

I.

Speaker Blair: "The House will be in order. The Invocation will be by Dr. Johnson."

Dr. Johnson: "We pray. Lord of Heaven and Earth, when your Prophet Jonah confessed that he was trying to flee from Your Presence, his companions realized that the storms besetting them were a mark of your Divine Displeasure and so they cried out in their trouble and their needs. So may we learn to fear Your Name and in the words of the Psalmist call upon you in the day of our trouble and our needs. You have promised to hear when we pray. And you have promised to deliver us that we may praise Your Mercy. If our Legislative Sessions become stormy; if our inner calm becomes ruffled; if our most intense deliberations find themselves beset by misunderstanding, then let us recall the word of the Psalmist that 'God is our refuge and strength' a very present Help in time of trouble. We are bold to pray this because your Mercies are everlasting in Christ, Our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Blair: "Roll Call for attendance. Committee Messages from the Senate. Committee Reports."

Clerk Selcke: "Mr. Washburn from Appropriations which House Bill 2007, 2204, 2499, 2530, 2531, 2552, 2553, 2562, 2652, 2762, 2819, 2820 and 2862 were referred, reported the same back with the recommendation the Bills do pass. Mr. Washburn from Appropriations which House Bill 2498 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation the Bill do not pass. Mr. Washburn from Appropriations which House Bill 2550, 2817, 2818, 2651, 2822, 2823, 2852, 2860 were referred, reported the same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation that the Amendments be adopted, the Bills as amended, do pass. Mr. Washburn from Appropriations to which Senate Bill 1284, 1354, 1355, 1359 were referred, reported the same back with the recommendation the Bills do pass. Mr.



2.

Washburn from Appropriations to which Senate Bill 1350 was referred, reported the same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation the Amendments be adopted and the Bill as amended do pass. No further Committee Reports."

Speaker Blair: "House Bills Third Reading. House Bill 2079. Is Mr. Rayson here? Okay, take that out of the record. 2089, Mr. Garmisa here? Okay, take that out of the record. 2195, Mr. Jones? Take it out of the record. I'm going down the priority call. Mr. LaFleur, 2561? You want that called? House Bills Third. Okay. Let's read 2561, we've got one here."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2561. An act authorizing the Department of Transportation to make improvements in the west bank of DuPage River. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. LaFleur."

LaFleur: "I would prefer, Mr. Speaker, if this could be taken out of the record until the Appropriation Bill accompanies it?"

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Telcser, how about your 2573? All right, have a little negotiation. How about Mr. Merlo on 2666? How about 2790, Senior Citizens, Disabled Persons Property Tax? Well, I'll come back to it. Mr. Bradley back there? How about Mr. Boyle? Mr. Boyle, you want 1114? Okay, here we got one."

Clerk Selcke: "Which one? House Bill 1114, Boyle. An act in relation to recommendation of the abandoned mine land. Third Reading of the Bill."

Boyle: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I'd ask leave to have 1114 and the companion Bill. 1115, which is the appropriation considered together."

Speaker Blair: "All right. Is there leave to have 1115 heard with 1114? Hearing no objections, read that Bill."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 1115. An act making appropriation to the Department of Mines and Minerals. Third Reading



of the Bill."
Boyle: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the

Abandoned Mine Reclamation Act is a new act. It provides for reclamation by the Department of Mines and Minerals pursuant to the direction of a land reclamation council of surface mine or deep mine land which was mined before January 1, 1962, which land is not being mined nor put to any other commercial use and on which taxes are in default. The land must be a force of air, land or water pollution. This legislation is a result of extensive hearings by the Land Reclamation Subcommittee held during the past year and is a joint effort of Representative McMasters and myself as the most expedient manner of dealing with this problem which has been a major force of pollution in downstate Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Blair: "All right. Is there discussion? The question is, shall these two Bills pass? All those in favor vote aye; the opposed no. The Clerk will take one Roll Call and make a copy of it for the second Bill. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On each of these questions the vote is 105 ayes, no nays. And each of these Bills having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Pierce on 2269, is he here? 2278. Mr. Anderson. On what, that last Bill? Those last two Bills? Record Mr. Anderson as aye on 1114 and 1115. Mr. Choate. Choate, aye and Maragos, is aye. Now, we're going to have to come up here because I'm not going to spend all day recording these votes. Mr. McPartlin on 2278, is he here? Or 2279, Mr. McPartlin? Ron Hoffman, you want your 2344? 2344. No, I'm going to come back and pick them up. Who? Mr. Hoffman."
Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and..."
Speaker Blair: "Wait a minute, Ron. 2344, read it a third



time."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2344. An act requiring the Secretary of State, Department of Transportation, to convey certain property. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Many years ago in the process of planning for highway extension the land was condemned, owned by a gentleman in Cook County, and subsequently the project was abandoned. The property was taken by process of eminent domain and subsequently not used. It was taken contrary to the wishes of the owner. This Bill seeks to, by legislative action, convey the property back to the heir of the original owner for the amount paid by the state to the gentleman at that time. It was passed out of Transportation Committee, 11 ayes, 1 nay. And I solicit your support."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Blair: "He indicates he will."

Leinenweber: "I didn't quite catch that, Ron, what was the original transaction?"

Hoffman: "In the process of establishing a wider highway, the project was planned to acquire land for this highway expansion. The project was subsequently abandoned even though the land was acquired by the State of Illinois against the wishes of the owner, the owner has since laid claim to this, feeling that the land was taken away and not used for the purpose that it was intended and consequently he would like to have the property reconveyed back to him for the same price that was paid at that time by the State of Illinois."

Leinenweber: "What's the justification for having the price be the same?"

Hoffman: "The justification would be that he was denied against



his wishes the use of this land that was originally acquired to establish a restaurant and that was the business that his father was in and he was denied use of this against his wishes by the State of Illinois and under the provisions we had, he acknowledged the fact that he could not financially fight the case in court...."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, I can't hear, could you... One other question I would have but he did have use of the money since 1951, did he not? The individual have use of the money?"

Hoffman: "Yes. Yes, in a sense."

Leinenweber: "Well, I tell you...do you know what the fair cash market value of this 2.37 acres is currently?"

Hoffman: "No, I do not, Representative, and I don't think ...it's.....germane to the proposition inasmuch as he was denied the right to do business as he desired to do by the State of Illinois and consequently did lose substantial revenue over the course of the 20 years. He was denied this unjustly, he would have certainly been reluctant to convey the land initially. But for the 20 years it was not used and the project was abandoned the State of Illinois maintained its hold."

Leinenweber: "One last question. When the land was originally acquired by eminent domain in 1951, did that go to a court verdict or was it by settlement?"

Hoffman: "He went to court."

Leinenweber: "Was it a jury verdict?"

Hoffman: "No. At the time that it was going to go to the jury he realized he did not have the financial means to fight the State of Illinois in court and then condescended to accept the \$4,000 offered by the state."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, might I address myself to the Bill?"

Speaker Blair: "Proceed, Sir."

Leinenweber: "I would have to oppose this Bill on the grounds



that as most people know that all lands in the state of Illinois is held subject to the rights...prior rights of the state to acquire the property pursuant to fair cash market value. Now, apparently in 1951 the state did acquire this land through court process which is the procedures which have been established by this General Assembly for acquiring property and the gentleman had the use of the money for 24-some years. The land, undoubtedly, is worth considerably more, I would think that the state should be in the same position as any purchaser of land that if they have land that increases in value then the state should receive from a sale the fair market value. So I would urge a no vote on this Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Gibbs."

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

Speaker Telcser: "Indicates that he will."

Gibbs: "Ron, what was on the property in 1951 when it was condemned by the state, any improvements? Was there any improvements on the property in 1951 when the..."

Hoffman:"It was vacant land."

Gibbs: "And what is the status of it now? What's on it now?"

Hoffman:"Exactly the same. It's vacant land now, it was then."

Gibbs: "And then, why wouldn't the state go ahead and sell it like they do any other separate properties? At auction, like they're required under statute?"

Hoffman:"Under the statutory provisions, if the state is no longer going to use the land, the statutory provision is that it is put up for public auction."

Gibbs: "Right."

Hoffman:"However, the precedent has been set in this General Assembly that if the state through its action has...or has no longer use of the land, we have conveyed the land back to the original owner for the exact same price. In



the last Session, I'm sorry, last year, I handled a similar Bill which did revert the land back to the original owner that we have established through the years the precedent of, if there was claim laid to it, of conveying it back in this manner."

Gibbs: "Did the state obtain an appraisal on this ground in the last year? Has the state obtained an appraisal on the ground in the last year?"

Hoffman: "The state? I cannot tell you?"

Gibbs: "Do you know what the fair market value of the ground is today?"

Hoffman: "Cannot..."

Gibbs: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, now this thing was given a very fair hearing in the Transportation Committee and I may remind my colleagues in the Transportation Committee what we heard and it's typical of what has happened by our state government in regards to land grant and here this individual's land was taken back, or taken, and then after a long time he couldn't get it back. He was going to develop it and make some money off of it and then after a long period of time, what has happened, the state decided they weren't going to use it. And that's all this individual is asking for is to give them back the land the way it's supposed to be. So therefore I would ask that my colleagues here on this side of the aisle, and those who are in Transportation that remember this Bill, to give this man his fair share of what he has coming. Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, now I'm interested in land and I feel that when a man



by the power of this state, is used to take someone's land away from them, now a lot of principles that our constitution has always rested on is property rights, and the right of the land owner, the right of the property owner; this land was taken as I understand it, by the power of the state eminent domain, from this individual. For 20 years it lay there, we did, the state, did nothing about it. Now this land originally his, there's a moral obligation of our state to return this land at the same value that he received for it. The fact that time has gone by or that he had the use of interest, perhaps, on this four thousand or whatever it was money is of no importance whatsoever. The fact is during the 20 years he was deprived of his own land by the action of this state. I think there should be a principle of this, here and elsewhere and forevermore, that when a state takes land from a man, or family, and does not use it that that family, that man, should have those first rights to have it back for what he paid for it. In no way was this man at fault, absolutely no way, only the state was at fault and I think we should support such Bills, this one and any other similar bills like it."

Speaker Miller: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, I don't think anyone in here knows what is going on and I, for one, believe that..."

Speaker Miller: "Proceed, Mr. Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, I believe that every person in here should be paying attention to this Bill and I don't think they are even after you asked for order and I believe that it's important that we know and I think we should have order. I believe that if we pass this Bill and it does what I think it does, that..."

Speaker Miller: "Now the Chair is waiting a moment 'til the noise level is reduced and the Chair would request that



all Members keep the noise level down so the debate can proceed. Mr. Stone's question is well taken.

Mr. Stone, thank you. Well, you care to proceed, Mr. Stone, if we have the noise level down?"

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, I believe that, as I said, this is an important Bill; that it's important that we know what's going on..."

Speaker Miller: "It sounds better up here, Mr. Stone, would you care to proceed?"

Stone: "Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker, it is sounding a little better. And I suppose maybe those that aren't listening don't care so if the rest will listen, I would ask if the Gentleman for a question. All right. Now, Representative Hoffman, this...the Digest says that this Bill requires the State of Illinois to resell land to the people, to the heirs of the people that it was purchased from year in 1951 for the same price that it was purchased from in 1951."

Hoffman: "Correct."

Stone: "Is that correct? Now, what heirs are involved, I mean how close...how, all right, how close an heirship is it?"

Hoffman: It is the son of the original owner of the property who is to have use of this property for the establishment of a restaurant on this property."

Stone: "You mean that's what he's going to do with it if he buys it?"

Hoffman: "I don't know what he intends to do with it now, he is a restaurateur and that's what the property was acquired for and it was to be for the son who was being trained in the business. And because the land was taken by the state, he was denied use of the facility, the location and the ability. He had, in that particular area, he had another restaurant and he was just acquiring this land to make a change of location by another res-

restaurant location."

Stone: "You mean now, he's acquiring it now to do that?"

Hoffman: "No, I have no idea what he's doing...it now. I am saying, with this Bill, that against the wishes of a citizen of the State of Illinois, the state condemned property against the wishes of a citizen for project, a state highway project, which was subsequently abandoned. The state denied a citizen of the State of Illinois his right to own land, establish a restaurant, and partake in the profession that he was trained to do it."

Stone: "Yes. Now is there any truth that he would have made a profit had he had a restaurant? He might have gone bankrupt if he'd opened up a restaurant at that time."

Hoffman: "As in any profession there is no guarantee that anyone can make a profit, Representative, but I think based upon the fact that the original owner was well-known in the area as a restaurateur would speak for its case."

Stone: "Yes. Now the state did condemn this land in 1951 and presumably they paid a fair price for it. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "In the eyes of the state, certainly not in the eyes of the owner."

Stone: "All right. Now, what is the value of that land today?"

Hoffman: "I have no idea, Representative."

Stone: "Is it more or less than \$4,000?"

Hoffman: "I would imagine it would be more."

Stone: "Did the person who sold the land have the use of the \$4,000 all during this period of time?"

Hoffman: "Against their will, yes, Sir."

Stone: "Then without knowing what the value of the land is presently, how can we, in good conscience, vote for this Bill? If it's worth \$20,000 isn't the State of Illinois entitled to more than \$4,000?"

Hoffman: "No, Representative, and I think this is the point of the reason I have this particular piece of legislation. Mr. Speaker, could I have some quiet, please? Ladies and Gentlemen of this Assembly, there isn't a person in this House or sitting in the gallery that does presently not own land somewhere in the State of Illinois and I think for those that are not paying attention to this, I think they're well-advised to do so. The course of the powers of the state, they have the right to condemn property for use by the state under the powers of eminent domain. Now it's certainly at this point many of us are not affected by it but consider the fact if you do have property that someone, the state, being... this problem could condemn this property and take it away and deny you use of this land..."

Speaker Miller: "Just a moment. For what purpose does Mr. Stone arise again?"

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, I think it's absolutely ridiculous that a Bill like this can be heard with absolutely no one paying attention. Representative Hoffman is absolutely correct, he's entitled to a fair hearing, he is not getting it and neither are the people of the State of Illinois getting a fair hearing. I think this is absolutely ridiculous and I..."

Speaker Miller: "Well, Mr. Stone, your statement is very well taken, the noise level is very high this morning and I'm sure everyone in this room recognizes that the Chair can hardly do anything about it as far as keeping the level down, only try. This is an important issue and please Members of the House, listen to the debate. Now, Mr. Stone, do you have further questions?"

Stone: "Yes, I do and I hope that I don't ask them until we have someone paying attention. Mr. Speaker, I've never seen it worse, this is an important Bill to Representative Hoffman and to the people. And the people that are



talking aren't even hearing what we're saying. The back halls are full of people back here, the aisles are full of Members and it's absolutely ridiculous and I apologize for having to stand here like this but we're not doing anything anyway."

Speaker Miller: "The Chair will request one more time that the Members keep the noise level down so those who care can listen to this debate. Now, Mr. Stone, I suggest you try to go ahead and ask your question, Sir. All right, the Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Alsup."

Alsup: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've been down here eight terms and I am...I've been down here eight terms and this is a...usually a Bill that's passed without question. Now it's clear the man had use of the money but he did not have use of the property. This is done by the federal government and has always been done by the state government. inasmuch as the land was either taken by eminent domain or he sold by the threat of eminent domain and therefore before it is sold at public auction it is a common courtesy that the government extends to its property owners to give them first chance at the price they paid for it. Whether they make a profit or not is their business and therefore if he had taken the \$4,000 and invested in a stock or a bond or something that increased in value tremendously, that's beside the point. He may have invested and lost his money but that is immaterial. It's always been the policy of the government to offer the land back to the individual when they decide to turn it back over to the public. And if it wasn't this way, the state could go around and take all the land and they wouldn't have anybody to pay any taxes. So it's only the fair thing to do and it's always been done this way and I support the Bill on principle of the thing."



Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Hoffman has a Bill here that I think is only right and just. I commend on coming in with a Bill like this. This Bill is nothing more to say than just. These people sold this ground about 20 years ago, I'll put it differently. The state took it away from them and that was all right. The state at that time thought they 'was' going to need this on a road building program. They've gone along for 20 years. They have not used this ground and they do not at this time intend to use it. But they...at the wishes of these people to not take it they still took it and I think anybody and anyone of us and any citizen of the State of Illinois when the state comes along and takes ground for highway purposes and then decides they do not need it and they've taken that under condemnation then I think that individual...is only fair and right that this man be entitled to get it back at the price that he paid for it. Now if he'd held this ground himself for 20 years he would have had this money. But he took a mere \$5,000 and therefore I just can't understand why the...support this important Bill for the people."

Speaker Miller: "The Lady from Lake, Miss Geo-Karis."

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

Speaker Miller: "He indicates he will. Proceed."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Sponsor, was there a staff report on this property in the Committee that heard it as to the present value of the land?"

Hoffman: "No, Representative."

Geo-Karis: "Was there any appraisal value shown in the Committee Report?"

Hoffman: "I don't think we're dealing in figures of amounts because if we start considering the actual value of the



JUN 13 1974

15.

land then we must consider what the State of Illinois is in a posture of doing to their citizens. Are we going to stand here and question the value of this property when the State of Illinois has denied a citizen of this state ownership in the one substantial thing in this land, his home and his property? What worth do we put on that, Representative?"

Geo-Karis: "Would you please tell me where the location of this property is, Mr. Sponsor?"

Hoffman: "It's in Cook County."

Geo-Karis: "Where?"

Hoffman: "Cook County."

Geo-Karis: "Where in Cook County?"

Hoffman: "Right adjacent to Indian Head Park in Cook County."

Geo-Karis: "What street is it on, can you tell me?"

Hoffman: "It's on Ogden Avenue."

Geo-Karis: "Ogden and what else, Sir?"

Hoffman: "It's the old Route 66 and Route 45."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Calvo."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as one who worked in this field of eminent domain, as an attorney for the state for some eight years, I can tell you that's ridiculous to argue what the present value of the property is because any increment that occurred during the ownership by the state, would not inure to the state under any sense of decency because the state took property that they in fact never used and do not now intend to use. And this property should be returned to the former owner at exactly the price that he was paid for it and I would urge you to vote yes for this bill which we've done many, many times and it's what should be done. And I understand the Department of Transportation has no idea of using this property. They've had it for 23 years, it's about time they gave

it back to the land owner and I urge a favorable vote on this Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker, having spent enough of the taxpayer's money to pay for this property, I move the previous question."

Speaker Miller: "All right, the previous question is, they move. All those in favor say aye; the opposed nay.

The ayes have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill may stand insignificant here but it does represent one of the greater inequities that the State of Illinois can foster upon its citizens. Also in the last two months I have prepared legislation changing the aspects of the law of eminent domain to indicate that if the property received by the state, under the statutory provisions of acquisition by eminent domain, is not utilized for the purpose intended it would be returned to the original owner at the price paid within a five year period. I think Lincoln could have said no finer thing than 'government should not deny at any price the right, liberty and property of the citizen of the State of Illinois'. And I would solicit an aye vote."

Speaker Miller: "The question is shall House Bill 2344 pass?

All those in favor will vote aye; those opposed nay.

Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill, to explain his vote."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we're voting on something here that's going to be very important in the future. I'd like to point out to you that at the intersection that this Gentleman has stated, 45 and 66, I feel confident that this particular intersection that he is trying to give away is much more valuable than \$4,000. Now in the past any of the areas



that the state has sold back to anyone in any category of properties in the state of Illinois, they have requested that appraisers meet on the property and set an appraisal on this particular plot of ground that's going to be sold. And to sell this back to an individual and it's not that individual, it's his heir, apparently, for \$4,000 when it might be worth a million dollars I think that we're not being fair to all of the citizens of the state of Illinois. It seems to me that this should go up for appraisal and go up for a bid. This is state property now. I don't think because some engineers in the Department of Transportation made an asinine situation available to us that we should then compound that mistake and make a more severe mistake and sell this property back for \$4,000. I think this is silly, asinine and a bad Bill."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Deavers, to explain his vote. All right. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to explain his vote."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House, I don't care if it's five cents or ten million dollars, the money has nothing to do with the matter. It's the principle involved here. That land belonged to that family. The state took it without their consent. They have an absolute moral right to have it back and I can't understand how anybody can see such a simple act of Americanism as that."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis, to explain his vote."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the right of eminent domain carries with it public benefits. Public benefits. It's the only reason the state would have to condemn this land for the benefit of the public. They took the man's land for the public benefit. Now



the land is idle, just sitting there. It isn't benefiting the public and I say to you that way back in the olden days when the king come through and take your land because he was a king and you had no right to get it back. I say to you we're not going back to the old English common law; we're not going back there. For the public benefit and the public is not using it, now that the public is not using it it ought to go back to the rightful owner for the same price that they gave him. And this is only right and just."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Walter, to explain his vote."

Walters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, as usual the Assistant Minority Leader, Reverend Davis, is correct and Representative Hill's argument about this land possibly being worth a million dollars, if that's the case the argument could be made that maybe the state ought to pay him a million dollars for the land. We think this is a good Bill and we would urge your support. Thank you."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hoffman, to explain his vote."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, could I prevail upon you to request quiet of the House please? Ladies and Gentlemen of House, one of the speakers has vehemently indicated his objection to returning something that was taken unjustly by the State of Illinois but yet last year, Senate Bill 230, which did exactly the same thing was passed and voted on by this Gentleman to do exactly the same thing, convey land back that was not used for the purpose that it was acquired, to the original owner. I see this no different. I feel that anyone that is here that, is a Member, that is a citizen of the state of Illinois has the right to feel that you, as a elected Representative, are going to worry about their needs and concerns. Right now none of us here and possibly none in the gallery



that may not be paying attention to this are in this situation but are we to take a stand that the state is in the business of speculation, land speculation. That if we deny a citizen his rights, that we will not stand up and rectify them? Government should respond to the citizenry not the reverse, Ladies and Gentlemen, and I would sincerely ask you to consider an aye vote."

Speaker Miller: "Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Hunsicker, to explain his vote."

Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I agree wholeheartedly with what has been said, this property should be returned to the rightful owner. I realize when land is taken by eminent domain and to build a highway on it, if the state takes it, you can't return it. But when they buy property by eminent domain, take it away from a property owner and hold it for 20 years and value goes up the property owner should still be able to get it back for exactly what he paid for it. Public confidence in government is at about the lowest ebb that it can get at the present time and for heaven's sake let's not make it any lower. We don't want to be king over the people, they are the government and these folks are entitled to get their property back. And I urge an aye vote."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I did want to explain my vote because I sat on the Transportation Committee and heard this Bill. Actually the principle is right, the principle in this Bill is right, I think. The problem is the property was condemned for public purposes at a cost of about \$4,000, as I recall, and it is now worth, as I remember, about \$100,000. We had a staff report indicating that. The problem is, I may be mistaken, that's about what it's worth but this Bill would benefit just the



one landowner and, as I recall, there are about eight or nine others in the same boat. And it was my suggestion that the Bill be broadened so that the eight or nine others who have been abused, you might say, by the state could also benefit. And in the event this Bill... is that Amendment on? I don't think it is. In the event this Bill is not passed it goes to postponed consideration. I should think the Sponsor could take it back and add an amendment to help the others. And that is the reason that I'm casting a no vote because there are other citizens who deserve to be helped at the same time instead of passing eight or nine different bills. And I hope the Sponsor will appreciate that I support the principle of what he's doing but I think an amendment will fix this up and we can pass it."

Speaker Miller: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, to explain his vote."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to vote for this Bill but one thing bothers me and that is, I've seen the time when government really practices collusion, and we have the problem that... not that this is the case in this particular Bill or this particular instance, but you have the problem where government and a private party could enter into collusion where government is actually holding someone's land even though it went through eminent domain, could be holding someone's land where somebody for a number of years doesn't pay the taxes. Government in effect is holding someone's land and they turn back and that party receives the land at the greater value because of the time, greater value of the land. Meanwhile the taxing bodies have never received any taxes, I see nobody saying that the private party is going to pay all the back taxes on it, the interest on the 4,000 even isn't in the Bill. So I think there is some



problem with the Bill and I think we ought to consider that problem as well and vote no. Also, I think Representative Hoffman mentioned Senate Bill 230 and as I recall there was an appraised valuation on that Bill where there isn't on this Bill. So I would urge Members, I realize some Members may be voting because Representative Hoffman is a real good Member of this House, but I think there are some real particular problems with this Bill and I would urge a no vote."

Speaker Miller: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 93 ayes, 44 nays, and 31 answering present. This Bill, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2365, Mr. Clain. Mr. McClain. Mr. McClain. House Bill 2365."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2365. An act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Registration and Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Miller: "Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2365 is the appropriations of Department of Registration and Education. We have two Amendments on the appropriation. One Amendment is an agreed Amendment put on the Committee with a reduction of \$48,000. Second Amendment is a \$5,000 Amendment which would have the portrait painting of Governor...I'm sorry, purchasing the Illinois arts by Illinois artist. And I believe Milt Thompson, Museum Director, has met with Bud Washburn. Everything is okay there. I respectfully ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Miller: "Any discussion? The question is, shall... all right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer."

Palmer: "If the Sponsor will yield for a question? Is this... Bob, the same or below the Governor's budget?"

McClain: "Representative Palmer, this is below...I mean this



is signed with the Governor's budget. It's \$48,000 less than what he originally asked for but that is ...fine."

Speaker Miller: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty."

Beatty: "Mike, I'd like to know if the Chief Legal Counsel for this Department, John Galvin, has paid back to the state the salary that he obtained while campaigning for state representative and remaining on the payroll and actually jaunting around my district in the spring, during the day and being paid by the State of Illinois. Has any effort been made to obtain this repayment of salary or is this the way the Department is going to continue to operate in the future?"

McClain: "Well, Representative, first of all I didn't know anything about that. Second of all, it's my understanding that all attorneys are supposed to be full-time and not be involved in politics. And if you want me to, if you feel that strongly about it I'll have Dean Barringer get in touch with you so that that's corrected."

Beatty: "Well, I think it would be a good idea if we checked into it before the Bill was passed. I think that it's fine to run for public office but I don't think that the Governor should have all these people campaigning and we should pay for the expense."

McClain: "Okay, I'll pull it out of the record until we get this cleared, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Miller: "All right, the Gentleman request that it be taken out of the record. 2484. House Bill 2484."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2484. Gene Hoffman. A Bill for an act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Miller: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hoffman. Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

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



House Bill 2484 amends the School Code and permits students who are attending a high school which becomes a part of the community unit district, who live outside that particular district, to continue to attend that school if they wish to and the tuition or some differential sum agreed upon between the sending district and the receiving district will be paid. Also, we amended the Bill to provide that if a elementary district is... well, part of an elementary district is left out of a consolidation and the students in that district have no building in which to attend that they may continue to attend their old school. And I would appreciate your support of this Bill."

Speaker Miller: "Is there discussion? All right. The question is, shall House Bill 2484 pass? All those in favor vote aye; those opposed nay. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Leinenweber, aye. On this question there are 126 ayes; no nays; and 2 answering present. Record Mr. Hanahan as aye. Mr. Laurino, aye. Mr. McLendon, aye. Mr. Getty, aye. Mr. Keller, aye. Mr. Walters, aye. Mr. Brandt, aye. Mr. Ewell, aye. If there are any more it saves a lot of time to come up and give your names to the Clerk. This Bill having received a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Schneider, you ready on your 2501?"

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2501. An act making an appropriation to Women's Ink. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Bill but it needs explanation. I'd appreciate if you'll listen so I don't have to run through it again. The appropriation on this Bill is \$100, the reason the Bill has been submitted to the Legislature is that the Department of Labor has no device for refunding on an over-



payment. The agency which is called Women's Ink is an employment agency which was charged a \$150 for registration and the actual and real fee was really \$50. In their efforts to get a \$100 return from the Department of Labor they found much to their despair that they either had to go to the Court of Claims or through the Illinois Legislature for their \$100 because of the state's error. In my inquiries to try to get it done through the Court of Claims I found that the Agency would have paid a \$10 fee in order to recover \$100, in effect getting only \$90 back because of a state error. So I was willing and agreeable to submit the legislation so that they would get their actual \$100 without penalty to them because of the state's error. So I solicit your support for a return to the Agency for \$100."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to ask the Sponsor of this Bill a question. Do you know what it cost approximately to pass a Bill in the Illinois Legislature?"

Schneider: "Well, I've had that question..."

Simms: "All the way through."

Schneider: "I don't know the cost but it probably isn't any worse than a resolution that you and I might put in to congratulate somebody on their birthday; nor is it any different from the cost of the veteran's benefits that we were paying over the last couple of years. So I would like to say we could do it for nothing but the only just and fair way to accomplish it was to do it through the legislation."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I beg to differ with the Representative. It does cost a little bit more than the resolution. In fact for a bill to go through both the House and the



Senate and the cost to the taxpayer of the State of Illinois is approximately \$2,000. And I think in this instance for giving \$100 back that the people of the State of Illinois have to pay approximately \$2,000. It's absolutely ridiculous."

Speaker Blair: "Further discussion? Gentleman...Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, at the proper time I'd like to ask the Chair a question after we get the vote on this Bill."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Schneider to close."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, all I say that it's the only way these people can get their money back legitimately and I also might add that I have a Bill which is now coming through the Committees, and when is on Second Reading will correct the Department of Labor's present ineptitude methods for not being able to return money. So once this is taken care of we'll solve it through Department of Labor. I solicit an aye vote."

Speaker Blair: "All right. The question is, shall House Bill 2501 pass. All those in favor vote aye; the opposed no. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 123 ayes and 10 nays. Now, Mr. Bradley, did you have something to point out at the passage?"

Bradley: "I have a point of inquiry, Mr. Speaker, I'm attempting to follow how we are going on the Bills here and I had a Bill that was just jumped over and it's rather difficult to tell which Bills we're going on. I'm tickled to death we're on Third Reading but I'd like to move my Bill along with the rest of them. Could I have some indication from the Chair as to what order we're going in or how we're going to proceed?"

Speaker Blair: "All right, we're following the rule with



respect to the call and that is, that those bills that have expiration dates earlier than the other Bills those come first in the call. Now, I started off with the June 19th expirations then I went to the June 27th expirations and I'm on the July 5th expirations. I'll be moving into the July 6th expirations with the next Bill which will be 2143."

Bradley: "Well, I appreciate that but you jumped right over mine which is 6-28 on 2490."

Speaker Blair: "Well, wait a minute. What number?"

Bradley: "2490 which has a 6-28 expiration, and we're already on the July expiration."

Speaker Blair: "What was the number again?..."

Bradley: "2490."

Speaker Blair: "Let me...that's not a problem with this Bill. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Okay, I see what happened. We've been going right down, that Bill was called and you were not here and I remember that distinctly."

Bradley: "Today?"

Speaker Blair: "Right. Right." I was through 15 Bills, Sponsors weren't here on the floor this morning and as soon as I get through I'm going back through those, that's all. Yeah. You were not...I remember, Jerry, I called that and you weren't here. 2143, Mr. Flinn. Mr. Flinn. Mr. Flinn on 2143 but he's not...not here. 2541, Mr. Grotberg, you want that? 2541."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2541. A Bill for an act to add Section 4.1 and 4.2 to an act creating a circuit court. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, very briefly House Bill 2541 accommodates statutorily the 21 senior clerks of the 21 chief judges



27.

of the 21 judicial districts in the State of Illinois, not the clerks the executive secretaries to the chief judges. Their salaries are set statutorily so they have been at the \$8500 mark for a number of years and were behind in their adjustment at that point and this will statutorily raise their salary. There is no appropriation for this fund or in the judiciary budget. I would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Blair: "Discussion. Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Blair: "He indicates he will."

Lechowicz: "If the salary is set at \$8500 what is the Bill proposing? What's it raised to?"

Grotberg: "This allows them to go to 11,000 but some of them are on per diem and do not take that much money but if the per diems add up to 11,000 that would be the case."

Lechowicz: "Now you've pointed out that the dollar amount for this Bill is in the judiciary budget, is that correct?"

Grotberg: "That's correct."

Lechowicz: "Well, we've reviewed some of them and I didn't see it in there, could tell me what line it was in?"

Grotberg: "I can't tell you what line it is in, Representative Lechowicz, but I have it...it's in the staff, they're on there now. They're paid by the state."

Lechowicz: "Well, we reviewed that pretty close and the only thing we seem to know is the cost of living increase."

Grotberg: "I'm not administering that budget as you know, Representative, until we can get an answer to that question for you."

Lechowicz: "Would you mind holding this Bill while we see what we do on the others?"

Grotberg: "I would be glad to hold it for a short time, I may have to leave the floor later on in the afternoon for a medical appointment but I would like to have it called today. If you and I work it out..."

Lechowicz: "Fine."

Grotberg: "...that...thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Blair: "All right, let's take it out of the record for now."



June 13, 1974

28.

Speaker Blair: "Now House Bill 2825. The gentleman asks leave to have that Bill recalled to Second for purposes of Amendment. No objections, back on Second Reading. Read the Amendment, 2825."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 2825, Amendment #12, Blair, Collins. Amends House Bill 2825 as amended and so follows."

Speaker Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #12 is ah... the Amendment that Representative Shea and I agreed with corrective language ah... which is a technical improvement in the Bill and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Blair: "Discussion? The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments? Third Reading. Okay, 2825 a third time."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 2825, a Bill for an Act to regulate campaign financing and amending certain Acts in connection therewith. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Blair: "The gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2825 is the one that we ah... all remember was debated at some length this week. This is the Bill that deals with campaign dis... campaign contributions and expenditures. Ah... As amended the Bill will now require the reporting of all expenditures ah... and contributions received ah... by any political committee ah... in excess of \$250. The ah..., the... all candidates for public office will be required to file under the Bill ah... however, local candidates will not be ah... under the Bill until 1975. I think the, the Bill was ah... debated at some length on Second Reading. I would move for its passage. If there are any questions of any Members, I would attempt to answer them at this time."

Speaker Blair: "All right, discussion? The question is... Mr. Sangmeister."

Sangmeister: "Representative Collins, ah... there was a Bill in here and maybe it was once upon a time that ah... that made us keep an accounting of it, but we didn't have to report it publicly. Is there any accounting in this Bill now at all?"

Collins: "Yes, \$250's the limit and we don't worry about anything under



that. Oh, yes. The Bill requires an exact accounting of all moneys received or expended in excess of \$10."

Sangmeister: "In excess of \$10, well we won't have to report anything over \$250, is that right?"

Collins: "You'll, you'll report anything that totals over \$250 in the aggregate."

Sangmeister: "Oh, I see."

Collins: "It is aggregate."

Sangmeister: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Blair: "Further, further discussion? Ah... Mr. Shea."

Shea: "I just want to explain my vote when I..."

Speaker Blair: "All right, Mr. Craig."

Craig: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question."

Speaker Blair: "Okay."

Craig: "Phil, is now... if you have this campaign filing and the... I am required to specify, to say the campaign is coming up and I want to help some precinct committeemen that I have to definitely specify and show, keep record of where this money and what committeemen would get it and how much?"

Collins: "You have to keep that record for yourself, yes. However, it is not subject to public disclosure unless it exceeds \$250."

Craig: "Now is that to each individual, now I know about the \$250, but I mean when I'm expending this, spending this money."

Collins: "It would be each individual expenditure."

Craig: "And I got to name who it is and how much?"

Collins: "Yes, yes, that's correct. Now if it's over \$250; now if you've given that precinct committeemen \$50, you'll have a record of it yourself, but it will not be reportable."

Craig: "If I do what now?"

Collins: "You mentioned if you give a precinct committeeman some money to assist you in your campaign, if that amount is under \$250, you do not have to report it."

Speaker Blair: "Further discussion? Mr. Tuerk."

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

Speaker Blair: "Indicates he will."

Tuerk: "Phil, let's assume the ah... 50 people donate \$5 a piece. That's



\$250 in the aggregate and yet individual donations are under \$10."

Collins: "Yes, there would be not report and as a matter of fact, there ah... would not necessarily be any record. I'm sure you would keep a record of it, but you wouldn't be required under the Bill. I should point out though that you will be required to report your total contributions received ah... whether ah... financial or not. You will report a total."

Tuerk: "What was that again. I didn't catch that last part."

Collins: "Part of the Bill will require you to report the total contributions you've received for just the purpose of your record keeping although you don't have to disclose the individual contributions or expenditures unless they exceed \$250 in the aggregate."

Tuerk: "Well, in other words, if they exceed... Say, for instance, I have a campaign going and I get \$500 for my campaign, all right? Do I, do I have to disclose each and every contributor because it exceeds this \$250 aggregate?"

Collins: "No, no. As a matter of fact, if \$500 is all you receive in your campaign, you wouldn't have any obligation at all because the Bill deals with campaigns who receive or expend in excess of \$1,000."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Barnes."

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

Speaker Blair: "Yes."

Barnes: "Phil, I'm kind of confused. If, say ah... for campaign purposes, a person gave a fund raising affair and ah... say the tickets were selling for \$5 a piece and 200 of them were sold. Would they have to report names of each one of those individuals?"

Collins: "No, no, you wouldn't. As a matter of fact, all you'd have to report is the total you received."

Barnes: "That's the total amount not the names of the individuals."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Berman."

Berman: "Mr. Collins, ah... I refer to Section 9-23 about anonymous contributions..."

Collins: "Yes."

Berman: "All right, if you have a campaign headquarters open house, if you



have a campaign headquarters open house, if you open up your campaign headquarters, and you have a hat or a bucket that ah... people can come in and drop a buck into. That's prohibited under this, is that my understanding cause those are, in effect, anonymous."

Collins: "Anonymous contributions are prohibited, that's right. Ah... I recognize the difficulty in ascertaining ah... what is an anonymous contribution, where it came from and what to do with it. This is not a... this is not something that I brought up myself. I accepted an Amendment on the Bill from the other side of the aisle, but you're right. You're supposition is correct."

Berman: "You know, this doesn't add up to much, it doesn't add up to much, but every little bit helps. Couldn't we put some kind of a ah... dollar figure or some kind of a exclusion for that kind of ah... anonymous contribution?"

Collins: "I, I don't know how and as a matter of fact, I think you could open up a huge loophole if you did."

Berman: "I didn't hear you."

Collins: "I said, I don't know how you could do it and if you did, I think you could open up a real loophole."

Berman: "All right."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Question, question for the Sponsor. Representative Collins, Representative Collins, what, what does happen under the provisions of the Bill to anonymous contributions, say somebody gives you ah... 10 tickets or something?"

Collins: "The Treasurer of your campaign committee is required to forward it to the safe, State Treasury."

Beaupre: "Okay."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "I would like to ask the Sponsor an additional question. Does this Bill provide as was amended to have uniform forms sent to the ah... authority that's going to the Election Board, are they going to forms sent to them?"

Collins: "Ah... yes, the Bill provides for notice to be given to all candidates of their obligation and as a matter of fact, the Amendment that we adopted this morning ah... states that it will be sent



by certified mail ah... receipt requested to the addressee only."

Maragos: "All right, now my question is, is the Election Board or the authority that's going to handle this particular ah... Bill and these campaign contributions, are they going to have uniform accounting forms to be filed. Are they going to be, does each one have his own statement to send in?"

Collins: "Yes, the, the State Board of Elections is to prepare all forms."

Maragos: "So, therefore, all reporting forms will be uniform and they will not be different for anybody else?"

Collins: "That's right, they will be uniform."

Maragos: "And the effective date is October 1?"

Collins: "Pardon."

Maragos: "The effective date is October 1?"

Collins: "No, the effective date is immediately upon becoming law. However, we are not required to ah... file our ah... our ah... organizational forms until October 1."

Maragos: "And this will be for the current campaign coming up then, is that right?"

Collins: "That's right, for state candidates, not for local."

Maragos: "And the local will be January 1, '75?"

Collins: "That's right."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Day."

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

Speaker Blair: "He indicates he will."

Day: "What are, what are the penalties here for violation of the Act?"

Collins: "It's a Class A misdemeanor which is \$1,000 and up to 1 year in jail."

Day: "All right, that's not disqualify... doesn't disqualify a candidate for violating the Act, he wouldn't be disqualified to hold office."

Collins: "I'm not sure I heard you right."

Day: "I say, a candidate who is in violation of the Act would not be disqualified from holding office."

Collins: "No, no, he wouldn't."

Day: "It doesn't do that."

Collins: "No, it does not."

Day: "I see, thank you."



Speaker Blair: "Mr. Mugalian."

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

Speaker Blair: "Yeh, he indicates..."

Mugalian: "Here's a situation of a township ward or a county party organization, now let's assume that in one calendar year that it receives \$2,500, but that all of that money is spent by the organization for its phone bill, for getting election judges and doing the things that are merely relating to maintaining a party organization so that none of those funds are, in fact, expended in behalf of a candidate of that party. Will that township ward or county organization ah... have to file a report?"

Collins: "I really, I really think so, but that distinction has not been made. I think that is subject to interpretation. I would think they would, but ah... that really that's a gray area which I'm not prepared to exhort."

Mugalian: "Well, could you look at the, at the language that... Would it be in terms of cover it or not to cover it because you can see..."

Collins: "It would be my intent and hope that that would be covered."

Mugalian: "All right, according to your memorandum, I believe that it would not strictly be covered because the expenditure would not be in behalf of the candidate. It would be merely in behalf of keeping the party in business. Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Polk."

Polk: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question? Mr. Collins, I have just a couple questions. On the loophole and as you point out, there are loopholes in the, in the contributions that are anonymous. It seems to be the biggest loophole that we have in this piece of legislation and again I'd like to summarize something that you said and you've indicated if a person receives a letter in the mail with a dollar in it and there's no return address, then that money must be, must be returned to the State or it's returned..."

Collins: "That's right."

Polk: "And what are, and what are the violations, ah... what, what, what are the terms of the ah... of the fine if a person does not do this?"

Collins: "What is the fine, did you say?"



Polk: "Yes."

Collins: "Up to ah... Let me read the penalty Section to you."

Polk: "All right."

Collins: "It calls it willful failure to file or willful filing of false or incomplete information required by this Article shall constitute a Class A misdemeanor."

Polk: "Doesn't this really set up, set anybody up... If I had an opponent that I didn't particularly like, couldn't I put a two dollars in an envelope and send it to him knowing full well that he would return it to the State and ah... You know, I just..."

Collins: "I don't see how."

Polk: "Well, you know, how can he prove, how can I prove he got the two dollars or ah..."

Collins: "You're absolutely correct. This is not a Section that I put into the Bill and I, I accepted it because the intent of the Amendment certainly ah... laudible although I don't know how it could be enforced frankly."

Polk: "What does, what does the Federal legislation do in relation to, to ah... Federal candidates in relation to anonymous gifts, do you know?"

Collins: "To the best of my recollection, I don't think it's included."

Polk: "Okay, thank you."

Collins: "Oh, Representative Lundy is going to correct me, I believe."

Lundy: "My understanding, Representative Polk, in the Federal campaign spending reporting legislation is that cash contributions can't be made at all, cash contributions cannot be made at all."

Collins: "Again, I don't think it says anything in the Federal about anonymous and I don't, frankly, don't remember the Section that he mentions on cash contributions. It might have been a later Amendment since we looked at the original Federal Bill."

Polk: "Well, ah... Representative Lundy's comment said it can't be made, that doesn't mean it can't be done. Representative Lundy states that it can't be done ah... but that still doesn't prohibit a person from, from putting \$10 bill in an envelope and sending it to a Congressman and ah... so apparently the law is not very well written or defined there either in relation to this particular problem."



Collins: "Apparently."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. McAuliffe. And Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, will the Sponsor yield to a question? There is nothing preventing cash contributions as long as you ~~request~~ it in your Bill, is that correct?"

Collins: "That is correct."

