

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-THIRD LEGISLATIVE DAY

MARCH 29, 1973

10:00 O'CLOCK A.M.

THE HONORABLE W. ROBERT ELAII., 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 Paul J. Randolph - illness;

Representative John F. Wall - illness.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Timothy Simms: "The House will come to order and we'll have our prayer by Mr. Joe Carrigan of Springfield."

Joe Carrigan: "Let us pray. Amen I say to you that so ever you shall live shall live and so ever shall die shall die. Amen."

Timothy Simms: "Messages from the Senate."

Fredric B. Selcke: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles, in the passage of which I'm instructed to ask the concurrence of the House. Senate Bills 32, 33, 35, and 36 and 104. Past by the Senate March 28, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following preamble and joint resolution, in the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House. Senate Joint Resolution #19, adopted by the Senate March 28, 1973, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary."

Timothy Simms: "Report the Standing Committees."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Ah... Mr. Tuerk, from the Committee on Industrial Affairs, to which House Bill 311 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bill do pass and it be placed on the order of Second Reading. Mr. North, from Cities and Villages, to which House Bills 344, 345, 594 were referred, reported same back, with the recommendation that the Bills do pass. Mr. North, from Cities and Villages, to which House Bill 441 was referred,



reported the same back with amendments thereto, with the recommendation the the amendments be adopted, that those amended to not pass. Mr. North, from Cities and Villages, to which House Bill 525, was referred, was reported the same back with amendments thereto, with the recommendation that the amendments do pass. Mr. North, from Cities and Villages, which House Bill 535, 595, 596, were referred, reported the same back with the recommendation the Bills do pass. Mr. Bluthardt, from Elections, to which House Bill 346, 422, were referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bills do not pass. Mr. Bluthardt, from Election, to which House Bill 356, was referred, was reported the same back with amendments thereto, with the recommendation that the amendments be adopted, those amended do not pass. Mr. Bluthardt, from Election, to which House Bills 389, 581, 675, were referred, were reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bills do pass. Mr. Bluthardt, from Elections, wo which House Bill 434, was referred, reported the same back with amendments thereto, with the recommendation that the amendments be adopted, that the the Bill, as amended do pass. Mr. Soderstrom, from Elementary and Secondary, to which House Bill 418 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bill do pass and it be re-referred to the Committee on Appropriations. Mr. Soderstrom, from Elementary and Secondary, to which House Bill 419 was referred, reported the same back with amendments thereto, with the recommenda-



tion that the amendments be adopted, that the Bill, as amended do pass. Mr. Soderstrom, from Elementary and Secondary, to which House Bill 561 was referred, was reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bill do not pass. Mr. Soderstrom, from Elementary and Secondary, to which House Bill 584 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bill do pass. Mr. Soderstrom, from Elementary and Secondary, to which House Joint Resolution #6 was referred, reported back with the recommendation that the resolution be not adopted. Mr. Randolph, from Revenue, to which House Bills 309, 310, 349, were referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bills do not pass. Mr. Randolph, from Revenue, to which House Bills 414, 443, 542, and 582 and 583, were referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bills do pass. Mr. Neff, from Transportation, to which House Bill 640 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bill do pass, to be re-referred to Appropriation. Mr. Neff, from Transportation, to which House Bill 250 was referred, reported the same back, pursuant to Rule 23 (d), the Bill was ordered tabled."

Timothy Simms: "Introduction and First Reading of House Bills."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 882, Collins et al. Amends the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill.
House Bill 883, Collins et al. Amends Chicago Policemens Fund Article. First Reading of the Bill."



House Bill 884, Collins et al. Amends the Chicago Police-
men's Pension Fund. First Reading of the Bill. House
Bill 885, Collins et al. Amends the Illinois Pension Code.
First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 886, Terzich et al.
An Act to permit public employees to enter into a deferred
compensation plan. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill
887, Deuster et al. Amends an act authorizing local im-
provements by counties. First Reading of the Bill. 888,
Skinner. Amends the Revenue Act. First Reading of the
Bill. 889, Timothy Simms, inacts the Illinois Credit Card
Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Timothy Simms: "Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Clabaugh moves
that the House stands at recess until 10:00 P.M. or
10:00 A.M."

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

Dr. Johnson: "We pray. Each of us stands before you this
morning, O Lord, confident of at least two things. We
know ourselves for what we really are. And that you know
us for not only what we are, but for what we ought to be.
I confess, O Lord, that I can be so lofty in speech, and
yet so slow in performance. So full of good intentions, and
yet so remiss in fulfilling them. So severe with my
colleagues and associates and yet so indulgent with myself.
So eager to find fault in others, and yet so resentful when
they find fault in me. So little able for the great task
that confront me, and yet so discontent, often, with the



the smaller ones. So weak at times of adversity, and yet so self satisfied when everything is going well. So helpless apart from your continuing power, and yet so remiss in acknowledging it daily. What would become of us, O God, if you were not a Lord of compassion? Give me therefore a full measure of your grace to be this day less of what I have been, and more of what you would have me to be in this my calling in the service of thie House. Here me in the name of my Savior. Amen."

W. Robert Blair: "The Roll Call for attendance. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

W. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, will the Journal show that Representative Randolph, Granata, and Wall are absent because of illness?"

W. Robert Blair: "The Journal will so indicate. Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Ah... will the record show that Representative Richard Carter is absent?"

W. Robert Blair: "The Journal will show that ah... he is absent, because of illness. Messages? Introductions?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 890, Duff. A Bill for an act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. An act concerning jurors. First Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "House Bills ah.... third reading. Allright, starting place is 186."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 186, Telcser. A Bill for an act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois.



Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Telcser: "Ah... Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 186 ah... simply makes it possible for non-profit organizations or transportation companies to apply for funds to the Department of Transportation out of the Bond Issue money to provide services for handicapped ah... citizens. I have been working with the Department who officially does not take a position, but they do have some applications on file and felt, however, the definition of carrier under the Act would not enable them to release any funds. The Bills passed the committee, I believe, unanimously, and I would appreciate a favorable vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion. Third.... Yeow, put Third Reading up there. All right, we're on discussion now. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question? Art, will this let a group like Seaton School apply for funds because they do transport handicapped children?"

Telcser: "I'm not familiar with that group, but I would say yes."

Shea: "Ah.... what.... what specific did you have in mind at the time you put the Bill in?"

Telcser: "Well, Jer, if you recall, ah... in my district, I had a group called Lilah Lou, and they provided transportation services for handicapped citizens. They.... They went to small vehicles, mini-buses and the CTA helped them install



a lift on the side of the vehicle, the wheelchair could go on the lift, lift them up a couple of feet and put them on the mini-bus. And what they did was, establish a route in an area and pick up people in the morning and drive them to work, and then drive them back home from work. They would also drive these people to their therapy sessions or to their physicians' offices. Ah.... the Legislature ah.... gave this particular organization a \$15,000 grant two years ago and that grant helped them greatly. Now they wish to acquire two more vehicles and some communications equipment, so they could have a dispatcher work with the vehicle. Now they went to DOT to see if they would qualify under a 900 hundred million dollar bond issue, and DOT felt that the definition of mass transportation and the definition of what a carrier is did not really apply to them, so all I'm doing in this Bill is changing the definition so that they could qualify if DOT feels that they could do the job."

Shea: "Well, I'm all for the concept, because it's certainly going to help something in my area, because I'm sure Seaton School's going to be able to get, at least I read the Bill and the Amendment, but are we getting this down to where we're using the Bond money for almost individuals rather than for mass transportation, Art?"

Telcser: "I would think not, Jerry, simply because we give the determination as to who was going to give the money to DOT. This Bill only says DOT can, if they think it's feasible."

Shea: "All right."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Further discussion? Gentleman care to close?"

Hunsicker: "I would just appreciate a favorable vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 141 'ayes' and no 'nays', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Hunsicker... oh....

Tom Miller, 'aye'. Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Hunsicker."
Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to introduce a group of farm bureau members from Livingston County up in the balcony, in back of the Republican side of the aisle."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "House Bill 196."

Mr. S. Salcke: "House Bill 196. Anderson. Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman ah.... from Winnebago, Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 196 amends the Illinois Municipal Code by providing that real property acquired for refuse disposal purposes be used in accordance with zoning ordinance of the municipality, township or county having jurisdiction over the same. To better inform you of what this is and what it means, I would like to take from another wording here. Here it is."



Now at the present time, every city, village and incorporated town may acquire purchase, gift or condemnation, any real property within or without the corporate limits of such city, village, or incorporated town for the purpose of providing facilities for the disposal of garbage, refuse and ashes. In all cases where property is acquired for or sought to be acquired by condemnation, the procedure shall be as nearly as may be like that provided for in an act to provide for the exercise of the right of eminent domain. Now House Bill 196 is designed to amend the above statutory enactment by requiring every city, village and corporated town, who wishes to establish a refuse disposal site under the statute to comply with the zoning authority having jurisdiction over the site locale. This Bill was up before the Municipalities Committee, and ah... was passed out 17 to nothing, and if there's any questions on it, I'd be glad to answer it."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Further discussion? Discussion? All right, the question is, shall House Bill 196 pass? All those in favor, will vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Berman 'present'. Clerk will take the record. This question, there 130 'ayes', no 'nays', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 205. Schneider. Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

House Bill 205 is a Bill that deals with the problem of determining ah.... establishing a policy for teachers who become pregnant and are requested school leave. Consistent with the Court decisions in the last couple of years, it has been established that the policy ah... of the School Board can be determined with cooperation of the physician and the teacher involved, and that the teacher ought to be granted a leave on the basis of that recommendation. Now the Bill was amended with Representative Brinkmeier's help to allow that there be 60 days notice prior to the time when she would inform the Board of her desire to take a leave of absence and then 60 days prior to her return to the position of employment that she held previous, without any loss on the ah.... tenure and ah... benefits accrued to her in here normal position as a teacher. So there seems to be adequate protection for the School Board this time and also the Bill was drafted to conform to much of the Court arguments that have been presented and firm in favor of the teachers. I solicit your support on 205."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? Gentleman from Winnebago."

Anderson: "Mr. Speaker, if the Sponsor would yield for a question. Ah.... Glen, if this Bill were to pass and ah... supposedly if the equal rights amendment were to be ratified



by the necessary states, would this this gauge this particular statute in that it would be a favoring discrimination in favor of women at the expense of the male species?"

Schneider: "Well, we're back to the question as to whether or not he would be granted a leave if he was pregnant, but ah... I think the Courts would argue that pregnancy is a unique function of the female and that they would'nt make the decision on the basis of legality, but rather on the basis of that function as an individual."

Anderson: "Well, wouldn't you say, though, this is Legislation that is ah... a favorable discrimination in that it gives benefits to one class of individuals based on sex?"

Schneider: "I'm not willing to make an assumption about the impact of ERA, because I'm not knowledgeable in terms of what the effect would be in the long run. That's a decision that's going to be made apart from this Legislation, so I don't think we can make a judgement in anticipation of what the equal rights amendment is going to do to policies that affect women in terms of maternity leave or employment in any other situation, so your speculation is as good as mine on that, and I'm reluctant to think the Courts would rule otherwise than the fact that it's pretty difficult for you or for me to become pregnant. I don't know how we can discriminate legally, when it's a function of the body that is determined, not by law, but by biology. So, I think you get into a kind of morase that's too difficult to extricate yourself from and I'm not going to, ah... you know, be put



in a position on this Bill to make a defense or argument against the Equal Rights Amendments."

Anderson: "Well, Glen, I'm going to support your Bill, because I do feel that women and men are different, and in this case, this is a bill that legislates in favor of women and I'm certainly in support of it."

Gerald Shea: "Lady from Lake, Mr. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Ah.... Mr. Shea and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm very happy to know that my colleague on the other side recognizes there is a difference between the sexes, because I agree with him, and I'm real happy to find out that he's found out about us by now. However, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking in support of Bill HB 205, because what..... never mind.... because this really helps the School District. The teacher has to give at least 60 days notice before she can get her leave, so I don't think there's anything wrong with this Bill, and I do hope my colleague really means it when he says he's with us."

Shea: "Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Day."

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

Shea: "He indicates he will."

Day: "Representative Schneider, as I read the synopsis on this Bill, it refers only to leave, ah.... maternity leave, pregnancy leave. It does not provide for compensation or pay during the leave period, does it?"

Schneider: "Bob, that's a Board decision and I didn't attempt to legislate in that area. My assumption would be that the



Board would not compensate, but that's their decision."

Day: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear you."

Schneider: "Bob, that's a School Board decision on the compensation. I would think the School Board would not compensate, but this Bill does not guarantee that there would be ah.... compensation for the teachers during the time she is absent from her teaching assignment."

Day: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah.... I think that this is a good Bill, and I think the Sponsor should be compensated for filing this Bill and bringing this matter to our attention, which is certainly long over-due, and ah.... I hope everyone will support it."

Shea: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm happy on this occasion, and perhaps it's one of few where I can rise in support of my esteemed colleague's Bill on the other side. I think it's a good Bill and I think it's also ah.... a clear case of our state legislature being permitted to legislate in an error which is our responsibility, clearly recognizing a difference here between the ah.... in the sexes, and something that ah... as mentioned before would be forever precluded in the event of the passage of the ERA. I'm happy, Glen, to support this measure. It... It does recognize the difference in the situation, men and women, relevant to teachers. It's a good Bill. Glad to cast an 'aye' vote on it."



Shea: "Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. May I have some order? Mr. Speaker.... Mr. Speaker, may I have some order please? I want to see if you had a carpenter's union card there, banging on that gavel. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, ah... to reiterate what ah.... Representative Hudson had said, this Bill is going to provide some relief for female teachers, certainly not for male teachers, because I don't believe the Bill will allow a maternity leave for the male species and we have to recognize as a State legislature, the differences in the needs of our citizens and our society. This once again emphasizes the point that the Equal Rights Amendment would not allow, and it is to differentiate between the male and female sexes concerning their employment and conditions of their employment. I commend the Representative on his astuteness in introducing the Bill. I just question his sincerity on Equal Rights Amendment Vote that will be cast here in the future, I understand, that he has supported in the past, that he would like to see the race or..... he would like to be prohibited from introducing this type of legislation under the Equal Rights Amendment, but I am going to support this Bill, because I don't believe the School Boards are going to grant maternity leave to the male teachers because their wives are pregnant, and I don't believe the physician, and it clearly states in the Bill, her physician; it doesn't say his physician - that there is some distinguishing differences between employment, reasons of employment,



and reasons for this legislature act."

Shea: "Gentleman from Ogle, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, just very briefly, I would like to add my support to this Bill. Ah... I would like to reiterate what Representative Schneider has already said, that this would merely put us in compliance with our School Boards in compliance with recent court decisions and with a sixty day notice that the teacher must give to the Board. I think it's adequate time for them to interview and contract another teacher, so I would certainly urge your support of this Bill."

Shea: "Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Shea: "He indicates he will."

McClain: "Glen, the question I have really is ah... that I'm in favor of the flavor of the Bill, but my question really rests with ah.... what if the woman that's asking for leave and then ah... is also asking within the sixty day limit to return to her position, is not married? I have real questions about ah... requiring a school board to rehire a person who ah.... who has that kind of morale perpitude."

Schneider: "As you know, Mike, ah... a teacher can be dismissed for moral perpitude, so if that's the factor, then I think the teacher would face dismissal."

Shea: "Proceed, Mr. McClain."



McClain: "It seems to me, Glen, that ah.... that this woman would be locked in under this law ah... that ah.... it doesn't mention... it just says maternity leave. It doesn't say anything about this kind of moral failing, and I guess I'm being very conservative, but it seems to me that I don't particularly want an elementary school teacher ah... not married, having an illegitimate child."

Schneider: "Well, as I said, Mike, teacher who is guilty of what illege, you know, the moral perpitude is faced with removal by the School Board, and ah.... just like any other tenure teacher, who has that kind of accusation against him or her, that's a decision they would make on the basis of their judgement. So, ah.... this doesn't lock the School Board in, nor does it lock the Teacher into anything as long as there are channels and avenues for a teacher to be replaced on the basis of the kind of judgement that you're trying to bring into the discussion."

McClain: "I guess my.... Maybe I used the wrong term, more perpitude. Would a woman having a child out of marriage, be considered moral perpitude?"

Schneider: "That's a decision that I can't make, because I'm not a Board Member, nor am I in the District in which I would be affected by that and I'm not going to bring my own judgement into it, because it's not a definition I can make for you. Whatever moral perpitude is is a question that you have to raise in a legal sense and would have to be provided on the basis of a hearing and possibly a court test, and ah....



things of that sort. I'm not familiar enough with case law, to know whether or not experiences like that have occurred and whether a teacher has been found guilty or not guilty of moral failing."

McClain: "Would it be possible for you to find out?"

Schneider: "Well, I think.... Well, if you would like to make a request to the Council, I'll join you, and I think it would be an interesting exploration, and then you may want to make some adjustments on that decision, but you get into a problem as I think we've found out over the last couple of years, that the Legislature cannot get into a position of defining certain kinds of aspects and qualities, the dimension of any problem, whether it's moral or anything else. So if you want to do research on it, I would be glad to go with you and take a look at what the cases have said. I probably think it would be better to ah.... select a person who's an attorney of some standing, who's had some experience in this area and I'm not a person like that, but ah.... I'll be glad to proceed with you and look it up."

McClain: "O'kay. I guess my problem is, Glen, that we're voting on the Bill now on Third Reading and I don't want to push it off to ah... legislative council and maybe I inappropriately used the term 'moral perpitude'. I'm dealing with a woman having a baby out of wedlock. Period."

Shea: "Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

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



Shea: "All in favor of the gentleman's motion, say 'aye', all opposed say 'no', the 'ayes' have it and Mr. Schneider to close."

Schneider: "I think, Mr. Speaker, there's an ample discussion on the question on the question and I would appreciate an affirmative vote on the issue."

Shea: "On House Bill 205, all in favor vote 'aye', all opposed, vote 'no'. The question is shall House Bill 205 pass. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Simms, 'aye'. Timothy Simms. Mr. McGrew, 'aye'. Kenny Boyle, 'aye'. Huskey, 'aye'. On this question there on 142 'ayes', 1 voting present, and no 'nays'. This Bill is hereby declared passed."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 216, P.W. Collins. A Bill for an act to amend the Election Code."

Shea: "I think Mr. Collins wants to table this series of Bills. I think ah... Collins wants to take from 216 through ah... 219 out of the record."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 224, Epton. A Bill for an act to amend the Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton."

Epton: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill which passed unanimously through the thank you again, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your cooperation today I sure will be comming forth in the future as always."

Shea: "You had lots of it yesterday."



Epton: "Yes, I ah... rely upon it again today. In view of that, I simply ask the House to act.....and vote favorably for this Bill archaic practice in our Insurance Code."

Shea: Any further discussion? The gentleman from Aurora, Mr. Hill."

Hill: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, I would like to what the ah.. practice is that your eliminating."

Shea: "Will the gentleman yeild for a question?"

Epton: "Yes, by all means. I'm sorry Mr. Hill. I'd assumed that ah... most of the people had been aware of the contents of this Bill. This removes the requirement of counter signatures in Insurance Policies. There may have been a need for it at one time, but at the present time it simply adds cost to the consumer. And to the best of my knowledge, no one in the State of Illinois is against this.... eliminating of this practice."

Hill: "Would this set up a situation where someone could send a policy from out of the state into the State of Illinois and eliminate some local individual from receiving a commission on that policy? Is that what your doing?"

Epton: "Yes, it does exactly that."

Hill: "In other words, your eliminating some citizen of the State of Illinois from receiving any commission on a policy that is sent in here by ah... any other state in the United States?"

Epton: "Yes, your exactly correct, and I might add, if I may,



that ah.. doing this as the approval of the independent Insurance Agents in the State of Illinois. They too believe that it's archaic."

Hill: Would this have a tendency than decreasing the amount of that policy that the individual would have to pay for it?"

Epton: "I would hope....."

Hill: "Or would the Insurance Company just pocket that ah... commission that they're now paying a ah... Insurance Agent here in the State of Illincis?"

Epton: "I would....."

Hill: "I don't have much faith in the Insurance Companies."

Epton: "I concur with you final conclusion. I don't either. By the same token since the agents who are directly involved approve of this elimination, I would go along with them in the hopes that it might conceivably, at least..... if not reduce the premium, certainly keep it stable."

Hill: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I would like to go along with a peice of legislation like this, and if in the Bill it would be mandatory that that insurance company would be in would decrease the amount that the individual had to pay for it, ah... by eliminating that commission that's paid to an Illinois citizen, I certainly would be for this peice of legislation. But I don't believe it does that and for that reason I'm going to vote in opposition to it."

Shea: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dunn."



Dunn: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, ah... Bernie, ah... I'm going to speak in favor of this Bill, ah... I hope it doesn't hurt you. I'd like to the Counter Signing Commission ah... Representative who just spoke ah... by eliminating this the agent in the other state who did all the work and put the policy together....."

Shea: "Excuse me Representative Dunn, could we have a little order, please?"

Dunn: The agent who did all the work in putting the policy together would benefit from this. He would get the full commission instead of having to pay part of his commission to somebody in the State of Illinois who did absolutely no work on the policy at all. And if we would pass this type of legislation, I know other states are doing it, and we would eventually eliminate this ridiculous counter signing law. This is a very good Bill, I can speak to it as an insurance agent. This is a very good Bill."

Shea: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Murphy."

Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, for the first time in eighteen years here, I'm going to ask you please to not just rap the gavel, but insist on getting some order in the House. We cannot here the debate at all."

Shea: "Mr. Murphy, per your request, we'll see if we can't get it quieted down. Is there any further discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton, to close."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I might say....."

Shea: "Mr. Epton, excuse me.... I didn't see Mr. Cunningham



up, did you have a question before he closed, Mr. Cunningham?"

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, better late than never. I wanted to allay the fears of any of you about this Bill. This is another example of fine and important legislation that has emerged from the Insurance Committee under the wise and benevolent leadership of our esteem Chairman, Bernie Epton. And I am proud to endorse this meaningful legislation and urge that each of you give it a unanimous vote. Is that what I'm supposed to say, Bernie?"

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, to close."

Epton: "Despite that, I hope that you'll vote favorably for this Bill."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 224 pass. All those in favor vote 'aye', and all those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Representative Walter is 'aye'. Mr. Grotbery, 'aye'. Boyle, 'aye', Polk, 'aye'. This Bill having received the constitutional..... 124 'aye' votes and 2 'no' votes is hereby declared passed.

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 227, Barnes A Bill for an act creating the Day Care Study Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "Is Mr. Barnes on the floor? Want to take that one out of the record for a minute?"

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 232, Juckett. A Bill for an act to provide for the licensing of State Health Facilities. Third Reading of the Bill."



Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Juckett."

Juckett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's very good to be able to address you as Mr. Speaker. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 232, I think will be bringing the Mental Health Department of this state into the 21st century. And it will do so by requiring that each facility be licensed by the Department of Public Health according to the standards laid down by the Department of Public Health. As of July 1, 1975, and that's when the facilities would have to meet these standards. It is estimated that the Federal Government will be making similar requirements. And I believe that it is more prudent for the state to do it, then the Federal Government. But we would set standards for the Mental Retardation Unit. We would set standards for the Mental Health Facilities. And all facilities would have to meet these standards. If you could come with me on the Visitation Commission Commission, and see many of our facilities you would be dumbfounded. But the problem is, you don't know what it was six years ago or twenty years ago when it was probably ten to twenty times worse than what it is today. All of the Associations connected with Mental Health and Mental Retardation are in agreement. The Departments of Public Health have worked very closely with us, and they are in agreement. We have ah... secured the cooperation of the Department of Mental Health on this Bill, and I would urge your support of House Bill 232."



Shea: "Is there further discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. B.B. Wolfe."

Wolfe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the gentleman yield for a question?"

Shea: "He indicates that he will."

Wolfe: "Ah... Representative Juckett, is the Bill only applicable to Mental Health Institutions, or is it a broader coverage than that?"

Juckett: "No, it is a broader coverage in that ah... we are proposing two new acts. One for Mental Retardation Facilities and one for Mental Health Facilities. This would apply to state facilities as well as private facilities."

Wolfe: "Would it include ah... facilities and clinics ah... now operating as ah... abortion clinics?"

Juckett: "Abortion Clinics?"

Wolfe: "Yes, it's not broad enough to cover that?"

Juckett: "No, those facilities would not come under the act."

Wolfe: "Thank you."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Shea: "He indicates that he will."

Cunningham: "Representative Juckett, as the law is presently constituted most municipally owned governmental owned units of hospitals are subject to license supervision in the Department of Public Health. How would this.... ah..... the Bill, expand that license your requiring?"



Juckett: "Well, this would not effect any of those hospitals ah.. presently the state facilities are exempt from the Hospital Licensing Act. The intent of the original Bill was to make the state facilities come under the same requirement as a private or municiply owned."

Cunningham: "Then the principle thrust of the Bill is to require licensure of angen..... facilities that are now owned and operated by the State of Illinois to the Department of Mental Health, isn't that true?"

Juckett: "That is correct."

Cunningham: "Well, doesn't it seem illogical to say that one branch of government is more trustworthy than another but specifically the Public Health Department can be counted on to enforce reasonable regulations but the Department of Mental Health cannot be counted on to do so?"

Juckett: "Well, this is an age old theory that the King cannot regulate the King. And ah... I reject that theory because of the fact that the experiance I've had in the last seven years of seeing Mental Health Facilities which are specifically exempt from the Licenseure Act. And we have found that these facilities are not fit to put somebody in. We have made great strides, but we have a long way to go. So we are creating by this Bill, we will be creating two acts which one is for the licensure of Mental Retardation Facilities, which are far different from Mental Health Facilities. Now is there is no distinction, and we we'll also be creating the Mental Ill Facilities Act. And that is far differ-



ent from a hospital. But ah... I do believe that a state facilities.....it is just impossible for me to think that a state can come down to a private facility and tell that private facility either you meet our requirements or we close you. And then they, on the other hand, sit back and their facilities couldn't even hold a candle to a private facility. But they are allowed to remain open, they don't have to go through the rules and regulations, they don't have to go through the inspections, and for that reason many of our citizens would rather die before they would go into a state facility. And I can assure you that many of them do, both before and after."

Cunningham: "But Representative Juckett, isn't there a possible harmful side effect from your legislation in that it would require many additional state employees to make the inspections that you would require by this Bill?"

Juckett: "No, it would not, because the facilities which we are now inspecting most of the private facilities fall under the Hospital Licensure Act. And they are not hospitals but they are being judged on hospital standards or they are being judged on a nursing home standard, which they are not. And because they are not nursing homes, these people that are presently doing that would be put into a new division of the Department of Public Health. It would require, from what they tell me, two additional personnel."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, if I might briefly comment on this Bill."



Shea: "Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "It has always been painful to disagree with the Sponsor in his excellent proposal. But this particular Bill, is a unnecessary boondoggle and a waste of the taxpayers money in that it's unreasonable to assume that the Department of Public Health is more reliable and dedicated then the Department of Mental Health. It is nonsense to suggest that the Department of Mental Health is presently maintaining facilities that endanger the lives of it's patients, or have those who would rather die outside then inside those facilities. When you create additional governmental responsibilities, you create a similar responsibility for additional employees, which in turn constituted an added burden on the taxpayers back. The good Governor of the State of Illinois, the present incumbent, is now embarked upon a program to reduce the number of unnecessary employees on the state payroll back and has made significant progress in recent days to pair that number and particularly so in the Health Facility feild. We should not toward his commendable efforts by now increasing the responsibility of the Department, which would require more payrollers rather then less. For these reasons, I should vote 'no'."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? Gentlman from Cook, Mr. Juckett to close."

Juckett: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. I would rather add an employee or ten employees and know that my loved one is in a facility that



is healthful, is in a facility that meets standards of common decency, then to commit my loved one to a life of horror and yell 'hell'. If the gentleman from Lawrence had been in all of these facilities, he wouldn't have made the statement that he did. This Bill will be the Department of Mental Health out of the 17th century and will bring it not only into the 20th, but into the 21st century. I can tell you that without reservation, every person connected with mental health, every person that is connected with mental illness; every person that is connected with mental retardation, whole heartedly supports this Bill, because they know that it will provide the treatment, it will provide the facilities and it will provide the tender loving care that is necessary to cheer or to treat these dreaded diseases, not for my sake, but for the sake of those who are committed to a live time of misery and suffering. Could you please give them a vote, a 'yes' vote on House Bill 232."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 232 pass. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed, 'no'. Shea, 'aye'. McPartlin, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Borchers, 'aye'. Capuzi, 'aye'. Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate to explain his vote. Choate, present'. Mr. Clerk, take the record. Duff, 'aye'. Skinner, 'aye'. Stiehl, 'aye'. Pierce, 'present'. Mugalian, 'present'. Garmisa, 'aye'? Change Garmisa from 'aye' to 'present'. Hill, 'present'. Mr. Holloway.... ok. Mr. Holloway votes 'aye'.



Mr. Kempiners. Mr. Kempiners 'present'. Mr. Thompson 'aye'.
 Mr. R. L. Dunne 'aye'.. ah.. Ralph Dunn 'aye'. This bill
 having 146 'ayes', 4 'nays' and.. 6 'nays' and 4 'present'
 is hereby declared passed. "

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 238, Ewell. A Bill for An Act
 regulating the fees charged by any home rule unit or unit
 of local government for the use of beaches which border on
 Lake Michigan, Third Reading of the Bill."

