the companies that they will not act arbitrarily and refuse to underwrite in certain..."

Epton: "No, it does not have the effect of having one rate in the City of Chicago. They will still be allowed to write as heretofore, by virtue of age, by virtue of driving record. It simply will not allow them to divide the area for geographic..."

Dunne: "I understand that. You're saying that you have the assurance of the insurance companies then that if we revert then it's eliminating territories in the city that they will continue to provide as much market as a..."

Epton: "When you say I have the assurance of the insurance companies. There are 528 insurance carriers in the City of Chicago. I do not have assurance from them, but I do have assurance from seven of the leading writers, that this will not effect writing.. that they will continue to furnish



a market."

Dunne: "They said this in committee?"

Epton: "Mr. Dunne, I said to you and I said before in the House that the Commission for 4 years has been talking to them. When I say that they have indicated this, the answer again is unequivocally 'yes'."

Dunne: "Do you, will the affect of this ah.. be that ah.. auto insurance rates in ' ah.. I do not remember the territory number but ah.. the territory I live in, you know, in Beverly Hills will probably go up."

Epton: "That's not true at all."

Dunne: "I kind of disagree with you. But,.."

Epton: "That's your privilege."

Dunne: "Can you explain that? You're.."

Epton: "You're making an assumption. I'm dealing with facts. I'm telling you that today, you may not be the companies that you represent, Mr. Dunne, but I'm telling you that today there are insurance companies in the City of Chicago writing one rate for the entire city regardless of this geographical discrimination. And when you suggest that they will raise rates, I submit to you that when they make a profit of \$200,000,000 and this possible change may cost them \$10,000, it doesn't seem logical that they will raise their rates. Even for those of you who live in the affluent areas."

Dunne: "Bernie, I'm not necessarily opposed to this bill, I'm just trying to get some facts."



Epton: "Well, I'm.. I have the.. I'm sorry. I did assume you were opposing."

Rep. Capuzi: "All right. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos is recognized."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker. Will the sponsor yield to a question?"

Rep. Capuzi: "Just a moment please. Gentlemen and Ladies. This is an important matter. Let's keep the noise level down, please. And Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Ah.. Representative Epton, ah.. in.. wasn't this bill brought up in last session? What happened? Was it killed in the Senate?"

Epton: "Ah.. this came up in two separate forms. The bill that Representative Collins passed was killed in the Senate. Thereafter in discussions with some of the leading insurance carriers, we included in an amendment on another bill, which eliminated the discrimination on bodily injury rates only. This bill now affects all rates."

Maragos: "May I speak on the question, Mr. Speaker?"

Rep. Capuzi: "Proceed, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, I would like to get leave of the House to become cosponsor of this wonderful legislation and I want to strongly support it because ah.. I don't.. I thought it was already law, but I see that it was only in a limited area that it would become law. And I think it should be generally in all areas and I would like to get leave of the House after conclusion of the debate to become a cosponsor on this bill as well. And I strongly urge passage."

Rep. Capuzi: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Gibbs is recognized."



7

Gibbs: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield to a question?"

Rep. Capuzi: "He indicates he will. Proceed."

Gibbs: "Bernie, we discussed this last year. And I'm certainly in favor of the principle here and I think maybe the answer to the question has been answered but because of the noise I couldn't hear. Ah.. the main thing we want to accomplish is to make sure the companies.. the ah.. the more solvent companies stay in these areas and continue to write. And is there any provision at all that requires this mandatory writing or to stay in the area? What's to keep them from pulling out of certain areas where the degree of risk is so much higher than in say, another area?"

Epton: "I think, in effect, you answered the question. I'm glad you raised the point. Some of these companies undoubtedly would not have been in quotes so generous. If we had not passed an insolvency, guaranteed bill in the previous session. As a result of that insolvency, guarantee bill, if they fail to write in the area, if the great, large standard companies pull out, they may very well be faced with smaller, substandard companies writing the bulk of the business and thereafter they could be faced with an insolvency which will wind up costing them money anyhow. So that was a big, big hammer that made them write. And second additional factor which comes as a surprise to many of us, is that this business has now turned out to be profitable."

Gibbs: "Well, as far you're concerned, Bernie, you are satisfied that these companies will stay in there and remain and continue to write, then. Is that right?"



Epton: "I have their reluctant assurance that they will."

Gibbs: "Well, I'm certainly in favor of this bill then. Thank you."

Rep. Capuzi: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield to a question?"

Rep. Capuzi: "Proceed, Sir."

Kosinski: "Ah.. Bernie.. In adjusting this and imposing equity, this will have an advantage to the high risk areas. But, as a direct question, will this raise insurance rates in my district?"

Epton: "In all probability, it will not. And I can simply point out to you that I have in front of me, for example, a rate,. obviously none of us can control what and insurance company might or might not do. But as early as 1971 when this was in effect, there were 7, 6 companies that were writing one rate of business throughout the entire city charging the same rate. For example, the rate was 193.50 for the inter-city, the rate was 193.50 for your area. The rate was, again another company, 243 and so on. The point is some companies charge individual rates, but there is no reason why anybody in your area should pay an additional premium by virtue of passage of this bill."

Kosinski: "Well, then how.. ah.. how will the insurance companies make out if they, if this imposes ah.. ah.. a factor on the high risk areas, they'll have to make it up somewhere certainly won't they?"

Epton: "Well, there's two ways. One, the factor that it imposed was so negligible that it was astonishing that they even did



it in the first place. For example, in testimony for the Commission, representatives of Allstate and State Farm stated that their differential from one area to the other was less than 10%. In addition to that, we're talking about insurance companies, who in the last three years have had tremendous profits. And because of that, they have found that it ah.. really doesn't make sense to raise their particular rates. You are perfectly right in assuming that one area may help defray the costs of another area. But this is true of the entire principle of insurance and the question very simply is, why you stop on one side of the street as against the other?"

Kosinski: "I would presume that this had opposition from the insurance companies and committees, did it not?"

Epton: "No it did not. It had comments, well yes, I would suppose you would call it opposition. What they.. what they tried to state was that they felt that restricting their writing by zones was proper. What they couldr.'t defend was why they chose to stop at what particular street. In other words, why should an area change at 87th Street, for example, why would one side of the street get one rate and the other not? So, it would really, the actuaries were unable to defend their position. Although you are correct, that they did object to this in committee."

Kosinski: "In their opposition, wasn't one of their pointed pleas was the fact that there would be increases in areas presently enjoying the lower rate?"

Epton: "No. Primarily, their implied threat and I say implied



10.

because I have insurances to the contrary, was that they would simply not write in the areas where they weren't making the profit. In other words, they would not go into your area and raise the rates, they just wouldn't send their agents into the inter-city where their loss experience might be higher."

Koskinski: "In other words, while this is intended to unify and do good for high risk areas, it might injure those areas not providing insurance for people in those areas."

Epton: "If that were valid, you're absolutely right. But as they pointed out, the insurance company, the industries have found out that the areas that they have heretofore ignored, have been profitable for the companies that they allowed to obtain that business. As a matter of fact, that is the greatest assurance we have, if they will write not their implied promises to me or any other member of the commission. The fact that it is profitable."

Koskinski: "Bernie, it appears that your intent in this legislation is laudable. But the end result is questionable. Thank you."

Rep. Capuzi: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff.":

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

Rep. Capuzi: "He will. Proceed."

Duff: "Ah.. the bill is a very brief one in wording and it's ah.. as I read it says that this applies to Section 4 of the Insurance Code, Risks included in Section 4 of the Insurance Code. Ah.. would you mind enumerating for us the.. the risks that are included in Section 4 of the



Insurance Code?"

11.

Epton: "This includes for all practical purposes all insurance rates. The only reason that emphasis is placed upon automobile is that to the best of our knowledge, there has been no ah.. geographical designation of any rating areas. What has happened in the past is, for example, in the case of fire insurance, some companies has simply refused to write. So that ah.. we.. although we include all of the types of insurance, we simply are attempting to avoid a repetition of a mistake which was initiated in 1970. It does not really affect any other rates."

Duff: "Ahh.. so you're saying that ah.. this bill will affect the rates and risk code selection thereby in fire insurance, automobile insurance, vandalism, theft, malicious mischief, and ah.. all of those property categories. Is that correct?"

Epton: "Correct."

Duff: "But not, I take it, life and health."

Epton: "Correct."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to the bill."

Capuzi: "Proceed, Sir."

Duff: "There is a very serious and.. and really literally dangerous and socially inhibiting effect to ah.. what would seem to be a simple and lotatory intent. Ah.. many Members will recall two years ago when a proposal was made on the floor of this Chamber, that there be a single rate covering a six-county area within 50 miles of Chicago. Ah.. there was ah.. certain other proposal made at that time which would have a single rate for automobile insurance for all of Cook



County. There was a proposal made similar to this, but limited specifically to automobile insurance. Now what the effect of this is, Mr. Speaker, is to take the historical risk selection based on experience.."

Rep. Capuzi: "Just a moment, Sir. Proceed, Mr. Duff."

B. B. Duff: "The effect of this, Mr. Speaker, is to take the historical loss experience in any number of very serious areas of insurance which affect the entire community and economy of the City of Chicago on a principle that can be and, in fact, has been attempted to be, extended over a much wide area. If you take, for example, only the fire insurance problem and you know very well that as a characteristic of neighborhoods you might have light industry, heavy industry, growing areas, apartment areas, residential home areas, all of which can be defined actuarially, statistically on the premise of character of the geographic area, on the premise of loss experience and this would be eliminated. In the area of automobile insurance or home insurance you would be saying that there is no difference within a community of 3 million people between one area where your vandilism may be high, another area where your fire risk may be high, and what you're saying is that the company who will write a risk for \$100, let's say, city wide, in the City of Chicago, which is at the moment the only area that would be affected by this, You're saying that if the company has a loss experience in one neighborhood of \$150 and it has a loss experience in another neighborhood of \$50, to exagperate the situation, the companies will not, Mr. Speaker, on the free and open market,



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

seek to sell business where they are guaranteed to lose money. If they are allowed, under a principle of spread of risks, to write a premium for a neighborhood which is appropriate, they then can and will write business to sustain the economy of that particular area. If they can make a profit in one part of town and not in another on the same rate, Mr. Speaker, there will be an inevitable movement towards writing only in the profitable areas resulting in a very serious economic loss to the city. This bill and the principles supporting it which have been propounded to us for the last two years have a very, very serious negative implication to the economy of the City of Chicago and all of the surrounding areas and ultimately, Mr. Speaker, the same principle can say there should be only one state wide rate. This is a very bad bill, Mr. Speaker. I urge the Members of the House to pay a great deal of attention to the implications of it to the people in their districts and to probably one of the most vital areas of the economy in Illinois."

Rep. Capuzi: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe."

B. B. Wolfe: "Ah.. thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the gentleman yield for a question or two."

Rep. Capuzi: "He indicates he will, proceed."

B. B. Wolfe: "Ah.. Representative Epton, the ah.. the bill, as I look at it, prohibits geographic discrimination in insurance rate charges in municipalities with a population of 500,000 or more. Now, by implication, does that mean that in municipalities under 500,000 insurance companies would be permitted to discriminate on the basis of geographic location."



B. E. Epton: "No, it doesn't mean anything except that we are trying to rectify a situation where they have already initiated that. To the best of our knowledge, they have not been quite as stupid in other areas."

B. B. Wolfe: "Well, I'm not talking about their stupidity, because we're speaking about the largest business in America. What I'm saying is would this.. would this provision the way it's written permit them, whether they're stupid or not, permit them to have discriminatory charges or different charges in communities under 500,000."

B. E. Epton: "Representative Wolfe, this bill seeks to rectify a situation. It has nothing to do with permitting them to do anything that they could or could not do. They can continue to do as they have in the past in other areas. I don't know whether or not they can discriminate by virtue of geography in other areas. The Department of Insurance hopefully could respond to that at this time. I submit to you, however, that, in my opinion, if the Department of Insurance had gotten off its duff, forgive me, had gotten.. had made movements in the past, this particular situation would not have happened. I submit that the Department of Insurance today has the right to prohibit such, if you'll forgive me again, stupidity."

B. B. Wolfe: "Then what you're saying is that the posture of the law before this change permitted them to select areas and create different insurance rates. Is that right."

B. E. Epton: "That's correct."

B. B. Wolfe: "Alright, which means that what I said and the



question that I asked in the first instance the answer to it is a simple yes."

B. E. Epton: "No, it is not, because I disagreed with the position of the Department of Insurance."

B. B. Wolfe: "I understand that.."

B. E. Epton: "No, no, you don't. In other words, you're asking me the posture of the law and I'm telling you that if the Department of Insurance had followed the tools we gave them this could have been prevented in 1970."

B. B. Wolfe: "But that's not a statutory direction to the Department. It's a rule.. it's a basis for rule changes in the Department and for a posture for that Department to take is what you're saying."

B. E. Epton: "It is not a statutory law. You're correct."

B. B. Wolfe: "Alright. O.K. that's what I'm talking about because we're dealing with a statute now and the bill. Now the second question that I have to ask is this, insurance, the purpose of insurance, now I'm talking about all kinds of insurance, is to protect against disaster and that's based upon experience or what we know as the actuarial findings in any particular field. Why haven't the insurance companies written this business across the State based upon a total experience and based upon an actuarial table that they find in this field as it applies to the entire State of Illinois."