Geo-Karis: "At this time, Mr. ~~Speaker~~ and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to speak ~~in~~ the Bill. Many of us have committed ourselves to meaningful disclosure Bills. It's about time we were honest with the public which we represent and pass a good meaningful disclosure Bill as this one ~~is~~. I think this an open Bill; it will show exactly what we're going to spend and what we're going to collect and from whom and I think the public is entitled to and I think we have a duty to support ~~one~~ that, at least, is... its meaning is not only meaningful but is ~~easier~~ to understand than some of the others that have been filed ~~in~~ this Assembly and I would like to suggest along with that to ~~the~~ Sponsor that the State Board of Ed... Elections makes a very meaningful sack... seat once this Bill is passed so we will not have ~~any~~ trouble about it and I would like to urge everyone to support ~~this~~ meaningful disclosure Bill. We owe it to ourselves; we owe ~~it~~ to the integrity of the party that represent and the people from our district."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Would the Sponsor yield ~~for~~ a question? Representative Collins, I want to make sure so that I don't get in trouble and nobody on this House floor gets in trouble ~~and~~ I want to make sure I understand very clearly what a State Representative has to do because ah... I'm thinking about the people, ~~where~~ the people ah... nominate somebody in a primary or elect them ~~and~~ then ah... we find that that person, for example, couldn't take ~~office~~ 'cause he didn't file a, a piece of paper. We want to make ~~sure~~ that doesn't happen. I almost didn't file my ethics statement ~~'cause~~ I thought I had filed it and I did when I filed my petition ~~and~~ then Speaker's office or somebody, you know, reminded me. I finally filed one; I wouldn't be on the ballot so I'm concerned that we ~~understand~~ what we have to do and I was wondering if you could just ~~hospitalize~~ for a State Representative,



what does this Bill require that we do. I have heard that there's several different reporting dates and I want to make sure I have it clear in my mind dates they are and what I have to do."

Collins: "You'll, you'll be required to make a report of all contributions that you have received in the aggregate in excess of \$250 30 days prior to the primary and 60 days after. Another report of contributions would be made 30 days prior to the general election and 60 days afterwards. You would, in July, make an annual report which would give the total of you contributions received in that 12 month period and the expenditures that you've made in excess of \$250 in the aggregate ah... during that year."

Deuster: "That, that, that's all?"

Collins: "Yes and we have written into the Bill procedures whereby the election authority with which you file will notify you by certified mail 30 days prior to the filing date of you obligation to file."

Deuster: "Fine, and what, what happens if I'm late? What happens if... if I'm running, I'm so busy running for election; I don't have a staff, I don't have a committee; I've just running and, and I'm a few days late getting that report in. What would be the effect?"

Collins: "Well, ah... you're, you're... You are technically in violation at the point, but the Bill does call for a willful violation and it would be, I think, rather difficult to establish willful violation in the case that you describe. However, you will have ample time; you're going to be notified 30 days prior to the filing date ah... of your obligation so ah... and, and the election authority will enclose the prescribed form so it, it will not be, I don't think it will put an undue burden on you to file in time and we have provided for the State Board of Elections to provide a manual of instruction ah... for you at the same time."

Deuster: "I want to ask this question and make it clear. I would not be disqualified from holding office?"

Collins: "No, you wouldn't."

Deuster: "And I'm told it's some kind of a misdemeanor, but what are the range of penalties for that misdemeanor."

Collins: "\$1,000 and up to one year in jail."

Deuster: "Up to one year in jail. Thank you."



Speaker Blair: "Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I do have a question for Phil if ah... in the area of a township or ward organization that has to do with, as you know, the ah... successful ah... hopeful successful campaigns of numbers of candidates ah... on the whole ticket, for example, how would those candidates running on a ticket in November, for example, be treated, er... How would they treat this Act as it relates to a township or ward organization and the moneys expended in their behalf as far as precinct workers are concerned, literature and so forth. Would there be a division of ah... to the total amount of money ah... as it relates to the number of candidates and in an average taken so that that candidates would have to report that income from the political organization or would the organization report it as contributions to individuals rather than to a slate of ticket, er... slate of candidates?"

Collins: "I, ah... I think it would be the candidates obligation to apportion their share of what they may have received from ah... an organization that is such as you described. Ah... It's, its'... I don't know if you're talking about direct cash payments to the candidate. If you're talking about the publishing of a brochure and this type of thing, I think the organization would report the money as expended upon printing of a brochure or some such ah... definition. I don't think that you would, the organization would be in a position, you know, for reporting by name so much every candidate. I think it would just be a general expenditure to A.B.C. Printing Company, but I do think the candidate would have the obligation of apportioning his portion of that as a receipt if it exceeded \$250."

Yourell: "Well, then what you're saying, in effect, is that there are 10 candidates running on the Democratic ticket or 10 candidates running on the Republican ticket, then the organization would have to disclose to each of those candidates what they thought they had expended in the behalf so that then the candidates could explore the possibility if that figure was over \$250 to report that. So, how do you equate precinct work, for example, of a precinct captain working on behalf of an entire ticket and how are you going to break



that down as far as candidate benefits are concerned from the organization, ah... wouldn't Amendment #11 have handled that. We, did we."

Collins: "I don't know that you're, that you can break down the value of ah... manual effort, human effort on your behalf and I, I don't think this would be the intent. I think that money expended by the precinct captains obviously would be under the Bill and would be reportable if it exceed \$250, but I do think we get into an area here where ground rules are going to have to established through experience and I think that the State Board of Elections will be responsible for, for establishing a lot of these rules and procedures."

Yourell: "Now, what you're saying..."

Collins: "Just breaking ground."

Yourell: "So what you're saying, for example, if ah... I as a committeeman of a township organization expended \$20,000 in the general election of November on behalf of all of the candidates running on the Democratic ticket that then I would have to determine as the ah... organization head or the committee that I appoint to handle these funds which in all possibilities will be myself, how much I'm expending to each of the candidates on the ticket."

Collins: "No, I don't think so."

Yourell: "Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Joe Gibbs."

Gibbs: "Well, Phil, I think the ah... most of my questions were answered concerning the penalties involved which is a class A misdemeanor. I think Representative Polk asked about if he'd sent in an anonymous two dollars, as I read the original Act, he'd have to spend about a year in jail if he did not. Has that been changed. In other words, you can't make anonymous contributions, can you?"

Collins: "No."

Gibbs: "So that's prohibited, it still is."

Collins: "It is prohibited under the Bill, yes."

Gibbs: "All right, now what was your answer, I didn't catch it, about cash contributions, can they be made?"

Collins: "Yes, yes, this is no prohibition on cash contributions."

Gibbs: "So if someone gave \$5,000 in cash then ah... they could break



it down and say they received it in cash from ah... so many people that it was under \$250, isn't that right."

Collins: "You mean if a number of people got together to arrange \$5,000 for you?"

Gibbs: "Or if just one person wanted to give \$5,000 and then they broke it down into less than \$250."

Collins: "Oh, no. It doesn't work that way; it's the aggregate. If one person gave you \$5,000, that would be reportable no matter how many installments he paid it in."

Gibbs: "Yeh, but he did it in cash and when they put it on the report, it came in \$200 increments ah... there's no way that you could show it, or prove it is there unless you could... contribution was made."

Collins: "I, I'm sure I can't stop anybody from cheating, but they would be in violation."

Gibbs: "Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Phil... Will the Sponsor yield for a question? Right here, right behind you. Phil, as I understand it, the Bill goes into effect October the 1st, right?"

Collins: "It goes into effect immediately upon becoming law. However, you are under no requirement to file your forms with the State until October 1st."

Mahar: "Well, if the, if the State ah... sends me out a 30 day notice, I won't be filing anything for November... What would I do for the November election."

Collins: "For the November election?"

Mahar: "Yes."

Collins: "You ah... you will file your organization, your political committee on October 1st."

Mahar: "And I will not file any income prior to October the 1st. Is that covered in the Bill?"

Collins: "No, only what you receive after the Bill becomes law."

Mahar: "Which... After it becomes law which could be in July or August sometime, right?"

Collins: "Right."

Mahar: "Okay, thank you."



Speaker Blair: "Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand in opposition to House Bill 2825. And I'll tell you why because this Bill is strictly for the wealthy as far as running for public office and my personal opinion. If you're a wealthy individual and you say, for example, you have \$10,000 to use to run for public, 10 or even it could be up to 100,000. All I have to do is on a personal basis, contact a respective party leader and the precinct committeemen downstate that are elected and in turn make a personal contribution to each and every one of them and not one dollare would have to be recorded. Just as long as the dollar amount is less fan \$250, in my personal opinion, this Bill is a complete facade. Did you hear me, Phil? Number 2, as far as the political organizations are covered and make no mistake, you are covered; you'll have to be reporting 5 times a year. Number 3, the penalties on this Bill is a class A misdemeanor and to answer Representative Deuster's question, as a candidate and I think as a candidate you'll probably want to appoint yourself as treasurer because no one else will want to take the job and if you've, God forbid, made a mistake, you're going to spending one year in prison and if you're spending one year in prison, you cannot serve on this floor and I would hope you'd vote 'no'."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Richard Walsh."

R. Walsh: "Will the gentleman yield, please?"

Speaker Blair: "Yes."

R. Walsh: "Phil, ah... the report that is due 30 days before the primary ah... what period does that cover? What's the reporting period?"

Collins: "The preceeding 12 months."

R. Walsh: "Well, in other words, you're going to have to include in your report ah... which is due at midnight on that date, anything you've received during that day."

Collins: "Up to the prior date, yes."

R. Walsh: "Well, in other... I mean, your income tax return is due on April 15 for the prior year. This report is due 30 days prior to the election for every minute up to the time you're actually filing which doesn't give you any time to prepare the report and get it



filed."

Collins: "Yeh, I'm afraid you're right although the form provided was just indicate where you have to add a space that day, but you, you are right."

R. Walsh: "Well, it would seem to me that that is a fatal defect ah... in the ah... in the Bill and it should be corrected before we ah... before we act on it because the reporting period cannot and should not include the day on which you report."

Collins: "I don't believe it's covered the day you report, Dick. I think it's up to the day you report."

R. Walsh: "Well, as I understand it, it would include the day you report, but even if it's up to the day you report, it still isn't time to prepare it and, and get it filed."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support this legislation as the cosponsor thereof. Sure there's many changes that need to be made and that could be made. I, for one, feel that we should of left the Bill in its original form of reporting over \$100 rather than \$250. However, we must make a start someplace. I also felt that we should have a ceiling, a limit that any one person or corporation or union could contribute to a candidate. This can be rectified in the future. We should start out, if we're going to pass any legislation, this one, obviously, is the most likely vehicle. Let's pass this good legislation and come back later after we have seen how it works in the year or two and make the necessary changes. I encourage you to support this Bill."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm ashamed to vote for this Bill and I'm afraid to vote against it. Logically, I should vote 'present' or hide in the washroom, but I felt that either of those postures is a little bit too mugwampish for my constituency so I shall with great reluctance and a minimum of pride cast an 'aye' vote for this Bill. In so doing, I will be guilty as the other hundred or so vote for it of a craven submission to the news media hysteria in this particular case. I shouldn't...



hysteria is not a good word, ah... obsession. This is not in response to any genuine public concern; the public is smart enough to know that it can separate the crooks and the thieves from the dedicated public servants with the existing laws that are already on the statute book. It doesn't need any selfindictment or any beating of the legislators over the head by themselves. It's a bit of an anomaly in the State of Illinois in the year of the lottery that all at once we feel in the necessity to point out how simon-pure and clean each of us is. It's a contradiction and it's a happy fact to note that in this particular year that the public won't let its servants hang themselves in nooses the servants have foolishly constructed, but we have evidence of that in the last few days in the effort to throw out so many people off the ballot and you notice the hue and cry from the very same papers that were demanding the original disclosure statements. We think that's a happy situation and I want to concur with one of the prior speakers who pointed out that this will benefit not the poor candidate, but the rich and already in the 54th District you have to be either a millionaire or have very trusting bankers, lenders who will loan you money at nine a half percent plus points to seek public office. The effect of this Bill, Ladies and Geneltmen, will be to dry up for the all present time to come, the availability of the money because those trusting friends who give you a few dollars to run for office have a passion for anonymity and they don't want their names spread over your books or over the publics books as having contributed to your cause and I hope that all the good people in my district will get their contributions in along time before this Bill takes effect because the ah... because of that reality of life. I'm going to vote for it; I urge everyone of you here to vote for it. If we have 177 votes, we will have created a situation. I think there is a Latin phrase. My, my scholarly friend, Caravello, knows the phrase. It's redictio ad abserdem. So we have 177 to 0 and perhaps we can come back here in a year and re-examine the question and take this, this terrible Bill off of the books at that time, but at the present time the noncourageous but practical thing is to vote it on our backs and I'll vote 'aye'."



Speaker Blair: "Mr. Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in reply to the last speaker, rather than let him vote against his conscience I think he should adopt the Latin phrase, 'illigiti mota non carberendum.'"

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Blair: "Yeh."

Shea: "Phil, what if you don't file under this, you just neglect to or refuse to."

Collins: "That is covered under the penalty section and it's willful failure to file."

Shea: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear the..."

Collins: "That would be willful failure to file and would be covered in the penalty section of the Bill."

Shea: "All right, now who has to file under this Bill?"

Collins: "Who has to file?"

Shea: "That's correct."

Collins: "All ah... all political committees which well receive ah... over \$1,000 or will expend in excess of \$1,000 for a candidate in opposition to a candidate or in support or opposition of some ah... proposal on the ballot."

Shea: "All right, what if you don't keep steady records?"

Collins: "Well, I would assume that would be willful violation."

Shea: "All right, now as I understand this, this applies to every candidate that's required to file an ethics statement, is that correct?"

Collins: "It was ah... originally introduced that way, but then we ah... established a \$1,000 threshold to take out people such as nonpaying offices, school boards, etc. where they're not spending that kind of money on a campaign."

Shea: "Where did that get in the Bill? I didn't see that one."

Collins: "That was in Amendment 6."

Shea: "Where in the Bill is it now?"

Collins: "Well, it's in the definition so if that's..."

Shea: "Well, does that mean that local candidates that make in excess of \$1,000 a year must file under this?"



Collins: "Yes, next year."

Shea: "All right, let's take in the, the village of Riverside where our trustees, I think, make a \$1,000 a year or \$1,200.."

Collins: "Oh, no, it's not salary. It's those that receive campaign contributions or make campaign expenditures in excess of \$1,000."

Shea: "Well, then who's required, what people are required? Is, is a member, is a person that runs for the school board required to file under this Act?"

Collins: "If he spends over \$1,000 in campaign expenditures or receives over \$1,000 in campaign contributions, yes."

Shea: "Well, what if, you know, my question goes something like this, Phil.

Candidates for the school board file with the local school, that's where they file their nominating petitions. Now will our schools then have to send to these candidates to forms and the information within 48 hours after their filing that they're required under this Act and subject to this Act."

Collins: "They can give them to them in person at the time of filing or mail them to them."

Shea: "All right, but they're required to do it, is that correct?"

Collins: "Pardon me?"

Shea: "They... The schools will be required to do this to the candidates and candidates running for the school board will be required to keep detailed records in case they collect of \$1,000."

Collins: "I didn't hear the last part of it, but you... ah... The authority, the election authority with which you file will..."

Shea: "That's the, that's the school board."

Collins: "All right, then they will ah... make available to you, the forms."

Shea: "All right, then a candidate that runs for the school board will have to keep detailed financial records of any income or expenditures and if he expends of \$1,000, he will have to report it, is that correct?"

Collins: "Yes."

Shea: "All right, now these are the same people that are required under the Governmental Ethics Act to file now, is that correct?"

Collins: "Yes."



Shea: "All right, then with regards to local candidates. They file their petitions with the local county, er... local city clerk, is that correct?"

Collins: "Yes."

Shea: "All right, so each municipal clerk throughout the State of Illinois will now be required to furnish to candidates to public office this information."

Collins: "The State Board furnishes the forms. They will be disseminated at the point of filing, yes."

Shea: "All right, and then the candidates that run for each local office will be required to keep detailed financial statements, is that correct?"

Collins: "Yes, if they go over th \$1,000 threshold."

Shea: "Well, no, you got to kind of keep the records don't you to make sure you don't get over the 1,000?"

Collins: "Well, I would assume that ah... anyone who is going to go over that threshold or near it will be keeping records, yes."

Shea: "All right, so that we will be required to do this at the local, the county, and then for us State candidates, it's the Board of Election, is that right?"

Collins: "Yes, it is."

Shea: "All right, let's take a trustee in the village of Riverside who runs for an office that is a nonpaying office, but he's still elected and we had a very hotly contested contest last time for two trustees and I'm sure they expended over \$2,500, but it was a committee. Now this committee would have to go through all this, is that correct?"

Collins: "Oh, yes."

Shea: "All right, if that committee, you know, didn't really know about all this law and everything, could either one of these trustees or whoever was collecting the money, would they be subject to \$1,000 fine and a year in jail?"

Collins: "If they did what?"

Shea: "If they didn't report this, would they be subject to \$1,000 fine or a year in jail?"

Collins: "You mean, if they just disregarded the law willfully ah..."

Shea: "They, they willfully disregarded the law similar to the 2,000



people that have failed to file their ethics statement at this time."

Collins: "Yes, and that's why we're being so careful to provide that they be given notice and I understand that we have a Bill coming up that will provide for notice for ah... the candidates under the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act, too."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to speak to the Bill. I full well wanted to support this Bill until I set down and went through it and read it and then I started to think and I think Roscoe Cunningham put it so very aptly. Are we going to worry about what people think or are we going to do the right thing? We passed an ethics act out of this House some 3 years ago. Last year we extended the time for filing for over 2,000 candidates 30 days after an extension. This year again we find ourselves with 2,000 people on a state wide basis that haven't filed these ethics statements and what we're going to do with this Bill is subject a large number of people throughout the state for inadvertance mistake or unwillingly knowing up to a \$1,000 fine or a year in jail. What we're saying to a lot of state's attorney's and attorney generals throughout the state is take your pick. If you want to go get somebody, you've got a good vehicle in this campaign disclosure law. I think we'd better look and see what we're doing out here this morning 'cause you're going to put a lot of people, a lot of innocent people in a position where they can go to jail for a long time. I'm full well interested in passing a disclosure law and I think that you and I sit out here on the floor of this House we're going to know what's in this Bill; we're going to know how to report because we're sitting here and every state wide candidate will know, but let me tell you that there's going to be a lot of people in a lot of small towns, there's going to be a lot of people running for school boards, there's going to be a lot of people throughout the State that don't know what this Bill is going to do. I think you're opening up the door to put a lot of people in jail because this Bill is got a lot of cosmetic, a lot of public relations and not a lot of substance."

Speaker Blair: "All right, Mr. Holloway."

Holloway: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question? I, I assume that most



candidates will ah... have a committee and assuming there's a violation ah... who will be responsible? Will the candidate ultimately be responsible."

Collins: "The individual officially designated as the treasurer is the responsible person."

Holloway: "But the candidate can operate as his own treasurer, but the, but the real person who will bear the brunt will be the treasurer of the, of the committee."

Collins: "That's correct."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. D'Arco."

D'Arco: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the previous question."

Speaker Blair: "All those in favor the gentleman's motion say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question's been moved. The gentleman from ah... Cook, Mr. Collins, to close."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I very briefly asking for support of your Bill will point out that we've been down this road many times over the last 3 years. I think this is a Bill that is long overdue; one that the Speaker and I and many others have worked many hours in putting it into shape a Bill that is a meaningful attempt to add real campaign disclosure legislation. At the same time, one that does not put a burden unnecessarily upon one individual. A lot of smokescreen has been raised here today about the potential dangers to people under this Bill and I say that there are no dangers to anyone unless those who will fully violate this act. This, this Bill give the Board wide discretion as to ah... correcting mistakes, legal procedures other, other than criminal procedures ah... the Board may go into Circuit Court to seek civil remedies to compel compliance with orders of this Board. This is not merely a criminal charge being lodged or nothing. There are many remedies under the Bill. It's been said that there's no public outcry for this Bill and I don't know that there is or not. However, I don't think that that makes any difference. I think the issue before us is what's right and I think the public expects and have every right to expect to know how we're getting our money to run for office and from where we're getting it. Maybe the



fact that there's no public outcry made the bed that people are just so fed up with all of us that they're too tired to, to stir up any more clamor. I think it's time that we start cleaning up our own House; let's open up the books and show that in the large great majority of cases those that run for office have absolutely nothing to hide and I think that this Bill will take a long, take a long time, giant step in that direction. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would urge the passage of House Bill 2825."

Speaker Blair: "The question is shall House Bill 2825 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. All right, no then, Mr. Dee."

Mr. Dee: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, want ethics legislation and I'm very, very much interested in it, but I stop and think that every candidate is going to have to make 5 reports, I would like to explain to you my vote. You are going to dry up in every township, for every school board, for every office in this State, the candidate to offer themselves. You're not going to be able to find a committee treasurer; you're going to have the candidate himself is going to have to act as his own treasurer. You're going to dry up the source of the most confident and the most willing and the most dedicated workers because you're offering them a \$1,000 fine and/or a year in jail. I cannot vote for a Bill that will put the burden on the public spirited citizen offering themselves free of compensation to work for their community in the event that someone has enough enthusiasm to raise \$1,000 to espouse their candidacy. I urge you gentlemen to reconsider your green lights; I urge you to vote against this Bill not against ethics legislation, but against a meaningful Bill where one report a year might do it. I urge you a 'no' vote."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Craig."

Craig: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'd like to make a few comments on this Bill and explain my vote. I've been down here for a few years and it wasn't too long ago, just a few years back that we made it possible for secretarial help and administrative aid, but we had to go clear out of our way to make so our mothers or fathers, brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, cousins and nephews could not be our aid.



Making ourselves out, if you please, from the township on up as far as you can go, we discriminated not only against ourselves, but to our entire family. I don't like to feel that I'm any better than anybody, but I want you all to know that I feel I'm about as good as any of you or anybody else. Number 1, I don't think that law, er... that legislation would even stand up in a court and I know attorneys, if that isn't discrimination, I don't know what is, but that wasn't enough. We come along with the ethics statement and we got to file and I've had the Secretary of State send me many of those pink slips that he sent probably many of you people and I don't mind them to go check my ethics statement, but when it says there's a little place on there that says about reasons why, and I've had about 5 or 6 and what was their reasons? Curious. Now if that's all they got time to do, I think they ought to have to pay to check those statements, a 5 or a 10 dollar fee. I don't know what it costs to do that and take that time, but if they don't have any more business down there than just being curious or searching, I think they... for doing these things and on these ethics statements, if you please, we, in my area, a lot of good men have been knocked off of school boards, junior college boards, sanitary district because they may work at a bank where the funds are deposited when they did on these bonds. You've taken a lot of good men out of office that will not subject themselves, if you please, to this kind of treatment. Now then, the press, if you please... I haven't had letters insisting from the people that I represent that this should be done. The press seems to be wanting to do it. Well, why don't some one put an Amendment on here that the press cannot endorse any candidate for office of any political party. If you want to talk about ethics and things that are right or wrong and who has any more influence on the rank and file people than the press. Why should they have the right when you have to pay for the publicity that you buy per column, square, inch, but they can come out with a full page, editorial page blasting you, me, or anyone else that they so desire and what right do they have to determine whether you should be setting in the halls of this General Assembly and I want you to know the things that I mentioned I can't say for one, droll



those things, that I think that the people have been really too proud of the things that we've taken action on in the past and I think you're doing only more things to put yourself in a bad light and also a lot of other people. And I'm going to vote no."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. McCormick."

McCormick: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you know that I'm going to vote aye on this Bill, but I guess its because I'm going to become a real private citizen this year and maybe I want to say that I want all of my public officials to be real open and honest. I don't know what I would do if I were running for reelection because I wouldn't know how in the world I would find anybody that would be silly enough to be my treasurer. But after looking over this Bill, I'd like to ask the Speaker and the fellow member, Brother Collins down there, I think there's one thing that you have left out of this Bill that is very vital. I didn't see any place in the Bill for the authorization of a new minimum security institution in Southern Illinois to handle the violations in this Bill. I want to, on the floor of this House today, tell you that you should have a Bill also in for a \$20,000,000 institution to be located in the Ozarks of Southern Illinois where they could have beautiful weather and real good education while there institutionalized and I offer you the land free of charge if you have the \$20,000,000 appropriation to build it. Thank you, I vote aye."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to second my 59th District legislative running mate in that imitation. But I want to say to the newer Members of the House that I was here when we voted in the law requiring the filing of the ethics statement. And we heard the same objections on the floor of the House then as we're hearing now about drying up the number of candidates. And as far as I know, there isn't anybody in Illinois that didn't file for office because of the fact that they had to file an ethics statement. Whether or not...whatever the reason they had to not filing it, probably would be as numberable as there are those who didn't file. This Bill isn't perfect. I guess the only



perfect Bill would be one that the sponsor draws himself. But I want to tell the Members of this House that I, in the primary, disclosed all of the contributions to my campaign from one cent, up. And I got more contributions than I ever did before. I made it known before any contributions were received that I was going to do this and some of them thought I didn't mean it and they tendered it under the conditions that I wouldn't report it. I rejected it and many of them then went ahead and gave it to me and said 'go ahead and report it'. But I did receive more contributions to my campaign by having said that I was going to disclose all of them then I ever did before. The issue on the floor of this House is ...are you for ethics in government or are you against it? If you're for it, vote yes. If you're against it, get up and say so."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Epton."

Epton: "Well Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I see old McCormick has raised a problem which has bothered many of us and my good seat mate, Mayor Mahar of Homewood, came up with the appropriate answer to his point. He has a friend, an exconvict, a bankrupt, serving in Joliet now for a long term and he intends to use him as treasurer of his campaign committee. That should solve some of the problems."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Douglas."

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."

Speaker Blair: "Now wait a minute, let's get the understanding, I'm going back and forth, Republican-Democrat, Republican-Democrat, okay?"

Douglas: "Those who are speaking against this Bill on the ground that it won't work are failing to recognize that the credibility of the American political system is at stake today as it has never been before. Watergate at the national level, scandals in our own State, and in various municipalities in the State, have drawn more attention than ever before in history to the one problem of campaign spending. As others have said, there cannot be any perfect Bill. And I'm perfectly willing to admit that no matter what we pass, the real crux probably will attempt to get away with violating the law anyhow. One speaker, earlier, said that what we're doing with this



Bill is putting a lot of people in jeopardy because they won't know about it. Well its high time that we recognized that those who don't know about it better find out about it because the public is demanding that something be done about this issue above all issues. This is what the Watergate scandal is all about. And since the credibility of politicians is at an all time low, we owe it to our constituents to show our sincerity in at least making an attempt to start eliminating one of the greatest evils in the American electoral system. Watergate has made a mockery of this system, we are constantly having to apologize to the people all over the world for this one single issue. As Representative Hart said earlier, if you really mean business, you'd better get on this Bill. Its going to be awfully hard to explain your (tape trouble) ...when after election or at election time, you end up having a red light. We need these votes and I ask that everyone vote green."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, I want you to . recollect that when the Election Commission first held their first meeting, they said that the County Chairman would replace....a...or... a....re....re-put on the ballot the Members of the legislature that had been removed because they failed to file a Bill...their ethics statement. But the newspaper, the news media including my newspaper, the Chicago ones, all jumped immediately on to the Commission for taking this position and said they were cowards. And at that time, last Friday as I recollect, they were really forced by public...by newspaper opinion, to hold another meeting. As a result of that meeting, they completely reversed themselves and some 500 or God knows how many....a...people running for office in this State are off the ballot and if you...they take the extreme view, they cannot even be replaced. Some other person will be put on the ballot instead of the ones that were nominated in the various primaries. Now I can easily foresee, and since I never had the support of my local newspaper, I don't care whether they like it or not, not because I can say what I think, I feel that over this State, the same newspapers that forced the Commission to take the action that



they did and change a position will immediately be singling out any one of us or the thousands of individuals running for the various offices in the State of Illinois to see if they have completely complied with a very difficult law, comply with in relation to the various reports...."

Speaker Blair: "Okay, your times up, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "I'm certain that they will take advantage of this and these people will be fined \$1000 or under. I don't fear so much a jail, but I think we should be very careful what we do...a...I vote no."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, very briefly, I'd like to address myself to those of you not voting green and I want to do this by sharing with you the results of the questionnaire that I submitted to the people in my district. I agree with those previous speakers that said they've had very little correspondence from people asking for ethics legislation. But if you take the time and the trouble to send out a questionnaire, I think that your results would be similar to those that I've received. Now those people responding to this questionnaire on this issue, 89% of them said 'yes that the elected State officials should be required to disclose their campaign contributions'. I would like to help you people be re-elected next fall, those of you not voting green and suggest that you reconsider. Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, I would like to explain my yes vote. I visited with the lobbyist from H & R Block and they feel that they're going to open 200 branch offices. And as you know, I'm always for the economic welfare of the community and keep people off the unemployment roll and that's the reason I'm voting yes."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Giglio."

Giglio: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know, I look at a piece of legislation like this and I wonder back in my mind just what some of our founders of the Constitution are doing. To me, they've got to be rolling over in their graves."



I look and think about some of the things I read in the history books, some of the things that I learned when I went to school. Perhaps maybe if I went to college, maybe I would be voting green instead of what I'm going to vote. But I'm wondering where, or what's left of that so-called 'American Dream' where somebody works hard, such as myself and a lot of others, and they get to a point in life where they have a little money and their family is well on their way and they come down to do some good and serve in public life, and then they find out there's going to be a law that they've got to reveal all the things, and all the money, where they are going to get it, and what they are going to do. Well I feel that if you don't believe that its nobody's business, no more is it mine where somebody gets theirs or what they do with it. For those who want to reveal what they do or how they get their money, God bless them and more power to them. But I don't believe it should be mandatory that it has to be revealed. And I'm not ashamed or scared to say exactly just what I believe because I don't know what its coming to, where its going to lead to. But I don't think this is going to help any more than the ten greatest laws that have been put on the books thousands of years ago. But then in that age, and now and in the future, they're going to try to get around them just like they have been. And I'm more than proud to say that for what we've seen and what we've heard about the things that are going on in the press, you are not going to make be believe that just because there is one bad apple, that the whole bushel is bad."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to explain my vote, I was careful over this legislation when it came to the Elections Committee and I did vote no. I spent some time working with the sponsors on some Amendments which were adopted. But I am fearful of one portion of this Bill and that is that it may seriously effect those who voluntarily participate and donate money to political organizations. I think that the thing that has made this country great is those people who have voluntarily become a part of the political system by donating their time and their dollars."



I fear that portions of this Bill may discourage, and probably will discourage, those people from continuing their participation. I think this is dangerous to our system. I think that we really want it to operate on voluntary participation. However, some of those fears I have allayed by some of the work we've done on some of the Amendments. And at this time, with some reluctance though, and hopeful that this will work out in the way that the sponsors intended it to, I do intend to vote aye."

Speaker Blair: "Have all voted who wished? Mr. Day, did you want to talk?"

Day: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I know that the sponsors of this Bill have put in many, many long hours in trying to work out the problems that are involved with campaign reporting. And I think that as a campaign reporting Bill, this is a good one. So it isn't any reluctance on my part to have any criticism of the Bill, itself. However, we had the experience behind us now of the financial disclosure statement, which are Ethics Bills, and in each of the elections that they have applied to, we have found that there are serious defects in the financial disclosure Bill, so we are considering and have considered in the past doing something which I think is a very unethical thing and that is to pass legislation which excuses those who fail to comply with the ethics law. This is not fair to the candidates who have complied with the law and who disclosed their financial interests well in advance of the elections and within the time prescribed by law. Now I think that the worse thing, the worse thing that this House could do would be to pass an ethics law and then not enforce it, or to enforce it..."

Speaker Blair: "A...you've run out of time. Alright, have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take...the Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 136 ayes, 21 nays, 4 present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."



Speaker Telcser: "House Bill 2143."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2143. An act authorizing the reorganization of certain sanitary districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn, is he on the floor? Take it out of the record. House Bill 2541."

Clerk Selcke: "Who's.... Grotberg's not here. Oh, here he is."

Speaker Telcser: "...We're going down the list...the dates they expire. 2606."

Clerk Selcke: "What?"

Speaker Telcser: "2606."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2606. Catania. A Bill for an act to amend Section 14 of Crime Victims Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Lady from Cook, Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as the Members of the House probably will recall the Crime Victim's Compensation Act took effect last October 1st 1973. Now shortly before that, about two weeks before that, a young man came to the city of Chicago from California to begin work on his Ph.D. at the University of Chicago. He was beat up, in my district, and it was feared that he was going to be a vegetable for the rest of his life. He's making remarkable recovery and it appears that he will now be able to continue to work for his Ph.D. at the University of Chicago. But there was an outcry from the residents of the 22nd and 24th districts saying this was certainly the sort of person who should be able to qualify for compensation under the Crime Victim's Compensation Act. I asked the Legislative Reference Bureau to draft a Bill for me back-dating it so that it would become effective September 1st 1973 instead of October 1st 1973. LRB said that since the Governor signed it August 22nd 1973 they



57.

thought that would be a reasonable date to backdate it to and that's what this Bill does, to backdate the Crime Victim's Compensation Act to August 22nd 1973 instead of October 1st 1973. Now the experience the Court of Claims has had with the Crime Victim's Compensation Act shows that no one has yet been awarded compensation under the provisions of the Crime Victim's Compensation Act; they have had 50 claims filed but so far none of those have been decided. They had a \$100,000 appropriation to cover those claims and I did not ask for an increase in the appropriations since they weren't able to come up with a figure on whether or not they needed any kind of increase. It appeared that the money that was appropriated probably would be sufficient to cover any additional claims that might be filed in this additional five-and-a-half weeks of time that we would be including. I also found that among the seven other states in the country that have Crime Victim's Compensation Act the State of Washington did pass an amendment to backdate their Crime Victim's Compensation Act two years and there was no substantial objection to that. So what I'm asking is the approval of the House to backdate this Bill five-and-a-half weeks to August 22nd 1973 instead of October 1st 1973. And I'll be happy to try and answer any questions you might have."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Telcser: "She indicates she will."

Hirschfeld: "Representative, can you tell me whether or not the people responsible for the Act in question were caught and punished?"

Catania: "As far as I know they have not yet been caught and punished, no."

Hirschfeld: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of



the House, I certainly have no objection to supporting Victim's Compensation Acts. As a matter of fact, I think they're excellent legislation and I intend to support Representative Catania on this particular piece of legislation. But it seems to me the best compensation we could give to victims of acts such as this is swift punishment and stiff punishment. And for some reason this House, and the Senate, and the General Assembly in Springfield, have been unable or unwilling, or both, to impose stiffer penalties on people who engage in this type of activity. And so while I'm going to vote for this type of legislation I hope we can also have the concomitant legislation in the future that will put these people where they belong for a sufficient period of time to give them an opportunity to meditate on their past transgressions."

Speaker Telcser: "Further discussion? The Lady wish to close debate?"

Catania: "I would ask for a favorable..."

Speaker Telcser: "Oh, one moment, Representative Peters, what purpose do you rise?"

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I understand that this Bill was heard in Judiciary. For my edification, I'm not an attorney, I don't know what the ex post facto situation in terms of setting the law back is, or if in fact, we're going to run into the same problems that we did in terms of the veteran situation. If we've got problems maybe what we ought to do is, in fact, backdate the thing two years, three years or four years so we don't have this kind of situation coming up again in terms of backdating it. And I certainly appreciate, and if it's permissible, to ask the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee exactly what the feeling was in Judiciary in regard to this particular Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative



Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Bill came out of Committee in a narrow vote, 7 to 6, because the ex post facto question was raised and unanswered. I would say that in my opinion the Reference Bureau was correct in the manner of drafting this Bill and the question would not be quite so much whether it would be unconstitutional as to whether or not it would be a complicated precedent. But more importantly the question that I think perhaps we should answer is when a Crime Victim Compensation Bill passed last year, if it passed before the 30th of June with 89 votes then I think this Bill would not have any problems in that regard with 89 votes. But if that Bill passed this House on the first of July or the second, those days that we were in after the 30th of June, then the Crime Victim's Compensation Bill would have required a three-fifths vote. And if that were the case, then I think this Bill would require a three-fifths vote; or we could have a constitutional and parliamentary problem in, and a bad precedent, so I think the only question that should be answered is whether the Crime Victim's Bill last year passed before June 30th."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fleck."

Fleck: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that this type of legislation, although laudable in its intent, establishes a very, very bad policy. If any of us are going to start introducing legislation for one person in our district and change the substantive laws of this state so that they may qualify for benefits I think it is a very, very bad practice. And we should look at this a lot closer because we're setting out on a course that would be disastrous for all the laws that we have passed heretofore. And I wish the Members would reconsider very closely how they are viewing voting on this par-



ticular measure."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any further discussion? If not, the Lady from Cook, Representative Catania, to close."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, not everyone is coming in and asking for backdated legislation. This is one particular instance and I did, as I say, respond to an outcry from the residents of the 22nd and 24th Legislative Districts in behalf of this young man. As I understand ex post facto and I'm not an attorney, so I wish I would be corrected if I'm misunderstanding it, it means that you could not backdate things so that you make crimes of activities that were not crimes at the time they were committed. Now this is in no way what we're talking about doing here. What we are talking about doing is extending benefits to a person who came to our state and received this sort of abuse at the hands of some of our citizens and it is a feeling of several thousands of the citizens that we should this sort of a response. I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 2606 pass? Those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? No one wants to explain their vote? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Epton, to explain his vote."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my yes vote on this let me add to the remarks of my colleague. This is a particularly savage beating that an individual suffered. As a result of this there was much newspaper publicity and I received letters in my district as well as many of you in yours. This is not retroactive legislation. This, as she indicated, is simply extending some benefits and I think that if there are any others who fall in this category. it's



not classed legislation, they too will be entitled to this small charge. Certainly if we can allow individuals whose property was appropriated compensation for that which was taken from them certainly we can provide funds for those who without any malice, without any harm, who came to this state of ours seeking wisdom and seeking help and seeking comfort to receive such a brutal beating, when we have such a law and not make provisions for an individual like that, I think it is less than human on the part of the Members of this Legislature. We have been accused of many, in most cases wrongfully, and I think that if we were to prove this kind of thing inhumane by our failing to provide these funds, I'm afraid we would be guilty. And I ask those of you who have failed to indicate that will help to reconsider and leave this poor individual who was not greatly removed from death as a result of this savage beating. Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this really points out the need for the legislation. It was an innocent victim of a crime that wronged here. The Commission has studied the compensation of the innocent victims of crimes was formed in 1965, nine years ago. And as the bar associations of this great state that worry very much about their clients, three square meals a day, medical and dental care in the jails where they are safe from the wrath of the citizens, and that some of our judiciary or some of the Legislators that went into the judiciary would have noted the plight of the poor innocents victims of crime we might have gotten some movement out of the General Assembly. I think the bar association members as a whole should be voting



for this Bill because they're very much aware of what happens to an innocent victim of a crime. And I think it's a crime if any member of the bar association doesn't vote for this Bill but they'll probably climb over themselves to vote for the judicial pay increase."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Duff."

Duff: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to clear up one question that was raised here, in Committee, I was the one that raised the question of ex post facto and I'm satisfied, now, so it's not being misunderstood here that this Bill does not have a problem, in my opinion, under that specific category. I think that this House should recall the strong vote the Crime Victim's Compensation Bill received last year. We have in front of us here a perfect example of the kind of thing we were trying to do. We also have an accident of time and timing as to whether this young man was not...was covered or not under this situation. I think that, I hope that everybody in this House who voted to give a hundred dollars back to an organization that couldn't get its money out of the...this morning, couldn't get their money out of the Court of Claims will feel that this kind of situation has equities in it which are far overwhelmed than giving a hundred dollars back to a business organization. I hope everybody who voted for that will see the merit in voting for this and I would only add one thing. Shakespeare said 'the quality of mercy is not strained, it dropeth as a gentle rain from Heaven. It is twice blessed. It blesses him who gives and him who takes'. And I think that everybody who puts their vote up here on a matter of compassion and concern for the public will be blessed."

Speaker Telcser: "Have all...Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."



Ewell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, in rising to support this Bill, I'd like to point out to the many Members of this Body that when we talk about the rains dropping from Heaven, I have not been here a Session that the rain has not fallen in the Mississippi River, the Cahokia River, Ohio River, and I could name them all. But everybody in this Body hasn't jumped in and responded simply because the rains came from Heaven and flooded a few valleys and a few houses and a few homes and yet we all got up and voted help simply because the rains fell from Heaven. I stand up and say to you again there isn't a time that any type of disaster might strike the southern part of this state; there isn't a time that a cow gets sick that we don't send a get well card. I say that there comes to be a time when you have to recognize your responsibilities in terms of what's right. We have here simply an exact case, a case that the Crime Compensation Bill was intended for. Yes, we have the bleeding hearts in here who will sit up and vote for every measure to protect every single solitary rights of everyone accused of crime. We've got the lawyers in this Body, we've got to talk about them, who will not hesitate, will not equivocate and demand their right to sit up and vote compensation for the judges and the clerks, the court reporters and everybody connected in their business. Yes, this is just one individual. This is a man who hails from southern California somewhere, he's not even a resident of the state. But let's say that the disaster that overtook him, overtook him in Illinois and we deserve to try to make some things right. I think that you're reneging on your duty and I suggest to you Members of this Body that when it starts raining and God knows it's going to rain on those farms in southern Illinois, it's going to rain on those farms



in the western part of this state, and yes, disaster is going to strike and you're going to come in here and ask us for money. There isn't a time that we haven't had a storm in a county fair that we haven't decided to subsidize and rebuild every grandstand in the state. I say that this is simply a matter of justice. And remember you can sit on your switches but when you start walking through here with those Bills for all the creeks, the bridges, the valleys, the dams, the grandstands, we're going to remind you that it was God who rained on you as Duff has said it and that you look to him for compensation. I think you're wrong and I think this Bill deserves to be supported."

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

Representative Rayson, for what purpose do you rise?...No?"

Rayson: "It looks pretty good now, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate this vote as the Chief Sponsor of the legislation that made these awards possible. I think that it's only fair that we should get as much people covered as we can. And I've been working on this since 1968. And I could even have it go back then if you want it."

Speaker Telcser: "Giglio, aye. This question...Patrick, aye. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask for a verification of the Roll Call."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay. Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise?"

Shea: "Recorded..."

Speaker Telcser: "How is Representative Shea recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as being absent."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting aye. Barnes, aye."

Clerk Selcke: "Wait a minute."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Simms, for what purpose do you rise? Ike Simms, aye. McPartlin, aye."



Clerk Selcke: "Who?"

Speaker Telever: "McPartlin."

Clerk Selcke: "McPartlin, aye?"

Speaker Telever: "Right. All right, we'll take a new Roll Call. Question is, shall House Bill 2606 pass. All those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Anybody wish to explain their vote? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer, you want to explain your vote, some? Now, have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am sure that this is an individual case that's deserving of our sympathy. Right after the Victims of Crimes Bill passed this House last year and was signed into law, I had a constituent in my district who just missed the deadline; he's a very unfortunate. I am sure there will be hundreds of deserving cases coming before this legislature who will request special treatment. This is the third bill today, at least the third bill, in which we have been asked not to legislate in the sense of enacting laws that will cover all the people in the state but to take care of one special situation. And we will be plagued with requests for exceptions and for meetings taking care of situations where they haven't met the deadline. I don't think it's fair to charge those of us who are voting no out of a feeling as to what legislation really should be and to say that we are heartless or inconsiderate of misfortune. I was forced to vote against the Bill of a very close friend of mine today because of the same principle. It is our duty to legislate in the sense of enacting general laws to operate equally. We have to set deadlines, we have to set limitations. I suggest that we are reinforcing a very bad precedent and I think we should reconsider that and change our green lights to



red lights."