Gerald W. Shea: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this bill is the
 product of a resolution that this House sent to those
 municipalities bordering Lake Michigan. The jist of the
 resolution was that Lake Michigan is a natural resource
 which belongs to the people of the State of Illinois and
 the is trustee of the public interest; and whereas all of
 the municipalities bordering on Lake Michigan only the
 City of Chicago and the City of Waukegan afford the people
 of Illinois free access to its beaches and lakefront areas
 for recreational uses; and whereas the municipalities of
 Evanston, Wilmette, Kenilworth, Winnetka, Glencoe, Highland
 Park, Lake Forest, Lake Bluff, North Chicago, maintain
 lake property for recreational purposes, but do not provide
 access to such property on a non-discriminatory basis; we
 direct this resolution to those areas and we ask, very
 kindly, if they would reconsider their policy. None of
 them chose to do so. When we talk about the warm summers
 of the 16th when the Lake had a very pleasant breeze, the



people of these areas were enjoying their lakefront property, but they were not allowing the rest of the people of the State of Illinois so to do on a non-discriminatory basis. However, as the Gods of Fortune change, and as the beaches began to wash away with the high tide, we heard cries of help from these communities. Cries for commissions to study the problems of lake erosion and all of a sudden once again the beaches that always belonged to the people of the State of Illinois are now the property of those people. What we did is propose a modest rule that no home rule unit or other unit of local government may charge fees of any person. It appeared that the committee disagreed slightly and, as a result, we amended it to allow reasonable, but equal, daily fees. Now, the gist of this bill was to get at those areas who refuse access to the people of the State of Illinois on an equal basis. I have here, for anyone who cares, the charges that are made by these various areas to date. Ladies and Gentlemen, this bill is simply to correct a wrong done to the people. These areas are coming to us now and, once again, talking about public beaches, our beaches, and the fact that the State of Illinois, the Federal Government and, in fact, anybody should come in and help save the beaches. I have no opposition to saving our natural resources, but when the beaches are saved once again we want it on an equal and non-discriminatory basis. We want it so the people of Johnson County can come up enjoy the beaches. We want it



so that if you come from Rockford you can enjoy the beaches. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a fundamental issue that if we're going to spend the money and we're going to help save our beaches then they ought to be accessible to all the people on a equal and non-discriminatory basis. I will be glad to answer any specific questions and I urge a favorable vote."

Gerald W. Shea: "Is there any discussion. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hope that all of you would ah.. pay close attention to this bill, because it doesn't just affect those of us on the shoreline. The philosophy of it extends to everybody in this General Assembly, because this philosophy can be extended to local park districts. Now, in my area, and Ray Ewell did mention the City of North Chicago and I'd like to say that the City of North Chicago is 50% Black, Ray, we may be discriminatory, but we're discriminatory as to non-residents. And, there is a fee, yes, to non-residents, but the fee doesn't even cover the maintenance. Doesn't even come close to it. And I think that that is reasonable. I don't think there's a hue and cry from anybody. Anybody in the State of Illinois for this legislation. I think that those communities along the shoreline will say 'yes, everybody is welcome, but pay a reasonable non-resident fee'. I think all of us would agree with that. Now, you may recall some weeks ago that we had an amendment



to this bill. With that amendment I still would have voted against the bill. That amendment said if we're going to open it up at least the State of Illinois ought to pay ah.. but even with that amendment I would have voted against this bill. Without that amendment, Ladies and Gentlemen, this bill is horrible. And I would urge everybody in this General Assembly to vote against House Bill 238."

Gerald W. Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson."

Rayson: "A question or two of the sponsor, ah.. Mr. Ewell.."

Gerald W. Shea: "He indicates he'll yield."

Rayson: "Thank you. Ah.. I take it.."

Gerald W. Shea: "Gentlemen.. Now this is an important bill."

It's going to require three-fifths vote because it is taking powers away from home rule units."

Rayson: "Ah.. I take it, sir, that any ah.. municipality that has a beach facility, whether they charge any rental fee or not, it must be offered to all on the same basis. Is the thrust of the bill."

Ewell: "That's correct."

Rayson: "Now, it doesn't impose any free beaches or anything it just.. whatever they charge has got to be equal, right."

Ewell: "That's correct."

Rayson: "Alright. It doesn't go to the question that if you don't have a facility you're required to have a facility."

Ewell: "No, it does not."

Rayson: "Alright, I appreciate your bill and it's a step



forward, but I think we have yet things to go such as to offer beaches for all and hopefully someday to have title to beaches enured to the benefit of the people."

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Pierce for a point of order."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, did I hear you say that ah.. this bill affects home rule units.. are park districts home rule units."

Gerald W. Shea: "The bill, on its face, says that you are taking away home rule powers and it requires a three-fifths vote. I think that we debated the point yesterday that anytime that you have legislation taking away powers from a home rule unit it requires three-fifths vote."

Pierce: "I don't think you understand the suburbs, we have park districts that are separate elected bodies that are in no case home rule units. The park district of Highland Park, the forest park district of North Chicago, Waukegan Park District, the Lake Forest Park District, the Lake Bluff Park District, Wilmette Park District, Glencoe Park District, Evanston Park District, are not home rule units. I don't want them given that dignity cause they're not qualified to be home rule units and they're separate bodies of government with elected park board trustees and they're clearly not home rule units."

Gerald W. Shea: "The way the bill is drafted, Mr. Pierce, it requires a three-fifths vote, to become law. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter."

Porter: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Speaker, could we have some order, please."



Gerald W. Shea: "Proceed, Mr. Porter."

Porter: "In response to Representative Pierce's ah.. statement, Evanston, for example, is not a park district, it is a home rule unit and the beaches there are owned by the municipality."

Gerald W. Shea: "And that's the way the Chair ruled, Mr. Porter."

Porter: "That's right. Now, this bill affects primarily the First District and the Thirty First District to our north. It's unfortunate, I think, that the sponsor of this bill is so well respected a member of this assembly because I think this is a bad bill. And it's probably his first one. Our beaches that stretch north from Chicago to Lake County in the First District and goes on to the Wisconsin border are open to all persons of the State of Illinois. But I think that no one would agree that the residents of those communities along the lake should provide free beaches at their expense to non-residents. It is unfortunate that the Lundy amendment, which would have made up the difference between user fees and expenses, was not adopted because that amendment would have said that 'yes, these beaches are for all of the people of the State of Illinois and the State of Illinois will pay for them'. Unfortunately, the House did not see fit to adopt this amendment. If it had, I could have supported this bill, because it has not, I think it's a bad bill. Without it, we have a situation where the direct costs of beaches, that is the maintenance, the 23



guards, etc., exceed the total user fees by at least twice in most communities along the Northshore. For example, in Winnetka, the direct beach costs are \$80,000, the amount raised from user fees are approximately \$41,000. Now the residents of that community make up the difference between that cost in paying property taxes. And they should receive help that they deserve from higher non-resident user fees. Even these fees do not take account of the indirect costs of beach development and shoreland protection, which are obviously very great and are becoming much greater. Under these circumstances a bill which requires local..... which requires equal fees for residents and non-residents alike simply must be inequitable unless user fees can be raised to a level that is sufficient to provide for all of these costs, both direct and indirect. In most communities....."

Shea: "Mr. Porter, I think our favorite parliamentarian has a point of order, Mr. Wolfe."

Wolfe: "Why should you escape, Mr. Speaker. I can't hear what the gentleman is saying there's so much noise on"

Shea: "Well, we'll try once again then, Mr. Wolfe, to get some order."

Wolfe: "And then again I want to be recognized on a point of parliamentary inquiry."

Shea: "Allright, Mr. Wolf. Proceed Mr. Porter."

Porter: "I was saying that in most communities, if the fees for users, were raised to cover all beach costs, both direct and indirect, this would make the fees so high that the



beaches wouldn't be available to either one. See the fees that Mr. Ewell mentioned are not very much different. For example, in Evanston, the fee for a season, for a resident is \$2.50. The fee for a season, for a non-resident is \$6.00. Even with these fees there is still a deficit. Now Representative Ewell has said that Chicago has it's beaches open and free to everyone, why shouldn't all the other communities. I think there is a great difference here. Chicago is a very large monolithic community. There are no other communities to the west of Chicago that are probably closer than ten miles. The communities along the Lake Shore to the north, all have boardering communities within a few miles of their beaches. This makes the situation different to begin with. Secondly, Chicago is a great economic center. They are anxious to attract business. They are anxious that their beaches be available to be part of that attraction. The communities along the northshore are not seeking economic advantage from the beaches; but merely seeking to provide them for all of the people of Illinois, but on a basis that is fair to each one. I think with these differences, everyone must recognize that this Bill is unfair. That it is a bad Bill, and I urge each of you in the General Assembly and the House to vote against it. Thank you."

Shea: "Now Mr. Wolfe, you had a point of order?"

Wolfe: "It's really a point of parliamentary inquiry. And the inquiry is this. This Bill, which covers both ah....



units of local government under home rule and units of local government not under home rule, if passed by 89 votes would the Bill be applicable just to those units ah... not under home rule?"

Shea: Let me look at the Bill."

Wolfe: "Now the reason for the inquiry, Mr. Speaker, is that in a previous session under the Tax Freeze Bill the Chair, not you of course, the Chair indicated that that would be the posture of the Bill if it passed with 89 votes as against 107."

Wolfe: "Mr. Wolfe, I think your interpretation is correct. If the Bill passed with only 89 votes, it would affect non home rule units. If it passes with 107 votes, it would affect non home rule units and home rule units."

Wolfe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to oppose this Bill. I think the Representative from Lake County ah... made some very very good points that should be brought strongly to the attention of the Members of the House. This Bill would establish a principle which would effect every river, every lake, and every stream in Illinois eventually. The concept of rights, is being very specifically attached any park district or city in Illinois, which wants to build a tennis court or a swimming pool and have a fee basis of a support, which would take the referendum perhaps to the people on that premise would be in jeopardy eventually



under the principles involved in this Bill. The fees that are used are used in order to accomplish on a local basis necessary support. In this instance, we're talking about the money necessary to pay life guards. We're talking about the money necessary to keep glass.... broken bottle glass, and cans off the beaches. We're talking about the money necessary, which comes from the local taxpayer to keep these recreational facilities available to all of the people of this state. The premise upon which they operate now is a long standing precedent in Illinois. A very excellent one, which does allow the facilities to be made available to not only along Lake Michigan, but as I say directly involving eventually every river, stream and lake in Illinois. This is a bad Bill, Mr. Speaker, not because it effects my district, which indeed it does, but because there is a principle involved that will injure all of the people of Illinois."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The gentlman from Cook, Mr. Mann: Bob, I see you over there, you don't have to have a stroke."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the stroke is cummulative. Ah.... Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in support of this Bill. I was amazed to learn from one of the gentleman that Chicago is a monolithic city. I thought it was one of the great cosmopolitan centers of the world. And I think it is very unfair to impose upon Chicago's limited



beach area, the suburban population. I think that the suburbs, especially the northern suburbs, which are perhaps the wealthiest suburbs in the world next to those in Westchester County, ought to be able to service their own communities out of their own funds. And I ah.. would like to point out that if all of the surburban population uses the Chicago beaches that there will be no Chicago beaches left, especially in view of the lake erosion problem. Now I'm going to be polite, I'm not going to call this a colored tax. And I know that Representative Ewell is not suggesting it is a colored tax, but along time ago we struck down the poll tax in this country, and I don't think we oughta have beach tax in this country either. And it's note worthy and interesting to see that the Representatives on this floor who are seeking out against this Bill do represent that tier of exclusive wealthy suburbs on the north shore of Chicago. And you may say 'boo', but it's a fact. Now I don't know whether your trying to protect the Illinois State Beach Park, or who your trying to protect, but I'm against 'Keep Out' signs on public land. And I would remind you gentlemen that the bed of Lake Michigan is owned by the state and the people of the State of Illinois. And I would also remind you that you can well afford to take care of all of the population of the surburban areas very much, just as we in Chicago have to accommodate you without any charge whatsoever. Public beaches are public beaches no matter where they are located. And I would ask you to



put aside your special interest and to vote for a Bill that will democratize the beach line in Illinois along Lake Michigan. And Mr. Speaker, I vote 'aye' on this Bill."

Shea: "The gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Katz."

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

I rise because my colleague, ah.. the Representative from Chicago, has taken some unwarranted slaps at the people in my district. If the people in my district have any money, there's no law that I know of in the State of Illinois that makes that particularly bad. As a matter of fact, the State of Illinois is very happy to collect their income taxes. We do more than our share in supporting everything in the state. We vote for better schools in Chicago. We do everything we can to assist in the problems that the City of Chicago has. That is not the issue in connection with this Bill. This Bill does not deal with the problems that my distinguished colleague from Hyde Park is talking about. This Bill does not open all the beaches in the suburbs in the same way that they are in Chicago. The Bill your voting on would not make it possible for all of the beaches in the state to be free beaches. All that this Bill does is to say that if in an area in my district, the amount of money that is required in order to have life guards, police protection to make the beach useable, to say that in order for all to share equally in those counts, they say that we will have to charge a high enough fee to cover all of those counts. In the village where I come from, the



amount of money that we collect in beach fees, covers about 14% of the expenses of that beach. And if we add the total cost of the actual costs involved in that beach to the charges that are made for the use of that beach, it will not open the beaches, it will close them. People will not pay that large of money in order to be able to use the beaches. So that the effect of that program will not be to open the beaches or to close the beaches. And I want to make a second point. If the Sponsor of this Bill had come in with any documented proof that any beach in my area, or any other area of the City of Chicago, was in fact closed to Members of his race or to anyone else; if there was in fact any discriminatory charging going on, then I would vote for this Bill. As far as I see it, this Bill is not related to any actual existing problems with reference to the Chicago area, or with reference to any discrimination that is going on. And the appeals that are being made to vote for it, are appeals that are directed to try in some way to cater to the prejudices that people may have to those who may be fortunate enough to live along the lake. The beaches in my area are freely and openly available to all of the citizens, even those who are not living in our communities. And the actual charges that are made to non-residents are very little and do not begin to amortize the actual cost that we had in maintaining those beaches. And so I say to you, we do not implement this policy for reasons of any prejudice, we do not appeal to bigotry. And I



would ask those who are asking you to vote, to have you sidcard any notions of bigotry, with reference to the way we maintain our beaches. There is not contention made of any discriminatory treatment, in attempt to keep people from using our beaches. All that we ask the Members of this House to do is to follow the good old American principle that those who want to use the beaches, let them participate in the costs of maintaining the beach, for that reason, I urge a 'no' vote."

Shea: "Gentlemen, I have reviewed this Bill again with the parliamentarian and the Chair is going to rule that it takes 107 votes to pass the Bill. If it has any less then 107 votes, the Bill will be dead. Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, ah... would I be in order to move the previous question?"

Shea: "All those in favor of the previous question, say 'aye', the opposed, 'no', the previous question has been moved. Mr. Ewell, to close."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen, I have always been proud of the northshore leaders of public opinion. When they batter down doors against the poor in Chicago, southwest Chicago, northwest Chicago, I admired them for their courage. I said surely, here we have men of profound courage and conviction. But today, we talk about a different issue. We talk about the beach have and the beach have not. That is the fundamental issue simply and clearly. It's not a color issue, it's a issue of people with money



and people without money. Now I have heard these unfounded charges that there is no discrimination, but we're talking about economic discrimination. Now the reason the questions came up in committee and we gave them the answers. Let me tell you about what they talk about being nondiscriminatory. Lake Bluff, \$7.50, residents only. They don't care how much money you got, your not going to use the beaches on Lake Bluff. Now you tell me that that's American? As simple as apple pie? I say it is not. They talk about Kenilworth , and we're not talking about in poverty areas, we're talking about areas that you can't even get on the lake front for under \$100,000. Kenilworth, residents only. You can't go there no matter how much money you have. If you save in your piggy bank for the next ten years, your not gonna sit on the beach at Kenilworth. You talk about lencoe, talk about discrimination, \$13.50 for residents, \$26.00 for non residents. If you go there and have to pay \$26.00 to use the beach one day, what are you talking about? People without money will never use those beaches. When the sun turns hot in the summertime, and the inland Illinois swelters, northshores sits on it's duff and says, 'we will not concede', and I'm not using the name of the Representa-tive. They sit down and say, 'we will not concede and the beaches now belong to us'. I'll ask you, if you want to vote against this Bill, will you also vote against giving money to all these communities to what they call 'stop soil erosion of 'our beaches'? When the soil soil washes



away, it's ours. They give you..... I'll give you some more illustrations. Wilmette charges \$8.00 for residents and \$16.00 for non residents. Let it be said for the ever benefit of some areas that they have no charges. Illinois State Beach Park charges nothing. Waukegan has no fees. North Chicago is only \$2.00 on Sundays and holidays to residents and non residents alike and that's all we're asking for. I suggest to you that this issue has been framed by an editorial in the Learner Newspapers of March 15, 1973. 'The real issue we suggest is who should benefit from this great natural asset of the area? Should it be for exclusive use of those who by accidents of geography happen to live on it's shores? Or should it be for all to enjoy? We suggest the latter.' I have to hail the confidence of the Learner Newspapers and I hail their liberalism. We of the City of Chicago, provide no charges whatsoever, however, we of the City of Chicago provide practically all of the boat and yacht marinas for all of the suburban residents and we do it against the people of the City of Chicago. But we still charge them the same fee. We don't ask because you suburbanites put your boats in our harbor, and take up valuable lake front land that we suggest that you move the marinas out to your own back yard, we allow everybody to come in and use it upon a free, equal and non discriminatory basis. We not suggesting that this is a colored problem, it's not. It's a problem of rich and poor, and we're talking about one of the most affluent areas



in the world, the North Shore. Ladies and Gentlemen, if all they wanted was some equal support from all the people who use the beaches, and this is all we have proposed, and equal division between the residents and non-residents, that's all that we're asking for. And, again, ladies and gentlemen, I will ask that the leaders of the great traditional, liberal, North Shore tradition stand forth like men and not cower simply because their own back yard is in the wringer. Thank you."

Gerald W. Shea: "Gentlemen, the question is shall House Bill 238 pass. And, since this is taking away from units of home rule certain constitutional powers it requires three-fifths vote. Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I agree with your ruling as far as home rule units go, but you've changed the ruling several times. Now, those of.."

Gerald W. Shea: "I just changed it once."

Pierce: "Those of Kenilworth has.. twice, I believe, the Village of Kenilworth only has 4,000 or 5,000 people and you're telling me that it takes 107 votes to tell the Village of Kenilworth, this Legislature to tell them, what they could charge for the use of their beaches. Is that your ruling. Are you requiring 107 votes for a non-home rule unit to be affected by this bill."

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr Pierce, I've looked at the bill again, there is no severability clause in this bill, and I'm ruling that it takes 107 votes to pass the bill in the form



that it's in. The Gentleman from Union."

Pierce: "I think that's a bad ruling."

Gerald W. Shea: "The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, just one point of clarification, isn't this just kinda a little bit ah.. opposite of the ruling that ah.. the Speaker made yesterday as far as home rule is concerned."

Gerald W. Shea: "Ah.. the.. yesterday's Speaker held that the ah.. something about the beaches ah.. or the lake bed didn't belong to somebody ah.. We have a different Speaker today and the bill specifically says that it affects home rule units and this Speaker says it needs three-fifths votes. Alright. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. Mr. Skinner to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I can't speak for the North Shore communities, but I can speak for the City of Crystal Lake and the Crystal Lake Park District. The residents of Crystal Lake have to pay \$40.00 per family ah.. in real estate and personal property taxes to finance the tax district. In addition, they have to buy a park permit of \$2.00 per person per year for beach rights. Now, we charge anyone who comes a parking fee and it.. for that parking fee people may get into the Crystal Lake Park District and the beach. I think the fee is \$5.00 a car at this time and I do not think this is discriminatory and I really don't want it to be free. So, I'm going to vote 'no'."



Gerald W. Shea: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, to explain his vote."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to utilize the personal privilege ah.. rule, although the Gentleman from Glencoe did mention my name, but you have generously recognized me to explain my vote. And I would just like to say that ah.. I was not accusing the gentleman of being discriminatory, because he certainly is not. Nor was I accusing anyone on this floor. But I merely want to point out that we have had public accomodations law in this State since 1910 and I always thought that the beaches were certainly within the area of public accomodations. Now, if one wants to talk about wealth and social justice, I'd like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that ah.. while wealth is not to be distributed in a capitalistic system on the other hand if we're talking about who pays for what for schools, I'd just like to point out that the citizens in the inner city in the ghetto of Chicago pay more in relation to their wealth to support taxes than the people on the North Shore. And the people on the North Shore ah.. pay maybe almost twice as much per student in average daily attendance as the citizens in the inner city. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that we can't have exclusive laws, ah.. zoning laws, to keep out people of the City of Chicago. All of the 53 miles of shoreline are public shoreline. All the municipalities..

Gerald W. Shea: "Will you bring your remarks to the bill."



Mann: "... ah.. along the North Shore are chartered by the State of Illinois. And I vote 'aye' and ask all those red lights to think about the implications of their vote."

Gerald W. Shea: "The lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis, to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Ah.. Mr. Shea, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, I sat on the committee that heard the bill. This is not an attempt to discriminate against anyone, if I vote 'no', it's pure and simple fact of economics. We have park districts that can't pass referendums to maintain the beaches and other areas and the people who live in those park districts pay taxes to that park district. And if we allow non-residents to come in without the same amount of money as the residents it isn't fair. Therefore, I speak against the bill, not for discrimination, but just for fair play."

Gerald W. Snea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson, to explain his vote."

Rayson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of this House, briefly, to explain my vote, it seems as the sponsor of this bill so ably presented, there's two areas of reprehensible discrimination. One, certain areas try to exclude non-residents. Two, certain other areas afford a higher fee for non-residents. Both of these concepts are, to say the least, unamerican, if not unconstitutional. And certainly when they apply to park beaches, or any kind of public utility area, they should be stricken down. That's



all this bill says. If we're talking in terms of economics, and if there are park districts that have ah.. tax levies for these purposes, well then, the people can charge user fees. No problem. It's just that user fees should be afforded the same amount to wherever you live and to whom-ever wants to use the beach. That's all this bill does. It doesn't affect economics. It doesn't affect the rarified air on the North Shore. All it says is to reinstitute what this Democracy is suppose to be--non-discrimination insofar as taxes go, user taxes, or exclusivesity. I vote 'aye'."

Gerald W. Shea: "Have all voted who wish. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, in defference to the time of the House and the fact that ah.. of your ruling ah.. I would ask ah.. say for postponement of this matter to a day when we have.. might have a Speaker that has a different outlook on ah.. lake property. I ask leave for postponed consiaderation."

Gerald W. Shea: "Does the gentleman have leave to postpone. Postponed Consideration"

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 251, Douglas, A Bill for An Act to Amend sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Gerald W. Shea: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Douglas."

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, by far the most significant part of the health care costs is in hospital bills. One of the problems that we have had



during the last decade or so in Illinois when large amounts of money have been paid to hospitals from the Illinois Department of Public Aid has been in the backlog of money that was owed from Public Aid to many hospitals. The burden has been especially great on those communities where large percentages of the patients who occupied beds in those hospitals are recipients of Public Aid. Now, I would like, before asking for the support of the House on this bill, to compliment the Department of Public Aid on having upgraded the system and having sped up.. speeded up the period of time from the request for funds from hospitals to paying the bills during the last couple of months. The Department of Public Aid, I'm pleased to say, supports this bill which will require that any bills paid by Public Aid, certified to be due more than 90 days, would be repayable to the hospitals on the basis of a 1% interest rate from us. This bill came out of committee with no opposition. The Department of Public Aid itself has been pleased to go along with it as amended. And I ask for the favorable consideration of this Body. "

Gerald W. Shea: "Any further discussion. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer."

Palmer: "If the ah.. sponsor will yield for a question."

Gerald W. Shea: "He indicates he will."

Palmer: "Mr. Douglas, ah.. will this in some way ah.. have a tendency to reduce the room rent ah.. bed and board for a hospital patient."



Douglas: "Representative Palmer, I have no way of knowing the answer to that question in selected instances. Hospitals are continually complaining of various reasons why their bills have gone as high as they have. I think it's clear that the greatest reason has been because of increased personnel costs. I have no way of knowing whether this will immediately lead to a reduction of costs. I would certainly hope so, but I have no control over how hospitals will react."

Palmer: "Well, I'm quite concerned about this for the reason that ah.. Presbyterian-St. Luke is now charging \$93.00 a day for one bed in a two-bed unit. Ah.. this is.. this is terrible. Extremely high, it would seem to me, and ah.. of course I don't know what their costs are, but I would like to ask you whether or not and efficiency studies have been ah.. performed or made insofar as the operations of hospitals in this State are concerned, or any one of them."

Douglas: "Yes, there have been many studies done, none of which, to my knowledge, have led to decreased costs, unfortunately. And I don't pretend that this bill, which in many hospitals will have a relatively small bearing on the ultimate costs of beds per day, is going to make any marked dent at the kind of hospitals to which you refer. It certainly should have a profound impact, though, on those hospitals such as Garfield Park Hospital in Chicago, Providence Hospital, hospitals in East St. Louis, and other parts of the State which have large proportions of Public Aid patients. I



don't know, Representative Palmer, that I can deal with the larger question that you're raising within the context of this particular bill."

Palmer: "Well, I'm not talking as much about quantity as I am about efficiency within the hospital industry's operations. And ah.. I'll redirect that question personally to you at a later time. I would like to ask further whether or not the Department of Public Aid pays the same amount as an individual and ah.. and ah.. the hospital services that are offered."

Douglas: "The.. you mean does the Department of Public Aid pay same as Blue Cross does, for example."

Palmer: "Well, yes, do they pay the same amount as Blue Cross or the same amount as an individual who doesn't have any sort of coverage."

Douglas: "To my knowledge, because the soaring costs of Public Aid have gotten so completely out of hand, the Department of Public Aid has had to be very tight and very careful in the amounts of money it pays and it quite definitely pays less than the individual would himself or herself or than Blue Cross or a private third party carrier would pay."

Gerald W. Shea: "Any further discussion. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington."

Washington: "Will the sponsor yield for one question. Ah.. Representative Douglas, ah.. the original bill covers only hospitals. I see you have an amendment on the bill, I can't



find it. Do you cover clinics, as well as hospitals."

Douglas: "No. The bill has not been changed.."

Washington: "The answer is no. Well, why didn't you cover clinics as well."

Douglas: "Because, Harold, it would be extremely unwieldy to include the large variety of health care facilities that receive ah.. support and payment from the Department of Public Aid. It was my intent, because hospitals occupy such a significant part of the total health care bill to make a step in the right direction. Many people have approached me about ah.. nursing homes, about other health care facilities, shelter care facilities, half-way house, a whole variety of other institutions to which Public Aid pays money and I am considering with them the possibility of introducing legislations along those lines. But, I think to include it in this one bill would make the bill so unwieldy that it probably would be very difficult to get it passed."

Gerald W. Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piotrowicz."

Piotrowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think probably one of the problems that hospitals encounter in terms of the treatment of individuals who receive Public Aid, is the fact that those hospitals and doctors have extreme difficulty in collecting what is their just fee for services from the State. I think this bill goes a long way in helping that situation out and further I think it gives the legislature and it gives to the people some



means by which we can bring the Department of Public Aid into some accountability in terms of their practices and procedures. It would become easy for us to see the operations of that department, how far behind they are, what they are not doing, by the fact that we will be required to pay an extra 1% interest on late payments that are made. I think this bill goes a long way in settling some discriminatory practices that might exist and it also goes a long way in bringing accountability to the part.. I support this bill and urge all members of this House to do likewise."

Gerald W. Shea: "Is there any further discussion. The

Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Will the sponsor yield to a question."

Gerald W. Shea: "He indicates he will."

Mugalian: "Representative Douglas, what was the reason to include only hospitals as the beneficiary of this incentive to pay on time. Why not doctors, laboratories, clinics have been mentioned, and other suppliers of medical and other services, drug stores, pharmacies.."

Douglas: "Well, as I answered Representative Washington's question, Representative Mugalian, which you may have missed, the feeling has been that hospitals occupy such a profoundly significant portion of all money spent on health care that this was an important first step to take in this direction. Ah.. if we start including pharmacists, doctors, ah.. all kinds of health practitioners, and I certainly would have nothing to do with one that would involve my



own profession, I think that the bill would get so unwieldy that it would probably be unworkable. I think what we're doing here is taking the single, most significant part of the health care costs spectrum, making it a first step in the right direction, having the support of the Department of Public Aid, which feels it can deal with this particular part of the total cost spectrum most effectively, efficiently, openly and honestly, and finding out whether this is important step, in what I consider to be the right direction, will work. I am working with the nursing home people, who are very concerned because they should be included in this, but my concern is for the patient. And along the lines with what Representative Palmer said, the ultimate intent here, hopefully, is to keep certain hospitals in certain kinds of communities open and functioning and also, hopefully, to keep costs at some reasonable level and, maybe, by some hopeful quirk of fate, lower the costs of beds in some of those institutions. That's a very specific objective that I think would not be met if we got involved with the whole spectra of the health care industry."

Mugalian: "Thank you. Would you answer one more question ah.. the interest rate is 1% a month or 12% annually, do you have an estimate as to what this will cost the Department of Public Aid."

Douglas: "Well, the answer is we don't. And I'm pleased that when I asked that question of the Department of Public



Aid they told me that they did not think it was going to be a significant cost at all. And the reason is that they have been working, and this bill will increase their incentive, hopefully, to continue to work in the direction of getting their bills paid on time. They told me, in contrast to when we first started working out the specifics of this bill, that they have moved the payment time down close to 30 days and at the most 45 days, which is far short of 90 days. I do not think that this is going to be a big total cost on the state. I suggest that what this bill is going to do is it's going to push Public Aid into making sure that they upgrade their business practices and make sure that they pay their bills on time, just as private people would have to do in similar circumstances."

Gerald W. Shea: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to support this bill. Now on Second Reading is my bill, House Bill 177, which does much the same thing only for all state goods and services. It sailed through committee. It provides that within 30 days the State ought to approve or disapprove a bill and pay it in an additional 60 days. This has many good features for it, both for the State and for the contractors, and I urge your support for this bill."

Gerald W. Shea: "Is there any further discussion. Mr. Douglas to close."

Douglas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I ask for your favorable consideration."



Gerald W. Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 251 pass.

All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'.
Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, to explain his vote."

W. D. Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm afraid we're getting into a very poor concept here. If the Department of Public Aid and the State as the agency that funds it is required to pay interest on ah.. indebtedness to hospitals there's no reason why other state agencies shouldn't also be required to pay interest on obligations they have. Now, I'm sure that ah.. most state agencies pay promptly. The Department of Public Aid, I'm told, on an average, pays within 45 days. But there are many times when there are disputes over bills. They have to be looked into and audited and payment could conceivably go beyond 90 days. Now, when this happens, the State is required to pay at the rate of 12% a year, according to this bill, and 12% a year is more than any one of us, even those of us with the poorest credit, have to pay on a mortgage on our homes. Now, that's unreasonable and no hospital, to my knowledge, and I'm sure this is true, has never been as it were 'stuffed' or did not receive their payment. And I think this is something to look for. A lot of us are in business have debts and have ah.. obligations ah.. that we never to collect. The State has always paid its bills and, hopefully, always will pay its bills. So, I think this is an unwarranted penalty upon the taxpayers of the State to have to pay usereous interest rate. And



ah.. I would suggest that you vote 'no' on this bill."
 Gerald W. Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman, to
 explain his vote."

Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to explain my vote, ah..
 the previous speaker said that ah.. this was not a fair
 thing because the State is paying interest. I would point
 out that ah.. the Department of Revenue charges for late
 charges on sales tax of 1% a month and I think that if a
 taxpayer is late to have to pay interest I don't think
 there's anything wrong with the State having the same
 reciprocal responsibility. And, regarding the question of
 the ah.. validity of the ah.. bills and any dispute, I
 would call the ah.. Majority Leader's attention to the fact
 that the bill says 'valid bills' and I believe that any
 interpretation of that would indicate that until a bill
 was finally adjudicated and ah.. the amounts were deter-
 mined in accordance with the requirements of the department
 that interest would not run. So, I don't think that that
 is a problem that we would have to worry about. I think
 this addresses itself to ah.. a big problem that transcends
 just the hospitals. I think that this is a very important
 first step to adequate and lower costs of medical treatment."

Gerald W. Shea: "Have all voted who wish. Take the record.

Laurino 'aye'. House Bill 251 receiving 99 'aye' votes,
 21 'nay' votes, is hereby declared passed."

F. Selcke: "House Bill 268, Giorgi. A Bill for An Act to
 Amend the Unemployment Compensation Act, Third Reading of



the Bill."

Gerald W. Shea: "The gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. House Bill 268 amends the Unemployment Insurance Act and removes the one week waiting period. This was requested to me by the new workers entering the automobile industry and the assembly lines and related industry to have model change overs constantly and have plants shut downs and other things that create habit with the new workers entering the employment field. It seems that just the new worker runs into this problem. And it's the new worker that's looking forward to his long tenure of employment, but his the same one penalized when the plants shut down when there is a inventory shut down or whatever you might have. Now this is the first change in the unemployment waiting week, since 1935 and ah.. there was a request for a fiscal note that was provided and I urge your support."

Gerald W. Shea: "Any further discussion? The question is shall House Bill 268 pass. Take the record Mr. Clerk.

Alsup 'aye'. Mann 'aye'. Yourell 'aye'. Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, comes the time in a days occupation as known as 'the childrens hour'. One of the fairest ladies of all has a birthday today. She's here somewhere. Adeline GeoKaris, may we all sing 'Happy Birthday' to you? Where are you?"

*****HAPPY BIRTHDAY SONG TO ADELINE*****



Gerald W. Shea: "Mrs. Geo Karis."

Geo Karis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you my dearly beloved seat mates. Thank you ladies and gentlemen, I din't know I was going to spend my birthday here today but couldn't have spend it in a more profitable place or nicer place or with nicer people. Thank you."

Gerald W. Shea: "On House Bill 268, have all voted who wish? Take the record. Mr. Tuerk, from Peoria to explain his vote."

Tuerk: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I was off the floor while this Bill was debated and I had requested a fiscal note and the Sponsor of the Bill did provide it. I want to call the attention of the membership that this Bill is going to cost the State of Illinois whomever in the vacinity of \$9,000,000. What the Bill does is eliminate that one week waiting period for unemployment compensation and ah... one of the reasons for the one week waiting period for unemployment compensation benefits has been to ah.. encourage people who are absent from..... or have been laid off, to go out and find another job. And I think that this is a bad Bill and I would ah...ask the membership to reconsider their vote."

Gerald W. Shea: "Hirshfield votes 'aye'. Porter votes 'no'. Day 'no'. William Walsh 'no'. R. A. Walsh 'no'. Kucharski 'aye'. Simms 'no'. Walters 'no'. Juckett 'no'. Gentlemen, I'll tell you, I think that there's enough people up, I'll just take a new Roll Call. Question is shall House



Bill 268 pass. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Bluthardt 'no'. Mr Kempiners 'present'. Geo-Karis 'yes'. This Bill having received 107 'ayes' and 37 'nays' and 2 'present' is hereby declared passed. Would you add Mr. Telcser and Mr. Murphy as 'ayes' on that Roll Call."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 273."

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Clerk, would you wait a minute, please? Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I wish to call your attention to the Governor's Prayer Breakfast. On each of your desks, you have a program and your ticket application. If you will while your thinking of it, please fill out your name and address and fill in your check to the Governor's Prayer Breakfast on the flap. You can turn it in to any of the local Representatives, Joe Gibbs and myself, and David Jones or mail your money to Room 818 Myers Building, Springfield, Illinois. For the new members, this is an annual affair, which the Governor and the legislature and people throughout the community come to Springfield for the Governor's Prayer Breakfast. It's always an outstanding program. It will be held this year on Wednesday morning, April 11, at 7:45. And it's at the Holiday Inn East. Wives and husbands are invited, so please fill out your application now while your thinking of it and we'll see you there at this annual Governor's



Prayer Breckfast."

Gerald W. Shea: "Resolutions. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Murphy on House Resolution 165."

Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask leave of the House to waive the proper rules so that we could hear House Resolution 165. It's very vital and important at this particular moment in the House."

Gerald W. Shea: "Is there leave? It's a congratulatory resolution to one of the Members ah... hearing no objection, would the Clerk please read the resolution?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Resolution 165, Murphy et al.

Whereas, Twenty years ago today, give or take, the world was brightened by a beautiful baby girl, eventually known as The Honorable Adeline Geo Karis and probably the first woman-libber and

Whereas, The Country of Greece and the United States of America both now have a mutual problem that eventually brought about the United Nations and

Whereas, The West Side of Chicago do to this event was finally recognized as a political subdivision of some depth, in future years known as the West Side Bloc, and

Whereas, This fine girl finally moved into the garden spot of Illinois, better known as Lake County, and

Whereas, She was so impressed with her outstanding Legislator from that District, that she decided to follow in his footsteps, and

Whereas, This course finally led her to personal fame as



evidenced by the fact that she became the first woman Legislator from Lake County as the Representative to the General Assembly from the 31st District, and Whereas, This girl immediately moved into a spot of prominence in the General Assembly, and has become loved and respected by all that know her; therefor be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 78th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that the Members of the Body pay tribute to Representative Adeline Geo Karis on this day, her birthday and that the Members of the General Assembly join together in wishing her good health and happiness on this day and for many years to come; and be it further resolved that a copy of this preamble and resolution be presented to the Honorable Adeline Geo Karis."

Gerald W. Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Murphy."

Murphy: "Ah... put me back at Lake, would you Mr. Speaker?"

Gerald W. Shea: "From Lake."

Murphy: "Thank you. Not that I have anything against Cook County, but I do reside in Lake, however. Ah... someone beat me to it by singing 'Happy Birthday' to our dear friend Adeline, but we all want to wish you a very happy birthday. We're happy to have you here and we'll be happy when we get through with E.R.A. so you can get down to other business, Adeline because I know you've got alot of capabilities and your going to add a great stimulance to this House as a Representative. And a very happy birthday to you. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution."



Gerald W. Shea: "All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. House Resolution 165 is adopted. House Bills Third Reading."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 273, Neff. A Bill for an act to provide that sales by retailers of property of 15¢ or more, through vending machines shall not be subject to the provision of the Retailors' Occupation Tax Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Gerald W. Shea: "Gentlman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 273 is a Bill to amend the Retailor' Occupation Act, as it applies to sales made by automatic merchandise machines. Although the Illinois Retailor Occuption Act is a previlaged tax on the retailer seller, the intent of the law is to put place this tax directly on the consumer. And therefore the law makes provision for the retailer to collect his sales tax from the consumer and he inturn remits it to the state. In order to avoid fractional coinage this collection is established by use of the 'brakett system', in which the retailer is barred from collecting the tax beneath the collection bracket. The ranges within the bracket usually allow the retailer the oportunity to collect sufficient taxes to offset the few sales he would make where it is not allowed to collect the tax. However, when the retailer makes many sales in the small price fraction, including sales that are below the minimum price bracket, he is then penalized unfairly by the application



1967

of the law. In such a case he cannot make himself whole by the use of the bracket system, and thus the tax burden is shifted from the consumer to the retailer, which violates the intent of the law. The merchandise coin operating vending business, retailing most of the items, from a five to ten to fifteen cents, is the most vulnerable victim through the method of operation vending process cannot be adjusted only to the nearest nickel. The automatic retailers can collect only sales tax pennies. Only by overcharging for the product and refunding the change to pennies that tax to the profit..... product. This system of rebate cannot not always proof seefull, such as a tax in pennies to ah.. coffee cups, soft drinks, and so forth. All vending sales are single sales, they have no way of combining their sales to two or more in order to pass it off. Therefore the vender must pay the sales tax from his net income. In Illinois where the sales tax rate is 5¢ over the counter,retailors collect \$1.05 for a \$1.00 sale. But this is not true with the coin vender, who sells at the \$1.00 bu also must remit \$.05 to the state, which estimates them dealing in a \$95 dollar. This puts them in a severe competitive disadvantage with other retailers, since the tax is shifted to him in place of the consumer. The businesses operate on a very low margin, approximately 5% and ah... also the Department of Revenue has a problem on auditing as the legislation now stands. In fact many



of these places are not being audited today because the department is not able to audit them. Under this Bill, putting it on the cost of ah... sales instead of on the retail end, it will be much simpler to ah... bring this... ah.. collect this tax and the ah... Revenue Department would have a much better chance ah.. of ah... collecting the tax ah.. and ah... therefore I think possibly we would collect more sales tax on this."

Gerald W. Shea: "The gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of House Bill 273. I come today representing several constituents, neighbors of mine who are in a small category of vending operations. I think it is to the advantage of this House and we are not talking about the juke box industry, we are not talking about game and devices, we are talking about the many other facets of the vending machine business, including the toll road operation of Illinois. We are only talking about sales under \$.15, similar to those up in the lobby and in the restrooms of this building and every other building in the State of Illinois. For those who feel that the vending industry is a very profitable one, I would remind you that the profit before income taxes on a national basis for the vending machine industry in these categories is approximately 5%. In 1970 it was 5.01, gross profit before taxes. Now while the mandamus and the businesses in this industry are working with \$1.00 units, rather than \$1.05 units as are our re-



tailing friends, it is an interesting thing to note that under operating ratios, simply the payment of sales tax, which they have collected from no one, in 1969 ran 1.87¢ out of each operating dollar. In 1970 ran 1.93¢ out of each operating dollar. And in calendar 1970 ran 2.08¢ out of each operating dollar to be taken away from their before tax profit, still lowering their operating ratios to a very very meager ratio. It is..... therefore on behalf of this wonderful industry that we all love and curse, depending on how good the machine is to us, that the many men who are trying to hang on to this business so need relief. And that relief can be found by paying an equitable 5% at the wholesale level for the merchandise in which they are involved. I would be pleased, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, to see as many green lights on that board for this hard working industry as we can find. Thank you very much."

Gerald W. Shea: "Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kimpiners."

Kimpiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a couple of questions?"

Gerald W. Shea: "He indicates that he will."

Kimpiners: "Thank you. I received mail on this and ah... I've probably been neglegent in not reading the Bill ah..... throughly, but I got a question now.... are you saying that as far as the vending people are concerned, your just going to eliminate collection of the ah... the tax entirely?"



Neff: "No, that isn't right. Anything under 15% that goes into a vending machine, they would pay it on the wholesale price. They would still pay the sales tax, but instead of paying it on the retail price, they will pay it on the wholesale invoices. The tax will be left on only it will be paid different."

Kimpiners: "Ok, that makes me ah..... I think I'll be able to vote for the Bill now. Thank you."

Gerald W. Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fary."

Fary: "I rise in support of this Bill, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. The vending machine industry is long been entitled to some kind of relief. There are now approximately 24 states, including California, that have given this type of relief to the vending machine operators, and I urge a favorable vote."

Gerald W. Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a special interest Bill. There is no question about that. The question for this House is whether this special interest is entitled to the special treatment it seeks. It is further apparent that the vending machine interest is asking through this Bill special treatment that will be afforded no other retail business. It is conceded by the proponent that this Bill will cost the people of the State of Illinois approximately \$4 million dollars each year. But will this \$4 million represent a saving, in whole or in part, to the costumers of the vending machines? The answer is 'no'.



The entire \$4 million, all of it will go into the pockets of the coin machine vendors. This was admitted by the industry spokesmen at the Revenue Committee Meeting. The special treatment requested is put on the basis of equity. One would assume that we are being asked to come to the rescue of a sick or dying vital industry. How poorly did the coin operated vendors of our state fare last year? This figures are not easy to obtain but I believe that the proponent said at the hearing that last year profits were \$8 million dollars for the Illinois segment of the industry. The year before was \$5 million dollars. In other words, in the last two years the Illinois coin vendors increased profits by 60%. This Bill in 1 year, in one full swoop, would swell these profits 50%. I suggest that equity is served by protecting our hard pressed taxpayers and or some of the pressing needs and programs of our state, that face cutbacks or insufficient funding. For example, the states' Art Council is gravely concerned about a proposed budget reduction from \$600,000 to \$500,000. One of our colleagues, from the 49th District seeks \$20,000 for a study to solve an urgent flooding problem affecting 300 families. As of now, there is nothing in the budget for this request. Members of the House, a plea for equity is usually supported by a plea of changed circumstances. The only change here is the rapidly growing profits of the industry that asks relief. The Illinois Sales Tax preceded the birth of the coin vending machine business, those who are claiming hard-



ship are those who have freely entered and continue to enter a relatively new field. They enter and continue to enter with full knowledge of the Illinois Sales Tax and the method of collection and admittedly those who ask relief who plea for industry are part of a booming industry both in terms of annual sales and annual profits. Ladies and gentlemen, how helpless is the industry to collect 5% from their costumers? This is a crucial point. The answer is; not very. They have complete freedom to set prices, completely free to add or eliminate locations. Machine locations further, involve relatively nominal capital cost. The industry complains that it's prices must go up or down in inclements of \$.05. It should be pointed out that it has the ability, which is generally exercised, to reduce the size or quantity of merchandise pervade, while maintaining the price. They can and do go to smaller cuts or measures of coffee or soft drinks. Smaller or larger sizes of candy bars. One less stick in a package of chewing gum, higher or lower quality of merchandise. I did some original reserch in connection with this Bill. I picked at random, completely at random, three candy bars in a vending machine in my district, and compared price and weight at the cigar candy counter in my law office building. I took a Heath Bar, a Baby Ruth Bar, and a Planter Peanut Bar. On the average, you pay 50% more in a vending machine for only 24% more in weight. This Bill asks us to increase the profits of sofisticated businessmen by treating them preferen-



tially to all other retailers. Businessmen who have built-in advantages to do for themselves....."

Gerald W. Shea: "Will the gentleman bring his remarks to a close, please?"

Mugalian: "Yes, I thought I had ten minutes."

Gerald W. Shea: "Five."

Mugalian: "Oh, alright..... to do for themselves what they ask the state to do for them. One more element; if this Bill becomes law, our Department of Revenue would be placed with very difficult problems of audit and importance. The tax would be paid by the wholesaler. Problem; the shipment X, from the wholesaler, include both resale over the counter and through vending machines. The package of apple pie sell in the machine at \$.15 or \$.20? If at \$.15, the wholesaler pays the tax, if \$.20, the retailer vending machine owner. Will softdrink extract the use in the vending machine or at the soda fountain? The Department is opposed to this Bill, the Department of Revenue. Finally, the proponency and the equity in the present sales tax law, as it applies to them. But what about the candy counter, where say 1/3 of the sales are single item sales of \$.15 or less? Will not they also be entitled to relief; 33% relief? I suggest that those who presently are trying to support this measure, may recognize that the taxpayers of Illinois are already over burdened. That they recognize that more money is needed by our schools, the poor, and the aged, and by the mentally ill, and the retarded for



many pressing needs. That for example, the \$1.2 million dollar appropriation, requested by the Illinois Art Council, can be met for more than three years by the monies involved in this Bill in it's first effective year. I suggest that upon reflection, they may a wait a year or two to see the effects of another year or two of inequitable treatment. An annual increase of net profits of 60% does not seem to indicate a hardship requiring action by the 78th General Assembly, which would automatically increase these profits by another 50%. I ask that you vote 'no' on the Bill."

Gerald W. Shea: "Gentleman from Winnébago, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "What would you like, Mr. Speaker?"

Gerald W. Shea: "I thought you wanted to speak on this Bill."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, when I want to speak on the Bill, I'll raise my hand for attention."

Gerald W. Shea: "Oh, alright. The Representative from Kankakee, Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, while I do not have any prepared remarks to make in support of this Bill, I would like to rise as a Member of the Revenue Committee to point out to the Members of the House, that this..... the speakers that we have heard concerning this Bill, really do not deal with the issue. The true issue here, as brought out in the Revenue Committee, and as a former hearing officer for the Department of Revenue, I can justify that this is the case, is whether or not we



provide an equitable tax structure here. This is the true issue. I would like to point out to you, that in my years as a hearing referee for the Department of Revenue, hearing hundreds and hundreds of cases involving the Retailors Occupation Tax and the Use Tax, that one gross injustice came to my attention very early in the game. And that is in this case we are dealing with an industry, an industry which provides a valuable service, which is run for profit, but an industry which under our Retailor Occupational Tax and Used Tax is treated differtly then any other. And the reason for that of course is, that unlike other retailers the vending machine industry cannot pass the cost of taxation on to the consumer without increasing the price in inclements of \$.05. What I'm suggesting to you is that while it is important to maintain taxes and to tax under the Retailors Occupational Tax Act, and to bring revenue into this state, that we have to do it on a fair basis. I have no connection with the vending machine industry. My only connection is much like yours, if I pull a lever to get a package of cigarettes or candy bar. But the fact is that these people are being treated unfairly. If we are going to tax, we going to have to tax justly. This is a industry that does not have the ability to pass the tax on to the consumer. And while this may appear to be special interest legislation, it's a matter of making out tax structure more bare and equitable. And I would plead with you to view it from that point of view, not concern yourself



with the profits of the vending machine industry, it seems to me that that is an irrelevant point. What we are really talking about is are we really going to levy our taxes in fair manner. This is one industry that cannot pass it on to the consumer and I would ask you to adjust this inequity that exists in our tax structure and ask you to vote for this Bill. Thank you."

Gerald W. Shea: "The gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Will the Sponsor yeild for a question?"

Gerald W. Shea: He indicates that he will."

Leinenweber: "Representative Neff, I may have missed it, how much money is this going to cost the state?"

Neff: "Well, the Department of Revenue estimates that it could cost \$3 1/2 to 3.6 million dollars. And I might add also that maybe it won't cost, I mentioned before no one emphasized this, that many places they aren't auditing today, and the department admitted that they weren't. I know ah.. several people have these small machines and ah... have never been audited. And ah... they admitted to me that this would make it easier to audit by ah... going in and just checking the wholesale sheet ah... slip and ah.... instead of having to get the retail end and ah.... so there's a possibility that they may not loose any money and ah.... but there's a chance that they could loose up to \$3.6 million dollars, I believe."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Gerald W. Shea: "The gentleman from Madison, Mr. Kennedy."



Kennedy: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I rise to support this Bill and the remarks of the speaker who spoke several members ago, about this being a special interest Bill, is entirely uncalled for. I would like to have him take a look at the Sponsors of this Bill. The Chief Sponsor of the Bill is one of the most distinguished Members in this General Assembly. He wouldn't handle a special interest Bill, and I urge you all to vote for this Bill, and I move the previous question."

Gerald W. Shea: "You can't do both Lee. Representative Kosinski, from Cook."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the Assembly, I to am acutely aware of the loss of revenue to the State of Illinois through this Bill. However, one reality is very obvious to me. In the final analysis the consumer will pay the tax. It's a question now, as we go along with this, if we will save the consumer the increment of a \$.05 rise, of an already too high food market. This industry has no recourse, except in increment of \$.05 to raise the price of candy bars and other commodities to the consumer to absorb this tax. In consequence, I feel by voting for this Bill, we ultimately save the consumer money out of his pockets. I request your vote."

Gerald W. Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giglio."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to move the previous question."

Gerald W. Shea: "All those in favor of the gentleman's motion on the previous question say, 'aye' all those opposed, say



'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and Mr. Neff to close."

Neff: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of the speakers mentioned that this is special interest for a special ah.. particular business. I ah.. don't look at it that way, but anyway this is a type of business that is different from almost any business that I am aware of I doubt whether we have anyother business that's been discriminated against on the sales tax such as the small vendors and I want to add toothat we're talkin about fifteen cents or under. Now when we talk about eight million dollar profit I we're taking in all the vending type of machines there and..a..I'm sure that if you..a.. would separate that to the fifteen cent of the vendor you would find that this..a..profit..that there profit isn't any where near this a.. I'd like to say this too, that if they do make more profit we know that they will pay more sales tax thereby the Revenue Department will gain on that. Again I want to repeat that House Bill 273 levies the sales tax on the cost of the price of the product purchased by the vending operators that ultimately sold at fifteen cents or less through vending machines, if this Bill is enacted into law would recognize an equality to which twenty-four states in the United States have already recognized this and..a..I might say that this particular Bill is copies exactly almost after the California Bill. I, therefore, would strongly urge a yea vote on House Bill 273. Thank you.



Gerald W. Shea: "The question is - shall House Bill 273 pass? The gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Laurino, to explain his vote. Mr. Laurino did you want to explain your vote? Oh. Mr. Matijevich from Lake to explain his vote."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of House, I'm really not going to explain my vote, but different times, the matter of how much time we have in debate has come up and it has really been confusing because we have...a...different rulings from the Chair and I"

Gerald W. Shea: "I just said five minutes to your seat-mate there Mr. Mugalian and found out that he had ten minutes and I was going to apologize to him when "

Matijevich: "I thought we ought to make that clear..I was.. I was going to say that with some trepidation because somebody might use the full ten minutes. But the rules say ten minutes and five additional minutes for the sponsor --thank you."

Gerald W. Shea: "Have all those who voted who wish the gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Mugalian, to explain his vote."

Mugalian: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a statement that this savings will be passed on to the consumers, it was admitted by the representative in the industry at the Revenue Committee hearing that this is not the case, that all of it would go into their pockets as profit--and, finally, it was stated in debate that the percentage of sales profit of this industry is only five percent. I should like to call to the attention of the Members of this



House, that in general retail sales of the chain-type of like Krogers and A&P, if you make .2% or 125th of five percent of the profit on sales you're doing very well."

Gerald W. Shea: "Have all those who voted who wished, take the record Mr. Clerk. Mr. Maragos 'Present', Giorgi 'Present', Barry 'Present', I'm sorry I can't hear you Mr. Barry. McPartland 'Aye', Schneider 'No', House Bill 273 received 127 nays and or 127 yeas, 24 nays, 1 present is hereby declared passed. The gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Laurino, on a point of personal privilege."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Last year on December 15, 1972, the House and the Senate, in their wisdom passed, a joint resolution, condemning the sale for distribution of The Godfather Game. This morning when I was thumbing through the Chicago Sun Times, I came across page 68, in a full page ad they are offering the sale of this game through the distribution of sixty-seven stores. Just to mention a few of the stores: Sears, J. C. Penney, Turn-Style, Toys Are For Us,; these are just a few of them and they are not what you would call adult stores, they are for children - quite a few of them anyway. The purpose of the game in the resolution is identified as such - is characterized by its makers as an adult strategy game being displayed for sale before the toy-buying public without regard to the age of buyers, but the effect of the game is to exhalt and glamorize criminal activities and discourage respect for law. The



manufacture and distribution of the game is a means to private profit without regard to public harm. It exemplifies the disregard for moral values, cultivated by the game itself. We, in our wisdom, deplore the sale of the game. In their ad, they say ' If you have been itching to get your fingers on The Godfather Game, the time is right. Why is it right? Obviously, because of the oscar awards. Buy your game now and then send us the coupon and as proof of purchase, the sales register receipt, an empty racket indicator card. It's a good deal! And your big chance to get into the big-time fun game the whole gang's been playing. I think that because we in our wisdom, ask that the sale the people that made up this game, Family Games, Incorporated, take from this State...take from the shelves of the stores that would possibly sell this game, have ignored us. I think its a slap in the face of the General Assembly and I again ask that the record show the intent of the General Assembly, because I doubt whether or not that this game is beneficial to the children that we are trying to show a good example here in the General Assembly. I don't know what other way we can attack this because it is hard to legalize morality. But I personally will send... a resol..the copy of the resolution to each of the store owners and a description of why it was adopted unanimously in the Senate and the House. Thank you very much."

Gerald W. Shea: "The gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Arrigon.



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

I, too, rise on a personal point of privilege because The Godfather Game is linked with a picture called The Godfather that presumes to depict life among Americans of Sicilian decent. I was not only born in Sicily, but I served in the Island of Sicily as an American military government prosecuter during World War II. I know what Americans of Sicilian extraction, of Italian extraction, suffer at the constant perpetuation of a stereo type that we find odious and completely untrue. The other night during the awarding of the best actor designation to Marlon Brando, the commentator had this to say, and I am quoting from memory. He says 'imagine a Nebraska boy that can act and depict a Sicilian killer' As though Sicilians have a special affinity for the art of killing. May I remind the Members of this Assembly that as an American military government prosecuter in the Island of Sicily I, indeed, saw less crime per capita than I have seen in many American cities. May I remind the Members of this House and the producers of the telecast that the Island of Sicily was the birthplace of western civilization. Rome, in her wisdom, copied the ancient Greek civilization that the Island of Sicily had, and had developed, made it her own, and distributed it to the world. May I also remind the Members of this House and the manufacturers of The Godfather Game that the Island of Sicily has given birth to probably, one of the largest segments



of the population in America who come from the Island of Sicily. The largest segment of the immigrants are immigrants of Sicilian origin. Indeed in this House alone, we have, in the Italian-American contingent, we have Representative Merlo, Representative Arrigo, Representative DiPrima, Representatives Giglio and Capuzi, cousins of the Sicilians because they come from Calabria. There is absolutely nothing offensive about any of us. May I remind that we have amongst us also Representative Giorgi who is a decendent of the ancient Romans. He, too, has nothing vicious and killer-like in his makeup. I want to remind the members of the telecast responsible for the telecast that two of the greatest of the Nobel prize winners in literature were natives of the Island of Sicily. Luigi Perindello and Salvatore Pozemitol. I'll even go further, the birthplace of the Italian renaissance started with the Sicilian painter, Antonello Domincina, who was the forerunner of the Italian renaissance. I want to remind most lovers of American history that Salvatore Catallano, the guide pilot in Stephen Decatur's ship, that crept into the Port of Tunis, that set fire to the capture American frigate during the war of the Barbary Coast Pirates was a native of the Island of Sicily. I could go on, I could remind you that Lord Nelson called Stephen Decatur and Salvatore Catallano as the perpetrators of the greatest feat in naval history. I also want to remind the Members of this House that when you listen to



this kind of stereo type, keep in mind that some of your greatest surgeons in America are the descendants of the immigrants from the Island of Sicily. I want to remind the Members of this House that some of your winners of the Medal of Honor are the descendants of the Island, descendants of immigrants of the Island of Sicily. I too, deplore the perpetuation of this type of game that sets a standard of crime and all of its evil aspects as a game for children, and I urge that we notify every one of the people selling The Godfather Game of our complete repugnance with this type of advertising and I then did not want to miss Caperelli who was a very distinguished son of Calabrian descendants, also first cousins to the Sicilians, and of course, Lorenzo, and I want to remind our Irish friends that a great deal of Celtic blood lies in the blood of the Sicilians, and again, and I urge that we reaffirm that resolution and again mail it out to tell these people of the feelings of the Members of this House."

Gerald W. Shea: "It seems that Representative Calvo was left out. Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. With all due respect I do not want to, I did not want to have Representative Hanahan and Representative Barry forgotten either..."

Gerald W. Shea: "Or Nardulli"

Laurino: "Or Nardulli, right."

Gerald W. Shea: "And one of our distinguished Members who is



not with us today - Representative Granata. House Bill's third reading.

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 274, Barnes Bill for an Act to Amend Sections of an Act creating the Department of Children and Family Services, third reading of the Bill."

Gerald W. Shea: "And I think I forgot Representative Leon. Representative Leon on a point of personal privilege."

Leon: "Mr. Speaker, I applaud Representative Arrigo's comments. However, he neglected to include all the persons of Italian decent in this House and for all of us, which I am one, I would like for them to know that Mr. Arrigo did not omit them, he did it by accident and I know that all of us join with him. Thank you."

Gerald W. Shea: "Representative Barnes on House Bill 274."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 274 is a very simple Bill. The Bill was presented in the 77th General Assembly and had no opposition at that time, I don't know of any opposition at this time. What House Bill 274 attempts to do is to create a revolving fund to provide a faster payment or reimbursement payment for hard-pressed day-care centers. We've heard, we've read much about the...a...problems centered around day care knowing then that this Bill will insure a speedier payment. I know of know opposition to this Bill and I solicit your support for it."

Gerald W. Shea: "Discussion, the question is Shall House Bill 274 pass?"



Gerald W. Shea: "Shea, 'aye'. Choate, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Representative Choate would you come here for a minute? Mann, 'aye'. Washburn, 'aye'.

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 343, Shea. A Bill for and Act to amend sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Gerald W. Shea: "House Bill 274, had ah... 130 'aye' votes, 4 'no' votes, and is hereby declared passed."

W. Robert Blair: "He's giving it back to me so he can explain his own Bill. Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "It wasn't my understanding that he gave you the gavel back, I thought he loaned it to you."

W. Robert Blair: "Well, there is a difference there. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 343 is a Bill that would allow the tax collector and the county government in Cook to provide for payment real estate taxes. Now I've talked to Mr. Skinner and Mr. Krause ah... about the down state portion of this and we've decided that the best way to do it is to put in another Bill, and I believe Mr. Skinner it gonna introduce that Bill and handle it so I do want to proceed with this Bill. This Bill will provide ah.. a speedy and efficient method of collecting taxes in Cook County and has a potential of saving the taxpayers some \$30 odd million dollars. I'd ask for the support of the House."