B. E. Epton: "In their testimony before the Commission that very question was asked and they failed to give any answer."

B. B. Wolfe: "Thank you. That's exactly.. Alright, Bernie, so



your charge.. your committee now is going to be charged, in my opinion, with the responsibility of getting the answer and I'll tell you what I'm opposed to in the insurance industry and that's whether it's life insurance, casualty, fire, etc., and that's their ability to select risks on a return of profit rather than to select it on the basis that I indicate a protection against disaster which every citizen is entitled to on some fair and equitable basis. And I think if your committee does nothing but establish that principle in the next two years you will have accomplished a great deal for the State of Illinois."

B. E. Epton: "We agree entirely."

Rep. Capuzi: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Juckett."

R. S. Juckett: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield for a question."

Rep. Capuzi: "He indicates he will, proceed."

R. S. Juckett: "Yes.. Is this an Administration bill."

B. E. Epton: "I would say no. The Department of Insurance, historically, has been afraid to touch this. We have discussed it with them over the years and I should add, I don't think it's privileged information, Director Baylor had no objection to this bill at all. His only fear was ah.. when it initially was brought up was that Department.. that the insurance companies would limit the market and not write. Today I think that that situation has been changed by virtue of the insolvency feature. So it is not certainly a present Administration bill although I doubt that they have any objection to it."



Rep. Capuzi: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

W. L. Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Rep. Capuzi: "Ah.. the que.. the previous question has been moved. All those in favor say Aye."

Members: "Aye."

Rep. Capuzi: "Those Opposed Nay. The Ayes have it and the motion is carried. And now we'll return to the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton, to close the debate."

B. E. Epton: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House I agree entirely that this is an important question. I agree with most of the points raised by my colleagues. It is something which ah.. kinda befuddles us. Why the insurance industry so constantly is so shortsighted. But what's even more striking about the debate on this is how some distinguished members of the House with such tremendous amount of knowledge can be so completely wrong on so many different points. For example one of the previous speakers indicated that this is historically the way it's been run. Well, I submit for 70 years it was run the other way and then for a period of 2 1/2 years it was run a particular way. And now that we're trying to correct the situation it seems to me that if history has anything to do with it it would be on the side of this particular bill. As I indicated earlier, when this same speaker would talk about the profit structure and what it may do to the market, obviously, for example, when he alluded to fire insurance, he's unaware of the fact that the fair plan which provides for fire insurance for those who cannot get it in the market is in existence in this particular



area. In addition which in the fair plan there has not, there never has been nor will be any restriction as far as geographic areas. So, therefore, I suggest to you that anyone who tells you that the insurance industry will pull out of this area because of this is just not looking at the facts. They can't pull out. The government, in its wisdom, will not allow it. And, therefore, I submit that this is a bill which will only correct a wrong which has existed for too long and I ask your favorable vote."

Rep. Capuzi: "Alright, the question is shall House Bill 149 pass. Those in favor vote Aye and opposed Nay. Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Calvo, to explain his vote."

H. L. Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I know this is ah.. we've done this a couple of times and I.. debate was cut off before I had an opportunity to ask the sponsor a question. Would help me a lot if he could ah.. perhaps answer my question. Would that be permissible."

Rep. Capuzi: "He can do it on Explanation of Votes, Mr. Calvo."

H. L. Calvo: "Well, that's what I want to do."

Rep. Capuzi: "Ask your question on your explanation."

H. L. Calvo: "Ah.. what I'm wondering, if this bill passed today and and gets to the Senate, if the sponsor would have the Senate sponsor amend it to include the St. Louis metropolitan area because we also in that area have a considerable increase in rates over the surrounding areas. In fact our rate has, at times, been the same as the inner city of Chicago rate. And ah.. I'm wondering if the sponsor would be willing to accept an amendment to include that area when



his bill gets over in the Senate."

Rep. Capuzi: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Thompson."

R. Thompson: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this bill. Having some knowledge about insurance and the discriminatory practices that are practiced by the companies, the largest industry in our country, of geographical areas. You talk about.. I heard the previous speaker say that the insurance companies will pull out and won't write insurance in certain areas. They cannot pull out. They will not pull out. Because the government is going to step in and do something that they don't like. They may tell them that they're going to pull out. I'm in favor of this bill. This is a good bill and the people in the areas paying these high prices they feel it in their pockets and other areas that have not hit home they have no feeling for the other people that are discriminated against. In the high risk areas they're paying a high price. I'm in the Near North Side, the highest district in the City of Chicago, and the expressways pass through our areas and the accidents that happen on the expressways are charged to that area. This is a good bill and I urge your yes vote."

Rep. Capuzi: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Merlo."

J. Merlo: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I too serve on the Insurance Committee and I've heard the various witnesses, but I rise in support of this measure for the basic reason that I know at the present time not only do applicants for insurance in high risk areas find it difficult



to secure insurance, but must pay an astronomical premium rate and he would, perhaps, in the end result be insured with an inferior company. For example, what is presently happening is that your better companies who can afford to be choosy because of the great volume of business they write will not accept their full and just responsibility and accept business in these high risk areas. On the other hand there are many companies today that are flourishing which specialize in high risk insurance, but you may find that they are not sound financially. And, of course, this is to the frustration of the insured. I believe that this is a good measure, that it will.. believe that the bill would bring about equalized rates throughout the City, which, in my estimation, would be just and the desired result and I urge your support of this bill. It's a good bill."

Rep. Capuzi: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis."

C. A. Davis: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my vote. Perhaps some of the new members don't know it, but I'm sure all of the old members know it, ah.. at the inception of this ah.. geographic discrimination ah.. in insurance rates even since it started it was wrong when they started it and it's.. in it's very inception and it's no less wrong now. And I'm going to tell you what they call it in my district and I want all of you to hear what they call it in my district and I want to congratulate the sponsors of this bill. This geographic discrimination in rate charges they call it a Black Tax in my district. That's what they call it. Tax on people



because of their color and then they start to talking about exposure. Well who exposed us when they built the Dan Ryan right through the Black district. With all of the traffic on the Dan Ryan during rush hours, cars are bumper to bumper there, and then we have to pay a Black Tax simply because we live in a district where there are more automobiles pass than any other districts in the City of Chicago. This is a good bill. And if you want to vote for civil rights here's your chance. Get on. Get on board little children, there's room for many more."

Rep. Capuzi: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holloway."

R. H. Holloway: "Ah.. Mr. ah.. Speaker, Members of the House, I want to explain ah.. my vote for this bill, and I'm speaking simply from my experience as a lawyer who has worked in the inner city for about 20 years. My observation has been that ah.. there are companies that specialize in.. in ah.. ah.. just writing this high risk insurance brought about by ah.. this division. Now that isn't to say that larger companies such as ah.. Allstate and State Farm ah.. ignore that market. What happens is that ah.. most of the people in the inner city who when they go to a independent insurance broker are given this insurance and in.. in most instances they are told that this is all that is available. What is really happening is that these particular companies pay a tremendous commission and these insurance brokers are interested in making this big commission rather than servicing a client with a policy from a larger company that does not discriminate. Now what is involved here is levelling out



the insurance business and taking away the opportunity of unscrupulous ah.. people who are selling insurance who sell high risk insurance simply because they make a bigger buck out of it. I'd like to also indicate that the State, through the ah.. assigned risk pool) makes it possible for any insurance company that feels that it is overloaded with this particular type of ah.. clientele, to refer it to the State to send it to another company and thereby even out the risk and insure that no one insurance company ah.. will be overburdened. And I support this ah.. bill and I hope that the House will do likewise."

Rep. Capuzi: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

H. Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as a member of the Insurance Study Commission, we heard much testimony relative to the merits of this bill from ah.. the insurers and the insured and we have come to the conclusion I think as a committee that what we're really dealing with here is accident and actuaries established by the insurance companies, but not indicating really the cause of accidents or where the cars come from that are a part of the accident syndrome. For example, many of the people that work or live in the suburban areas and their car is counted from that location travel to and from and through the city each and every working day of the week and as a result of this travel back and forth through these highly impacted zone areas that are being charged the exorbitant rates and different rates that we in suburbia enjoy do contribute much in the way of causing and being a contributing factor to



accidents. For example, an individual who lives, has his residence, in the high impact area parks his car on the street and somebody from the suburban area or from out of the town, out of the city, comes into that area and strikes his car, that accident is charged to the residential area in which the car is registered. So, really what we're talking about is accidents caused by those people who are not really residents of the highly impacted areas where the rates are so much different than they are in the other areas. So I think in good conscience and in fairness we ought to be voting for this bill to relieve the situation that is presently being administered in these highly ah.. accident prone areas. And I'm happy to vote Aye."

Rep. Capuzi: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dunne."

R. L. Dunne: "Explaining my No vote, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the best way to explain it would be comment on some of the previous statements. Representative Davis and Representative Holloway I think are mistaken when they think that they are not going to lose market in the higher rated territories of Chicago. I'm in the insurance business and I can give you my opinion, you will lose market and you're going to create the high risk market in Chicago again. The.. the ah.. the fly by night companies are the only ones that'll write and ah.. automobile insurance, if you will, in the ah.. inner city. And ah.. you're.. you're not really voting for your constituents when you vote for this bill. Ah.. you're just mistaken. You're going to lose your market and I'd like to.. to ask



ah.. Representative Yourell if he'd like to have Oak Lawn included in this rating with the City. Have the same rates as the City."

Rep. Capuzi: "Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Krause."

J. G. Krause: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to support this piece of legislation. I serve on the Insurance Study Commission. We've heard much testimony about this. In the last session of this General Assembly we passed out of this House, by way of an amendment to the Open Rating Bill, this very bill here. It.. it's time.. it's time that the insurance industry realized that they can't charge rates differently in certain areas in the City of Chicago than they charge in other areas. And if you saw the maps and as to how they were drawn and how the rates were arrived at you'd realize what a discrepancy there really is in the rates that are charged in one area against the other area. It's time that the rates were the same throughout that whole ah.. City of Chicago and made into one district. Ah.. I compliment Representative Epton on this bill and I ask everybody in the House to vote Aye on this bill because it's time we straightened out the insurance industry."

Rep. Capuzi: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Barry."

T. Barry: "At the.. ah.. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, at the risk of ah.. repeating what has been said, I think it should be recalled that this was exactly what we're trying to accomplish and did accomplish by the bill referred to by Representative Krause in the last session when some of us were trying to mandate rates. We



got this as a settlement. I think that ah.. now we have an opportunity to implement it and I suggest a green board."

Rep. Capuzi: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania."

S. Catania: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is an extremely important bill to those of us who live at the heart of the City of Chicago. I happen to be married to one of the people who computes the actuarial rates for one of the large insurance companies that practices this sort of geographic discrimination. A year ago last January 1st we received our automobile insurance bill which was twice the bill we had the previous year. We found an equally reputable but much smaller insurance company with which we now have our automobile insurance. This is not a fly by night company this is a responsible company. I would like to put the pressure where it belongs and ask the large companies to come back and insure us at equitable rates. I vote Aye."

Rep. Capuzi: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

G. A. Bradley: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and in explaining my No vote, I would simply urge every member in Downstate Illinois to take a long hard look at this piece of legislation. There's nothing that says that the next piece of legislation that's going to be introduced will put the whole State in one particular rate and I don't think that the people in Monticello and Piatt County should be charged a higher rate than they are presently being charged, but they will be with this type of legislation. There's no question about it. What we're talking about is the crime rate. We're not talking about the insurance rate, we're talking about what



the crime rate is in these different areas and that's why the rate and the insurance rate is higher in some areas than it is in others. Now the sponsor of this legislation keeps asking the question why is it higher on the South Side of 87th Street than it is on the North Side and if he will answer me the question why water freezes at 32° and not 33° then I'll answer his question on why the rate's higher. It's a bad piece of legislation because it's going to affect everybody in downstate Illinois very shortly and the changes in the rates differential.. difference.. differentials in each area in the City of Chicago is based on a loss factor. And that's why the rates are higher in some areas than they are in others because of the loss in that particular area the same as the rates are figured in Downstate Illinois. So I think that the people who are voting green on this particular piece of legislation are asking for a.. a whole.. a state wide law to put us all in the same rate giving us no benefit at all from the area where we have less loss on automobiles than we have in other areas. And let me remind you, too, we take care of Chicago pretty good in the school formula. We waited because we realized that it costs more to do business in the City of Chicago. So we give them more funds in our school rates. We just passed a bill, a C.T.A. bill, to give them 12 1/2 million more dollars. The City of Bloomington gets \$37,000. They have factors and they have problems up there that we don't have Downstate. I urge a no vote on this particular legislation."

Rep. Capuzi: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff," to explain his

vote."



B. B. Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I concur heartily with comments of the previous speaker. I'd also like to add an explanation of my vote that any Representative in this Hall who lives in an area let's say like Rogers Park or the Northwest part of Chicago or any of those areas should realize that if this bill passes the home insurance premiums and the automobile insurance premiums for the neighborhoods of that district will be increased by enormous amounts on a experience basis. This bill will eliminate the possibility of distinguishing between one area where it may be difficult to handle fires because of the character of the neighborhood and another area where it would not be. This bill will eliminate the distinction between a high theft area and a low theft area. This bill will eliminate the distinction between heavily crowded areas where the accident rates are very high because of the congestion in the street and neighborhood areas where there is a very low rate. The insurance rates of every one of those areas will increase very substantially. The same principle will apply if this bill passes to the bills that were put forward before us a couple of years ago to have a county wide rate and to have a six county rate and ultimately a single rate for the entire State. On the principle of experience, insurance experience, and statistical actuarial analysis, this is a very poor concept."