Speaker Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Mr. Clerk, can you take the record? This question 107 aye, 29 nays, 10 answering present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2143."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2143. An act authorizing the re-organization of certain sanitary districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn. Representative Flinn, you want your Bill called, Sir? You want your Bill called? I just called it, Sir. The machine hasn't checked out the last Roll Call. I've got to wait 'til it's finished, Sir."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2143 provides in the act that created the East Side Levy and Sanitary District for the first time, since it was created in 1908, the opportunity for the people in that district to call for a referendum to change that system of government. This so-called East Side Levy and Sanitary District has for many, many years been mismanaged...Mr. Speaker, could I have a little bit of attention please, this is a very important Bill to the St. Clair-Madison County area. This East Side Levy and Sanitary District has been mismanaged for so many years and has been a political populated station where precinct committeemen who do no work at all have a check mailed to their house. Some of them reportedly do not even know where the office is at. They have, in the past, had such jobs as culvert inspectors, rodmen and everything else and people...some people who do not even know what a rodman is. This provides, as I mentioned, an opportunity for the first time for the people to take a system of government out that there has been so much mistrust with. It's our little local Watergate,



if you don't mind, down in St. Clair and Madison counties in this part of the 96 square mile district. Today these drainage ditches down there are silted up, the pumps in many cases are not in good working order. The Corps of Engineers warned two years ago that the channels from the Mississippi River are about to cave in and flood all of East St. Louis with the river waters. The Corps of Engineers cannot trust this body to the extent that we cannot get Hillside Drainage Program started, we're about 10 years late with that and just recently the State of Illinois agreed to be the local sponsor in order that the Corps of Engineers could have someone they could trust with their money. There are some other speakers who want to speak on this Bill and I'm not going to take too much time. I would solicit a green vote."

Speaker Telcser: "Lady from St. Clair, Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the third attempt in recent years to bring about some type of long overdue and much needed reform to this system of government. I support this Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman wish to close debate? The question is, shall House Bill 2143 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question 146 ayes, no nays, none answering present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Bob Dunn, Representative Dunn, for what purpose do you rise?"

Dunn: "Just to inquire what order are we following here?"

Speaker Telcser: "We're following the order by which Bills



expire. Now if a Sponsor is not in his seat, we pass him by, he comes up here, if it is convenient I'll go back one or two Bills as a convenience to the Sponsor. But we're taking the Bills according to date they expire. And if I jump back it means the Sponsor wasn't here earlier and I'm going to pick up his or her Bill now. Okay? All right, by the way, for those of you who have inquired of the Speaker, we will be in Session tomorrow. We will be in Session tomorrow. I don't know yet what time we'll...what time we're coming...Okay, go back pick up two Bills that were called earlier and the Sponsor wasn't on the floor, House Bill 2278. I'll pick up a bunch of them now...weaving back pick up some we passed up."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2278. A Bill for an act to amend Section 2 of an act concerning museums and public parks. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask leave of the House to hear these two Bills together they are companion Bills, 2278 and 2279."

Speaker Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, will the Clerk please read 2279."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2279. A Bill for an act to amend Section 19 of an act in relation and creation of maintenance and operation improvement to Chicago Park District. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2278 is a Bill that would increase the revenue rate for the aquariums and museums from four to six cents. House Bill 2279 would allow the Chicago Park District to increase its general tax rate from 47 cents to a maximum



of 50. The problem being dealt with these Bills is that the Chicago Park District is currently at its maximum and it has to be done through a statutory provision and without a referendum. So I ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Randolph."

Randolph: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, these two Bills came out of the Revenue Committee without any negative votes. House Bills 2278 and 79 would provide much needed help for Chicago's great museum and the Chicago Park District in continuing their outstanding public educational and recreational service. I am especially aware of the importance of this legislation to all the citizens of the state of Illinois and to Chicago's greatest asset. I...your favorable support of these two measures."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The question is shall House...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Juckett."

Juckett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question or two?"

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Juckett: "It's my understanding that a few years ago we authorized, or the Park District authorized, the charge for admission at the museums in Chicago. How much money has that raised?"

McPartlin: "I passed out a brochure on that, but it was a very, very small percentage of the operating costs that (unintelligible)...needed. It did not meet its operating costs."

Juckett: "Now, did they feel that an increase in that admission rate would drive clientele away or something?"

McPartlin: "Well, it probably would, yes. I would say that it would. If you raise the... It would."



Juckett: "What are the charges of the Chicago Park District for its activities?"

McPartlin: "For the museum?"

Juckett: "No, its regular activity."

McPartlin: "Which one do you mean, there are six museums that we're talking about."

Juckett: "Okay, now, are we discussing only its levies for museums? My understanding 2279 is more than just museums."

McPartlin: "This increases it three cents."

Juckett: "Yeah, well, what are the charges that the Chicago Park District has for its programs in its park districts? I mean, do you charge for swimming lessons?"

McPartlin: "No."

Juckett: "Do you charge for swimming passes?"

McPartlin: "No. All of that is free, that is..."

Juckett: "Do you charge for...like baseball activities or..."

McPartlin: "No. All those services are free through the Chicago Park District."

Juckett: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I might speak on the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Proceed, Sir."

Juckett: "I sympathize with the Sponsor in wanting to give... make everything available to everybody but in some of these cases we are increasing almost 50% the rates which they can charge, as far as taxes are concerned. In others, we are making a small increase, only 6%. But there are no referendums connected with this and as the Sponsor has just indicated, the Park District makes no charge to any of the people who are using its services. All of the park districts in my district charge for their activities. It's a lesser amount for those who are residents of the district, if they hire them out for those who are not residents. But in this case we're asking all of the people in the city of Chicago to pay for all of the activities whether they use them



or not and we already know that the...I'm not sure whether the Sponsor of this Bill sheds the crocodile tears for the overburdened property taxpayer but in this Bill he is overburdening the taxpayers especially if they do not use those facilities. Especially if they do not use those activities. Especially if they make no effort to participate in them. Now what the question would be, why doesn't the Chicago Park District charge for some of this special activities? Why don't they do it like all the suburban areas and downstate areas where you have to buy passes if you want to participate in the swimming activities or in the other activities of the Park District. Let's go to the people that use the service and say 'we don't have enough money but if you're willing to pay for it we can put on these programs without overburdening the property taxpayer'. So I urge a no vote and then let the Sponsor come back and say 'yes, we have done this and if we haven't still raised enough money help us some then'. But I think he's premature. Let's vote no and let's help that overburdened property taxpayer."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "If the Sponsor would yield for a question..."

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Palmer: "What's the present tax rate, max tax rate, on...for ...I'm sorry, the permissible tax rate in the Bill is to 50% for the year 1974. What was the...as it appears in the synopsis...now that's five mil, now what was it before?"

McPartlin: "47. Forty-seven cents."

Palmer: "It's only going 47 and you're raising it to .50?"

McPartlin: "That's right exactly."

Palmer: "Was there any operating losses for the last fiscal year?"



McPartlin: "They were running at a deficit in the last year, yes."

Palmer: "What about your revenue sharing? Does the City of Chicago..."

McPartlin: "As far as...well, federal funding is out. There is no federal funding now, at this time."

Palmer: "Well, there is revenue sharing that the City of Chicago..."

McPartlin: "Yes,...City of Chicago there is...."

Palmer: "Has that been applied?"

McPartlin: "Yes, it has, Sir."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Miller."

Miller: "Representative McPartlin, isn't it true that the Field Museum would be aided financially by passage of this Bill?"

McPartlin: "Postively and they are in dire need of it for rejuvenating the buildings which are quite old."

Miller: "Doesn't it also hold true, I believe, for the Shedd Aquariam?"

McPartlin: "Yes, Sir. The Shedd Aquariam is included in this also."

Miller: "Are there any other public institutions that are a benefit to the people that are benefitted by it?"

McPartlin: "...One thing that is being picked up and is being used quite frequently now is for the senior citizens group through the Park District, yes."

Miller: "All right, thank you, Representative. I'd like to address myself briefly to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House."

Speaker Telcser: "Proceed."

Miller: "With regard to the comments offered by my good friend, Representative Juckett, with regards to how the Park Districts activities in general in the City of Chicago are managed, I believe it's the prerogative of the local



municipality to decide whether or not they're in favor paid fees or whatever the case might be. But I do know based Representative McPartlin's input here with regard to how the institutions that we are all benefactors of will be helped by this, I think it is for our distinct benefit for all citizens throughout the state of Illinois to support not only the Field Museum, the Shedd Aquarium, the Museum of Science and Industry, the Art Institute and all the other major institutions that are not only a landmark in the city of Chicago but throughout the state of Illinois. And I would encourage a yes vote on House Bill 2278 and 2279."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, ...M.: Speaker..."

Speaker Telcser: "Go ahead, Jim."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, I...am I on?"

Speaker Telcser: "Try another mike, this one's got static."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, it was rather amusing a few moments ago when my good friend from Park Ridge mentioned the fact that it might be well if the Park District charged a fee for all the activities and all the people that are served. But I think I should remind my good friend from Park Ridge that part of the reason this tax is needed is that many of our facilities such as the Field Museum, the Museum of Science and Industry, the Historical Society, the Planetarium and the Aquarium are favorite visiting spots for people from Park Ridge and the various parts outlying Cook County. And it is for this reason that we provide these facilities and it would seem to me that this is a worthy Bill and should receive your favorable consideration."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The question is, shall House Bills 2278 and 2279 pass? ...Want it now or explain your vote? The question is, shall House Bills 2278 and 2279 pass? All those in favor signify



voting by aye; the opposed by voting no. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Beatty, to explain his vote."

Beatty: "I briefly would like to explain my yes vote. After the Committee meeting, well we really have enough votes but, these museums 70% of the people that visit these are from outside the city, so we really have enough votes I won't say anymore."

Speaker Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question, 125 ayes, 8 nays, 4 answering present. Beaupre, aye. On this...yes, two bills, these two Bills having received the constitutional majority are hereby declared passed. The Clerk will make a duplicate Roll Call. House Bill 2269. I'm going back up now on the calendar, pick up those Bills that were called earlier. Representative Craig, you want your Bill called, 2269?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2269. A Bill for an act to amend the Local Library Act and amend the Illinois Public Library District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Craig."

Craig: "That's not my Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "That's not your Bill? Oh, I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2269 is sponsored by Representative Pierce who is unnecessarily absent from the House and asked me to handle the Bill for him."

Speaker Telcser: "All right, proceed."

Deuster: "He's necessarily absent... House Bill 2269 simply makes it possible for a library board to have a larger working cash fund. It raises, it has nothing to do with the taxes they receive, it simply means that the libraries may maintain a larger working cash fund. The present authority is for a cash fund measured by one mil of the



assessed valuation. This raises this to three. An example, the library in Deerfield suggested this higher ceiling as it happens in Lake County will probably not get our tax funds distributed 'til September. It's a very simple change, it will help our library function have more working funds on hand. I urge your favorable support for this Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Any...(tape)...The question is, shall House Bill 2269 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Bob Dunne, aye. This question 131 ayes, 2 nays, 3 answering present. This ...Katz, aye. Sharp, aye. This Bill having received a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2216."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2216. A Bill for an act to amend section of the Illinois Highway Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Kane, Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2216 helps to remedy a problem that occurred when this Legislature in its wisdom, the 77th General Assembly, in its wisdom extended the terms of office of the township road supervisors by two years to consolidate some election programs across this state. At the same time we did that we automatically locked them in to a six year salary structure. If you'll recall the Constitution of this state says that an elected official cannot negotiate his salary during the term of his office. So we have out there 1500 township road supervisors who have been precluded from even going in and talking to their auditors. And that's all this Bill does, there's no state money or county money involved in this thing. It has to do with township road supervisors being allowed to go in before their term



expires and discuss the following two years of compensation with their township auditors. And if it were not for this Bill it would not be possible for them to do it. I would be glad to answer any questions on the Bill but it's a very simple enacting enabling Bill for a local unit of government to carry on a conversation. With that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a positive Roll Call."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Barry."

Barry: "Are you sure that's all it does?"

Grotberg: "Judge Barry, in my humblest opinion, that is exactly what it does."

Barry: "It doesn't extend the terms of supervisors along with what you said otherwise?"

Grotberg: "No, this is the Transportation Act, not the Township Government Act, Sir. It's a Township Highway Act."

Barry: "Okay, I'll take your word, of course."

Grotberg: "I appreciate that, Sir."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman...(unintelligible) yield for a question?"

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Mahar: "Does this mean that the highway commissioner can go in before the auditor and if they can grant him a raise during his term of office?"

Grotberg: "During the extended portion the extended portion of the term to which we appointed them and they never were elected to."

Mahar: "During the two years which they were appointed."

Grotberg: "Right."

Mahar: "Doesn't this set some kind of a precedent in...face..."

Grotberg: "...Us to be careful when they extend people's terms, Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Well, it seems to me that constitutionally we can't raise our salaries during the term of office no matter



how it's arranged."

Grotberg: "Well, like all of the careful research that I put into my legislation, may I answer your question from a legal opinion? The Illinois Constitution, Article VII Section 9 states 'an increase or decrease in salary of an elected official of any unit of local government shall not take effect during the term of office for which that officer is elected'. He was not elected for that next two years, Representative Mahar, we appointed it."

Mahar: "Well isn't his term...doesn't he serve until his successor is qualified, which would include a two year period?"

Grotberg: "No. No. The next term, they will revert to four year terms."

Mahar: "In other words, you say this is exception to the rule so to speak, is that right."

Grotberg: "If that helps you feel better, yes."

Mahar: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to this Bill. What we're doing here as you know by law we've extended the term of the highway commissioner by two years and I recall when they wanted that extension. That's all they wanted. Now we are going to allow them to have a salary increase. Now I don't care how you cut it, this is unconstitutional because the highway commissioners are an elected office, they are serving a term of office whether...we extended it, yes. But they were elected by the people and I don't believe under the constitution we have any right to allow them to have a salary increase until they're next election. Now they, I'm sure, would like to have the best of two worlds but you remember all the mail that we received and all they wanted was an extension so that they wouldn't have to



face the electorate again. And we allowed them that. But for us to now say that they can have a salary increase while they are holding office, I think, is not only unconstitutional it will allow them to dicker with the trustees and I think it's bad policy and I would urge the Members of this House to vote against this Bill, 2216."

Speaker Telcser: "Further discussion? If not, the Gentleman from Kane, Representative Grotberg, to close."

Grotberg: "I appreciate the opinion from across the aisle on the constitutionality of this Bill and I would recommend that if they had any question about that now, that the contest on constitutionality could have taken place in the 77th General Assembly when we precluded hard-working road supervisors who are out there ahead of the county officials and they're out there ahead of the superhighway snowplows and they go by my door every night when it snows. And when they are locked in from \$3,000 and \$4,000 a year for six years, let's not go back to Brian Duff's prayer that he spoke on behalf of Bill Shakespeare and recall a few old scenes that happened here in the last hour and get on with the business of taking care of our people. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "Question is, shall House Bill 2216 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye and all opposed voting no. Give 'em hell,... One for the dipper. Hey, somebody out there vote me. Giddy, give me a vote up there. Have all voted who wish? Get around there. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question 107 ayes, 10 nays, 2 answering present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Chuck Campbell, aye. Jim McCourt, aye. House Bill 2490, the Sponsor around?"



Jerry,...Representative Bradley on the floor? There he goes. House Bill 2490."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2490. A Bill for an act to amend Section 5 of the Hospital District Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're amending the Hospital District Act. We're just putting in some additional information. And to be exact we're saying...about requirements of the number of people needed for a district, we're adding some additional information. It simply says 'unless a district includes at least one entire county in which event the population of the district shall not be less than 15,000 inhabitants'. I'd appreciate your support on the Bill. If there are any questions I'd be very happy to answer them. Briefly what we're doing here is allowing a county to add referendums to create a hospital district if that county has at least 15,000 population. I have a few of those counties in my district that without this amendment would be impossible for them to supply much needed medical service. And I urge your yes vote."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Robert Dunne."

Dunne: "A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Telcser: "Indicates that he..."

Dunne: "Does this have any effect in Cook County?"

Bradley: "I don't see how it possibly could, we're not doing anything with a county that size. We're simply adding additional information, we're saying the county must at least have 15,000 in the whole county to create that district. It's that referendum. In other words, the whole county will vote that referendum if they want to



create a hospital district. I don't see how it would affect Cook County."

Dunne: "It previously was at 25,000..."

Bradley: "Well, 25,000 doesn't include the whole county though. Now we are adding the addition of the whole county with at least 15,000. Otherwise, if you had a community such as Bloomington with 25,000 or more they could create a hospital district. Now we're allowing a county with at least 15,000 and I'll tell you why I'm doing it, Ronnie. I have a hospital in Clinton that due to the fire marshal coming and saying two-thirds of the hospital is of wood construction, by December 31st 1976 they must tear down that two-thirds or refrain from using that two-thirds of the hospital. They have no other way to construct unless we allow them, at referendum, to create a hospital district. And I'd appreciate a yes vote."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Any further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill certainly looks very good, very worthwhile on the surface. The problem with it is, is that it does not take into consideration what we have been struggling with the past several years and that is, some facilities planning in the health care field. The cost of hospital care, the equipment required, and everything else requires that we become involved because we're dealing here with tax exempt institutions, for the most part. But we become involved in where hospitals are built and in what kind of equipment that is used in these hospitals and what is purchased in these hospitals. So I suggest to you that we're going in reverse when we take a 25,000 population threshold and reduce it to 15,000 because then we're going to have more inadequate small facilities that



do not really serve the people that they purport to serve. What they are doing is building buildings and not providing service. So I suggest to you that this is not a good Bill, it is indeed a bad Bill and it should be opposed."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? If not, Representative Bradley to close the debate."

Bradley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker in closing the debate I'd like to respond to the Majority Leader's remarks regarding how many people we're serving with this particular hospital. In one year the John Warner Hospital served 6,292 persons from that particular county. I could go ahead and relate to you how many individually town by town, so when you have a hospital serving 6,292 people in one county and it's the only hospital in the county and they stand to lose that county and we do not pass some legislation that allows them, at referendum, to continue to have that kind of hospital service then I ask the Majority Leader, what are they supposed to do for hospital service? Are they supposed to run 30 or 40 miles to Lincoln, or 30 or 40 miles to Bloomington or Decatur? I suggest to you that there is a need. This hospital for many years has provided a service to that community and to that county. And if we don't allow them to help themselves then what are we doing here? We're here to serve the people and I suggest to you that we are leaving the 25,000 number in there. We're not deleting anything from the Hospital Act. We're simply saying if these people want to continue to provide themselves with hospital service and tax them for that service, we're allowing them to do it, that's all that we're doing. And again I urge your support because it's a good piece of legislation. I think everybody in this House can vote for it and I'd appreciate it very much if you would. Thank you."



Speaker Telcser: "Question is, shall House Bill 2490 pass?

All those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, Clinton where Representative Bradley is speaking about is not in my district but I know something of their problems. May I have a little order, please? This is a critical matter to this particular hospital and other hospitals, I'm sure, of comparable size counties downstate. The problems of a large area such as Cook County or DuPage County will be different than our own. I merely want to back up and ask your support in support of Representative Bradley's Bill because based on personal knowledge I know they need this legislation. And I ask you to consider their needs and help them."

Speaker Telcser: "Telcser aye on this Roll Call, please, Mr. Clerk. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question there are 116 ayes, 6 nays, 3 answering present. Mr. Porter, aye. John Porter, aye. That's Telcser and Porter aye. And Merle Anderson? Merle Anderson, aye. Ray Ewell, aye. Ray Ewell, aye. George Sangmeister, aye. Mike Getty, aye. Bruce Douglas, aye. This Bill having received the constitutional...And this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Bob Mann, aye. House Bill 2791. House Bill 2790. Do '90 first."



1.

83.

Arthur Telcser: "House Bill 2790."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 2790. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to hear both Bills, companion Bills, ah..... in my report?"

Arthur Telcser: "All right, ah... are there any objections to having the companion Bill read at this time? Objections have been heard."

Jones: "2790 then."

Arthur Telcser: "House Bill 2790."

Jones: "All right. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2790 is the result of the Sub-Committee study in great detail and depth of the Senior Citizens Tax Relief as mandated by the Revenue Committee to a special Sub-Committee composed of Representative Skinner, Representative Lundy and myself. The details of the recommendations were contained in the report submitted to you about two weeks ago. Most of you have signed on as Sponsors and are now probably so listed in the Digest. 2790 in the judgement of the Committee accommodates the objective of a variety of Bills related to this subject including one of my own, House Bill #9, ah.... on the Homestead Act, that were under consideration



2.

84.

before the Revenue Committee. This Committee has worked since last October on this matter and basically, ah.... 2790 takes the existing Circuit Breaker Law and it and expands this coverage to do the job as it was originally designed to do. If there are any questions as to the specific changes in the ah... Circuit Breaker Act will be referred to Representative Lundy and if there are any questions in regard to the fiscal implications, ah.... they will be referred to Representative Skinner."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Representative J.J.Wolf."

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

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Wolf: "Representative Jones, I know that you put an amendment on Second Reading, ah.... could you explain what that amendment did?"

Jones: "The amendment lowered the trigger finger from 5% to 4%, Sir."

Wolf: "Maybe I'm looking at the wrong Bill. Is this the ah.... the tax....."

Jones: "The Senior Citizens Tax Relief..... The Circuit Breaker."

Wolf: "Oh, this is the Circuit Breaker? Not the Deferral Bill?"

Jones: "No, Sir."

Wolf: "O'kay, I beg your pardon."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Juckett."



3.

Juckett: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Juckett: "As I remember, one of those amendments covered the not for profit nursing home situation, is that correct?"

Jones: "Right."

Juckett: "And this does allow an individual in a not for profit nursing where they do not pay for the operator, does not pay a tax, they'll get a refund of a portion of what they pay in to cover that amount of tax that was not paid. Is that correct?"

Jones: "The Act doesn't specifically say that as such, but it gives the Department of Revenue the authority to do so."

Juckett: "O'kay, now....would this then cover a County Nursing Home ah.... where an individual is in a County Home and a payment is being made?"

Jones: "The interpretation that ah....I would put on it is that it would, Sir."

Juckett: "Well...."

Jones: "Because this is a.....a relief.... this relief goes to the individual here and not to the institution and relates to their.... to their ah..... cost of their rent while they are in the nursing home, no matter who it may be operated by."



4.

Juckett: "And I think when the amendment was brought up... the reason that it was put on was because some of the charges are similar to what they are in the for profit, but of course the answer was also given that you did not check the level of service so that you don't know whether they were giving less service or more service then a for profit organization. Is that correct?"

Jones: "Well, the Committee didn't go into the level of service ah... delivered by nursing homes, ah... no, Sir."

Juckett: "Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "The gentleman from Madison, Representative Calvo."

Calvo: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I really don't want to ask the Sponsor a question, but I would like to some way get the record straight. I was ah... had a Bill in the Subcommittee and as the result of that, anticipated being listed as a Sponsor of the Bill that came out.... made such a request. I noticed that I am included as a Sponsor on 2791, but some way was omitted, at least according to the Digest, on 2790. Is there some way that we can correct that record? After ah.... you know.... the reason being that I had a Bill addressing it to this problem and ah.... the result was I hope, was consideration on my Bill as well as the others."



Arthur Telcser: "We'll so correct that, Representative Calvo.
Gentleman...."

Jones: "No intention of it not being on there according to
my.... you see, we turned in, it was so listed."

Calvo: "Then Mr. Speaker, could we see that that's someway
taken care of?"

Arthur Telcser: "I think so. It's being taken care of right
now. Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Hunsicker."

Hunsicker: "Does this include both bills, 2790 and 2791, or
are we only working on 2790?"

Arthur Telcser: "Only on 2790."

Hunsicker: "Only on 2790?"

Arthur Telcser: "That's correct. Gentleman from Rock Island,
Representative Polk."

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

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Polk: "Ah.... how many of the eligible people in the State
of Illinois last year applied for this circuit breaker?"

Jones: "About 45 percent according to the estimates."

Polk: "And do you have any idea of how many received a rebate?"

Jones: "About half."

Polk: "I understand that there were some confusion last year
inasmuch as the charts did not indicate or give any help
to the people so that they could have some idea if they
were going to receive a small return or a large return.
Is that correct?"



6.

Jones: "Yes, in this legislation, we are directing the Department of Revenue to include such a chart so that People can get some idea of what they might be entitled to receive."

Polk: "Is the Department of Revenue also going to do a public relations job on it this year and do a better job of getting to the Senior Citizens and advising them of their rights?"

Jones: "Well, I'm sure that they will, but we particularly mandate in this Act that the Department of Aging take on that responsibility and they have agreed to do so, because this is a new Agency and it's one of the first things they ought to do is to catalog all the Senior Citizens and be sure they are getting the notice of the possible aid that they could receive."

Polk: "And this Bill also ah... have some safeguards in so that if a person is to receive less than a minimum amount, that can be held over to the following year?"

Jones: "That's five dollars, because we had the embarrassing situation that some people would receive a check for one cent."

Polk: "Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Richard Walsh."

Walsh: "Ah... I would like to know if Representative Skinner's available to answer some questions on the fiscal impact?"



7.

89.

Arthur Telcser: "Yes, he is."

Walsh: "Cal, you'll recall in the Revenue Committee, there was some testimony as to the fiscal impact of this Bill and ah.... I just wanted to clarify to the Membership, what is the.... what is the ah.... amount of money, the additional expenditure at the current level, when you reduce it to four percent."

Skinner: "We estimate that the 20.5 million dollar expenditure during this fiscal year will rise to 29 million dollars next year, which is precisely the amount that was appropriated for Senior Citizen tax relief under the circuit breaker program for the last two fiscal years."

Walsh: "Well, that doesn't answer my question. You're assuming a 45 percent participation, I believe. Well, what... are you saying then that there's an additional fifty percent of whatever had been expended?"

Skinner: "It's approximately 45 percent to 50, yes."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I may address myself to the question. The Governor's budget this year appropriates 35 million dollars for ah.. Senior Citizens tax relief under the so-called circuit breaker. Ah.... this Bill, if it passes, as I understand it, is going to increase the proposed expenditure by 50 percent, so we're talking about maybe 17 million dollars. Now there's some question, of course, as to what the level of participation will be. It was 45 percent in Illinois last year. In Wisconsin where this



8.

program has been in existence for some ten years, the level of participation is 75 percent. Certainly the participation is going to increase year by year as people become aware of their benefits and certainly will increase as the benefits become greater. This year under legislation, which has been introduced, the Department of Revenue will send out forms to ah... all applicants of prior years. I think we should look at the amount of money involved and ask ourselves if we can afford it. We voted out full funding for common schools earlier this week, which cost them 78 million dollars. I think we're going to insist on an appropriation to municipalities of an additional 11 million over the Governor's budget. We voted some 12.5 million for the common schools for this fiscal year, which was not in the Governor's budget. We can only spend so much money, Ladies and Gentlemen, it seems to me we should leave the circuit breaker where it is for this fiscal year and I intend to vote 'no'."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "Representative, what group of citizens will be benefited by this Bill that aren't being presently benefited by the existing circuit breaker law?"

Jones: "For one thing, by lowering the circuit.... I mean the



9.

trigger figure to four percent will bring more.... as it is now, you know, that this relationship of their taxes to their income, six percent of their income to three thousand dollars, and seven percent over that. And by lowering it to four percent, it will bring more people under the Act. Under the coverage. There's some amendments in there ah..... for People that were paying the ah... mobile home privilege tax, but it wasn't listed as a property tax so they did'nt qualify, so this puts them under the coverage."

Schlickman: "What does the Department of Revenue estimate would be the additional cost of administration of the Circuit Breaker Law by this Amendment?"

Jones: "They don't ah.... anticipate any additional. In fact in the present administration, there was no appropriation for them for administration, and they've done it without. The money is only for grants and I might say that the grants for this last year, the first year, were 20 million dollars, so as Representative Walsh raised the question, if it ah.... increases 50 percent, we're still at 30 million dollars, and there's an appropriation in the ah.... in the Revenue Department's ah.... Bill for 35 million to accommodate them."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the ah.... House, at the time that the original circuit breaker law was passed, I voted for it, but with some reservation. I was concerned about the administrative costs. I was concerned about



10.

92.

the extent of benefits that the citizens of the State would receive. Experience has certainly satisfied me, that my original reservation was founded. And now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I see the deficiencies in the original law, the existing law, being compounded by this Bill, House 2790. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we ought to consider the facts, that the best kind of tax relief, is not the tax at the very outset. Rather than to tax and try to give back which costs additional monies, and for that reason, I'm going to vote 'no'."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to two questions?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Matijeich: "Representative Jones, ah... and I applaud your Committee for this, but you make certain mandates within your law to try to improve the system so that there is more participation in the Senior Citizens breaker law. Right?"

Jones: "Right."

Matijeich: "Now, if that is true, don't you anticipate there will be more participation?"

Jones: "We think there will be. Yes, Sir."

Matijeich: "Well, then, if that is true, then why don't we admit the fact that we ought to appropriate more money, because in your statement, on the Floor here, and on your



JUN 13 1974

93.

11.

statement on Second Reading, you said that we are still going to an anticipate 45 percent participation."

Jones: "No."

Matijevich: "Yes you did."

Jones: "I didn't.... I don't.... I can't assure you what the participation would be, but we would think that if more people were made aware of it, they would sure come under it, but I'm repeating back that on the fiscal equation, this year there were 29 million dollars appropriated. Twenty million was the payout. There, then, the appropriation this year for this purpose, 35 million dollars, so it would easy accommodate.... 50 percent increase would still bring us under the ah.... amount that's been appropriated."

Matijevich: "Representative Jones, as I understand the presentation by both you and Representative Skinner, that additional amount doesn't take care of an additional participation at all."

Jones: "Well, if the studies by the appropriations staff, of both the House and the Senate, one was 28 million, and the other was 29 million, it was their estimate for a four percent trigger figure, but that study could be made of it under the existing information, maybe Representative Lundy would like to respond to this."

Telcser: "Representative Lundy, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

12.

94.

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may respond to the last Speaker. John, you're right, there are two variables in the calculation. One is the increased benefits necessary if you lower the trigger percentages. The other variable is the increased participation percentage. What we said is, in the last fiscal year, we expended 20 million, 9 million less than we actually appropriated. If we lowered the figure percentage to four and the participation rate stays the same, it would cost 29 million. But we're appropriating 35, so we've already got leeway in there for increased participation. Six million dollars worth of leeway for the participation rate to go up to 50 or 55 percent, which is about all that is realistic over a one year period to increase the participation rate."

Matijevich: "Well, I understand that. All I can say, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, is that whatever your steps you mandate to improve it, evidently you think they are going to be a failure, because if those steps are implemented and you think there's only a five percent increase in participation, I think you've failed. Ah.... And I'd have to agree, you know I sponsored the first Senior Citizen tax circuit breaker ever introduced in Illinois, and I'm beginning to believe that it's a failure. And I believe no matter what types of ah... improvement you try to make to increase participation, still those who need tax relief the most aren't going



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

13.

to get it, and I think that's a shame. I think maybe... if we really believe in tax relief for Senior citizens, maybe we only ought to have the one, and that's the homestead exemption, and let's increase it and let's make it the one, and we'll probably do a lot better for all of the people. But one thing I've got to admit, this system isn't working. We better look for some other system, even though I introduced the first one."

Arthur Telcser: "Representative Jones to close the debate."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we to say this is a product of a subcommittee that made a thorough study of the problem. It's the... the Bill entails our best judgement as how we can do the job for the Senior Citizens in tax relief as we... it sure was the intent of the circuit breaker when it was first established, and that we appreciate your affirmative vote on putting the Bill into action so we can ah... get the job done that we originally determined that we wanted to do."

Arthur Telcser: "Question is, shall House Bill 2790 pass?"

Those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this question, 141 'ayes', 4 'nays', none answering 'present', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."



A. Telcser: "House Bill 2791. What?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 2791, a bill for an act in relation to the deferral of payments of real estate taxes to a person 65 years of age or older. Third Reading of the bill."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, I refer to Representative Skinner, who is the... really the author of this bill, in which we concurred in his judgement and he can explain it, ah... better than I."

A. Telcser: "Gentlemen from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. We now have two effective forms of Senior Citizens Property Tax Relief. We have the Homestead Exemption which gives relief from \$75 to \$120, depending upon where one lives, to every homeowner in the state, but ignores renters. We now have passed the bill that will make the Circuit Breaker extremely effective for both renters and homeowners. It compares one's income to one's property tax or one's... 25% of one's rent. But there is still the possibility, small though it may be, that some people, some senior citizens, may be taxed out of their home. I did some research. I had the reference... the council do some research on Senior Citizens Tax Relief, and I discovered in the state of Oregon, a 3rd type of property tax relief. It's one that would be used only as a last resort by the senior citizens ah... and what it consists of is the ability, if one is earning under 10,000 dollars, after one has received the Homestead Exemption, the original deduction from one's assessment, to defer



one's taxes until one dies or until one wished to pay them. That is essentially what this bill does. Repayment is required, the state definitely would have a lien against the house, and I would like to say from my experience in public hearings in my district, I am quite aware that senior citizens are very independent, in fact their fiercely independent, and extremely proud people. They are not going to take this option, unless there is absolutely no other way to make it. They don't want to owe anybody anything. Now we estimate the cost of this program based on Oregon's ten year experience, to be about a half a million dollars. Ah... as you can see, very few people are expected to avail themselves to this opportunity. Now is there are any questions, I would be happy to ah... attempt to answer them."

A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Richard Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, just briefly to indicate my opposition to this bill, the Bureau of the Budget ah... estimates the revenue overture at anywhere from \$500,000 to \$31,000,000, depending upon the level of participation once again. The level of participation in Oregon is apparently is extremely low ah... Apparently 3/10's of 1%, 3/10's of 1% of the eligible property owner. And the question is raised, 'if the participation is low, why do we need the bill, because it isn't gonna provide any relief after all?' But there is one other aspect that's important, ladies and gentlemen, ah... ah... I don't know why we here in the state of Illinois have to pattern our laws ah...."



after Oregon. But I guess if they have a good one I guess maybe we should do so. But in the City of Chicago where the extended property taxes remain uncollected to the extent of at least 10%, I think we have to consider whether we're not going to find a lot of people in the over 65 age bracket, who just aren't going to pay their taxes, let the state do so, and maybe let their property fall into the state of disrepair. Now we all know that a property owner takes better care of his home, than a tenant, living in the same home. And if that property owner becomes in effect a tenant, because he takes advantage of this bill, we're going to find property falling into a great state of disrepair. Now that might not be a problem in McHenry county or downstate, but I think it is a very real problem in Cook ah.. and ah.. I would urge that this bill ah.. be defeated notwithstanding that fact that they have it in the state of Oregon."

A. Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative J.J. Wolf."

J.J.Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I hope that you look very closely at what this bill is doing. You are deferring real estate taxes and in an area that would go under some kind of economical change, the state is going to end up holding the bag for property that's not going to be worth whatever the deferrals were made for a long time. This bill was also amended to cover the spouse aged 55, of anyone who dies, it was 60, it was changed to 50... I beg your pardon, from age 50, so a spouse within six months of ah... a woman or a man, of their spouses death, comes under



this as well. Now I submit to you, a person age 50, who is deferring real estate taxes, is probably going to be around an awful long time and it is very conceivable that many of these properties are not going to be worth the amount of the taxes that are being deferred. So I hope that you'll look very closely, this is not like the Circuit Breaker in the previous bill."

A. Telcser: "Gentlemen from Cook, Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "If the sponsor will yield to a question."

A. Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Palmer: "Mr. Skinner, will this take care of the widow lady and those who are old, who for some reason or another, don't pay their taxes and then the tax people come in and buy them up for about two bucks or so, and then finally after two years, get title to the real estate, will that cut out this sort of thing?"

Skinner: "If the lady applies every year, it will. It will not take care of an incompetent, because some... as with all exemptions in the state of Illinois, you have to apply annually."

Palmer: "Well, it would take care of the intolerable situation that we have now in this state, where the tax buyers come in and buy up taxes for a pittance."

Skinner: "If this bill passes we will all be able to stand in front of audiences in our district and say 'There is no reason for any senior citizen to be taxed out of their home.' "



Palmer: "I think it's a very good bill. And I think that we should address ourselves in an affirmative way on it."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Hunsicker."

Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I'd like to ask the sponsor a question if he'll answer...."

A. Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Hunsicker: "Representative Skinner, does this bill only take in senior citizens up to a certain amount of income per year? This doesn't include all senior citizens?"

Skinner: "No, Mr. Hunsicker, you have to be earning less than \$10,000 a year."

Hunsicker: "I also understand, unless the bill has been changed, that 6% interest will be charged on the deferred taxes?"

Skinner: "Yes sir, there will be an interest charge on the deferred taxes."

Hunsicker: "Who pays that, the State of Illinois?"

Skinner: "No sir, the homeowner.. well it will come out of the homeowner's estate if it goes to the state or if the individual wishes to repay it, it will come from the individual."

Hunsicker: "From the individual owning, the home?"

Skinner: "Yes."

Hunsicker: "Well I'd like to speak to the bill, Mr. Speaker. I checked with my local bank a week ago, and on a house where the tax is only \$300 a year and it doesn't take much of a house to be \$300, not in our area, anyway. Over 20 years of compounded interest, and many people today that start doing this at 65, live to be 80 and 85. In 20 years



the taxes and in interest compounded, they came up with the figure of \$11,296.21. Now will one of these homes be worth that much in 20 years? Your guess on that is as good as mine. Who's gonna make up the difference if this property doesn't bring this amount when it's sold? Taxpayers as a whole, gonna be left holding the bag? Suppose over the years the General Assembly decides in it's wisdom, and I use the word loosely, to prohibit the state from recovering these advance funds, such as elimination of a lien on a relief recipient's property? Now I think this is bad legislation and we better take a right good look at it. Everyone is for a tax reduction for the senior citizen, including myself, but by the same token, everytime we give the senior citizen a reduction, the young that enter the labor market get a bigger burden piled on their back and it's getting to the point where they can't hardly stand up under it anymore. I think it's about time we look to the young who are going to have to pay the bills pretty soon, also. So you better take a good look at this."

A. Telcser: "Gentlemen from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Will Representative Skinner yield?"

A. Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Peters: "Representative Skinner, do you have any idea how many senior citizens in the ah.. City of Chicago or county of Cook avail themselves of the Homestead Exemption?"

Skinner: "I'm sorry, Representative, I do not."

Peters: "110,000. I would assume from that figure, that we must have at least another 10,15,20, maybe 30,000 other



senior citizens who in fact, did not avail themselves for one reason or another, of the opportunity ah.. to file under the Homestead Exemption Law. My old section, in the City of Chicago, which is now capably represented by Representatives Nardulli, Garmisa, and Capuzi, is an old section. The people who own the homes there are basically individuals who are retired, and frankly the section of the city I live in now, on the northwest side of the City of Chicago, on my block, at least 2 out of 5 houses are owned by senior citizens. All that I am suggesting to you is we are really talking about a tremendous, tremendous burden that we're gonna end up putting on the taxpayers of the state, if in fact just ah... 110,000 people, who have already filed for Senior Citizens Homestead Exemption, file for a deferral of their taxes. It doesn't take much to multiply for 110,000 times probably an average of \$500 and to come out with an astronomical amount of money, which the state treasury is going be called on to give to the County of Cook. Ah... the other ah... problem that I see is, that if the tax referral does go from the spouse, does go back to the wife who is 50, what we end up getting into is involving the City of Chicago and the County of Cook, and the State of Illinois, as parties in probate action and in estate actions and in fact would probably make ah.... the County of Cook one of the largest land holders and the home owners in Cook County. Now ah.... I know what your trying to get at ah... but as Representative Walsh indicated, I think that the problems in Cook County are pretty serious along these lines, and ah... very, very serious for



the state. Now if you have some adequate ah... answers for this you might still persuade me to vote in favot of this bill, but my inclination certainly is that it would be ah... very, very detrimental."

Skinner: "Well, I'd like to try, Representative Peters. First of all the Homestead Exemption of which I'm quite willing to take your word, there are 110,000 eligible in Cook county, has no income limitation. W. Clement Stone, if he's over 65, I assume applies for the Homestead Exemption and is given a tax rebate. Secondly ah.. representing a number of senior citizens, I'm sure, that you have perceived as I have perceived, that they are extremely proud people. They do not want to owe the government anything, And so most of them will take the Circuit Breaker approach, which will be increased from an average ah... an average rebate this year of about \$156 by about 50%. I would estimate it would go, the average would go over \$200 next year. Just from the amount of money that we estimate will be needed to be appropriated. This will not in my opinion, put an increased burden on those who are under 65. And in fact I am well... I'm somewhat disappointed that my more conservative colleagues don't understand that this is the most conservative approach to Senior Citizens Tax Relief, that has yet been presented in this House. In fact, the state will end up loosing virtually nothing over about a 30 year period. It is not a give away like the Circuit Breaker Program is, and like the Homestead Exemption is, the individual who decides to take this option, is saying, 'I want to remain in my home



now, but in the future I'm willing to pay my full way, I'm not going to take a subsidy from the state. I'm going to pay it back with 6% interest.' And incidently for Representative Hunsicker's information, ah.. the interest will not be compound interest. And so if you figure up the average tax on a home is about 2% to 3% of it's value, you will see it will be about 30 years before the value of the average property, and I have to in deference to Representative Wolf, have to exclude changing neighborhoods here because certainly I'm thinking about the average property where the value ah.. is maintained over the years, it will be about 30 years before the state loses anything. And if they become eligible after the age of 65, that means they would have to live to the age of 95, and I really don't think the life expentancy in the state of Illinois is that high. So I hope that this will answer Representative Peter's questions, I certainly would be willing to answer any additional questions my comments may have raised to Representative Peters."

Peters: "I still, Representative Skinner, have the kind of feeling that it's going to create a tremendous problem with the State Treasury. I am however, going to ah.. consider very carefully the ah... vote of the Representatives of the city of Chicago to see what their feeling is as I cast mine."

Skinner: "Thank you."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House I know it's true that we're thinking about saving taxes, but we should consider the part of the senior citizen, and in



my county of Lake, the taxes are a prohibitive nature, and in my county of Lake, my people have worked hard to save for these nice homes cannot even live in them anymore, because they don't have enough money to support themselves on Social Security and their taxes. And this will be a relief for them because let their heirs pay for it, if this will give these people a chance to live in their homes without being disturbed, and when they die, let their heirs pay back the taxes. For heavens sake, we committed ourselves to Tax Relief for Senior Citizens, we should not consider him obsolete because of computerization, specialization, and decriminalization, I speak for the bill and I urge all of my colleagues to support it."

A. Telcser: "Representative Skinner to....Gentlemen from Cook, Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, one brief word about the way in which both these bills, 2790 and 2791 were ah... derived by the sub-committee. I want to pay tribute to the many sponsors ah... and that includes Representative Jones, Representative Joe Gibbs, Representative Jack Lauer, Representative Horace Calvo, Representative Skinner, Representative Zeke Giorgi who had two bills in our committee on Senior Citizens Tax Relief, Representative Mike McClain and Represenative Pete Peters, all of whom agreed that, I don't mean to imply that they necessarily endorsed the end product, but they all agree that the responsible approach for the committee to take was to put all of the bills into a sub-committee, study, hold hearings



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

and come out with an agreed bill. That was the procedure that was followed. To me, that's the way the legislature oughta work, we oughta be creative, we oughta be imaginative, and we oughta work out our own solutions to these tough problems like Senior Citizens Tax Relief. I am proud to have served on this sub-committee, I think we all owe a debt of gratitude to the individual sponsors who were willing to forego ah.. bringing their own bills out on the floor in order that we could have an agreed approach, which hopefully will go through the legislature and see the Governor's desk, and become law without ah... some of the partisan fighting that we often see relating to the Tax Relief field. I am proud to have been a part of this, I urge those of you who would like to serve in the credit, for this legislatively generated Tax Relief Package, to vote 'aye' on this bill."