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



W. Walsh: "Well Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I have no intention of getting into the lengthy debate we got into on this Bill on Second Reading. I, however, have serious objections to it, and I would hope that you people of downstate, since you aren't going to be amended into it and don't have to worry about the effect that another amendment might have, I would hope that you might listen carefully and perhaps go along. Now this Bill mandates that there be four payments in the Cook County for the collection of taxes. The effect of this, as the County Treasurer, the Democratic County Treasurer of Cook County, pointed out, is to double..... actually double the cost of the collection of taxes. The cost will then be an additional \$4 million dollars to the County of Cook, if this Bill is enacted. Now let me point out that the Senate has been addressing themselves to this question since the Session began. They have two Bill in the Senate Revenue Committee. One to do what the gentleman from Cook, the Minority Assistant Minority Leader is attempting to do, and another to do it the correct way. The correct way to do it is to do it in two installments. The first installment being an estimate, based on last..... the previous years taxes, the second installment being the ah.... tax as levied and corrected. Now I submit to you Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, that this will work a hardship on no one. The people who will be paying the first..... who are paying their taxes are people



who own their own homes generally. If you don't own your own home, you don't have an opportunity to pay it anyway. The Savings and Loan Association or the Bank pays your taxes and you pay them 1/12 of it every time you make a payment. So I submit to you that this is simply a way that the Cook County Democratic Machine can add payroll patronage employees to do nothing and to increase the cost of government in Cook County, which has sky rocketed far out of proportion with the cost of government in the rest of the state. And I submit to you also that it gives the Savings and Loans the opportunity to hold the money just a little bit longer than they would if we did it in two payments. So let's not vote for this Bill. We have a better Bill coming, let's wait until we get it and vote for it, and do this in two installments."

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

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill. Many of my constituents ah.... would really feel that we have given them some type of break if they're allowed to pay their taxes in four installments, rather than in two. I have failed to understand, and I'm not a tax expert, but I fail to understand ah... how those of us who represent alot of one and two family ah... home owners, could have any violent objections to this, I think it is a good Bill, I would urge all of my colleagues to support it."

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



Shea: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I urge your support of this measure. As another former distinguished Majority Leader, on that side of the aisle used to say, there was a lot of saw dust raised about a Bill and it's just absolutely not true. This Bill can save the taxpayers, the property taxpayers, of Cook County some \$30 million dollars a year. And that's why the Bill is here and I ask for your support on this measure."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright, the question is shall House Bill 343 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Schoeberlein, 'aye'. This question there are 129 'ayes', 21 'nays', and this Bill having received a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Kempiners, 'aye'. Leinenweber, 'aye'.

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 354, Hill. A Bill for an Act to authorize the Department of Transportation to make an engineering examination survey evaluation....."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, this is very simple Bill and the Bill itself has no appropriations. But this particular area was flooded last August and there was approximately 50 homes under water in this particular area. The three Representatives from this area, Mr. Kempiners, Mr. Schoeberlein, and myself had seen the area, and I would appreciate very much your support of this



piece of legislation. It would only entail the Transportation Department to ah... conduct a survey in this area ah... to see what could be done. I would appreciate your vote.

W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? The question is shall this Bill pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Skinner, 'aye'. On this question there are 142 'ayes', no 'nays' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 369, McPhartlin. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Shea: "Ah.... Representative McPartlin is in the nurses room and will be back in a couple of minutes."

W. Robert Blair: "Allright, we'll take it out of the record and move on."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 411, Calvo. A Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Clavo."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, this is ah... most merely Bill I have ever seen. This merely provides that the people petitioning for a change in government in the under the.... Cities and Villages Act, ah.... from the manager form of government, will file their petition with the Circuit Clerk of their county instead of with



the City Clerk. I would ask your favorable support."

W. Robert Blair: "Question is shall.... Gentleman from Christian,
Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Will the gentleman yield for a question?"

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

Tipsword: "Mr. Calvo, there's nothing about this Bill that
would ah.. however change the election machine....."

Calvo: "No, the election machine would be exactly the same.
The election would be called for assuming the court found
the petitions to be adequate, and the referendum would be
the same as it is now."

Tipsword: "And it would be operated in the manner, the Circuit
Clerk wouldn't have to take over that election?"

Calvo: "It would be operated in the same manner as it is now."

Tipsword: "Thank you."

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

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to
speak in opposition to House Bill 411. I served in the
Cities and Villages Committee where this Bill was heard,
and it was indicated that the basis for the Bill lyed
with a suspicion of a particular Village Clerk. Ah...
a Village Clerk whom suspected will not be sympathetic
to the petition ah.. to be filed. Therefore the petition
to be filed not with the Village Clerk, but rather with
the Circuit Court, ah... Clerk of the Circuit Court. I
think it's bad policy to come up with legislation...pur-
posed legislation, that's relates to a particular person



which will have application, state wide. I should also point out that this will create an anomaly in the law, this would be the only case in regard to petitions involving form of government or involving municipal affairs to be filed with someone other than the Village Clerk. It would be filed with the Clerk of the Circuit Court. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I ah... request that ah... suggest that this Bill not pass."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Calvo to close."

Calvo: "Well, Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the last Speaker said, it's my understanding that in all other changes in government, the petitions are filed with the Circuit Clerk. And I was told that by the Municipal League. What we're really doing here is making this conform to the other situations in the statute, and I would ask your favorable support."

W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question is shall House Bill 411 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 117 'ayes' and 12 'nays' and 1 'present' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 433 or 421, I'm sorry. House Bill 421, Juckett. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



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

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 421 would amend the Election Code and would allow for the mailing of absentee ballots to the voting residents of the voter in the county in which he is registered. At present almost all of the counties of the state do this. There are some counties which do not, even though there is no prohibition about it. In the Election Committee, the County Clerk of ah.. Cook County, and this is the reason for the Bill, he ah... by regulation has refused to mail the ballots to the voting residents. The new County Clerk agreed with the Bill and ah.. whole heartedly supports it. This will end the nefarious practices of setting up dummy drops just outside of the counties in order to have the ballot mailed out by the county. In Cook, a resident of Barrington would have to make a 100 mile round trip to vote absentee. This will ease the voting process, will encourage absentee voting and would encourage the participation in our elction process. And I urge an 'aye' vote on House Bill 421."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Bob, on the Bill, the applicant does have to make a request, is that right?"

Juckett: "Yes, he would still make the request as he does now but instead of having the ballot mailed to some far off place outside the county, it could be mailed only... well



it could be mailed at his request to a spot inside the county but only to the voter's official residence."

Schneider: "Is there some kind of a provision that ah...

assures the residence or the ah... individual will be out of town or is unable to make it or....."

Juckett: "No, we did not change that, if he is in the county at the time of the election and he does not vote in person and relies on the absentee, he is subject to the criminal penalties of the Act."

Schneider: "Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Calvo."

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

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

Calvo: "Do I understand this right, ah... Representative Juckett, that ah.. the ah... it doesn't change anything, in other words, if he's going to be out of the state or out of the county, he can have it mailed where he requests. All this does, if he requested mailing to his voting address, it's to be mailed there?"

Juckett: "That is correct."

Calvo: "All right, thank you."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, may I ask Mr. Juckett a question?"

W. Robert Blair: "Ya, he...."

Giorgi: "Is it possible, Mr. Juckett, that after the next election, which will occur in Rockford next Tuesday, that I can go around the precinct after they've all voted



and for the next election ask those that failed to vote to ask for an absentee ballots so that I can get 100% voting record in my district?"

Juckett: "I would certainly be possible for him to do that, and if they did and if they were not out of the county, or out of the city, they could be sent to jail for violating the law. They could do that process now by going down to the County Court House and voting absentee even though they would not be out of the county."

Giorgi: "Ya, but the practice of the Election Boards now are to send the ballots to where they've moved and where they are going to be for election day, which sort of precludes someone walking through the precinct and telling the people if voting election days inconveniences you just ask that the ballot be mailed to your home and then ah.... I think that this is a very good Bill and I think it will be very good in my precinct and I'm going to support you."

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

Mann: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, while I share the gentleman's desire for a full ah... participation by all of our entitled voters, I just afraid that this Bill would open the door to more vote fraud than we've ever experienced in any county or any city in the state. I am very suspicious of a Bill which would encourage voters not to appear in person at their respective polling places. It's one thing to vote absentee because your ill or out



of the state. It's quite another thing to provide a vehicle and a mandate for vote fraud and controlled voting. And I am just afraid, Bob, that while I recognize ah.. your commitment to ah.. voting as many people as possible, I want to make sure that those people that are supposed to vote, vote. And I also want to make sure that if they want to split a ballot, they can split it. I think that this is a dangerous Bill, Mr. Speaker, and I would urge a 'no' vote on it."

W. Robert Blair: "Lady from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentleman of the House, ah.. I hate to rise in opposition to my neighbor and good friend Mr. Juckett, and his Bill, but I do foresee, as the last Speaker pointed out that there could be abuses in behalf of this particular Bill. I do feel that the administrative cost of that would be raised by this kind of voting. And the tendency of probably encouraging people to ah.. vote absentee rather than in person ah... the risk is just too great for us to consider at this time. I think that there are other ways to remedy this that would be more equitable and I think there will be Bills coming before us that could take care of this, so I urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

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

Piotrowicz: "Will Representative Juckett yield for a question?"

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

Piotrowicz: "Representative Juckett, in line with the question-



ing we've heard here, it would be possible for me to go into my precinct and get 100 or 150 or even 200 people to sign a statement indicating that they believe that they will be out of town on election day and would like a absentee ballot mailed to their home ah.. so that they can vote. Am I right so far?"

Juckett: "Well, first of all, you can do that now ah... you can ah... if your a good political worker you will canvas your precinct, you will determine who is going to be or who thinks they will be out of town. You will have them sign an application as provided by the County Clerk. The only difference between this Bill and the present law is that the ballot could be mailed to the home, instead of having to be mailed to the location of where they're going to go. The problem with the location mailing, if your on a trip, how do you know the ballot is going to get there at the place that your going to be when your there. That's the problem."

Piotrowicz: "I understand the problems with the law as it exist now. What I am extremely concerned about, however is what abuses my creep into this situation ah... in allowing what you are advocating in this Bill here. Now it's extremely..... it's conceivable to me that we can end up getting 100 or 150 or 200 applications as I indicated per precinct for individuals who say ' I believe I will be out of town, please mail that application to my home.' On election day they are no out of town. You suggest that



then would be subject to some criminal penalties. I ask you how we can attack the creditability of the individual when he signs that statement saying, 'I believe I will be out of town on election day.' And then the day before election day he changes his mind. What problems do we then end up in with regard the ah... entire election procedure and machinery. Right now he'd have to vote in the precinct, what would we do with all those double ballots?"

Juckett: "That is the present law now, when you make your application, your indicating that you will be out of town on that election day and that you cannot vote in person. Now the law also states that the County Clerk or the person that is in charge of the ballot procedure must as a public record, document each and every request for an absentee ballot, by the name of the individual, his voting address, and the destination to which the absentee ballot is mailed. That is a public record, that is available for anybody to check. And if you wanted to make sure that there was no fraud, you can check on that and no exactly where these ballots are being mailed. And then you can check on these individuals to see whether they have in fact, left the county on that particular day. If they have not, then you will have case for fraud and you can bring it and the people can be sentenced if they are guilty."

Piotrowicz: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, the present law, I think, does afford protection to our entire electrons of our electro system by requiring that



that absentee ballot be mailed to a location out of town if the individual does indicate he shall be out of town. If he then decides that he will be in town, that ballot is brought back to the polling place, and he can vote in the polling place. I think there's adequate protection involved in the law right now. I think it has worked generally satisfactory to the entire system, and I fear very much that the proposal before us now, although it's intentions are laudable in terms of including participation in the electoral process, I fear very much that it leaves us very wide open to election fraud and really a denial of the entire electoral process. I would urge the Members of this Assembly to vote 'no'."

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

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, ah... in all do respect to the Sponsor and the Elections Committee, which I'm sure we're trying to solve a problem. I'm sure some people who are legitimately out of town are disfranchise because that ballot never catches up with them. However, one of the essential parts of our present system of voting is that a person votes alone behind a curtain. I can envision that in some precincts in the City of Chicago, if this Bill passes that the majority of the people voting in the precincts will be in their home with the Precinct Captain sitting along side of them marking the ballot for them. This Bill scares me to death and urge everyone to vote 'no' on it."



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

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

W. Robert Blair: "All right the previous question has been moved. All those in favor say 'aye', the opposed, 'nay' the motion is carried. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Juckett may close the debate."

Juckett: "Well, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, the present law as it stands today does not, and I must repeat, does not prevent the County Clerk or the Election Authority from doing exactly what this Bill would allow them to do. There is absolutely nothing in the Election Code that would prevent the absentee ballot from being mailed to the voters residence. As a matter of fact, it is done in approximately 90 of the counties in this state right now. The fact that some of the people are overlooking is a time element. The person is going to be out of town on election day and you say, 'Well, mail the ballot to the place he is going.' But unfortunately many times he will be arriving on election day or a day or two before election day and there's absolutely no way for him to get that ballot back. What we're saying here is, 'He must make an affidavit he's going to be out of town, you mail the ballot to the official voting residence or any other place he wants it to go outside the county.' But if it's inside the county it would be identical with on such as a medical ballot. The medical ballot is mailed



say to a person.... say a gal is expecting a baby, she's at home. The ballot is mailed to the house. It's not mailed t outside the county. Or let's suppose the person is for a religious holiday, the ballot is mailed to the home. And there hasn't been any ah... fraud connected with those and I doubt if there would be fraud connected with these. Now if there were fraud, and I'm not going to accuse any party or any section of deliberately committing fraud, but if there were, it's prosecuted by the State's Attorney or by the Federal District Attorney. The lists are known, they are public as to who got the absentee ballot and where. This Bill will allow for the full participation. It will eliminate the fraudulent practices that are now being conducted in sending ballots to drops outside the county. So for those of you who do not travel, for those of you who have never been in this situation, believe me there are people who have a great regret that they can't vote. This will allow it. This will prevent the fraud and it will allow for full participation and I urge an 'aye' vote on House Bill 421."

K. Miller: "For what purpose ah... does the gentleman from Cook, ah... the Minority Leader, Mr. Choate, rise? Ah... Union, I'll get it right."

Choate: "I was going to correct you, Mr. Speaker, because Union County is far been removed from the County of Cook." Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal previlage, for the purpose of introducing a group of distinguished young



americans. In behalf of my colleagues from Southern Illinois, I would like to advise this House and these visitors in the gallery that the beautiful music that they've been hearing from the rotunda has been provided by the Harrisburg, Illinois High School Band, under the able leadership of their Director, Kurt Berklow. And I'd like to advise the Members of this House and the visitors that this is a first stop on a tour that this band is making. Tonight they will be in Bloomington, I think it is, and tomorrow they will have a concert at Illinois State University. I have never in my life seen a more distinguished group of young americans and their leader Mr. Kurt Berklow in this gallery and in this gallery. Would you please stand?"

K. Miller: "All right, with respect to House Bill 421, the gentleman has closed his debate. The question is shall House Bill 421 pass. Those in favor please vote 'aye', the opposed please vote 'nay'. Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Calvo."

Calvo: "Uh... I know that this is unusual, but I asked Mr. Juckett a question during the debate and I know what he intends by his answer, but Bob, the way this reads there's is not alternative but to either mail it. There's no alternative to mail it any place else. And I wondered if it.... when it gets to the Senate if you would agree to an amendment or otherwise as requested?"

K. Miller: "All right, this is a little bit unusual but the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Juckett is recognized."



Juckett: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Calvo, there would then be three methods of voting absentee for those who are are going to be out of the county. One would be to vote in person, one would be to mail the ballot to the place to which you are going, and one would be to mail the ballot to your official voting residence. Three ways."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I'm voting 'no' and I'm voting because I don't really think that what Mr. Juckett just said is what the Bill now says. The Bill previous to this amendment said that it was to be mailed, postage pre-paid, or delivered in the office in person. Now it says that it is to be mailed to the voting address, if requested, postage pre-paid, or delivered in person. And I don't think that you could mail it to a person who is actually out of the county or out of the state, to the place where he is at that time. And I think you'd be disfranchising those people who are away on business. Now if that was specifically included back in here again, it would be all right, but I think this amendment removes the general language of mailing and specifies the mailing to be only to the voting address, if requested.

Otherwise, can only be delivered in person."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Redmond."

Redmond: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain why I intend to vote 'yes' on this measure. I live in DuPage County, and in DuPage County we have had these previlage of having absentee ballots mailed to our



home address as long as I have lived in the county. And I can assure you that there has been little if any, fraud involved. And it seems to me that the people of Cook County and the people of Chicago are probably as trustworthy as the people in DuPage County. Now if a person wants to commit fraud, there really is no way in the world that you can prevent it because there are such things as letter drops. And somebody could give an address in McHenry County and make sure that the ballot was mailed to McHenry County and then transmit back to his address in Chicago. So if they really wanted to do it, there isn't any way in the world that it could be prevented. Now I'm not to sure of the reason for this limitation, but my guess is that it comes back to the time before voting machines and the time that we had all paper ballots. And one of the obvious methods of vote fraud, is what is known as chain voting, where a ballot..... an unmarked ballot would be taken from the voting place and taken to a person who was interested in the way it was going to be marked. It would be marked. Then the voter would go into the voting place and get a new ballot, put the new unmarked ballot in his pocket and drop the marked ballot into the box. And then he would receive whatever gratuity was involved by going back to the original spot, turning over the unmarked ballot to his benefactor and then the thing would continue all day. But as I understand the situation in Cook County and Chicago, they have voting machines. And the paper ballots that are involved in the absentee are



only a handful as contrasted to the number of ballots that we cast in the precinct. So I don't really see that there is a possibility of a chain vote. It only makes it possible for people to exercise their franchise. I don't think, and from our experience there hasn't been any fraud, unless you want to construe making it possible for the maximum number of people to vote, if that is fraud. And I see absolutely nothing wrong with it, so therefore I'm going to vote 'yes'."

K. Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holloway."

Holloway: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I only wish that I had the ah.... words and the wisdom and the ability to articulate just how bad this Bill is."

K. Miller: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Juckett rise?"

Juckett: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and I hate interrupt my good friend on his great speech on my Bill, but I think that the point that Representative Tipsword and Representative Calvo might be a valid point and I would like to pull it out of the record so that we could check with the Reference Bureau and make sure that we are not eliminating one of the methods. If I could please have leave of the House to do that."

K. Miller: "Mr. Juckett, I think the proper order is that the Bill must be postponed, do you so move, Sir?"

Juckett: "If that's the proper motion, then I would so make it, Mr. Speaker."

K. Miller: "Does the gentleman have leave? All right the Bill will be placed on postponed consideration."



Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 633, Craig. An Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Secretary of State. Third Reading of the Bill."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Craig."

Craig: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, what House Bill 633 does is give the Secretary of State, after reviewing his appropriations and more than a 2% transfer, which is permitted by law now, to transfer to one fund to another in order to carry out the operation. Now this does not increase the overall appropriation at all, it just gives him more on a 2%, which is allowed now. There is also a Division Appropriation here for ah... \$615,000 additional money which is needed for Social Security and Pension Payments only. I'd like to urge your support of this measure."

K. Miller: "All right, the question..... is there discussion? All right, the question is shall House Bill 633 pass. All those in favor vote 'aye', the opposed, 'nay'. Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham is recognized."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, lest my vote be thought inadvertent or quixotic I would observe that there is a need for the House to obtain the attention of the genial Secretary of State. The signs are ominous that in the next few days we will see a purge of employees in the Secretary of State's Office under the heading of..... Mr. Speaker, let's have order, under the heading of re-testing. I would suggest to you that that word is but euphemistic title for replacing the Republicans with Democrats."



The Secretary of State would be better advised to follow the example of the Governor who has shown no tendency to follow into that time worn discredited habit. This House has shown last week, foolishly shown, a petulant ability to waste the public treasury in an effort to show the Chief Executive who's boss. The House would be better advised at this time to send the clear, unmistakable message to the Secretary of State that we will never condone a return to any time worn slogan like: 'To the victor belongs the spoils', or any facsimile thereof. Now is the hour for each of you to reaffirm your dedication to an honest to God merit system that presently exists in the Secretary of State's Office. If you believe with me in this matter, change you vote up here. I want to say in conclusion, there's nothing..... there's nothing personal about this, I think very highly about Craig and also the Secretary of State. But we need, and there might be some small merit in his Bill, but for the purpose of suggestion, I urge you to vote 'no'. Thank you."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I've seen the light."

K. Miller: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr.

Clerk. McClain 'aye' on this Roll Call. Palmer, 'aye'. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dunn, wants to change his vote from ah.... to 'aye'. The gentleman, Mr. Grotberg wants to vote 'aye'. Mr. Polk, 'aye'. Mr. Piotrowicz, 'aye'. How is Mr. Piotrowicz recorded on this Roll Call, Mr. Clerk?"



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

K. Miller: "Ah... Mr. Duff, 'aye'. Mr. Yourell desires recognition."

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I think it is appropriate at this time to request a Roll Call of the negative votes."

K. Miller: "On this question there are 147 'ayes' and 10 'nays' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 634, Blair. An Act to impose a tax on food products, medicine, drugs for human consumption. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Blair: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, I've asked leave of the House to bring House Bill 634 ah... back to the order of Second Reading for purposes of tabling the amendment that was put on yesterday and then offering another amendment, which is clarifying in nature."

K. Miller: "Does the gentleman have leave? The gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate is recognized."

Choate: "I was wondering if we could be furnished with a copy of the amendment that we might consider it."

K. Miller: "The Clerk tells me that they've been distributed. Does the gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, the Bill is returned to the order of Second Reading for purposes of amendment. Proceed Mr. Blair."



Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment #2, amend House Bill 634 on page 1, by deleting lines 1 and 2 and so forth."

Blair: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, I would move to table Amendment #1, the Committee Amendment, ah... because ah... #2 addresses itself more completely to some matters that were raised in the Revenue Committee when we passed the Bill out. So I would so move."

K. Miller: "The question is shall ah.. Amendment #1 be tabled. All those in favor say 'aye', the opposed..... just a moment, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea is recognized."

Shea: "Are you in effect, tabling everything after the inacting clause and putting a new Bill on it, is that the way I read this?"

Blair: "The question now is on the tabling of Amendment #1."

Shea: "That was the Committee Amendment that straightened this Bill out, is that correct?"

Blair: "That's right. Amendment #1 is a clarifying amendment but it didn't go far enough and we didn't address ourselves to the ah.. S.O.T. and the S.U.T. part of the R.O.T."

Shea: "Did the D.O.T. get in too?"

K. Miller: "All right, the question is shall Amendment #1 be tabled. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #1 is tabled."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment #2, amend House Bill 634 and so forth."

Blair: "Now, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2 to House Bill 634 does not change the basic character of the Bill or of Amendment #1,



which is offered in Committee, and adopted, and which we adopted yesterday, and now tabled. A...the Amendment...#2 clarifies the type of food and drugs we intend to reduce sales tax on. The discussion in the Revenue Committee indicated that there were certain ambiguities in the earlier definitions of food and drugs, and we've tried to incorporate the Committee's excellent suggestions on language clarifications in this Amendment. There were several technical and drafting errors in the Bill which we have incorporated as well, we've also added a list of whereas to establish more precisely the legislative intent behind this approach, and...a...I had the Amendment reviewed by my revenue counselor, Representative Maragos, and...a..he says...that it, without going into the substance of the Bill, that...a.. the Amendment is a far better Amendment than that...a..the one that we adopted yesterday."

K. Miller: "Is there a discussion on the Amendment?" Alright the question is shall Amendment #2...the gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Wolfe". B.B. Wolfe. Thank you. Will the gentlemen yield for questions.

Representative B.B. Wolfe: "Alright."

K. Miller: "He indicates he will proceed."

Representative B.B. Wolfe: "You indicated to the Committee, I believe, that a fiscal note on this Bill would involve what...a 189 million dollars of revenue?"

Blair: "No...a..."

B. B. Wolfe: 90 million, what was..."



Blair: "Right, the best estimate that we can make, is...a..around 100 million dollars."

B.B. Wolfe: "Now, does the Amendment broaden the original definition that was contained in the original Bill, and increase the 100 million to 102,4, 5 or..."

Blair: "No, the Amendment merely brings the Bill into the intent that was there when we introduced the Bill, as far as to those items that..."

B.B. Wolfe: "As I recall, the original Bill referred to prescription drugs as kind of a limitation. .."

Blair: "And the original referred to medicines, and because of the descriptive problem involved in what are and are not medicines, we, in this Amendment, limit ourselves to prescription drugs. "

B.B. Wolfe: "Oh. Then the everyday aspirins, everyday patented so called drugs would not be included now under this Amendment."

Blair: "That's right."

B.B. Wolfe: "Thank you."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor of the Amendment yield for question?"

K. Miller: "Proceed sir, he indicates he will."

Houlihan: "This..this Amendment changing the categories, ...a will you provide a checklist for the checkout cashiers, or how will that be handled?"

Blair: "Well, the Department of Revenue is under the Amendment,



given the authority to establish rules and regulations in regard to the definitions used in the section, and...I think its...that the educational process really shall not be all that complicated...a...food for given consumption ..are the things that we're after, and certainly a checkout girl at the ...in the grocery store...knows the difference between shoe polish and shoe laces on the one hand, and butter and eggs and things of that nature on the other."

Houlihan: "And will things be true in terms of prescription drugs as opposed to aspirin..?"

Blair: "I think they'll question the very description of prescription drugs, means that a doctor has to write a prescription and that the drug..."

Houlihan: "Was there any testimony in the Committee concerning this particular problem of the cashier or the checkout list?"

Blair: "Well, yes, there was. It was brought up by the retailers."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "In support of this Amendment, I might say to the Speaker and members of the House, that I'd like to have a copy of the roll call, so I can go back to my district and say that I'm keeping my commitment for tax relief as long as other people are flying around the State, I was hoping that I could get permission to use the State plane, maybe to go into my district and explain to the citizens of the 33rd district that I'm for tax relief for sales tax on food, clothing, and medicine."

K. Miller: "Is there further discussion?" The gentlemen from



Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House. So there will be no misunderstanding, Speaker Blair didn't let me see the Amendment earlier, but I told him I would not object to it because he's got a right as the sponsor of the Bill to put it in any shape he wants it. And it the truth, its a better Amendment and it does clarify what the...in a better fashion than what the original Bill...Amendment did; however, I still am against the proposal, as of the whole crux of the Bill, which I'll speak when it comes up for the third reading. Therefore I vote present."

K. Miller: "The question is, shall Amendment #2 be adopted? All those in favor say Aye, opposed, nay, and the Amendment is adopted. The Bill is now advanced to the order of third reading. For what purpose does the gentlemen from Lake, Mr. Murphy rise?"

Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, I like leave of the House to table a Bill that I had previously introduced and its in Committee, and the fact is, its even up for a hearing today, but I wish to table House Bill 524."

K. Miller: "Does the gentlemen have leave?" Hearing no objection the Bill was tabled. I can't see for sure, back there but does the gentlemen from Tazewell, Mr. VonBoeckman, proceed, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

VonBoeckman: "I would like to have a leave to table a Bill that I previously sponsored, House Bill 405."

K. Miller: "Does the gentlemen have leave? Hearing no objection,



the Bill is tabled. The Chair recognizes the gentlemen from Union, Mr. Clyde."

Choate: "Mr. who?"

K. Miller: "Mr. Clyde Choate."

Choate: "You spell that with a "C". Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the democratic members would give me their attention. I would like to ask leave of the House, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of about a thirty minute conference for the democratic members, and would you give me a room number? Is 212 available? I'm informed M-5 is available, I would ask the democratic members to come to M-5 as soon as possible for a thirty minute democratic conference."

K. Miller: "Alright, the gentlemen from Cook, Mr. W. Walsh, is recognized."

W. Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd make the same request of the Republicans. There will be a republican conference for thirty minutes in Room 212, and I move that the House recess now for that purpose."

K. Miller: "Alright, the House will now be in recess and will return to floor action at 2:15."

Telcser: "The House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. House Bills' third reading. House Bill 634."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 634, Blair, a Bill for an Act to reduce tax on foods and drugs, third reading of the Bill."

Telcser: "The gentlemen from Wills, Speaker Blair."

Blair: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 634 is a deceptively simple Bill. It proposes to cut the State's



share of the retail occupation tax on food, and the sales occupation tax on prescription drugs, service occupation tax on prescription drugs in half. From 4% to 2%. It does not touch the 1% that goes to local government. These sales taxes impact regressively and in our opinion, the only way to relieve the people of their burden, is to cut them directly. Neither of these taxes is based on ones ability to pay. They cut deepest into the pocket book of those with the least to spend, and there is no way to avoid them even though they are not particularly visible taxes. Our endorsement of these proposed reductions will bring immediate relief to the housewives of Illinois. Our long term goal is, of course, to reduce the total burden of these taxes as fast as fiscal prudence and responsibility will permit. The relief inherent in this Bill will be greatest for those, who of necessity, must spend the largest proportion of their available income for food and prescription drugs. What we can do here today, is demonstrate to every taxpayer in this State, that we understand the day to day travails of life, the petty frustrations inconsistencies we all endure, and inequitable tax only adds to the layers of mistrust and suspicion which all to many people today, regard government. We can begin to bring some order to things by starting now to refine our revenue systems and to get more equitable and just. The people who have sent us here deserve no less, they, the citizens of Illinois, and I, solicit your support for House Bill 634."



Telcser: "The gentlemen from Cook, Representative Mann."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, members of the House, I think it is a matter of record, which anyone can check out, that since time in immorium, the platform of the democratic party has been to reduce the regressive sales tax, particularly, on food and medicine, and I think that we all can take legislative notice of the fact that the number one item on the agenda of the people in the State of Illinois."

Telcser: "Excuse me, Representative Washington, for what purpose do you, sir?"

Washington: "My point of order, sir, is this, I saw the Minority Leader on the floor with his hand up asking to get the floor to speak. Now, in my opinion, when the Minority Leader on this side of the aisle, rises to speak, he should have preference over any member on this side, and I resent very strongly, the fact that he wasn't recognized."

Telcser: "Representative Mann, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with the gentlemen from Chicago. I wasn't aware that the Minority Leader raised he hand. I would only ask that you call on me after the Minority Leader has made his presentation and I yield the floor to the Minority Leader."

Telcser: "The Chair overlooked, he apologizes." The gentlemen from Union, Representative Choate."