Rep. Capuzi: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton, to explain his vote."

B. E. Epton: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't like to take up the time of this House anymore than necessary. I did, however,



want to call to your attention that my colleagues on the Insurance Study Commission, Representatives Yourell, Representatives Krause, and Representative Klosak, worked with us on this bill, so it is a bipartisan bill. And I also could not sit down without commenting that it's unusual that one speaker can make so many erroneous statements in one short space of two minutes. As a matter of fact, it's ri.. it's rather unique that he was able to make statement after statement and that they all were wrong. You would think that the law of averages would indicate that perhaps one of them might be right. But let me just simply point out to you that those who have stated that they know what's on our mind as far as going.. rest of the State. Really our ah.. we should use them in other instances they must be omnipotent because we have no intention of doing anything except what this bill says, restore the City of Chicago to what it was. And, finally, I would simply say those of you who suggest that this takes away the rating of individual drivers simply aren't listening. This does not affect their rating. A bad driver will be rated as a bad driver. All it simply says if you live in one area you can't be penalized. Ladies and Gentlemen, I certainly believe those who are voting green are not only being correct legally, but morally you're doing the proper thing."

Rep. Capuzi: "Have all voted who wish. Mr. Clerk, take the Record. On this question.. On this question there are 92 Ayes and 53 Nays. Now, for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dunne, rise."



R. L. Dunne: "Verification of the Roll Call."

Rep. Capuzi: "Alright, is he joined with five other members.

Okay, you shall have a verification. For what purpose does the Gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe, arise."

B. B. Wolfe: "If the Speaker please, before the verification of the Roll Call, will you poll the absentees."

J. F. O'Brien: "Alsup.."

Rep. Capuzi: "Record the Gentleman as present."

J. F. O'Brien: "Arnell.. I think he want present."

Rep. Capuzi: "The Gentleman wishes to be reocrded present. Record him as present. Proceed."

J. F. O'Brien: "Blades. Brandt. Brummet. Carter. Collins. Ralph Dunn."

Rep. Capuzi: "Ah.. record the Gentleman as present."

J. F. O'Brien: "Granata. Griesheimer. Hart. R. K. Hoffman. J. D. Holloway."

Rep. Capuzi: "Present Mr. Holloway? Record the Gentleman as present."

J. F. O'Brien: "Hyde. Jacobs. Keller."

Rep. Capuzi: "Record Mr. Jacobs as present. Ah.. Mr. Keller.. All right. Proceed Mr. Clerk."

J. F. O'Brien: "Laurino. McDonald. McAvoy. McCourt. McGah. K. W. Miller. Murphy. Randolph. Redmond. Schlickman."

Rep. Capuzi: "Ah.. Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker. At this time, I should like to be recorded as voting present."

Rep. Capuzi: "Vote the Gentleman as present."

J. F. O'Brien: "Schoeberlein."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Rep. Capuzi: "Record the Gentleman as present."

J. F. O'Brien: "Skinner. Stedelin."

Rep. Capuzi: "Record Mr. Skinner as present."

J. F. O'Brien: "Stedelin. Terzich. VonBoeckman."

Rep. Capuzi: "Record Mr. VonBeockman as present."

J. F. O'Brien: "Wall. No further."

Rep. Capuzi: "All right, Mr. Clerk. Proceed with the verification of the affirmative roll. And Gent.. Ladies and Gentlemen, please be in your seats so the roll can be properly verified. Will the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle, in the aisles, please ah.. take your seats or sit down somewhere so that this record can be properly verified."

J. F. O'Brien: "Arrigo. Barnes. Barry. Beatty. Beaupre. Borchers. Boyle. Brinkmeier. Caldwell. Capuzi. Catania. Chapman. Choate. Cox. Cunningham. Davis. DiPrima. Douglas. Dyer. Epton. Ewell. Farley. Fary. Flinn. Garmisa. Geo-Karis. Gibbs. Giglio. Giorgi. Grotberg. Hanahan. Hill. G. L. Hoffman. R. H. Holloway. J. M. Houlihan. Huskie. Jaffe. Emil Jones. J. D. Jones. Katz. Kelly. Kempiners. Kennedy. Kozubowski. Krouse. LaFleur. Lempke. Leon. Londrigan. Lundy. Mann. Maragos. Martin. Matejevich. McClain. McCormick. McGrew. McLendon. McMaster. McPartlin. Merlo. Molloy. Mugalian. Nardulli. Neff. Palmer. Pappas. Patrick. Piotrowicz. Polk. Rayson. Rigney. Rose. Ryan. Sangmeister. Schneider. Sharp. Shea. Ike Sims. Soderstrom. Stiehl. Stone. Taylor. Telcser. Thompson. Tipsword. Washburn. Washington. Williams. B. B. Wolfe. Yourell.



Mr. Speaker."

Rep. Capuzi: "All right. Are there questions of the affirmative roll call? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dunne."

R. L. Dunne: "Ah.. Representative Barry?"

Rep. Capuzi: "Barry's on the Floor."

R. L. Dunne: "Borchers?"

Rep. Capuzi: "Borchers is in his seat."

R. L. Dunne: "DiPrima."

Rep. Capuzi: "Mr. DiPrima. I can't see whether he's in his seat or not. I don't see the Gentleman on the Floor. Take him off the roll."

R. L. Dunne: "Flinn."

Rep. Capuzi: "Mr. Flinn here? Yes, he's in his seat."

R. L. Dunne: "Kozubowski?"

Rep. Capuzi: "Yes, he's in his seat."

R. L. Dunne: "McGrew."

Rep. Capuzi: "Mr. McGrew. in his seat."

R. L. Dunne: "Where?"

Rep. Capuzi: "I don't see Mr. McGrew. All right. Take him off the record."

R. L. Dunne: "McPartlin."

Rep. Capuzi: "Mr. McPartlin here? Yes, he's in his seat."

R. L. Dunne: "Kelly."

Rep. Capuzi: "Kelly? Yes, he's here. He's in his seat."

R. L. Dunne: "Ewell. He's here. Polk."

Rep. Capuzi: "Mr. Ewell is here. Polk? Representative Polk on the Floor. I don't see him. Take him off the roll."

R. L. Dunne: "Representative Rose."



Rep. Capuzi: "Rose? He's back near his seat."

R. L. Dunne: "Representative Sharp."

Rep. Capuzi: "Mr. Sharp. Yes, he's here."

R. L. Dunne: "Shea."

Rep. Capuzi: "Mr. Shea is in his seat."

R. L. Dunne: "Representative Leon's in his seat. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich rise?"

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker. How am I recorded?"

Rep. Capuzi: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Terzich: "Vote me 'aye'."

Rep. Capuzi: "Vote the Gentleman 'aye'. Are there further questions of the affirmative roll? Do you wish to proceed with the negative, Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dunne? All right, Mr. Clerk, may I have a count, please? There are 90 yeas, 53 nays and 10 present. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe, rise?"

B. B. Wolfe: "Having voted on the prevailing side.."

Rep. Capuzi: "Just a minute, just a minute. I haven't announced the roll yet. This bill having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Now the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe."

B. B. Wolfe: "Thank you Mr. Speaker.. a little premature. Having voted on the prevailing side, I now move to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 149 passed."

Rep. Capuzi: "Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Krause."

Krause: "Mr. Speaker, I move that motion lie on the Table."

Rep. Capuzi: "The question is on the motion to Table. All those



in favor say 'aye'."

Members: "Aye."

Rep. Capuzi: "Those opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion prevails."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 151, Epton. An Act creating the Illinois Insurance Law Study Commission defining its powers and duties. Third reading of the bill."



1352

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 169, Bluthardt. A bill for 'An Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code'. Third reading of the bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. This bill would amend the Illinois Vehicle Code by allowing the Municipal Attorney or Municipal Prosecutor with the permission of the State's Attorney to prosecute those violations which occur within that municipality. This bill passed the House last session by a large majority, then died in the Senate the last few days of that session. I would ask your support."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

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

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He indicates he will." Proceed, sir."

Totten: "Mr. Bluthardt, does this do away with the post of appointed prosecutors as appointed in municipalities?"

Bluthardt: "I don't think I quite understood, ah, the question Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Do you have prosecutors appointed by most municipalities to handle various offenses in the municipalities? Does this affect their job at all?"

Bluthardt: "No, not at all. It would be by agreement by the municipality and the State's attorney as to whether that municipality would prosecute, ah, violations that occurred under the Illinois Vehicle Code. Those municipalities that do have prosecutors, wouldn't be affected, other than, perhaps it'd have a greater volume than they do now."



Totten: "Is it permissive in nature?"

Bluthardt: "Entirely permissive, yes."

Totten: "Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there further discussion? All right, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 169 pass?' Those in favor vote aye... opposed nay... Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk.... Maragos, aye... On this question there are 135..35 ayes... 2 nays, and record Representative Barry as voting aye on this roll call. This bill... Barry.. this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."



1340

Fredrick B. Selcke: "House Bill 171, Kempiners."

W. Robert Blair: "The chair recognizes the gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, ah... I would like leave of the House to ah.. take vote on House Bill 171 and 172, back to Second Reading, for puposes of amendment."

W. Robert Blair: "Does the gentleman have leave? Alright leave is granted."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Ah.. Amendment #4, Kempiners..."

W. Robert Blair: "This is on House Bill 171."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Ah..Amend House Bill 171 as amended on page 1, line 31, by the being of part time employees and so forth..."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Will... Cook, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. The purpose of this amendment is to take out any reference to employees, so that the ah.. bill, as it will finally read, will affect part time officials. Part time being defined as those who work 20 hours less than, less than 20 hours a week. I introducing this amendment to House Bill 171 and to House Bill 172 as a request of Representative Alsup and I move it's adoption."

W. Robert Blair: "The question is shall amendment #4 to House Bill 171 be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nye', and the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments; Mr. Clerk? The Bill is ordered to Third Reading. Now House Bill 172."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 172, Kempiners..."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the gentleman from Will, ah..Mr. Kempiners."



Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, am I correct in assuming this has been brought back to Second Reading?"

W. Robert Blair: "No, make your motion."

Kempiners: "Ok, Mr. Speaker I move that ah..this is moved back to Second Reading for pupose of amendment."

W. Robert Blair: "Does the gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, the Bill is now on the Order of Second Reading."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Ah.. Amendment #4, Kempiners, amend House Bill 172 is amended on page #1, on lines 22,23,24."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. This amendment will make House Bill 172 consistant with House Bill 171 in that it will affect ah.. locally elected officials only are not employees of a municipality, and I move it's adoption."

W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? Question is shall Amendment #4 be adopted. All those in favar say 'aye', opp-osed 'nye'... the 'aye's have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? Bill is ordered to Third Reading."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Ah.. House Bill 174, Pierce. A Bill for and act to amend the Revenue Act of 1939. Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 174, which was approved unanimously by the Revenue Committee of the House, is similar to legislation that past out of this House two years ago...one Bill sponsored by Representative Randolph, and another by Representative



Berman. It provides that condominiums or cooperatives will be assessed at the same level as single family homes in counties over 200,000 that have the power to classify real estate. Condominium owners own their own apartment ah.. they pay their own tax bill and ah.. they pay their mortgage and so on and their entitled to be treated as the owner as a home is treated and not as income property, not as income apartment building, and rental property at the much higher assessary that's used particularity in Cook County. The same is true of Cooperative owners. Although they do not pay individual tax bills, the tax bills, the tax bills that come into our Cooperative Association is divided among the members and ah.. the apartment owners and ah..they in truth pay their own taxes, there's no... ther's no income in either a Condominium or a Coppelative. To make certain... to make certain that the developer will no benefit from this we require that the apartments be owner occupied and we insure that the condominiums are residential condominiums and not industrial or commercial. I feel that this Bill puts on a parity condominium owners with singal family home owners and will be assessed at that rate in Cook County, rather than a much higher rate applied to income rental property to which there is now assigned and to which they do not belong. I therefore ask that we reaffirm our position taken two years ago and pass House Bill 174 which was voted out unanimously by the House Revenue Committee."

W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."



Shea: "At the time this was on Second Reading, we discussed some amendments now you gotta.... is it right? You've got it owned or occupied? Would you explain that part? Ah... Mr. Speaker, could we get Mr. Pierce's mike turned on, I've got a question for him."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright, turn on Mr. Pierce's mike."

Pierce: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ah... yes, Mr. Shea. You pointed out that ah... problem, and so did Representative Richard Walsh in Committee and we put that amendment on Second Reading that required that it be owner occupied ah.. for a minimum of six months during the year. Ah... that is in case someone goes away for a few months, and sublets the apartment, they'll still be covered. But what we're trying to eliminate, and I think we did, was developers ah.. who are renting apartments before they sell them and also we have conversion shch as John Hancock Building where it might take five or six years for the owners of that building to convert all those apartments to condominium ownership. They may be renting them out in the meantime, and I think that this amendment clears up the situation which was a legitimate problem in the Bill, and I feel that we've now limited... now limited ah.. tax provision to owner occupied condominium apartments."