A. Telcser: "Gentlemen from Cook, Representative Tom Miller."

Miller: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and members of the House, ah... will Representative Skinner yeild to one question?"

A. Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Miller: "If a property owner, 65 years old, ah.. owns property, ah..\$20,000 home Cal, couldn't he go to the bank and get a loan, and put up his title to his property for his collateral, in order to raise the necessary revenue to pay his property taxes?"

Skinner: "Yes, he could."

Miller: "It would achieve the same objective as ah.. the bill tries to do, I believe."

Skinner: "Well, in the first year it would."



Miller: "Well he could continue to borrow against that collateral up to the full value of the home."

Skinner: "Well, but you see... I don't know how to put this, but senior citizens fear government. Ah... they need government to exist but they also fear it. And I just... I have the real feeling that senior citizens will be likely.. will be virtually unlikely to go to a bank and get a loan in such a situation. They'll take the Circuit Breaker Relief, they'll take the Homestead Relief, and if they can't pay the rest ah... the House will probably be sold for delinquent taxes."

Miller: "Well, they may be reluctant, but on the other hand, ah..we would avoid creating a large administrative responsibility on state government to administer a program of this type."

Skinner: "Well you see, we're back to the original question that Representative Peters suggested.... asked. And that is, 'How big will this program be?' Now the figures that Representative Walsh was using... were using, was from the Department of Revenue, completely unsolicited, and completely fallacious. Ah... they site that the Bureau of the Budget, using the most recent data available in a comparable state and adjusting for population, indicates that the participation will cost \$500,000. Now the Department of Revenue which has absolutely no ability, in my opinion, to estimate revenue needs, and has been totally unable to give us any revenue estimates on the Circuit Breaker, even though they've been asked six months ago, comes up with the figure \$30,000,000 saying that it will cost \$30,000,000 if as many



people participate in this program as participate in the Circuit Breaker Program. Completely ignoring the facts that if they participate in the Circuit Breaker Program, they can't participate in this program. So we would save the \$29,000,000 on the other program. Ah.. I would like to point out one other thing. Representative Walsh has pointed out that about 10% of the taxes of Cook, go uncollected. What he left unsaid was that the largest percentage of those are personal property taxes and we all know why they go uncollected. 96% of the taxes, the real estate taxes of Cook county, are collected. So ah.. the problem is not as great as he would have us believe."

A. Telcser: "Gentlemen from Stevenson, Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions and perhaps these have been answered, my apologies to the sponsor for being off the floor for awhile, but do I understand now that if they elect to go into this program, they are not eligible for any Circuit Breaker relief? Is that correct?"

Skinner: "That is correct, because in order to be eligible for Circuit Breaker relief, you have to pay taxes."

Rigney: "In other words, they are not considered to a half paid when they go into this program, the fact that they have given the lien and someday it will be paid, they have forever lost any chance to get any Circuit Breaker."

Skinner: "This is an alternative relief, not a supplemental relief, to the Circuit Breaker, however it is supplemental to the Homestead."

Rigney: "Ok,.. but the Homestead they can get, the \$1500



Homestead Exemption comes off as many years as they remain under that program. is that correct? Thank you."

A. Telcser: "Gentlemen from Cook, Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and members of the House. In order to save the most money for the taxpayers, I move the previous question."

A. Telcser: "The gentlemen has moved the previous question. All in favor 'aye', the opposed 'no'. You want a roll call? Represn.... Alright now... we've been on this thing 45 minutes, by the way. Can you explain your vote? Representative Lechowicz, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Lechowicz: "Well the people that this bill is affecting has been here for 65 years, I'd like to ask a question."

A. Telcser: "Alright, do you want to withdraw your motion Representative Totten? He indicates that he will. Gentlemen from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I know that I notice that the bill has been amended, ah.. Dave, with four amendments. And I was wondering ah.. Cal.. I am wondering if there has been any amendment that would effect the revenue going back to the various counties, on the tax bill?"

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

Lechowicz: "The bill has been amended by four amendments. Have any of the amendments been in reference to the rebate of the various counties? What do the amendments do?"

Skinner: "The first amendment changes from one to two years the amount of time that the ah.. taxpayer has to pay back the bill, after he dies, or his estate has. The second



amendment lowers the eligibility ah.. ceiling from.. income ceiling from \$15,000 to \$10,000. The third amendment defines income the same way it is in the Circuit Breaker Bill. And the fourth amendment ah..lowers the age, that the spouse may have ah.. survivorship rights from 60 to 50 years. There was a fifth amendment that was circulated but was not adopted."

Lechowicz: "Now does that mean ah.. say that I own a building and I in turn transfer it over to my folks, ah.. what protection is there as far ah.. nontransferability of existing property to parents who are surviving? Or living? And if that's the situation.. say for example that my dad is 70 years old and ah...and his wife, or my mother, is 55. He passes away and actually the building goes back into her name. So we're talking a possibility of 20 years of not paying taxes, and the state picking up the tap. Has there been any protection for this? Do you follow me?"

Skinner: "Well, I'm with your example so far, what's your question?"

Lechowicz: "What protection is there so that this doesn't happen?"

Skinner: "Well, the value of the house does not exceed the value of the taxes until until after about thirty years. So the state would have itself protected."

Lechowicz: "Your assuming that the property is going to stay constant in value."

Skinner: Well, as a matter a fact, before I talked to Representative Wolf about the problems in changing neighborhoods,



I would assume over a twenty year period, that the value of the property would probably double. The value of the property in my area is increasing about 50% every 10 years."

Lechowicz: "Your very fortunate. We're talking about the major municipalities or the major municipal areas in this state, and I don't think that's true."

Skinner: "Well, my experience is limited, I'm sorry."

Lechowicz: "What is the cost of this bill?"

Skinner: "The estimate by the Bureau of the Budget, and by myself, is \$500,000. Now I do not think it will be that great in the first year."

Lechowicz: "Well, I don't know about your area, but as far as our area, people over 65 or senior citizens, I think that sum is probably absorbed in two districts that I know of."

Skinner: "Well, Representative, you may be correct, and the situation that Representative Wolf explained to me, the reason for the exorbitantly high taxes, were because the assessments had not followed closely enough to the value of the property, the property had decreased to 1/3 of it's value, but the taxes were still at it's old level. Now under the new assessors market value assessment program, that shouldn't happen."

Lechowicz: "Alright, but is there any protection in this bill to protect the nontransferability of existing property to ah... there is."

Skinner: "Well, there would be a lien on the property and you wouldn't be able to get a clear title until it was cleared up."



Lechowicz: "What about the.. how does the Chicago Title & Trust Company feel about it? Would there be a lien?"

Skinner: "Yes, it's very clear in here that there.. that you know.. you have to pay the taxes that are deferred."

Lechowicz: "Alright, thank you."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Jacobs."

Jacobs: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of 2790 and House Bill 2791 also. It happens to be that there's been approximately 30 separate bills pertaining to senior citizens in the House this session. In as much as the Illinois Council on Aging has endorsed both 2790 and 2791. Also, the Legislative Committee of the Illinois Council on Aging has approved it. Because of this, I ask for a favorable vote on House Bill 2790. Thank you."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Robert Holloway."

R. Holloway: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield to a question."

A. Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Holloway: "As I understand ah.. the application to this law, ah.. the tax would not be paid for any given year where application for this benefit ah.. would be made by the owner of the property. My question is ah.. in the meantime, how would that tax deficit resulting from this application be made up."

Skinner: "Any loss of local taxes at the local level, would be



reimbursed from the state treasury. Not like the Homestead Exemption where we gave everybody \$1500 off their assessment and local government had to raise tax rates to make up the difference. We're adopting a new philosophy that says that if we're going to give property tax relief at the state level, we ought to be paid for it and we shouldn't expect the local governments to pay for it."

R. Holloway: "Okay."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Juckett."

Juckett: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield for a question."

A. Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Juckett: "My understanding is that if an individual is 65 years or older they can apply for this deferment of taxes."

Skinner: "That is right."

Juckett: "And their spouse, if they die and the spouse is what. 60 or more, that deferment will continue. Is that correct."

Skinner: "There is survivorship rights."

Juckett: "Now, let's suppose that the individual owns a home in joint tenancy with a child and the individual dies and that child, then, is 65, is the child eligible for a deferment."

Skinner: "Representative Juckett, I'm afraid I'm not a legal eagle on survivorship rights and joint tenancy between mothers and sons or mothers and daughters. I cannot answer the question. If Mr. Lundy is on the Floor perhaps he can add some expertise."

Juckett: "Well, as you know, in joint tenancy, if the survivor



dies the interest passes to that joint tenant. My question is, if that surviving joint tenant is over 55 at the time of the death, would that surviving joint tenant be eligible for a deferment of taxes so that the lien would not be foreclosed."

Skinner: "I don't know."

Juckett: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this would be a great bill for bringing families back together. I don't think you'd need anybody in a nursing home. All apologies to anyone who might have an interest in them. But.. you wouldn't need a nursing home. I mean they.. the old folks could come home, you could put the titles in their name in joint tenancy, they'd live to be 95 and be very happy at home and by that time the kids are 65 and who knows it opens up a great possibility that we have finally been able to beat the tax game and the home owner can win."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, the Majority Leader was called away from his post on account of official duties and the Assistant Minority Leader was very gracious and kind and I would ask that the Speaker introduce to this group a very distinguished delegation from Cumberland and Effingham Counties, Republican Womens Organizations from both of those counties led by Frances Kerner and by Roberta Marksman are in the West Read Balcony. Mr. Speaker, would it be an imposition for you to call attention to the group, that



distinguished delegation that we have with us today."

A. Telcser: "It would be a distinct honor, Representative."

Cunningham: "The Representatives are Shurtz, Keller and Cunningham, I wanted to point out that. Oh, there they are.."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, having conferred with Representative Lundy, I do have the answer to Representative Juckett's question. There is no survivorship between the.. except between spouses, not between ah.. mothers and fathers and daughters and sons. They could qualify anew, but they have to pay the original bill that the mother or father had deferred, plus interest."

A. Telcser: "Now, is there anyone else that wants to add a pearl of wisdom to this bill. I don't want to get anybody excited by cutting off the debate like we just tried, but who wants to say something else. Take another half hour or hour, I don't care. Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise, sir."

Shea: "I thought I'd put on my light. That's how you got recognized with your.."

A. Telcser: "Well, we've got a lot of lights here. I want to be sure not to cut off debate, though, because some of the members are a little fisty about this bill."

Shea: "Will the sponsor yield for a question."

A. Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Shea: "Cal, as I figure this, about 100,000 people took advantage of it at \$500, that's about \$50,000,000 isn't it."

Skinner: "Well, you know, virtually everybody in this House has



JUN 13 1974

senior citizens as constituents and, if you haven't talked to some of them in a group, I would suggest you do so because they are not after a give away. They do not want to owe government anything. And the assumption that that magnitude of people will take advantage of this program, after they have the Homestead Exemption and the Circuit Breaker, I think is unfounded. I also would suggest that you're assumption that the average tax bill for a senior citizen home owner is \$1000 is unwarranted unless you're talking about my district."

Shea: "I said \$500."

Skinner: "\$500 would be closer."

Shea: "Alright, if a 100,000 people took advantage of that, that's \$50,000,000."

Skinner: "That is correct."

Shea: "Alright, now where do we get.. now if you build this up over a period of ten years that's \$500,000,000. You know, where do we.."

Skinner: "After ten years in Oregon, there are.. just a minute.. I apologize to have to refer to Oregon, but this is the only state that has adopted this program and really, I believe, is the only indication of what will happen. After ten years there are only about 400 participants. Now, let me read why, according to ah.. Charlie Minors who talked to one of the people in Oregon. He says that the elderly do not consider this deferment to be tax relief, but a lien on their property. And, secondly, they want something to



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

leave to their children. So, if there's a way for them to pay it they will. You know, I've sat in a county treasurer's office and seen people come in in July when they should have been paying their bills on June 1st and they come in after July 1st because it takes two social security checks to pay the bill and they don't get it until the 3rd of the month and they have to pay two month's interest. And these people are proud people. They're not going to be raiding the state treasury. If anything's a raid on the state treasury, it certainly is the Circuit Breaker and not this one."

Shea: "My concern, I like the conception of the bill, but I'm just concerned where we get the money."

Skinner: "Well, of course, there's a recycling. People do die and over, I would suggest, probably a ten to thirty year period it will pay for itself."

Shea: "Where's it going to pay for itself."

Skinner: "Well, because you get title to the homes and you get to sell the homes. You know, you get your money back. You get every cent back plus 6% simple interest."

Shea: "Alright."

A. Telcser: "Further discussion. Nope. Representative Skinner wish to close the debate. Question is shall House Bill 2791 pass. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish. Will someone throw Brinkmeier's switch over there, huh. Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to explain



his vote."

Skinner: "I hope that we get 89 votes here because if we do we will be able to go back to our people and say 'now there is no way a senior citizen can be taxed out of their homes'. I thank you for your support on this bill."

A. Telcser: "Have all voted who wish. Take the record. On this question there are 119 'ayes', 15 'nays', 1 answering 'present', Friedland 'present'.. Friedland 'aye' .. and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."



Speaker Telcser: "Okay, now for one...there's one more that we've got to take care of before the Senate adjourns. On Senate Bills Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1349. We want to jump to that matter then go back to House Bills Third. On Senate Bills Second Reading, Senate Bill 1349. Now I think that Bill has been read a second time, has it not, Mr. Clerk? Has that Bill been read a second time? Now, Representative Schraeder, this Bill has not been read a second time, you're not going to save any time today if the Senate leaves, are you aware of that? Let's take that out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, we're privileged to have with us today, Pack 11 of Den I of the Wilmette Cub Scouts. They're in the company of Mrs. John Graham, Mrs. Bernie Allen and Mrs. John Brun. They're represented by Representative Brian Duff, John Porter and Harold Katz. They're in the balcony to the rear, on the Republican side."

Speaker Telcser: "House Bill 2666. Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise?"

Shea: "I think you raised a very interesting point when you asked about a Senate Bill on Second Reading that's been read a second time. And I'm wondering if we might in the future when we hold Senate Bills or House Bills on Second Reading indicate that they've been read a second time and they're in a position to pass. Because I've had some criticism from people saying 'how can a Bill appear on your calendar on Second Reading and be passed that same day'? Well, it's fine for us that are sitting here but for the average person looking at a calendar I think we ought to make some indication of this when it passes."

Speaker Telcser: "Your point is well taken, Sir. All right,



back on that Senate Bill Second Reading. There's an emergency in a department and if we can't get this taken care of today there'll be a...apparently a large number of employees who will not be paid tomorrow. We need a transfer of funds. So with leave of the House, I'd like to go to Senate Bills Second Reading, take up that one matter then go back to House Third. Are there any objections to that? The Bill has been read a second time. The Clerk was in error. So Senate Bills Second Reading, Senate Bill 1349, it's been read a second time. Amendment #1 has been adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #2. Schraeder. Amends Senate Bill 1349..."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, there's been a subsequent Amendment introduced which will make some changes so I would move at this time that Amendment #2 be withdrawn, or leave to withdraw in deference to Amendment #3."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1349. All in favor aye; opposed no. Amendment's tabled. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #3. Leinenweber. Amends Senate Bill..."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1349 makes a transfer of funds within the Department's fiscal '74 appropriation from those funds which have been appropriated for Juvenile Reception and Diagnostic Center to the Illinois State Penitentiary at Joliet in order to pay employees retirement and social security for the time during which the Juvenile Reception and Diagnostic Center pursuant to Executive Order had been changed, allegedly changed, to an adult penal facility. This has been worked out with the agreement



of the Department of Corrections and I would urge adoption of Amendment #3. Does not provide for expending any new...appropriating any new money, merely technical change to permit payment of employees salaries, retirement and social security. I urge adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? Gentleman offers to move the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1349. All in favor of adoption signify by saying aye; the opposed no. Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments? No more? All right, Third Reading. Amendment #3 has been adopted. Third Reading. Now this Bill's been read a second time, the Clerk please read Senate Bill 1349 for a third time."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1349. An act making appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense to the Department of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, this is a transfer of funds one account to another so that these people can be paid and I would move its adoption."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1349 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question, there are 147 ayes, no nays, 1 answering present. Calvo...Representative Calvo."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, I just wondered. I have a Bill on ...Senate Bill Third Reading on the calendar which expired, I know we've been extending them, was there some specific emergency or is it...you know, this Bill hadn't expired on the calendar yet."

Telcser: "I announced that if this Amendment isn't adopted and the Bill's sent over to the Senate, there are a

group of prison guards who won't be paid."

Calvo: "Fine. Okay. Fine. Fine. That's the fund."

Speaker Telcser: "And this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Back to House Bills Third, House Bill 2666. 2666."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2666. An act to amend the Revenue Act of 1939. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Merlo."

Merlo: "The purpose of the House of this legislation is to remedy a tax inequity which imperils specific programs of the Federal Housing Administration and the Illinois Housing Development Authority designed to facilitate the construction and operation of decent multifamily housing for low and moderate income tenants; those that are living on fixed income. Generally speaking, these programs utilized some combination of mortgage insurance, interest and rent reduction subsidies. Housing built under these programs show special characterizations not found in the normal multifamily residence, namely, maximum building cost limitation. They have limited land cost. Tenant income is limited. Profit is limited. Rentals are limited. Tax increases are not subsidized. Thus, this type of housing does not have the profit making ability that the conventional residential property has. Taxes have been confiscatory on this type of housing thus discouraging development of additional types of this here. Even though many of our citizens, and I speak again of the senior citizen, those on limited and fixed incomes desperately need more housing and decent housing. What House Bill 2666 directs, the county assessor, the classified, subsidized housing properties at a fair market value no greater than the lowest value applied to any other kind of assessed property, namely single family dwellings. In the Reg-



ular Session of the 78th General Assembly a similar Bill, in concept, was introduced in the Senate by Senator Partee, passed the Senate by an overwhelming majority; came over to the House, I was the House Sponsor. We passed the Bill in the House however the Bill was vetoed by the Governor and in his language of course he said that the Bill was ambiguous. We feel, now, that this Bill has been drawn by the Illinois Development Housing Authority which was a creation of this General Assembly. We feel that the objections have been done away with and we think that the Bill is a better Bill now. This Bill has the support of the Metropolitan Housing and Planning Council, the Illinois Association of Real Estate, the Leadership Council for the Metropolitan Open Committee, the Ad Hoc Committee on Multifamily Subsidized Housing, and the witness that appeared for it was the Chairman of the Illinois Housing Development Authority, namely Bruce Hagen who was also a local newspaper publisher. And Ladies and Gentlemen, I wish that you will give me the support that you gave me when this Bill was heard in Regular Session of the 78th General Assembly."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Telcser: "Indicates that he will."

Hirschfeld: "Representative, can you tell me whether or not there's any possibility under this Act for a slum landlord to receive mortgage assistance and thereby would be put in a position where he would be receiving mortgage assistance and then still be classified at the lowest possible real estate tax limit?"

Merlo: "I would imagine that there is a possibility for anyone to ask for assistance however they must meet the specifications that are set forth by the Illinois Development



Housing Authority I would imagine they would scrutinize any individual of this type and would not permit him to be eligible for a loan under this program."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "If the Sponsor will yield for a question. I'm looking at the jacket the synopsis and some of these terms I'm not too acquainted with. They mention a limited profit equity, a limited distribution mortgagor, et cetera. What are they talking about on a limited profit as a factual example."

Merlo: "Very briefly, and this is of course according to the statute, a limited profit entity means any individual, joint venture partnership, limited partnership, trust or corporation, organized or existing under the laws the State of Illinois or authorized to do business in the state and having articles and incorporations and comparable documents of organization or a written agreement with the authority which in addition to other requirements of law will provide and then of course there's a whole list of things. I'd be happy to show you this in length, I couldn't possibly explain it on my own, I am not a lawyer but I do have and it's defined in the statutes."

Palmer: "Do we have any previous experience in this? Is there anyone now engaged in this? Is it a brand new act or what?"

Merlo: "No, the Act has existed, Representative Palmer, and..."

Palmer: "Do we have any previous experience in the Chicago area in this particular type..."

Merlo: "I would say we have, yes."

Palmer: "All right..."

Merlo: "...And it's been good."

Palmer: "Can private enterprise enter into it? You and I get together and say this is what we're going to do



and put up some capital?"

Merlo: "Yes. Providing, of course, the Housing Development would consist of low and moderate income people as established by the Illinois Housing Development Authority."

Palmer: "Well, limited profit is there some to your knowledge going through, is the profit for this thing for the developer is that limited, and if so, to what extent in terms of percentage."

Merlo: "Yes. It limits the amount of the profits which is 6% today."

Palmer: "In other words that's all that they can make on it."

Merlo: "That's correct, 6%."

Palmer: "So the taxes to this would then be to perpetuate low income housing."

Merlo: "This is correct."

Palmer: "Now, involved in this would be the 234, 235 housing type of project, this is essentially what we're talking about."

Merlo: "Correct."

Palmer: "The National Housing Act, I believe, of 1961."

Merlo: "...69, that's right."

Palmer: "Limited distribution mortgagor, as a practical matter, what are we talking about on that?"

Merlo: "Now the definition of this was by statute, Palmer."

Palmer: "Well...if you can tell me."

Merlo: "Well, the limited distribution mortgagor shall be a corporation, trust partnership, association other, and be, or any individual. Such mortgagor shall be restricted by law, or by the Commission as to the distribution of income and shall be regulated as to its rank, charges, rates of return, et cetera."

Palmer: "So they would be limited. That means a group, perhaps, of mortgagors that want to enter into this."



Merlo: "I would say so."

Palmer: "Is this Bruce Hagen's Bill?"

Merlo: "Yes, it is."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Adams...were you through, Representative Palmer? Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Telcser: "Indicates that he will."

McClain: "Representative Merlo, could I ask what kind of restrictions are there on any individual to form a not-for-profit organization? Within the state."

Merlo: "I would imagine that they would have to apply to the statutes and of course the regulations of the Illinois Development Housing Authority, that's as far as I can tell you..."

McClain: "...That's pretty liberal though is it not? Isn't that pretty liberal though?"

Merlo: "I would say not."

McClain: "For instance, in our community we have an individual that just formed his own church, just for a tax break. Now, what I fear that being done by a landlord in a slum or a city area."

Merlo: "No, I would say no. That they would have to comply, as I say, with the statute. This is all I can tell you. Whether they do it unbeknown and of course this...no one could answer for you because you don't know whether these people are unscrupulous or not, we hope that they are not, those that are making application to develop housing under this Illinois Authority Act."

McClain: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Representative Merlo, I just had a question, will you yield?"

Merlo: "Yes, Sir."



Speaker Telcser: "Indicates that he will."

Borchers: "Do you consider this rather discriminatory against the, you might say, regular taxpayers of the state?"

Merlo: "I most certainly do not."

Borchers: "Well, isn't this rather a special dispensation to one group of people as opposed to another group who do not have the same privilege?"

Merlo: "All I can tell you, Representative Borchers, that the Illinois Development Housing Authority was created by this General Assembly committed for this type of housing. If you feel it's discriminatory, then I would suggest that you put in a Bill and rescind the present statute which of course created the Illinois Development Housing Authority."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Representative Merlo to close the debate."

Merlo: "In closing I can only say that in the last Session of the General Assembly we passed legislation which gave a substantial tax break to the more affluent segment of our society, the owners of condominiums and cooperatives by assessing them as single family dwellings, however in the type that we speak about we do not. I certainly think that we as Legislators committed ourselves to this type of housing and I certainly ask for a favorable vote which I also had received in the last Session of the General Assembly."

Speaker Telcser: "Question is, shall House Bill 2666 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Well...do a little quick talking. Okay, have all voted who wish? Get on those switches. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Punch that record. Yes, Sir. On this question 102 ayes, 15, nays, none answering present. This...receiving the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2628. 2628."



Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2628. What did he say?

...Amends Local Mass Transit District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is one of the Bills that we had in to try to resolve the problems of the local downstate mass transit. One is to get some money from the state and the other one is to, if they have to, they have to go back to their local taxpayers and raise the rate. Now this is permissive with the referendum Bill to give them the authority to raise their local tax levy by a direct referendum if the Committee so decides to support their mass transit district. I move its passage at this time."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 2628 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question 126 ayes, no nays, 1 answering present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2561, Representative LaFleur, you want your Bill called? No? Okay, hold it. 2519, Dave? House Bill 2519."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2519. An act to provide operating assistance grants to certain mass transit carriers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Jones."

Jones: "This is another in the series that I call backup bills for mass transit possible. Now this is only the enabling legislation. There is an appropriation bill proceeding which is not yet on the calendar. This is permissive for the state to pay the deficit for the local downstate mass transit district. And I'm just



moving this along as a holding action to see what other legislation comes aboard to help to assist the downstate mass transit agencies and will not be proceeded if we get some meaningful help like in 2772 which is upcoming."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Calvo."

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

Speaker Telcser: "Indicates that he will."

Calvo: "Dave, did you have me in this Bill at one time you say?"

Jones: "You wanted to be amended out."

Calvo: "Yeah, I know. This...I was in it once, I've a separate Bill now we've got, well I'll have on Second Reading tomorrow so it's all right. I just wanted to know."

Jones: "Okay."

Calvo: "But I was in it."

Jones: "Right."

Calvo: "...Probably get in the Senate or something that's necessary."

Jones: "Take it out at your request."

Calvo: "I understand."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Telcser: "Indicates that he will."

McCourt: "It's a little fuzzy in my mind exactly, we've had so much talk on RTA and all, but as I remember it somewhere back some months ago we passed as a companion to the RTA legislation a supplemental highway appropriation. I think the amount was 140,000,000, something like that, and is this in conjunction with this or will we rescind the supplemental freeway program should this particular bill pass?"

Jones: "No, Sir, no connection with that. There is, as I say, there is a supplemental bill to this for appropriation



to accommodate this action if it was determined that's what we should do."

McCourt: "It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that without passing a House Resolution that we have...are attempting to change Christmas to the month of June."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Sponsor answer a question?"

Speaker Telcser: "Indicates that he will."

Ewell: "Could you tell me if this Bill is sort of known as downstate double dipping on the Transportation Act?"

Jones: "No, Sir, this is...no, Sir. Ewell, this is an alternative, not a double one. This is an alternative action if we need it."

Ewell: "Just one final question."

Jones: "Yes."

Ewell: "How much is this going to cost?"

Jones: "The estimate on this would be \$8,000,000 if...all the deficits of the downstate mass transit district where it's all accommodated. ...Also in a separate appropriation Bill and it's not...we haven't got it before us yet."

Ewell: "Okay. Is there any bond money involved?"

Jones: "No."

Ewell: "How much are the communities that are getting the benefit of this contributing by additional taxes or the like?"

Jones: "Well, there were about 11 downstate..."

Ewell: "No. No. How much money are these communities contributing by the way of additional taxes like parking taxes, any other kind of taxes..."

Jones: "Okay. I'll give you an example right now as it is in Sangamon County, in Springfield the Mass Transit District has a five cent tax levy which produces \$250,000 a year. They're facing with diesel fuel, for



example has gone from nine cents to thirty cents, next year a deficit of \$300,000. So we're trying to see where we can get them some help to do this and that's one of the possibilities."

Ewell: "All right. One final question."

Jones: "Yes, Sir."

Ewell: "Would you have any objections to taking this money out of the Road Fund?"

Jones: "I don't believe I can settle that policy question in this Bill, Sir."

Ewell: "I'm sorry for the questions, I just like to know things."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think Representative Duff this morning eloquently quoted Bill Shakespeare and about the rains from Heaven but I think this Bill as well as some of the other Bills could be more aptly described as a Bill wherein there are pennies from Heaven which there is a good tune for."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Jones, to close the debate."

Jones: "I'm saying this is one of the alternatives to resolve the needs for downstate mass transit districts and we're professing if we're passing this along that get it by the deadlines that were calendared so that we could...we promise though that this Bill will not be processed if get some assistance from any other Bills that are on the calendar at the present time which is the Downstate General Mass Transit Aid Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The question is..."

Jones: "...Request your vote."

Speaker Telcser: "...2519 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Geo-Karis, aye. You're on. Have all voted who wish? Polk, aye. Take the record. Fleck...



Mr. Clerk, record Representative Fleck as voting aye also. No? Fleck, no. This question...Collins, no. This question 126 ayes, 9 nos, 7 answering present. And this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2518."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2518...."

Speaker Telcser: "Charlie, no? Tomorrow? Take it out of the record."

Clerk Selcke: "Out of the record?"

Speaker Telcser: "Out of the record, the Gentleman said. ...A little more maneuvering. House Bill 2195. Representative Jones on the floor? Dave? This one's yours, Dave. House Bill 2195."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2195. An act to provide for the reimbursement for reduced kinds of fares to the elderly. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Jones."

Jones: "This is a Bill to pick up a legislative oversight of the end of the last Session where there was legislation before us for the Department of Transportation to reimburse the local communities for school children, now this is not the School Children Bill it's still coming up, it's for...and Senior Citizens Tax Relief. Whoa, I'm back to my old Bill, excuse me, this is for the reduced fares of senior citizens and with this covers the period that was neglected in the legislation that did not pass the last day of the last Session. And we move its adoption."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 2195...Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "The Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Telcser: "Indicates that he will."

Schlickman: "You started off your introduction of this Bill



by saying it's a correction of an oversight but isn't it true that this is a new act?"

Jones: "Yes, Sir."

Schlickman: "All right. Now this is an act that would provide for state reimbursement to mass transportation carriers for reduced transit fees for the fares for the elderly. Just how much money are we talking about on an annual basis?"

Jones: "Well, the Department of Transportation has already appropriated the money for this, I mean, this is just the authorization to release it."

Schlickman: "Well, how much are we authorizing this year?"

Jones: "I recall I think in the last year that about \$6,000,000."

Schlickman: "Last...what's the basis..."

Jones: "I mean the estimates of it. Wait a minute, that's for the school children, this is the Senior Citizen..."

Schlickman: "What is it for the senior citizens?"

Jones: "Right."

Schlickman: "You don't know what the cost of this program will be?"

Jones: "Well, in Springfield Mass Transit District it will be about \$20,000, for example."

Schlickman: "But you don't know what the cost will be statewide?"

Jones: "I don't have that figure. But this is already, the money has already been authorized and...by the Department of Transportation."

Schlickman: "How much is being authorized for the implementation of this program? Is 17,000,000 about right?"

Jones: "Oh, no."

Schlickman: "How much?"

Jones: "I don't have that information."

Schlickman: "You don't know."

Jones: "...Say it's at nine."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman



from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Perhaps on...to be helpful to Representative Schlickman, there was \$9,000,000 in fiscal '74 and there's \$13,000,000 proposed in fiscal '75. And these are the Bills that I think Mr. Juckett had in the First Special Session. There are...one of the Special Sessions that somehow were not passed and the consoler has refused to provide any reimbursement for fares to the elderly...for reduced fares for the elderly without the implementing legislation."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Juckett."

Juckett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, as far these...as far as the budget was concerned and the Bills that were concerned in the last Special Session, it was \$17,000,000. And the request of the CTA was 15.7 million; and the downstate portion was 1.3 million."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? If not, Representative Jones to close debate."

Jones: "2195 simply authorizes the payment of the reduced fare discount given to senior citizens and the money has already been appropriated and the Department of Transportation this needed authorization here to release it and it will cover the period of the gap starting July 1, '73. Solicit your affirmative vote."

Speaker Telcser: "Question is, shall House Bill 2195. All those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Don. Fleck, aye. Lauer, aye. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question...taking the record, This question, 138 ayes, 6 nays, 1 answering present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2089. Representative Garmisa on the floor? No. He'll be here? Garsy, wherever you are, come to the floor. Is he coming out? Garmisa.



Maybe he's not there, Fred. Hold up the show for gosh sakes. Okay, let's go to 2079, let's get that one. Representative Skinner on the floor? Skinner. Okay, wait a second, Skinner's not here either. Oh, here he is."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2079. An act amending the Revenue Act of 1939. Third Reading of the Bill."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, the handout that I have is, I've just learned, is not ready so I would ask that you take it out of the record."

Speaker Telcser: "Out of the record. You want 2792 called, Representative Skinner? No. Okay. No, he wants it out of the record. 2360, Representative McGrew on the floor? Representative McGrew, Sam, are you there? Nope. 2056. House Bill 2056. House Bill 2056."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2056. An act to amend Section 2, 3 and 7 of Crime Victims Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson."

Rayson: "...Speaker and Members of the House, this is a Bill that's worked out with the Governor's Office, the Attorney General and the judges of the Court of Claims to clarify and improve the victims of crime compensation act. This Bill, as amended, it covers three points. First, it changed the definition of those excluded from compensation being those committing a crime of violence, to exclude those for compensation involved in a crime of violence during a riot, insurrection and rebellion. Right now the provision is under the code on mob action and that can be two or more people. So it excludes this kind of activity from compensation. The other point is instead of a one year notice of your intent to file a claim it's cut down to six months. The purpose is to facilitate a prompt investigation while the evidence is still fresh. The third point



in the Bill is to amend Section 7-D to provide a collateral source rule so that the victim or his dependents would not be compensated over and above the actual out-of-pocket cost regardless of the source. And it would not deprive those because you need five hundred dollar... requirement to get compensation, it wouldn't deprive those who had...and that five hundred wouldn't be deducted from the wood. These are the three points in this Bill and I encourage a favorable vote."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 2065 pass. All those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Adeline, please get on so we can move the House along here. Okay. Adeline, have you voted? Take the record. This question 134 ayes, 3 nays, 3 answering present. And this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 2772 and 3? 2772, 2773, no? That's that downstate stuff. Okay, let's go on 2522. Don, Representative Totten, you wish to have your Bill called, Sir? 2522. No? Okay. Deuster's not here. Okay, let's go back now to House Bill 2360."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2360. An act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Illinois Historical Library. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Perry, Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "I'd like leave of the House to return House Bill 2360 to Second Reading for purposes of two Amendments."

Speaker Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, House Bill 2360 is on the order of second reading. Will the Clerk please read the Amendment? Back on second for an amendment."



Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #2. McGrew. Amend House Bill..."

McGrew: "Mr. Speaker, I move to table Amendment #2."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman moves to table Amendment #2 to House Bill 2360. Any objections? Hearing none, the Amendment is tabled. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #3. McGrew. Amend House Bill 2360..."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Perry, Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Amendment #3 is sponsored by Representatives Neff, McMaster and myself, provides for a much need long overdue parking space at Carl Sandburg birthplace in Galesburg. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? Gentleman offers to move the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 2360. All in favor of the adoption signify by...Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, do you have a question, Sir?"

Totten: "Question of the Sponsor if I could please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "Indicates that he will..."

Totten: "Is this similar...is this in anyway duplicate that appropriation we passed yesterday for Carl Sandburg?"

McGrew: "No. No. No. No. That was a couple of days ago, that was Carl Sandburg Junior College. This historical library is what is now the source of library that was the birthplace of Carl Sandburg himself."

Totten: "For how much money?"

McGrew: "It's \$6,000. I talked to Representative Washburn, Representative Lechowicz and it's an agreed amendment. It's what we had a little problem with yesterday."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman offers the adoption Amendment 3 to House Bill 2360. All in favor aye; opposed, no. Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments? Third Reading."

McGrew: "No. No. No."

Speaker Telcser: "No? Another Amendment? Leave it on second. Are there further Amendments beyond Amendment



#3?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #4. McGrew. Amend House Bill 2360..."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Perry, Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "This is the same agreed...second part of the agreed amendment. It provides for the allocation of the staff member for the preparation of historical sites and publication and such. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment #4 to House Bill 2360. All in favor of adoption signify by saying aye; opposed no. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments? No more? Third Reading. Bill's been read a third time and now...on Third Reading now. It's been read a third time, you wish to have it called, Sir? Gentleman from Perry, Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "House Bill 2360 is the regular expenses for the historical library. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 2360 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye; opposed by voting no. Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm sure this is a private joke just for the old Members but I'm beginning to think after watching the distinguished Gentleman, Representative McGrew, he's beginning to sound more like Wilbur Lauterbach every day."

Speaker Telcser: "Take the record. This question 116 ayes, no nays, none answering present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2792. Maragos, aye, on the last"



Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 27 . . . 2792, a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Fuel Tax Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to Bill . . . bring House Bill 2792 back for . . . to Second Reading for two Amendments."

Speaker Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, House Bill 2792 is on the order of Second Reading. Will the Clerk please read the . . ."

Clerk Selcke: "Huh? Amendment . . . which one . . . ah . . . Amendment #1, Houlihan, amends House Bill 2792 on page 1 and so forth."

Speaker Telcser: ". . . one . . . one minute, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "Mr. Speaker, I . . . at this time would ask leave to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Telcser: "All right, the Gentleman . . . is there any discussion? . . . the Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #1 to House Bill 2792. All in favor 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the Amendment's tabled. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment . . . Amendment #2, D. Houlihan, amends House Bill 2792 . . ."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2, which I have discussed with Representative Skinner, the Sponsor of this Bill, follows the approach of the Bill which changes the allocation formula of motor fuel tax revenues by increasing the percentage here for road districts, by increasing, likewise, by a smaller percentage rate the share of motor fuel tax revenues for municipalities; specifically,



by increasing the municipality share or the percentage share from the present 32% to 34%; and, secondly, by earmarking that increased percent or share for the improvement of non-arterial residential streets in the communities or in the municipalities. The effect of the Amendment would be a revenue transfer from the Department of Transportation. The local municipalities have an estimated 6.3 million dollars to be used for non-arterial residential street improvements. The Bill has . . . or the Amendment has state-wide application and will result in the direct benefit in every city, village and incorporated town in the state and will do so without the imposition of any new taxes. It will allow the municipalities to improve and repair non-arterial residential streets, which have been want and neglected simply because of lack of funds; and I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Where will the increase of the municipal share come from?"

Houlihan, D.: "It would be a . . . it would come from the Department of Transportation. There will be a decrease in the percentage of allocation to the Department of Transportation of 2% and . . . ah . . . correspondingly, taking the 2% and increasing it for the share for municipalities."

Schlickman: "Well, when you say taking it from the Department of Transportation, you say taking it from the state, is that correct?"

Houlihan, D.: "That is correct."

Schlickman: "So that the state as a consequence to this Amendment would have less money available for state road improvements, is that correct?"

Houlihan, D.: "That is correct."



Schlickman: "That is not correct. Ah . . . If . . . if . . ."
Houlihan, D.: "Excuse me, Representative, well, I refer
that one to Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "The . . . the Appropriation's Committee has plugged
the other end, the Appropriation Committee has plugged
the other end. There have been unconscionable expendi-
tures from the Road Fund for years, including the Illinois
Supreme Court, and some expenditures for Secretary of
State's . . . ah . . . I believe it's title employees
out of the Highway Fund; but the title funds have been
going into the General Fund. Ah . . . There are . . .
there are . . . the two totals add up to 17.7 million
dollars that we are transferring from the General Fund
to the Road Fund and that's more than enough for this
Amendment, plus the original Bill."

Schlickman: "Well, you're making it even worse . . . ah . . .
by what you're . . . because . . . by what you're doing
is that you are draining from the General Revenue Fund
for road improvements, is that correct?"

Skinner: "I would . . . I would suggest that that is a
matter of opinion whether I'm making it worse or better.
I, for one, do not believe that Motor Fuel Tax Funds
that are supposed to be going for highways should be
going to pay Supreme Court expenses; nor do I believe
they should be going for . . . well, frankly, did you
know that the interest from Motor Fuel Tax Fund . . .
investments of Motor Fuel Tax Funds goes to the General
Fund. I consider that a complete rip-off, and I think
that this is . . . ah . . . redressing the balance."

Schlickman: "Well, that may be your opinion, . . . ah . . .
but it's not mine; and I would suggest, . . . ah . . .
Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that we have been
draining the General Revenue Fund so much during this
Session . . . ah . . . that I think these kinds of mea-
sures are going to result ultimately in an increase in



the income tax; and I would suggest that this Amendment be defeated."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, although in theory I agree with what Representative Schlickman has said, and what this Amendment does is make it equal for the whole state. As long as the other Bill has passed, it has a very good chance of passing, I think we should equalize it for the rest of the state that is not included in the original Bill. I think the Sponsor of the Bill in the Revenue Committee did not . . . ah . . . disagree to have the other Amendment put on, that's why it passed out of Revenue; I think we should pass this Amendment to make it equal for every taxing body and every representative body throughout the state."

Speaker Telcser: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian, are you seeking recognition? Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "I think . . . Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I . . . I think the original Bill is a lot worse than the Amendment, but both the Amendment and the original Bill represent sort of an open season on the State Highway Fund and the State 'Apportionment' Fund. I . . . I think that there are legitimate demands for improving rural roads, and also for non-arterial streets of municipalities and also for state highways; but I don't think that we should . . . ah . . . get into this on a 'helter-skelter' basis to see who can get his hands into the State Treasury first. I think this House ought to reap . . . reappraise its priorities on the limited funds available both in the Revenue Fund, the General Revenue Fund, and especially in the Highway Fund. Ah . . . For example, the original Bill takes approximately \$8,000,000 from the State Highway Fund and gives it to the Township Road Fund, and



that's on a mileage basis and not on a population basis. Now, the Amendment, which is under discussion, takes another 2%, about \$6,000,000, from the State Highway Fund and gives it to the cities and villages. Now, of course, combined there's going to be a lot of support for this Bill. We might as well add the county road systems while we're at it, and perhaps add the County of Cook and the City of Chicago. I think it's irresponsible without any real study as to the balancing of priorities just to stick our premiums into the pot and try to take out money from the State Road Fund on the basis of . . . ah . . . of no examinations and no real concern about the limited State Highway Fund . . . ah . . . Road . . . ah . . . Fund."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this is a good Amendment, and I think for the first time it addresses itself to areas that heretofore seem to have been ignored in the townships, and I think those areas who cannot because of the present cost of road systems per miles, it's going to give these people something that they need on an equitable basis, along with the non-arterial streets in the city, and those who rise in this day and age for mass transportation systems and all the rest of it and wish to raid those very same funds better consider the other people that are not in the townships. I think this is a good Amendment."