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, after discussing this important matter with Mr. Mann, I'm not sure that he's happy that he's



gonna follow me. But Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I agree to a degree with the Speaker of this House, when he said this is a simple Bill, its simple, and what he attempts to do in this Bill, is laudatory in itself. But, as Representative Mann said in his opening remarks before he kindly yielded the floor to myself, is a fact that this has long been a plank of the democratic platform. This has long been a measure that the democratic party has tried to bring about. This has been a measure that I dare say, there has not been a single solitary candidate for district office or state office that hasn't gone through out their district of the State, and talked to the people and said yes, were going to bring about tax reform, yes we're going to bring about a reduction of the sales tax, yes, we're going to try to help the people of this State by reducing taxes, but the crux of the whole matter, is how you go about it. Do you do it in a manner that is most feasible to the taxpayers of this State? Or do you do it in another manner that is less feasible and less saving, as far as the taxpayers of this State is concerned? I personally feel that Illinois Retail Merchants Association summed it up in one short sentence. That if enacted into law, House Bill 634 would create more problems than it would solve, and it would cost more than it would save. So what are we confronted with. We're confronted with the problems that we have all talked about during our campaigns. But we're confronted with a problem that we must need, we



must meet headon and we must meet in a responsible fashion as far as the benefit of savings to the taxpayers of this State of Illinois, and I would suggest to you, I would suggest to you, that there's other proposals, there is other proposals in front of this House of Representatives that I dare say would effect and bring about a bigger savings to the taxpayers and create less confusion as far as enforcement is concerned. The Retail Merchants Association have said that this Bill would be practically impossible to administer as far as the retail merchants of this State are concerned. Representative Maragos has a Bill, I would hope, I would hope that before we cast a vote on this particular piece of legislation, I would hope that we would consider, we would consider the input as far as Representative Maragos' piece of legislation is concerned. I would hope that we would consider that possibility of comparing the two pieces of legislation, and see which is most beneficial to the taxpayers of this State. This is a responsibility which we should face here today. Look at them. In our hearts we do want to help the already overburdened taxpayer of this State. And if in your hearts, you want to do this, and I know you do, then look at Representative Maragos' legislation, and I feel that you will find that it will be most beneficial as far as the taxpayers of the State is concerned in bringing the money back to them, and putting in their pockets rather than someone else's. I'm going to vote present on this legi-



slation."

Telcser: "Representative Choate, let the Chair apologize to you once again. The gentlemen from Cook, Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, as the Minority Leader, the distinguished Minority Leader has indicated, this has long been a position of the democratic party in its platform, and I would like to indicate that I, too, would hope that everyone would look with favor upon Representative Maragos' Bill and..a...the proposal which the Governor will perhaps introduce in this same area. But at the same time, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I'm not going to oppose or sit on my hands on a Bill merely because it is offered by the Speaker and I know that this was not the position that the Minority Leader was taking. He sincerely believed that all measures ought to be taken together. But the fact of the matter is, that there is the crises in Illinois, we have consumers on strike, meat prices have become confiscatory because of how high they are and the people of my district and the people across the State are looking for immediate relief and this Bill, as the Speaker indicated, will give us immediate relief to the beleaguered taxpayers. Illinois has the dubious distinction of being second to Alabama as the highest sales tax state in the nation. That is not quite consistent with the fact that we are considered the wealthiest nation in per capita income. And what we are doing with this Bill, Mr. Speaker, and members of the House,



trying to introduce an elasticity, some productivity into the tax structure here in Illinois. I understand that this will cost us a hundred million dollars in revenue, so be it, there are other ways, and other taxes more equitable in nature, which will produce the revenue which we need to keep this State on an even keel. Mr. Speaker and members of the House, the sales tax in Illinois isn't a real sales tax. Its a retailers occupation tax, its one that requires the retailers to first deduct from the person paying the tax, and you better believe it falls hardest on the little guy and you better believe that poor people get sick and require prescription drugs. Theres nothing magic about prescription drugs, when you're sick, you go to a doctor and you get a prescription. Mr. Speaker, and members of the House, this Bill is long over due, I would be a hypocrite, after twelve years of standing for introducing some regressivity into the sales tax and cutting down the tax on food and drugs if I went against this particular Bill. I think the Speaker is right, I commend him for his position and I would ask members of the House on both sides of the aisle to join me in voting Aye and also join me on looking with favor and objectively on anyother measures that are put in regardless of the party or the sponsor that introduces them, and I'm going to vote Aye, Mr. Speaker."

Telcser: "The gentlemen from Cook, Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, members of the House. When I arise, I



am not in a sense, speaking against the Bill which is before us today which is being...whose chief sponsor is our own Speaker. I am though, arising in a sense of objection to it in the form that it is being introduced at this time, because of the fact that other valuable legislation in this same area was left to die or wither. If you will notice that House Bill 121, which is a similar type of Bill, in giving tax relief in the sales tax area, has co-sponsors on both sides of the aisle, because I think and I realize that sales tax relief or any tax relief is not a partisan matter, it is a matter that effects all of the people whether Republicans or Democrats or any independents. It effects the people who are old and young, and the only thing I am saying at this time, Mr. Speaker, and members of this House, is that let us agree to let most of the other legislation leave this House as well as the legislation being sponsored by the Speaker today. I'm still waiting for a commitment from the Speaker or any one who can speak for him, who can tell us that sure, we're not makin this a political issue, but we are trying to give adequate relief in the best form possible in the sales tax area to the people of the State of Illinois. On my Bill I have Mr. Collins, I have Mr. Hyde, I have Mr. Palmer, I have Mr. Randolph, the Chairman of the Revenue Committee, I have Mr. Hudson, all good Republicans and who believe in the idea, like everyone else does, that we should give sales tax relief in the area where it is most needed. The reason why I



favor the other approach rather than the one that is being proposed at this time is that because of the fact, that even by the testimony of the Department of Revenue, that as stated time and again, the credit approach is the most effective way and the least costly way to give relief in this area.your sales tax or other, we don't care as long as there is some relief given to the people especially in the lower or middle income. While, I have some objections to the present Bill that is being proposed Number 634, is that it will give greater relief to the people who need it least, as compared to those who need it more. The poorer people will not get as much relief as the richer people will out of the 634. Secondly, in a prescription and drug area, there is much confusion because it ties in with areas where already there is some tax relief being given in prescription drugs. There might be a question of constitutionality involved on a technical standpoint, we should also take that into consideration. Representative Londrigan also had a similar Bill to my approach. We have Representative Schlickman, whose got a Bill which also came out of Committee, which I voted for to show that they should take all tax off drugs entirely. But I think all these packages and all these approaches should be considered simultaneously rather than have one go out and kill the others which I'm afraid will happen. That is why I'm asking you Mr. Speaker, and members of the House to hold off on this Bill until we know that the others are also



ready to be proposed and considered by the House as a whole unit rather than having it killed by Committee or otherwise. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I, at this time, will vote present on this Bill until the other Bills do approach the same status on the House calendar, at which time we can give them all proper consideration that they deserve and the people of the State of Illinois should have. Thank you."

Telcser: "The gentlemen from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, and members of the House, very happy day that the trade union movement will have today. That after thirty years the State Federation of Labor the A.F.L.C.I.O. the Chicago Teamsters, and all other trade union groups in Illinois is having when we have before us a reduction in the most regressive, the most heinous of all the taxes we have on our books. I'm very proud to stand up and support this Bill and I'm very proud to support other Bills that will either reduce or do away with any form of regressive taxation. The important issue here before us is not the system or the series of Bills that are going to be presented to us. I'm going to support Representative Maragos and I'll support Representative Londrigan and I'll support Representative Schlickman's Bills on reduction of sales tax. But I'm not gonna vote present here now, and I don't think anyone else should vote present. The issue is right before us today, right at this hour, we are going to be asked to either vote for or against, but to side step, or to step aside an issue as great as this get all working men and women in



Illinois are waiting for, then it is the relief, the immediate relief. I don't know about the other members of the General Assembly, but I represent a district in Northern Illinois that isn't interested in who sponsored this Bill, they're interested in tax relief, and that's what this Bill is offering us, I suggest that if the Governor don't like this Bill he can run around the State in his airplanes and talk about it. But I'm gonna tell you right now, Hanahan, if I have to charter my own plane, I will be proud to go to the people in the 33rd district and say I voted aye on this Bill."

Telcser: "The gentlemen from Sangamon, Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, where were you for the last four years when I needed you? When the people of the State needed you? This legislation had been before us four year's ago, but all during the time of the Republican administration, we could not get a vote on my Bill or any Bill giving this very same tax relief. We come in with an approach this time similar to the Governor's, 'Sam Maragos' Bill, my Bill, and other Bills which we believe is a better approach, the tax credit approach, because it is easier to administer. We are going to vote to get all of these Bills out on the floor for discussion. Maragos' Bill, my Bill, all of them have been killed by party politics. It is time to stop party politics, and after condemning it, I am certainly not going to support it. I am going to vote for this Bill. I'm going to vote for every Bill until we give the people



the promise tax relief we promised them for four years ago at the time the income tax was put on. Now I would hopfully suggest that others will follow this example that I will be able to discharge my Bill out of Committee, that we will give all of these Bills a hearing. Pass the good Bills on to the Governor, and the Governor at about the time in the end of June and thereafter, when he knows the condition of the State, will be able to select the best approach, the one that most ordinarily fits the budget and the appropriations and the money spent. So I would ask you Mr. Speaker, to give us the same support that we are going to give you here today, and I would encourage everybody to get off the political kick and let's give the people the promised tax relief."

Telcser: "The gentlemen from Winnebago, Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in enthusiastic support of this legislation. We're not dealing with a partisan issue, we're dealing with tax relief, immediate tax relief to the people of the State of Illinois. As Representative Hanahan says its to working men and women of Illinois that want this relief. Its also the retired people and the senior citizens in the State of Illinois that can't wait any longer. This is the first opportunity that we've had at this time to give some meaningful relief, sales tax relief on food and medicine to the people that need this type of relief. No question that the sales tax is repressive and now we have the opportunity to



follow through in an act of progressive piece of legislation putting partisan politics aside and strike a blow for every-day, average Illinois citizens. I urge your enthusiastic support for this most important Bill."

Telcser: "The gentlemen from Cook, Representative Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, and members of the House. I agree with the analysis of the sales tax as given by Bob Mann, I agree with the rationale that Jim Londrigan set forth, except that I cannot come to the same conclusion that my good friend, Jim Londrigan, did. I will vote for House Bill 634, eventually, if I have a chance, I say eventually. I will vote for House Bill 634 when and if the Speaker can guaranty this side of the aisle that he will muster the votes to pass House Bill 121. A deal, not behind the clothes closet, but out in the open. That's my deal for my vote. Because, whether we like it or not, the Governor of this State is part of the legislative process, whether we like it or not, he probably has in his hand as much information about the fiscal position of this State as anyone else, if not more. And whether we like it or not, he should have some discretion in dealing with such fiscal matters. I'm not being inconsistent on this vote and the C.T.A. vote because that was a slightly different problem that dealt with amendatory veto, and the crisis was imminent in it. But I maintain, that if we are really seriously concerned with...about bring tax relief to the people of this State, we should send to the Governor every conceivable



of tax relief. I am convinced reading of Representative Maragos' Bill that it will get that kind of relief. But I am not an authority on fiscal matters, I don't want to hold myself out as being so. I simply say this. Thanks for the applause. I simply say this, the Governor has a right to look at all of these programs and conceptions of tax relief and make up his judgement, and I challenge the Speaker of this House to stand up on this floor and he will support a democratic sponsored Bill, House Bill 121, in the same sense, in the same heat, and give as much mind to it as he does his own House Bill 634. That's my deal. I urge everyone else to do the same. If you are sincerely concerned about tax reform, don't get hung up on a party Bill, look at the whole spectrum of tax relief and vote accordingly. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to pick up that gauntlet."

Telcser: "The gentleman from Logan, Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, as a new man, its not for me to exhume old skeletons, rather it is to take a clear-eyed look, not being one who has voted on a partisan basis, not being one who has gone for sales tax or income tax or anything of the sort. They say that the united..in fact it was Oscar Wilde who said, 'United States is that country where the young and inexperienced give their elders the benefit of their inexperience'. If you will bear with me for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, I will do just that. As I see it, and as I travel my district, and travelled through this



State last year, the people are wanting tax relief now. They don't care how they get it, they want it now. It comes to a situation, ladies and gentlemen, that if we give tax relief on a sales tax basis, it goes into effect and starts leaving money in the pockets of the consumer, just as soon as the Governor signs the Bill into law. If we go on the basis of an income tax rebate then there is a delay of six to eight months, because the tax must be paid and then a credit claimed. It seems to me that this is an unnecessary delay to a burning problem, and Representative Mann is exactly right when he refers to this as the most regressive of the taxes which is on the books. Joe Doaks, with an income of \$2500 or \$3500 or \$4500 a year cannot afford to have that extra money taken out of his pocket when he pays the bill for food or prescription drug. Leave it in his pocket and give him an alternative basis for spending it himself. Don't say, well, in six or eight months, Joe, you'll be able to have that money to spend. In the meantime, we're going to have it. Quite the contrary, Mr. Speaker, it is not only a case of the sales tax is the most regressive tax, we have it is also a case and one of the reasons why I rise in support of House Bill 634 is the delay in time that is involved in choosing an alternative vehicle. When the House Bill 121 comes up Mr. Washington, I shall be happy to vote for it, because it is tax relief. And I think the people of the State are requiring it, but I solicit your vote today in order that they



have ~~that~~ tax relief on an immediate basis."

Telcser: "~~The~~ gentlemen from Cook, Representative Rayson."

Rayson: "~~Well~~, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, Members, just
 brief~~y~~, I'm gonna support this Bill, I've been down here
 nine ~~years~~ now, and I've always supported this kind of
 legisla~~tion~~, I think its the right thing to do, I think
 there ~~are~~ some other good Bills and they should be supported
 too. ~~But~~ I'd like to tell the sponsor of this Bill, the
 dist~~inguished~~ Speaker of this House, that this not one of
 those ~~Bills~~ that we have to pass today or it will die on
 the ~~calendar~~, and there are lots and lots of columns now
 of ~~second~~ reading Bills with Amendments. This is the
 inf~~ormation~~ we get, that we gotta take care of the priority
 Bill~~s~~. I suggest that this is not one of them, but its up
 now, ~~and~~ I'm gonna cast my vote for it, but I hope the
 Spea~~ker~~ is humble, an I hope he realizes that henceforth,
 he ~~make~~ a little better effort to give equality to all
 mem~~bers~~ of this House. I would support this Bill."

Telcser: "~~The~~ gentlemen from Champaign, Representative Hirsch-
 fe~~ld~~"

Hirschfe~~ld~~ "Well, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the
 Hou~~se~~ I hesitated some time before I stood up on this
 par~~ticular~~ Bill, but I must say with all due respect to my
 col~~league~~ across the aisle, Representative Washington, whom
 I ~~have~~ actually emulatted in many ways, in social legislation
 du~~ring~~ the past three years, that I'm shocked at your
 na~~ture~~. If you feel that we will vote this Bill out of



the House with votes from your side of the aisle and that you can expect reciprocity when and if the other Bills are called. Now I was not going to rise, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, but I am just a little bit tired of being tarred with the brush from the Speaker's race. It seems to me the Speaker's race ended in January and I'm getting damnably tired of my fellow Republicans coming to me and because of the stance I happen to take, they want to know is this Mr. Hyde's stand? Is this your stand? Is this an anti-speaker stand? Is this an anti-leadership stand? I think the members of our side of the aisle are going to have to start remembering that we're down here to represent our constituents, and by God, we're entitled to vote the way we want to vote to best represent our constituents. Now I predict to the members on the other side of the aisle, that there will be very few votes forthcoming from this side of the aisle, when my good friend, Representative Maragos' Bill is called, or Representative Londrigan's, or Representative Schlickman, or Representative Juckett. I'm going to vote for this Bill because I campaigned on the theory that we should eliminate sales tax completely from food and drugs. I think it is a step in the right direction. But it seems to me that there are better Bills before this House, and despite the fact that this is being called a Republican Party Bill, I do not consider it a Republican Party Bill, the first time I knew that it was a Republican Party Bill, was when we went into conference this morning.



And, frankly, I'm a little tired of being told extofacto that a Bill is a party Bill. If the gentlemen from my side of the aisle and the leadership expect me to vote a party position, I would like to know in advance how I'm going to vote. I do not intend to vote in the dark like I did for the past two years. This is a new ball game, its the 78th General Assembly, and I'm going to vote to represent my constituents unless I am told in advance that we've taken a party position. Very frankly, I am please with the changes that were brought by the Speaker and the Minority Leader and Representative Katz and others, but I must say Mr. Speaker, and members of the leadership, that I dislike very much the fact that we seem to be resorting to a business as usual approach on members Bills. And that certain members are not getting fair treatment or being relegated to a secondary position in calling their Bills while a Bill has the preferred status because it happens to be sponsored by the leadership, is called first and passed out of this House. Now I will vote for the Bill, but I want my fellow members from the Democrat side of the aisle to know that I'm also support Representative Maragos' Bill which I consider a better Bill, and I will try and do everything I can to muster support for any Bill that is a better Bill regardless of which side of the aisle it is sponsored on. Thank you."

Telcser: The Gentlemen from Cook, Representative B. B. Wolfe."

Wolfe: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I hope the Democrats on this



heard that talke and paid a little attention to it because I think he hit the nail right on the head. We knew about it two days ago, when this Bill was tagged as a "Party bill". There's only two things in life that are certain. Death and taxes. Everybody is opposed to taxes. Everybody wants tax relief. Now I campaigned on tax relief, I campaigned on a reduction in the sales tax, how am I going back to my district and explain to my voters that this ia a cheater's Bill. What do I mean by that? You got a duel rate of taxes here on food and some prescription medicine. The real hard crux of the drugs and medicines that people buy everyday are not included in this Bill. You got a duel rate which means that the people enforcing the collection of the tax are going..are not going to classify many items as food, there not going to include many of the deductible items, the housewives and the people who shop every day are going to find a great difficulty in feeling the real effects of this Bill which is going to cost the State 114 million dollars. Now we know the sales tax is regressive. Why couldn't a very simple Bill been introduced in this House would have avoided all of these hangups give us the same relief and still reduce the sales tax across the board on every item, cost of living and other-wise give the people of the State of Illinois, the benefit of the reduction and gradully, the elimination and I hope of a regressive tax. Sure, I've got to vote for this Bill cause I can't explain these things to my people. I can't



explain to the votes why if I voted against it, I am voting against a Bill which reduces the tax on "food and medicine". But I hope that we will have the benefit of the other legislation before us, and that we will get joint support on Bills that call for the reduction of regressive taxes in a simple Bill and simple legislation."

Telcser: "The lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

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

Telcser: "The lady has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying Aye, all opposed, no. The motion prevails, and the gentlemen from Wills, Speaker Blair."

Blair: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this is not a party bill, this is a people bill, and the people would appreciate your support."

Telcser: "Question, shall House Bill 634 pass. All in favor signify by voting Aye, the opposed by voting No. The gentlemen from Union, Representative Choate."

Choate: "Mr. Speaker, so that there will be no misunderstanding from the public as to why one member on this side is not being cast as voting, I would like for the official journal to show that Representative Krause, although in attendance, up until just a few moments ago is now absent because of illness, and I would like to be recorded as voting present."

Telcser: "Record Representative Choate as voting present. Gentlemen from Cook, Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. In explaining my vote, I might say I appreciate the lady from



Lake having taken over responsibility for moving the previous question, I did want to speak on the Bill, but now I'll try to limit myself to the two minutes. We haven't had much chance to talk about the merits of these Bills, I think...I think we ought to, I think there are significant differences between 121 and 634. They may be differences that many members on the other side of the aisle have not been briefed on because I have a feeling that they have only heard one side of the argument. I was on the Revenue Committee, I listened to the arguments on 121 which clearly is a Bill that comes significantly before 634, there's not much question why 634 is out on this floor first, because the merits of the Bill were not listened to in Committee. It was a straight party line vote. Let me say just a little bit about the merits. Tax relief will not be more immediate under the Speaker's Bill. Under the ...a...the House Bill 121, tax withholding tables can be modified to reflect the additional credit when this...when they are modified, notice can be given to taxpayers immediately upon the promulgation of new withholding tables, that tax relief has been enacted by this General Assembly. They will see that relief at exactly the same time they would see relief under the Speaker's Bill. Second, who benefits? Higher income people spend more on food and medicines, they will get more tax relief under the Speaker's Bill than low income people under House Bill 121 every income group gets the same amount of tax relief, that helps



reduce the regressivity of the sales tax. Another point of comparison. Some people have said there will be more unclaimed relief under an income credit system. The information that we have received is that this is not so. That elderly people are already, elderly people who do not file income tax returns because their income is too low already reached through the circuit breaker systems, they will be reached for refunds as well. We have also been told that...a..."

Telcser: "You want to bring your remarks to a close, Representative?"

Lundy: "Alright, I will..I would have liked to have had a little more time. I think I have indicated there are real differences between these approaches. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, let the House act like a deliberative body, and debate the merits of the Bill for the good of the people in this State. Not simply pass out a Bill because its one party's Bill or another, but I think there are probably people on the other side of the aisle are amiable to that approach, we can do that if you vote present, you don't have to vote against this Bill. For those of you who have committed yourself, for voting for the Speaker's Bill, fine, vote for it, you don't have to vote for it today, it will not die..."

Telcser: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: " Mr. Speaker, I wondering if you could show on the journals that Representative McPartlin is absent because of



a sickness in his family. He just got called back home and record me as voting present."

Telcser: "Record Representative Shea as voting present."
Gentlemen from Bureau, Representative Barry."

Barry: "Present, please."

Telcser: Record Representative Barry as voting present."
McLendon, present. Thompson, present. Representative Katz, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Katz: "I wanted to be recorded as present for the reason so eloquently stated by my colleague from the 11th district."

Telcser: "Record Representative Katz as voting present. Leon.. Leon, present. Huskey, present. Sangmeister, present. Kozubowski, present. Getty, present. Hart, present. Sharp, present. Merlo, present. Jim Houlihan, present. Calvo, present. Fennessey, present. Craig, present. Holloway, present. Farley, present. Williams, present. Redman, present. Anyone else, Fary present. Representative Lundy, do you . . . a . . . well, the switch is still open, you're not voting yet. You can still vote. Record Representative Lundy as voting present. Record D. L. Houlihan as voting present. Terzich, present. Representative Davis?"

Davis: "My vote, Mr. Speaker,"

Telcser: "Proceed, sir, there's plenty of time, go right ahead."

Davis: "My distinguished friend in the back of me, whose learned in legislation and in law, said he was lookin for a deal. It seems to me that were not going to get anywhere if we don't get a deal from lookin at the board. I'm



bein practical now. Now, I'm gonna be the preacher. We want some tax relief. Listen to this, this is what I way in my church. While the lamp holds out the burn, the sinner may return. Let's open the doors of the church, the man has asked for deals, let's open the doors of the church and agree to put all of these Bills out. Come one, come all and I'm sure we'll give the people some tax relief. But if we tie it up here in an argument, it seems to me that we're not going to get anywhere. Now, in explaining the vote, I think we could change this thing and probably pass this Bill and all the rest of them, if there was an agreement that we would do just that and the people would be assured of some tax relief. I'm waiting for a deal like my friend out there and the door's open. Come here and shake my hand."

Telcser: "The gentlemen from Cook, Representative Mann, to explain his vote."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and members of the House, I obviously do not speak for the Governor on this particular Bill. But I don't think the Governor who won this election in this State without one single newspaper endorsement, is going to be a Governor who's going to rely on making deals and I know that I am not. I was not sent down here by the people of the 24th District to make deals. I will cast my vote and my conscience on any Bill that comes up before this floor, but it sickens me, and I don't want to sound self-righteous or sanctimonious, but it sickens me to hear



legislators who are sent here by their constituents to talk about deals. Either this Bill is a good Bill or its a bad Bill. Vote it up or vote it down. Vote your constituency, vote your hide, vote your soul, have the courage to vote yes or not. You can't vote present on a Bill like this. This is a Bill for tax relief in the State of Illinois, and either your for it or against it. Either your for regressive taxes or your against regressive taxes. And let's just say that a present vote is a no vote. And Mr. Speaker and members of the House, let's stand up like men and women and cast our votes on this Bill. I'm voting aye because its a good piece of legislation."

Telcser: "The gentlemen from Cook, Representative Washington to explain his vote."

Washington: "In a land where the deal is the thing, it amazes me that the gentlemen is sickened by a open-door deal. That's life sustenance in which this legislature is run, let's face it, and I think if I'm making any contribution to the legislative process, I am informing the people of the State of Illinois that the legislature moves on deals. I think my proposition was very simple and I should reiterate what it was. We have several good pieces of legislation in various stages of the process here in this House. We have other legislation which is being drafted. All the records of the proposition of the people of the State of Illinois should have some tax relief, you can't fight that. The situation is very political. We, on this side, know



from bitter experience, that unless a deal is made, the Governor is not going to give any choices in the matter. We feel that he should have several pieces of legislation from which to choose. Now, that's a clean deal. If you can't handle that deal, you can't handle any deal. I maintain that the Governor's a part of the legislative process. I'm not hoodwinked by the phrase, sales tax relief, I'm not even so certain, as Representative Lundy said, that this Bill can be administered to the people that its directed to. I'm not afraid of deals. Bob Mann. I'm amazed that you are and I don't want to be held up like the people in the region because I've said to the people of the State of Illinois that this is a place where deals are made."

Telcser: "The gentlemen from Cook, Representative Juckett."

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House.

It is true that several of us do have alternate proposals. Mine was to remove the sales tax from food and drugs completely. Representative Schlickman was to remove sales tax from drugs and medicine. Representative Maragos had an income tax credit. It is true that some of us are still being punished for previous digressions. And I'm saying that with a smile on my face. It is true that some Bills get held up because of politics, but I think it is beneath the dignity of each and every one of us, if we put that so far ahead of the welfare of the people. How can any one of you who have campaigned for the removal or the reduction of a sales tax, face any one of your people and try to



explain the intricacies of the General Assembly? You weren't sent down here to deal in politics. You weren't sent down here to do what was the best for yourself. I believe that you were sent down here to do the best job for the people for both your District and the State. Any while I don't think that this Bill goes far enough, while I do think that it will provide some problems, its a heck of a lot better than the straight 5%. At least we're making headway and I urge you to vote aye on this sales relief, this tax relief for the common ordinary guy. "

Telcser: "The gentlemen from Henry, Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Contrary to what the last speaker just did. I would like to explain my vote on this Bill. I heard the other day that the distinguished leader on the other side of the aisle said that Democrats, or excuse me, Republicans are smarter than Democrats, and I submit to you that looking at the past record on the complications involved in House Bill 634 that perhaps Republicans are beginning to be as smart as Democrats. Therefore, I support the Bill."

Telcser: "The gentlemen from Cook, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker and members of the House. To explain my vote, I'm sitting here very quietly and trying to study this piece of legislation. I'm not a lawyer, I'm not a tax man, I'm just average joe on the street. I see that this is offering some relief, and I say that very loosely, that some, I remember when the income tax came down the pike, we were told, and I was only a voter at that time, that the sales..



the tax on food and drugs would be removed when the income tax was instituted. It wasn't. It seems to me that there are better alternatives than what is being offered to us today. I would like to say that I think the Governor or any administrator should have more than one alternative offered to him that will ultimately become the law of the land, that will ultimately effect all of the people in this State. I don't see the provision in this Bill on the reduction on prescription drugs getting to the heart of the problem for poor people, going into the drugstore to buy medicine, because most of the money they spent, they've spent it on taxes on medicine, not prescription drugs. I think that we need some alternatives to study. I think Representative Maragos has one, and if I had my way, we would repeal the whole section dealing with taxes on drugs and food for everyone in this State. I'm waiting for that deal I heard offered here today. I haven't heard no reply to it. Until I do so, I will vote present."

Telcser: "Record the gentlemen as voting present. The gentlemen from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. We can end up standing here for another hour, another two hours, another three hours in explanation of votes and in waiting for somebody to end up saying something so that we can end up getting some more green lights up there. There has been much discussion here in terms of party position, in terms of submitting to his excellency, the



Governor, a great variety of Bills from which he can make a determination as to what may be best for the people. I suggest to you that as the elected representatives of the people, 177, in this chamber, we represent the thinking of the people in matters of this nature. I suggest to you that if in the measures that we send up to his excellency's desk, if he finds that they are not palatable to him, he can send them down on a amendatory veto. I suggest to you that if any roll call is to be carried from one end of this State to the other, it is going to be this roll call and its not going to be carried by an individual, but its going to be carried by every citizen in this State who is fed up with party bickering when it comes to tax relief for people, who are fed up with the regressive nature of this tax, who are fed up with, what at times, appears to be personality clashes and conflicts in this chamber. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, if we are to be true to what we campaigned for, if we are to be true in representing the constituents we were sent here to represent, this Bill will get the vote of every member in this legislature. I urge you to put those votes on, and Mr. Speaker, after this, if no one else is to speak, let us take the roll."

Telcser: "The gentlemen from Cook, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Am I recognized?"

Telcser: "Yes you are, sir."

Davis: "On a point of personal privilege."

Telcser: "State your point, sir."



Davis: "All of a sudden, when you mention deals, it seems to stink to the very high heavens. If it stinks now to the very high heavens, it should have smelled just as bad last week on the C.T.A. as it smells now. We were all involved in a deal, do you hear me? And I don't know much about law, but one of the things that I'm grateful for, I sat at the feet of a man in this House, I think one of the greatest constitutional lawyers in the country, and he comes from my distinguished friend's District, and his name was Noble Lee. He tells me that most of the laws in this country was brought about by deals. So the deals have been stinking a long time ago, I said I wanted to see the people get some kind of a tax relief, I didn't introduce any one of these Bills or any of them. But I'm willing to see, to help the people who make policy in here, let's get their heads together and let's come out here with some tax Bill rather than let it all get tied up like we had the C.T.A. tied up here and we had to pass it over the Governor's veto, and all that kind of stuff. I say get together and give the people some tax relief and not go into a big political argument like we have going in here now."