Shea: "Allright now... does it specify apartments, condominium apartments? Because I still raise the question as I read the Bill and I raised theis before,... it says, 'owner occupied' , and I don't think it says condominium apartment."



Pierce: "It says 'occupied by the owner as a resident', so we do have the word resident."

Shea: "Ok, now how do we get around the Equal Protection Clause where we have ah... a man that owns the apartment and lives in it, and he is taxed at rate 'Y', and the identical apartment next door is owned by a person that's not owner occupied, but his rate is taxed at Commercial Rate.? Now the identical piece of property, but one is used as a residence the other one is income producing. How do we get around the Equal Protection Clause when they are both identical pieces of property?"

Pierce: "I think we get around this because one is being used for income pupose, and one is being used for a personal residence. The same way the Homestead Exemption, that we have in the real estate law, which... which you supported allows the Homestead Exemption if someone ah..resides in ah.. property. But that's ah.."

Shea: "But that's specifically spelled out in the Constitution, that we're allowed to do that."

Pierce: "And the Constitution allows...ah... counties over 200,000 to classify real estate. So in Cook County and ah.. a homeowner is assessed at 22% to 24% of fair market value, and a condominium apartment owner is assessed at 40% fair market value,even though he does not have the property for income puposes. I think this helps satisfy the Uniformity Clause of our State Constitution and Federal Constitutional requirements as well.....the Constitutionality all day, I



feel this makes a present assessment system more constitutional."

Shea: "Dan, I know what your trying do to and I think the purpose is worthwhile, because I too feel that Co-op owners and condominium owners should be paying just like single family residence. But I think you could be opening up a whole can of worms here ah...and I frankly don't have the answers to it, I don't know if this Bill is it either."

W. Robert Blair: "Well, is there further discussion? Allright the question is shall House Bill 174, pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'nay'. All voted who wish? Allright. Mr. Clerk, take the record. Blair..'aye'. Gene Hoffman... 'aye'. On this question the 'aye' are 122, 2 'nays', Mr. Caldwell...'aye'. Mr. Ralph Dunn 'aye'. Mr. Beaupre...'aye' Mr. Schrader..'aye'. Chote...'aye'. Kosinski...'aye'. Barry...'aye'. 130 'ayes', 2'nays', and 1 present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Under the rules of the House, as you know we have a deadline. There are three Bills on the Thrid Reading, which must be acted upon today, or they will be tabled under our rules. These Bills are House Bill 277, 278, and 279. In accordance with the rules the Chair will now call House Bill 277.

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 277, Maragos. An act to amend an act in regards to judgemnts and decrees. Third Reading of the Bill."

Blair : "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."



Maragos: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to leave to consider ah.. Bill 277,278, 279 together because they are the same subject matter, and it would save the time of the House."

W. Robert Blair: "Does the gentleman hve leave? The gentleman from Dupaines, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Would you explain to me the procedure for skipping over my Bill, which I've asked to be heard today?....to get to Representative Marago's Bill?"

W. Robert Blair: "Under the rules, these three Bills will be ... would be tabled as of today and the intention of the Speaker is to adjourn the Session in a very short time. And there will be no other Third Reading Bills called today, apparently."

Maragos: "Well, I ', interested in taking my Bill back for purposes of tabling an amendment, which would be very routine and now with the discussion at this point, I wonder ah... I'll be facing that same penalty ah.. next week, that Sam's dealing with right now, I wonder if you might not consider to abide first."

W. Robert Blair: "Well, let's procede with ah.. 277, right at the moment. And is there leave to consider these three Bills together? Hearing no objections, proceed and call 278, and House Bill 279."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 278, an act to aspect the 16.100 act, in regard to judgements and decrees, Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 279, an act to amend Section 18,18D



18E, 24A, in an Act in regard to judgements and decrees, Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: All right, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This series of three Bills, has to do with technical amendments regarding the Mortgage Foreclosure Section of the Statutes, and they amend the Act regarding the portion of judgements and decrees. This does not have to do... does not concern any area where the mortgagor's, or the owners of the House have already... are still in possession or does not concern their redemption rights. These three Bills are, in effect, housekeeping Bills, because they take care of some ah... abjurations in the language, and secondly, it clarifies the language between the creditors, one of who may have bidden and bought the property after their redemption rights have expired. And these Bills have been supported by both the Chicago Bar and the Illinois State Bar Associations and the various sections dealing with mortgages and real estate and they're almost unanimous approval in the Committees. There were a couple of 'no's in the Committee, Judiciary Committee, only because they did not want to put these on the consent calendar and there was some misunderstanding at that time. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I asked for your favorable vote on these three Bills."

W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion? The question is shall House Bills 277, 278 and 279 pass, and there will be three



roll calls. All those in favor, vote 'aye' and opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? All right, Mr. Clerk, take the record. On these three questions, there are 150 'ayes' and no 'nays', and each of these three Bills, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Record Jerry Shea 'aye', on this roll call. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Now that Speaker Blair is at the podium, I would like to have a motion on House to discharge a Committee or move the Bill from... Bill 121 from the Speaker's table and I would like....."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, we'll have to get to that after we finish on third reading. I've got some requests with regard to some measures on Third Reading. Now, let's see. On the Calendar, on the Order of Postponed Consideration, there are a series of four Bills that expire on March 29, which is tomorrow, and ah.... there is a series of about 6 bills. Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, desire to address himself?"

Borchers: "Yes Sir, Mr. Speaker. First I would like to withdraw ah... take back to Second Reading House Bill 170, for purpose of amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right. Is there objection? Hearing none, House Bill 170 will be brought back to the Order of Second Reading for purpose of an Amendment. Read the Amendment."

F. Selcke: "Amendment No. 2. Amend House Bill 170 on Page 1



Line 20, by inserting between the words 'each' and appointing the word 'such', and on Page 1, Line 20, by deleting the word 'one', and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'two', and on Page 1, by deleting Lines 21 and 22 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'Persons who are not Legislators', and on Page 2, Line 13 by deleting the following 'The Commission shall take special', Page 2, by deleting in entirety, Lines 14 through 19 inclusive'."

Borchers: Mr. Speaker, now the Amendment does just one thing.

It takes out, I hope, the criticism of a few individuals that are on the floor when this was up for a vote on third reading. The commission shall take special cognizant of including and so on. I have removed anything that... especially for any bad parts of the EPA ah... in relation to this Commission on the EPA. It will just.... The Commission will merely look at all facets, good and bad, of the EPA Act, whatever they may be. On the ah... other ah... section that was mentioned, ah... changing it to two, means that the Speaker of the House, the Minority Leader, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Minority Leader there each would be able to pick two individuals not legislators, from whomever they please throughout the State, whether it be industry, EPA, it doesn't matter, so they have freedom of choice. And ah... I move ah... the adoption of the ah... the ah... to the amendment to the Bill."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any discussion on the Amendment?

Gentleman ah... from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: Well, ah... Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman read that portion ah... which is amended?"

Borchers: "Yes. 'The Commission shall.... now this is what was in the Bill and this... I will delete it. 'The Commission shall take special cognizant of and include in the Report that is required to submit under this Act, all instances in which the Rules and Regulations of the Illinois Pollution Control Board or the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency have caused undue or unreasonable hardships to individuals, persons or political subdivisions of this State'."

Mann: "Well, ah..., Webber, wasn't there another part of the ah... Bill that we discussed, too, that seemed to have a built-in bias?"

Borchers: "I do not believe so. I think this is the only paragraph. I don't see any here, unless you can point out a word that may be displeasing to you."

Mann: "What are you substituting in terms of language?"

Borchers: "It just completely eliminates them."

Mann: "I see. All right. Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman."

Berman: "Ah, will the sponsor yield to a question? Ah.... Webber, I see that HJR 14 sponsored by ah.... Representative Choate, yourself, Yourell, Representative Jaffe and myself, ah... it's on the Speaker's table. How does the



language of ah... House Bill 170, differ from the language of HJR 14?"

Borchers: "Ah... They're very similar... ah, they may be some minor differences. I haven't read them that closely. Ah... they are very similar; however, ah... this Bill of course to be vetoed by the Governor. I'm for both this Bill and for the Resolution. The ah... fact is, and it may not be needed, but there is a companion bill which will come up in due time with this Bill in front of the Appropriations Committee for \$25,000, which if this Bill is passed and signed in law by the Governor, will give them an independent amount of money to be used to carry out the Commission's function. The resolution, of course, is ah... just the House, I think it's joint, with the Senate as I recollect, and the funds come from the House and the Senate."

Berman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may address myself to the ah... Well, we're on Second Reading. I'll reserve my comments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "We're on ah... the question of the discussion of the Amendment. Further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe."

Wolfe: "Ah... point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. The ah... Amendment that ah... Mr. Borchers is referring to, is that on the desk of the Members of the House? Or is this a new Amendment that you're just now introducing?"



W. Robert Blair: "Clerk advises that it is on the desks."

W. Robert Blair: "On the members desk?"

W. Robert Blair: "On the Members desks. Further discussion? All right, the question's on the adoption of the Amendment. All those in favor, say 'aye'."

Members: "Aye."

W. Robert Blair: "Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments. Third Reading. Now, ah... Mr. Borchers, ah... all of your Bills will run out tomorrow. The Rules provide that they shall be called today. If you don't want them called today, they can be called again then tomorrow. Now, do you desire to have them called tomorrow?"

Mr. Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, if they can be called tomorrow, I understand you wish to ah... go on to other business, ah... I'll leave it entirely up to your desire. If you want them tomorrow, it's o'kay with me."

W. Robert Blair: "O'kay. All right. Let's get back to Introduction of First Reading."

Mr. Selcke: "House Bill 841. Calvo et al. Amends an Act in relation to meetings. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 842. Calvo et al. Amends the Cannibus Control Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 843. Calvo et al. Amends the Illinois Controlled Substance Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 844. R. L. Dunne et al. Creates an Act relating to Conformed Consent to Abortions. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 845. Lundy. Amends the



Aeronautics Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 846. Timothy Simms et al. Amends the Public Junior College Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 847. North et al. Amends the Downstate Firemen Pension Fund. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 848. Pappas et al. Amends the Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 849. Fennessey et al. Amends the Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 850. Walters et al. Amends the Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 851. Kuharski. An Act providing Housing Loans to Viet Nam Veterans. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 852. Kucharski et al. Appropriates five million dollars to the Viet Nam Veterans Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 853. Schraeder et al. Amends the Intergovernmental Ethics Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 854. Schraeder et al. Amends an Act in relation to the employment of relatives of Public Officials. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 855. Stone et al. Amends Public Junior College Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 856. Stone et al. Amends Public Junior College Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 857. Stone et al. Amends the General Not for Profit Corporation Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 858. Chapman et al. Amends the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 859. Brinkmier et al. Amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 860. J. Houlihan et al. Creates an Act prohibiting the



sale of detergent containing over 87 percent phosphate. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 861. Lauer et al. Appropriates \$114,900 to Board of Regents. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 862. Emil Jones et al. Amends the Banking Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 863. Emil Jones et al. Amends the Public Utilities Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 864. Huskey et al. Amends the Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 865. Blair et al. Amends Juvenile Court Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 866. Ewell et al. An Act relating to Zoning. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 867. Ewell et al. Amends the Aeronautics Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 868. Ewell et al. Amends the Airport Zoning Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 869. Kosinski et al. Amends the Illinois Highway Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 870. Kosinski et al. Amends the Illinois Highway Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 871. Kosinski et al. Amends the Highway Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 872. Bradley et al. Amends the Board of Regents Revenue Board Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 873. Getty et al. Appropriates \$2,268,500 to the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 874. Porter et al. Amends the Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 875. Merlo et al. Makes an appropriation for ordinary and contingent expenses to Board



of Trustees, General Assembly Retirement System. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 876. Douglas et al. Makes an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses to the Department of Public Health. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 877. Mann et al. Amends the Code of Criminal Procedure. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 878. Kozubowski et al. Makes an appropriation to the Department of Law Enforcement. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 879. Matijevich et al. Amends the Motor Fuel Tax Law. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 880. Ralph Dunn et al. Amends the Game Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 881. Flynn. Amends the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Agreed Resolutions. House ah... Resolution ... Joint Resolution 28. W. D. Walsh. Resolved by the House of Representative of the 78th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that when the House of Representatives adjourns on Thursday, March 29, 1973 and stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 3, 1973 at 9:30 O'Clock AM, and when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, March 29, 1973, it stand adjourned until Wednesday, April 4, 1973 at 11:30 O'Clock AM."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

William Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, this is the adjournment resolution, and when we adjourn on Thursday, tomorrow, we will convene



on Tuesday, April 3, 1973 at 9:30 AM in perfunctory session and will have no regular session on Tuesday, April 3. We will meet on Wednesday, April 4 at 9:30 AM in perfunctory session and at 10:00 O'Clock in Regular Session. I might point out also that the regular Tuesday Committee meetings will be held on Wednesday, the Wednesday meetings on Thursdays and the Thursday meetings on Friday next week and next week only, and I move the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right. The question is on the gentleman's motion on the amendment that's on the Agreed list. The gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

For some reason or other, the ah... Committee on Counties and Townships were left off of today's calendar. There will a meeting, it wasn't posted. There will be a meeting at 4:00 O'Clock in room M-5."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ah... all right, ah... the question is on the adoption of the Agreed Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and that's accomplished. I've got about a half dozen things to do. All right. Now we're going to go to Constitutional Amendments, Second Reading, which is not a category on the calendar, but it should be because HJR CA 10 and HJR CA 14 are on Second Reading. So if the Clerk would read those two. Mr. Skinner, you want your's read? O'Kay, and Mrs. Dyer wants her's read. Read those two that are suppose



to be on Second Reading. We can advance those to Third."