Speaker Telcser: "Further discussion? Representative Houlihan to close the debate."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House; I submit that the rationale for the present formula for allocation of Motor Fuel Tax Funds has



changed in several key respects since its adoption in 1969. In 1969, recognizing that the primary roads of this state were in the deteriorated condition and required corrective action and the dedication of additional state resources, we raised the Motor Fuel Tax a cent and a half, and out of this a full one cent was allocated for the use of state highway construction and repair. The remainder we shared among all the other recipients. Now, five years have passed since that allocation was made; many roads . . . state roads have been repaired, enlarged and resurfaced. Additionally, we have seen in the past five years new state bond financing programs for highway construction, which now allows the construction of many more miles of highway than was previously possible; and, thirdly, we have seen increased Federal matching funds, which have provided available resources for state highway construction. As a result of these changes and the funding structure since 1969, we now have several additional sources of funding available at the state level; but the local units of government have not had the vast increases in funding that the state program has enjoyed. Their share of the increase granted in 1969 was half of those provided to the state system. If you consider the total miles of roads in the state system as of the end of 1972 for primary and supplementary roads of 16,834 miles, those of the municipal street systems were 27,000--some hundred miles; we submit that there is not a distinct imbalance in the allocation formula. The total impact of this Amendment is approximately 6.3 million dollars to be distributed state-wide to all municipalities. Before you submit that this is a modest effect compared to the tremendous growth which has occurred and available resources for highway construction at the state level, this will place the legislative emphasis on the roads



146.

that the payers of this tax use daily to go to work, for recreation and to get to their homes; and I move the adoption of the Amendment and ask for your support."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman offers to move the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 2792. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Now, let's get on this Roll Call, please. Let's get on the Roll Call. Have all voted who wish? Let's move. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. Hold it for what? It's 81 to 18, geez. Calvo 'aye'. Calvo 'aye'. This . . . take the Record, Mr. Clerk. Ralph Dunn 'aye'. On this question there are 88 'ayes', 18 'nays', 3 answering 'present' . . . Garmisa 'aye'. Harpstrite 'aye'. Jack Williams 'aye' . . . and Amendment #2 to House Bill 2792 is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #3, Skinner, amends House Bill 2792 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, the . . . the Amendment . . . the General Assembly . . . the last Bill allowed municipalities to use the extra money that . . . in fact, it mandated municipalities to use the extra money for the paving of non-arterial streets, that is, the non-main streets. This Amendment makes it permissive if the township road commissioner and the township . . . ah . . . board of auditors desire to use the extra money . . . ah . . . to . . . ah . . . on . . . on non-dedicated subdivision streets; and the purpose for this is . . . the reason for giving them this discretion is that they may use the revenue-sharing money on these roads. I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman offers to move the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 2792. All in favor of the adoption signify by



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'; the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments? Third Reading. The Bill has been read a third time, now, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. At the present time, we have what I consider to be a . . . a balanced Bill, one that redresses an old grievance . . . ah . . . throughout the years, the General Assembly and prior General Assemblies have . . . seem to have a tendency to take money from the State Road Fund when they couldn't find it in the General Revenue Fund. Now, as I have related earlier a large part . . . portion of the Secretary of State's budget . . . ah . . . came out of the Highway Fund in this year. The Appropriation's Committee in its wisdom has put under the . . . the General Revenue Fund. In addition the . . . ah . . . excuse me, just a minute . . ."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion?"

Skinner: ". . . in additon, they shifted the . . . ah . . . funding for the . . . ah . . . the Supreme Court from the Highway Fund to the General Fund where it rightfully belongs, and this Bill is a balance to pro . . . it should help both the cities and the townships; and I would urge support."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall . . . the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Richard Walsh."

Walsh, R.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think there should be a word or two at least said about . . . ah . . . these Bills and the effect they will have on the State Road Fund and the maintenance of state highways. Ah . . . I . . . I think you all realize that . . . ah . . . state revenue from the motor vehicle taxes is down because of the increased taxes and also because of the shortage. I have some figures



from the Department of Revenue which indicate that . . . ah . . . April of 1974 as compared with April of 1973 there's in excess of 2.5 million left in Revenue into the motor vehicle taxes. Now, the motor vehicle taxes are distributed, as you know, to your State Road Fund . . . ah . . . to the counties, cities and townships. Now, this Bill would reduce the amount available for maintenance of state highways . . . ah . . . by . . . I think it's now $4\frac{1}{2}$ or 5 %, I'm not sure of the exact amount . . . ah . . . with the Amendment; but when you consider the . . . ah . . . shortage and decrease of money which is being raised from motor vehicle taxes and add to that the fact that we're going to have a smaller percentage available for state roads, I think this Bill is . . . ah . . . entirely ill-timed and ill-considered. I would urge my colleagues, notwithstanding the prestigious sponsorship, to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from . . . ah . . . Will, Speaker Blair."

Blair: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. What I would like to point out is simply this, that . . . ah . . . to an extent that we are reducing the state percentage . . . ah . . . formula from 35% to $32\frac{1}{2}$ % insofar as the township part of this . . . ah . . . Bill . . . ah . . . and then $2\frac{1}{2}$ % for non-arterial streets in our cities and villages. Ah . . . The total of that being around \$12,000,000. Ah . . . We are making up the difference in the State Road Fund whereby holding in line the amount of money being diverted out of that fund for non-highway purposes. Every year there's a percentage growth . . . ah . . . too high actually over the last several years . . . ah . . . money is taken out of the State Road Fund . . . ah . . . for non-highway purposes. Now, what we are going to do on the D.O.T. appropriation Bill is simply hold the line on the amount of money being



diverted out. So we expect to have no net loss as a result of this insofar as the State Road Fund is concerned. Now, the motivation for this program in the beginning was simply because up in the R.T.A. area . . . ah . . . there was a great hue and cry, especially in the collar counties, about the fact that we weren't doing anything for the township roads, we were doing things for public transportation, and people that live on the on the farms in Marquette and out in those areas they weren't getting anything, they were having a little R.T.A. program. So we felt that we ought to give them something and what we came up with was this \$100 a mile, which is actually a 22% increase, and right now they get \$465 a mile and this will take 'em to \$565 a mile, and that buys a lot of gravel and . . . ah . . . patch asphalt for these . . . ah . . . local-rural roads. So I think this is a sound program . . . ah . . . we . . . we've got a little bend in on it now to take care of the bumpy stretches and the . . . ah . . . non-arterial streets in the cities and villages. So there's a little bit for everybody here, and I would urge you to vote for it."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "May I . . . ah . . . ask the Sponsor a question please . . ."

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates he'll yield."

Schneider: ". . . or anybody that can answer it? Is there a redefinition of what a road is in this Bill?"

Skinner: "I'm sorry, I . . ."

Schneider: "All right, well, there is . . . according to my Committee of answering . . . ah . . . people here, the answer is 'no' but one of the problems in DuPage is that it . . . it is an area that has township service that doesn't provide service. We have a road in Milton



Township that the township road supervisor says is not road, so I'd like to know . . . ah . . . how to explain that because for 25 years the people who have lived in that area have insisted that it's a road, they drive their cars over it and, indeed, even walk over it; and yet when the Milton Township Supervisor has been called to service that road and to make it serviceable even on snowy days so that school buses can go down there and pick up kids . . . ah . . . he refused to do it because he claims it's not a road. Now, if we're going to support a Bill like this, I would like to have a new definition or else a new road supervisor or maybe a county chairman from that area might help us out."

Skinner: "Okay, I can answer your question . . . ah . . . Representative Schneider, and the potential exists for that road to become . . . to be maintained and to become part of the township road system if the board of auditors and the highway commissioner agree under this Bill."

Schneider: "Well, I regret to say they can't agree at present and I don't know why this is going to change it; so I think it's a bad Bill and we ought to vote it down and think we ought to put the money in roads instead of into other things."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from . . . ah . . . Kankakee, Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Representative Skinner, a question in regard to your third Amendment that was added . . . ah . . . a few minutes ago. Did I understand you correctly that your Amendment would allow municipalities to use these funds for roads and unin . . . unincorporated subdivisions?"

Skinner: "Well, it certainly would not allow municipalities to; it would allow townships if the township highway commissioner and the township board agree to utilize the increase in Motor Fuel Tax Funds to maintain . . . ah



. . . subdivision roads; and if they did so, they would become part of the system, and the reason for doing this is that they have surplus revenue sharing funds in some townships and there's no way to use that money on the roads that need because they're not part of the system."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Ah . . . Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Skinner: "Certainly."

Ewell: "Ah . . . Now, I know that when . . . ah . . . you Gentlemen live out in the . . . ah . . . rural areas you talk about the great need for roads and improvements and et cetera, et cetera. Ah . . . In the city we have somewhat of a problem . . . ah . . . my simple problem is I have more people . . . ah . . . who use my alley than probably use your roads, and so I was wondering while the . . . ah . . . Speaker was talking about a little sand and a little asphalt for everybody, . . . ah . . . if we could sort of get my alleys . . . ah . . . in this Bill in some form or fashion."

Skinner: "Representative Ewell, I have another vehicle, House Bill 2391, which I would be happy to accommodate you with that on it. I would like to inform you that . . . ah . . . Representative Williams has already approached me on the same subject."

Ewell: "Well, all right, I just wanted to know that the alleys would be taken care of in the cities now."

Skinner: "I want to take care of whatever area . . . area you want to take care of."

Ewell: "All right, thank you. Now, we're . . . we're getting a good understanding about these matters now."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Representative Skinner to close the debate."



Skinner: "This . . . this Bill is not a rip-off of the Highway Fund; as a matter of fact, it's a reverse. It's the ending of a rip-off of the Highway Fund by the General Fund. We have compensated for the money we are taking from the Highway Fund and we are putting it where the roads are needed most, right in front of your constituents' streets or houses, that is. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 2792 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Any . . . we're having even started . . . get a movin'. Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. Hanahan 'aye' Giorgi 'aye'. Take the Record. On this question there are 117 'ayes', 25 'nays', 1 answering 'present'; and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed."



Speaker Telcser: "House Bill 2365. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah, I just called them, let's get this one done, right back here."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2365. An act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Registration, Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 2365 is the appropriation for the Department of Registration and Education. We've worked hard to try to make sure there are no problems with this Bill and I think it was accepted by all. And I ask for a favorable vote. Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 2365 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Get on the Roll Call. Have all voted who wish? Garmisa, aye. Barnes, aye. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question 164 ayes, 2 nays, none answering present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2772. 2772."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2772. An act providing for the establishment of downstate programs of financial assistance for public transportation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Will, Speaker Blair. Representative Fennessey, you have some Amendments to this Bill, Sir?"

Fennessey: "Yes."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay. Now. Wait a second now, I just want to be sure you really called it. ...2772. Okay. I don't know yet, Sponsor's in a conference. Out of the record or what? Gentleman from Will, Speaker Blair, with respect to House Bill 2772."



Blair: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave to bring this Bill back to Second..."

Speaker Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none House Bill 2772 is on the order of Second Reading. Will the Clerk please read the Amendment?"

Blair: "Wait a minute, we..."

Speaker Telcser: "Whoop."

Blair: "There is one Amendment we'd like to table, Amendment #4."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #4. Calvo."

Blair: "Yeah."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Madison, Representative Calvo."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to table Amendment #4 to House Bill 2772."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman moves to...House Bill 2772.

All in favor aye; opposed no. The Amendment is tabled."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #5. Fennessey. Amend House Bill..."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from LaSalle, Representative Fennessey."

Fennessey: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave to table Amendment #5..."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman moves to table Amendment #5.

All in favor aye; opposed no. Amendment's tabled.

Further amendments."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #6. Fennessey. Amends House Bill 2772."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from LaSalle, Representative Fennessey."

Fennessey: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #6 broadens the scope of the Downstate Transportation Act. As it was originally introduced it was a state local program however Federal Transportation Act of 1972 was passed which provides for a \$30,000,000 for federal rural transportation program for the fiscal year '75, '76, '77. There will be \$10,000,000 available for



the program in each of these years. You may recall that last year we passed a Bill establishing the downstate pilot project...Downstate Transportation Project and this is the same Bill that was passed last year. It launched counties to set up a pilot project, applied to the DOT for...submit their plans to the Department of Transportation and if they think its worthwhile they can grant them the authority to establish a project and it also allows them to rent school buses from the school district as they see fit. It doesn't mandate, it's just permissible. I discussed this with the Speaker and he's in favor of the Amendment. Ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? Gentleman offers the adoption Amendment 6 to House Bill 2772. All in favor aye; opposed no. Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments? Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk? No. Third Reading. Gentleman from Will, Speaker Blair."

Blair: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to defer consideration on Third Reading until Mr. Choate returns to the floor."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay. When Representative Choate returns we'll call both of them, is that correct? 72 and 73, Representative...okay. All righty. House Bill 2541, Representative Grotberg? Okay. House Bill 2541."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2541. A Bill for an act to amend Section 4.1, 4.2, an act relating to ... Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Kane, Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "2541, Sir? I believe that's the one I agreed with...it was 2741 was the one I was concerned about Sir."

Speaker: closer don't want 25..."

Grove: "No with Mr. Shea that we would hold that one."

Speaker: closer right, let's take it out of the record."

Grove: "you... to 2741, it'd only take a second."

Speaker: closer go out of order."

Grove: "Oh... you."

Speaker: closer Bill 2268, Representative Friedland, you want your Bill... how? House Bill 2629, Representative Juckett. 2629, Representative Juckett, you want that called? 2629. No? Linda... that. House Bill 2752, Representative Hill, you want... called, Sir? Representative Hill, you want that called... Bill 2752."

Clerk: "Bill 2752. A Bill for an act to amend Sections 1, 2, 3 and... Boiler Safety Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker: closer... man from Kane, Representative..."

Hill: "Speaker... like to bring this back to Second Reading for... Amendment..."

Speaker: closer: "Are any objections? Hearing none, return House Bill 2752... order of Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Clerk... of the Amendment."

Clerk: "Amendment #2...#1. Amendment #1. Hill. Amend House Bill 2752... line 2 and so forth."

Speaker: closer: "Man from Kane, Representative Hill."

Hill: "This is an... Amendment by the people that are involved in this and... about four hours of meetings and this is the Amendment... they want in this piece of legislation and I know of... to know if this Amendment is adopted."

Speaker: closer: "Gentleman offers to move the adoption of Amendment... House Bill 2752. All in favor of adoption signify by saying... The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendment... Third Reading. Wish to be called on Third Reading... Hill's been read a third time. Gentleman from Kane, Representative Hill."

Hill: "This... Amendment, House Bill 2752, is the...amends the



Boiler Safety Act to include vessels and is something that is not covered by the Boiler Act now and with the Amendment that was just adopted, I've been led to believe that all sides are in accord. I'd appreciate your vote."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 2752 pass? All in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question 128 ayes, 1 nay, 2 answering present...Juckett, aye. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Springer, you want your Bill called, Sir? House Bill 2796."

Springer: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, may I have leave..."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2796. An act to provide grants to obtain directors for planning, establishment, expansions of community education programs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, Gentleman's asked leave to return 2796 to the order of Second Reading. Are there any objections? Hearing none it's on Second Reading. Clerk, please read the Amendment."

Clerk Selcke: "Where's the Amendment?"

Speaker Telcser: "Are there Amendments, Representative Springer?"

Springer: "May I have leave for House Bill 2796 and 2797 be handled... as they are companion Bills?"

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, let's return 2796 to...Third Reading, Mr. Clerk. Okay, does the Gentleman have leave to hear 2797 as a companion Bill?"

Clerk Selcke: "House...does he have leave?"

Speaker Telcser: "Yes, hearing no objections..."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2797. An act making appropriation to the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Springer."

Springer: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2796 provides for the planning and establishment for the expansion of community education programs and provides grants for the training of directors for these programs. The companion



Bill, House Bill 2797, appropriates to the Superintendent of Public Instruction 350,000 for grants and \$33,312 for the administration of the Act. House Bill 2796 and 2797 would be an investment in the education of the citizens of Illinois. Federal legislation has passed in both Houses in Washington, House Resolution 69, provides one vital program for the community education and Section 406 of Senate Resolution 1539 provides for federal funding for three years to states which qualify. The best way for the state to qualify is to have a law on the books recognizing community education. If Illinois can pass these two laws the state would be funded anywhere from...three to six million. I appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Doc, could you explain to me what the purpose of this is?"

Springer: "Community education."

Speaker Telcser: "Further discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 2796, 2797 pass? How can you be so..."

Jerry?"

Springer: "Representative Shea, what do you mean? The purpose of the Bills?"

Shea: "Well, I understand it's community education but that's why we have schools, isn't it?"

Springer: "Basically, Representative Shea, the purpose of the Bills are for an Act to dovetail into Title V which was passed, I think, in April of this year, April the 24th by Congress, in such a manner that we, as the State of Illinois, where community educational programs and programs are set up can qualify for federal funding."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion?"

Shea: "Yeah, can I just find out...you know, I understand we're going to get federal matching funds. Is this



an educational program in connection with schools?"

Springer: "Let me give you a definition, Representative, as far as Title V is concerned. For the purpose of this title a community educational program is a program in which public buildings including, but not limited, to a public elementary or secondary school is utilized as a community center operating in conjunction with other groups in the community, community organizations and local governmental agencies to provide educational, recreational and cultural community services for the community which that center services in accordance with the needs and interests and concerns of that community."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Question is, shall House Bill...Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman."

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

Speaker Telcser: "Indicates that he will."

Berman: "Doc, what's the position of LSDI on this Bill?"

Springer: "Can't hear."

Berman: "What's the position of LSDI...what's the position of LSDI on this Bill?"

Springer: "They are in favor of the...these two Bills. They were in the Senate last year, for some reason they went on the consent calendar and for some reason they were taken off of the consent calendar, but they are back here."

Berman: "What is the prospect for continued...what is the relationship between state funding and federal funding under Title V Program? How much federal, how much state?"

Springer: "I can't hear you."

Berman: "What's the relationship, what's the ratio between the federal funding and state funding under this program?"

Springer: "Matching."

Berman: "50-50?"



Springer: "Yes."

Berman: "For the whole program of \$700,000?"

Springer: "I didn't hear."

Berman: "And what's the prospect for future federal funding?"

Springer: "As far as the federal funds appropriated, the Commissioner shall reserve such amounts but not in excess of 1% per population within the state, or within the local districts."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further..."

Berman: "Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that this is a kind of a Bill, that I think, should have gone in addition to Appropriations for the Primary and Secondary Education Committee. And for that reason, I'm going to vote present."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further...Lady from Cook, Representative Catania. Representative Catania, do you wish to speak to this Bill?"

Catania: "Would the Sponsor yield for some questions, please?"

Speaker Telcser: "Indicates that he will."

Catania: "Well, Representative Springer, community education is very important in my district on the south side of Chicago and I just wondering how it was going to help in my district."

Springer: "Right now, Representative Catania, the University of Illinois, the Chicago Circle Campus and Southern Illinois University have extensive plans to implement when funds are available."

Catania: "Well, Southern Illinois University is pretty far from the south side of Chicago, now how is that going to help me?"

Springer: "...Through your schools and through the Circle Campus of designing a plan that's acceptable by the ...and acceptable by the Office of Public Instruction which then applies for grants back to your local area."

Catania: "Well, now, how does this work? Exactly what are



asking for so OSPI can accept something from the Circle Campus so that ultimately something's going to happen in my district on the south side of Chicago. I don't...I don't understand whole mechanism to this."

Springer: "I can't hear."

Catania: "Well, I'd just like to understand the mechanic of how the University of Illinois Circle Campus sends something to OSPI and then if someone approves that, something will happen to benefit my people on the south side of Chicago."

Springer: "...Your schools or agencies, at your local level, applies or sets up a planning area with the Director out of the Circle Campus which then presents a plan to go into the Office of Public Instruction to be approved in regards to getting public funding as well as leadership within that...your area...."

Catania: "Well, now, you're saying that there is a director at the Circle Campus at the University of Illinois is going to do this?"

Springer: "Yes. There will be if this goes into law. The basic thing we have to have an agency to develop or to get any federal funds."

Catania: "So you're asking for an appropriation for an agency?"

Springer: "I'm asking for an appropriation for basically to establish an act so.... For the planning and establishment of the expansion of community education and also to provide grants for the training of directors thereof. Read the Bill."

Catania: "And this agency is going to do that, is that it?"

Springer: "That's right."

Catania: "What's the name of the agency going to be?"

Springer: "Illinois Community Education Act."

Catania: "That's a nice name for an agency. Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes."



Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question, please?"

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Barnes: "Representative, exactly what is the kit, Community Education Program? I hear you say...thank you very much. I hear you talking about planning, exactly what are they planning? Now you said planning about nine times but you never said what they would be planning."

Springer: "Now, Representative Barnes, first of all I can go through various areas and communities that have community education development that are in actually educational projects at this time. And I will call them off. Bolingbrook, Danville, East St. Louis, Evanston, Galesburg, Marengo, McLeansboro, Peoria, Port Byron, and Romeoville and Wheeling. There is another group of developing...they're just beginning to develop community education projects and these are them. Arlington Heights, Berwyn, Carbondale, Champaign, Chicago, Elgin, Elk Grove Village, Forest Park, Geneseo, Geneva, Greenville, Joliet, Lincolnwood, McHenry, Oregon, Quincy, Royal Lake, Sorento, Urbana and Waukegan. There's also another list of communities currently studying feasibility for community and development, education development, and there's about 32 more. I don't want to go into it... in all due respect, Representative..."

Barnes: "I didn't ask you who was planning, I asked you what were they planning and you still haven't said what they were planning. Now if you've got all of these communities that you've missed it, that have plans, all I'm asking is a simple question. What have they planned? That's all I ask. I didn't ask who was doing it, I asked what were they doing."

Springer: "I would say they are planning from an educational standpoint, or from your educational or secondary



schools programs, as I mentioned before, in regards to...wait a minute, I got it. In regards to educational, recreational and cultural community services."

Barnes: "I see. Well, thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, and to address the Bill, and I'm going to be very brief. Very, very brief. And I think in all due respect to the community education planning, I believe, that got this call that there's so much confusion on what the planning action is, I think in all due respect to that, we have to define what they will be planning before we can put agency to act on the plan. So until that time I would have to oppose this kind of legislation."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Clabaugh."

Clabaugh: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill is very clear in what it proposes. I hadn't studied the Bill, I knew about it, but I got it out of there and Section IV is entitled: 'Training of Directors' and it says 'an annual appropriation shall be made to the Superintendent of Public Instruction for grants to designated centers for training directors of community education programs. Initially, the grants shall be distributed only to those public state universities with the personnel and demonstrated ability according to the guideline set up by the Superintendent of Public Instruction'. Then Section V entitled 'Community Education Grants. An annual appropriation shall be made to the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the purpose of making grants to applicants desiring to develop or expand their community educational program'. And then there are about three or four provisions on that page and sets it up. It's a rather small amount of money. Most educators seem to be for it. I've had several communications from these people and Circle Campus is



one of the state universities, University of Illinois is another, and Southern is another that do have departments in them that's capable of training people to do this work in the local community."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan."

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

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying aye; the opposed no. ...This question has moved. Representative Springer to close."

Springer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there are three classifications of community education programs in this state, eleven community education programs are now functioning but because of lack of funds they're severely crippled in their offering. They need money to continue and prove their programs. The second classification involves 20 programs which are in the developing stage. And the third group of twenty-two programs is those in the initial stages of development, the preliminary planning and feasibility study stage. These Bills would benefit all the areas of the state and I ask your favorable consideration."

Speaker Telcser: "Question is, shall House Bills 2796 and 2797 pass? Those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Clerk will take two Roll Calls. What? Yeah, well you xerox one Roll Call so you wind up getting two Roll Calls. Okay. Anybody wish to explain their vote? Gentleman from Ogle, Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, frankly I'm a little disappointed, too, that this Bill is not assigned to the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee, I think that's where it should



have it gone. But I do want to add my support to this basic concept. I'd like to point out that the training centers, geographically, are located, Southern Illinois University, the Champaign University of Illinois, center part of the state, and of course, the Circle Campus in Chicago. And I would urge the Members to cast a vote of support for this legislation."

Speaker Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Mr. Clerk, will you take the record, Sir. This question 113 ayes, 1 no, 111 answering present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 320. House Bill 320."

Clerk Selcke: "An Act to amend Section 1 of an Act relating to certain blood donations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Douglas."

Speaker Telcser: "320, Bruce."

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 320 would, under law, lower the blood donor age from 18 to 17. This Bill has been universally approved, it has now become the law in a number of other states. We have calculated that it would give us the amount of blood that we are presently short each day and each week in Illinois since this House passed the Blood Labelling Act a few years ago. And I would solicit your favorable support. Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 320 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Okay, have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm sorry that I was...I'm sorry that I was otherwise occupied when this Bill was presented by its Sponsor."



I wonder if he would repeat the explanation, by way of explanation of vote, and if I could reserve the right to speak again after he does that."

Speaker Telcser: "I think he would. Representative Lemke, for what purpose do you rise?"

Lemke: "I...looking at this Bill, in lowering the age to 17 to donate blood, I, in no way can see how a minor can consent, legally, to give blood as a donator. And therefore I think the Bill is a nullity and I think we should vote against."

Speaker Telcser: "All right, now, let Representative Douglas respond to Representative Walsh's request."

Douglas: "Well, I'll make an effort to do both, Mr. Speaker. First of all, statutorily, prior to this only an 18 year old could give blood in Illinois. It has been determined by medical groups, by the American Association of Blood Banks, by the American Red Cross and by many other medically oriented and public health groups that at this time in American history, 17 year olds have been judged, physically and emotionally in every other way, capable of contributing to the enormous needs for enlarged blood pool. Representative Lemke, in response to your comment this would make it legal even though under law in other respects they might be minors. Illinois law is unusual in that it specifies the lower limit of eligibility for donating blood. The need is there, 17 year olds were themselves responsible for being included in the blood donor pool when the Blood Labelling Act was passed by this...by the last General Assembly when we eliminated the sale of blood and made the only blood that could be available for use, volunteer blood, Illinois stepped into the picture with the most progressive blood labelling legislation in the country. And what this Bill would do if it would enlarge the pool to this new age group



and I don't know any other explanation, Representative Walsh, that would answer your question."

Speaker Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question 116 ayes, 10 nays, 14 answering present. And this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2017, Representative Molloy on the floor? 2017. Representative Molloy on the floor? Take it out of the record. House Bill 2117."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2117. An act to amend the Revenue of '39. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House I'd like to take this back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none House Bill 2117 is on the order of Second Reading will the Clerk please read the Amendment."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #1. Amend House Bill..."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker..."

Clerk Selcke: "...And so forth."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "This would..."

Clerk Selcke: "Turn him on."

Shea: "What this would do would strip everything after the enacting clause and put in this Bill an act to create the Illinois Health Finance Commission and define its powers. What it would do is set up a commission to regulate the cost of health care in the State of Illinois. What I propose to do is get this Amendment adopted, move the Bill back to Third Reading and leave it there long enough for everybody to have a good look at it."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer."



Palmer: "If the Sponsor will yield for a question."

Speaker Telcser: "Indicates that he will."

Palmer: "On the calendar here it says it's a Bill to amend the Revenue Act and...is that what you're addressing your Amendment to? Does this Amendment address of it or some other Bill?"

Shea: "The Amendment in the terms of my friend 'C. L.' would take everything out of the Bill after the enacting clause and create a new commission. And like I said it would be a commission to regulate health care and health facilities and what I propose to do is leave it on the calendar and let everybody get a good look at it."

Palmer: "Well, 2117 is...I have no objection to your, I don't have, to your Amendment but 2117 concerns itself with the, I thought, with the banks doing the collecting in Cook County."

Shea: "That's correct."

Palmer: "And you're taking...you're deleting all of that and then putting in a health care type of a..."

Shea: "Commission."

Palmer: "Commission. Which is not...has it been distributed yet?"

Shea: "I...the Bills have been on the desk, or at least on the Clerk's desk. Mr. Palmer, I don't intend to call the Bill on Third Reading today. I hope to amend it and then let it sit for several days to let everybody have a chance to look at it."

Palmer: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Would the Gentleman yield for some questions?"

Speaker Telcser: "Indicates that he will."

Shea: "Yes."

Kempiners: "Jerry, if I understand your explanation correctly, this creates a commission to regulate health care



facilities. Is there legislation presently in the House or the Senate that would accomplish this same purpose?"

Shea: "I know of no other Bills in the House. I had heard that there were some Bills put in in the Senate. I don't know where they're at."

Palmer: "Does this implement the Governor's program of the cost of hospital care?"

Shea: "Yes, it does."

Palmer: "Does it relate at all to the granting of permits for the construction of medical facilities or the addition of medical facilities?"

Shea: "No, that's in another Bill that I believe is in Human Resources. This has nothing to do with that."

Palmer: "This is what I'm getting at, there's no more to Senate Bill 69..."

Shea: "No. No, this has nothing to do with grant applications for additional facilities, that's in another Bill that came over, I think it was Senator Knuepfer's Bill..."

Palmer: "Okay."

Shea: "Came over from the Senate, it's now in Human Resources. This has nothing to do with that Bill."

Palmer: "Okay. It's just for the Governor's proposal for a commission to regulate the cost of hospital care to the consumer."

Shea: "Yes, it is."

Palmer: "Okay, thank you, Jerry."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that this Amendment has been distributed. This is a 19 page Amendment that changes the Bill entirely. As the Sponsor said, it deletes everything after the enacting clause and I would suggest that in fairness to the Membership the Gentleman ought to leave the Bill on Second Reading and



amend it tomorrow when everyone has had an opportunity to see what this does. It is very far reaching. I could easily support a concept like this. I think the health care costs are outrageous but I think there are many things to be considered here and that is one-sided regulations, the regulation of the deliverer but not regulating the prices that he pays for things that he must have to serve the consumer. I..I.."

Shea: "Can I make a suggestion? Can I get the Amendment on and I'll leave it on Second Reading?"

Walsh: "Really, I just don't think that's fair. This Bill at....(tape failure)..."

Shea: "All right, why..."

Walsh: "Was...was...yeah, when this Bill was...wassconsidered first...it was exempt..."

Shea: "Bill. Bill. Bill. I'll leave it just where it's at."

Walsh: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Out of the record. Huh? Wait a second now. Representative Shea. for what purpose do you rise?"

Shea: "I don't want to take this Bill out of the record."

Speaker Telcser: "You want it on Second Reading."

Shea: "I...it's on Second Reading, there's been an Amendment offered to it and that's the stage of the proceedings I'd like to leave it."

Speaker Telcser: "That's fine. The Amendment has not been adopted however."

Shea: "No, the Amendment has not been adopted."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, Representative Kempiners, what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Kempiners: "With regard to the status of the Amendment in this Bill I would like to ask the Sponsor a question, if I could."

Speaker Telcser: "Indicates he'll yield."

Kempiners: "Jerry, with this Amendment on it and, you know, without having looked at it and feeling neutral on the



concept you're talking about, would you be willing to, once the Amendment's added, to re-refer back to Committee? ...You know whichever Committee would be..."

Shea: "Why don't you do this, why don't you look at it. I think that you'll find that all health care deliverers support this concept."

Kempiners: "Right."

Shea: "Why don't we just leave it at this place and if there's some question at a later date when we get to it again, you've got something you want to work out like that I'm very amenable to it."

Kempiners: "I understand that the health care delivery people do subscribe to the concept but I'm kind of concerned about no Committee having a look at it."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Ryan, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Ryan: "I'd like to ask a question about this Amendment, if I may."

Speaker Telcser: "Proceed, Sir. Now the Gentleman is not going to move to have it adopted."

Ryan: "Oh, he's not?"

Speaker Telcser: "Well, I really wonder...has this had any kind of a Committee Hearing at all? Representative Shea."

Shea: "I think that's the question that some people are asking. Why don't we do this, the Amendment should be distributed and on our desk by tomorrow or Monday and at that time we'll go into the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative McMasters, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Parliamentarian. Is this according to the Rules of this House that we can take a Bill, strike everything on the Second Reading after it's been through Committee, make a completely different Bill of a different subject completely and put it in on Second Reading this way? I



cannot see that this is in conformity to our Rules. It's a flagrant violation of them in my estimation."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative McMasters, as long as the Amendment is germane to the title of the Bill, you can strike everything after the enacting clause on Second Reading."

McMaster: "On Second Reading you can?"

Speaker Telcser: "Yes, Sir."

McMaster: "Is this germane to the Bill?"

Speaker Telcser: "Well, that's another question."

McMaster: "That's what I'm asking the Parliamentarian."

Speaker Telcser: "Well, but the question is really premature since the Gentleman is not offering to have the Amendment adopted to what...you know, he might change his mind by tomorrow morning. All he's done now is taken the Bill, it's to appear on the calendar under the order of Second Reading tomorrow. The Amendment is to be distributed. You'll have a chance to look at them. The Gentleman may or may not move to adopt the Amendment. Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "I would still like the Parliamentarian to answer this whether this can be done or whether the Amendment is germane to the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise?"

Shea: "Could Mr. McMaster hold his question 'til we get back to the Bill again and let me have an opportunity to talk to him. I'm not going to move the legislation today and I won't until I discuss it with him."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Sometime this question has got to be answered. I don't care when it is, but I think this is a flagrant violation of our Rules to take this process. And I am objecting and I do want a Rule of the Parliamentarian sometime or other. I don't care whether it's today



tomorrow or next week."

Speaker Telcser: "All right. Representative McMaster.

Representative McMaster, just so you understand that the...mechanically it's a proper procedure, the question would be whether or not the Amendment is germane to the act, not the procedure of gutting a Bill. Okay. House Bill 2181. House Bill 2181. Mr. Clerk, 2181. Mr. Clerk, 2181. please. C'mon, Kenny, leave him alone."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2181. A Bill for an act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook. Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2181 amends the Chapter 108-1/2. You might recall that last year we passed through the House and the Senate and the Governor signed a Bill which would allow volunteer firemen over the age of 35, if they had served five years as a volunteer and they were so otherwise qualified, to become fulltime firemen in a community. Now throughout the State of Illinois and in my district, there are many fire departments who have previously been all volunteer fire departments who are now gradually becoming fulltime, two or three firemen per year. When this Bill was enacted into law in some of the communities in my district, wanted to use the Bill for purpose of hiring fulltime firemen who might be 37 or 38 years old, the pension people said they could not come under the Pension Code. So this is just merely an Amendment, if you will, or a Bill to allow those people who now otherwise can be hired to come under the Pension Code. And I urge its adoption."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? Question is...Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "If the Sponsor will yield for a question."

Speaker Telcser: "Indicates that he will."

Palmer: "First of all, it applies to downstate firemen, is



that correct?"

Speaker Telcser: "Hello."

Mahar: "Yes, downstate...it applies to all volunteer firemen throughout the state of Illinois wherever they might be."

Palmer: "All right. That would effectively exclude the city of Chicago. Now, if they serve for five years as a volunteer, they...and they become fulltime firemen, then they are...then they can come under the Pension Code and go back to the five years, is that correct?"

Mahar: "No, they cannot. The only thing that happens is that they're able to be hired if they otherwise qualify, they can receive a pension if they can serve twenty years. In other words, a volunteer fireman at the age of 50 would not be covered by this."

Palmer: "Well, are you saying if they are volunteer firemen serving twenty years..."

Mahar: "No."

Palmer: "They can have a pension?"

Mahar: "No. It has nothing to do with the volunteer firemen as far as getting a pension is concerned. First of all, it allows volunteer firemen who have served in a community over five years, as a volunteer, to be considered as a fulltime firefighter. Now, if he happens to be 37 or 38 years old previously he could not come under the system. This allows the municipality to hire him provide he qualifies physically and qualifies whatever the Police and Fire Commission stipulates. Now the Act did not allow him to get a pension according to the interpretation of the Pension people. So volunteer firemen who are 39 years old in my district did not want to become fulltime firemen because they couldn't get a pension. This now allows them to come under the pension system. And still if



they can serve 20 years they can get a pension."

Palmer: "Well, how much money does he have to put up? Does he have to put up some of this private funds?"

Mahar: "Just exactly the same as a man who is 22 or 27 or 29, just exactly the same. There's no difference."

Palmer: "And then the municipality has to come in with a levy for such amounts as are necessary to make it actuarially..."

Mahar: "The municipality would be covered exactly the same way as they are now. Municipalities levies every year for firemen's pension and police pension and they would be levying for this man. Instead of being a man of 32 years of age he could be a man of 37 or 38 years old."

Palmer: "The Illinois Municipal League in favor of this Bill?"

Mahar: "Absolutely."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 2181 pass. Those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Telcser, aye. Get me on... Telcser, aye. Take the record. This question 142 ayes, no nays, none answering present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2296. House Bill 2296."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2296. A Bill for an act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from McLean, Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House, House Bill 2296 is an amendment to paragraph 12-215 chapter 95-1/2 to permit the use of operating red lights on coroner's vehicles. I move for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 2296 pass. All in favor signify by



voting aye: the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question 119 ayes. 2 nays. 4 answering present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2391."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2391. A Bill for an act to amend the Highway Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner. ...Wish to have that Bill called. Cal? No. Out of the record. House Bill 2402."

Clerk Selcke: "What did you say?"

Speaker Telcser: "2402. Out of the record. 2402."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2402. A Bill for an act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense Department of Personnel. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like leave of the House to bring this back ...Bill back to Second Reading for purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Telcser: "Any objection? ...Return House Bill 2402 to the order of Second Reading. Will the Clerk please read the Amendment?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #5. Houlihan. Amend House Bill 2402 and so forth."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Amendment #5 is worked by the staff on both sides of the aisle. It relates Amendment #1 where there was a sizeable cut in the Department's budget, it restores about \$100,000. I don't believe there's any disagreement on this particular Amendment. And I would urge its adoption."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? Gentleman offers to move



the adoption of Amendment 5 to House Bill 2402. All in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by ...all in favor signify by saying aye; opposed no. Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #6. Houlihan. Amend House Bill..."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan: "This Amendment is similar in that it really corrects a technical error when we had made Amendment #1. I urge its adoption."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? Gentleman offers Amendment 6 to House Bill 2402. All those in favor aye; opposed no. Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #7. Houlihan. Amend House Bill 2402 and so forth."

Houlihan: "This Amendment is...was suggested by Representative Fary and it puts additional funds for Workmen's Comp claims so we won't have to come in for a deficiency appropriation. And I urge its adoption. I don't believe any opposition on this particular Amendment."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? Gentleman offers Amendment 7 to House Bill 2402.say aye... Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments? Third Reading. Bill's been read a third time, Gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd urge the adoption of House Bill 2402. It provides for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Personnel. I'd ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Telcser: "Question is, shall House Bill 2402 pass. Those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question.....aye. This question 135 ayes, 5 nays, 3 answering present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House



Bill 2437. I'll give you his... 2437, Representative Wolf, you want 2437 called? Yes, Sir. 2437."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2437. An act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "This Bill amends the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund Article in the Pension Code and provides for reinstatement of service...by any Member of General Assembly who is receiving retirement annuity right now from the IMRS."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? The question is shall House Bill 2437...Gentleman from Cook, Representative Juckett."

Juckett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you explain the Bill once again, I'd appreciate it."

Wolf: "To the best of my recollection the information available to me at this time does not correspond, to my knowledge, at the time I...your statement."

Speaker Telcser: "Now that explains it fully. Question is, shall House Bill 24...Question is shall House Bill 2437 pass. All in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question 123 ayes, 2 nays, 2 answering present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Lechowicz and Berman, aye. House Bill 2345."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2345. A Bill for an act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense the Department of Revenue. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Bill for the contingent expenses for the Department of Revenue for fiscal '75. It's total \$263,744,900, as



amended. I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? Question is...Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Telcser: "Indicates that he will."

Skinner: "Could you tell us how much is budgeted for Senior Citizens Property Tax Relief under the Circuit Breaker Program?"

Beaupre: "No, I cannot, Cal. I'll get that information for you...my recollection is that it was \$28,000,000."

Speaker Telcser: "Question is, shall House Bill 2345 pass? All in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question, 143 ayes, no nays, none answering present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2359. What? Peters and Capuzi, aye. Peters and Capuzi, aye. Fary, aye."

Clerk Selckę . "House Bill 2359. An act making appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense, Department of Mental Health. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Bob Dunn, aye. Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Chairman...Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 2359 is the appropriation Bill for the Department of Mental Health. The Committee and four Amendments add \$13,742,340 from the original \$347,026,000. I ask for your favorable support of House Bill 2539."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 2359 pass? Those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question 145 ayes, 2 nays, 1 answering present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2545."



Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 25...what was that?"

Speaker Telcser: "2545 and 55."

Clerk Selcke: "...2545. An act authorizing the Director of Law Enforcement to convey certain property to the city of Macomb. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Henderson, Representative Neff."

Neff: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2545 is authorization...change of land between the City of Macomb and the Department of Law Enforcement. They're needing a 60-foot strip of ground.."

Clerk Selcke: "Turn him on."

Speaker Telcser: "...Representative, yeah."

Neff: "They are taking, are asking for about 60-foot of ground in exchange for a certain things in enumeration. The land they're taking, as I say, is 60-foot. It covers about...a little over seven-tenths of an acre. In exchange for this land which is appraised at \$12,000 they're making certain enumerations which runs almost 12,000, or \$11,500...such things as putting in new concrete sidewalks, sewer tops and constructing a small metal building and so forth. I would appreciate a favorable vote on this."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Kane, Representative Hill."

Hill: "I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a question?"

Speaker Telcser: "Indicates that he will."

Hill: "Is this a transfer between two taxing bodies?"

Neff: "No, it's from the state. It's actually state ground, it's 60-foot of ground, Jack, to the city in order to get a....project that they need."

Hill: "It's a transfer between two taxing bodies, the state and the local government. And the local government is paying how much for this you say?"

Neff: "It's a private appraisal, appraised at \$12,000 and they're doing enough work putting in new sidewalks



and sewers and so forth that amounts to about that same figure. It's agreeable with the state police and also with the..."

Hill: "Yes, there has been an appraisal on it."

Neff: "Yes, I have the appraisal here if you'd like to look at it."

Hill: "Well, this is the way it certainly should be handled and they're...it's something like \$12,000 for .79 of an acre?"

Neff: "Yes."

Hill: "Okay. I appreciate your..."

Speaker Telcser: "Further discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 2545 pass? All in favor signify by voting aye; opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question, 137 ayes, no nays, none answering present. And this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2634. 2634. 2634."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2634. An appropriation for Division of Land Reclamation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as you recall when we passed the Surface Mine Land Reclamation Act yesterday, 1277, I mentioned that there would be an appropriation Bill to provide some \$25,000 to permit the Department of Mines and Minerals to fund them, to hold hearings if necessary back in the counties where the reclamation plans. This is that appropriation and I would urge your vote in support of it. It's a very small one."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 2634 pass? All in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. ...All voted who wish? Take the record. This question, 142 ayes, no nays,



183.

I answering present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. George, put me on there, will you. 2671."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2671. A Bill for an act to amend the Comptroller's Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Juckett."

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, I believe there's an Amendment there. We'd like to move it back...leave to move it back to Second Reading for purpose of Amendment."

Speaker Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, move House Bill 2671 to the order of Second. Clerk, please read the Amendment."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #2. Juckett. Amend House Bill 2671, as amended."

Juckett: "Okay, Mr. Speaker, I believe there was an...Amendment #1 was adopted and we...I would move to table Amendment #1, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz, has risen to his feet."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, what's Amendment #1 do, Bob?"

Juckett: "Amendment #1 is embodied in the Amendment we're going to offer but we put it into a different paragraph in the Bill, or in the law. We're amending, this is amending the State Finance Act, Section 9, and we're creating Section 8-3/4. And we embodied the same thing but we put it in front of the Bill rather than the back of the Bill. We're cleared with Dave Epstein, in fact he gave us the suggestion for it."

Lechowicz: "What's Amendment #1 do?"

Juckett: "Amendment #1 made the initial change in amending the State Finance Act. We do not take anything out.."

Lechowicz: "Okay."

Juckett: "We just put it back in in different order."

Speaker Telcser: "Further discussion? Gentleman offers to



move the adoption...Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1 to House Bill 2671. All in favor signify by saying aye; opposed, no. Amendment #1 is tabled.

Are there further Amendments?"

Juckett: "Amendment #2, Mr. Speaker."

Clerk Selcke: "I read Amendment #2..."

Speaker Telcser: "...Been read. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Juckett."

Juckett: "And this amends the State Finance Act, it allows for the advanced payment. It sets an expiration date for the law which would be July 1 of 1975. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "I have a question. Representative Juckett, you're talking about advance payments to whom and for what?"