Telcser: "The gentlemen from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, and members of the House." Earlier today, we granted some some of relief on sales tax on purchases of vendible foods. It doesn't seem consistent with the roll call that's up on the board right now. With a roll call of 127 votes, of which I even cast an aye vote, on exempting the



sales tax on vended objects of food, that one the medium income people can afford, because certainly, poor people can't go and pay the premium prices of vended food. I just suggest that the trade union movement who endorsed many members who voted present, did not consider themselves, when they voted for these candidates last November, it is just bein on the ballot and therefore voting present on those candidates. Trade union men and women in Illinois voted for representatives because they said they were for tax relief, and especially tax relief in the area of a regressive sales tax on food and medicine. I just hope that those members who vote present, remember that when they look at their roll call as how labor judges how they have voted as a member of the General Assembly, and don't come around then and say 'Oh my God, I only got three flags, one flag, or I wasn't endorsed'. Now is the time when you seek your endorsement by labor on how you vote on an issue like this, when it takes guts, I'll say this much for Governor Walker, at least he had guts enough to veto, he didn't side step, he didn't waffle on the issue. At least he did something, but those of you who vote present, I wonder if the trade union movement, maybe next election, when you seek out help and support of working men and women, should maybe also just say present, to you."

Telcser: The gentlemen from Cook, Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I arise to explain my vote. I have several points



to make, but I want immediately to respond to the previous speaker who has apparently made some type of threat regarding labor. I want to say to the gentlemen that he is not the only one representing labor in this chamber. I want to say to him when he tells me about how many flags were going to get, I'm going to keep a little bit of the record, he doesn't always...he may represent labor, but he doesn't represent all labor. And when he says without anyone who's going to vote present, we can vote as we damned please and that doesn't mean that he can imply with an implied threat talkin about when we come around lookin for assistance. I represent a District where the people sent me down here prior to this election by the largest vote of all the 177 member body. I want to say that in political science, both in highschool and in college, I learned that politics was a concept of give and take. I want to say to you that that's what this thing is all about. Now just last week, just last week, if you please, one of the gentlemen who got up here and said that a deal smells to high heaven, and it sickened him, this very gentlemen brough up a proposition from the Governor, that said that if we voted for not to override, we would get three and one half million as a straight loan. Now if that's not a deal, I'd like to know what is. Let's cut out all of the shenanigans and talking about no deals are made. There's hardly a Bill that's voted on this floor in which a deal is not involved in one manner or another. Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that I think



Representative Washington got up here and in an open meeting, if you please, offered a proposition in which all of us could live with. One that doesn't smell, and I would repeat I think that all of these Bills, and I've read most of them should come to the floor and let's send them on to the Governor, or to the Senate and to the Governor and let him decide. I don't believe that I think the Speaker has usurped some power in..in..jumpin ahead of ...these...these Bills and I like the Speaker, but I don't think that it is fair for him to put his Bill and try to cram it down our throats, even though he may already have the 89 votes that he needs, I'm going to vote present, and I'm going to vote present in good conscience and when these other Bills come up I'm going to vote for them including this one."

Telcser: "Record the gentlemen as voting present. The gentlemen from Livingston, Representative Hunsicker."

Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. I'd like to explain my vote. I campaigned on the issue last year of no reductions in sales taxes and no elimination of sales tax on food and clothing, I would vote for taking the sales tax off of medicine and drugs. And this is the stand that I'm going to have to take. When you eliminate sales tax on food and clothing, reduce it, especially, if you eliminate it, you're giving thousands and thousands of people practically a free ride as far as paying anything towards the upkeep of their government is concerned,



whether it's at the State or the local level. They don't pay any income tax if they're poor people, personal property tax has been removed for them, and the only real estate tax they pay is what is included in their rent. Now if we need any tax relief, let's give the real estate owner a little break instead of somebody else all the time. These people will have the same privilege, these poor people of low income of going into a local election voting a bond issue on a property owner's back and sitting back and enjoying all the benefits of the community. And this goes for everything. They have children to educate the same as everybody else does and I think they should pay something toward the upkeep of their government in whatever shape it is and having campaigned on that issue and being elected by an overwhelming majority, I'm going to vote no, I'm not going to vote present."

Telcser: "Okay, the gentlemen from Mann, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Mann: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Telcser: "State your point, sir."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, my name was mentioned in debate.

I don't have a thin skin, I can certainly take it, and I hope that my colleagues can take it back. Now I really respect the gentlemen that spoke, Mr. Hunsicker, he voted no because he campaigned no. Now I'm asking the members of this House who campaigned yes to vote yes. Now as far as the deal is concerned, it was the Governor, himself, who



said that he wanted to be reasonable and he wanted to offer as a last moment compromise, a three million dollar loan, I didn't say it, I don't carry anybody's messages. I voted to sustain the Governor, because I thought he was right. I'm voting to sustain the Speaker, because I think he's right."

Telcser: "The gentlemen from Cook, Representative Douglas."

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, and members of the House. Even though this is my third year in this House, I must confess that I'm throughly confused at this point about the hypocritical and complicated nature of what everybody is saying. I think that the people of Illinois should know that is what is going on on the floor of this House right now, is not as simply as some of us would like to believe, fulfilling campaign promises of voting for or against something, but of course, there's a deal and there are deals going on. Now I want to be part of the deal too. I don't...I'm...I'm going to put on...I'm going to put on my green light as part of the following deal. I may change my mind if you don't stop makin so much noise. I facing right to the Republican side and I'm saying that if my Republican friends who are voting yes on this Bill, because, as they say, they're fulfilling their campaign promises. If they really mean it, then I want to see what other Bills similar to this one come up, that there going to continue to fulfill their campaign promises and not participate in fooling the people of Illinois. Now, I'm voting yes on this, having



no idea what deals have been made to get the 89 votes up there, but I'm voting yes because I assume that all of those people who sanctimoniously said that they believe in fulfilling their campaign promises, better do the same thing whether the Bills are sponsored by Maragos, or Juckett, or whether they are the Governor's Bills. I want to see the hypocrisy thrown out the window."

Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record."

On this question there are 114 ayes, one nay, and this to having received a constitutional majority, Hirschfeld aye, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mann, for what purpose do you rise?"

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I move that the House Bill 634 was passed be reconsidered." The

Telcser: "The gentlemen from Winnebago, Representative Simms."

W. T. Simms: "Mr. Speaker, I move that it lie upon the table."

Telcser: "For the gentleman that moved it lie upon the table, all signal by saying aye, the opposed no, the gentleman's motion prevails. Now Representative Boyle's for what purpose do you rise, sir?:"

Boyle: "Mr. Speaker, I would, as they say, I was caught at the switch and I would ask leave to be shown as aye."

Telcser: "Record Representative Boyle as voting aye. Representative Matijevec, Representative Matijevec, for what purpose do you rise?"

Matijevec: I want to make a point of order, I think with all those present votes and all the aye votes, there are over



177."

Telcser: "Representative Tipsword, for what purpose do you rise sir?"

Tipsword: "Inask, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the same privilege Representative Boyle's just asked for to be recorded voting aye."

Telcser: "There are no objections, record the gentlemen as voting aye. Yourell, aye. Bradley, aye. Alsup, aye. Representative Juckett, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of parliamentary inquiry. It is my understanding that a, wasn't it locked up?"

Telcser: "Yes, we moved to reconsider it and the motion was tabled."

Juckett: "Can a vote be added afterwards?"

Telcser: "If there are no objections and it is not altering the outcome of the vote." Taylor, aye. Now if we can save some time, if there are no objections, if the gentlemen who wish to be voted ...alright are there objections to a new roll call? Are there objections? Alright there are some objections. Representative Walsh for what purpose do you rise?"

Walsh: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we can have a new roll call, since there was a motion to reconsider, and that motion was tabled."

Telcser: "The clerk says we don't need one, he can get... Representative Choate, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"



Choate: "I just wanted to know if I was still recorded as voting 'present'?"

Telcser: "How is the gentleman recorded?"

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

Telcser: "Your recorded as voting 'present'."

Choate: "Leave it that way."

Telcser: "How is Representative Maragoes recorded?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "He's recorded as voting 'present.'"

Telcser: "Your recorded as voting 'present'." Is that the way you wish to have it remain? Representative Jones. 'Present'? Record Representative Emil Jones as voting 'present'. Representative Davis, for what purpose do you rise?"

Davis: "I know I didn't vote at all and I stepped out before the Roll. Now just a minute. I didn't vote at all so I want to be recorded like I'm going to vote on all of them. I want to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Telcser: "VonBoeckman, 'aye'. Brinkmeier, 'aye'. Getty, 'aye'. Thompson, 'aye'. All right now wait a second. There are objections being heard now to ah... getting on the Roll Call. How is Representative Berry recorded on there? Leave him the way he is. Representative Bradley, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of order."

Telcser: "State your point, Sir."



Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, ah... House Bill 634 was the last Bill on Third Reading. And according to the rules, we would move on down the calendar. And appearing on the calendar on the order of business in motions is a motion that I put House, ah... to discharge committee, on House Bill 146. I filed that motion on March 21st. Now the Elections Committee has notified me that as of March 27th, they tabled that Bill so the motion to discharge committee was not a proper motion. And I have filed with the Clerk the proper motion under Rule 33, asking that that Bill be taken from the table. And under Rule 33, part 'C', it says that if no written motion is made within those two days and supported by a majority of the Members the Bill shall be considered as finally tabled and stricken. Now I am assuming that we are on the two day period ending today and so my point, Mr. Speaker, is that I would like to have the next piece of business before the Assembly be the motion under House Rule 33 to take from the table House Bill 146. Because of the time limit, today being the last day or else the Bill is forever lost."

Telcser: "All right now, wait.... we'll get down to your matter, Mr. Bradley in just a minute. I want to I'm on Third Reading and I'd like to get these Senate Bills, third. They expire then there are Bills here on postponed, they expire today, then I'll get each one of your motions, if that's all right. The gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."



Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, I hope the Clerk can get about 150 copies of the last Roll Call, in case the Governor decides to fly around the state. I'd be very happy if he would drop a few off in the 33rd District and for those who voted for the C.T.A. if you'd leave a little around for those bus drivers around the city."

W. Robert Blair: "Senate Bills, Third Reading."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 39, Telcser. "An Act to implement the Constitution of 1970 in relation to the Office of the President of the Senate, by amending certain acts therein name. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Telcser: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, the Members I'm sure recall that Senate Bills 39 through 46 were on the consent calendar and they were objected to and brought back to the order of Third Reading. I wonder that in an effort to save time today, ah.... if there would be any objections to hearing all of the Bills in this series?"

W. Robert Blair: "All right, are there any objection?" Objection has been heard."

Telcser: "Ok, Senate Bill 39, then?"

W. Robert Blair: "O'kay."

Telcser: "On Senate Bill 39 ah... is a Senate Housekeeping Bill, which implements the 1970 Constitution. It strikes the word 'protemporary' from the statutory references to the



President of the Senate and it deals with his relationship to Commission appointment. The Bill deals with Commission appointments and a variety of commissions such as the Commission on Children, Commission on Status of Women, ah...The Spanish Speaking People Study Commission, etc., and merely gives the power to appoint to those commissions to the President of the Senate, rather than to the President Pro tem, who received those powers in the old Constitution. It has a joint sponsorship of the Senate Leadership on both sides of the aisle and I would appreciate your support."

W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "I just wanted to say, Mr. Speaker, that they way they manipulate things behind the scenes over in the Senate, they would have been better off to rename him 'The Wizard of Oz.'"

W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? All right, the question is shall Senate Bill #39 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed, 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Kempiners, 'aye'. Borchers, 'aye'. Brinkmeier, 'aye'. McLendon, 'aye'. Jim Houlahan, 'aye'. All right, take the record. On this question there are 143 'ayes', 148 'ayes', no 'nays', and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 40, Telcser. An Act to authorize attendance at National Conference of Legislative Leaders. Third Reading of the Bill."



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

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 40 guarentees that all of the Senate and the House Leaders can legally attend the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, representing Illinois."

W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Hart: "How many leaders are there in the Senate?"

Telcser: "I'm not quite sure, Representative Hart, but on of these Bill's allows them to appoint on more. They are anxiously awaiting that appointment. My guess would be three or perhaps four on each side of the aisle. I really don't know."

Hart: "Four on each side of the aisle. That's over 10% of the Membership on each side of the aisle will be receiving Leadership pay then, is that correct?"

Telcser: "Well, if my guess is correct. If you give me a moment, I'll look..... Yes, I guess there would be four Republican Leaders and three Democate Leaders. And the Senate President."

Hart: "In effect the Senate is adding a Member to the Leadership, is that right? On the majority side?"

Telcser: "That's included in the one that they are adding."

Hart: "How many did they have last Session?"

Telcser: "Last Session with the Lieutenat Governor acting as



a presiding officer who I would not include in the Senate Leadership, that would have been three and three, six. Now they want to add Stan Weaver to make it seven which gives the majority side the extra leadership position since the President will now be the presiding officer."

Hart: "Did they clear that with the House Leadership before they decided that?"

Telcser: "I really can't answer that question, Representative Hart. I really don't know."

Hart: "All right, thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Walters."

Walters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

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

Walters: "All right, how much money are we talking about on this Bill?"

Telcser: "Well, I could take a..... there's no fiscal note filed, but at the last Leadership Conference which I attended, if I remember correctly, the voucher for ah... my expenses was \$400 or \$405."

Walters: "You said that there was no fiscal note filed. I wonder why?"

Telcser: "Well, no one requested it, so I didn't file it, Bob."

Walters: "In other words, we're going to vote on something that we don't have any idea what it's going to cost, Art?"

Telcser: "Well, I think if you take a ball-park figure of \$500



times 7 leaders, if they should all attend, it should be about \$3500."

Walters: "This includes only the Senate?"

Telcser: "No, this is the House and the Senate. If all 7 Senate Members attend, you could multiply it roughly by 500. If in the House, only the leaders attend, it would be ah... the multiplier times 500. And that would be a.... depending upon where the Conference is.... the air fare varies maybe \$20 or \$25, to get one place to another."

Walters: "Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Berry."

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

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

Berry: "Art, is this the series of Bills that we are holding hostage until we find out what we're going to do about our Secretary's pay?"

Telcser: "I don't know, are we holding Bills hostage?"

Berry: "Yes, I think we are. I believe this is.....Is this the series?"

Telcser: "Well, this was the series that was taken off the calendar when there was some question put ah.... I don't know that they were in hostage really ah..., Representative Berry."

Berry: "Thank you very much."

W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question is shall this Bill pass. All those in favor vote 'aye' and the opposed, 'no'."



Shea, 'aye'. Brinkmeier, 'aye'. All right, have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 116 'ayes' and no 'nays' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 41, Telcser. An Act to amend Section 2 of the Space Needs Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, this Senate Bill 41 amends the Space Needs Act of 1967 and it removes the reference to the Senate Chambers Maintenance Commission and it provides for the appointment of seven Senate Members, four by the President and three by the Minority Leader. And it also provides for the appointment of seven House Members, four by the Speaker, and three by the Minority Leader to the Space Needs Commission. This is the substance of the Bill, and I'd appreciate a favorable vote."

W. Robert Blair: "All right, any discussion? Mr. Shea."

Shea: "How is it set up now?"

Telcser: "Presently, Jerry, the Senate Delegation of ah.... to the Senate Space Needs Commission consists of five Members of the Senate Chambers Maintenance Commission and two others appointed by the Pro Tem. And what we're doing is deleting the reference....."

Shea: "In other words, they're gonna be all appointed Members



and so many of the Senate Operations Committee, is that right?"

Telcser: "Right."

W. Robert Blair: "Question is shall Senate Bill 41 pass. All those in favor vote 'aye', the opposed, 'no'. Take the record. On this question there are 139 'ayes' 2 'nays' and this Bill having received a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 42, Telcser. An Act to amend
....."

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

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 42 amends the Operations Commission, Section of the law, which relates to the operation of the General Assembly. It changes the language from President Pro tem, to the President of the Senate as a Member. It adds one Assistant Majority Leader to bring the total to three. It adds one Member of the Senate appointed by the Member. And repeals the requirement that the Chairman of Committee on Committees and Senate Operation Committee be Members. And I ask for the Commission responsibility to the Senate Chambers, Senate Offices, Committee Rooms, and all of the rooms and physical facilities that which are used by the Senate. I'd appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."



Hart: "This is the one that gives the Senate the authority to set the salaries of their secretaries and their pages and their ah... maintenance people, is that right?"

Telcser: "I would say yes, I don't have the factual information. My guess, as yours, would be yes, this would be the one."

Hart: "All right. Now it is true, even though we've had these Bills held all this time that the Senate Secretaries, for example, receive more than the House Secretaries. Is that correct?"

Telcser: "Yes, it is."

Hart: "And what is the difference?"

Telcser: "Well, bases on the proposals that were passed on our desk, we've closed that gap, as I understand it, and I think it might be about \$100, if I'm not mistaken. I really don't know what they get paid in the Senate."

Hart: "What about the Pages? Do they get more over there than our Pages get?"

Telcser: "I don't have any idea, Representative Hart."

Hart: "Well, I think that they do and what about the janitorial help? Do they get more over in the Senate than our janitorial help?"

Telcser: "I'm sorry, I don't know."

Hart: "And our Doorkeeper?"

Telcser: "Can't answer that."

Hart: "Well, I think that these our questions that are legitimate. And I think that they are things that ought to be answered. I don't see any reason why we should give lip



service or votes or any other thing to creating an unequal situation between the two sides of the rotunda. As far as I'm concerned, every Member here is equal to any Member over there. As far as I'm concerned any employee of the House of Representatives is entitled to as much as any employee of the Senate. In fact, our Secretaries, for instance, work for three Representatives generally speaking, where their Secretaries only work for two. Any Secretary can tell you that it's a much harder job, to work for three bosses than it is for two. Our Pages are here just as long as the Senate Pages are and maybe longer. Our Janitorial help is here and does just as much work as the Senate's does. Our Doorkeeper's are here and work just as hard on the job as the Senate Doorkeepers. And I'm not going to vote for any legislation to continue that kind of a practice. I think that that kind of thing spills over to the whole operation. I don't intend to be, in any way, a lesser body than the Senate."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. This subject was approached the first time these series of Bills were considered on the House floor. And the disparity described by the gentleman on the other side of the aisle was brought to everyone's attention, and those concerned with this subject and those who have the authorization to correct it. Now today we have presented to us under the date of March 29th, the recommendation to adjust



this, after having this brought to all of our attention. We find that the disparity that Representative Hart was questioning about still leaves us almost an excess of \$100 between the Senate operation and the House. Now while going over these series of Bill, I find no fault with the Senate operations and recommendations therein. However, I do take issue with the approach taken by the leadership in this House as to the equity of the staff that we have. Now I have been working with many of the Members on this House floor for the last three of four weeks trying to come up with a comprehensive approach to rectify this. And many of the House Members here have contacted me and we've discussed it at length. But even so, those vested with the authority to make this correction, those who should have been comprehensive in their approach to straightening this out, prior to putting something like this on our desk, did not..... I repeat, did not take into consideration the fact that a slight... a token increase is not exactly what's going to be the answer to this problem. Now I recommend to every Member on this House floor and specifically to the gentleman on the other side of the aisle, your staff on the other side does not have any possibility of getting anything more than what is stipulated on this piece of sheet. Unfortunately for you, you do not have the prerogative of having Committee Clerks, where they could be up-graded to a higher salary. And I think that we have to realize the worth of these people. These gals over



here are under a mandate that while the Legislature is in Session, they will be here. If we're here 12 hours, by God, they've got to be here 12 hours. And I think that if we are going to expect quality work on the other side and be supported by our staff on the other side, that we're going to have to get up and say something in their defense and make sure that this gap is eliminated, that they are compensated for the work load that they have, and that they are given equal consideration. I cannot look at a provision like this and.... that mandates... and I am one, no person shall receive more than one pay raise per 12 month period, no raises may be received arbitrarily without working a 12 month period. Gentleman, State Employees have excess to better raises. They have excess to cost of living raises. What are we doing? Putting our Secretaries in a second class categorization? I ask you at this time here, to consider this in light of the fact, that the Senate has good proposals, we're not objecting to this, but bring our staff up to a level equality. Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question is shall Senat Bill 42 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed, 'no'. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I'd like to say your learning the first thing about separate but equal. I say to you that the Senate has always taken care of it's personnel, and I dare say to you that had it been a Member of the Senate that lost a staff member, they would have



sent the Sargeant of Arms over here forthwith, demanded their return, and gotten an apology. We're just beginning to learn about unequal we really are and when the Senate gets down to our Bills we shuffle over there, I suggest the members of the House will really learn how unequal they are. I think that the only time you're are going to stand up to anybody, and assert your rights, is if you stand on your own hind leg and let's say let's have it equal or not at all, and I would suggest that everybody vote no."

W. Robert Blair: "The gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House.

I couldn't agree more with what Representative's Hart, Hoffman, and Ewell feel in their hearts about the...the differences between the pay scale between the House and the Senate and the normal on going competitive feeling between the two chambers. First of all, today is the last day in which we can pass this Bill, which really is not all that significant, but if we're going to let ourselves at this point in the session, get into a situation where we are going to have retribution against Senate Bills and the Senate starts doing it against the House Bills, that would be a ludacrist situation. Now, we're going to try and solve the problem of desparity on pay scales for secretarial and other help between the House and the Senate. That I can assure you, but all of us are adults, we're here



to solve the problems of the State and to take something out on a very, very non-substantive Bill is only going to cause us to fight and scrap, we now in the end of the session and the ones who are going to suffer will be the people in our Districts, and perhaps ourselves, at the polls. So, again, I assure each and every one of you that I will do everything possible to see to it that our people are paid just as much as the people in the Senate, if not more, but I implore you not to take it out on a Bill such as this."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentlemen from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House. Equal pay for equal work is what we're all after. We don't need an equal rights amendment to apply it in this situation, and if we talk about the unfair procedures that have happened in the past history as long as I've been a member here, I recall when Representative Choate and myself had Bills last session that were tabled by the Senate, but the House didn't do those things to the Senate members, and other members of this body had Bills, hundreds of Bills that were tabled helter skelter for no apparent reason outside that it was done. Now, I think that the Senate has been forwarned long enough on this problem of equal pay for it. I'm not against anyone getting as much money as they can for their labor, but believe me, its very unfair to see a secretary working for \$550 a month, working for three members, and compare that to a \$790 a month



secretary for the Senate, that's clipping newspaper articles and haven't even got the answerability to the amount of members that our secretaries' have, and if it takes the defeat of these Bills, if it takes the defeat of many Senate Bills, so be it. Let them learn that we want an accountability and the equal pay for equal work in this General Assembly and that we're all one General Assembly, not just the Senate and not just the House."

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

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House. Unfortunately, this is the last day, as Representative Telcser said for these Bills on the calendar according to the new rules which we have adopted, and there's been much dialogue contrary to some of the remarks that have been made. There has been much dialogue between the leadership of the Senate and House as far as the staffing is concerned. I would say that the Senate has, as far as the girls are concerned, has said that this is a six month's job, as far as those girls are concerned, and that if they stay on after the six month's, that the salary will be adjusted to where it will be compatible with what the secretaries in the House are getting. Now the House secretaries is a full year's job, as you well know. And if you look at it from a year's time rather than just the six month's time, you'll find that these girls are not in as bad a condition with the raise as they were prior to the dialogue that started between the leadership.



I believe, I believe that the Senate has got a message. No one has stood up stronger against the activities in certain instances as Representative Hanahan has just said than I have in the past with the Senate. But I'm going to take them, I'm going to take them at their word, I'm going to take their word that they are going to erase and eradicate the differences between House and Senate employees. I'm going to take them at their word that their going to correct the situation that has existed in the past, much greater than it does today. And I'm going to take them at their word, that they're going to correct the situation that does exist today. I'm going to vote aye."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, members of the House. I would have to agree with all of our colleagues that talked about the despairity between the Senate and the House members. However, I feel that we should attach each Bill on its merit. Now if we have to set up a conference committee as we do with other Bills, or work it through the House-keeping Committee of the House and the Senate or through the leadership, how ever we have to work it out, I think that's the way for us to work it out and I think its not in good taste for us to take a simple Bill and vote against it on the last day to vote it out and then we can resolve this problem in a civil-like manner, and if we don't, we can still take care of the problem after that. I urge everybody to vote aye."



W. Robert Blair: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I along with the rest of the leadership, have talked with the Senate about this and I'm sure that the inequities will be changed and that we will get this thing straightened out, and I'd ask my colleagues if they wouldn't please vote green on this Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "Now let's see. The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Juckett."

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House.

I think it's more than just the inequities between the Senate and the House. That is one of the matters. Another one of the matters is the inequity between that of the House, my secretary, as well as yours, receives \$550. The secretary to man the, who clerk a committee and work only for one man, receives about \$700. That's an inequity that must be corrected. And before the vote was taken, I was going to ask what were the secretaries of the leadership. My understanding is that the secretary to the majority leader gets almost \$900 a month working for one man. Where our girls get \$550 working for three men, and our girls work, at least mine does, she's in there about eight and she spends plenty nights working until 11 or 11:30 and on weekends. That's an inequity that I think has to be corrected. And I don't know what the secretaries for the Speaker get or some of the other people. But with those kind of inequities, how can you expect our girls to



the job and continue to do the great job that they're doing when they can see people who are doing half of the work that they're doing and getting almost twice as much pay for what they're doing? That's an inequity, that's what its all about and its not a question of whether we lower ours, raise ours, so that we get them on a par. I don't see how any of you can face your girls knowing the long hours they are working and realizing they are getting a crumb, a virtual crumb, compared to what the leadership secretaries are getting, compared to what the clerks who are clerking a committee and working four hours during the regular time of the day are getting, and then only secretarying for one man. That's the issue, let's equalize them, let's put it on the basis of the time that they are working, not that they're working for the majority leader or the Speaker, but that they are working for a representative. That's the point, that's the job. Let's look at the whole pay schedule and not just complain about the Senate. The Senate is one part, yes; but so is the House, and I think we ought to hold it up until we get all the figures. Let's have the Senate roll theirs back or let's have the House raise theirs. Let's have the House leadership say we're wrong, we shouldn't pay our girls \$900 a month when they are working just for one man and you are right, this girl is underpaid and over worked. Let's hold it off. Let's get the arrangement or the agreement or the schedule agreed to and then let's vote on



it. I think we can make an exception to the rules. We can waive the day, we can put it over until next week, but I think if we pass it today, our girls are going to be right where they were before and there's not going to be any difference in the leadership, there's not going to be any difference in the clerk, etc. Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."
Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. The previous speaker certainly has a nice way of going about things. The secretary to the majority leader, contrary to what he may think, does have a considerable amount of work. The majority leader, as I have found out unfortunately, receives mail from throughout the State on a variety of subjects, and it has been our feeling that our correspondence has been responded to, so believe me while your girl is working for three people, the majority leader's secretary is working for 59 districts. So she is kept, indeed, busy. I might suggest to you also, that the secretary to the majority leader has been in State government for more years than your secretary probably has been alive. And I would point out to you also that the salary schedule as adopted by the leadership does provide for step allowances, and I am sure that when your girl, the secretary that you have, has been here as long as the secretary to the majority leader, she will be making far more money than the secretary to the majority leader. I suggest to you that we will and we are carrying on



negotiations with the Senate and as the minority leader pointed out, the girls working for the Senate will be working there until June 30, at which time they may continue, or they may not, but if they do, the salaries will be renegotiated and the salaries for the people working for House members will be identical of people working for Senate members and I solicit your support."

W. Robert Blair: "The Clerk will take the record." The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe."

Wolfe: "I just wanted to briefly explain my vote, but you've already taken the roll call."

W. Robert Blair: "That's alright, go ahead."

Wolfe: "If you had permitted me to explain my vote, I would have said that in support of the secretaries in the leadership on our side of the aisle, who work long and strenuous hours and deserve whatever they get, I don't think that our vote in support of this Bill is related to the differences of the secretaries who are working for leadership and the secretaries who are working for members of the House."

W. Robert Blair: "In this question, there are 120 ayes and 29 nays, and this Bill having received a constitutional majority is declared passed."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 43. Telcser. An Act to repeal "An Act creating the Senate Chamber Maintenance Commission, and so forth, the third reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Telcser."



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

Senate Bill 43 repeals the Act which created Senate Chamber Maintenance Commission and the Commission's duties are transferred to the Senate Operations Commission under Senate Bill 42. I would appreciate a favorable vote."

W. Robert Blair: "Discussion. The question is Shall Senate Bill 43 pass? All those in favor vote aye, any oppose, no. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. McCormick, aye. Taylor, aye and Walters, aye. On this question, there are 140 ayes and 2 nays. This Bill having received a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 44. Telcser."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House.

This Bill amends the State Finance Act to permit the President of the Senate to certify and approve vouchers for the expenditures of funds for the operations of the State Senate. On the Department law, the Senate Operations Commissions approves and certifies the vouchers of these operations. I would appreciate a favorable vote."

W. Robert Blair: "Discussion. The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Richard Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. I think those of us who were concerned about despairity in pay scales, etc. as is indicated by the discussion of the other Bills were probably voting no on the wrong Bills. I think that this is the Bill to oppose and I would just



like to point out to the membership that this is the Bill that would eliminate the Senate Operations Commission and put the President of the Senate in exactly the same position as our Speaker with regard to approval of vouchers of Senate employees. I was one of those who supported an Amendment to our rules which would have created a House Operations Commission similar to that which has always existed in the Senate. Because I think that its more than just one man who has authority over hiring and firing and approving of the vouchers. I think the procedure which did exist in the Senate and as a matter of fact, was ratified by them when they adopted the rules, that is, the establishment of a Senate Operations Committee to be concerned with those day to day operating problems, is the best procedure. And I would hope that we would defeat this Bill and that the House in time would go along with what has been the practice of the Senate and establish a House Operations Committee to be in control in charge of all House employees. And just one further thing...a...in response to the gentlemen who objected to the salary being paid to the majority leader's secretary. Let me say this, that knowing the majority leader as I do there is just no way you can pay anyone who works for him enough money. And further if you knew how hard it was for him to get anyone to take the job, you wouldn't object to whatever Virginia's being paid. I would hope that you would oppose this Bill."



W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the question is Shall Senate Bill 44 pass? All those in favor vote aye and the opposed no. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. There are 101 ayes, 24 nays. This Bill, having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 45. Telcser. An Act relating to the operations of the General Assembly, third reading."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 45 amends an Act relating to the operations of the Senate and changes its title of President Pro Tem to the President and provides that the Governor shall convene the Senate in the odd number of years and I would appreciate your favorable vote."

W. Robert Blair: "The question..the question is Shall Senate Bill 45 pass. All those in favor vote aye all oppose vote no. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 131 ayes, 1 nay, and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 46. Telcser. An Act to amend Section 1 of An Act to provide for and fix the compensation and emoluments of members of the General Assembly, third reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 46 allows the President of the Senate and



the new third assistant majority leader to get paid for their services and Senator Weaver would appreciate a vote."