F. Selcke: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment No. 10. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 78th General Assembly, State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the General Election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Article, a proposition to amend Section IV of Article IX of the Constitution to read as follows: 'Article IX, Section 4. Real Property Taxation. A. Except as otherwise provided in this Section, tax upon real property shall be levied uniformly by valuation ascertained as the General Assembly shall provide by law. B. Subject to such limitations, the General Assembly may hereafter prescribe by law counties to classify and to continue to classify real property for purposes of taxation. Any such classification shall be reasonable and assessments shall be uniform in each class. A level of assessment or rate of tax or the highest tax in a county shall not exceed two and a half times the level of assessment or rate of tax as the lowest class in that county. Real Property used in farming and in a county shall not be assessed at a higher level of assessment than single family residential real property in that County. C. Any depreciation in value of the real estate occasioned by a public easement may be deducted in assessing such property. Second Reading of the Resolution. House Joint Resolution



Constitutional Amendment #14, whereas the 92nd Congress of the United States of America, at it's Second Session, both Houses by a constitutional majority of 2/3, adopted the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America. Joint Resolution. Resolved by the House of Representatives and Senate of America Congress assembled 2/3 rd's of each House concurring therein that the following article is propsoed as an amendment to The Constitution of the United States which shall be valid to all intense and purposes as a part of the Constitution and ratified by the Legislature of 3/4's of several states within seven years of the date of it's submission by Congress. Article, Section I. The qualities of rights by law shall not be denied or bridged by the United States or any state on the account of sex. Section II. The Congress shall have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation and provisions of this Article. Section III. This amendment shall take affect three years after the date of ratification, therefore be it resolved by the House of Representatives, 78th Assembly, State of Illinois. The Senate concurring herein that such proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be in the same, is hereby ratified, and be it further resolved that a certified copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of the State....forward by the Secreatry of State of Illinois, that the Administrator of General Services of the United States, to the present protem....

W. Robert Blair: "One moment, please. For what pupose does the gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson rise?



Hudson: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I rise to a point of ah.. order here on the H.J.R. #14, in as much as it is listed on Third Reading, on ah.. sheet, it's being read a second time. I think my point of inquiry is, rather or not it should not be properly listed before it's... tommorow and read a second time at that point."

W. Robert Blair: "Ah.. now ah..this is a pair in the Clerk's Office that it is shown under Third Reading when it should have been shown under Second Reading and ah.. all the Constitution requires is that they be read by title on three separate days. Ah.. and we in fact reading it and the transcript will show that this was a Clerk's error and that we are in fact reading this Constitutional Amendment for a second time before the House ah.. of Representatives."

Hudson: "Thank you Mr. Speaker."

Fredric B. Selcke: "To the present protem of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of United States, and to each Senator and Representative of Illinois, and the Congress of the United States, Second Reading of the Constitutional Resolution."

W. Robert Blair: "Third Reading on both of them. We have ah.. a distinguish guest from Veit Nam here today, Representative Kriegsman is going to introduce her."

Kriegsman: "First of all I'd like to introduce Mrs. Harry Iloff up in the balcony, would you stand Mrs. Iloff? And my wife Wanetta, and my sister Florence. And Harry Iloff here. It's always nice to get a standing ovation before you give a talk."



Some years....a year ago last January, I had the dubious honor and the great pleasure of taking 525 hogs to Siagon. At that time... I didn't know, I knew what a hog was from a cow, but I didn't know the difference in color made any difference, so I had Harry Iloff here to teach me those things. It was quite an experience ah.. there was alot of work and effort going around and getting these pure breeds around the State of Illinois. And after about a month of deciding which were the brothers and sisters of these pure breed hogs, we got them together over at Elpaso and for about 24 hours we managed to get them up to O'hare, and about midnight a Flying Tiger airplane came in here with a DC 8, stretched 8, and we loaded them up and headed for Siagon. Now if you take a string and stretch it from Chicago to Siagon, you'll now that'll go right over Anchorage, Alaska and Tokyo and then Siagon. Each segment was about eight hours long. Well, everything went fine until the last segment from Tokyo, then we got the real icing, 525 hogs. What do you do with 525 hogs in Veit Cong Territory possibly at an airport where you didn't know anything about, where there were no trees, no water, no nothing to accomadate them. And everytime you eat a sandwich or a cup of coffee the hogs looked at you with beady eyes, wondering when it was their turn. So we got to Siagon, and they proceeded to tell us to taxi here and taxi there, and we taxied back and forth and the first thing you know the airpots behind us and nothing ahead of us. And all of a sudden loomed up about 20 trucks



all these beautiful airport dollies, and all the elevators and heisters. And about 50 people standing there waiting for us, and Madame Ley standing there with an umbrella and a beautiful blue silk gown. They.. as we stoped, everybody clapped and the cameras started grinding away, and there I was with two days of beard, holes in my jacket, holes in my pants, hog manure up to my knees, and there was no difference in looks between myself and hogs, the only difference is I could speak English and they could speak Pig Latin, I suppose. We came up and here was Madame Ley, she had everything absolute percision within ten seconds the elevators were up to the door, starting to unload the pigs and in a half hour the whole operation with all the paper work was finished. I didn't have passports to stary there, Harry stayed for another three days. But it was a great thing, it gives me great pleasure to introduce Mrs. Madame Ley."

Mrs. Madame Ley: "Well, thank you so much. And I want to say thank you so much for you all to take your time that ah.. so that I can meet you. I want to say thank you for Mr. and Mrs. Inoff to take me ah.. to Illinois so that I can have a visit and I learned some more about the farming and later on I can make my farm a litte bit better. And ah.. especially I would like to visit this House and to know what is... your hearing and what the policy is, I am... I do not know anything about this, I am just a farmer, so I am very pleased to be here. Thank you very much, everybody."

W. Robert Balir: "Consent Calendar, Second Reading."



Fredrick B. Selcke: "House Bill 202, Bill for an act concerning Public Utilities, Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. House Bill 376, and act to amend the Illinois Pension Code, Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments. House Bill 378, bill for an act to repeal an act relating to the Upper Mississippi Way, Compact Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments. House Bill 416, a Bill for an act to amend Section IV of the Equal Opportunities for the Handicapped Act. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. House Bill 420, a Bill for an act to amend the Park District Code, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments. House Bill 432, a Bill for an act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Act, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments. House Bill 470, a Bill for an act to repeal a Section IV of an act to regulate refrigerated warehouses and so forth, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments. House Bill 527, a Bill for an act to amend the Probate Act, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments. House Bill 543, Bill for an act to amend the Fair Employment Taxes Act, Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, what ah.. are the rules with regards to amending Bills on the Consent Calendar?"

W. Robert Blair: "The Amendments that are adopted in Committee, ah.. they are automatically ah.. adopted when the Bills moved from Second Reading to Third Reading."



Shea: "So that we can have Bills on the Consent Calendars that can be amended?"

W. Robert Blair: "Floor Amendment take the Bills ah.. off of the Consent Calendar."

Shea: "I thought last year, and maybe we changed the rules and I didn't quite follow the process, but I thought that if a Bill was amended, it had to go on the Regular Calendar, and it couldn't go on the Consent Calendar."

W. Robert Blair: "Rule Nine says: 'No amendment other than an amendment contained in a Committee Report is in Order regarding any Bill on the Consent Calendar. On the Second Reading of any Bill, appearing on the Consent Calendar, any amendments contained in Committee Reports on the Bill, shall be deemed adopted, and the Bill advanced to the Order of Consent Calendar, Third Reading, unless the Bill is objected to and removed from the Consent Calendar.' "

Shea: "That's a change from last year, is it not, Mr. Speaker?"

W. Robert Blair: "No, that's the same...."

Shea: "So that the only way that you can get those Bills off and really find out what the Amendments say would be to object to them, is that correct?"

W. Robert Blair: "Six or more Members or the Sponsor of the Bill or one or more of the appointed challengers, three of which are on your side and three of which are on ours."

Shea: "Allright, Thank you Mr. Speaker."

W. Robert Blair: "Third Reading. Allright ah.. Consent Calendar Third Reading, Third Day."



Fredric B. Selcke: "Ah...House Bill 178, an act to define the nature of all transactions relating for procuring, furnishing donating, processing, distributing, or using human blood in blood derivative, Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 246, Bill for an act to amend the Administrative Review Act, Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 298, Bill for an act to amend Illinois Municipal Code, Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 342, a act to amend the Illinois Vehichl Code, Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 359, an act to amend the Illinois Pension Code, Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 386, an act to amned the Revenue Act of 1939, Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 391, an act to appeal an act relajing the Illinois - Indiana Air Polution Control Compact, Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 499, an act relating the Morgages of Real Property and Morgages of Personal Property of Public Utilities, Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, this final passage on the Consent Calendar and I move the passage of these Bills."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright now, we have discussions... anybody care to raise any questions or have any discussion on the Bills on the Consent Calendar? If not then, the question is shall these Bills pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. And ah.. the Clerk will take one roll call and... that will be applied then in so far as separate roll calls are concerned to each one, now... for



those of you who haven't been watching the procedure, you now...is the time when..if you desire to be recorded as 'present' or 'no' on any one of these one particular Bills, if you'll advise us, the Clerk's people will take that down and the Journal will so indicate a vote different ah.. than otherwise. Berman will be recorded as 'present', all the way. B.B. Wolf 'present' no. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. B.B. Wolf."

B.B.Wolf: "On 499, Mr. Speaker, 'present'.

W. Robert Blair: "Allright, on 499, B.B.Wolf, 'present' and on the rest of them 'aye'. Anybody else? Allright the Clerk will take the record." Mr. Schneider says report him 'aye' on 3... 386, Glen? 386. Allright, the Clerk will take the record. Blair 'aye'. J.J. Wolf 'aye'. Capuzi 'aye'. Schoeberlein 'aye'. Duff...Duff wants to talk, turn Duff on."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I think we should congratulate Representative Geo-Karis who has put her first Bill through on the Consent Calendar."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright, each of these Bills having recieved the Constitutional majority, 126 'ayes', no'nays', and then the individual ajustments as indicated by the Members will be reflected in the Journal. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer rise?"

Palmer: "Mr. Speaker, ah.. point of inquiry as to rather or not this is an appropriate time to ask leave of the House to table a Bill?"



W. Robert Blair: "Well, it's allright, I'll move to annouements and the gentleman asked to table House Bill...House Bill what? What number?"

Palmer: "Well then... I'd like to ask leave of the House to table House Bill 385, I've covered it in the subsequent Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright, is there leave? Hearing no objection the Bill will be tabled. Allright, we'll get back on House Bills Third Reading and.. for what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Juckett rise?"

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to seek leave to move House Bill 232 back to Second Reading for purposes of an amendment."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright then... I think that in order that untill we get matters such as this cleared up in the rules, ah.. that we... in.. we're going out of order, numerical order, to have this matter addressed, it is a Perfunct Rematter in the sense that you... your not asking for the matter to be heard and voted on Third Reading, you just want to take the Bill back to Second, but as a technical matter I think we oughta move to suspend ah.. so that that might be done to take the 107 votes, so all those in favor of the gentleman's motion, which is really to have House Bill 232 heard out of order only for the purpose of asking leave to take it back to Second Reading will vote 'aye', the opposed 'no', and this will take 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Allright the Clerk will take the record. Expressed 121 'ayes', 1 'nay', and the gentlman's motion prevails. Ok, 232 is back on Second now... do you want to table them, gentleman



from Cook, Mr. Juckett."

Juckett: "Yes, Mr. Speaker there were two amendments which are both incorporated into amendment 3, so I would move to table amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 232."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright ah..the gentleman's has leave... allright,... the man must consent to....is then given to table amendment #1 and amendment #2. Ah... and now the Clerk will read amendment #3."

Fredrick B. Selcke: "Amendment #3, Juckett. Amend House Bill 232 on page one by starting line 16 concerning of the following and so forth."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Juckett."

Juckett: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, amendment #3 incorporates amendment #1 and #2 and further provides that in the licensing of Mental Health Facilities and licensing of Mental Retardation Facilities, that the Department of Mental Health will follow the rules and regulations of the Department of Public Health and we've worked with both of these departments on this amendment and I would move for the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 232."

W. Robert Blair: "Any discussion? Question on the adoption of the amendment... all those in favor will say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. Amendment is adopted, further amendments? Third Reading. Now Mr. Schnider has a similar request."

Schnider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, it is a similar request ah.. I ask to have the proper motion to have approval to take the



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Bill back for purposes of favoring an amendment."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, now he is doing the same thing... not asking for consideration of the Bill on Third Reading, but wanting to take it back to the Order of Second Reading, for purposes of addressing the amendatory stage ah.. so again until we get this matter straightened out it will take 107 votes to take it out of order. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record."