Juckett: "The advanced payments are as in the Bill and in Amendment #1 which we tabled. It's advanced payment for the community grant and aid agencies by the Department of Mental Health."

Boyle: "Well, does this also include hospitals and nursing homes?"

Juckett: "No, it would not."

Boyle: "Well, what agencies and what..."

Juckett: "The local..."

Boyle: "...What facilities does it include and what facilities does it exclude?"

Juckett: "It would be the local mental health agencies who are assisting the Department of Mental Health in treating mental health patients in the community and those who have been released from the state hospital."

Boyle: "But: this would not..."

Juckett: "It would not assist those who are purchase of service agreements. Right."



Boyle: "That's what I was getting at, this wouldn't authorize them or allow them to pay nursing homes for mental health patients put in nursing homes prior to the time they've actually been there..."

Juckett: "You're absolutely correct."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart."

Hart: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question."

Speaker Telcser: "Indicates he'll yield."

Hart: "I had some correspondence about this Bill. Would this in anyway speed the payment of these warrants? There's been a lot of complaints about the long delay between commission of vouchers and return of money."

Juckett: "This is the entire purpose of the Bill where now these agencies have gone through maybe a six to nine months review of their budgets, their programs, prior to the start of the fiscal year. This would...and then have...they provide the service and they wait anywhere from two to four to five months to be paid for the providing of the service. This would allow for the Department to pay that...pay for the service to be rendered as the service is being rendered."

Hart: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Further discussion? Gentleman offers to move the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 2671. All in favor signify by saying aye; opposed, no. ...Adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #3. Juckett. Amend House Bill 2671 and so forth."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Juckett."

Juckett: "Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I think we've got a mixup, Amendment #3 is the one that we discussed. I thought Amendment #2 had been withdrawn."

Speaker Telcser: "Having...you want to table #2 now, Bob?"



Having voted on the prevailing side on which Amendment #2 to House Bill 2671 was adopted, Gentleman moves to reconsider that vote. All in favor, aye; opposed, no. Gentleman's motion prevails. Gentleman now moves to table Amendment #2 to House Bill 2671. All in favor aye; opposed no. Amendment's tabled. Further Amendments? Amendment #3 has been read..."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #3. Juckett...amend House Bill 2671..."

Speaker Telcser: "...Representative Juckett with Amendment #3."

Juckett: "Amendment #3 is what we just discussed. I move its adoption."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman offers to move the adoption ...Amendment 3 to House Bill 2671. All in...adoption ...aye; opposed, no. Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments? Third Reading. Bill's been read a third time, do you wish to proceed, Sir?"

Juckett: "I think everyone knows what's in the Bill now..."

Speaker Telcser: "...Clerk. Any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 2671 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Let's hit those switches. Giddy, will you get me on? Giddy. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Question, 141 ayes and 1 nay and 1 answering present. And this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2673. 2673."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2673. A Bill for an act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2673 is similar to the Bill that we passed last very unanimously without one dissenting vote. It's a deferred compensation Bill which would simply allow all state employees to participate in a deferred compensation plan. And I urge your support on this Bill."



Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 2673 pass? Those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Okay. Have all voted who wish? No? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Take the record yet? This question 147 ayes, 1 nay, 2 answering present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. No, he doesn't want to call it. House Bill 2692."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2692. An act to convey certain in Johnson County. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Johnson, Representative McCormick."

McCormick: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an administration Bill, I should say Department of Transportation Bill conveying to the United States Department of Agriculture or the Shawnee Forest about 118 acres of land for...to pay back, I should say, what the Forest Service gave to the State of Illinois in order to have right-of-way for Route 24 across Johnson County. I know of no opposition to the land transfer. I would appreciate an aye vote."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "C. L."

McCormick: "Yes, Sir."

Schneider: "On the question of Shawnee National Forest, my real concern is whether or not it's easier, under the United States Department of Agriculture, to explore that property for oil for large corporations than it is under the State of Illinois."

McCormick: "No, this is...if you'd go with me and let me show you where this is..."

Schneider: "I'd love to go with you but we haven't got the time now between supper and our talk."

McCormick: "Actually, actually, the State of Illinois in



building Route 24 which is one of the federal aid roads through the state, they had to have the right-of-way and they purchased it from everyone else. But as you know, the federal government cannot sell forest land, they could only trade forest land. And that's what they did in this case but it takes an act of the General Assembly to....the contract."

Schneider: "Some of those leasing arrangements make me a little un...well, a little nervous, a little leery and I'm hoping that when you retire down in Johnson County that you'll keep your eye out..."

McCormick: "We won't have any need... There won't be any leasing in Johnson County our country is too beautiful for that."

Schneider: "You're going to be the defender of the forest."

McCormick: "We are going to see to it that it's not ruined."

Schneider: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Just a question as to whether or not they're doing any oil drilling in that Shawnee National Forest now."

McCormick: "Not any that I know of anywhere. No."

Speaker Telcser: "Further discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 2692 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? For C. L., gee, I don't worry about it. All voted who wish? Take the record. Catania, aye. Catania, aye. This question 143 ayes, 1 nay, 1 answering present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 27...Grotberg leave...? Grotberg. House Bill 2743, Tuerk, isn't here. 2744 is here. Wait a second, I'm thinking out loud. 2753, Berman. House Bill 2753. Representative Huskey, aye, on the last Roll Call. 2753."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2753. Amend School Code. Third



Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman."

Berman: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2753 is a cleanup Bill for the School Aid Formula we passed last year. There's only one provision in there of substance that clarifies the intent of the Bill regarding the payments of the school districts over a four year period as was the intention when we passed the Bill last year. I'd appreciate a favorable vote on House Bill 2753."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Question is shall House Bill 2753 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question, 147 ayes, no nays, none answering present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2769. Representative Juckett on the floor?"

Clerk Selcke: "Juckett, you ready for this?"

Speaker Telcser: "No. Out of the record. Where is... Representative Douglas on the floor? House Bill 2785. 2785."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2785. An act relating to the Department of Mental Health in Developmental Disabilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Representative Douglas."

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative McCourt has spoken to me about his interest in amending this Bill...he did before it passed off Second Reading, out of courtesy to him, I am willing, if the House is willing, to move the Bill back to Second Reading. Mr. Speaker, would it be appropriate Representative McCourt to express his concern? I'm willing to move it back to Second Reading."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman has asked leave to return House



Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman has asked leave to return House Bill 2785 to the order of Second Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Any objections? Hearing none, Bill's on Second Reading. Will the Clerk please read..."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #1. McCourt. Amend House Bill 2785."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment merely requires that the Department of Mental Health when they're using community facilities must abide by local municipal ordinance such as licensing if a local community is licensing mental health facilities or other facilities used by the Department. The way it is at present time, the state licensed these facilities and many municipalities are licensing these facilities and it just makes it loud and clear that the local communities has a regulatory function in the facilities and I'd ask for the adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Lake. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Only to protect the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if you could check the germaneness of the Amendment? That's the only thing that bothers me. What I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, as I understand the Bill it's strictly to change the name of the Department of Mental Health to the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities and it just doesn't appear that that type of Amendment would be compatible with the intent of the Bill."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, may I respond?"

Speaker Telcser: "Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "I've checked with the Reference Bureau on this, the particular chapter that's involved in this Bill is referred to in this Amendment, it's completely germane, Representative. There's...a noncontroversial type of



an issue."

Matijevich: "I'd rather...I'd rather get a ruling from the Chair, Jim, I understand what you're trying to do and I have no reason to object to what you're trying to do. I'd just like to make sure it's proper."

Speaker Telcser: "The Chair would rule that the Amendment concerned is the same agency, the same department and it would be germane. Representative Douglas, for what purpose do you rise?"

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the Amendment.

"Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill as many of you will recall is the product of extensive negotiations that started with a Bill introduced under the sponsorship of Representative Bill Walsh last year that would have established a completely separate Department of Developmental Disabilities. As a matter of fact, as I recall, this House passed that Bill with virtually no opposition whatsoever and the Bill was vetoed by Governor Walker. We were in the process then of discussing whether or not to overrule...override Governor Walker's veto when negotiations took place between representatives of these two fields, Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities, and an agreement was reached between both the Legislative and Executive branches of government to change the name of the Department of Mental Health to the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities with an understanding, as I recall, that the Department of Mental Health would give recognition to this important newly developing and extremely important activity that has previously taken place under Mental Health. Now, I must out of loyalty to the original cause for which this Bill was developed oppose this Amendment because I fear out of respect for those who have negotiated the new name for the Department of Mental Health



that by adding this Amendment that we may be making a Bill which was agreed to by all segments of government and the different groups relating to developmental disabilities and mental health. We may be making a Bill that was agreed to somewhat controversial and may affect the final outcome of the Bill. I have out of respect to Representative McCourt who has a right, as any Member of this House does, to attempt to amend the Bill by taking this back to Second Reading out of respect, but I do not approve myself of this idea. I think that it might be detrimental to the intent of the original Bill and I would ask you in the hopes that Representative McCourt's idea might be adopted in some other fashion on some other Bill to defeat this Amendment."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to ask a question on the Amendment but maybe I'm not germane - but my question is, if we take, and this is addressed to the speaker, the Sponsor, we passed out of the House today...we passed out of the House today the Department of Mental Health fiscal appropriation of 1975. Now if we...now with...does not have the change of name in it. Now if we pass this Bill, how will it affect the appropriation for fiscal '75?"

Douglas: "Well, if this Bill were to pass with Representative McCourt's Amendment on it, it would still include the name change. So there'd be no effect on the appropriation whatsoever, it would simply incorporate into this Bill a new amendment to the present Mental Health Code which would obligate the Department of Mental Health in the event that a municipality had not passed an ordinance, or had passed an ordinance and objected to people being sent to their municipality



some mental institution, it would simply give them the right to overrule the Department of Mental Health's decision. It would not affect the appropriation Bill."

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman wish to close? Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, as has been explained before basically this just allows local... some local control in where these community mental health facilities are located in the way they're being regulated. Many communities downstate have to license a local mental health facility but those communities that might license them, it would seem to me, that they should have some input into this expanding field in the state. And I think the Amendment is germane to the Bill. I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman offers to move the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 2785. All in favor of adoption signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I respectfully suggest that this is not a good Amendment. This Amendment would permit a small village who, for example, respond to the unwarranted request of a neighborhood to keep a facility from having, for example, mentally retarded children within it. They do this for reasons that I certainly cannot understand but I am familiar with one case where it did happen and where a facility for the mentally retarded within Proviso Township had a very difficult time becoming established because they were booted from village to village because the various village boards would not grant the authority to operate a facility such as that within their village. Now I suggest to you that this, I suggest to you that



this is not appropriate that the state should be... have the exclusive rights to do this and I solicit your no vote."

Speaker Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question there's 25 ayes, 85 nays, 14 answering present. Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #1 to House Bill 2785 fails. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #2. McCourt. Amend House Bill 2785..."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it would appear that the state is completely preempting the local community to decide what might be best for them. Now as... Representative from LaGrange has said that some communities if they had more restrictive regulations, it would be ruled unconstitutional. All I am saying that the local community should have some input in the problem. I'll table this particular Amendment and do the same thing on another vehicle coming through next..."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman moves to table Amendment #2 to House Bill 2785. All in favor aye; opposed, no. And the Amendment is tabled. Further Amendments? Third Reading. The Bill's been read a third time. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Douglas, on Third Reading."

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, the Bill as it was originally drafted, simply changes the name of the Department of Mental Health to the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. And I would appreciate your support in passing it. Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Question is, shall House Bill 2785 pass? All in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Let Kempiners get on. All voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 148 ayes, 2 nays, none answering present. And this Bill having received



the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed.
House Bill...Shea is not here. ...Shea isn't here.
2844. House Bill 2844."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2844. An act to amend Section 1 of an act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense Illinois Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Kane, Representative Hill."
Hill; "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a transfer of monies within the Commission for \$1584. I'd appreciate your vote."

Speaker Telcser: "...Question is, shall...question is, shall House Bill 2844 pass? Those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question 138 ayes, 1 no, none answering present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2848."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2848. Amend the State Employee's Group Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Johnson, Representative McCormick."

McCormick: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill that authorizes the State of Illinois, the Department, to pick up the difference in the insurance contract premium that the state employees would have to pay in comparison to what the old contract was. I think the figure, not in this Bill, but in the appropriation is around two million nine. And it will affect something like 32,500 maybe 600 hundred people in the state. I..."

Speaker Telcser: "Excuse me. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mann."

Mann: "I wonder if the Gentleman would yield to a question?"

McCormick: "Sure."



Speaker Telcser: "Indicates that he will."

Mann: "How are the mosquitos down there?"

McCormick: "Well, mayor, I'll tell you. If we fail to take care of this insurance problem the nettings are going to be awful thin."

Mann: "Couldn't you take a couple of minutes and run that down a little bit more?"

McCormick: "Well...the thing...I've been waiting on that for the right time and I think everybody's too tired for that right now. I'll get to it though because I'd only have another week or so and I'm out of here for good then I'll give it to you real good."

Speaker Telcser: "Question is, shall House Bill...Gentleman from Cook, Representative Robert Dunne."

Dunne: "I'd like to ask a question or two of the Sponsor."

McCormick: "If I know it I'll answer it, Robert."

Dunne: "C. L., I believe you cited the number of employees involved and how much money, rough, we're talking about?"

McCormick: "These are the Department figures as of February 28th for the enrollment. It's 32,599 figure."

Dunne: "How much?"

McCormick: "That's the number of employees that have the option, see, what you're doing...this is picking up the employees, this is in their option choice. In other words, if you were paying before 18.20 now you have to pay \$26.00. That's a 7.80 difference increase in the state employees contribution and because of the vast increase in the insurance contract this would virtually eliminate any of the Governor's increase to state employees in their regular salary schedule you have set here for them to get."

Dunne: "How about...what happens if a year from now we have another in...bump in the program?"

McCormick: "We're hoping that we don't run into the same situation a year from now where you have only one



bidder, we hope that the changes in the set-up of the insurance department, I mean the state employee's department, will be such that we won't have to resort back to this. This is strictly something to salvage for the state employees that at least their cost-of-living wage and the Governor's Office and the Budget Bureau has recommended, see. No, this is not a good practice, I'm not going to tell you it is, but I don't know how else we can do it and take care of the state employees and I think the Governor's recognized it, too, in his statement that he issued."

Dunne: "Well, then, I...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'll speak very briefly to the Bill and I'm going to have to oppose this Bill and I recognize the problem that I guess 115,000, I think, is the figure we were talking about..."

McCormick: "You're talking..."

Dunne: "Go ahead, C. L."

McCormick: "I think what you're talking...Rob, I think what you're talking, you're getting into the total enrollment, that's 125,000 in round figures. But this is only the people that are hit with this increase over their dependents, the dependent option, see."

Dunne: "All right. Okay, I see what you mean. But, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I oppose this Bill because there's absolutely no indication in the world that anything is going to happen in future years to change the trend of continuous rise in hospital costs and inflation and hospitalization. And while I respect the problem of the state employees, there's 11,000,000 taxpayers out there in the state of Illinois that we're going to dig so deep into their pocket over the next few years that this is better than any pay raise that the employees could get is to have a lid on any cost, additional cost in health care in the future. And I



don't see how the state could conceivably afford the potential additional cost that we're raising here by passing this Bill. And I urge you to take a good close look at this and perhaps if it were restricted to just the additional cost this year and we could peg the cost it might be a plausible Bill, but this is open end for all future increases and I just don't think we can afford that kind of thing."

Speaker Telcser: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Representative McCormick, the Bill that you have here, that's just picking up the increased costs of this year, is it not?"

McCormick: "Yes. Yes, and it authorizes the pickup and of course the money has been put into the Department's budget for that purpose. And it couldn't be a continuing thing because this legislation would have to make that decision year by year, it's intended to. It is not intended to be a continuing thing, no."

Terzich: "But this...This is just..."

McCormick: "One year, one shot deal is what it's intended to be."

Terzich: "And I assume this was approved by the Administration?"

McCormick: "Well, I don't know whether the specific Bill but here's the Governor's press release and it definitely states that..."

Terzich: "Be for it."

McCormick: "Well, I know but I'm saying...all I've got is the press release."

Terzich: "Is that where the Governor stated he would pick up the additional cost for the group insurance?"

McCormick: "Yes, Sir. And I will tell you this, if you want me to go farther into it, and Representative Berman was at the meeting. We had a meeting in the Senate and working out some changes we think is necessary in



the program and at that meeting the Department of Personnel and I believe one of the Senators from the other...well, the Senate and across the rotunda said that they would not be in favor of the 2.9 or whatever it took to pay this Bill. And we discussed it and I said I thought it was a terrible thing that we would be...a contract like this would absorb all of the cost of living that the state employees had. Well, apparently, it got through because the next morning is when the Governor's Office issued this memorandum, see."

Terzich: "Well, I think that was very nice of Governor Walker to take into consideration all of the state employees, it shows what a great Governor he is. And I would like to also mention when this Bill was put in, I think I had the only dissenting vote on this group insurance program, with the prediction that it did have an open end where it will continuously increase and I think it's governed by the substantial increase in the rate for this year. Even though I understand the heavy burden I would suggest support of this Bill."

McCormick: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in response to the Gentleman's question, this...these costs are put into the Department of Personnel's budget and it is figured in, C. L.,

McCormick: "Yeah, that's right."

Houlihan: "So it wouldn't cause any particular problem. I think... there is a serious problem which arose from the other Bill, C. L., in terms the negotiating with the insurance companies when you have those pending, that we would go into self-insurance."

McCormick: "Well, I think we can go into that whenever they



call the Bills and see how the General Assembly feels about it."

Houlihan: "That's right."

McCormick: "But this is...was figured into the Department of Personnel's budget."

Houlihan: "Yes."

Speaker Telcser: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Richard Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe there's some confusion on this Bill and I would suggest the Members look at their digest where the Bill, I think, is explained very well. What it does is, it provides that the state pick up any increase over, at least, for fiscal '74. In other words, any increase this year. Now we're amending the Act, we're not just making an appropriation for fiscal '75. And I would have to agree with the Sponsor, we can't bind future General Assemblies to make an appropriation. However, we are saying, in the Act, that fiscal '74 is the year and any increases over '74 is going to be picked up by the state. So, if it's two million this year in fiscal '75, it could be four million in fiscal '76, and God knows how much thereafter. And peace of mind it's not an appropriation Bill of 2,000,000. We're amending the act to provide that the ceiling be that which is now in existence. And I would urge a no vote."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Any further discussion? Gentleman from Johnson, Representative McCormick, to close."

McCormick: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think everybody knows that your contract is for one year at a time, at the present time. And all of the world we're trying to do is to...to pick this up for the one year. Now if, in the contentions of this House, that you think there should be an Amendment attached



201.

to this Bill to limit it to the one year, I have no objection to asking the Senate to do that when it gets over there but I think that we do need to pass this Bill today. And I'd appreciate an aye vote."

Speaker Telcser: "Question is, shall House Bill 2848 pass?"

Those in favor signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Laurino, aye. Take the record. Okay. ...Clerk...130 ayes, 13 nays, 2 answering present. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Okay, now we're going to start to try and wind down today's Session with Committee Reports, announcements, Senate Bills First Reading, maybe, Okay. Representative, no...Committee Reports first. Representative Houlihan, for what purpose do you rise?"

Houlihan: "You indicate we're going to wind down, are we going to go to House Bills Second Reading?"

Clerk Selcke: "Committee Reports."

Speaker Telcser: "No. No, Representative Houlihan."

Clerk Selcke: "Mr. Blair from the Committee on Rules to which House Bills 2120, 2399, 2480, 2487, 2572, 2594, 2650, 2707, 2718, 2736, were referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bills be referred to the Committee on Assignment of Bills for assignment to Standing Committee. Mr. Blair from Committee on Rules to which Senate Bill 880 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bill be returned to the calendar on the order of Third Reading. Mr. Collins from Executive to which House Bill 2622 and 2633 were referred, reported the same back with the recommendation the Bills do pass and be re-referred to Appropriations. Mr. Collins from Executive to which House Bill 2721 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation the Bill do pass. Mr. Collins from Executive to which House Bill 2832 and



2840 were referred, reported the same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation the Amendments be adopted and the Bills, as amended, do not pass. Mr. Collins from Executive to which House Resolution 985 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation the Resolution be adopted. Mr. Washburn from Appropriations to which House Bill 2607, 2756, 2839, 2872, 2873 were referred, reported the same back with the recommendation the Bills do pass. Mr. Washburn from Appropriation which House Bill 2755 was referred, reported the same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation the Bills, as amended, do pass. Mr. Washburn from Appropriation to which Senate Bill 1246 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation the Bill do pass. Mr. Neff from Transportation to which House Bills 2218, 2219 were referred, reported the same back with the recommendation the Bills do pass. Mr. Bluthardt from Elections to which House Bill 2610 was referred, returned the same back and ordered it tabled. Mr. Capuzi from Human Resources to which House Bills 2689, 2710 were referred, reported the same back with Amendments thereto with recommendation the Amendments be adopted and the Bills, as amended, do pass. Mr. Capuzi from Human Resources to which House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #32 was offered, reported the same back with the recommendation the Resolution do pass. Mr. Wall from Registration and Regulation which House Bill 2647, 2648, were referred, reported the same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation the Amendments be adopted and the Bill, as amended, do pass, be re-referred to Appropriation. Mr. Wall from Registration and Regulation which House Bill 2811, 2812, were referred, reported the same back with the recommendation the Amendments be adopted and the Bills, as amended, do pass, be re-referred to Appropria-



tion. Mr. Wolf from Veteran's Affairs, Personnel and Pensions to which House Bill 2870 was referred reported the same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation the Bill, as amended, do pass. Mr. Wolf, Veteran's Affairs, Personnel and Pension to which Senate Bills 1476 and 1550 were referred, reported the same back with recommendation the Bills do pass. Mr. Schoeberlein from Public Utilities to which House Bill 2861 and 2864 were referred reported the same back with Amendments thereto with recommendation the Bills be adopted and the Bills, as amended, do pass. Mr. Dyer, Committee on Higher Education to which House Bill 1509 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation the Bill do pass and be re-referred to Appropriations. Dyer from Higher Education to which House Bill 1510 was referred, reported the same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation the Amendments be adopted and the Bill, as amended, be re-referred to Appropriations. Mr. Randolph from Revenue to which House Bill 2221 was referred, reported the same back with recommendation the Bill do pass."

Speaker Telcser: "Senate Bills First Reading."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill First Reading. Senate Bill...

wait 'til I find them, on what page are they on?

Senate Bill 1240, act amending an act relating to compensation of county officers. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1261, appropriation and expense Liquor Control Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1282 appropriations and expense Pollution Control Board. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1325, appropriation and expense Local Government Law Enforcement Officers Training Board. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1458, an act to accept retrogression of legislative jurisdiction over certain



lands of state and government...of United States to State of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. 1475, an act provides the law in relation to personnel administration. First Reading of the Bill. 1541, an act to amend the Retailers Occupation Tax. First Reading of the Bill. 1548, Bill for an act to amend the Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1549, an act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1567, supplemental appropriation, Community College Board. First Reading of the Bill. 1638, an act to amend Section 27 of an act to provide for the license and regulating of detective and detective agencies. First Reading of the Bill. 1641, a Bill for an act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. Now, we've got... well, let's wait a minute, he's bringing some more in here, I guess."

Speaker Telcser: "All right. Gentleman from Lawrence, let me get...Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, I request that suspension of Rule 33-A that House Bill 2564 to be read a second time. It's now on First Legislative Day, Second Reading."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman."

Berman: "You're asking to bypass Committee on this Bill?"

Cunningham: "No, it was approved by Committee. It's on the calendar on the First Legislative Day, Second Reading. We want it read here on the Second Day and the rule that we seek to suspend is 33-A. The purpose of it, of course, is to get it over to the Senate so it can be acted on."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "What was the...what was the Bill that the Gentleman..."



~~Speaker~~ Telcser: "Now the Gentleman has moved to suspend the provisions of Rule 33-A for the purposes of having House Bill 2564 read a second time today thereby eliminating Second Reading First Legislative Day, No..."

~~Telcser~~: "...My friend, Roscoe."

~~Speaker~~ Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman."

~~Berman~~: "Has this...question made to the Leadership on our side of the aisle?"

~~Dunningham~~: "No, I'll be glad to talk to them about if you ...let's just hold it up a moment."

~~Berman~~: "Let's hold that up for now..."

~~Dunningham~~: "...The question."

~~Berman~~: "...And talk to them Roscoe, just to get it..."

~~Speaker~~ Telcser: "Any announcement? All right, let's get the Agreed Resolutions. Then I'll get to announcements. Agreed Resolutions."

~~Mark Salcke~~: "Agreed Resolutions. Resolution #1014, Kucharski. Resolution 1016, Choate, et al. 1017, McParlin. 1018, J. J. Wolf, et al. 1019, DiPrima, et al. 1020, Geo-Karis, et al. 1022, Leinenweber, et al. House Joint Resolution 108, Shea, et al. That's it."

~~Speaker~~ Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh, moves the adoption of Agreed Resolutions. All in favor aye; the opposed, no. Resolutions are adopted. ...Some announcements. Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh. Turn on Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, included with the Agreed Resolutions was the Adjournment Resolution which says that when we adjourn Friday, we will return at 12 noon on Monday, June 17. And now, Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of Rule suspensions. The first one, the Rule relative to the expiration of Bills, Motions and Resolutions on the Calendar, and there are three rules I believe that are applicable, in order that they may be extended for one day to tomorrow. I



move the suspension of these rules."

Speaker Telcser: "All right, wait a second, now. The Clerk did not read the Adjournment Resolution yet, Bill."

Walsh: "I have that as part of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Telcser: "All right, I think he's created two motions. The Adjournment Resolution hasn't been read, yet."

Walsh: "All right."

Speaker Telcser: "So let's...now what was the second part of your motion?"

Walsh: "All right, the...my motion...my first motion is to move to suspend the rules relative to the expiration of Bills, Resolutions and Motions on the Calendar."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, Gentleman has moved to suspend the provisions of Rule 37 for the purpose of extending..."

Walsh: "They cut that other Rule off of it, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Telcser: "Suspend the appropriate Rule dealing with the expiration of Bills, Resolutions, and other matters on the Calendar for one day, through tomorrow. Now is there leave to use the Attendance Roll Call, the Affirmative Roll Call? Hearing no objections that will be the Gentleman's Roll Call. Now, you want to read the Adjournment Resolution, Bill? Let's get the message from the Senate now."

Clerk Selcke: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to-wit: Senate Joint Resolution #76. Resolved by the Senate, 78th General Assembly, State of Illinois, House of Representatives concurring herein when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, June 13th 1974, it stand adjourned until Monday, June 17th, 1974



at 1 o'clock p. m. And when the House of Representatives adjourns on Friday, June 14th 1974, it stand adjourned until Monday, June 17, 1974 at 12 o'clock, noon, Central Daylight Saving Time. Adopted by the Senate June 13, 1974. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, this is the Adjournment Resolution and, again, when we adjourn tomorrow we will stand adjourned until Monday, June 17th at 12 noon. And I move the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman moves the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All in favor aye; opposed, no. The Resolution's adopted. Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, in an effort to dispose of House Bills in the House tomorrow and to move those Bills which are on the calendar on the order of House Bills Second Reading, First Legislative Day; have them read a second time today, so that they may pass tomorrow and perhaps be amended tomorrow, also, and pass. I move to suspend the provisions of Rule 33 A which would provide for the calendar showing House Bills on Second Reading, First Legislative Day."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman has moved to suspend the provisions...Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "What about the Bills we got out yesterday that are not on the calendar? Are you going show supplemental calendar or what?"

Speaker Telcser: "The ones reported out today, you mean? Well, we ought to take the ones... The Clerk's Office will get the list down of all the Bills that were reported in today, so they'll be included in the Gentleman's motion. Mr. Clerk, is that correct? All right, now, so I can put the Gentleman's motion. Gentleman



from Cook, Representative William Walsh, moves to suspend the provisions of Rule 33 A for the purpose of eliminating, in effect, Second Reading First Legislative Day, for all Bills on the Calendar, today... pardon? ...And all Bills reported..."

Walsh: "No. No, Mr. Speaker, my motion doesn't go to that. My motion goes to the Bills that are on the Calendar so that they may be read a second time today."

Speaker Telcser: "All right. All right, by Representatives Lechowicz and Berman, the inquiry on Bills recorted today. The Clerk is now going to make a supplemental calendar for us quickly, is that right, Jack? So we can include those Bills."

Walsh: "Well, I...I, we need a supplementary calendar to do that, Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Telcser: "He's getting that it right now."

Clerk Selcke: "Here. Here. Here it is."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, the Gentleman moves to suspend the provision of Rule 33 A for the purpose of having all Bills on the Calendar on the order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day, today, and all Bills on the Supplemental Calendar which would include those Bills that were reported today on Committee Report. Got that Jack? To be read a second time today, that'll appear on the Calendar tomorrow on the order of Third Reading: No? No, I'm not wrong, I'm right. You just ...a little bit of confusion here, fellas. If they're read a second time today, they're on Third Reading tomorrow. Okay. All right, what we're going to do is read...we're going to read the Bills a second time and leave them on Second, okay? Representative Cunningham, you have objections? It's six to one, half a dozen of the other. It's really, you're talking about the same thing. Mr. Clerk, now...all in favor ...now is there any objections to using the Attendance



209.

Roll Call to suspend provision of Rule 33-A? Hearing none that will be the Attendance Roll Call. Now, would the Clerk read all of those Bills a second time. And you're talking about semantics, it's the same thing."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill...you want me to just read the number or actually read the...all right. House Bill 297, amends Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2090, appropriations, reduced fares, reduced transit fares for handicapped. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2109, amends School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2150, amends Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "By the way, Bills that have Committee Amendments on them will be adopted on the floor tomorrow."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2199, amends the Regional Transportation Authority Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2200, appropriation, expense Legislative Advisory Committee. Second Reading of the Bill. 2207, appropriation, Department of Transportation. Second Reading of the Bill. 2217, amends Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. 2280, amends Civil Administrative Code. Second Reading of the Bill. 2304, appropriation, the Department of Revenue. Second Reading of the Bill. 2341, appropriation, Department of Transportation. Second Reading of the Bill. 2354, appropriation expense certain agency state government. Second Reading of the Bill. 2366, appropriation expense to Allocation Office. Second Reading of the Bill. 2383, appropriation, Department of Transportation. Second Reading of the Bill. 2464, amends Mobile Home Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. 2564, amends Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. 2567, amends the Illinois Income Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. 2669, appropriations for Department of Services of the Handicapped. Second Reading of the Bill. 2675, appro-



priation, State Board of Elections. Second Reading of the Bill. 2725, amends the Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. 2751, amends the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. 2781, amends the Mobile Home and Mobile Home Park Act. Second Reading of the Bill. 2804, appropriation, Board of Trustees Southern Illinois University. Second Reading of the Bill. 2810, appropriation, Department of Transportation. Second Reading of the Bill. 2835, amends the Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. 2847, amends the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. 2849, appropriation, Teachers Retirement System. Second Reading of the Bill. 2850, appropriation, Teacher's Retirement System. Second Reading of the Bill. 2851, appropriation of Comptroller. Second Reading of the Bill. 2857, amends Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. 2858, amends Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. 2868, amends Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. 2874, amends Motor Fuel Tax Law. Second Reading of the Bill. 1509, act relating to Western Illinois University. Second Reading of the Bill. 1510, appropriation, Educational Television Western Illinois University. Second Reading of the Bill. 2004, appropriation, Department of Transportation. Second Reading of the Bill. 2007, appropriation, Department of Conservation. Second Reading of the Bill. 2218, creates the Rural Transportation Assistance Demonstration Project. Second Reading of the Bill. 2219, amends School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. 2221, amends Income Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. 2499, amends Act relating Private Employment Agency. Second Reading of the Bill. 2530, appropriations, Automatic Fire Sprinklers Contractors and General Examining Board Act. Second Reading of the Bill. 2531, act creating Automatic Fire Sprinklers Contractor and Journeymen Examining Board. Second



Reading of the Bill. 2550, appropriation, Department of Conservation. Second Reading of the Bill. 2552, appropriation for improvements, Willow-Higgins Watershed, Cook County. Second Reading of the bill. 2553, act authorizing improvements in Willow-Higgins Watershed in Cook County. Second Reading of the Bill. 2562, appropriation improvements West Bank, DuPage River. Second Reading of the Bill. 2607, amends Juvenile Court Act. Second Reading of the Bill. 2651, an act creating Illinois Energy Resource Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. 2652, appropriation, expense, Illinois Energy Resource Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. 2689, act conveying real property... Tinley Park. Second Reading of the Bill. 2710, Jack, what's this other one? 2710, amends act relating to Department of Mental Health. Second Reading of the Bill. What's that? 2721, act creating Chain-O-Lakes Study Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. 2755, act creating Energy Conservation Study Commission. Second Reading of the bill. 2756, appropriation, Energy Conservation Study Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. 2762, appropriation, Department of Transportation. Second Reading of the Bill. 2817, act requiring statement of promulgation costs of state publication. Second Reading of the Bill. 2818, appropriation, State Comptroller. Second Reading of the Bill. 2819, act creating Illinois Commission on Labor Laws. 2820, appropriation, Commission on Labor Laws. Second Reading of the Bill. 2822, appropriation, Superintendent of Public Instruction. Second Reading of the Bill. 2823, appropriation, Superintendent of Public Instruction. Second Reading of the Bill. 2839, appropriation, Department of Children and Family Services. Second Reading of the Bill. 2852, appropriation, expenses, State Board of Education. Second Reading of the Bill.



2860, appropriation, portrait of Honorable Richard B. Ogilvie. Second Reading of the Bill. 2861, amends act relating public utilities. Second Reading of the Bill. 2862, appropriation, Department of Transportation. Second Reading of the Bill. 2864, amends act relating public utilities. Second Reading of the Bill. 2870, amends the Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. 2872, amends Harness Racing Act. Second Bill. 2873, appropriation, DuQuoin State Fair Association. Second Reading of the Bill. Yeah, that's it."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Beaupre, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2204 was reported out of ...came out of the Revenue Committee, or excuse me, not the Revenue Committee, the Appropriations Committee on Tuesday. It was reported on this morning, it should have been on the calendar on Second Reading, First Legislative this morning. As a result, I believe, that it inadvertently has escaped that list and I would ask that it be included in the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Telcser: "The Clerk informs me it was just read, Jack. He said it was just read. Okay. All right, now, Representative Bluthardt, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, to make a motion. I move to suspend House Rule 18-B, that's the posting rule, so that the Elections Committee can meet on Tuesday morning at 10 o'clock to hear the following Bills: House Bill 2837, 2838, Senate Bills 1641 and 1291. I've checked with both sides of the aisle and there is no objection."

Speaker Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing no objections we'll use the Attendance Roll Call as the Affirmative Roll for the Gentleman's motion. Representative Duff, for what purpose do you rise?"

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for



the purpose of an announcement. Judiciary II recessed on Thursday to meet tonight, Thursday, in M-5 right after the adjournment this evening. We need to get a quorum down there and the meeting shouldn't take too long."

Speaker Telcser: "Mr. Clerk, would you read House Bills 2163 and 2196 in the same fashion you just read the others so they're evened up and they'll stay on Second."

Clerk Selcke: "Okay..."

Speaker Telcser: "House Bills Second Reading."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2163, amends Workmen's Compensation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2196, amends an act relating to transportation of school children. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, Representative Totten..."

Clerk Selcke: "No. No. No, they stay on Second."

Speaker Telcser: "They stay on Second like the others. Representative Totten, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for purposes of an announcement. The Chairman of the Appropriations Committee has asked me to announce that the House Appropriations Committee will meet at 8 a.m. tomorrow morning in Room 400."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, Representative Mahar, for what purpose do you...what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Mahar: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask for suspension of Rule 18-B so that Senate Bill 1612 can be heard in Cities and Villages on Tuesday morning. Have the approval of the Chairmen on both sides of the aisle."

Speaker Telcser: "Any objections? Hearing no objections, we'll use the Attendance Roll Call of the affirmative vote to suspend the provisions of Rule 18-B for the purposes of hearing Senate Bills 1612 in Cities and Villages. Okay, Representative Collins, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

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



JUN 13 1974

214.

I'd like to remind the Members of the Executive Committee we are meeting tomorrow morning at 8:30 and remind them also that we've had a room change. We will be meeting in Room 212 at 8:30 tomorrow morning. And the Republican Members of the Executive Committee, I'd like to remind them that we are meeting immediately after adjournment in the Speaker's Office."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, Representative Schlickman, for what purpose do you rise? Schlickman there? Your light's on. Representative Lauer, for what purpose do you rise? Representative Lauer? Nothing? Okay, Representative...Gentleman from Ogle, Representative Brinkmeier, moves to suspend the provisions of Rule 18-B... what's your Bill?"

Brinkmeier: "House Bill 2736."

Speaker Telcser: "For the purpose of hearing House Bill 2736..."

Brinkmeier: "In Executive Committee tomorrow morning."

Speaker Telcser: "In Executive Committee tomorrow morning."

Are there any objections to the Attendance Roll Call as the Affirmative? Hearing none, that will be the Attendance Roll Call. Okay, now, one more little... let me take one matter for my friend, Jaffe, huh? Okay, on the order of nonconcurrency...On the order of Conference Committee Reports appears House Bill 32. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe, moves that the House adopt the Conference Committee Report. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying aye; no, wait...wait...now we had this the other day, let's...this Conference Committee Report says that they can't agree and a second one should be reported. So it's not final action. Ann says 'in all votes'. Oh, I'm sorry. Now, now, I say an oral vote. We'll get a second...right...I said an oral vote, I'm sorry, Annie. If you want a do not...all right, the Gentleman moves that the House do not adopt the Conference Com-

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

mittee Report. All in favor signify by saying aye; the opposed no. A Second Conference Committee will be reported...will be organized. House Bill 32. They agree to disagree. Are there any other announcements? Oh, yeah, we have to have a couple of non-concurrences. Okay on the Order of Nonconcurrences, is Jake Wolf...want a one call, is he here? Okay, on the Order of Nonconcurrency appears Senate Bill 641, for which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Dan Houlihan, is recognized."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 641 and request the appointment of a conference committee."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman...is there any discussion?"

Gentleman moves the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 641. All in favor aye; the opposed no. House refuses to recede, a conference committee will be appointed. Okay, Mr. Clerk, is there anything you want me...it's a... Jim Houlihan asked me. All right, now,...all right, now, Representative Houlihan, Jim. Earlier you made inquiry about House Bills Second Reading being moved. I think you're referring to House Bill 2878. Now, pursuant to Representative Walsh's motion to keep everything even, we'll read that a second time now. It will stay on Second Reading and tomorrow amendments can be offered. Okay? Representative Philip, right? It's yours, okay? Got that? No, it was left out, it's on the calendar that just came down. We're going to read your Bill a second time, leave it on Second, if there are amendments someone wishes to offer tomorrow we can offer them and then shoot it out. Okay, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2878. A Bill for an act to amend the Illinois Intergovernmental Ethics Act. Second



Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "On Nonconcurrences, Mr. Clerk, let's get this piece of action out of the way. On the Order of Nonconcurrences appears Senate Bill 84, for which purpose the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Philip, is recognized."

Philip: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the House do recede from Amendment #1 to..."

Clerk Selcke: "Can't hear you."

Speaker Telcser: "Bring your mike...turn your mike on..."

Philip: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move the House do recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 84."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, the Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 84 and that a conference committee be appointed. Is that right, Sir? Is that correct? All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying aye; the opposed no. The ayes have it. The House refuses to recede from Amendment #1. On the Order of Nonconcurrences appears Senate Bill 634, for which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf, is recognized."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would move that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 334 and that a conference committee be appointed."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion. Gentleman moves the House refuse to recede House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 634. All in favor aye; opposed no. The ayes have it. The House refuses to recede; a conference committee will be appointed. Okay. One second... Representative Berman, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Berman: "Do you want to go to Concurrences?"

Speaker Telcser: "Concurrences are final action, Art, and



they'll take 89 affirmative votes. Well, if you would want...try to wind it down so we don't get in- to debate and explanation of vote and things like that."

Berman: "Well, I've got a simple Bill that flew out of here the first time and I want to fly it out of here the second time and I'm afraid by the time we get to this tomorrow night you'll have even fewer people on the floor. House Bill 2489 is what I have reference to, we've already voted once and the Senate Bill also. That's up to the Chair, whatever you would say."

Speaker Telcser: "All right, let me seek other advisement."

Berman: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "And the Board of Election Commissioners say-
Further Resolutions."

Clerk Selcke: "House Resolution 1021. Murphy."

Speaker Telcser: "I don't know. No, we adopted this morning and ruled. ...Well, that's the...wait a minute... Representative Murphy, do you wish to put on a Resolu- tion, Sir?"

Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, the Resolution has been read, huh?"

Speaker Telcser: "Well, will you read the Resolution, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Selcke: "House Resolution 1021. Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 78th General Assembly, State of Illinois, that upon recommendation of the Com- mittee on Rules, adopted therein by a three-fifths vote of Paragraph B of the House Rule 55, as amended to read as follows: 'B. The Speaker may grant other persons the privilege of access to the House area; however, while the House is in Session registered lobbyist shall not be admitted to the House Chamber'."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Lake, Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, this...here...this is approved by Rules Committee in a meeting this morning by a three-fifths vote. And this is to correct some abuses that's been happening by lobbyist while we're in Session. Mr.



Speaker, I move the adoption of this Resolution."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder...one slight little technical question. It's been my understanding that former Members of the Legislature have freedom of access to the floor. Is that going to be still accorded to those Members in spite of the fact that they might happen to be registered as lobbyist?"

Speaker Telcser: "No, the Rules state, Representative Duff, that only former Speakers are entitled to the floor, not Members."

Duff: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay. Further discussion, now, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Philip. Take the next one over,..."

Philip: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I'm a little confused now. Is this a resolution or are you amending the House Rules?"

Speaker Telcser: "It's a resolution to amend the House Rules."

Philip: "And what's the object of your Amendment, now, to the Rule? You're trying to keep, who, off the floor?"

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Lake, Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "The purpose of it, Representative Philip, is to keep a registered lobbyist from coming on the floor and lobbying on the floor. A registered lobbyist."

Philip: "A registered lobbyist. May I say this, I think my attendance has been very good during this Session and I haven't noticed any registered lobbyist on the floor to any great extent or feeling any great problem. And I don't see any need for this Rule and I question this Rule."

Murphy: "Well, the Rules Committee unanimously agreed that there is very much of a need for this Rule without going into great detail."

Philip: "Well, I can't remember the last time the Rules



Committee was right."

Murphy: "You've got a bad memory, Phil."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a good resolution. Only I think it ought to go a little further. While we are in Session I don't think a registered lobbyist should be in anybody's office, anybody's office. Because that's where the lobbying is being done. Let's really do what we're supposed to do. I mean, let's face it. We know this Resolution is to chase Pete Miller off the floor of the House. But let's really chase the lobbyists out of the offices, over there, over here. You know, let's do the job."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Okay, Gentleman offers to move the adoption of House Resolution 1021. All in favor of adoption signify by voting aye; the opposed by voting no. Takes 89 affirmative votes. We're voting on the adoption of House Resolution 1021; 89 affirmative votes to amend the House Rule. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Philips."

Philip: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to explain my vote. You and I and all of us know here the Chair has the authority to run anybody off this floor. Why we have to amend our rules and make a rule to do that, I don't know. And I...absolutely, it's an Amendment to our rules but I think it's unnecessary. I have seen the Chair in the Leadership run people off the floor if necessary. And I suggest you vote no on this Amendment."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Will, Speaker Blair."