W. Robert Blair: "Discussion. The question is Shall Senate Bill 46 pass. All in favor vote aye, any opposed vote no. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this questions, there are 126 ayes and 5 nays and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Now, we've got about five items that will expire today unless they are attended to. I think they are all involved with Mr. Borchers. Do you desire to go to your Bill on third reading first or to the Bills on postponed and have them brough back?"

Borchers: "Let's have the Bill on postponed. "

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, we'll go to the order of postpone consideration and the Clerk will read those Bills that expire. Oh, they've already been read. Alright. House Bill 40. "

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, with permission of the House, I would like to make a package of House Bill 40, 41, 42, cause actually there all the same in relation to farmers. "

W. Robert Blair: "Now, wait a minute. Alright, 42 doesn't expire today, but its in order there so I ..

Borchers: "We might as well do it all together."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, Webber." The gentlemen is asking for leave to have House Bills 40, 41, 42 heard together and hearing no objection and those Bills having been read and those Bills now having been placed on third reading



for consideration on that order the Chair recognizes the Gentlemen from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Chairman, fellow members of the House. Perhaps I have approached some of this in the wrong way and some of you from the Chicago area do not understand. There is no, there is no attempt to limit the power of the E.P.A or destroy it. All three of these Bills are to protect our farmers and protect their right against discrimination in relation to the surrounding States, for example, Iowa, Wisconsin, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan. States that are similar to our own in raising of grain, livestock and the handling of grain, such as elevators. All of these Bills do just one thing, make it impossible for one of our agencies of government to make tougher rules that would discriminate against these various farming interests than the federal government. They can only make rules equal to the rules that the federal government will lay down which will be on all states. Therefore, I would like to have your support on these Bills. You are protecting our farmers and I assure you, many of them are very worried about what is happening in this State."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe."

Wolfe: "Doesn't sound right to me, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen. I was at a Cook County farm meeting last night the dinner, you know, and they said they opposed these Bills."

W. Robert Blair: "Okay, you want to close, Mr. Borchers?"



Borchers: "I'm amazed at the Cook was affected. I didn't have any Cook County Farm Bureau up there. But I can assure you that the Better Farm Bureau downstate is for the Bills."

W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question is shall these three Bills pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. The Clerk will take three Roll Calls. Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, in the way of explaining my vote, let me say that the farmers in my area, are certainly in support of this ah...legislation, all three of the Bills. Let me say that we quite often hear speeches down here in regards to protection for those ah... laboring people in the State of Illinois. For industry, let's do something for the big industry in the State of Illinois, the agriculture industry. Let's have some 'yes' votes for this."

W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Just one last word of appeal. This is not a anti E.P.A., it merely protects our farmers. I repeat, our people our worried about having tougher laws and rules put on them than the surrounding states. They can live with the federal regulations, they may not be able to live with the state. I assure you that from letters and from knowledge, that if the present proposed rules on ah... grain elevators goes into effect, we will loose half of the grain elevators in the State of Illinos. We can't carry the expenses involved. I implore you to give us a



vote."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I'm very disappointed that there isn't more 'green' lights up there. I know that all you folks have heard about the high prices of meat and ah... food prices. If these Bills are not passed and if the farmers continue to be harassed as they have been, you haven't seen anything yet on what your going to see on high prices. Under the today, 90% of our feed lots could be closed under the present ruling of the E.P.A. And ah... just stop and think what this could mean if all of these livestock and feeding lots were closed. Now there isn't any of us that are against clean water and pollution control and so forth, but it's going to take time and the farmers are going to have to take time to do it. Now if we push him to where he goes back to organic farming, where he raises 50 bushel corn instead of this last year, 118 bushel, there's nothing else to come about but probably 50,000,000 people in this country are going to starve. Besides there won't be ah... the prices are nothing to what they will be. We could see, even though prices high right now, I venture to say that we could see these prices doubled. So I think that this is a Bill for the people of the State of Illinois and should be supported."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I don't come from a county that has an inordinate amount of



farming. I don't have farmers beating on me in support of this measure. But I think the people in my district and the people in ah... the part of DuPage County that I represent would agree with me, that if our farmers are prohibited from doing the job that they are trying to do in feeding our people throughout this state, we can end up in a bad situation. And I think that our farmers have to be understood that they have to be helped. Wherein so far as humanly possible. I don't think they have to be helped at the expense of ruining our environment, not do I believe that that is what Representative Borchers is asking us to do, in supporting his Bill. What he's asking us to do is to keep this agency from passing laws that out 'big brother', our 'big brother' government in Washington. Not to exceed those things that are already being done, which seems to be sufficient to do the job to protect our environment, and at the same time let the farmer do his job so that our people can be fed. I think it's reasonable, I think it's fair, and I think it's a series of Bills here that any of us could support and I am proud to vote a 'green' light on the measures."

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

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Lord knows that I don't even think I got a victory garden in my district, much less a farm, but I'm not worried about these Bills because in the City of Chicago we have our own air pollution department and also the County of Cook has one."



And so they are able to make regulations to control whatever problems we might have from grain elevators. But I don't think the problems that we have in the Metropolitan area are the same in a county of 5 or 10 thousand people, and I don't think the same regulations have to apply. And so I'm supporting these Bills. I don't think probably it will do much good because it appears that we are trying to attack E.P.A., but in the Metropolitan areas that do have their own pollution control bureaus, I think there is sufficient safe guards and standards."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I don't get up here very often, but when I do I know it's a serious situation and something has to be done. Under the rules that your setting up now to operate farming under, you will loose about 50% of your production in the State of Illinois if they go through. This is no joke. People know that. These farmers are up in the air about it. Everytime I go home, they say: 'What are you going to do.' I said that we could go along with what the Federal Government sets up, I think maybe we could make it, but something has to be done. Give us some 'green' lights and give us a chance to produce some food for you people. This is gonna raise the devil with us out there, I ask for a 'green' light."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell."



Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I just want you to know, that I hear the farmers crying and I'm going to respond."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Well, I guess coming from an area up north, that as somebody said, I haven't go a farm in my district, and I've talked to some of my colleagues and they tell me that it's something they need to protect their farmers in their districts, so I'm going to change my vote from 'red' to 'green'."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, a little earlier in the day, we accommodated Cook County with one of their problems and allowed them to save some money for the taxpayers by collecting taxes four times a year. I plead with some of the gentlemen and the compassionate people in Cook County to consider the fight of the farmer and the downstater and to put a 'green' light on there. Thank you."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Marion, Mr. Stedelin."

Stedelin: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I'm a little amazed at this. There is nothin in this Bill that contaminates anything. This is a good Bill. It follows the federal standards. The farmer needs it bad. Now is you folks would have heard me catching hell over the radio, Don Brummet and I catching hell over the radio, last Monday or last Saturday, because we stood up and stayed with the C.P.A., you would sure in the world say: 'God Bless you, I don't see how you took it.' Jim Holloway is another one,



and you would vote for this Bill. There is nothing wrong with this Bill. Let's keep red meat on our table. And this is one way to keep red meat on the table. Give us a 'green' light."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I believe we're three votes away from really doing something significant for the farmers. I come from a district that is loaded with the great people that feed this state, and the nation, and the world. For heaven's sake, give us those three votes."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I was not going to speak on this issue, I was just going to vote 'yes', because I owe Mr. Borchers a lot of thanks from yesterday, so you get a 'green' vote from me. Thank you."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Tasewall, Mr. VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I see we have enough 'green' lights on there, but I just want to make a few comments. The surrounding states have lead their stingent rules and we in Illinois, and I feel like this is a good piece of legislation that if we have all the states abide by one federal rule, that as an industrial and agricultural state, as the State of Illinois, we'll be able to ah.. progress futher. Thank you."

K. Miller: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Roll. Just a moment before I announce the Roll. The gentleman from



Cook, Mr. Jaffe, has sought recognition."

Jaffe: "At the appropriate time, I would like varification of the affirmative Roll Call."

K. Miller: "On this question there are 94 'ayes' and 51 'nays' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Now Mr. Jaffe.... the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe, do you wish to renew your motion?"

Jaffe: "Yes, I wish to renew my motion, Mr. Speaker, and I wish to ah... ask for the varification of the Affirmative Roll Call."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe requested, before I announced the Roll Call that he did desire for varification. In fairness to the gentleman, we will now give him that right for varification of the Affirmative Roll. Now first, the gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers is recognized."

Borchers: "I request a Roll Call of absentees. A Poll if the absentees."

K. Miller: "That is your prerogative. Will the Clerk pull the absentees?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Barnes, Bluthardt, Boyle, Caldwell, Calvo, Carter, Collins, Duff, Granata,"

K. Miller: "Barnes, aye on this Roll Call."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Griesheimer, Gene Hoffman, Hyde, Juckett, Klosak, Krause, Kriegsman, Laurino, Macdonald, Martin, McPartlin, Merlo, Philip, Pierce, Randolph, Schlickman, Sevcik, Soderstrom, Telcser, Totten, Waddell, Wall."



K. Miller: "All right, ladies and gentlemen now, there's been a request for a varification of the Affirmative Roll. Will the Members please be in their seats while the Clerk reads those who voted in the affirmative."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Alsop, Anderson, Barnes, Barry, Beatty, Blades, Borchers, Bradley, Brinkmeier, Brummet, Campbell, Capparelli, Capuzi, Choate, Clabaugh, Cox, Craig, Cunningham, Davis, Day, Deavers, Deuster, DiPrima, Ralph Dunn, Ebbesen, Ewell, Farley, Barry, Fennessey, Fleck, Flinn, Friedland, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Gibbs, Giglio, Grotberg, Harpstrite, Hart, Ron Hoffman, J.D. Holloway, Hudson, Hunsicker, Huskey, Jacobs, Dave Jones, Keller, Kent, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Kucharski, LaFleur, Lauer, Lemke, Leon, Londrigan, Madigan, Maragos, MacAuliffe,....."

K. Miller: "Record Mr. R.L. Thompson as 'aye' on this Roll Call." For what purpose does the gentleman from Madison, ~~Mr.~~ Calvo rise?"

Calvo: "On a parlimentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker." I understand that we voted here on Bills 40, 41, 43, on one Roll Call, and I can't find House Bill #43 on the calendar in any way, shape or form, and I can't.... how come we voted on #43."

K. Miller: "I don't think #43 was ever read. The Clerk tells me that #40, #41, and #42 were read."

Calvo: "Well, I heard the gentleman ask permission to include #43, and I thought the Speaker ruled that he could."

Fredric B. Selcke: "McAuliffe, McAvoy, McClain, McCormick, McGah, McGrew, McMaster, Kenny Miller, Murphy, Nardulli,



Neff, North, Pappas, Patrick, Polk, Redmond, Rigney, Rose, Ryan, Sangmeister, Schlisler, Schoeberlein, Schraeder, Sharp, Shea, Timothy Simms, Ike Sims, Springer, Stedelin, Stiehl, Thompson, Tipsword, Tuerk, VonBoeckman, Walters, Washburn, Washington, J.J. Wolf."

K. Miller: "All right, does the gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder desire recognition?"

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, just a point of order. Were there five requests on this varification?"

K. Miller: "That's not necessary under the rules for varification."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Grant?"

K. Miller: "How is Mr. Grant recorded?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

K. Miller: "Change the gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor rise?"

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

K. Miller: "How is the gentleman recorded?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Taylor: "Will you change that to 'aye', please."

K. Miller: "Change the gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'. Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Boyle."

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

K. Miller: "How is the gentleman recorded?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Boyle: "Vote me 'aye'."

K. Miller: "Vote the gentleman 'aye'."



All right ah... Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: Representative Beatty."

K. Miller: "This is a question of the Affirmative Roll."

Jaffe: "Oh all right."

K. Miller: "He's here in his seat."

Jaffe: "Representative Bradley."

K. Miller: "Representative Bradley is on the floor."

Jaffe: "Representative Choate."

K. Miller: "Representative Choate is on the floor over on the
Republican side."

Jaffe: "Representative Craig."

K. Miller: "He is in his seat."

Jaffe: "Representative Cunningham."

K. Miller: "He is in his seat."

Jaffe: "Representative DiPrima."

K. Miller: "I don't see him in his seat. Is Representative
DiPrima on the floor? I don't see the gentleman, take him
off the Roll."

Jaffe: "Representative Dunn."

K. Miller: "Which Dunn, Sir?"

Jaffe: "R. Dunne."

K. Miller: "R. Dunne is back in his seat."

Jaffe: "How about Bob Dunn?"

K. Miller: "The gentleman voted 'no'."

Jaffe: "Representative Farley."

K. Miller: "Representative Farley is in the aisle."

Jaffe: "Representative Fleck."



K. Miller: "He is in his seat."

Jaffe: "Representative Gibbs."

K. Miller: "He's over here near the telephone."

Jaffe: "Representative Harpstrite."

K. Miller: "I don't see him in his seat. Is the gentleman
on the floor? How is the gentleman recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

K. Miller: "Take him off the Roll."

Jaffe: "Representative Hart."

K. Miller: "He is in his seat."

Jaffe: Representative Jacobs."

K. Miller: "I don't see him in his seat. Is Representative
Jacobs on the floor? How is the gentleman recorded?"

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

K. Miller: "Take him off the Roll."

Jaffe: "Representative Keller."

K. Miller: "He is in the back of the room."

Jaffe: "Representative Holloway."

K. Miller: "Which one?"

Jaffe: "Jim."

K. Miller: "I don't see him in his seat. Is he on the floor?
How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

K. Miller: "Take him off the Roll."

Jaffe: Representative Jones."

K. Miller: "Representative Jones is in his seat."

Jaffe: "Representative Madigan."



K. Miller: "Representative Madigan. He is on the floor."

Jaffe: "Representative Laurino."

K. Miller: "Representative Harpstrite back on the floor? Put him back on the Roll under an 'aye' vote."

Jaffe: "Representative McAuliffe."

K. Miller: "McAuliffe? I don't see him in his seat. Is he on the floor? How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

K. Miller: "Take him off the Roll. Representative James Holloway is back on the floor, do you wish to be recorded?"

Holloway: "'Aye'."

K. Miller: "Record the gentleman as 'aye'."

Jaffe: "Representative McCormick."

K. Miller: "He's there in his seat."

Jaffe: "Representative McGah."

K. Miller: "He's there in his seat."

Jaffe: "Representative Ryan."

K. Miller: "He is in his seat."

Jaffe: "Representative Ike Sims."

K. Miller: "I don't see him in his seat. How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

K. Miller: "Take him off the Roll."

Jaffe: "Representative Pappas."

K. Miller: "Yes, he is in his seat."

Jaffe: "Ah.... I..."

K. Miller: "Are there further questions on the affirmative?"

On this question there are 95 'ayes', 48 'nays' and these three Bills, having each received a constitutional majority are hereby declared passed." The lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, having voted in the affirmative move to consider vote."

K. Miller: "All right, the gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

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

K. Miller: "Request is on the motion to table. All those in favor say 'aye' and the opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion prevails. Proceed with House Bill 208, Mr. Clerk."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 208"

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I'll read just one sentence from the March 'Environment' with Mary Leahy's picture on the front. It says: 'Recycling keeps made from the earth articles in circulation longer conserving energy and natural resorces of green land for use other than garbage graze.' All I want to ask you folks to do is to help save hundreds of tons of metal. In 1945, they made a rule about scavenging. It was a good rule. It meant that all people had no right to scavenge. But under the interpretation of the rule, it included metal. Now for two years, I've attempted to get the rule changed. Now this is by the Pollution Control Board in Chicago, not Mrs. Leahy, she has to exercise the rule. I have been unable to do it. All we want to do is



just save....."

K. Miller: "Just a moment, please. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill rise?"

Hill: "What business is on the floor of the House, I don't believe there is any Bill or resolution in front of us?"

K. Miller: "House Bill 208 was called, Sir."

Hill: "O'kay."

K. Miller: "Continue Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "All I'm asking us to do is to permit people who operate land fills to take out the dye of the metal, aluminum, brass, copper and iron, that's all. With a paid employee, I concur that matches, old clothes, all this other material should be buried. This does not change the rules of burying or the present rules enforced in the slightest degree. They are all the same. All it does is permit the saving of our natural resorces. It is odd to me that it is o'kay to recycle glass and bury copper. I solicit your support."

K. Miller: "Is there discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Harold Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, very briefly in support of this Bill, I must confess that I made an error when I voted against this Bill, I operated without sufficient knowledge. Since that time I have had occasion to check into this and let me briefly say this. Under the present E.P.A. rules, scavenging of metal is prohibited by the rules. Now all Mr. Borchers' Bill does is permit employees of a



land fill operation to pull out the metal from the land fill immediately after it's dumped and place it on the side for disposal and ultimate recycling. Not only does it perform a valuable service to that extent, but Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, quite a few people, particularly in the Decatur area, are employed in making gainful, meaningful wages out of scavenging and recycling this metal. I made a mistake and submit that some others might have made a mistake and I urge that you support this very worthwhile Bill."

K. Miller: "Is there further discussion? The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers to close."

Borchers: "Roll Call."

K. Miller: "The question is shall House Bill 208 pass. Those in favor vote 'aye' and the opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "All I have to say is"

K. Miller: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Choate 'aye'."

K. Miller: "On this question there are 98 'ayes' and 30 'nays', and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 241, which is also on postponed consideration." The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, there are under 600 land fills in the State of Illinois. Now this is really good in many ways. But many of the land



fills that were closed up were closed up because they could afford the \$30,000 bulldozers that are required, and which I agree with, to cover material. I have no quarrel with the idea, I agree with it also. However, it has forced many small communities to travel many many miles to ah... take their garbage and their refuse to be properly buried. Now there is a proposition to require all land fills to have scales. Another \$15,000 or \$20,000 for the minimum. There are many small land fills and small communities in the state that simply cannot afford it. And I ask you, who cares about an old water heater that's buried, by rules and law, within eight hours with six inches of dirt, who cares here to create a bureaucracy to save the records of this old water heater that will be buried forever. It's perfectly ridiculous. Please don't help force many more land fills out of business, because they can't afford the expense cost, and vote in support of this Bill. I assure you that scales should not be mandatory, they should be permissive and I solícite your support."

K. Miller: "Is there discussion? All right, the question is shall House Bill 241 pass. All those in favor vote 'aye' and the opposed vote 'nay'. The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "First, Mr. Speaker, I hope you will vote to give me the rest of the votes so that I can instantly sit down. I made the shortest speech of my life a few moments ago. Again, this is needed. There is no earthly reason for a



record and billing to be kept of what an old water heater or a load of brick weighs. All it is is a tremendous expense to often very poor people who can't afford it. It will cause the closing of other land fills in this state, which is against the best interest of the people. I do solicit more 'green' lights."

K. Miller: "Have all voted who wish? The gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart is recognized."

Hart: "I'm just a little mistified, ah... I wish someone who is against this would briefly explain the reason for it. I can't see anything wrong with the logic that Mr. Borchers said, and wish somebody would explain why we do have it this way."

K. Miller: "Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "In answer to the question raised by the last Speaker, ah... the reason that I'm voting 'no' on this Bill is not that I disagree with the intent as a whole. I think the Bill includes another big problem. It has an absolute prohibition against any ah... scales in a junk yard. Well, I certainly would not support having the scales for every junk yard, or any land fill or whatever, it seems to me that there are certain times that it would be required. Such as when they're dumping toxic materials or something of this nature. I don't know all the answers, but I think an absolute prohibition is ridiculous. In many many cases, we do not have the need for them. And in fact, I think that is what the Pollution Control Agency, The E.P.A. and everyone,



that is their job to find out if and when we do need to measure things. This Bill goes too far. It says in no way can they require it. And that's why I'm voting against it."

K. Miller: "Have all voted who wish? The lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer is recognized."

Dyer: "In answer to the gentlemans question over there ah... DuPage County runs a very fine landfill and in fact they are creating a ski hill at the same time that they're running a landfill. They allow all the private disposal companies to dump their loads there. And the charges are based on the weight that is dumped. It would completely put the DuPage landfill out of business if you couldn't have the scales. So I don't know how many other landfills operate the same way but it's an essential part of the operation."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones."

Jones: "In response to the inquiry on the other side of the aisle. This is permissive that they do this, it's not mandatory that they do not have it, but it just provides that they do not have to have it unless that they think it's beneficial to their operations and also doesn't apply to junk yards, this is landfills involved."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fleck."

Fleck: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I found myself in the embarrassing position of supporting this Bill and Mr. Borchers in his last two motions. However, on this one I find it quite difficult to go along with his



view. It seems to me that what Representative Dyer says is quite correct. And that if you have a person who is running a landfill operation, any charges that would be made by the landfill operator would be by guess, and not by the weight of the load that comes in. And you could have these landfill operators charging whatever they see fit, and not be the weight of the actual load. So I think that this is a need for scales, just for the economy as a situation, if nothing else."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "I think that there has been a little misunderstanding about what this Bill means with respect to scales. This Bill just means there can be no state regulation saying that you gotta have a scale. If DuPage County wants to have one, than they can have one. If anybody else wants to have one, they can have one. But the purpose of the Bill is simply to prohibit the requirement that everybody must have one, whether they want to or not. And if there is a landfill somewhere that simply charge on a truckload or a dump whether than a weight, they can do it under this Bill. This Bill is a good thing. It just prohibits forcing people to go out and make this heavy expenditure of purchasing a scale."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, again I'm going to emphasize what has just been emphasized by the last two Speakers. This is permissive on these scales



and they would not have to have them. Now let's keep in mind the closing of these different dumps. We've had several of them close downstate, and what's happening this? Is being spread out along the highways and roads. I had a letter just recently from the County Superintendent of Roads that the E.P.A. has got onto him for not picking this stuff up and hauling it. He would have to haul it 25 miles.....the people that brought it out there from this little village would have had to haul it for 25 miles, and instead of doing that they're putting it out on the roads. And if we continue to close these dumps, we're going to have our road sites littered with litter and ah... it will be a continued problem with us and therefore I'd hope would do nothing but to help these landfills stay open and Representative Borchers's Bill, all it does is to keep some landfills open that would have to be closed. I hope we'll all vote 'yes' on it."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. J.J.Wolf."

J.Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to those of you that still might have your minds open on this, let's really look at what this thing does. It doesn't stop anybody from weighing junk or refuse that goes into a landfill. And it's not the weight that's important, it's how much space it takes up in the hole. Now if you look at the doughnut and not the hole, you can understand that this is not important, whether they are forced to have a scale. You take a small landfill operation, they may wish to



charge by the load. I'm sure that those of you who have private scavengers, they don't weigh that trash container, they charge you so much a drum, and that's what's important."

K. Miller: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ron Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. Looking at the board I see that many of the Members from Cook County being very reluctant to either voting on this proposition or voting against it. I think that if we search our memories back to the actual vision of the Chicago area, you'll find that if we had required at that time, that all the landfills be weighed or should be weighed, prior to the conception, Chicago would have been a long time coming. Now let's be sensible about this. This is something that we ought to do. We ought to inact on this thing, and not ⁵⁻³⁰ on downstate just because we're in a process now of being very environmental orientated. I would appreciate your consideration on this vote and an 'aye' vote."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Marion, Mr. Stedelin."

Stedelin: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, there is a good many things about landfills that are not enforced. Now I will be glad to intorduce a Bill that if 25% or a certain percent of the rules are not abided by that in effect, we can close it. Because we've got a condition in our county that is terrible and it's not strict enough. But this particular thing with the scale is completely stupid. There is no if and and about it. You don't



need a scale for a landfill. What we do need is to cover it every single day, we want to have it cleared and everything sanitary. But a scale does not make it sanitary, this is a good Bill."

K. Miller: "The lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, I've had legal council here from my seat-mate in how to interpret the legal language of the actual Bill itself. I think the synopsis was misleading. As I understand it, I'm standing corrected. There is nothing in this Bill that will prohibit a county from weighing loads, if that's the way that we want to operate out landfills. So I am changing my 'no' vote to a 'yes' vote."

K. Miller: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk." On this question there are 74 'ayes, and 56 'nays' and 100 'present'. This Bill having failed to received the constitutional majority is hereby declared lost. House Bill 259, it's on postponed consideration. And for this purpose the Chair will recognize Mr. Yourelli."

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 259, as all of you know, is the U.S. Steel vs. The Public Bill, and I would suggest to you that because of the lateness of the hour, that many of the arguments proposed in the first debate ah.... on 259, that I will not repeat. I would like however to call to your attention that since the Bill was debated on Third Reading a week or so ago, I have found out that the United States Steel Corporation at Waukegan, The Steel Wire Division, is



presently under indictment by the State of Illinois for dumping into Lake Michigan, without permit and causing a tremendous amount of pollution at that location. I also would advise you in answer to Representative Gibbs question as to what the Chicago Park District had to say about House Bill 259. In conversations and meetings with the Law Department of the Chicago Park District they have advised me that at no time, no time ladies and gentlemen, did they ever consent, or wasn't their intention to give title or to convey title to the state for the purpose of giving this 200 acres of land to U.S. Steel. They were opposed to it at the time and they are opposed to it now, and they don't want this to happen. I would also call your attention to House Bill 153 that passed out of this House just a day or two ago, that....."

K. Miller: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate rise?"

Choate: "I would like to ask you M. Speaker, and I would like to inform this House that this Bill is on postponed consideration probably the last time that this gentleman is going to have an opportunity to explain some of the things that was asked of him when it was originally called, and I would ask you Mr. Speaker, to get him just a wee bit more order because he is saying some very meaningful things as far as the merits of this legislation is concerned."

K. Miller: "Thank you Mr. Choate. The House has been very noisy, but give the gentleman an opportunity to explain



his Bill. Proceed Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Leader. To continue with the House Bill that provided the ban of airports in the lake, that Bill as you know received 95 votes to pass and 27 opposed. Now an airport, in my judgement, and I hope in your judgement, is no different than the 200 acres proposed as a give away to U.S. Steel. Because if you use the employment argument, as has been used in the original debate on the Bill, that if you don't give these 200 acres to U.S. Steel, your going to curtail employment in that area, and I say to you that you banned airports in the lake, that would have created tremendous potential for employment in that area, so I don't think that that's a valik argument. It was pointed out, ladies and gentlemen, that we are going to curtail employment if we pass this Bill. I call to your attention again that in ten years, ten years, ladies and gentlemen, the state has held in trust 200 acres of land for U.S. Steel. You haven't had employment for ten years, there is no plans presently, that I've been able to find out from U.S. Steel, if they're ever going to develop this land. And if they are going to develop this land, when that is going to take place. So if your thinking about employment, I would suggest to you, as Representative Washington suggests, that again your talking about something that's possibly ten fifteen or twenty years in here after. I would also explain to you ladies and gentlemen, that the City Hall's Department of Planning is absolutely opposed, absolutely



opposed to this give away of 200 acres of fine lakefront land. They are presently engaged in an extensive study of the lakeshore, and all that means to the people of the State of Illinois. In a telephone conversation and the people down in my office, yesterday and today, have indicated to me that they are absolutely opposed to this kind of give away. Now I ask you ladies and gentlemen, to believe when I tell you that there is nothing in Senate Bill 782 that will provide that U.S. Steel will ever use this land and if they fill it in as they tell you they are going to fill it in, that they won't seel it to somebody else and make a tremendous amount of profit. I again call your attention to a letter dated March 19, 1973, from United States Steel Corporation and I quote from that letter: 'The 194.6 acres of submerged land are valueless, and until reclaimed and buildings placed on the land, the property tax is minimal. When this acreage is reclaimed the current market value in a comparable industry area, would be approximately \$3 1/2 million dollars.' And I say to you ladies and gentlemen that if it's a valueless now and they are going to develop, and then it's worth \$3 1/2 million dollars, then were talking about a substantial give away to U.S. Steel of land that rightfully belongs to the public. I ask you again to reconsider you vote. Vote those 'green' lights as you did for ban the airport in the lake. See that the public is entitled to the land that it owns and not some private vested interest, that is now polluting Lake



Michigan land and all areas where they have facilities there on. If there is any questions, I hoped to be able to answer them, but I do earnestly ladies and gentlemen, solicit your support."

K. Miller: "All right, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer is recognized."

Palmer: "If the Sponsor will yield for a question?"

K. Miller: "he indicates that he will, proceed Sir."

Palmer: "Did U.S. Steel ever deposit any monies with the State of Illinois?"

Yourell: "Representative Palmer, U.S. Steel has made not one move to either git title of the land, nor have they ever attempted to pay to the land..... or to pay to the state the \$19,000 that this land would take to make Senate Bill 782 a legal instrument."

Palmer: "Mr. Yourell, did you examine the tax returns or get some tax reports as to whether U.S. Steel paid any income tax in the year of 1971?"

Yourell: "Income tax?"

Palmer: "Income tax."

Yourell: "U.S. Steel reported a net earnings of \$157 million dollars in 1972 and did not pay one cent of Federal Income Tax on that earning."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Farley."

Farley: "Will the gentleman yield for a question?"

K. Miller: "Proceed Sir."

Farley: "Mr. Yourell, do you have any idea what the real estate



taxes would ah... come up to as far as this land it concerned?"

Yourell: "Yes, Representative Farley, I have material that indicates to me that the loss to the state and local taxing districts in the last ten years would amount to \$231 million dollars."

Farley: "Thank you."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Phil Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to House Bill 259. This has been debated throughly before and I would suggest when the Sponsor refers to U.S.Steel and the public, I would think that U.S. Steel are on the same side and that this issue and both would be will served by the rejection of this Bill. We're being asked today to rescind and action taken by this Body ah... in 1963 by an overwhelming vote in both Houses. And in effect, we're being asked to impede the growth of the largest manufacturing installation in the State of Illinois. A corporation that has and does employ ten thousand people in and around the district that I represent, and that will when they construct the new facilities that are contemplated on the new landfill will hire additional thousands of people. Reference has been made to pollution and I would suggest to the gentleman that in the time that we had..... U.S. Steel has been waiting to act, that they have poured millions of dollars into making the South Works, a model plant in complying with environmental



standards. And when I say millions, I mean \$50,000,000 or thereabouts in environmental procedures alone, not to mention the additional million that has been expended to update and improve the facilities that are old. This is a very old plant. Now the Park District has been brought into this and I haven't had any conversation with the Park District, but they are on record as having said that they have no interest in the land or any present purpose to expand on the land. It is in the area of 79th street where Rainbow Beach will expand and marinas are contemplated in plans by the Chicago Park District, which will not be interfered by the land of the fill on this useless and submerged land which will become valuable land and which will go on the tax rolls when completed. It has been suggested that no plans have been drawn as to installation on the land when built. But I have in my hand a document that does call for procedures to be taken, not only to build the land, but to beautify it when it is completed. An additional 1/2 millions dollars is going to be put into trees and shrubs alone to have a green area around the perimeter so that these buildings will not be an eyesore, and I must assure you that they are ah... at the present time. It will go along ways towards beautifying the area. But I think that the major thing is that we are taking useless land and we're making it productive land, it's going to go on the tax rolls, there are going to be additional jobs for people in our area, it's good for the



economy. U.S. Steel has been an interval part of our community, and will become even more so. As I stated in the original debate on this Bill, it has the backing of all of the Chambers of Commerce in the district, the Local Press, the..... it has been editorialized in the past favorably by the Metropolitan Press. U.S. Steel obviously wants this, the United Steel Workers of America want it, and I think that we should again reject House Bill 259, and I would urge a 'no' vote."

K. Miller: "Is there further discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Bill. And I would like to tell you that this is not only a good Bill, I think that this is a great Bill. I think people voting against this Bill are voting for special interest legislation of the worst type. They are in essence saying that what is good for U.S. Steel is good for the people of the State of Illinois. It really distresses me to hear argument after argument over here saying that this Bill..... this property in its present state will not hurt the ecology, will not hurt the environment. Ladies and gentlemen, I tell you that Lake Michigan is in serious danger. I think that this Bill attacks a problem that should have been attacked a long time ago. This attacks a great give away. And the Sponsor should be commended for introducing this Bill, and I think that if we don't vote this Bill out of this House



we are going to be derelict in our duty and I urge an 'aye' vote."

K. Miller: "Is there further discussion? All right, we'll return to the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell to close."

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I'll be very brief because I understand that this is the last Bill to be considered today. I know that many of the Members have to be in Committee. I would however call your attention to ah... a statement made on Sunday, the 25th day of March by Mr. William Thompson, who the United States District Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, and I quote: 'U. S. Steel is the number one pollutor in the State of Illinois.' Now the number one pollutor, ladies and gentlemen, in the State of Illinois despite all of these so called good work that they've done at the South Works. I maintain and submit to you for your consideration that the State of Illinois has in effect held 200 acres in trust for U.S. Steel for the past ten years. And I suggest to you that they're are still no plans despite of what the opponents of this Bill have said to you, for the development of this land. There is no provisions in the Bill for the containment of this land by U.S. Steel should they be awarded this land. They can sale that land as they did in Clearwater, Florida for \$3,000,000. They submit that they are not in the real estate business, and I submit to you that they just sold 575 shares in the Great Northern Trust Company, all real estate, ladies and



gentlemen, and that's exactly what they might do with this land. I think you ought to give this your consideration and certainly hope that you would support my position for the environment for the people of the State of Illinois and not for the private vested interest, U.S. Steel. I ask for your support."

K. Miller: "The question is shall House Bill 295 pass. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. The gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider to explain his vote."

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Since we have taken the time today in a long hard day to disinvolve one agency on a whim of fatigue and a few other things I guess, I think for once that we oughta take a look at a good Bill that's drafted by a person who's taken on a pretty considerable challenge, I would say, one of the largest corporations in the United States and Illinois of course. And I would guess that the Assistant Minority Leader who felt the compelling desire to support the problems of the farmer, might take a look now at an area that he lives close to and that I know that I'm familiar with, and I would ask the Assistant Minority Leader to say: 'Well I hear the cry, I hear you calling Chicago, I hear you are of the area of Chicago and need recreation and open land, and I think now maybe I'll switch my vote and ask my colleagues from Chicago to vote a 'green' light.' It's not often that the House bears lightly on many problems that stretch the length in bread to the State of Illinois. So I would ask



that the Members of the city who are Representatives of the city ah... to join their leader and suggest that this is a good time now to cast a 'green' vote and maybe balance the scales a little bit on the side of the people, on the crucial issue. It's a..... I know not a very difficult issue to vote on, I do realize that we face head on and into the interests of the corporate state, but I think for once on a day like today, that we oughta put alot of 'green' lights up there on the board."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, with regards to the previous Speaker. I think that if he would look and look at the Roll Call, you'll find the facts as they are. And I resent that fact that any part of Leadership bringing.... being brought in on any Bill, and as far as how they feel on a certain matter. We from Chicago take great pride in the City of Chicago, and in turn our contribution to this great state. I vote on this Bill, as I voted for it in the past. I think it was a mistake then, and I think it's our turn to have the opportunity of correcting a mistake that was made by this state some time ago. I think there is a serious question when an opportunity was given to a major steel industry in this state and in this nation, in my opinon, a special opportunity, and in turn over ten years, they have never taken advantage or shown good faith in that time. Yes, as Representative Yourell pointed out, there has been



a tremendous tax loss through the residents of the City of Chicago and Cook County. I think it's time to rectify that situation. I would hope that we would vote on every Bill for it's merit or demerits. I vote 'aye' and ask for your support."

K. Miller: "For what purpose does the gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider rise?"

Schneider: "Through a direct reference to me, although not by name, Mr. Speaker, and I think I would like to respond to Representative Lechowicz at that is if you listened to what I said, Representative, I said that the Assistant Minority Leader of there was directive imploring of him to make a show on the board, which he hasn't done yet, and then I was suggesting that the legislator from Chicago, who supported the downstaters might solicit some support from them as well. So if we could play the tape back again, Ted, I think that you'll note that the comments were not an indictment of anybody following one person in order to maintain one's loyalty. All of saying is that if you'll listen to the sentence, is two separate suggestions. One is that the Assistant Minority Leader give us a hand on this one, and the second one, maybe the people of Chicago deserve some help, not only from Chicago but from the downstaters. So there was no reference to you or anybody else, and I think you ought to listen."

K. Miller: "Have all voted who wish? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."



Duff: "Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding that the Sponsor had taken this Bill on postponed consideration and had agreed to amend it, and he hasn't done it. Consequently I vote 'no'."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer."

Palmer: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I agree with the remarks of Representative Lechowicz, Schneider, and my colleague, Representative Yourell. I believe also that there is something else that might be involved here in the future. The lake current runs in a southerly direction hitting the bottom shore and then turning to a northerly direction. The crib, which is the place of the intake of the lake water which about 3,000,000 people in the Metropolitan area use, is located not too far north. If a facility is built there, at some future time, it is highly likely that there can be a contamination spilling into that lake. I believe that this could be avoided at this time. If we take the action requested by the principle Sponsor of this Bill. There is another matter here that's involved. The shores of Lake Michigan certainly should be sacred to all of us. And they should be remain in the condition, as much as possible, as they were in it's original condition, except for those things that are necessary for municipal or governmental services. The installation on a construction of a facility a steel facility, at that point, certainly will encourage others at some future time do to likewise, and I think it's a sad day if this thing accures



again. I believe that the people of the state would be much better off if we rescinded the offer that the state made in 1963, which has not been accepted, certainly by U.S. Steel, they have not paid the money. So let's put things back like they were before. And let's avoid a possible confusion and an awful amount of problems that might arise in the future. I would urge all of those, certainly in the Metropolitan area to put on their 'green' lights for this Bill."

K. Miller: "Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, It amazes me that when it comes to the E.P.A. ah... we know we gallop to dismantel the E.P.A., but when it comes to overturning a give away to U.S. Steel, this House suddenly becomes paralyzed. This House has been deluged with lobbying against this particular Bill like I've never seen before. And the Sponsor to his credit has stuck with his guns and has fought a good fight on behalf of this Bill. I think it is to our great shame if we defeat this Bill and do not pass it, and I urge a 'green' vote for it."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I'm indeed confused. Sometimes I here people talking about our lake and then other times I hear you talking about your lake. I'm so confused in this matter, I'm going to have to vote present."

K. Miller: "Want to vote the gentleman 'present'. Also vote



Mr. Hart 'present'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Huskey 'present'. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 69 'ayes' 56 'nays' and 4 'present', and this Bill having failed to receive the constitutional majority is hereby declared lost. Now on the order of Third Reading House Bills, there is one Bill that must be called today, House Bill 170."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 170, Borchers. An Act creating the Environmental Protection Agency Legislative Study Commission and defining it's powers and duties. Third Reading of the Bill."

K. Miller: "Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, I'll make it very brief. The Bill has been amended as many in this House requested. There is no paragraph whatsoever that's sounds prejudicial good or bad, it's completely neutral. All it will do is look into the operation of C.T.A. from personnel and all of its actions, that's all it does..... I don't mean C.T.A., sorry about that.... I mean E.P.A. I've looked at it from top to bottom and we'll make a decision to make the report of this House by ah... January 9th, 1974. I feel this is something that should be done, we created this agency, we should examine it. The organization is very simple. Each House, ah.. Majority Leader, ah... the Minority Leader ah... the Speaker of the House, and the Minority Leader each pick several Members ah... it's non-partisan, the same in the Senate, non



partisan. I would solicit your vote. Thank you."

K. Miller: "Is there discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman."

Berman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

K. Miller: "He indicates that he will."

Berman: "Representative Borchers, what is the requested appropriation on this Bill?"

Borchers: "The appropriation is \$25,000 and according to the request of mine of Representative Washburn, it will do time come up in the rules of the House."

Berman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I just might address it. I think that we can do the same thing that Representative wants to do on this Bill, and save ourselves \$25,000, by not supporting this and supporting House Joint Resolution 14, which is sponsored also by Representative Borchers, along with Minority Leader Choate, Representative Yourell, Jaffe, and myself, and I would suggest that we take the cheaper way to accomplish the same thing to House Joint Resolution 14 and not support House Bill 170."

K. Miller: "Is there further discussion? We'll return to the gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers to close."

Borchers: "I agree that there is a companionability of \$25,000 that will come up. However, I just wanted to point out that we have two vehicles. I intend to support the resolution. It may be the cheaper way and it may not, we don't know yet just what will happen. But there is one thing... ah.... we oughta try both vehicles and see if we can't get



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

one of them. I'm perfectly willing, if it works out to the advantage of the resolution, I'm perfectly willing to ah... forget this Bill ah... as far as that's concerned. However, I think that we should pass both out of this House so we are certain that we will be able to have this commission to examine and look at the activities of the Pollution Control Board and the Environmental Protection Agency."

K. Miller: "All right, the question is shall House Bill 170 pass. All those in favor say 'aye' and the opposed 'nay'. The gentleman from Knox, Mr. Mc Masters."

McMasters: "In a way of explaining my vote, I'm wondering about the difference in the two proposed ah... committee vs. commission. I would like to be able to put this in form of a question ah.. Mr. Borchers. Is yours a commission that would allow public members to serve on it? And is the other committee that would not allow public members and would allow only members of the House and the Senate? I sort of think that in a situation like this we might appreciate public members with expertise who can provide information that we might not have as far as House Members are concerned, or Senat Members."

Borchers: "My Bill has public members that are appointed by the Speaker, the Minority Leader, the President pro tem of the Senate, and the Minority Leader in the Senate. It is public and public members are included in the Bill, eight of them. Eight Legislators and eight public members."



K. Miller: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Leon 'no' on this Roll Call. On this question there are 49 'yeas' and 60 'nays', and this Bill having failed to receive the constitutional majority is hereby declared lost. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, On the calendar under the order of motions there are three Bills and one House Joint Resolution on which motions have been filed either to discharge the committee or to take from the table. Unless we handle these matters tonight, or suspend the rules, which is the motion I'm going to make, ah... they would die. And so Mr. Speaker, I move that the appropriate rule be suspended in order that we may hear these three Bills and one House Resolution ah... next week on either Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday. And I would appreciate 197 votes."

K. Miller: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Calvo rise?"

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, I have a motion on the Speaker's table that it's in the same situation. If it isn't heard tonight, it dies. It's a motion to discharge committee on House Bill 163. I would like to have it included in the motion."

K. Miller: "I don't see it on the calendar. Can you inform me to where it is, Mr. Calvo?"

Calvo: "The Committee Report came in Tuesday and I filed it



today, which is the second day so it couldn't have been on the calendar yet."

K. Miller: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, would the Speaker accept a substitute motion which in effect would say that all matters and Bills, and Resolutions which would die today.... Monday, Tuesday.... Monday and Tuesday of next week, be continued to, or extended to third day of next week. So you've got two or three days to dispose of them. And that would take care of any Bills which we might have overlooked in the ah... Majority Leader's motion and preserve to the Membership of the House their right to have the Bill heard next week? I think that motion would do it. Would you accept that?"

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, no. I'm reluctant to accept that. In connection with Representative Calvo's question, I think probably the committee your referring to did not report until yesterday, so that your not effected by this. But in connection with anything else that might be on here that was not called, I think the Sponsor would have made ah... it apparent to the Speaker that it was not called. I think that if we're going to abide by the rules at all we oughta do it in ah... less of a shotgun manner."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."



Choate: "Well, I think I understood Representative Wolf to make a suggestion that if we're going to save one or two pieces of legislation that might die by not having action taken on it today, that by your motion to suspend the appropriate rule, and ah... let it be alive until next week when we come in, I think he only suggested that all matters of all Members, that are on the calendar of that nature be ah...your motion be made applicable to all of them. And I'll just say to you right now that if some of my Members over here have got something that falls in that category, that unless they are included in the motion ah... Representative Walsh, while then I don't think that your gonna get 107 votes."

K. Miller: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Three of the four items, Representative Choate, that we're referring to are sponsored principally by your Members so I could care less whether we get 197 votes. It just seems to me though that a better way of operating is to have the Sponsors come and if they wish to have something included, as Representative Calvo did, then he can ask to have it included in this. I would rather not make a blanket motion involving everything."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Well, I guess I was a little bit surprised to hear the House Bill 163, a motion was filed to discharge. The Bill ~~was~~ beaten Committee 12 to 4. There was no close vote, there was a full an ample hearing and ah.... I

26.06



just can't see the purpose of delaying this matter, I don't even see it on the calendar."

K. Miller: "The Gentlemen from Champaign, Mr. Hirschfeld if recognized."

Hirschfeld: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. There are two points, a.. with the leave of the House, I would prefer the H J R C A 8 be let to die a natural death and so there's no necessity for that motion, to be a...for that particular motion to be moved ahead, as point number 1. Point number 2, Mr. Speaker, a...Representative Deuster, I do not see on the floor of the House, but he and I die file motions today, due to the fact that we just received notice today from the Elections Committee that are primary Bills had been reported out Do Not Pass out of the sub-committee. They do not show on the calendar and I, since Representative Deuster is not here, I would like to protect his motion, mine also, and have it included in Representative Walsh's motion."

K. Miller: "A...did the chair understand you to say that the motions were filed today?"

Hirschfeld: "We filed the motion today as soon as we were told by the committee that the matter had been reported out Do Not Pass. We received notice today and it would be the forty-eight hour rule. A.."

K. Miller: "Mr. Hirschfeld, can you give me the numbers of the Bills to which you refer?"

Hirschfeld: "I'm looking at Representative Deuster's Bill right now. Well, let me ask you this Mr. Majority Leader? You see,



under the rules of the House, the motion must be filed within forty-eight hours and heard, as I read it, it was filed within the forty-eight hours, but it would not be heard because its not on the calendar. Yes he does."

K. Miller: "The Gentlement from McClain, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. Representative Deuster's Bill is House Bill 223 and what Representative Hirschfeld is referring to, I believe, is House Bill or a rule 33c ...a...I read it earlier, but it says that if no written motion to take Bills from the table is made within those two days, after notification of these Bills being tabled, which according to our sheet here, it was tabled March 27 and today is the 29th. If we have not made a motion to take from the table and supported by a majority of the members, these Bills shall be considered as finally tabled and stricken, now I'm willing to go along with the ...a...for the sake of expediency in getting out of here a little bit earlier, fine; but let me say this. If the Majority Leader doesn't care if we get 107, I don't either, I just as soon stay here all afternoon and in fact all day, listening to Bills and voting them up or down and I'll stay the rest of the evening to vote them up or down and that's my feeling on it, but the word of the Majority Leader...a...I'll go either way on them."

K. Miller: "The Chair recognizes the Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "May I restate my motion, Mr. Speaker. I moved that



House Bills 146, 346, and 383, 163, 223, and 155 on which there have been motions either to discharge the committee or to take from the table, that the rule be suspended for a...a...the rules be suspended on the action..a..that we hear these motions today and that we can hear these Bills, or motions' rather, next week, either Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday. And House Bill 349."

K. Miller: "Is there discussion on the motion? The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe."

Wolfe: "Yah, my suggestion to the Majority Leader was for the very point that was just raised now, and I look at the calendar, Bill, have we got, I don't care whether its your member or our member, to me, its one of the 177 members but I want to preserve their right and the motion, the suggestion, was for that very reason. In the event we overlooked something on this calendar, that it should be extended, its not a shot gun deal, because there might be something coming up, I don't know, don't forget we extended Tuesday to a Wednesday meeting, so if there is anything coming up on Tuesday that expires we won't be here to preserve it, that's all I'm saying."

K. Miller: "For what purpose does the Gentlemen from Lake, Mr. Matijevich rise?"

Matijevich: "A point of order on...a...Now I've heard two different members say that a sub-committee reported their Bills up Do Not Pass, now under what rule can a sub-committee report a Bill out without a member being present and a



full committee, I thought a sub-committee reports a full committee and a member surely ought to be present, I know we've got some new rules, but we've got that one, I think its a hell of a rule and I think we ought to repeal it in a hurry."

Walsh: "Well Mr. Speaker, that doesn't go to the motion that I had made. However, an objection such as that can be brought up next week just as well as it could tonight, and any objections to the motions as filed can be brought up when they are finally heard next week."

Matijevich: "Amen, I'll make it."

K. Miller: "The Gentlemen from Livingston, Mr. Hunsicker."

Hunsicker: "Chairman Bluthardt of the Elections Committee is not on the floor. We had a sub-committee hearing, the sub-committee reported back to the full committee, the full committee voted unanimously Do not Pass, that's the recommendation and that's the way the committee voted on these elections bills."

K. Miller: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Caldwell."

Caldwell: "A, Mr. Speaker, I think I understand the Majority Leader's final motion and ...I'd like to second it and suggest that it's a good deal."

K. Miller: "Alright, the question is Shall Mr. Walsh's motion with respect to suspension of the rules so that these seven bills, am I correct Mr. Walsh? Seven bills may be held on the calendar so that action may be taken next week.?"



All those in favor of this motion please vote aye, those oppose, nay. The Gentlemen from Union, Mr. Choate, is recognized."

Choate: "Point of information, Mr. Speaker. And maybe the Clerk could answer this question. Is there any other bills that would be effected by the deadline other than the seven that are referred to in the motions?"

Fred Selcke: "A..Clyde, we check the calendar and we don't think there are any other bills."

Choate: "In other words, you think this takes care of all that would be effected by the deadline under our rules?"

Fred Selcke: "Yes."

Choate: "Then I vote aye."

K. Miller: "Alright, the Chair recognizes the Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Epton."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. Ordinarily, I would vote for this motion immediately, but last week, the Minority Leader was so persuasive when Representative Choate indicated to me how important it was to follow the House rules, I certainly..a..I'm completely convinced that I must vote against this, although I agree entirely with what we are trying to do."

K. Miller: "The Gentlemen from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "May I tell my distinguished colleague that just spoke that that was another week."

K. Miller: "For what purpose does the Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. J. J. Wolfe arise?"



Wolfe: "I'd like to raise a point of order with regard to House Bill 163. That Bill was assigned to the House Committee on Veteran Affairs Personnel Intention on February 7. The forty five days have since expired. The Bill was recommended Do Not Pass, 12 to 4, it is already dead and I can't see how we can include that particular Bill in this motion." I'd like a ruling of the chair."

K. Miller: "The Chair recognizes the Gentlemen from Madison, Mr. Calvo."

Calvo: "Well maybe I missed something in the rules. I thought we had two days from the time the report was made to discharge a motion from committee."

K. Miller: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Wolfe."

Wolfe: "Well, it seems to me that the gentlemen would have two days to file his motion, but the forty-five days have since lapsed, that Bill was assigned to committee on February 7, so you would have March 7, that's one month and two weeks, thereafter...I think the day after it was killed in committee, it was officially dead, the forty five days had lapsed, so your motion would not be in order and that's the point that I'm raising."

K. Miller: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, again we find ourselves all bogged down with these rules that were going to help us, but as I remember the motion made by the Majority Leader, he said that these seven Bills would be kept on through the end of



next week and any motion that...a...could be made or any parliamentary inquiries that could be made...a...would all be alive and available next week, so I think it covers Mr. Wolfe's point, and I for one, am ready to get it to committee."

K. Miller: "A, Mr. Wolfe, in answer to your question. I'm informed that the report from the committee was filed March 27, which was two days ago, so the motion is timely. Have all voted who wished? Take the record Mr. Clerk." To this question there are 125 ayes and 2 nays, and the gentlemen's motion prevails. The Chair recognizes the Gentlemen from Kane, Mr. Schoeberlein."

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House. The Public Utilities Committee will meet immediately after adjournment in M-4. Now we have one Bill and there is no opposition to the Bill and you will be out of there in ten minutes. Be there so we have a quorum."

K. Miller: "The Gentlemen from Wayne, Mr. Blades."

Blades: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. The Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee will meet in C-1 thirty minutes after adjournment."

K. Miller: "The Gentlemen from Rock Island, Mr. Pappas."

Pappas: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. Motor Vehicles will meet in M-5 immediately after adjournment."

K. Miller: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. J. J. Wolfe."

Wolfe: "Mr. Speaker, I request leave of the House to have the



waived, the six and one-half day posting notice, so we could hear House Bill 599 in the Veterans Committee next week."

K. Miller: "Does the gentleman have leave?" Having no objection, leave is granted." The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, the Executive Committee will meet in room D-1 fifteen minutes after adjournment."

K. Miller: "The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, Higher Education Committee will meet in Room M-3 immediately after adjournment, we'll be as quick as possible."

K. Miller: "The Chair recognizes, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Douglas."

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I would like to table House Bill 472."

K. Miller: "Does the gentleman have leave to table a Bill? Hearing no objection, the Bill is tabled. Alright, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn until 9:30 A.M. Tuesday, April 3 for perfunctory session, 10:00 o'clock Wednesday, April 4 for regular session. We come back here at 10:00 o'clock, Wednesday, April 4. I move we adjourne."

K. Miller: "Alright the question is on the motion to adjourn all those in favor say aye, those oppose, no, the motion is carried, the House stands adjourned until Wednesday, next week, at 10:00 o'clock."



Peggy Martin: "The House will please come to order. We will have prayer by Mr. Carey."

Carey: "Let us pray. The Lord has said My House shall be a House of Prayer for all nations. Amen."

Martin: "Messages from the Senate:"

Fred Selcke: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives Senate has passed Bills to the following Title, passage of which I'm set to ask concurrence of the House. Senate Bill, 110, 119, 122, 127, 134, 144, 151, 171 172, 174, 222, 260, 261, 302 passed by the Senate March 29, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representative that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of the following Title, House Bill 99, passed by the Senate March 29, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secreary. Mr. Speaker I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives, Senate has exceeded to the request of the House of Representatives for a conference committee to consider the difference of the two Houses in regard to House Amendment No. 1, Senate Joint RESolution No. 25, action taken by Senate March 28, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that it concurs with the House in adopting the following joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 28, concurred in by the Senate March 29, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary."



Martin: "Committee report."

Fred Selcke: "Mr. Blades from the Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources to which House Bill 481 and 642 were referred to were reported back with Amendments set to Recommendations that Amendments be adopted and reported Do Pass, Mr. Blades from Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee, House Bill 466, 632, 654 were referred reported same back with recommendations that Bills Do Pass and be re-referred to appropriations. Mr. Blades from Agriculture and Natural Resources to which House Bill 641 and 653 were referred were reported same back with recommendations that Bills do pass. Mr. Blades from the Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources to which House Bill 660 was referred was reported same back, recommendations that Bill Do Pass. Mr. Pappas on the Committee on Motor Vehicles to which House Bill 301 and 696 were referred reported recommendation that Bills do pass. Mr. Pappas from Motor Vehicles to which House Bill 302 is referred reported same back with Amendments as to the Amendments be adopted and the Bills amended do pass. Mr. Pappas from Motor Vehicles to which House Bill 423 and 590 were referred and reported same back with recommendation that Do Not Pass. Mr. Pappas from Motor Vehicle to which House Bill 697 was referred reported same back with Amendments there to that the recommendations that the Amendments be adopted and Bills amended Do Pass. Mr. Rose from Judiciary 1 which House Bills 288, 362, 363, 402 and 585 were referred reported



the same back with Amendments there to with the recommendation that the Amendments be adopted and the Bills amended Do Pass. Mr. Rose from Judiciary 1 to which House Bill 528 was referred reported same back with the recommendation that Bill Do Not pass. Mr. Rose from Judiciary 1 to which House Bill 529 was referred, reported same back with the recommendation that Bills Do Pass. Mr. Rose from Judiciary to which House Bill 611 was referred reported same back with the recommendation that Bill do pass. Mr. McMaster from County and Townships to which House Bills 508, 517, and 600 were referred, reported same back with recommendation that Bills do pass. Mr. McMaster from County and Townships to which House Bill 465, 25 21, 23, were referred reported same back with recommendation that Amendments be adopted and reported Do Pass, that under rule 33, a replacement in the order of Second Reading. How come they put that in there. Mr. Duff, from Judiciary 2 to which House Bill 287 and 394 were referred reported same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation that the Amendments be adopted and the Bills amended Do Not Pass. Mr. J. J. Wolfe from Senate Affairs to which House Bill 431 was referred reported same back with recommendation that Bill Do Pass. Mr. Wolfe from Veterans Affairs to which House Bill 455 was referred reported same back with Amendments thereto therefore the recommendation that the Bill do not pass. Mr. Wolfe from Veterans Affairs to which House Bill 587 was referred reported same back with



recommendation that Bill do pass. Mr. Epton from Insurance to which House Resolution No. 68 was referred reported same back with the recommendation that same resolution be adopted. Mr. Epton from Insurance to which House Bill 629 was referred same back with Amendment thereto recommendation that Amendments be adopted and Amendments do pass. Mr. Epton from Insurance to which House Bill 622 was referred reported same back with recommendation that Bill Do Pass. Mr. Washburn from Appropriations to which House Bill 591 = 610 were referred, reported same back with Amendment-s thereto, with the recommendation Amendments be adopted and Amendments do pass. Mr. Washburn from Appropriations to which House Bill 591 and 610 were referred reported same back with Amendments therefo with recommendations that Amendments be adopted and do pass. Mr. Washburn from Appropriations to which House Bill 586 and 677 were referred reported same back with recommendation that Bill do pass. Mr. Capuzi from Human Resources to which House Bills 319 and 724 were referred, reported same back with Amendments thereto with recommendation that Amendments be adopted and Amendments do pass. Mr. Capuzi from Human Resources to which House Bill 644 was referred reported same back with recommendations that the Bill do pass."

Martin"Introduction and First Reading please."

Fred Selcke: House Bill 891 Hanahan. Amendment of the Municipal Code, first reading of the Bill. House Bill 892, Hanahan. Amendment to an Act in relations to counties, first reading



of the bill. House Bill 893, Hanahan. Amendment to the Illinois Municipal Code, first reading of the Bill. House Bill 894, Hanahan, Amendment to the Municipal Code, first reading of the Bill. House Bill 895, Hanahan, Amendment to the State Police Act, first reading of the Bill. House Bill 896, Hanahan. Amendment to the Municipal Code, first reading of the Bill. House Bill 897, Kenny Miller, Amendment to the Probate Act, first reading of the Bill. House Bill 898, Day, Appropriates 100 thousand dollars to Department of Local Government Affairs, first reading of the Bill. House Bill 899, Mann, et al, prohibits to pay toilets in public places, first reading of the Bill. House Bill 900, Amends the Criminal Code, first reading of the Bill. House Bill 901, Beatty et al, amends an Act relating to real mortgages on property, first reading of the Bill. House Bill 902, Mugalian, An Act to provide for the payment of compensation to persons who are eligible for Illinois World War II Bonus, first reading of the Bill. House Bill 903, Mugulian, appropriates \$7500 to the Illinois Veterans Commission, first reading of the Bill. House Bill 904, Philip, et al, amends the Banking Act, first reading of the Bill. House Bill 905, Gene Hoffman, amends School Code, first reading of the Bill. House Bill 906, Geo-Karis, et al amends the Municipal Code, first reading of the Bill. House Bill 907, Totten, et al, amends the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act, first reading of the Bill. House Bill 908, Totten, et al, amends the Election Code, first reading of



the Bill. House Bill 909, Blair, et al, amends the Election Code, first reading of the Bill. House Bill 910 Chapman, amends the Registration of Vehicles Chapter, Vehicles Code, first reading of the Bill. 911, McCormick, An Act to the Property Tax Freeze Act, first reading of the Bill. 912, Tipsword, et al, amends the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund Article, first reading of the Bill. 913 Polk, et al, amends the Illinois Municipal Code, first reading of the Bill, 914, Bluthardt, et al, amends the Election Code. First reading of the Bill. 915, Madigan, et al, an Act to amend the Election Code, first reading of the Bill. 916, Duester, an Act to provide certain appointive powers to county boards, first reading of the Bill. 917, Beaupre, et al, Amendment to oppose junior college tax, first reading of the Bill. 918, Beaupre, et al, make an appropriate for the Department of Registration and Education first reading of the Bill."

Martin: The Gentlemen from Sinclair, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It gives me a great deal of pleasure as your temporary Majority Floor Leader to adjourn this Session until 9:30 A.M. for perfunct session on April 4, Wednesday and for a regular session starting at 10:00 o'clock, on the same date."

Martin: "All in favor say Aye..A..Mr. Clerk, Gentlemen before you leave, I'd like to have a few words to say. When I went to the democratic national convention as a poor black woman from the ghetto of Chicago, I thought that at that time,



That it was the greatest thing that ever happened in my life. When I became elected a State Representative from the 26th District, having ran twelve years, five times, I thought this too, was the greatest thing that ever happened in my life. But today I stand before you acting as Speaker, by far exceeds anything that has ever happened to me in my life. I'm grateful, thank you. The House will now be adjourned. Thank you."