Fredric B. Selcke: "You want the record?"

W. Robert Blair: "121 'ayes', no 'nays' , and the Bill is now back on Second Reading. Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker ah... we adopted two amendments on House Bill 205, ah they were conflicting amendments. I would like to table my amendment which is Amendment #1."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright the gentleman ah.. asking for unanimous consent now to table Amentment #1, which he says is his amendment to his Bill, ah.. any objection to that? Alright than, hearing none than ah..Amendment #1 is tabled. Now do you desire to take any further action? Alright, ah Third Reading. Ah... Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham has a similar request in regard to House Bill 20, and so in order to keep the record straight, all those in favor of suspending the Rules so that we can go out of order to that Bill so that he can take it back to the Order of Second Reading where he intends to leave and address an amendment



to it, at later time, will vote 'aye', the opposed 'no' and this will take 107 votes. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea rise?"

Shea: "I just want to comment and explain my vote, on this very important matter."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright"

Shea: "Our zealousness to reform our rules, I see where we've blown about a half and hour and taken four or five Roll Calls probably at about a cost of about \$100 to the State of Illinois ah.. to do this, and normally we could have done it in one or two minutes with the Speaker moving around. So I would wonder in this particular instance we haven't acted with haste and are now paying for it, a little bit everyday."

W. Robert Blair: "allright, have all boted who wish? Clerk, take the record. 119 'ayes', no 'nays', and it's back on Second Reading. Now are there nay similar requests of that type?"

Miller: "Just hold it on Second. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Juckett rise?"

Juckett: "Well, Mr. Speaker, yesterday I made some comments about the Executive Committee and the Majority Leader was quite upset because I made the comments, because the Chairman of the Executive Committee was off the floor and I wish to apologize to the gentlman, the Chairman of the Executive Committee, because he was off the floor yesterday when I made those comments and I hope that he hears these remarks so he knows that I am apologizing to.. because he was off the floor at the time."



Miller: "Now we will go to the Second Reading in the House Bill, ... Second Reading and the Chair recognizes Speaker Blair."

Blair: "Mr. Speaker, ah.. I would ask that the appropriate rule be suspended so that we can go to the ... ah House Bill 634 on the Order of Second Reading. Out of numerical order so that it can be read a second time today and advanced to Third Reading."

Miller: "Is there discussion on the Speaker's motion? This will take 107 votes. The question is a motion to take House Bill 634 and place it for immediate consideration on Order of Second Reading. Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed 'nay'. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos rise?"

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the ah.. Speaker Blair what the purpose of advancing it so fast and not take it in natural course?"

Miller: "Gentleman from Will, Speaker Blair."

Blair: "I think that's a matter of great import that ah.. that the subject matter of the Bill ah.. be addressed as expeditiously as we possibly can and it's simply a matter of ah.. wanting to get it on to ah... Third Reading and there's an amendment to be adopted and ah...and than we can go on to Third Reading and consider it on Third Reading when we get to that point of business."

Maragos: "The question that bothers me... similar bills have been killed in Committee and I was wondering if the Speaker



intended to move this way ahead of.... for what purpose..

he'd have plenty of time to do it, and that supprises me.

I will give him the privilege because I will vote for it.

Miller: "On this question the 'ayes' are.... take the record.

On this question there are 127 'ayes' 1 'nay' and the motion prevails. Ah... Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 634."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 634, a bill for an act to reduce the tax imposed on food products, medicine drugs for human consumption, Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amend House Bill 634, page 1, by deleating lines 14 through 19, and so forth."

Miller: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Will, Speaker Blair."

Blair: "Now this is a clairifing amendment that was adopted in Committee, so I would move it's adoption."

Miller: "Question is.... gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "I would again like to ask the Speaker the more specific or more of an understanding of what his amendment does to his present Bill 634."

Miller: "Speaker Blair? Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Murphy is recognized."

Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, in answer to Mr. Maragos's question, this is the Bill, ah... the amendment we discussed in Committee, that excluded, spelled out the exclusion of alcoholic beverages, the exclusion of food consumed, and spelled out to quite an extent the food on which we were reducing the tax \$.02, that was... would be purchased in any grocery store



or anyplace retail outlet selling foods. And this is a clarifying amendment that covers those areas."

Miller: "Mr. Maragos?"

Maragos: "I would like to ask Representative Murphy what items besides the respirent and what other items are you changing or clarifying... would you read the amendment to me, what your doing here. please?"

Murphy: Yes, you do not have the amendment?"

Maragos: "No."

Murphy: "Well, amendment #1, amend House Bill 634 on page 1, by deleating lines 14 through 19, and inserting lieu thereof the following. However the rate is 2% of the selling price of prescription drugs dispenced by either a registered pharmacist or a licensed practitioner and the selling price of foods for human consumption which is to be consumed away from the sellers premises by excluding cooked or prepared food sold on a carry-out basis by a retailer for immediate consumption on ot off the premises of the retailer. Items of food or drink prepared or sold in or by restaurants, drug-stores, lunch-counters, cafeterias, hotel, drive-ins, all the licensed places of business are sold ready for immediate consumption from push-carts, motor vehicles or any other form of vehicle and also excluding alcoholic liquor including alcohol, spirts, wine, and beer, and every liquid or solid presented, patented or not, containing alcohol, spirits, wine, or beer, and capable of being consumed as a beverage by a human being, purchased on or after the effective date



of the amendments of the act."

Maragos: "Does this in effect say that they will not be subject to per such, because ah... you have to take into light that what?...."

Murphy: "What? I didn't get that?"

Maragos: "Does this reduce a 2% for those items or are they excluded from the 2%?"

Murphy: "The alcoholic beverages and food investings... excluded."

Maragos: "Allright, I'm going to vote 'yes' for the amendment even though the Bills not what I like... even though it's better than before so....I'll vote 'yes'."

Miller: "Allright the question is ah...shall amendment #1, be adopted? All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? The Bill is ordered avanced to the Order of Third Reading.

W. Robert Blair: "Allright on the Order of Motions appears a motion in respect to ah...House Bill 121. Ah... I think we... well let's let the Clerk read the motions so we can make sure exactly how the gentleman desire to proceed..I think that with the motion of this charge I think it was amended to take from the table and ah..."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Motion persuent to House Rule 33C, on the next Legislative Day, I will move to take House Bill 121 from the table, and place it on the calendar on the Order of Second Reading, 1st Legislative Day."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."



Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I originally had my motion to discharge the Committee as it reads on the Calendar, but I amended it yesterday, and then I had another draft made today to vote to discharge to ah.. to take the removal from the table. Now the point that I try to bring out Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, why I'm asking that this Bill be heard by the Committee and put in place on the Calendar of Second Reading is because of the fact that for the first time in the five years that I've been in the House, and on the Revenue Committee, we took a political vote of 12 to 7 in defeat of my Bill on the Sales Tax Reduction, and therefore I feel that this measure should be fully heard before the whole House. It is a similar Bill to 654, which was just amended by the Speaker, it's a different way of attacking the same problem, and ah.. also yesterday another similar Bill which was like mine, was also defeated in the Committee and that was Representative Londrigan's Bill. Now I feel Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that the full House should have the opportunity to hear this way of giving tax relief to the small tax payers which makes it more easily handed by the Department of Revenue and less cost to the taxpayers. And as is stated by the Department of Revenue itself were to testify on both of these Bills, 64 on both Londrigans and my Bill, which is 121, they said it would be easier.... our approach is easier to administer. Therefore Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to remove House Bill 121 from the table



and have it placed on Second Reading for the consideration by the full House. I know there are.. right now,..many forces ar work on the other side of the aisle, under certain leaderships, whose name I will not mention, but I ask of you to put the politics aside and get to the equities of this matter so you can get for the people and the taxpayers of the State of Illinois to have full consideration of the proposed approachs to this problem of giving tax relief. I ask that you put aside your political consideration and give the people the oppportunity to have this heard fully. Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the HUse."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentleman of the House, I hasten to say at the very beginning to say that I am not the name that the gentleman would not mention. I can't imagine who that would be. Now Mr. Speaker.... this Bill was heard and defeated in the Revenue Committee Meeting as the gentleman correctly pointed out, by a vote of 12 to 10. And if it turns out that it was 12 Republicans and 10 Democrates, that just indicates that the Republicans are smarter than the Democrates and I'll try and tell you why. This Bill proports to give the credit of sales tax for food and for drugs. Now it does that after a fashion. The big problem with the Bill is that it does not give that credit to the people who need it the most. If a person is not required to file a state income tax, then theres no credit available to that person ah.. under the gentleman's Bill. There is



no negative income tax as ah.. the Governor seemed to indicate he would want ah.. in his proposal in his ah..budget message. Now persons who are pensioners, ah.. generally, or many of them, don't pay any income tax. The pension income was excluded ah.. a couple of years ago from the state income tax. Consequently persons receiving pension generally don't pay income tax to the state, but they do pay sales tax and the sales tax to these people is particually burdensome. Ah...any arrangements to assist these very worthy people ah.. should be certainly made and there are Bills in the House that will do this, that will assist persons on pensions, to get credit for sales tax paid on drugs and for food, and I think these Bills are the ones that should be passed, not a Bill that specificclly in effect, excluds senior citizens. So I urgently request that you vote 'no' on the gentleman's motion to ah.. bring this Bill befor the whole House, it has been heard in Committee and I must just for one moment, suggest to you that the House operates on rules and we depend very strongly on the Committee System, and we should depend on the Committee System, because if we did not we would be hoplessly bogged down. This Bill has been heard and it has been defeated and may I say that it was defeated on merit. And so I urge you to vote 'no' on the gentleman's motion."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, ah.. Mr. Shea."

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

I think all we're asking is to get Mr. Maragos's Bill to the



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

floor and to give this body it's choice of which proposal it would like to take. Now theres been lots of courtesies extended this morning back and forth and I would hope that those same courtesies are extended to Mr. Maragos. Thank you very much."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, it's bad enough to have your Bill defeated twice in straight political moves but than to have your present Bill described as it was, that it's not a superior to your old one, is something else again. Now Sam Maragos and I have taken the tax credit approach this year. The Bill that the Speaker introduced, is the approach I took last year. The Republican Governor and Speaker Blair were behind that Bill, were'nt you Mr. Speaker? Until it came down to the time to vote, there wasn't one Republican vote on that side of the aisle for this approach, which all of a sudden, after Speaker Blair introduces a Bill this year, is the answer to all of our tax problems. So let's don't kid.... I don't know who we're trying to kid, I don't think we're kidding the Members and I don't know if the Press knows it or not but the Bill and the approach taken by Speaker Blair, is the same approach that the Republicans went down the line against last year. And now they propose it as all the answers to our tax problems. Now last year, when I presented that approach the retailers were against it and many other organizations. And they persueded me that this tax credit approach, is the best



approach. That's why I came back this year with this approach and why Sam Maragos did to. Everybody, I believe, in the State of Illinois, including the tax... the retailer, the taxpayer, everybody but the Republican Party in the House, has said that this is the correct approach. Now the Republican Party in the House in a straight Party vote, in the Committee, has killed every Bill, except Speaker Blair's Bill. The only thing we're asking to do is, let these Bills out on the House, so that we can have a public discussion of these Bills. I think that's fair enough, and that the people than can decide themselves which approach is the best."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Miller."

Miller: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I feel compelled to point out one or two things regarding the motion which we are now discussing. For some reason Mr. Speaker, I cannot forget the campaign oratory that took place in 1972. I cannot forget the promises made that there was going to be plenty of money in the State Treasury and that we could reduce the expenditures of the State of Illinois. If we need to reduce the expenditures of the State of Illinois, it seems to me Mr. Speaker, that the right way to do it is along the line of tax on food, that the previous speaker referred to. Now Mr. Speaker, a year ago.... yes, two years ago, there was no indication whatsoever that the State of Illinois would be in as good a fiscal condition that it apparently now is. At least we're told that excellent fiscal condition. So now Mr. Speaker, it now is incompetent upon the



the Members of the General Assembly to consider the possibility of reducing taxes. And that's the purpose now. A year.... two years ago, we could not take that posture, because than it would be fiscal irresponsibility. Now it is fiscal resoponsibility, we are told by the size of the anticipated surplus in the State Treasury, and therefore Mr. Speaker I think it is now very proper that we consider removing the sales tax on the food. I think most of the people who are listening to my voice, recognize that I have had some experience in income tax preparation, over some years. Mr. Speaker, it's a long and involved process. If we have to change the Illinois Income Tax Forms, if we have to provide facilities for reimbursement of the type of proposal that House Bill 121 addresses itself to. By far the simplist way to give tax relief is by a reduction of sales tax on food and that my friends, is the point of this whole argument. So Mr. Speaker, I to strongly oppose ah... the gentleman's motion to take House Bill 121 from Committee, where it had a very fair hearing and I think we should uphold the Committee System."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. B.B.Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentleman of the House, I don't believe that the question before this House at this time, is the comparative qualities of either the Speaker's Bill, or Sam Maragos's Bill, because if you want to talk about what is good and what is bad, both the Sam Maragos Bill provides for tax relief of about \$114,000,000, it's



within the guidelines set up by the Governor, who indicated that there was perhaps a \$118,000,000 of tax relief to the people of the State of Illinois. The other Bill provides for relief way beyond the \$118,000,000. And when you consider on that basis, it's a raid on the Treasury, and it's only a partial relief because it does not provide for the complete elimination of tax on food and drugs. But the real question before this House is, 'are we gonna give equal treatment to both sponsors' and I think with the support that the Speaker had in his motion, to advance the hearing on House Bill 634, which doesn't expire until April 26th, there's no emergency in that.... in the hearing of that Bill. Now we extended the courtesy to him to have the Bill brought back to Second and advanced to Third. I don't think we can, in good conscience, and in fairness, do any less for the Sam Maragos Bill, and I would suggest that we support the motion to discharge, put it on the floor of the House where it can then be fully debated as to which concept the Members of this House want, and not take up the time of the House at this time, in debating the merits of these Bills."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House,

I think we have a question here dealing with the Committee structure that's examined the various proposals. And I feel....."

W. Robert Blair: "Wait just a minute.... The gentleman from Hirshfield.... I mean...Champaign, Mr. Hirshfield, has a



point of order."

Hirshfield: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker, is this a debatable motion?"

W. Robert Blair: "Yes, it is, ah... it's not to suspend, it's a motion to take from the table."

Hirshfield: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I ah.. with all do respect to the Speaker's decision, when I moved to take from the table a Constitutional Amendment about ten weeks ago, ah...Mr. Telcser was presiding that day, and decided that it was not a debatable motion and that I could not speak on the subject matter and neither could anyone else."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman can proceed. I don't frankly recall that instance ah.. do you have a citation from out of rules of order concerning the motion to take from the table, that's it's not debatable?"

Hirshfield: "Mr. Speaker, I was quoting the prior ruling of the Chair, and at that time Mr. Telcser's exact comments were that the Speaker... the maker of the motion is entitled to speak briefly on the subject of his motion and that the Chair has always let one person, usually the Chairman of the Committee reply, and after that time, no further debate has been allowed. And I think that some of the Members should remember that decision that was rendered less than a week ago."

W. Robert Blair: "Well, lets ah... the indication was, I was not in the Chair at that time, and let's find out what the... Allright, the Parlintarian says that the prior ruling was correct, that the motion is not debatable, so that's where



we are now, and ah.... so... we'll let Mr. Simms finish though, and ah... since we have let others talk on the issue."

Simms: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Just briefly I think we're engaged of the process of having our Committee study both proposals. I think too, we should take into consideration, that the Governor of the state, the Chief Executive, recently showed that he can't handle two measures that are presented to him at the same time, with the alternatives method. I certainly don't think that we should want to confuse the Chief Executive with alternative plans or facts, and so for this reason I think that we should sustain the decision of the Committee."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright now, for what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski rise?"

Kosinski: "It's a combination point of order and personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

W. Robert Blair: "Which one first?"

Kosinski: "Lets take them both together, you extended the courtesy of the House to hear the finish of Mr. Simms's comments. Will I be extended the same courtesy?"

W. Robert Blair: "Well, the point of the matter here, simply is that a point of order had not been raised concerning the fact that debate was going on on a motion that's not debatable. And so we simply allowed the gentleman that had been interrupted to close his remarks, after the point of order had been raised, and the Chair ruled that the point was well taken. I think that was courtesy. Now to extend beyond



we are now, and ah.... so... we'll let Mr. Simms finish though, and ah... since we have let others talk on the issue."

Simms: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Just briefly I think we're engaged of the process of having our Committee study both proposals. I think too, we should take into consideration, that the Governor of the state, the Chief Executive, recently showed that he can't handle two measures that are presented to him at the same time, with the alternatives method. I certainly don't think that we should want to confuse the Chief Executive with alternative plans or facts, and so for this reason I think that we should sustain the decision of the Committee."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright now, for what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski rise?"

Kosinski: "It's a combination point of order and personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

W. Robert Blair: "Which one first?"

Kosinski: "Lets take them both together, you extended the courtesy of the House to hear the finish of Mr. Simms's comments. Will I be extended the same courtesy?"

W. Robert Blair: "Well, the point of the matter here, simply is that a point of order had not been raised concerning the fact that debate was going on on a motion that's not debatable. And so we simply allowed the gentleman that had been interrupted to close his remarks, after the point of order had been raised, and the Chair ruled that the point was well taken. I think that was courtesy. Now to extend beyond



that I think is a clear breach of the fact that the matter is not debatable."

Kosinski: "I accept your ruling."

W. Robert Blair: "Now we can have a roll call debate.... I mean a roll call, and you can explain your vote. Certainly there is no question about that, and I'll be happy to recognize you first."

Kosinski: "I accept your ruling."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright. What purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. B.B. Wolf rise?"

Wolf: "A point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Is the gentleman's motion to take from the table or to discharge the Committee?"

W. Robert Blair: "Well, it's varied from time to time, ah... the last one that I had put before me was newly drafted and it says that he wants to take from the table, although the motion that was originally filed was to discharge."

Wolf: "Well, if it is to take from the table, your ruling is correct, it requires 107 votes."

W. Robert Blair: "Does it?"

Wolf: "Yes, it does. A motion to take a rule 65, a motion to take from the table, requires 107 votes."

W. Robert Blair: "I'd be happy to accept that, is that.... "

Wolf: "That's what it says, unless it was amended."

W. Robert Blair: "60... what rule?"

Wolf: "65, a motion to take, a motion to discharge the Committee takes 89 votes, that's why I was making the inquiry."



W. Robert Blair: "Well, he's filing his motion under 33 and not under 65."

Wolf: "Under 33? Thank you, that's all I wanted to know."

W. Robert Blair: "Ok, Mr. Wolf? Ok on 33? Allright. We'll let Mr. Maragos close as a matter of House courtesy."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I only going to reply to one point that was made by the opposition to this... to my motion, and that is that this will help the small people as well. One of the provisions of the Bill does give relief to those who don't pay taxes by giving refunds thereof... as it make... a .. file a short form and get a refund. It is a taxpayers benefit Bill, I don't care how they clout it, and as I say it is a crime to clout it with political significance, but it should not be, and that is why I'm asking as a courtesy, which has been extended to many other people in the past, to get the Bills out on discharge of the Committee and to... have it fully heard by the House, I'm asking the same courtesy from each one of you. Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright, the question is shall the gentlemen motion prevail. All those in favot will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, having some little experience in Committee, marginal votes of 8 to 10, always concern me. I can't understand why the majority leader would take exemption to this request. It smacks of something on a party line, and that concerns me."



I think that the Members of this House are entitled to hear this Bill in it's fullest. I think it concerns us all. And I would urge you to take this from the table."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I was glad to hear, in a way, the majority leader, a moment ago, say that on the heels of suspending the rules for the Speaker, that he believed in them. I always thought that the old adage of 'turn about is fair play'. The Bill which we have helped advanced with 107 votes, to the order of Third Reading, a moment ago, deals with exactly the same subject matter that Representative Marago's Bill deals with. And the only thing that Representative Maragos is asking 89 Members of this body to do is to give him the puragative of placing that Bill on the Calendar, giving the puragative to this legislative body, and the opportunity of this legislative body to distinguish between the two peices of legislation. If you don't like this one, the majority of the Members, it can go down. If you like the other one better, it can go down, it can pass. The only thing that he is asking, is the same courtesy that has been appointed other Members of this body. And I would hope that some of you would join with us, as we have joined with you, in making this possible."

W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will..... well sure.... Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, again I arise, which I very seldom do, except that I feel so strongly about



the issue and the merits of this legislation. I say to you, that we should give this our full consideration, and it is upsetting a bad precedence if we're gonna get into this area of using, because of political affiliation, an opportunity of killing good legislation, what I think is good legislation. You can vote me down on Third Reading if you don't think that this is a good Bill, or a good approach, if the ah.. if you have.... after you've had the full consideration and measures. But now I feel, Mr. Speaker, that you should give the opportunity, because this is a good approach, this has been brought to me by other experts, it's not only a part of officeship, but the meritorious approach to a simple way to give tax relief. And that's why I feel strongly towards this, and I amended the Bill to comply with the requests of many Members of your side of the aisle, during the debate in Committee. And I did it when we went before the Sub-Committee. And I think that we should be allowed to have this Bill heard in it's fullest. So you have an advantage to go back to your people and say that we considered both measures and we took this approach against the other. Until you have had this opportunity to fully hear this as a debate and decide on it, I think your 'not only cheating yourselves, but your cheating your consitiuents. So I would like to have 89 votes if I may, please."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Hirshfield."

Hirshfield: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I realize my green vote up there, is gonna look a little bit unusual but I have seen



the time when I have been unable to get a Bill out of the Committee, not just in this Session, but during the last Session, and it's very important to have help from both sides of the aisle, when you want a Bill out. I realize that the Bill in the Committee was probably a political vote and I did not sit on that Committee, but I think that Representative Maragos is at least entitled to have his concept of the tax consequence of this Bill, heard before this House. And I don't think that it would hurt the Republican side of the aisle to show the same generosity towards the Democratic side, that they just showed to our side of the aisle within the last thirty minutes. And I suggest, particularly to the new freshmen legislators, that the day is going to come during this Session, when your going to have a Bill that your going to need one or two votes on, and you will not be able to get it from your side of the aisle. It will not be a partisan vote, but it will get locked up in a partisan battle, which it unfortunate, and I don't think it hurts to extend a hand of friendship across the aisle and give the man an opportunity of having his Bill heard on the merits, by the entire membership. I'm very happy to give Mr. Maragos and 'aye' vote on this."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wish to commend Representative Hirshfield for two reasons. 1. He is voting on the right side. 2. He preempted my speech, because he said exactly what I wanted to say. So I'll simply para-



phrase it very briefly. I have no qualms about voting for the Speaker's motion on House Bill 634, because not withstanding what a party line might have been, I thought it was essentially important to get it in the form he wanted before the House in the most expeditious manner possible, and quite a few others Members on this side of the aisle felt the same way too, and so they supported it. Now Representative Maragos has a similar Bill, covering more or less the same subject, but some minor degree of change, I don't know the difference, and it seems to me only fair that the Members of the other side of the aisle should put both Bills before the public, because let's face it, the issue is one of tremendous importance to the people of the state, and I don't think that we should be vying for position on this particular kind of issue. Your not kidding anyone in the public's mind, they see what's happening here today. They see it, I'm sure that the Press is going to disclose quite clearly that the Republicans attempted to preempt the seal unfairly by squashing a good Democratic Bill, and playing up their own, hopefully to the edification of our wonderful Speaker. But I think it will ah..it will be a great issue, it will lessen you in the terms.... in the esteem of the public. Clyde Choate says that 'turn about is fair play', that's true, absolutely true. And all your doing is exacerbating a minor problem that exists between the aisles. I think now might well be the time, Mr. Majority Leader, whom I admire and respect, to extend the hand of fair play across



the aisle and let's try this small meaningful way to get these two sides together on an issue that concerns the people. I want to close by commending Representative Hirshfield again, and simply say to him, "John, let's you and I compare notes before you get up." "

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I am impelled to feel along with Representative Hirshfield on this. We have one man right now that's been sick for quite some time, he might not be back, who knows? We may have the same situation. That means we don't have the chance to or the votes to have the same courtesy. So I'm going to vote on the understanding that when the time comes, and it may very well be pretty soon for some of us on our side, that the same courtesy is given to us as we will give to you right now. So please remember that over there."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

W. Walsh: "Well, may I say Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, and there is nobody on the other side of the aisle that has been here more than one term, and I'm sure most of the first termers on the other side of the aisle, realize that two of our Members, I'm afraid perhaps three, have been lead up the primrose path. I have no greater friend in the House than the Sponsor of this motion. Sam Maragos is a great friend of mine, but I'll tell you this, that if I ever had a motion or a Bill, and I needed one vote and there were a Democratic position against my Bill, Sam wouldn't vote for it to his dying day. Never to his dying



day would he give me a vote against a party position. And you know I wouldn't blame Sam. Sam is a good friend of mine and so is the Assistant Minority Leader, but it would be a cold day in hell before either of them or anyone over there would give me a vote or any Member or any Member over here, Weber, so don't hold your breath waiting for a vote from them, against a party position. So I suggest to you that a few of our Members are wrong ah.. some of them should know better, but apparently they don't, and I would once again urge that they ah..not vote, or vote red with their party."

W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Murphy."

Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, I would suggest a varification of this affirmative vote."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright ah..Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "At this time I would like to have a poll of absentees before the varification, and ah..I would like to say in answer to, if I may, it's a matter of personal privilage, since my name was brought up, I didn't want to stop the voting.... At any time in the Revenue Committee that I have been in for five years, Mr. Majority Leader, I have never voted party lines, in fact I voted all Bills to get out, that I felt were meritorious. And so many times I voted against my own party. This is on the question what your final vote is gonna be on the Bill, on Third Reading, All I'm asking for is some consideration. Time and time again, you can look at my record, I've always voted to discharge or have the



Bills removed from the table, as every Member has asked for it. "

W. Robert Blair: "Allright, poll the absentees."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Anderson, Arnell,Blades, Bluthardt, Campbell, Capuzi,....."

W. Robert Blair: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea rise?"

Shea: "I know the Clerk is kind of non-partisan and he....and I don't think he means to be reading so fast cause... when a fellow's name gets called, he might want to think about voting if he is present here on the floor. So if he could just slow down a little bit."