Blair: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I just cannot imagine, under any circumstances in the operation of a legislative branch, where registered lobbyist should be allowed on the floor of the House while it is in Session. I cannot imagine



of any greater conflict of interest than allowing registered lobbyist on the floor of a legislative body when it is in Session. I cannot understand why anybody would suggest that that would be proper. And that's all this Amendment to the Rules does. It simply says that the Speaker who has discretion to allow other persons than those designated under the Rules to be on the floor, that he...that he may not allow in any event a registered lobbyist to be on the floor while the House is in Session."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman."

Berman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in favor of this Resolution, I would point out that this does not limit lobbying efforts either in the gallery or in the runways or out in the rotunda. And I think that it helps us to keep a certain dignity about the operations of the House in keeping them off while we are in Session. It doesn't limit lobbying efforts in any other place of this Capitol complex. And I think if the Speaker in particular asks for this Rule to be adopted, we ought to allow it because also it will eliminate any embarrassment to any particular lobbyist that do want to come on the floor, or any pressure or embarrassment to the Speaker. I urge your aye vote on this Resolution."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I think that this is a very important matter to change the Rules and I think that it really deserves consideration when everybody's on the floor. And I notice a lot of lights going on with people not here. And I suggest that...I suggest that we maybe take this out of the record and do it tomorrow."

Speaker Telcser: "Anyone else wish to discuss the Gentleman's motion. Okay, have all...Representative Houlihan, for



what..."

Houlihan: "At the proper time I'd like to ask for verification in this...if we're going to put this in this."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, Representative Philip, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Philip: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order."

Speaker Telcser: "State your point, Sir."

Philip: "Doesn't this Resolution have to be posted on the calendar?"

Speaker Telcser: "No, it does not, Sir."

Philip: "Not at all? Not for at least one legislative day?"

Speaker Telcser: "No."

Philip: "I have been maybe misinformed or led astray but I think you have to post it for one day anywhere or have it on the calendar for one day."

Speaker Telcser: "There's nothing in the Rules, Representative Philip, that require a posting for the adoption of a Rule. Adopt by three-fifths of the Rules Committee as this Amendment was adopted to be posted. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ron Hoffman, what purpose do you rise?"

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, just to comment on this. I think, unfortunately, I had one of the Bills today that was creating quite a bit of difficulty in trying to have questions and answers taken at that time. In fact to such an extent that I had to cross the aisle and apologize to some of the Members who were attempting to oppose my Bill. Now I saw at no time any registered lobbyist creating all of this confusion on the floor but I did find an awful lot of people unauthorized to this floor, that were here in the aisles and in the back that were creating this noise. Now if we're addressing ourself at this point with attempt to correct the situation that is becoming intolerable, let's preclude anyone on this floor that is a non-elected official



and make it a little more possible to work in."

Speaker Telcser: "Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, did it ever occur to any of us how it looks when we have some of these people come to our desks, as there are a lot of bystanders up there, they probably think we're being insolent and I'm sure we're not. But I think this Resolution is a good one, I don't see anything wrong with it in order to promote good decorum. It's high time we learned to promote it "

Speaker Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question there are 94 ayes. 5 nays...I'll get you. don't worry. Jim. 94 ayes. 5 nays. 6 answering present. Now you wfsh...Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Houlihan, has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Will the Clerk read the Affirmative Roll Call? Poll of the absentees has been requested."

Clerk Selcke: "I'll poll the absentees. Arnell, Borchers, Bradley, Brummet, Caldwell, Capparelli, Capuzi, Carter, Cunningham, Dee, DiPrima, Duff, R. L. Dunne, Ebbesen, Epton, Fleck, Flinn, Garmisa, Gibbs, Giorgi, Grieman, Harpstrite, Gene Hoffman, Jimmy Holloway, Robert Holloway, Huskey, Hyde, Jacobs, Emil Jones, Dave Jones, Klosak, Kozubowski, Kucharski, LaFleur, McAvoy, McCourt, McMaster, Tom Miller, Molloy, Mugalian, North, Pappas, Peters, Pierce, Porter, Rayson, Rose, Sangmeister, Schisler, Schlickman, Sevcik, Ike Simms, Springer, Stedelin, Stone, Terzich, Thompson, Wall, R. Walsh, Walters, Washburn, Washington."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Will the Clerk please read the Affirmative Roll Call?"

Clerk Selcke: "Alsop, Anderson, Barry, Beatty, Beaupre, Berman, Boyle, Brandt, Brinkmeier, Catania, Chapman,



Choate, Clabaugh,..."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Matijevich, what purpose do you rise?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, did I hear somebody say that this shouldn't be on the calendar?"

Speaker Telcser: "That's right."

Matijevich: "Well, could you look at Rule 73-G? 'A resolution to amend the House Rules, or Joint Rules, which is adopted by the Committee on Rules by a majority of the Members but not by...' Oh, this was by three-fifths? Okay."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Calvo, for what purpose do you rise?"

Calvo: "I understand...well, how am I voted, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Telcser: "How is Representative Calvo..."

Clerk Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as voting present."

Calvo: "Vote me aye, please."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting aye...."

Clerk Selcke: "Where did I quit? Collins, D'Arco, Davis, Day, Deavers, Deuster, Douglas, Ralph Dunn, Dyer, Ewell, Farley, Fary, Friedland, Geo-Karis, Getty, Giglio, Griesheimer, Grotberg, Hanahan, Hart, Hill, Hirschfeld, D. Houlihan, Jaffe, Jenison, Katz, Keller, Kelly, Kempiners, Kennedy, Kent, Kosinski, Krause, Lauer, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Lemke, Leon, Londrigan, Lundy, Macdonald, Madigan, Mahar, Mann, Maragos, Martin, Matijevich, McClain, McCormick, McGrew, McLendon, McPartlin, Merlo, Kenny Miller, Murphy, Neff, Palmer, Polk, Randolph, Rigney, Ryan, Schneider, Schoeberlein, Schraeder, Sharp, Shea, Shurtz, Timothy Simms, Skinner, Soderstrom, Stiehl, Taylor, Totten, Tuerk, William Walsh, Williams, J. J. Wolf, Yourell, Mr. Speaker. 95 ayes, now."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative...Representative Lechowicz, what purpose do you rise, Sir?"



Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, am I recorded as aye on this?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Lechowicz: "Thank you. I just want to make a point. It's the same...that we passed the campaign disclosure, we can't even keep the lobbyist off the floor of the House."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay. Question of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Houlihan, do you have questions of the Affirmative Roll Call?"

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Maragos."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Maragos on the floor? Maragos. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting yes."

Speaker Telcser: "Take him off the Roll Call."

Houlihan: "Representative Shea."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Shea on the floor? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Wait a minute. Wait a minute. The Gentleman is recorded as voting yes."

Speaker Telcser: "Take him off the Roll Call."

Houlihan: "Representative McPartlin."

Speaker Telcser: "McPartlin's on the floor, now. Let's get this now. North, aye."

Clerk Selcke: "Wait a minute."

Speaker Telcser: "Let's a couple more. North, aye. Tom Miller, aye. Okay. Tom Miller, aye. North, aye. Representative Houlihan, further questions, Sir?"

Houlihan: "Representative Barry."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Barry on the floor? Barry. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Speaker Telcser: "Take him off the Roll Call."

Houlihan: "Representative Von Boeckman."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Von Boeckman on the floor? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Aye."



Speaker Telcser: "Take him off the Roll Call. Representative Kozubowski, do you seek recognition, Sir?
How is Representative Kozubowski recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Speaker Telcser: "Record him as voting aye."

Houlihan: "Representative Deuster."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Deuster on the floor? What? He's up in the gallery. He's in the gallery, coming right down. Proceed."

Houlihan: "Representative Keller."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Keller on the floor? Keller. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Aye."

Speaker Telcser: "Take him off the Roll Call."

Houlihan: "Representative Brummet."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Brummet on the floor? Brummet. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as being absent."

Houlihan: "Representative Boyle."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Boyle on the floor? Kenny Boyle. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Yes."

Speaker Telcser: "Take him off the Roll Call."

Houlihan: "Representative Douglas."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Douglas on the floor? How is he recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting yes."

Speaker Telcser: "Take him off the Roll Call."

Houlihan: "Representative McLendon."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative McLendon on the floor? McLendon. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "What's his name? McLendon?"

Speaker Telcser: "McLendon."

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting yes."

Speaker Telcser: "Take him off the Roll Call."



Houlihan: "Representative McClain."

Speaker Telcser: "One minute. Representative Matijevich,
for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to change my vote. I'd
like to quickly explain it. I read Rule 55 and I don't
see where any lobbyist has the right to be on the floor,
under Rule 55, and therefore I think the Resolution is
superfluous. And really, I think, it detracts from the
present Rule 55 because some may be led to believe that
they have the right to the floor of the House like so
many were today when Representative Hoffman had his
Bill and therefore I'd like to be recorded, changing
my vote aye to no."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting no.
Representative Murphy, for what purpose do you rise?"

Murphy: "I'm hungry, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to withdraw the
Resolution."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman has withdrawn the Resolution.
Gentleman from...anything else, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Selcke: "Introductions."

Speaker Telcser: "Introduction, First Reading. Introduction
to First Reading."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2880, Neff. Prohibits operation
actual and physical and...fixed Rail Committee and
transport. First Reading of the Bill. 2881, Dyer,
et al. Amends the Illinois Insurance Code. First
Reading of the Bill. 2882, Blair, et al. Amends
Capitol Development Board Act. First Reading of the
Bill. 2883, Choate, et al. Amends the Illinois
Industrial Pollution Control Financing Act. First
Reading of the Bill. 2884, Blair, et al. Amends
Capitol Bond Act. First Reading of the Bill. House
Bill 2885, Choate, et al. Amends Eminent Domain Act.
First Reading of the Bill. That's it."

Speaker Telcser: "How...it take them. I'm ready to."



JUN 13 1974
227.

How long will that take you, Tom? Do you have anything else, Fred? All right, we only have one more Committee Report. Is that it...what...you'll collect them, too. First chance I got. Now whenever you want them, Fred, you've got 'em. All right, Death Resolutions."

Clerk Selcke: "Death Resolutions? House Resolution 1015. Boyle, et al. In respect to the memory of Mr. Merle Dunham."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Representative Merlo. That isn't...Representative Boyle offers to move the adoption of Death Resolution #1015. All in favor signify by saying aye; the opposed no. The Resolution is adopted. Is that report ready, Sir? Waiting for a Committee Report here that's being done here ad hoc. Committee Reports."

Clerk Selcke: "Committee Report. Mr. McMaster from Counties and Townships reports House Bill...House Bill 194, - 2592, 2655, 2783, 2784, 2152, 2153, 2539, 2619, be reported out do pass. McMaster from the Committee on Counties and Townships to which Senate Bill 1227 reported the same out with the recommendation the Bill do pass."

Speaker Telcser: "Mr. Clerk, those Bills will have to appear on Second Reading First Legislative Day because you have not read them by title. Okay. Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh. ...Going to be on First Legislative Day. They can suspend Rules tomorrow."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House now stand adjourned until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman moves the House to stand adjourned until until the hour of 10:30 a.m. sharp, tomorrow morning. All in favor aye; the opposed no. House stands adjourned."



1.

Speaker Telcser: "The First Special Session will now come to order. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh, asks leave to have the Attendance Roll Call of the Regular Session used as the Attendance Roll Call for First Special Session. All...any objections, hearing none, that will be the Attendance Roll Call. House Bills Second Reading. Committee Reports."

Clerk Selcke: "Mr. Collins from Executive to which First Special Session Senate Bill 8 was referred, reported the same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation the Amendments be adopted and the Bill, as amended, do pass."

Speaker Telcser: "Messages from the Senate."

Clerk Selcke: "Message from the Senate. Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution and the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to which Senate Joint Resolution #10. Resolved by the Senate of the 78th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, First Special Session thereof, the House of Representatives concurring herein, that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, June 13, 1974, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, June 19, 1974 at 12 o'clock noon. When the House of Representatives adjourns on Friday, June 14, 1974 it stands adjourned until Monday, June 17, 1974, at 1 o'clock p.m. Central Daylight Savings Time. Adopted by the Senate June 13, 1974. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary."

Speaker Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh, now moves to adopt the Adjournment Resolution for the First Special Session. All in favor signify by saying aye; the opposed no. The Resolution's adopted. House Bills Second Reading."



Clerk Selcke: "House Bills Second Reading, Chalky...which one?"

Speaker Telcser: "27. House Bill 27."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 27. A Bill for an act to amend
the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act. Second Reading
of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Telcser: "Amendments from the floor. "

Clerk Selcke: "No Amendments."

Speaker Telcser: "Third Reading. Gentleman from Cook now
moves that the House, the First Special Session to
stand adjourned until after the adjournment of the
Regular Session tomorrow. All in favor aye; the opposed
no. The First Special stands adjourned."



1.

W. Robert Blair: "Ah.. now House Bill 2825. The Gentleman asks leave ah.. to have that bill recalled to second for purpose of an amendment. Ah.. no objections.. back on Second Reading. Read the amendment. 2825."

F. B. Selcke: "Have you got the amendment? What number is it? Huh? Okay. Ah.. House Bill 2825. Amendment #12. Blair, Collins. Amend House Bill 2825 as amended and so forth."

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

Collins: "Ah.. yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #12 is the amendment that Representative Shea and I agreed to with the corrective language ah.. which is a technical improvement in the bill and I would move for its adoption."

W. Robert Blair: "Discussion. Question's on the adoption of the amendment. All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the amendment's adopted. Further amendments. Third Reading. Okay, 2825 a third time."

F. B. Selcke: "Ah.. House Bill 2825. Ah.. bill for an act to regulate campaign financing amending certain acts in connection therewith, Third Reading of the bill."

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

Collins: "Ah.. yes. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2825 is the one we all remember was debated at some length this week. This is the bill that is dealing with campaign, ah.. disclosure of campaign



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2.

ah.. contributions and expenditures. Ah.. as amended, the bill now will require the reporting of all expenditures and contributions received ah.. by any political committee ah.. in excess of \$250. The ah.. all candidates for public office will be required to file under the bill ah.. however, local candidates will not be under the bill until 1975. I think the bill was debated at some length on second reading. I will move for its passage. If there are any questions of any members, I would attempt to answer them at this time."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. Discussion. The ah.. question, the question is. Ah.. Mr. Sangmeister."

Sangmeister: "Ah.. there was a bill in here and maybe it was once upon a time that made us keep an accounting of it but we didn't have to report it publicly. Is there any accounting in this bill now at all? Two hundred and fifty is the limit and we don't have to worry about anything under that?"

Collins: "Oh, yes. Ah.. there.. the bill requires an exact accounting of all monies received or expended in excess of \$10."

Sangmeister: "In excess of \$10. But we won't have to report anything over \$250, is that.."

Collins: "You'll report anything ah.. that totals over \$250 in the aggregate."

Sangmeister: "Oh, I see."

Collins: "It is aggregate."



3.

Sangmeister: "All right. Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "Further discussion? Ah.. Mr. ah.. Shea?"

Shea: "I just want to explain my vote."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. Mr. Craig."

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

W. Robert Blair: "Okay."

Craig: "Phil, now, if you have this campaign fund and I'm required to specify to say the campaign is coming up and I want to help some precinct committeemen that I have to deathly specific and show.. keep record of where this money and what committeeman would get it. And how much?"

Collins: "You have to keep that record for yourself, yes. However, it is not subject to public disclosure unless it exceeds \$250."

Craig: "Now is that to each individual? Now, I know about the \$250. But I mean when I'm expending.. spending this money.."

Collins: "It would be each individual expenditure."

Craig: "And I've got to name who it is and how much?"

Collins: "Yes, yes. That's correct. If it's over \$250. Now, if you've given that precinct committeeman \$50, you'll have a record of it yourself but it will not be reportable."

Craig: "If I do what now?"

Collins: "You mentioned if you give a precinct committeeman some money ah.. to assist you in your campaign. If that



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

4.

amount is under \$250, you do not have to report it."

W. Robert Blair: "Further discussion. Mr. Tuerk."

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

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

Tuerk: "Phil, let's assume that 50 people donate \$5 a piece.

That's \$250 in the aggregate. And yet individual donations are under \$10."

Collins: "Yes, there would be no report and as a matter of fact there would not necessarily be any record. I'm sure you would keep a record of it but you wouldn't be required under the bill. I should point out though that you will be required to report your total contributions received whether it's by name or not. You will report a total."

Tuerk: "What was that again? I didn't catch it."

Collins: "Part of the bill will require you to report the total contribution you received which is the purpose of your record keeping although you don't have to disclose the individual contributions or expenditures unless they exceed \$250 in the aggregate."

Tuerk: "Well, in other words if.. if they exceed, say for instance I have a campaign going and I get \$500 for my campaign. All right? Do I have to disclose each and every contributor because it exceeds the \$250 aggregate?"

Collins: "No. No. No. As a matter of fact, if \$500 is all you received in your campaign, you wouldn't have any obligation at all because the bill deals with



5.

campaigns who receive or expend in excess of \$1,000."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "Ah.. Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the sponsor yield to a question?"

W. Robert Blair: "Yes."

Barnes: "Phil, I'm kind of confused. Ah.. if a ah.. for campaign purposes, a person gave a fund raising affair and say the tickets were for sale for say, \$5 a piece. And 200 of them were sold. Would they have to report the names of each one of those persons."

Collins: "No. No. No, you wouldn't. As a matter of fact, all you'd have to report would be the total you received."

Barnes: "Just the total amount. Not the names of the individuals."

W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Berman."

Berman: "Mr. Collins, ah.. I refer to Section 9-23 about anonymous contributions."

Collins: "Yes."

Berman: "If you have a campaign headquarters open house.. if you have a campaign headquarters open house.. you open up your campaign headquarters and you have a hat or a bucket that people can come in and drop a buck into.. That's prohibited under this. Is that my understanding? Cause those are in effect anonymous.."

Collins: "Anonymous contributions are prohibited. That's right."



6.

SP 21 X

Ah.. I recognize the difficulty in ascertaining ah.. what is an anonymous contribution and where it came from and what to do with it. This is not something that I brought up myself. I accepted an amendment on the bill from the other side of the aisle. But you're right. Your supposition is correct."

Berman: "You know. This doesn't add up to much but every little bit helps. Couldn't we put some kind of a dollar figure or some kind of exclusion for that kind of anonymous contribution?"

Collins: "I don't know how. And as a matter of fact I think could open a huge loop hole if you did."

Berman: "I didn't hear you."

Collins: "I said I don't know how you could do it. And if you did, think you could open up a real loophole."

W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Question for the spnsor. Representative Collins? Representative Collins? What does happen under the provisions of the bill to anonymous contributions. Say somebody gives you ten picnics or something."

Collins: "The ah.. treasurer of your campaign committee is required to toward it to the State Treasury."

W. Robert Blair: "Ah.. Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Ah.. I would like to ask the sponsor an additional question. Does this bill provide as was amended to have uniform forms sent to the authority that it's going to the Election Board. Are they going to have forms sent to it?"



7.

Collins: "Yes. The bill provides for a notice to be given to all candidates of their obligation and as a matter of fact the amendment that we adopted this morning states that they will be sent by certified mail ah.. receipt requested to the addressee only."

Maragos: "Now, my question is ah.. is the Election Board or the authority that's going to sponsor.. handle this particular bill ah.. and these procedures are they going to have uniform accounting forms to be filed or does each one have his own statement to send in?"

Collins: "Yeh. See the State Board of Elections is to prepare all forms."

Maragos: "So, therefore, all reporting forms will be uniform and they will not be different from anybody else."

Collins: "That's right. They will be uniform."

Maragos: "And the effective date is October 1? The effective date is October 1?"

Collins: "No. The effective date is immediately upon becoming law. However, we are not required to ah.. file our organizational forms until October 1."

Maragos: "And this will be for this current campaign coming up then."

Collins: "That's correct. For state candidates. Not for local."

Maragos: "And the local, January 1, 1975?"

Collins: "That's right."

W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Day?"



8.

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

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

Day: "Phil, what are the penalties here for violation of the act?"

Collins: "It's Class A misdemeanor, which is \$1,000 and up to one year in jail."

Day: "That's.... that doesn't disqualify a candidate for violation of the act? He wouldn't be disqualified to hold office?"

Collins: "I'm not sure I heard you, Bob."

Day: "I say, a candidate who was in violation of the Act, would not be disqualified from holding office?"

Collins: "No, no he wouldn't."

Day: "It doesn't do that?"

Collins: "No, no, it does not."

Day: "Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Mugalian."

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

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yeow, he indicates he will."

Mugalian: "Ah.... take the situation of a township, ward or county party organization, and let's assume in one calendar year, it receives \$2500, but that all of that money is spent by the organization for its phone bill or getting election judges and doing the things that are merely related to maintaining the party organization, so that none of those funds are, in fact, expended in behalf of a candidate of that party. Will that township, ward or county



9.

organization have to file a report?"

Collins: "I.... I really think so, but that distinction has not been made. Ah... I think that is subject to interpretation. I... I ah... would think they would, but ah... really, that's a gray area that I'm not prepared to explore."

Mugalian: "Could you look at the language.... Would it be intended to cover it or not to cover it, because you can see....."

Collins: "It would be my intent and hope that that would be covered."

Mugalian: "Ah... according to your memorandum, I believe that it would not strictly be covered because the expenditures would not be in behalf of a candidate. It would merely be in behalf of keeping a party in business. Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Polk."

Polk: "Would the sponsor yield to a question? Mr. Collins, I have just a couple of questions on the loop-holes and as you point out, there are some loop-holes in the contributions that are anonymous, seems to be the biggest loop-hole that we have in this piece of legislation, and again, I'd like to summarize something that you've said. You've indicated that if a person receives a letter in the mail with a dollar in it and there's no return address, then that money must be returned to the State, or....given to the State, and what are the violations? What are the terms of the ah... fine if the person does not do this?"



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10.

Collins: "What is the fine did you say?"

Polk: "Yes."

Collins: "Up to ah.... let me read the penalty section to you. It calls for willful failure to file or willful filing of false or incomplete information required by this article shall constitute a Class A misdemeanor."

Polk: "Doesn't this really ah... set us up, set anybody up if I had an opponent that I didn't particularly like, couldn't I put \$2 in an envelope and send it to him, knowing full well he wouldn't return it to the State, and ah... I just...."

Collins: "I don't see how."

Polk: "Well, how could he... how could I prove that he got the \$2 or ah...."

Collins: "You're absolutely correct. This is not a Section that I put into the Bill and I ah... accepted it because the intent of the Amendment certainly ah... was laudible although I don't know how it could be enforced frankly."

Polk: "What does the ah... Federal legislation do in relation to ah... the Federal candidates in relation to anomomous gifts? Do you know?"

Collins: "Ah.... to the best of my recollection, I don't think it's included."

Polk: "O'kay, thank you."

Collins: "Representative Lundy is going to correct me, I believe."



11.

Lundy: "My understanding, Representative Polk, the Federal campaign spending reporting legislation is that cash contributions can't be made at all."

Collins: "Again, I don't think it says anything in the Federal law about anonomous and I frankly don't remember the Section that he mentions on cash contributions. It might have been a later amendment since we looked at the original Federal Bill."

Polk: "Well, ah..., Representative Lundy's comment said it can't be made; that doesn't mean it can't be done, and ah... Representative Lundy states that it can't be done, but that still doesn't prohibit a person from putting a ten dollar bill in a envelope and sending it to a Congressman, and ah... so apparently the law is not very well written or defined there either, in relation to this particular problem apparently."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mr. McAuliffe. Oh, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Mrs. Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, will the Sponsor yield to a question? Ah... there is nothing preventing cash contributions as long as they are reported in your Bill. Is that correct?"

Collins: "That is correct."

Geo-Karis: "At this time, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to speak on the Bill. Many of us committed ourselves to meaningful disclosure Bills. It's about time we were honest with the public which we represent and pass a good, meaningful disclosure Bill as this



12.

one is. I think this is an open Bill. It will tell exactly what we're going to spend and what we're going to collect and from whom, and I think the public is entitled to and I think we have a duty to support one that is at least, is... not only meaningful, but is one that is easier to understand than some of the others that have been filed in this Assembly, and I would like to suggest along with that to the Sponsors that the State Board of Elections makes a very meaningful back seat once this Bill is passed, so we will not have any trouble about it and I would like to urge everyone to support this meaningful disclosure Bill. We owe it to ourselves. We owe it to the integrity of the parties we represent and the People from our Districts."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question? Ah...

Representative Collins, I want to make sure, so that I don't get into trouble and nobody on this House floor gets in trouble, and I want to make sure I understand very clearly what a State Representative has got to do, because ah... I'm thinking about the people, where the people nominate somebody in a primary or elect them and then ah... we find that that person, for example, couldn't take office because he didn't file a piece of paper. We want to make sure that doesn't happen. I almost didn't file my Ethics Statement, because I thought I had filed it, and I did when I filed my petition, and then the Speaker's Office



13
or somebody you know, reminded me and I finally filed one. I wouldn't be on the ballot, so I'm concerned that we understand what we have to do, and I was wondering if you could just capsulize for a State Representative, what is this Bill require that we do? I have heard that there's several different reporting dates, and I want to make sure I have it clear in my mind what dates they are and what I have to do."

Collins: "You will be required to make a report of all contributions that you have received in the aggregate in excess of \$250, thirty days prior to the primary and 60 days after. Another report of contributions would be made 30 days prior to the General Election and 60 days afterwards. You would, in July, make an annual report, which would give the total of your contributions received in that 12 month period and the expenditures that you've made in excess of \$250 in the aggregate during that year."

Deuster: "That's all?"

Collins: "Yes. And we have written into the Bill procedures whereby the Election Authority, with which you file, will notify you by certified mail 30 days prior to the filing date of your obligation to file."

Deuster: "Fine, ah.... And what happens if I'm late? What happens if I'm running, I'm so busy running for election and I don't have a staff, I don't have a committee, I'm just running and I'm a few days late getting that report in. What would be the affect?"



14.

Collins: "Well, ah.... your... you are technically in violation at that point, but the Bill does call for a willful violation, and it would be rather difficult to establish willful violation in the case that you describe. However, you will have ample time. You're going to be notified 30 days prior to the filing date of your obligation, so ah.... and the ah... Election Authority will enclose the prescribed form, so it... it will not... I don't think it will put an undue burden on you to file in time and we have provided for the State Board of Elections to provide a manual of instructions for you at the same time."

Deuster: "I want to ask this question to make it clear. I would not be disqualified from holding office?"

Collins: "No you wouldn't."

Deuster: "I'm told it's some kind of misdemeanor, but what are the range of penalties for that misdemeanor?"

Collins: "Up to \$1,000 fine and up to one year in jail."

Deuster: "Up to one year in jail. Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I do have a question for Phil, if... in the area of a township or ward organization that has to do with, as you know, the successful, hopeful successful campaigns of numbers of candidates, ah... on the whole ticket, for example, how would those candidates running on a ticket in November, for example, be treated, or how would they treat this Act as it relates to a township



15.

or ward organization and the monies expended in their behalf as far as precinct workers are concerned, literature and so forth. Would there be ah... a division of ah... the total amount of money that relates to the number of candidates and an average taken so that the candidates would have to report that income from the political organization, or would the organization report it as contributions to individuals, rather than to a slate of tickets.... slate of candidates?"

Collins: "I... I think it would be the candidates obligation to apportion their share of what they may have received from an organization such as you described. I don't know if you're talking about direct cash payment to the candidate, or if you're talking about the publishing of a brochure or this type of thing. I think the organization would report the money as expended upon printing of a brochure or some such ah... definition. I don't think the organization would be in a position of reporting by name so much to every candidate. I think it would be just a general expenditure to ABC Printing Company, but I do think the candidate would have the obligation of apportioning his portion of that as a receipt if it exceeded \$250."

Yourell: "Then, then what you're saying in affect is that there are ten candidates running on the Democratic ticket, or ten candidates running on the Republican ticket; then the organization would have to disclose to each of those candidates what they thought they had expended in their



16.

behalf, so that then the candidates could explore the ah... possibility if that figure was over \$250 to report that, so how do you equate ah... ~~precinct work~~, for example, of a precinct captain working on behalf of an entire ticket and how are you going to break that down as far as candidate's benefits are concerned from the organization? Wouldn't Amendment No. 11 have handled that?"

Collins: "I... I don't know that you can break down the value of ah... manual human effort on your behalf and I don't think this would be the intent. Ah... I think that money expended on the precinct captains obviously ah... would be under the Bill and would be reportable if it exceeded \$250. But ah... I do think that we get into an area here where ground rules are going to have to be established through experience, and I think the State Board of Elections will be responsible for establishing a lot of these rules and procedures."

Yourell: "So, what you're saying that, for example, if ah... I, as a Committeemen of a Township organization, expended \$20,000 in the General Election on behalf of all the candidates who are running on the Democratic ticket, that then, I would have to determine as the organization head, or of the committee that I appoint to handle these funds, which in all possibilities will be myself, how much I'm expending to each of the candidates on the ticket? No?"

Collins: "No, I don't think so."

Yourell: "Thank you."



17.

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ah.... Mr. Joe Gibbs."

Gibbs: "Well, Phil, I think most of my questions were answered concerning the penalties that are involved, which is a Class A misdemeanor. I think Representative Polk asked about if he sent in an anonymous \$2, as I read the original Act, ah... he'd have to spend about a year in jail if he did that. Has that been changed? In other words, you can't make anonymous contributions, can you?"

Collins: "No."

Gibbs: "So, that's prohibited? It still is."

Collins: "It is prohibited under the Bill, yes."

Gibbs: "All right, now, what was your answer, I didn't catch it about cash contributions? Can they be made?"

Collins: "Yes, yes, there is no prohibition on cash contributions."

Gibbs: "So if someone gave \$5,000 in cash, then they could break it down and say that they received it in cash from ah.... so many people, but it was under \$250. Isn't that right?"

Collins: "You mean if a number of people got together to arrange \$5,000 for you?"

Gibbs: "Or just say that one person wanted to give \$5,000 and then they broke it down into less than \$250?"

Collins: "Oh, no, it's the aggregate. If one person gave you \$5,000, that would be reportable no matter how many installments he made it in."



18.

Gibbs: "Yeow, but if they did it in cash, and then they put it on the report and it came in \$200 increments, ah... there's no way you could show it or prove it, is there, unless you could actually show that the contribution was made."

Collins: "I'm sure I can't stop anybody from cheating, but it would be a violation."

Gibbs: "Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Phil. Will the Sponsor yield for a question? Right here, right behind you. Phil, I understand the Bill goes into effect October 1, right?"

Collins: "It goes into effect immediately upon becoming law. However, you are under no requirement to file your forms with the State until October 1."

Mahar: "Well, if the.... if the State sends me out a 30 day notice, I won't be filing anything for November.... What will I do for the November Election?"

Collins: "The November Election?"

Mahar: "Yes."

Collins: "You ah.... you will file your organization, your political committee on October 1."

Mahar: "But I will not file ah... any income prior to October 1?" Is that covered in the Bill?"

Collins: "No, ah... only what you receive after the Bill becomes law."



JUN 13 1974

19.

Mahar: "Which... after it becomes law, which could be in July or August sometime, right?"

Collins: "Right."

Mahar: "All right, thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand in opposition of House Bill 2825, and I'll tell you why, because this Bill is strictly for the wealthy as far as running for public office in my personal opinion. If you're a wealthy individual and you say for example you have \$10,000 to use to run for public office, ten or it can even be up to a hundred thousand, all I have to do is on a personal basis, contact the respective party leaders and the precinct committeemen in downstate that are elected, and in turn make a personal contribution to each and every one of them and not one dollar would have to be recorded. Just as long as the dollar amount is less than \$250. In my personal opinion, this Bill is a complete facade Did you hear me Phil? Number 2, as far as the political organizations that are covered, make no mistake, you are covered, you'll have to be reporting five times a year. Number 3, the penalties on this Bill is a Class A misdemeanor, and to answer Representative Deuster's question, as a candidate, and I think as a candidate, you'll probably want to appoint yourself as Treasurer, because nobody else will want to take the job, and if you've, God forbid you



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

20.

make a mistake, you're going to be spending one year in prison, and if you're spending one year in prison, you cannot serve on this floor. And I would hope you'd vote 'no'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ah.... Mr. Richard Walsh."

Walsh: "Would the gentleman yield, please?"

Collins: "Yes."

Walsh: "Phil, ah.... the report that is due 30 days before the Primary, ah... what period does that cover?"

Collins: "The preceding 12 months."

Walsh: "Well, in other words, you're going to have to include in your report, ah.... which is due at midnight on that date, anything you've received during that day?"

Collins: "Up to the prior day, yes."

Walsh: "Well, in... I mean your income tax return is due on April 15 for the prior year. This report is due 30 days prior to the election for every minute up to the time you actually file it, which doesn't give you any time to prepare the report and get it filed."

Collins: "Yeow, I'm afraid you're right, although the form provided would just indicate where, you'd have to add a space that day, but you are right."

Walsh: "It would seem to me that that is a fatal defect, ah... in the Bill and it should be corrected before we ah... act on it, because the reporting period cannot and should not include the day on which you report."



21.

Collins: "I don't believe it covers the day you report, Dick, I think it's up to the day before you report."

Walsh: "Well, as I understand it, it would include the day you report, but even if it were up to the day before you report, it still isn't time to prepare it and get it filed."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support this Legislation as the co-sponsor thereof. Sure, there's many changes that need to be made, and that could be made. I, for one, feel that we should have left the Bill in its original form, or reporting over \$100 rather than \$250. However, we must make a start someplace. I also felt that we should have a ceiling, a limit that any one person or corporation or union could contribute to a candidate. This can be rectified in the future. We should start out, if we're going to pass any legislation, this one obviously is the most likely vehicle. Let's pass this good legislation and come back later after we have seen how it worked in a year or two and make the necessary changes. I encourage you to support this Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm ashamed to vote for this Bill and I'm afraid to vote against it. Logically I should vote 'present' or hide in the washroom, but I have felt that either of



22.

those postures is a little bit too mug-wampish for my constituency, so I shall, with great reluctance and a minimum of pride, cast an 'aye' vote for this Bill. In so doing, I will be as guilty as the other 100 or so that vote for it of a craving submission to the news media hysteria in this particular case. Hysteria's not a good word, their obsession. This is not in response to any genuine public concern. The public is smart enough to know, that it can separate the crooks and the thieves from the dedicated public servants with the existing laws that are already on the statute book. It doesn't need any self indictment or any beating of the legislators over the head by themselves. It's a bit of anomaly in the State of Illinois in the year of the Lottery that all at once we feel the necessity to point out how simon pure and clean each of us is. It's a contradiction, and it's a happy fact to note in this particular year, that the public won't let its servants hang themselves in nooses, the servants have foolishly constructed. We have evidence of that in the last few days, the effort to throw out so many people off the ballot. You notice the hew and cries from the very same papers that were demanding the original disclosure statements. We think that's a happy situation. I want to concur with one of the prior speaker's who pointed out that this will benefit not the poor candidate, but the rich. And already in the 54th District, you either have to be



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

23.

either a millionaire or have very trusting bankers, lenders who will lend you money at nine and a half percent plus points, to seek public office. The effect of this Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen, will be to dry up for the all present time to come, the availability of the money, because those trusting friends who give you a few dollars to run for office, have a passion for anonymity, and they don't want their names spread over your books or over the public's books as having contributed to your cause, and I hope that all the good people in my district will get their contributions in a long time before this Bill takes effect, because of that reality of life. I'm going to vote for it. I urge every one of you here to vote for it. If we have 177 votes, we will have created a situation, I think there's a Latin phrase, my scholarly friend, Caravello knows the phrase, it's *reductio ad absurdum*. So we have a 177 to zero, and that's... perhaps we can come back here in a year and re-examine the question and take this terrible bill off the books at that time. But for the present time, the noncourageous, but practical thing is to vote it on our backs, and I'll vote 'aye'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in reply to the last speaker, rather than let him vote against his conscious, I think he should adopt a latin phrase, *illegitimatta non carbarendum*."



24.

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Collins: "Yeow."

Shea: "Phil, what if you don't file under this? You just neglect to or just refuse to?"

Collins: "That is covered under the penalty section, willful failure to file."

Shea: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear the...."

Collins: "That would be willful failure to file and would be covered in the penalty section of the Bill."

Shea: "All right, now, who has to file under this Bill?"

Collins: "Who has to file?"

Shea: "That's correct."

Collins: "All.... all ah.... all political committees, which will receive ah... over \$1,000 or will expend in excess of \$1,000 for a candidate in opposition to a candidate or in support or opposition of some proposal on the ballot."

Shea: "All right, what if you don't keep any records?"

Collins: "Well, I would assume that would be willful violation."

Shea: "All right, now, as I understand this, this applies to every candidate that's required to file an Ethics statement, is that correct?"

Collins: "It was ah... originally introduced that way, but then we ah.... established a \$1,000 threshold to take out people such as non-paying offices, school boards, etc., where they're not spending that kind of money on a campaign."



25.

Shea: "Where did that get into the Bill? I didn't see that one."

Collins: "That was in Amendment 6."

Shea: "Where in the Bill is it now?"

Collins: "Well, it's in the definition."

Shea: "Well, does that mean that local candidates that make in excess of \$1,000 a year must file under this?"

Collins: "Yes, next year."

Shea: "All right, let's take in the village of Riverside, where our trustees, I think, make a \$1,000 a year or \$1,200....."

Collins: "Oh, no, it's not salary. It's those that receive campaign contributions or make campaign expenditures in excess of \$1,000."

Shea: "Well, then, who's required.... what people are required is a Member.... is a person that runs for the School Board required to file under this Act?"

Collins: "If he spends over \$1,000 in campaign expenditures or receives over \$1,000 in campaign contributions, yes."

Shea: "Well, what if.... you know, my question goes something like this, Phil. Candidates for the School Board file with the local schools. That's where they file their nominating petition. Now, will our schools then have to send to these candidates the forms and the information within forty-eight hours after their filing, that they're required under this Act and subject to this Act?"



26.

Collins: "They can give them to them in person at the time of filing or mail them to them."

Shea: "All right, but they're required to do it. Is that correct?"

Collins: "Pardon me?"

Shea: "They, the schools will be required to do this to the candidates, and candidates running for the school board will be required to keep detailed records in case they collect over \$1,000."

Collins: "I didn't hear the last part of it, but the Authority, the Election Authority with which you file will....."

Shea: "That's the School Board."

Collins: "All right, then they will make available to you the form."

Shea: "All right, then, a candidate that runs for the School Board, will have to keep detailed financial records of any income or expenditures, and if he expends over a \$1,000, he will have to report it. Is that correct?"

Collins: "Yes."

Shea: "All right, now, these are the same people that are required under the governmental Ethic Act to file now. Is that correct?"

Collins: "Yes."

Shea: "All right, then, with regards to local candidates, they file their petitions with the local county or local city clerk. Is that correct?"



27.

Collins: "Yes."

Shea: "All right, so each municipal clerk throughout the State of Illinois, will now be required to furnish to candidates for public office this information."

Collins: "The state board furnishes the forms. They will be disseminated at the point of filing. Yes."

Shea: "And then the candidates that run for each local office will be required to keep detailed financial statements. Is that correct?"

Collins: "Yes, if they go over the \$1,000 threshold."

Shea: "Well, no, you got to kind of keep the records don't you, to make sure you don't get over the thousand?"

Collins: "Well, I would assume that anyone who is going to go over that threshold or near it, will be keeping records, yes."

Shea: "All right, so that we will be required to do this at the local, the county and then for our State candidates at the Board of Elections. Is that right?"

Collins: "Yes, it is."

Shea: "All right, now let's take a trustee in the Village of Riverside, who runs for an office that is a non-paying office, but he's still elected. And we had a very hotly contested contest out there last time for two trustees and I'm sure they expended over \$2,500, but it was a committee. Now this Committee would have to go through all this. Is that correct?"



28.

Collins: "Oh, yes."

Shea: "All right, if that Committee, you know, didn't really know about all this law and everything, could either one of these trustees or whoever was collecting the money, would they be subject to a thousand dollar fine and a year in jail?"

Collins: "If they did what?"

Shea: "If they didn't report this, would they be subject to a thousand dollar fine or a year in jail?"

Collins: "You mean, if they disregarded the law willfully, ah...."

Shea: "If they disregarded the law similar to the 2,000 people who have failed to file their Ethics Statements at this time?"

Collins: "Yes, and that's why we're being so careful to provide that they be given notice, and I understand we have a Bill coming up that will provide for notice for the candidates under the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act, too."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to speak to the Bill. I full-well wanted to support this Bill until I sat down and went through it and read it, and then I started to think, and I think Roscoe Cunningham put it so very aptly. Are we going to worry about what people think or are we going to do the right thing? We passed an Ethics Act out of this House some



29.

three years ago. Last year, we extended the time for filing for over 2,000 candidates, 30 days after an extension. This year again, we find ourselves with 2,000 people on a state-wide basis that haven't filed these Ethics Statements, and what we're going to do with this Bill is subject a large number of people throughout the State for inadvertance, mistakes or unwillingly knowing up to a thousand dollar fine or a year in jail. What we're saying to a lot of states attorneys and attorney generals throughout the State is take your pick, if you want to go get somebody, you've got a good vehicle in this campaign disclosure law. I think we better look and see what we're doing out here this morning, cause you're going to put a lot of people, a lot of innocent people in a position where they could go to jail for a long time. I'm full-well interested in passing a Disclosure Law and I think you and I sit out here on the floor of this House, we're going to know what's in this Bill, we're going to know how to report, because we're sitting here, and every state-wide candidate will know, but let me tell you, there's going to be a lot of people in a lot of small towns, there's going to be a lot of people running for school boards, there's going to be a lot of people throughout the State, that don't know what this Bill is going to do. I think you're opening up the door to put a lot of people in jail, because this Bill has got a lot of cosmetics, a lot of public relations and not a lot of substance."



30.

W. Robert Blair: "All right. Mr. Holloway."

Holloway: "Will the sponsor yield for a question? I assume that most candidates will ah.. have a committee. And assuming there's a violation, who will be responsible. Will the candidate ultimately be responsible?"

Collins: "The individual officially designated as the treasurer is the responsible person. But the candidate can operate as his own treasurer."

Holloway: "But the real person who will bear the brunt will be the treasurer of the committee."

Collins: "That's correct."

W. Robert Blair: "Mr. D'Arco."

D'Arco: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the previous question."

W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor of the gentleman's motion say 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins, to close."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I very briefly in asking for the support of your bill will point out that we've been done this road many times over the last three years. I think that this is a bill that is long overdue. One that the Speaker and I have and many others have worked many hours in putting into shape a bill that I think is a meaningful attempt at a real campaign disclosure legislation. And



31.

at the same time one that does not put a burden unnecessarily upon any individual. Ah.. ~~alot of smoke~~ ~~has~~ been raised here today about the potential dangers to people under this bill. And I say that there are no dangers to anyone unless those who willfully violate this act. This bill gives the board wide discretion ah.. as to correcting mistakes, legal procedures other than criminal procedures. Ah.. the boards may go into circuit court to seek civil remedies to compel compliance with orders of this board. This is not merely a criminal charge ah.. being lodged or nothing. There are many remedies under this bill. It's been said that there's no public outcry for this bill and I don't know that there is or not. However, I don't think that that makes any difference. I think the issue before us is what's right. I think the public expects and has every right to expect to know how we're getting our money to run for office and from where we're getting it. Maybe the fact that there's no public outcry means that the people are just so fed up with all of us that they're too tired to stir up any more clamor. I think it's time that we start cleaning up our own house. Let's open up the books and show that in the large, great majority of cases, those who run for office have absolutely nothing to hide. And I think that this bill will take a long giant step in that direction. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I would urge the passage of House Bill 2825."