W. Robert Blair: "Clerk will proceed in his usual course."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Forgot where I quit. Carter, Catania, Clabaugh, Collins, Cunningham, Day, Deavers, Deuster, Duff, Ralph Dunn, R.L. Dunn, Dyer, Ebbesen, Epton, Fleck, Friedland, Geo-Karis, Gibbs, Granata Grieshejmer, Grotberg, Harpstrite, Hoffman, Ron Hoffman, R. Holloway, Hudson, Hunsicker, Huskey, Hyde,"

W. Robert Blair: "Record the gentleman as 'aye'."

Fredric B. Selcke: "J. David Jones, Juckett, Kempiners, Kent, Klosak, Kriegsman, Kucharski, LaFleur, Lauer, Leinenweber, Macdonald, Mahar, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McCormick, McCourt, McMaster, Kenny Miller, Tom Miller, Molloy, Murphy, Neff, North, Palmer, Pappas, Philip, Piotrowicz, Porter, Randolph, Rigney, Rose, Ryan, Schoeberlein, Sevcik, Timothy Simms, Skinner, Soderstrom, Springer, Stiehl, Telcser, Totten,



Tuerk, Waddell, Wall, R. Walsh, Walters, Washburn, J.J.Wolf."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright now, now varify the affirmative."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Alsup, Arrigo, Barnes, Barry, Beatty, Beaupre, Berman, Borchers, Boyle, Bradley, Brandt, Brinkmeyer, Brummet, Caldwell, Calvo, Capparelli, Chapman, Choate, Craig, Davis, DiPrimi, Douglas, Ewell, Farley, Fary, Fennessey, Flinn, Garmisa, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Hanahan, Hart, Hill, Hirschfeld, J. Holloway, D. Houlihan, J. Houlihan, Hyde, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Katz, Keller, Kelly, Kennedy, Kosindki, Kozubowski, Krause, Laurino, Lechowicz, Letke, Leon, Lonōrigan, Lundy, Madigan, Mann, Marago, Martin, Matijeovich, McClain, McGah, McGrew, McLendon, McPhartlin, Merlo, Mugalian, Nardulli, Patrick, Pierce, Polk, Rayson, Redmond, Sangmeister, Schisler, Schlickman, Schneider, Schraeder, Sharp, Shea, Ike Sims, Stedelin, Stone, Taylor, Terzich, Thompson, Tipsword, VonBoeckamn, Washington, Williams, B.B.Wolf, Yourell."

W. Robert Blair: "We want to varify, ah... we want to varify the affirmative first, then if you want to go to the negative you can, but it might not serve any purpose, it depends. I'll certainly recognize you. Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Murphy."

Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, is Representative Hirshfield here, please?"

W. Robert Blair: "He is back in the back."

Murphy: "Representative Brandt?"

W. Robert Blair: "Brandt? Yes, He is here."

Murphy: "Representative Brinkmeyer?"



W. Robert Blair: "I cant see, ah.. is he back there? How is the gentleman recorded?"

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

W. Robert Walsh: "Take him off the record."

Murphy: "Representative Martin?"

W. Robert Blair: "How is the lady recorded?"

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

W. Robert Blair: "Take her off the record."

Murphy: "Representative Farley?"

W. Robert Blair: "I'm sorry, what's the name?"

Murpny: "Farley."

W. Robert Blair: "Farley? Farley is here."

Murphy: "Representative Keller?"

W. Robert Blair: "How's the gentleman recorded?" No, he's there."

Murphy: "Representative Madigan?"

W. Robert Blair: "Madigan is here."

Murphy: "Representative McPhartlin?"

W. Robert Blair: "McPhartlin is here."

Murphy: "Representative Stone?"

W. Robert Blair: "Stone is here."

Murphy: "Representative Fary isn't really here, I don't think."

W. Robert Blair: "Barry? Oh Fary, no, he's away now."

Murphy: "Representative Davis?"

W. Robert Blair: "Davis? Yes, he's here."

Murphy: "Representative Arrigo?"

W. Robert Blair: "Arrigo is here."



W. Robert Blair: "Now wait a minute, Representative Martin is back, so put her... yes, she was 'aye' she wasn't there in her seat when we were varifying, we often make the point now that if your not no matter how you vote on the roll call, if your not there when the thing being varified your name comes off, however ah.. would varified. Go ahead."

Murphy: "Representative Barry on the floor?"

W. Robert Blair: "Barry? This time it is Barry, Barry is there."

Murphy: "Representative Giorgi?"

W. Robert Blair: Giorgi? There he is back in the back."

Murphy: "Representative Leon?"

W. Robert Blair: "Leon is here."

Murphy: "Representative Yourell?"

W. Robert Blair: "Yourell, how is he recorded voting?"

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

W. Robert Blair: "Take him off the record."

Murphy: "Representative Schisler?"

W. Robert Blair: "Schisler, there he is."

Murphy: "Representative DiPrimà?"

W. Robert Blair: "DiPrimà, how is he recorded?"

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

W. Robert Blair: "Take him off the record. There he is, put him on."

Murphy: "Representative Beaupre?"

W. Robert Blair: "Beaupre? Is he back there? How is he recorded voting?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "The gentleman is....."

W. Robert Balir: "Take him off the record until he gets through"



with his phone conversation."

Murphy: "Representative Lemke?"

W. Robert Blair: "Lemke is there."

Murphy: Represent.....

W. Robert Blair: "Now wait a minute, Beaupre is there, put him back on."

Murphy: "Representative Redmond?"

W. Robert Blair: "Redmond, is with Capuzi, he is here."

Murphy: "Representative Mann?"

W. Robert Blair: "Mann? Mann, is Mann back there? I can't see? Mann there? I don't see him. How is he recorded?"

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

W. Robert Blair: "Take him off the record."

Murphy: "Representative Schraeder?"

W. Robert Blair: "There he is, standing back there." Mann has returned to the scene here in the middle aisle, put him back on."

Murphy: "Representative Houlihan?"

W. Robert Blair: "Up there, wait a minute, Houlihan, which one are we talking about now?"

Murphy: "James."

W. Robert Blair: "James?, Jim's there, and Daniel also. There both here and I... Yourell is back. So put Yourell back on the roll call. Now Mr. Kelly, what did you want? Nothing, Ok, Go ahead."

Murphy: "Representative....."

W. Robert Blair: Wait a minute... Mr. Kelly, how is he recorded?"



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

Murphy: "Representative B.B. Wolf?"

W. Robert Blair: "B.B. Wolf is there."

Murphy: "Representative Polk?"

W. Robert Blair: "Representative Polk? How is he recorded?"

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

W. Robert Blair: "Take him off the record, he's not there."

Murphy: "Representative Rayson?"

W. Robert Blair: "Rayson, is here in the center aisle."

Murphy: "Representative John Matijevec?"

W. Robert Blair: "He's back there."

Murphy: "Representative ah...."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright on this question there are 90 'ayes' and 3 'nays', and the gentleman's motion prevails. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe rise?"

Jaffe: "Having voted on the prevailing side, I move that the vote be reconsidered."

W. Robert Blair: "Ok no, what you do is move to lay it on the table, ya. I was being too helpful, we'll take the gentleman's Second. And the question is, all those in favor of the motion..... Allright, the gentleman from Cook has moved to reconsider and the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski, has moved to Second. All those in favor.... Allright the questions on the gentleman's motion to,.... ah... now wait a minute....B.B.Wolf, he'll get it straightened out."

B.B.Wolf: "Did I hear you say that there was a motion to reconsider and that there was a Second to that motion?"



March 28, 1973

93.

If there is, I'll move to lay it on the table, Mr. Speaker."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright, gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "May I present a substitute motion to table?"

W. Robert Blair: "Allright ah..if we could do it all over ah.. who moved to table? Mr. Jaffe? Then he moved to reconsider the vote by which the motion to take from the table prevailed and Mr. Kosinski now moves to table, that motion to reconsider. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. Allright the 'ayes' have it and the gentleman's motion prevails. Now... on the order of postponed consideration is House Bill 29, which the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe asks leave to have considered. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos rise?"

Maragos: "Personal privilage."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, at this time I'd like to thank those of you who assisted at having this motion to disch...to remove from the table, and ah... as I said before, I've never taken any of these Bills lightly in Committee and I always voted to discharge, and I thank you all, especially those on the other side of the aisle. Thank you again."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright... the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe, ah... House Bill 29."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have leave to return this to Second Reading, for pupose of an amendment that Mr. Kempiners wishes to put on."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

W. Robert Blair: "Allright ah.. gentleman have leave than, to put this on Second, and ah.. gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber wants to ah..Wait a minute now... is your amendment out on your desk? I guess he got it mixed up, the gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, ah.. this would be amendment #5 to House Bill 29. And basically what it does is remove the present requirement that current clinical diagnosis be supplied to the Secreat Service by the Director of Mental Health, and it also would make this Bill applicable only to state operated hospitals or institutions and I move it's adoption."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright, any discussion on the gentleman's amendment? All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it and the amendment passes. Are there further amendment? Allright, Third Reading. Now announcements. Gentleman from Cook, ah.. or Champain, Mr Clabaugh."

Clabaugh: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have an announcement that is of impostance to several of the Members. That would be Stone, Washburn, Yourell, Hart, Rose, Collins, and Berman, know some of them are not in the room, ah.. the meeting of the Study Finance Committee on Education will meet this afternoon at 4:30 in Room 3G. Now that's the room next to the room that we have been meeting in before. Some have said that they could not come, but if it's at all possible to get there, I'd like to have you be there at 4:30 or as soon after as possible. Thank you."



W. Robert Blair: "Allright now,....gentleman from Cook, Mr. Capuzi."

Capuzi: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentleman of the House, the members of the Human Resources Committee will meet immediately after adjournment, we have about 60 or 70 people there waiting. So let's get there as soon as possible."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from ah.. Grundy, Mr. Washburn."

Washburn: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentleman of the House, the Appropriations Committee will also meet immediately in Room A1, across the street."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer."

Palmer: "Mr. Speaker, Chairman Rose has ask that I announce that Judiciary 1, will meet this afternoon, fifteen minutes after adjournment, there are some fourteen Bills to take out." In D1."

W. Robert Blair: "Any more annoucement? Ah.. gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

W. Walsh: "Relative to the announcement that Representative Palmer just made ah.. the Minority Leader suggested, and I think it's probably a good idea, that instead of meeting fifteen minutes after adjournment, we meet 45 minutes after adjournment. In order that people can get a bite of lunch!"

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from ah.. Johnson, Mr. McCormick."

McCormick: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I would like to announce that tommorow I will introduce into the House a Comprehensive Property Tax Freeze Bill. I would like for it to be a non-partasan as possible, and I'm gonna



leave it on my desk, and anyone who wants to Co-Sponsor it, can sign it today, or befor I introduce it tomorrow. I'd appreciate all of you becoming a part of that, especially Representative Shea. Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Vermillion, Mr. Craig, now we go back to House Bill, Second Reading, ah.. and the a gentleman from Vermillion, Mr. Craig has a...."

Craig: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to suspend the appropriate rule to advance House Bill 633 from Second Reading to Third. It has a Committee Amendment on it, ah.. a typographical error amendment.. and I would like to have the rules suspended at this time."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright, ah.. wait a minute... what you really want to do is to go out of order so that this Bill may be heard at this time so you can put an amendment on it and you can get it advanced to Third. Now that's gonna take 107 votes, so the question is the gentlemans motion to go out of order so that he can consider this matter which he says is an emergency, the Effeciency Appropriation for the Secretary of State, all those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. This is simply to allow him to have his Bill out of order on Second Reading, so that he may address an amendment to and have it advanced to Third. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 134 'ayes' and no 'nays' and the gentleman's motion prevails, and the Clerk will read 633."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 633, a Bill for an act to amend



Sections 1,2,and 3, Second Reading of the Bill, One Committee Amendment. Amend House Bill 633, page 5, line 20, and so forth."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Vermillion, Mr. Craig."

Craig: "This is a typographical error, correction is typographical errors and I move for the adoption of Committee Amendment #1, House Bill 633."

W. Robert Blair: "allright, all those in favor of the adoption of the amendment say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it, and the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? Third Reading. Any further announcements? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. ah... gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, the Industrial Affairs Committee, will meet immediately after adjournment in Room M4."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "I thought that we ah... the gentleman evidently didn't hear ah... the Majority Leader's suggestion to let the Membership have an opportunity to get a bite to eat and refresh themselves a wee bit. And that Committee Meeting would start approximately 45 minutes after adjournment."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright, the gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, frankly I would just a soon get at the business, but if that's been the agreement among all the Committees, I'll bother that, but ah.. our guys are ready to go."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

W. Walsh: "Well, we did have some agreement on it, Fred. that



the 2:00 Committees would meet 45 minutes after adjournment, that would be at 20 minutes to 4. And that the 4:00 Committees would meet at 5:15. Ah.. that seems reasonable to me, we've been here a'long time, many of us haven't had lunch and we would like to relax a bit before we have Committees."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn until 9:30 tomorrow morning, Perfunct Resession, and 10:00 for Regular Session."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright, all those in favor of the gentleman's motion to adjourn, say 'aye', the opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it, and the gentleman's motion prevails."