JUN 13 1974

32.

W. Robert Blair: "Question is shall House Bill 2825 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. All right. Now then. Mr. Dee?"

Dee: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I, too want ethics legislation. I'm very much interested in it. But when I stop and think that every candidate is going to have to make five reports, I would like to explain to you my vote. You are going to dry up in every township, for every school board, for every office in this state, the candidates who offer themselves. You're not going to be able to find a committee treasurer. You're going to have the candidate himself who's going to have to act as his own treasurer. You're going to dry up the source of the most competent and the most willing and the most dedicated workers because you're offering them \$1,000 fine and or a year in jail. I cannot vote for a bill that will put the burden on the public-spirited citizens offering themselves free of compensation to work for their community in the event that someone has enough enthusiasm to raise \$1,000 to espouse their candidacy. I urge you gentlemen to reconsider your green lights. I urge you to vote against this bill. Not against ethics legislation, but against a meaningful bill where one report a year might do it. I urge you a 'no' vote."

W. Robert Blair: "AH.. Mr. Craig."

Craig: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'd like to make



33.

a few comments on this bill and explain my vote. I've been down here for a few years and it wasn't too long ago.. a few years back that we made it possible for secretarial help and administrative aid. But we had to go clear out of our way to make it so our mothers or fathers, brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, cousins, and nephews could not be our aides. Making ourselves out, if you please, from the township on up as far as you can go. We discriminated not only against ourselves but our entire families. I don't like to feel that I'm any better than anybody but I want you all to know that I feel that about as good any of you or anybody else. Number one, I don't think that law.. that legislation would even stand up in the courts and I'm no attorney. Because if that isn't discrimination, I don't know what is. But that wasn't enough. We come along with ethics statement. And we got to file. And I've had the Secretary of State send me many of those pink slips that he sends probably many of you people. And I don't mind them to go check my ethics statement. But when it says, there's a little place on there that says about reasons why. And I've had about five or six. And what was their reason? Curious. Now that's all they want time to do. I think you ought to have to pay to check those statements. A five or a ten dollar fee. I don't know what it costs to do that and take that time. But if they don't have any more business down there than just being



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

34.

curious or searching I think they ought.. For doing these things. And on these ethics statements, if you please, we in my area, a lot of good men have been knocked off of school boards, junior college boards, sanitary districts because they may work in a bank where the funds are deposited when they bid on these funds. You've taken a lot of good men out of office that will not subject themselves, if you please, to this kind of treatment. Now then, the press, if you please, I haven't had letters insisting from the people that I represent that this should be done. The press seems to be wanting to do it. So why don't someone put an amendment on here that the press cannot embarrass any candidate for office of any political party. If you want to talk about ethics and things that are right or wrong, who has any more influence on the rank and fire people than the press. Why should they have the right when you have to pay for the publicity that you buy per square column inch. But they can come out with a full page, editorial page blasting you, me or anyone else that they so desire. And what right do they have to determine whether you should be sitting in the halls of this General Assembly. And I want you to know that the things that I've mentioned, I can't say for one of those things that the people have been really too proud of the things that we've taken action on in the past. And I think you're doing only more things to put yourself in a bad light and also a lot

SP X



35.

of other people. And I'm going to vote 'no'."

W. Robert Blair: "Mr. McCormick. Mr. McCormick."

McCormick: "Mr. ah.. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Now, you know that I'm going to vote 'aye' on this bill but I guess it's because I was going to become a real private citizen this year and maybe I want to say that I want all of my public officials to be real open and honest. I don't know what I would do if I were running for re-election because I wouldn't know how in the world I'd find anybody who'd be silly enough to be my treasurer. But after looking over this bill, I'd like to ask the Speaker and the fellow member, Brother Collins, down there.. I think there's one thing that you have left out of this bill that is very vital. I didn't see any place in the bill for the authorization for a new minimum security institution in southern Illinois to handle the violations from this bill. I want to, on the floor of this House today tell you that you should have a bill also in for a \$20,000,000 institution to be located in the Ozarks of southern Illinois where they could have beautiful weather and real good education while they're institutionalized and I offer you the land free of charge if you add the \$20,000,000 appropriation to build it. Thank you. I vote 'aye'."

W. Robert Blair: "Ah.. Mr. Hart."

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



36.

want to second ah.. my running ah.. 59th District Legislative made in that imitation. But I want to say to the newer members of the House that I was here when we voted in the law requiring the filing of the ethics statement. And we heard the same objections on the Floor of the House then as we're hearing now about drying up the number of candidates. And as far as I know, there isn't anybody in Illinois that didn't file for office because of the fact that they had to file an ethics statement. Whatever reason they had for not filing it probably would be as numerable as there are those who didn't file. This bill isn't perfect. I guess the only perfect bill would be one that the sponsor draws himself. But I want to tell the Members of this House, that I, in the primary, disclosed all of the contributions to my campaign from 1 cent up. And I got more contributions than I ever did before. I made it known before any contributions were received that I was going to do this and some of them thought I didn't mean it. And they tinted it under the conditions that I wouldn't report it. I rejected it and many of them then went ahead and gave it to me and said go ahead and report it. But I did receive more contributions to my campaign by having said that I was going to disclose all of them than I ever did before. The issue on the floor of this House is are you for ethics in government or are you against it? If you're for it, vote yes. If you're against it, get up



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

37.

and say so."

W. Robert Blair: "Ah.. Mr. Epton."

Epton: "Well, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. C. L. McCormick has raised a problem which has bothered many of us and my good seatmate, Mahar of Homewood, came up with the appropriate answer to his point. He has a friend, an ex-convict of bankrupt serving in Joliet now for a long term and he intends to use him as treasurer of his campaign committee. That should solve some of the problems."

W. Robert Blair: "AH.. Mr. Douglas."

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

W. Robert Blair: "Now, let's wait a minute.. Let's get the understanding. I'm going back and forth. Republican, Democrat, Republican, Democrat, okay?"

Douglas: "Those who are speaking against this bill on the grounds that it won't work are failing to recognize that the credibility of the American political system is at stake today as it has never been before. Watergate is at the national level. Scandals in our own state. And in various municipalities in the state have drawn more attention than ever before in history to the one problem of campaign spending. As others have said, there cannot be any perfect bill. And I'm perfectly willing to admit that no matter what we pass, the real crooks probably will attempt to get away with violating the law



38.

anyhow. One speaker earlier said, that what we're doing with this bill is putting a lot of people in jeopardy because they won't know about it. Well it's high time that we recognize that those who don't know about it better find out about it. Because the public is demanding that something be done about this issue above all issues. This is what the Watergate Scandal is all about. And since the credibility of politicians is at an all time low, we owe it to our constituents to show our sincerity in at least making an attempt to start eliminating one of the greatest evils in the American electoral system. Watergate has made a mockery of this system. We are constantly having to apologize to people all over the world for this one single issue. As Representative Hart said earlier, if you really mean business, you better get on this bill. It's going to be awfully hard to explain your.. (tape failure).... when after election or at election time you end up having a red light. We need these votes and I ask that everyone vote green."

W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Borchers. Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and fellow members of the House, I want you to recollect that when ah.. the election commission first held their first meeting, they said that the county chairmen would ah.. replace ah.. or re ah.. replum the ballot, the members of the legislature that have been removed because they failed to file their ethics



39.

statement. But the newspaper, the news media, including my newspaper, the Chicago ones all jumped immediately onto the commission for taking this position and said they were cowards. And at that time, last Friday, as I recollect they were really forced by public.. by newspaper opinion to hold another meeting. As a result of that meeting, they completely reversed themselves and some 500 to God-knows-how-many ah.. people running for office in this state are off the ballot and if they take the extreme view, they cannot even be replaced. Some other person will be put on the ballot instead of the ones that were nominated in the various primaries. Now, I can easily foresee and since I never have the support of my local newspaper I don't care whether they like it or not because ah.. I can say what I think. I feel that over this state, the same newspapers that forced the commission to take the action that they did and change a position will immediately be singling out anyone of us or the thousands of individuals running for the various offices in the State of Illinois to see if they've completely complied with a very difficult to comply with in relation to the various reports....."

W. Robert Blair: "Okay, you're time's up."

Borchers: "I'm certain they they will take advantage of this and many people will be fined a thousand dollars or under. I don't fear so much of jail but I think we should be very careful what we do. I vote 'no'."



40.

W. Robert Blair: "Ah.. Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, very briefly. I'd like to address myself to those of you not voting green. And I'd like to do this by sharing with you the results of a questionnaire that I submitted to people in my district. I agree that those previous speakers have said that they've had very little correspondence from people asking for ethics legislation. But if you take the time and the trouble to send out a questionnaire, I think that your results would be similiar to those that I've received. Now those people responding to this questionnaire on this issue, 89% of them send yeah that the elected state officials should be required to disclose their campaign contributions. I would like to help you people be re-elected next fall, those of you not voting green and suggest that you reconsider."

W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, I'd like to explain my yes vote. I visited with the lobbyist from H. and R. Block and they feel that they are going to open 200 branch offices and as you know I'm always for the economic welfare of the community and keep people off the unemployment rolls and that's the reason I'm voting 'yes'."

W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Giglio."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't know. I've looked at a piece of legislation



41.

like this and I've wondered back in my mind just what some of our founders of our constitution are doing. To me, they've got to be rolling over in their graves. I look and think about some of the things I've read in the history books. Some of the things that I've when I went to school. Perhaps maybe if I went to college maybe I'd be voting green instead of what I'm going to vote. And I'm wondering where or what's left of that so-called American dream when somebody works hard such as myself and a lot of others and they get to the point in life when they have a little money and their family's well on their way and they come down to do some good and serve in public life and then they find out that there's going to be a law that they've got to reveal of all the things, of all the money, where they get it and what they're going to do. Well, I truthfully don't believe that it's nobody's business no more is it mine for where somebody gets theirs and what they do with it. For those who want to reveal what they do or how they get their money, God bless them and more power to them. But I don't believe it should be mandatory that it has to be revealed. And I'm not ashamed or scared to say exactly just the way I believe. Because I don't know what it's coming to or where it's going to lead to. But I don't think this is going to help anymore than the 10 greatest laws that's been put on the book thousands of years



Blair: "Ah.. Mr. Brinkmeier."

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House, very
I'd like to address myself to those of you
ing green. And I'd like to do this by sharing
ou the results of a questionnaire that I submitted
le in my district. I agree that those previous
s have said that they've had very little correspondence
ople asking for ethics legislation. But if you
ve time and the trouble to send out a questionnaire,
that your results would be similiar to those that
ceived. Now those people responding to this
naire on this issue, 89% of them send yeah that
cted state officials should be required to
e their campaign contributions. I would like to
u people be re-elected next fall, those of you
ing green and suggest that you reconsider."

Blair: "Mr. Deavers."

Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, I'd
explain my yes vote. I visited with the lobbyist
and R. Block and they feel that they are going
200 branch offices and as you know I'm always
economic welfare of the community and keep people
unemployment rolls and that's the reason I'm
'yes'."

Blair: "Mr. Giglio."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
I don't know. I've looked at a piece of legislation

42.

ago. Within that age and now in the future they're going to try to get around them just like they have been. And I'm more than proud to say that for what we've seen and what we've heard about the things that are going on in the press, you're not going to make me believe that just because there's one bad apple that the whole bushel is bad."

W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Totten."

sp^y Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to explain my vote. I was quite tearful over this legislation when it came through the Elections Committee and I did vote no. I spent some time working with the sponsors on some amendments which were adopted. But I am still fearful of one portion of this bill. And that is that it may seriously affect those who voluntarily participate and donate money to political organizations. I think that the thing that has made this country great, is those people who have voluntarily become a part of the political system by donating their time and their dollars. I fear that portions of this bill may discourage and probably will discourage those people from continuing their participation. I think this is dangerous to our system. I think that we really want it to operate on voluntary participation. However, some of those fears I have allayed by some of the work we've done on some of the amendments. And at this time with some reluctance though and hopeful that this will work out in the way



43.

that the sponsors intend it to, I do intend to vote 'aye'."

W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? Mr. Day, did you want to talk?"

Day: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know that the sponsors of this bill have put in many, many long hours in trying to work out the problems that are involved with campaign reporting. And ah.. I think that as a campaign reporting bill this is a good one. Ah.. so it isn't any reluctance on my part ah.. to ah.. or any criticism of the bill itself. However, ah.. we have the experience behind us now of the ah.. financial disclosure statements which are ethics bill. And in each of the elections that they have applied to, we have found that there are serious defects in the ah.. financial disclosure bill. So we are considering and have considered in the past of doing something which I think is a very unethical thing, and that is to pass legislation which excuses those who feel to comply with the ethics law. This is not fair to the candidates who have ah.. complied with the law and who disclosed their financial interests well in advance of the election and within the time prescribed by law. Now I think that the worst thing, the worst thing that this House could do would be to pass an ethics law and then not enforce it or to enforce it....."

W. Robert Blair: "AH.. You ran out of time!! All right. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk, the Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 136 'ayes',



JUN 13 1974

44.

21 'nays', four present. This bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."



75
228
11/11/74
Duplex

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Richard Walsh."

Walsh: "Ah.. I understand Representative Skinner is available to answer some questions on the fiscal impact?"

Arthur Telcser: "Yes, he is."

Walsh: "As you recall in the Revenue Committee ah.. there was some testimony as to the fiscal impact of this bill and ah.. I just wanted to clarify for the membership ahh.. what is the amount of money, the additional expenditure, at the current level, will you reduce it to 4%?"

Skinner: "We estimate that the 20.5 million dollar expenditure during this fiscal year will rise to 29 million dollars next year which is precisely the amount that was appropriated for Senior Citizens Tax Relief under the Circuit-Breaker Program for the last two fiscal years."

Walsh: "Well that doesn't answer my question. Your assuming a 45% participation, I believe. Well what ah.. ah.. are you saying then that there is an additional 50% of whatever had been made expended?"

Skinner: "It's approximately 45 to 50, yes."



Arthur Telcser: "Let's go to Senate Bill 98."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 98. A Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Arthur Telcser: "Are there amendments on the floor? Third Reading."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1		Speaker Blair	House in order.
1		Dr. Johnson	Invocation
1		Speaker Blair	Roll for Attendance
2		" "	Committee Reports
2		Clerk Selcke	Read Committee Reports
2		Speaker Blair	House Bills 3rd
2		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2561
2		Speaker Blair	
2		LaFleur	Out of record?
2		Speaker Blair	H.B. 2561-Out of record
2		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1114
3		Boyle	
3		Speaker Blair	
3		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 1115
3		Boyle	
3		Speaker Blair	H.B. 1114 & 1115 passed
3		Hoffman	
3		Speaker Blair	
4		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 2344
4		R. Hoffman	Explains H.B. 2344
4		Speaker Blair	
4		Leinenweber	Gentleman yield?
4		Speaker Blair	
5		Leinenweber)	Questions
5		Hoffman)	
6		Leinenweber	Opposes



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
6		Speaker Telcser	
6		Gibbs	
6		Speaker Telcser	
7		Gibbs)	Questions
7		Hoffman)	
7		Speaker Telcser	
7		Giglio	
7		Speaker Telcser	
7		Borchers	
8		Speaker Miller	
8		Stone	
8		Speaker Miller	
8		Stone	
8		Speaker Miller	Keep noise level down
8		Stone	
8		Speaker Miller	Sounds better
9		Stone)	
9, 10		Hoffman)	
11		Speaker Miller	
11		Stone	
11		Speaker Miller	
12		Stone	
12		Speaker Miller	
12		Alsup	
13		Speaker Miller	
13		Neff	
13		Speaker Miller	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
13		Geo-Karis	Sponsor yield?
13		Speaker Miller	
14		Geo-Karis)	Discussion
14		Hoffman)	
14		Speaker Miller	
14		Calvo	
15		Speaker Miller	
15		Grotberg	Moves previous question
15		Speaker Miller	Previous question moved
15		Hoffman	Closes on H.B. 2344
16		Speaker Miller	H.B. 2344-vote
16		Hill	Explains vote
17		Speaker Miller	
17		Borchers	Explains vote
17		Speaker Miller	
17		Davis	Explains vote
18		Speaker Miller	
18		Walters	
18		Speaker Miller	
18		Hoffman	Explains
19		Speaker Miller	
19		Hunsicker	
19		Speaker Miller	
19		Deuster	
20		Speaker Miller	
20		Matijeivich	
21		Speaker Miller	H.B. 2344 passed



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
21		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 2365
21		Speaker Miller	
21		McClain	
21		Speaker Miller	
21		Palmer	Question
21		McClain	
22		Speaker Miller	
22		Beatty)	Questions H.B. 2365
)	
22		McClain)	Out of record
22		Speaker Miller	
22		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 2484
22		Speaker Miller	
22		Hoffman	
23		Speaker Miller	H.B. 2484 vote-passed
23		Speaker Blair	
23		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 2501
23		Speaker Blair	
23		Schneider	
24		Speaker Blair	
24		Tim Simms)	Question
)	
24		Schneider)	
24		Simms	
25		Speaker Blair	
25		Bradley	
25		Speaker Blair	
25		Schneider	To close
25		Speaker Blair	H.B. 2501 - vote - passed



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
25		Bradley	Point of inquiry
25		Speaker Blair	
26		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 2541
26		Speaker Blair	
26		Grotberg	
27		Speaker Blair	
27		Lechowicz	Sponsor yield?
27		Speaker Blair	
27		Lechowicz)	Discussion
)	
27		Grotberg)	
28		Speaker Blair	H.B. 2825 back to 2nd
28		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 2825 Amendment #12
28		Collins	
28		Speaker Blair	Amendment #12 adopted
28		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 2825
28		Speaker Blair	
28		Collins	
28		Speaker Blair	
29		Sangmeister)	Questions
)	
29		Collins)	
29		Speaker Blair	
29		Shea	
29		Speaker Blair	
29		Craig	Sponsor question?
29		Speaker Blair	
29		Craig)	Discussion
)	
29		Collins)	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
29		Speaker Blair	
29		Tuerk	Sponsor yield?
29		Speaker Blair	
30		Tuerk)	Discussion
)	
30		Collins)	
30		Speaker Blair	
30		Barnes)	Sponsor yield?
)	
30		Collins)	
30		Speaker Blair	
31		Berman)	Discussion
)	
31		Collins)	
31		Speaker Blair	
31		Beaupre)	Questions sponsor
)	
31		Collins)	
31		Speaker Blair	
32		Maragos)	Questions
)	
32		Collins)	
32		Day	
32		Speaker Blair	
32		Day)	Questions
)	
32		Collins)	
33		Speaker Blair	
33		Mugalian	
33		Speaker Blair	
33		Mugalian)	Questions
)	
33		Collins)	
33		Speaker Blair	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
34		Polk)	Questions
34) Collins)	
34		Lundy	Explains answer
34		Collins)	Questions
34) Polk)	
35		Speaker Blair	
35		Geo-Karis	Sponsor yield?
35		Collins	
35		Geo-Karis	Speaks on Bill 2825
35		Speaker Blair	
35		Deuster)	Sponsor yield
36) Collins)	
37		Speaker Blair	
38		Yourell)	Question
38) Collins)	
38		Speaker Blair	
39		Gibbs)	
39) Collins)	
39		Speaker Blair	
39		Mahar)	Sponsor yield?
39) Collins)	
39		Speaker Blair	
40		Lechowicz	Opposes H.B. 2825
40		Speaker Blair	
40		R. Walsh	
40		Speaker Blair	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
41		R. Walsh)	Discussion
41) Collins)	
41		Speaker Blair	
41		Londrigan	Supports H.B. 2825
41		Speaker Blair	
42		Cunningham	
43		Speaker Blair	
43		Hirschfeld	
43		Speaker Blair	
44		Shea)	Sponsor yield?
45) Collins)	
46		Shea	Speaks to Bill
46		Speaker Blair	
47		Holloway)	Sponsor yield?
47) Collins)	
47		Speaker Blair	
47		D'Arco	Moves previous question
47		Speaker Blair	
47		Collins	To close
48		Speaker Blair	H.B. 2825 vote
48		Dee	Explains vote
48		Speaker Blair	
49		Craig	
50		Speaker Blair	
50		McCormick	
50		Speaker Blair	
50		Hart	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
51		Speaker Blair	
51		Epton	
51		Speaker Blair	
51		Douglas	
51		Speaker Blair	
51		Douglas	Explains vote
52		Speaker Blair	
52		Borchers	
53		Speaker Blair	Time is up.
53		Borchers	
53		Speaker Blair	
53		Brinkmeier	
53		Speaker Blair	
53		Deavers	
53		Speaker Blair	
53		Giglio	
54		Speaker Blair	
54		Totten	
55		Speaker Blair	
55		Day	
55		Speaker Blair	H.B. 2825 passed
56		Speaker Telcser	
56		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 2143
56		Speaker Telcser	Out of record
56		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 2606
56		Speaker Telcser	
56		Catania	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
57		Speaker Telcser	
57		Hirschfeld)	Question
57		Catania)	
58		Speaker Telcser	
58		Catania	
58		Speaker Telcser	
58		Peters	
58		Speaker Telcser	
59		Duff	
59		Speaker Telcser	
59		Fleck	Speaks on H.B. 2606
60		Speaker Telcser	
60		Catania	To close
60		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2606 vote
60		Epton	Explains vote
61		Speaker Telcser	
61		Giorgi	Explains vote
62		Speaker Telcser	
62		Duff	Explains vote
62		Speaker Telcser	
63		Ewell	
64		Speaker Telcser	
64		Rayson	
64		Speaker Telcser	
64		J. Houlihan	Verification
64		Speaker Telcser	
64		Shea	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
64		Speaker Telcser	
65		Clerk Selcke	
65		Shea	
65		Speaker Telcser	New Roll Call
65		Mugalian	
66		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2606 passed
66		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 2143
66		Speaker Telcser	
66		Flinn	
67		Speaker Telcser	
67		Stiehl	
67		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2143 vote passed
67		B. Dunne	
67		Speaker Telcser	
68		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2278
68		Speaker Telcser	
68		McPartlin	Aks leave for 2278 & 2279
68		Speaker Telcser	
68		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2279
68		Speaker Telcser	
68		McPartlin	
69		Speaker Telcser	
69		Randolph	
69		Speaker Telcser	
69		Juckett	Questions sponsor
69		Speaker Telcser	
69		Juckett)	Discussion



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
71		Speaker Telcser	
71		Palmer	Sponsor yield?
71		Speaker Telcser	
71		Palmer)	Discussion
72		McPartlin)	
72		Speaker Telcser	
72		Miller)	Discussion
72		McPartlin)	
72		Miller	Speaks to Bill
73		Speaker Telcser	
73		Miller	
73		McCourt	
73		Speaker Telcser	
73		McCourt	
73		Speaker Telcser	
73		McCourt	
73		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2278 & 2279 vote
74		Beatty	Explains vote
74		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2278 & 2279 passed
74		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2269
74		Speaker Telcser	
74		Craig	
74		Speaker Telcser	
74		Deuster	
74		Speaker Telcser	
74		Deuster	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
75		Speaker Telcser	
75		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2269 is passed
75		Speaker Telcser	Reads H.B. 2216
75		Grotberg	
76		Speaker Telcser	Explains H.B. 2216
76		Barry)	
76)	
76		Grotberg)	
76		Speaker Telcser	
77		Mahar)	
77)	Yield
77		Grotberg)	
77		Speaker Telcser	
78		Matijevich	
78		Speaker Telcser	Speaks to Bill
78		Grotberg	
79		Speaker Telcser	To close
79		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2216 passed
79		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2490
79		Bradley	
79		Speaker Telcser	Explains H.B. 2490
80		R. Dunne)	
80)	
80		Bradley)	
80		Speaker Telcser	
81		W. Walsh	
81		Speaker Telcser	Speaks to Bill
81		Bradley	
82		Speaker Telcser	To close

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
82		Borchers	Explains vote
83		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2490 passed
83		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 2790
83		Speaker Telcser	
83		Jones	Leave to hear H.B. 2791
83		Speaker Telcser	Objections heard
83		Jones	Explains H.B. 2790
84		Speaker Telcser	
84		J. J. Wolf)	
)	
84		Jones)	
84		Speaker Telcser	
85		Juckett)	
)	
86		Jones)	
87		Calvo)	Sponsor listening?
)	
87		Jones)	
87		Speaker Telcser	
87		Hunsicker	
87		Jones	
87		Speaker Telcser	
88		Polk)	
)	
88		Jones)	
89		Speaker Telcser	
89		R. Walsh)	
)	
89		Skinner)	
90		Speaker Telcser	
91		Schlickman)	
)	
91		Jones)	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
92		Speaker Telcser	
93		Matijevec)	
93		Jones)	
93		Speaker Telcser	
94		Lundy	Responds to Matijevec
94		Matijevec	
95		Speaker Telcser	
95		Jones	To close
95		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2790 passed
96		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2791
96		Speaker Telcser	
96		Jones	Yields to Skinner
96		Speaker Telcser	
96		Skinner	Explains 2791
97		Speaker Telcser	
97		R. Walsh	Opposes
98		Speaker Telcser	
98		J. J. Wolf	Opposes
98		Speaker Telcser	
99		Palmer)	
100		Skinner)	
100		Speaker Telcser	
100		Hunsicker)	
100		Skinner)	
100		Speaker Telcser	
101		Peters)	
102, 103, 104		Skinner)	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
104		Speaker Telcser	
104		Geo-Karis	Supports
105		Speaker Telcser	
105		Lundy	
106		Speaker Telcser	
107		T. Miller)	
)	
107		Skinner)	
108		Speaker Telcser	
108		Rigney)	
)	
108		Skinner)	
109		Speaker Telcser	
109		Totten	MOVes previous question
109		Speaker Telcser	
110		Lechowicz	Question
110		Speaker Telcser	
111		Lechowicz)	
)	
112		Skinner)	
112		Speaker Telcser	
112		Jacobs	
112		Speaker Telcser	
113		R. Holloway)	
)	
113		Skinner)	
113		Speaker Telcser	
114		Juckett)	Yiled
)	
114		Skinner)	
114		Speaker Telcser	
114		Cunningham	Introduction



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
115		Speaker Telcser	
115		Skinner	Answers Juckett
115		Speakr Telcser	
116		Shea)	
117) Skinner)	
117		Speaker Telcser	
118		Skinner	Explains vote
118		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2791 passed
119		Speaker Telcser	Senate Bills 2nd
119		" "	S.B. 1349 out of record
119		W. Walsh	Introduction
120		Speaker Telcser	
119		Shea	Inquiry
120		Speaker Telcser	Back to Senate Bills 2nd
120		" "	S. B. 1349
120		Clerk Selcke	Reads Amendment #2
120		Speaker Telcser	
120		Schraeder	Table Amendment #2
120		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #2 tabled
120		Clerk Selcke	Reads Amendment #3
120		Speaker Telcser	
120		Leinenweber	Explains Amendment #3
121		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #3 adopted
121		" "	Third Reading
121		Clerk Selcke	Reads S.B. 1349 3rd
121		Speaker Telcser	
121		Schraeder	Explains S.B. 1349



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
122		Speaker Telcser	S.B. 1349 passed. H.B. 3rd.
122		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2666
122		Speaker Telcser	
122		Merlo	Explains H.B. 2666
123		Speaker Telcser	
124		Hirschfeld)	
124		Merlo)	
124		Speaker Telcser	
125		Palmer)	
126		Merlo)	
126		Speaker Telcser	
126		McClain)	
126		Merlo)	
126		Speaker Telcser	
127		Borchers)	
127		Merlo)	
127		Speaker Telcser	
127		Merlo	To close
127		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2666 passed
127		Speaker Telcser	
127		D. Jones	Explains H.B. 2628
127		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2628 passed
128		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 2519
128		Speaker Telcser	
128		Jones	Explains H.B. 2519
129		Speaker Telcser	
129		Calvo	Yield?



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
129		Jones	
130		Speaker Telcser	
130		McCourt	
130		Jones	
130		Speaker Telcser	
130		Ewell)	
)	
131		Jones)	
131		Speaker Telcser	
131		Palmer:	
131		Speaker Telcser	
131		Jones	To close
132		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2519 passed
132		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 2195
132		Speaker Telcser	
132		Jones	Explains H.B. 2195
132		Speaker Telcser	
133		Schlickman)	
)	
133		Jones)	
133		Speaker Telcser	
134		Shea	
134		Speaker Telcser	
134		Juckett	
134		Speaker Telcser	
134		Jones	To close
135		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2195 passed
135		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 2079
135		Skinner	Out of record



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
136		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2079 Out of record
136		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2056
136		Speaker Telcser	
136		Rayson	Explains H.B. 2056
137		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2056 passed
137		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2360
137		Speaker Telcser	
137		McGrew	Take back to 2nd
137		Speaker Telcser	Leave granted
138		Clerk Selcke	Reads Amendment #2
138		McGrew	Table Amendment #2
138		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #2 tabled
138		Clerk Selcke	Reads Amendment #3
138		Speaker Telcser	
138		McGrew	Explains Amendment #3
138		Speaker Telcser	
138		Totten)	
)	
138		McGrew)	
138		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #3 adopted
139		Clerk Selcke	Reads Amendment #4
139		Speaker Telcser	
139		McGrew	Explains Amendment #4
139		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #4 adopted. 3rd Reading
139		McGrew	Explains H.B. 2360
139		Speaker Telcser	
139		Hirschfeld	
139		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2360 passed



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
140		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2792
140		Speaker Telcser	
140		Skinner	Bring back to 2nd
140		Speaker Telcser	Leave granted
140		Clerk Selcke	Reads Amendment #1
140		Speaker Telcser	
140		D. Houlihan	Table Amendment #1
140		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #1 tabled
140		Clerk Selcke	Reads Amendment #2
140		Speaker Telcser	
140		D. Houlihan	Explains Amendment #2
140		Speaker Telcser	
141		Schlickman)	
)	
142		D. Houlihan)	
142		Skinner)	
)	
142		Schlickman)	Opposes
142		Speaker Telcser	
143		Maragos	
143		Speaker Telcser	
143		Mugalian	
144		Speaker Telcser	
144		Waddell	
144		Speaker Telcser	
145		Houlihan	To close
146		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #2 adopted
146		Clerk Selcke	Reads Amendment #3
146		Speaker Telcser	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
147		Skinner	Explains Amendment #3
147		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #3 adopted
147		" "	Third Reading
147		Skinner	Explains H.B. 2792
147		Speaker Telcser	
147		R. Walsh	Opposes
148		Speaker Telcser	
148		Blair	Supports
149		Speaker Telcser	
149		Schneider)	
)	
150		Skinner)	
150		Speaker Telcser	
150		Beaupre	
150		Skinner	
151		Speaker Telcser	
151		Ewell)	
)	
152		Skinner)	
152		Speaker Telcser	
152		Skinner	To close
153		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2792 passed
153		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2365
153		Speaker Telcser	
153		McClain	Explains H.B. 2365
153		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2365 passed
153		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2772
153		Speaker Telcser	
154		Blair	Leave to take to 2nd



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
154		Speaker Telcser	
154		Clerk Selcke	Reads Amendment #4
154		Speaker Telcser	
154		Calvo	Table Amendment #4
154		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #4 tabled
154		Clerk Selcke	Reads Amendment #5
154		Speaker Telcser	
154		Fennessey	Table Amendment #5
154		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #5 tabled
154		Clerk Selcke	Reads Amendment #6
154		Speaker Telcser	
154		Fennessey	Explains Amendment #6
155		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #6 adopted
155		" "	Third Reading
155		Blair	Come back to it.
155		Speaker Telcser	
155		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2541
155		Speaker Telcser	
156		Grotberg	Take out of record
156		Speaker Telcser	
156		Hill	Bring back to 2nd
156		Speaker Telcser	Leave granted
156		Clerk Selcke	Reads Amendment #1
156		Speaker Telcser	
156		Hill	Explains Amendment #1
156		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #1 adopted. 3rd



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
156		Hill	Explains H.B. 2752
157		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2752 passed
157		Springer	Leave to take to 2nd
157		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2796
158		Speaker Telcser	Leave granted
158		Springer	Leave to hear 2796, 2797 together
158		Speaker Telcser	Back to 3rd. Leave granted
158		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2797
158		Speaker Telcser	
158		Springer	Explains H.B. 2796 & 2797
159		Speaker Telcser	
159		Shea	
159		Springer	
159		Speaker Telcser	
159		Springer)	
160		Shea)	
160		Speaker Telcser	
161		Berman)	
161		Springer)	
161		Speaker Telcser	
162		Catania)	
162		Springer)	
162		Speaker Telcser	
163		Barnes)	
164		Springer)	
164		Speaker Telcser	
164		Clabaugh	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
165		Speaker Telcser	
165		Ryan	Move previous question
165		Speaker Telcser	Question's moved
165		Springer	To close
165		Speaker Telcser	
165		Brinkmeier	Explains 'aye' vote
166		Speaker Telcser	2796 & 2797 are passed
166		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 320
166		Speaker Telcser	
166		Douglas	
166		Speaker Telcser	
166		W. Walsh	Explains vote
167		Speaker Telcser	
167		Lemke	Explains vote
167		Speaker Telcser	
167		Douglas	
168		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 320 passed
168		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2117
168		Speaker Telcser	
168		Shea	Back to 2nd
168		Speaker Telcser	Leave granted
168		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Amendment #1
168		Speaker Telcser	
168		Shea	Explains Amendment #1
168		Speaker Telcser	
169		Palmer)	
)	
169		Shea)	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
169		Speaker Telcser	
169		Kempiners	
170		Shea)	
)	
170		Palmer)	
171		W. Walsh)	
)	
171		Shea)	
171		Speaker Telcser	Out of record. H.B. 2117
171		Shea	Don't take out
171		Speaker Telcser	
172		Kempiners)	
)	
172		Shea)	
172		Speaker Telcser	
172		Ryan	
172		Shea	
172		Speaker Telcser	
173		McMaster)	
)	
173		Speaker Telcser)	
173		Shea	
173		Speaker Telcser	
173		McMaster	Objects to ruling
174		Speaker Telcser	
174		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2181
174		Speaker Telcser	
174		Mahar	Explains H.B. 2181
174		Speaker Telcser	
175		Palmer)	
)	
176		Mahar)	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
176		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2181 passed
176		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2296
176		Speaker Telcser	
176		Deavers	Explains H.B. 2996
176		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2296 passed
177		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2391
177		Speaker Telcser	Out of record
177		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2402
177		Speaker Telcser	
177		J. Houlihan	Back to 2nd
177		Speaker Telcser	Leave granted
177		Clerk Selcke	Reads Amendment #5
177		Speaker Telcser	
177		J. Houlihan	Explains Amendment #5
178		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #5 adopted
178		Clerk Selcke	Reads Amendment #6
178		Speaker Telcser	
178		J. Houlihan	Explains Amendment #6
178		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #6 adopted
178		Clerk Selcke	Reads Amendment #7
178		Speaker Telcser	
178		J. Houlihan	Explains Amendment #7
178		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #7 adopted. 3rd Reading
179		Houlihan	Explains H.B. 2402
179		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2402 passed
179		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2437
179		Speaker Telcser	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
179		J. J. Wolf	Explains H.B. 2437
179		Speaker Telcser	
179		Juckett)	
)	
179		Wolf)	
179		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2437 passed
179		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2345
179		Speaker Telcser	
179		Beaupre	Explains H.B. 2345
180		Speaker Telcser	
180		Skinner	
180		Beaupre	
180		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2345 passed
180		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2359
181		Speaker Telcser	
181		Neff	Explains H.B. 2545
181		Speaker Telcser	
182		Hill)	
)	
182		Neff)	
182		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2545 passed
182		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2634
182		Speaker Telcser	
182		McMaster	H.B. 2634 explained
182		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2634 passed
183		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2671
183		Speaker Telcser	
183		Juckett	Back to 2nd



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
183		Speaker Telcser	Leave granted
183		Clerk Selcke	Reads Amendment #2
183		Juckett	Table Amendment #1
183		Speaker Telcser	
184		Lechowicz)	
184		Juckett)	
184		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #1 is tabled
184		Juckett	Explains Amendment #2
184		Speaker Telcser	
185		Boyle)	
185		Juckett)	
185		Speaker Telcser	
185		Hart)	
185		Juckett)	
185		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #2 adopted
186		Clerk	Reads Amendment #3
186		Speaker Telcser	
186		Juckett	Mixup- table #2
186		Speaker Telcser	
186		Clerk Selcke	Reads #3
186		Speaker Telcser	
186		Juckett	
186		Speaker Telcser	Amendment #3 adopted. 3rd
186		Juckett	
186		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2671 passed
186		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2673
186		Speaker Telcser	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
186		Terzich	Explains H.B. 2673
187		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2673 passed
187		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2692
187		Speaker Telcser	
187		McCormick	Explains H.B. 2692
187		Speaker Telcser	
187		Schneider)	
188		McCormick)	
188		Speaker Telcser	
188		Palmer	
188		McCormick	
188		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2692 passed
188		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.B. 2753
189		Speaker Telcser	
189		Berman	Explains H.B. 2753
189		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2753 passed
189		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 2785
189		Speaker Telcser	
189		Douglas	Back to 2nd?
189		Speaker Telcser	Leave granted
190		Clerk Selcke	Reads Amendment #1
190		Speaker Telcser	
190		McCourt	Explains Amendment #1
190		Speaker Telcser	
190		Matijevich	Questions germaneness
190		Speaker Telcser	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
196		Speaker Telcser	
197		R. Dunne)	
197) McCormick)	
198		Speaker Telcser	
199		Terzich)	
199) McCormick)	
199		Speaker Telcser	
200		J. Houlihan)	
200) McCormick)	
200		Speaker Telcser	
200		R. Walsh	Opposes
200		Speaker Telcser	
200		McCormick	To close
201		Speaker Telcser	H.B. 2848 passed
201		Houlihan)	
201		Speaker Telcser)	
202, 203		Clerk Selcke)	Committee Reports
204		Speaker Telcser	Senate Bills 1st
204		Clerk Selcke	Reads Senate Bills First
204		Speaker Telcser	
204		Cunningham	Suspension of Rules request
204		Speaker Telcser	
204		Berman)	
204) Cunningham)	
204		Speaker Telcser	
204		W. Walsh	
205		Speaker Telcser	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
205		Berman)	
205		Cunningham)	
205		Speaker Telcser	Agreed Resolutions
205		Clerk Selcke	Reads Agreed Resolutions
205		Speaker Telcser	Agreed Resolutions adopted
205		W. Walsh	Moves Adjournment Resolution
206		" "	Suspends Rules
206		Speaker Telcser	Leave granted for Rules
206		Clerk Selcke	Messages from Senate
207		Speaker Telcser	
207		W. Walsh	Moves Adjournment Resolution
207		Speaker Telcser	Adjourned Resolution adopted
207		W. Walsh	Suspend Rules?
207		Speaker Telcser	
207		Lechowicz	Inquiry
207		Speaker Telcser	
208		W. Walsh	
208		Speaker Telcser	
208		W. Walsh	
208		Speaker Telcser	Rule 33A suspended
209		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 297, 2090, 2109, 2150. 2nd
2039		Speaker Telcser	
209		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 2199 2nd.
209 through		" "	2200, 2207, 2217, 2280, 2304, 2341, 2354, 2356, 2383, 2464, 2564, 2567, 2669, 2675, 2725, 2751, 2781, 2804, 2810, 2835, 2847, 2849, 2850, 2851, 2857, 2858, 2868, 2874, 1509, 1510, 2004, 2007, 2218, 2219, 2221,
210, 211, 212		" "	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 2499, 2530, 2531, 2550, 2550, 2552, 2553, 2562, 2607, 2651, 2652, 2689, 2710, 2721, 2755, 2756, 2762, 2817, 2818, 2820, 2822, 2823, 2839, 2852, 2860, 2861, 2862, 2864, 2870, 2872, 2873
212		Speaker Telcser	
212		Beaupre	
212		Speaker Telcser	
212		Bluthardt	Motion
212		Speaker Telcser	
212		Duff	Announcement
213		Speaker Telcser	
213		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 2163. 2nd. H.B. 2196
213		Speaker Telcser	
213		Totten	Announcement
213		Speaker Telcser	
213		Mahar	Asks suspend rules
213		Speaker Telcser	18B suspended
213		Collins	
214		Speaker Telcser	
214		Brinkmeier	
214		Speaker Telcser	Conf. Com. Report not adopted H.B. 32. Rule 18B suspended
215		Speaker Telcser	Non-con. S.B. 641
215		D. Houlihan	H.A. 1 & 2. S.B. 641. Req: C.C.
215		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 2878. 2nd
216		Speaker Telcser	S.B. 84 Non-con.
216		Philip	House do recede?



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
216		Speaker Telcser	Ref. #1
216		J. Wolf	Ref. recede H.A. 1 S.B. 634
216		Speaker Telcser	
216		Berman	
216		Speaker Telcser	
217		Berman	
217		Speaker Telcser	
217		Berman	
217		Speaker Telcser	
217		Clerk Selcke	H.R. 1021
217		Speaker Telcser	
217		Murphy	
217		Speaker Telcser	
217		Clerk Selcke	Reads H.R. 1021
217		Speaker Telcser	
217		Murphy	Moves to adopt
218		Speaker Telcser	
218		Duff	
218		Speaker Telcser	
218		Duff	
218		Speaker Telcser)	
218, 219		Philip)	
219		Speaker Telcser	
219		Matijevich	
219		Speaker Telcser	H.R. 1021 vote.
219		Philip	Speaks against H.R. 1021



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
219		Speaker Telcser	
219		Speaker Blair	Speaks for H.R. 1021
220		Speaker Telcser	
220		Berman	Speaks for H.R. 1021
220		Speaker Telcser	
220		J. Houlihan	Speaks for H.R. 1021-Out of record
220		Speaker Telcser	
221		Houlihan	Verification
221		Speaker Telcser	
221		Philip	Point of order
221		Speaker Telcser	
221		Philip	
221		Speaker Telcser	
221		Ron Hoffman	
222		Speaker Telcser	
222		Geo-Karis	
222		Speaker Telcser	Verification of Affirm. Roll
222		Clerk Selcke	Poll absentees
222		Speaker Telcser	
222		Clerk Selcke	Reads Affirm. Roll Call
223		Speaker Telcser	
223		Matijevich	Rule 73-Q
223		Speaker Telcser	
223		Calvo	
223		Clerk Selcke	
223		Calvo	
223		Speaker Telcser	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
223		Clerk Selcke	Continues Roll Call
224		Speaker Telcser	
224		Lechowicz	
224		Clerk Selcke	
224		Lechowicz	
224		Speaker Telcser)	
)	
225		Houlihan)	Questions Roll Call
)	
226		Clerk Selcke)	
226		Matijevich	Explains vote
226		Speaker Telcser	
226		Murphy	Withdraws Resolution
226		Speaker Telcser	
226		Clerk Selcke	Introduction & First Reading H.B. 2880, 2881, 2882, 2883, 2884, 2885.
226		Speaker Telcser	
227		Clerk Selcke	Death Resolution H.R. 1015
227		Speaker Telcser	H.R. 1015 passed
227		Clerk Selcke	Comm. Report
227		Speaker Telcser	
227		W. Walsh	Moves House adjourn
227		Speaker Telcser	House adjourned.
1		Speaker Telcser	First Special Session
1		Clerk Selcke	Committee Reports
1		Speaker Telcser	
1		Clerk Selcke	Messages from Senate



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1		Speaker Telcser	Resolution adopted
1		Clerk Selcke	
1		Speaker Telcser	
2		Clerk Selcke	H.B. 2nd Reading
2		Speaker Telcser	First Special Session adjourned



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES