

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ONE HUNDRED FIFTY-FOURTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

JUNE 21, 1972

11:00 O'CLOCK A.M.

THE HONORABLE W. ROBERT BIA IR,

SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

- Representative John H. Conolly - no reason given;
- Representative Raymond W. Ewell - illness;
- Representative J. Horace Gardner - death;
- Representative John Henry Kleine - no reason given;
- Representative Henry J. Klosak - illness;
- Representative Elmo McClain - death;
- Representative Michael H. McDermott - illness;
- Representative Edward J. Shaw - death;
- Representative John W. Thompson - no reason given;
- Representative James VonBoeckman - illness;
- Representative Gale Williams - illness.



Hon. Robert W. Blair: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Blades, Rise?"

Ben C. Blades: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have consent for the Journal to show that Williams is absent on account of illness."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The Journal will so indicate. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

M.J. Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would the Journal show that Representative McDermott, and Representative Ewell are absent because of illness?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The Journal will so indicate. House bills third reading. House Bill 4684. Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Barry."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 4684. An act to authorize and direct the Department of Transportation to improve that portion of the Illinois and Michigan Canal between Utica and LaSalle, in LaSalle county. Third reading of the bill."

Tobias Barry: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, this is one of those little old creek bills to help the city of LaSalle accomplish something started many years ago in the way of a park. Very cheap and very automatic with just a little help from the State. They've already spent, the city of LaSalle, I should say, at the suggestion of Representative Fennessey and myself already spent quite a bit of money. And all the other legislators have joined in this. And we would appreciate your favorable vote."

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

Tobias Barry: "No I'll take the vote if Carl Soderstrom will start it out, because he's involved in it as has been Carl Hunsicker and the others."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the question is shall House Bill 46.....Alright, the question is shall House Bill 4684 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 149 'ayes', no 'nays'. And this bill having received a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 4654."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 4654. An act to make an appropriation to the Department of Consevation for certain payments to the Illinois Building Authority. Third reading of the bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Take that out of the record? O-K. "

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "On the order of concurrences appears House Bill 4190 for which purpose the gentleman from Henderson.....Representative Downes, for what purpose do you rise Sir?"

John P. Downes: "Mr. Speaker, would you please adivise me as to what happened to House Bill 4654?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "That was taken out of the record, Representative Downes. On the order of concurrences appears House Bill 4190 for which purpose the gentleman from Henderson, Representative Neff is recognized."



Clarence E. Neff: "Mr. Speaker, I move to concur with the Senate amendment to this bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Krause."

James G. Krause: "Clarence, what does Special Mobile Equipment mean on this...under the exemptions here?"

Clarence E. Neff: "Ah..Jim, I haven't got this information on this and I'm sorry ah...on this concurrence and I was told something about it. Ah...I believe it made it ah...this was the bus bill you know, for the inspection of busses."

James G. Krause: "Well, Clarence, if your not sure, why don't you hold this until we get an explanation?"

Clarence E. Neff: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to hold this until I get a little more information on this."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "O-K, we'll take it out of the record. On the order of concurrences appears House Bill 4523. For which purpose the gentleman from cook, Representative Juckett, is recognized."

Robert S. Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, the Senate amended House Bill 4523 to clarify the last sentence of the bill which, where we indicated that a joint district could not levy taxes or incur indebtedness. And we, the Senate indicated, and very wisely so, that this would not prevent them from passing a budget and incurring the normal expenses in operating a joint district. So I would move to concur with Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4523."



Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart."

Richard O. Hart: "Ah...just one question. Is the digest now accurate ah...the last one, as to what this bill does? With the amendment?"

Robert S. Juckett: "Yes, that would be correct."

Richard O. Hart: "With the amendment?"

Robert S. Juckett: "Yes."

Richard O. Hart: "Thank you."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman has moved the House concur with Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4523. All those in favor of concurrence signify by voting 'aye'. The opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 135 'ayes', 1 'nay'. And this House concurs with Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4523. On the order of Concurrences appears House Bill 4577, for which purpose the gentleman from Bureau, Representative Barry, is recognized."

Tobias Barry: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I move for concurrence of Senate amendment to 4577, its just clarifying, making it distinctly clear that officials, elected officials are not included under workman's compensation. I recommend a favorable action."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has moved the House Concur with Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4577. All those in favor of concurrence signify by voting 'aye'. The opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted



who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 132 'ayes', no 'nays'. And the House concurs with Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4577. Schlickman 'aye'. Clabaugh 'aye'. On the order of concurrences appears House Bill 4278, for which purpose the gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Pappas is recognized."

Pete Pappas: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I move for concurrence on Senate amendment no. 1. This merely makes a technical correction of enrolling and engrossing error. The bill should have read 332nds and instead they had 322nds. The Senate amendment corrects this error."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has moved the House concur with....Gentleman from Franklin Representative Hart."

Richard O. Hart: "Ah...would this bill prevent the use of tires, which we commonly call slicks?"

Pete Pappas: "Ah...I don't know what a slick is."

Richard O. Hart: "Well, a slick is a tire without any tread, and ah...there's alot of young people that use them, you know, they put them on their cars. And ah...in many ways, a slick gives better traction than a treaded tire. And ah...what I'm...what I'd like to know before I vote on this bill again, is with the passage of this bill, would slicks be illegal?"

Pete Pappas: "I'd have to check it, why don't you pull it out of the record and I'll check it."

Richard O. Hart: "Thank you."



Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman has moved the House concur with Take it out of the record? I'm sorry, take that out of the record. On the order of concurrences appears House Bill 4105, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman is recognized."

Eugene F. Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 4105 is a companion to House bills 4106, 4107 and 4108, and I would ask leave of the House to consider all four bills as a package and simultaneously."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman will be recognized in reference to House Bill 4105, 4106, 4107, 4108 on the order of concurrences."

Eugene E. Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, Senate amendment no. 1 to each of these bills, 4105, 4106, 4107, 4108, in no way effects the substance. What the amendments do is simply to provide as follows: 'This amendatory act of 1972 is not a prohibition upon the contractual and associational powers granted by article 7 section 10 of the Illinois Constitution.' Article 7 Section 10 is the inter-Governmental cooperation section. It is an agreed amendment, Mr. Speaker, and members of the House. And I do move that the House concur with Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4105, Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4106, Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4107, and Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4108."



Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has moved the House Concur with Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4105, Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4106, Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4107, Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4108. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. The clerk will take four roll calls. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 130 'ayes', no 'nays'. And the House concurs with Senate amendments no. 1 to House Bill 4105, Senate amendment no. to House Bill 4106, Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4107, and Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4108. On the order of Concurrences appears House Bill 2555, for which purpose the gentleman from Cook, Representative Meyer, is recognized."

J. Theodore Meyer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. The Senate amendments to House Bill 2555 provide for, that the bonding authority shall make ah...a portion of the money, the bonding money, \$70,000,000 available to small business as defined by the Small Business Administration, that the committee, that the financial authority rather, shall have five members rather than three members, that the ah...that they shall be of both political faiths, and they shall be at the service and advise of the Senate. I move for concurrence of Senate amendments to House Bill 2555."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has moved that the House Concur with Senate amendments no. 1 and 3 to House Bill 2555. All in favor of concurrence

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are....Gibbs'aye'. On this question there are 143 'ayes', no 'nays'. And the House concurs with Senate amendments no. land 3 to House Bill 2555. On the order of concurrences appears House Bill 4353 for which purpose the gentleman from Union, Representative Choate, is recognized."

Clyde L. Choate: "I'm not ready, take it out."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Take it out of the record. O-k lets go back to House Bill 4353 on the order of concurrences."

Clyde L. Choate: "That's what I get for worrying about that Revenue Study Committee, Mr. Speaker, The amendment to House Bill 4353 is simply changing the effective date as far as the Black Lung Provision of the bill is concerned. And I would move that the House concur with Senate amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has moved the House concur with Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4353. All in favor of concurrence signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 134 'ayes', one 'nay'. And the House concurs with Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4353. On the order of concurrences appears House Bill 4298. For which purpose the gentleman from cook, Representative Hyde, is recognized."

Henry J. Hyde: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I would like to move that the House concur in Senate



amendments 1 and 2. This is the circuit breaker of which we have four identical bills floating around, and this is my bill and I'm asking that we concur in the Senate amendments which put this bill in the exact shape that the other three are in and I know of no opposition."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate amendment no. 1 and 2 to House Bill 4298. All in favor of concurrence signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 153 'ayes', no 'nays'. And the House concurs with Senate amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 4298. Lechowicz, 'aye'. On the order of concurrences appears House Bill 4152, for which purpose the gentleman from Livingston, Representative Hunsicker, is recognized."

Carl T. Hunsicker; "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, Senate amendment no. 2, amend House Bill 4152 on page 6, strikes reasonable publicity and inserts thereof, publicity, and on page 6 line 4 by striking the word Press, and inserting immediately thereafter no less than twice. And on page 7 by striking less or, and inserting in lieu thereof, lesser. And on line 8 by striking...on page 8, rather, by striking line 10 and inserting in lieu thereof the following; 'records are kept at an annual audit, summary, and a program evaluation are provided'. And on page 12, by striking lines 19 and 20 which read as follows; 'takes effect after July 1st, 1972 or upon its becoming law, which



ever is later.' This is the ah...House Bill 4152, is a bill that creates the Egg Marketing Development Act, for the Egg Producers of the State of Illinois. And I would move that the House concur with Senate amendment no. 2."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from cook, Representative Juckett."

Robert S. Juckett: "Well, Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield for a question?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Robert S. Juckett: "The digest indicates that this is the Egg Development, Egg Market Development Act. Could you just give me a short Farmers version to a City layman as to what this bill would do?"

Carl T. Hunsicker: "Its the further promotion of the sale of Eggs from the State of Illinois. Going to upgrade the egg marketing procedures and it will create a fund among the egg producers of the state for promotion Illinois eggs. This is the consensus of the bill. Has to be by referendum of the Egg producers. They will be a fifth of a cent per dozen, as I understand the bill that will be assessed to the producer. This will come out of his own pocket because, as everyone knows, eggs are...the cost of eggs is governed by the market and not by what the farmer says he wants. And this is the jest of the bill. The bill similar to the fruit growers that had one in here a year ago. Same principle."



Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Vermillion, Representative Craig."

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

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "He indicates he'll yield."

Robert Craig: "Carl, a few years back here, they passed an Egg Law that was suppose to help the egg producer and really all it did was to put him in a bad light. And alot of these people couldn't get rid of their eggs because they made such a hardship on them that they had to keep them in such a way, and the stores and everything, that it practically put the 'little men' out of business. Now this has nothing to do with anything like that is it?"

Carl T. Hunsicker: "No, this is to eliminate the sale of dirty eggs and things like that. And its for the benefit, mostly for the promotion of sale of eggs in the State of Illinois. It's not going to work any hardship on the producer in any way. And any producer that doesn't want to go along and be assessed a fifth of a cent a dozen for the eggs that he sells can get his money back. And it'll have to be...the act will not be put into effect until it is by referendum of the eggs producers. They have to vote it themselves, to actually want it, by a majority vote."

Robert Craig: "Just a sales promotion act?"

Carl T. Hunsicker: "Sales promotion act is what it is. Correct."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."



J. Glenn Schneider: "Carl, on the last comment ah...you mention a fifth of a cent per egg, is that correct?"

Carl T. Hunsicker: "I didn't get your question, Representative."

J. Glenn Schneider: "A fifth of a cent per dozen is the cost to the farmer?"

Carl T. Hunsicker: "No it won't cost the farmer that, it'll cost the person that is in the egg business. As I recall the statement was made when we had the committee hearing, that it would not take in any flocks under, I believe, 3000 chickens."

J. Glenn Schneider: "Who absorbs that fifth of a cent? It sounds small, but I wonder if the cost is passed on. Is it passed on to the consumer?"

Carl T. Hunsicker: "Who's going to stand the fifth of a cent a dozen? No sir this will be boarded by the egg producer, because the market governs the price of eggs and the producer has no way of saying what he wants for his eggs."

J. Glenn Schneider: "There's a fiscal note requested. Was there been one provided in regard to your bill?"

Carl T. Hunsicker: "It isn't going to cost the State of Illinois anything. The cost is going to be borne by the ah...egg producers."

J. Glenn Schneider: "But there's ah...the asterisk indicates there is a fiscal note. Did you get any response on that?"

Carl T. Hunsicker: "The statement was made in committee that it was not suppose to cost the State of Illinois anything.

That's the only answer I can give you."



J. Glenn Schneider: "Thank you."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from cook, Representative Peter Miller.."

P.J. Miller: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask Carl a question, but before I do I want to say that I'm no expert on eggs, in fact, I tried to discover a process of cattling powdered eggs. And I was a failure in that. But I do know that Astrives, one of the greatest egg producers in our state ah...Hunsicker, is ah...interested in this bill. And I purchase the eggs that our family consumes there. And if he feels that this is a good promotion thing, I want to recommend it to this House and I think that this is stimulating and it'll bring...help us in competition with other states. I think this is a very good bill, and I as a city slicker, and not much of a farmer, support it."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart."

Richard O. Hart: "Ah...I'd like to interupt this just a minute, Mr. Speaker, One of our young pages has a cup of coffee and a cup of sanka here and he can't remember who ordered it. Mr. Walterhausen here, would you hold up your hand. O-k. Thank you."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is he going to split the tip with you now, Representative? Is there further discussion? Does the gentleman wish to close the debate?"

Carl T. Hunsicker: "All I ask is a favorable vote."



Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate amendment no. 2 to House Bill 4152. All in favor of concurrence signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 119 'ayes', 9 'nays'. And the House concurs with Senate amendment no. 2 to House Bill 4152. Representative Sevcik, for what purpose do you rise Sir?"

Joseph G. Sevcik: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of an announcement. The pages are now distributing the Illinois Legislative Investigating Commission's report on the alleged charges made by one; Oscar Wilde. So they are now in the process of issuing a copy to each member. The reason for the delay is that ah... Representative Tipsword's resolution House Joint Resolution 134, was not adopted by the Senate until yesterday. Thank you."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "On the order of concurrences appears House Bill 4278, for which purpose the gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Pappas is recognized."

Pete Pappas: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I move for concurrence on the correction of the technical amendment."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4278. All those in favor of concurrence signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 126 'ayes', no 'nays'. And the House concurs with Senate



amendment no. 1 To house bill 4278. On the order of concurrence appears House Bill 4266 for which purpose the gentleman from cook, Representative Schlickman is recognized."

Eugene F. Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4266 does two things; number one it strikes the appropriations of \$42,000 and number two it provides for an effective date of July 1, 1972. The appropriations for the implementation of the program contained in this bill was placed by the Senate in Senate bill 1604 which is an omnibus bill. The purpose for this is to avoid the constitutional issue. I do, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, move that we concur with Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4266."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4266. All in favor of concurrence signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 147 'ayes', no 'nays'. And the House concurs with Senate amendment no. 1 to House bill 4266. On the order of concurrences appears House Bill 4190, for which purpose the gentleman from Henderson, Representative Neff, is recognized."

Clarence E. Neff: "Ah...Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, Ah....Senate bill no. 1 to House bill 4190 ah...was an amendment put on which really straightens up



something that we've been doing by executive order. The State police have for a number of years. This puts into a law. Any vehicles that are owned and operated by a manufacturer and is being delivered, school bus, and so forth, being delivered from the manufacturer to the dealers to be prepared for delivery would exempt them. Also special mobile equipment, which includes such vehicles such as; ah..... ditch digging, ah...well boring apparatus and many other pieces of equipment that ah...do not carry people and generally only move a short distance. I'll be glad to answer any other questions on this. And I move for the concurrence....adoption.. concurrence of this amendment."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate amendment no. 1 to House bill 4190. All in favor of concurrence signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 133 'ayes', one 'nay'. And the House concurs with Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4190. On the order of concurrences, consideration postpones, appears House Bill 1463, for which purpose the gentleman from Vermillion, Representative Craig is recognized."

Robert Craig: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I wish to concur in Senate amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1463. This... amendment no. 1 was offered by the Department of Transportation to require all vehicles, and that's saddle mounts, to be operated in response with the safety regulations of the



Federal Highway Administration. The industry has agreed with this amendment and amendment no. 2 is the amendment which authorizes the use of 45 foot trailers in Illinois. Now under the existing law, if they are 42 feet with the overall length of 55 feet from the front of the tractor to the rear end of the trailer, this does not increase the overall length at all. This bill was passed in the House and it went over to the Senate and in the wee hours of session it was, got lost in the shuffle. Now we're only one of about four states that don't allow 45 ft. trailers. And the reason mainly for this is for livestock haulers that come into Illinois, or people who haul glass ware, or rubber companies, or light loads. This isn't increasing the load weight, or the axle weight at all. And I urge the adoption of amendment no. 2 and also I'd like to say that they teamsters union is not opposed to these amendment. And I'd urge the concurrence of amendment no. 1 and 2 to House Bill.....or Senate bill....or House Bill 1463."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Lake, Representative Murphy."

W.J. Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the sponsor a question."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "He indicates he'll yield."

W. J. Murphy: "Ah...I don't quite understand how this can say 45 ft, Bob, and you say its not increasing the length at all."

Robert Craig: "Well, now then, it was in the Attorney General's opinion that at one time we were running 45 ft. trailers



But, I think that if you will check now, the cabs and the overall cabs and the way they build these cabs down and over the top of the motor, the overall length will not be increased in this bill. Some states are even running longer trailers than 45ft. and still being under 55 ft. the overall length. Now if you have a hood out in front of the tractor, an old style tractor like that, you couldn't pull a 45 ft. trailer because you would be over 55 ft. overall length."

W. J. Murphy: "You mean on tractors that have the engine out in front of them?"

Robert Craig: "Right."

W.J. Murphy: "Makes them too long. Of course I don't need an Attorney General's opinion to know the difference between 45 and 42 feet. But ah...it does seem to me like we are increasing the length of the trailers."

Robert Craig: "The trailer length is increased, but the overall length, and the trailer isn't going any place without the tractor, so the overall length is not being increased. Or the weight isn't being increased."

W.J. Murphy: "Then I don't understand why this wasn't put on the House Bill, I mean on the bill without having it on the Senate amendment, at the last minute."

Robert Craig: "As I said, this bill was passed in the House, 45ft. trailers, and it was lost in the shuffle over there in the Senate in the wee hours of session. And then they amended this and put it on the bill with saddle mounts."



Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Does the gentleman wish to close the debate? Gentleman has moved...."

Robert Craig: "I wish to concur with Senate amendments 1 and 2."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman has moved the House concur with Senate amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1463. All in favor of concurrence signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 93 'ayes', 29 'nays'. Blades 'aye'. And the House concurs with Senate amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1463. On the order of concurrences appears House Bill 2881, for which purpose the gentleman from Kane, Representative Schoeberlein is recognized."

Allan L. Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2881 ah...passed the House unanimously and in the Senate there was an amendment, and I do agree with the amendment. And I would move that we concur in the amendment as attached by the Senate. Ah...what it does, it does delete a portion of our bill, and ah...makes it applicable that ah...the ah...head of the labor department may assist in the collection up to \$1000."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative Schoeberlein are you moving that the House concur with both Senate amendments number 1 and 2?"

Allan L. Schoeberlein: "Senate amendment no. 1 is not applicable to the bill, actually number 2 was adopted. According to the information I have here."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Do you wish to non-concur with Senate amendment no. 1, Sir?"



Allan L. Schoeberlein: "Senate amendment no. 1, is no longer applicable, when number two was adopted in the Senate. Well, they adopted both and I would move that they both be....."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2881. All in favor of concurrence signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 115 'ayes', no 'nays'. And the House concurs with Senate amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2881. On the order of concurrences appears House Bill 3648, for which purpose the gentleman from Perry, Representative Cunningham, is recognized."

W.J. Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, when our bill went over to the Senate it was in proper form according to the new constitution, and for some reason or other it got juggled around over there and it looks like a little bit of this political Gerrymandering. So, we'd like to non-concur in this, and set down with out Senators, the House of the Lord, and talk it over. I'd ask your favorable consideration in non-concurrence to Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 3648."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman has moved the House non-concur in Senate amendment number one to House Bill 3648. All those in favor....Gentleman from cook, Representative Maragos."

Samuel C. Maragos: "I'd like to ask the sponsor, Mr. Cunningham, did he say the House of the Lord, or the House of Lords?"



Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "All those in favor to non-concur signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. And the House does not concur in Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 3648. House Bill's third reading. House Bills second reading. House Bill 4689."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 4689. Bill for an act creating a commission to study and produce a collective bargaining bill for public school educators. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Are there amendments from the floor?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment no. 1, Choate, amend House Bill 4689, on page 1, line 8 by deleting 14 and soforth."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

Clyde L. Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, this amendment simply clarifies the bill and makes it constitutional as far as the appointment powers are concerned, on the advice of many members of the Bar, from both sides of the aisle. And ah...it attempts to direct its attention to a problem, the entire bill does, to a problem that has existed in the state for many years. That is the collective bargaining as far as teachers are concerned. The one's of us who are sponsoring this bill felt that it was high time that the legislature attempt to devote some of it's time to this important question and attempt, by these appointments, to bring about a solution to this problem that has confronted this legislation for the past several decades.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would move the adoption of amendment

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



one to House Bill 4689."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from cook, Representative Simmons."

Arthur E. Simmons: "Would the speaker answer a question?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Arthur E. Simmons: "Just how does the amendment change the bill?"

Clyde L. Choate: "It changes the appointment powers, Representative Simmons. It was thought in the original bill that we would spell out that people from various agencies, such as the Illinois Education Association, The American Federation of Teachers as well as teachers as such, should be included in the committee. However, I was advised, by members of the bar, that it was unconstitutional to spell out that they definitely had to come from these agencies, therefore it has been agreed by various agencies that the power of appointment will be left in the hands of the ah...legislative leaders. One public member appointed by the Speaker, two members from House of Representatives, one public member appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives, and two... one member of the House rather..therefore we get the public members on without doing it the way we originally intended to do, by specifically saying they must come from one of these agencies, or others."

Arthur E. Simmons: "Ah...is there any appropriations connected with this?"

Clyde L. Choate: "Not in this bill, there is a companion bill

that we sent to the appropriations committee, if you'll

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



recall correctly, last week when we introduced this legislation, we advanced this one creating the commission to the order of second reading without reference, but in keeping with the agreement between the leadership on both sides of the aisle, we did send the appropriation measure to the House Appropriations Committee and there is a \$15,000 appropriation bill for this commission."

Arthur E. Simmons: "Thank you."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman has move the House adopt amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4689. All those in favor of the adoption signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? Third reading. House Bills third reading. House Bill 4614."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 4614. An act to provide for the orderly, efficient and economic financing acquisition in the construction and development of the...by the State of Illinois, its Departments Authorities, Public Corporations, Commission, Boards, Agencies, Universities, Colleges and Junior Colleges, and Capitol facilities consisting of structures and durable equipment as well as the acquisition of real estate in connection therewith, etc. Third reading of the bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Will, Speaker Blair."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to have House Bills 4615, 4616, 4617 and 4683 heard at the same time. It would be my intention to ask for separate



votes on each of these bills, since a different vote requirement is present, with regard to 4614. But they are all one package and I would ask leave to have the discussion on them at the same time."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Are there any objection? Hearing none will the clerk please read House Bills 4615, 4616, 4617, and House Bill 4683 a third time."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Ah...House Bill 4615. An act to provide for the appropriation to the State Treasurer for payment of interest and principle on certain bonds. Third reading of the bill. House Bill 4616. An act to amend section 5 of an act in relation to state finance. Third reading of the bill. House Bill 4617. An act creating a Capitol Development Board, defining its powers and duties and make an appropriation in connection therewith. Third reading of the bill. House Bill 4683. An act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Capitol Development Board. Third reading of the bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Will, Speaker Blair."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Speaker, House bill 4614 through 4617 and 4683 create the Capitol Development Bond Fund and Capitol Development Board. Taken together, these bills offer a bold program to restructure the bond financing for the State Capitol Programs and to provide for the sound management of these programs. No legislation before the General Assembly this year, offers an opportunity to realize greater potential savings, or greater potential benefits over



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

the long run. The Illinois Building Authority was established over a decade ago, and through its issuance of revenue bonds the IBA has provided more than a half billion dollars of Capitol facilities, including scores of Junior College Campuses, Projects at Senior Education Institutions, Mental Retardation Facilities, and Correctional facilities. IBA Revenue bonds are, however, more costly than State General Obligation Bonds. The 1970 constitutional convention recognized the extra expense incurred by the state in financing through the IBA, rather than through General Obligation Bonds. And provided the mechanism for eliminating the fictions associated with the IBA. The Capitol Development Bond Act of 1972 implements these provisions of the new constitution. Use of General Obligation Bonds for the Capitol programs included in this coming years fiscal budget will save between \$45,000,000 and \$65,000,000 of interest costs over comparable revenue bonds. These savings represent one of the most significant fiscal reforms of the new constitution. The total authorization in House Bill 4614 of \$560 millions of dollars is, that is being requested, consists of approximately \$400,000,000 in prior authorizations and \$160,000,000 in new authorizations. Now included in the \$560,000,000 are facilities for Universities, for Junior Colleges, the School Building Commission, and the Departments of Mental Health, Corrections and Conservations. Now Illinois is particularly well suited to carry out such a program of responsible debt financing. It is one of 15 state in the nation who can boast of a tripple A

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



rating. This high credit rating permitted the State to finance the Transportation Bond Issue last November, which we passed in the full session last year, for the low interest rate of 4.6%. This low interest cost that the State paid is, in effect, testimonial of the bond market as to our sound financial, and economic status. Now the Capitol Development Board follows logically from the new approach of financing. Management of Capitol Programs have previously been applied in the patchwork fashion. At times, following the financing vehicles used for that particular program, and at other times, and add, simply an add hock outgrowth of what was convenient or available at the time. The result has been a diminished level, or managerial expertise, applied to these programs as talent has been scattered among a proliferation of agencies and departments. The proposal to create a Capitol Development Board is made with the primary intent of capturing the positive activities and influences of those agencies, boards, commissions, and task force efforts which are currently operating. In order to fulfill this intent a Capitol Development Board, consisting of seven members each serving for a term of four years, would be appointed by the Governor. Initial terms of board members are to be staggered so as to provide for appropriate changes in the board constituency. No more than four members, however, may be from one political party at the same time. And appointments will, of course, be confirmed by the Senate, and

provisions of membership will follow the same guidelines now in use for other authoritative and commissions. Establishment of the Capitol Development Board would shift the focus of project review from a point where design is complete, and the project ready for construction, to an earlier stage of planning. By doing this, the legislature will have available more reliable information when reviewing projects for a construction authorization. At a time when the demands on the fiscal resources of the state are becoming more pronounced the legislature cannot afford the luxury of ignoring the dual opportunity to provide significant continuing savings by the creation of the Capitol Development Bond Fund and the Capitol Development Board. These bills merit favorable action by the House and General Assembly as they hold."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Will the sponsor of the bill yield to a question or two?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "What has been the increase in state general obligation revenue bonds in the past four years?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I'd like to give a full explanation, in connection with that question. The state has three major bond programs. \$750,000,000 for anti-pollution. \$900,000,000 for Transportation, and this proposed Capitol Development Bond Act, which will total approximately \$557,000,000. ~~The anti-pollution and transportation bonds~~



programs, as you are aware, are already authorized as are over \$400,000,000 of the project under the proposed Capitol Development Bond Act. By approving the Capitol Development Bond Act, we are approving only \$150,000,000 of new debts. More importantly, by reauthorizing previously authorized projects under the Capitol Development Bond Act rather than through the IBA, we are savings, as I indicated earlier, some \$45 to \$65 million over the period of time that these bonds would be annotated in so far as interest costs are concerned. Now the state is in a strong position to provide responsible bond financing for the Transportation bonds, the anti-pollution and the Capitol Development Bond programs. We are one of 15 states in the nation who can boast of a triple A rating. And it has permitted the state to finance the anti-pollution and Transportation bond programs at extremely low interest costs. The anti-pollution bond issue in June of a year ago came in at 4.9% and as I indicated earlier the Transportation Bond issue that was issued subsequent to that in November of last year came in at 4.6% which are both well below the average. Our total debt outstanding in relationship to wealth compares favorably with other triple A states as rated by Moody's investors services. For example, if you take on a percentage basis the net direct debt as a percentage of personal income you'll see that Vermont is 15.2%, Connecticut 12%, Maryland 7.1%, Maine 6.9%, New Hampshire 5.8%, South Carolina 3.7%, Ohio 3.5%, New Jersey 3.1%, North Carolina 2.7%, Texas 1.3% and

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



Virginia 0.6%. Illinois would be at 1.9% with the passage of this bond proposal. Our excellent position relative to these other triple A states will not be altered with implementation of any of the programs. If you assume that all currently authorized indebtedness is bonded by the end of 1977, the net direct debt as a percent of personal income in Illinois would be 2.9%. The state would remain in a very favorable position relative to the other triple A states, even if debt in those states did not increase. And since others are facing many of the same problems as Illinois, they're debt, in all likelihood, will increase as well. Further, this bond financing, I'm concluding on this question, that this bond financing can be achieved without a tax increase. Under the assumption of the issuance of \$400,000,000 of bonds next year a level principle retirement and a 4.5% interest cost the maximum annual growth in debt service required would be \$34,000,000, at a natural growth rate of 6.5 to 7% per year, the state revenues will increase by more than \$200,000,000 per year in the near future. This maximum annual growth in debt service is not an unreasonable portion of new revenues to be devoted to all new State Capitol spending."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I'll renew my question. What is the total of all principle and interest on bonds, both pending and outstanding as of today's date. That the State of Illinois has incurred? I don't want to hear a report from Moody's, and I don't want to hear a report from



Abbott, but I think that I'm asking, I think that my figures show that its over \$7,000,000,000. Now I wonder if that is correct or incorrect? This was a question that was raised in the appropriations committee, if you remember."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes, we have the answer. \$450,000,000 in IBA bonds, \$400,000,000 in general obligation bonds. \$300,000,000 in University Revenue Bonds, and \$450,000,000 in tollway bonds."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "And according to your statement tax increases will not be necessary, in the future, to pay off these bonds, is that correct?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "That's correct."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Is it possible that this series of bonds passes, as far as the Capitol Development Improvement Bond Issue, that we will have to increase property taxes to increase these bonds. Because this is full faith of credit in the State of Illinois? And with this provision you will be able to impose a property tax, if you're interest is not paid on these bonds."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes the back up provided in this series is the same as we provided in the Transportation series, and that is for a continuing appropriation. There's no reference to a back up as you suggest to a state property tax."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Well, in the appropriations committee it was also pointed out that full faith in credit means if the appropriation is not passed and we do not have the



revenues within the state of Illinois, that a property tax can be assessed on all the residents within Illinois. And other point, that's the reason why there is a lower interest rate on these bonds."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, number one I've made the statement that we have, on the basis of our projections, sufficient increases in revenues in the future to take care of the annortization of the bonds that have been and will be authorized under this new, including, under this new program. Ah...the...therefore, the likelihood of having, under any circumstances to fall back upon a state property tax is remote to the imp degree, and further more such an imposition would have to ah...come through this general assembly before action could become affected."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, in your bill I believe you have a maximum 7% interest rate on the-bonds. And in testimony on behalf of these series of bills, you made mention of the fact that as far as the success of the state of Illinois in selling the highway bonds at a rate of 4.6%. And I was wondering why, if thats the case, why don't we have an amendment to reduce the maximum ceiling fix to 5.5%?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, these are coupon bonds and they will range up to a maximum up to 7% and then the coupons reduce ah...on down so that we would expect to be issuing these bonds at an average interest rate of somewhere in the neighborhood of 4.5%. But it is necessary to have this maximum of 7% so the coupons can come up that high. It's



my understanding that the program would call for the issuance of the highest coupon at somewhere in the area of 6.5%."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Well, the total issue is also the coupon bond issue and inturn their maximum was 3.25, 4.25, 4.75, and in turn I think that since the Governor's agrument for full faith in credit bond is that they are cheaper and you're echoing the same statements, I think they should be reflected in the maximum permissible interest rate. And you're rate costs us 7%, I'm asking that if you think there should be an adjustment on that area?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, we have a similar provision in the Transportation bond package and in the Illinois Building Authority. This maximum ceiling on the coupons of 7%. And as you well know, these bonds will be competatively bid and we are hopeful that we will be able to bring them in around 4.5%. Of course it depends upon the market at the time."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, will the interest earn, and the proceeds of the bonds issues be deposited in a general revenue fund or what type of fund will be deposited?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Right, that has been clarified to provide that the interest will go into the Capitol Bond Retirement Fund, and not into the General Revenue Fund."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Is that fund transferrable?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, there's no provision at all, ah... in these bills for any transfer out of this fund to any other fund. The monies in the Bond Retirement fund will be those appropriations that the General Assembly will ah..



be making every year to retire the, or to meet the required principle and interest payment on the bonds that are outstanding."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should, to insure that interest earned on the bond issues will go to paying off the bonds in order to reduce the cost of the bonds to the tax payers, I think we should have that provision so that it could not be transferred. That's the reason why I brought it up. I believe, Representative Walsh, had a series of bill in this General Assembly that passed and took money out of the McCormick Place which again was set aside for the retirement of bonds and a shifting of money went into General Revenue. And I don't want to see that provision take place on these bonds. So I was wondering if you would agree that this money should not be transferrable."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I've...I've said that, and we have, as you know, the amounts that we are appropriating, for example in 4615 reflect what the intention is as far as the issuance of bonds and that's calculated right down to the dollar on principle and interest repayment. So ah... I can't imagine any circumstance where there would be any transfers going on out of this fund."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, what are the projects that are included in this bonding program now, I know that we had certain reservation as far as some equipment that has a very short life was included intitally. In fact, we



pointed that out in the appropriations committee that there was one facility that we found that amounted to, I believe it was, \$586,000 in short term equipment as toasters and colored TV sets. And I thought this was corrected by an amendment yesterday, but I was wondering if you would be so kind as to tell me exactly what is included in this bonding program now, and what projects have been eliminated from the original submission?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, this point was raised, it was a valid point, and ah...the amendment that was agreed to that Representative Choate put on yesterday ah...specified that in so far as any equipment that would be purchased through the issuance of these bonds that that would have to be durable equipment. The intention, as far as it is behind the addition of that word, is that the equipment would last the period for which the bonds would be issued. But to give you a fast break down of the, what these bonds will be used for in the first in the series of bills ah...some \$398,000,000 will be used for the acquisition, development, construction, reconstruction, improvement, financing, architectural planning and installation of capitol facilities consisting of building, structures, equipment, and land for educational purpose by state universities and colleges and junior college board and by the school building commission. Some \$35,000,000 for

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "If I just may, Mr. Speaker, the \$398,000,000 do we have a break down as far as what educational facilities



we are speaking of? The location of them, and the purpose of them?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "They are, of course, in each of the departmental appropriation bills, which the appropriations committee has been considering, those are line itemed in there. And that knowledge is within your knowledge as those bills are coming through your committee as to the specific jobs that are being accomplished. And I think that this is important to realize, that we have the checks and balances necessary here so that the legislature is the body that will be putting the final approval to the appropriation process of these various projects that will be funded through the Capitol Development Bond ah...Board and the fund."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Well, I think we'll get to that in 4617, which establishes the board, and exactly how that procedure works, but we have ah...I'm well aware as far as the dollar amount that's presently allocated within the various, not only the Board of Higher Education and the various Universities but I believe there is some money in Conservation for this area. I believe there is some money in, in fact the bills that we considered today is in the Department of Corrections. Ah....so...."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "That's correct. I was finishing off here that \$35,000,000 would be for these same purposes that I have indicated ah...and then for Correctional purposes at state prisons and correctional centers all within the state of Illinois, and some \$59,000,000 ah....for open spaces,



recreational and conservation purposes."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "What is the maximum length of time which would elapse between legislators authorization of a project and the actual construction of a project? Like, if we ah.. pass this series of bills and in turn its provided in their respective budgets, do we have, is there a time that they have to be in process as far as the planning and the construction, and a time it has to be completed? The reason why I'm raising the question, I personally believe that if an item is authorized and in turn we in good faith allocate the money and in three years it isn't completed, I think we should have another look and say well...does this item, what type of priority did it have. Why wasn't it completed? Too many times in the appropriations committee I see where we have tremendous lapses. Lapses in areas where it's human need. And in my opinion, I don't know who puts the freeze on them and for why, but I know this General Assembly has appropriated the money. And I'd like to have a little bit of a safeguard in these series of bills that if an item is authorized and not completed, we should have the authority to reconsider our actions."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, as I indicated, ah...there are approximately \$400,000,000 of dollars that are being authorized under this proposal that have been previously authorized. And I am informed that on those projects that they are all practically ready to go. Ah...we are very hopeful that in one of the primary reasons why we are establishing this

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



centralization through this board ah...is to cut the lagged time that has been involved in the past on getting these Capitol Projects started and finished. And we would expect that on new projects that they would all be under way within the fiscal year for which the appropriations will be being made."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Could we have a safeguard that, if say for example, given a period of time of three years if an item is not in the process of being completed according to its projection that we inturn should have the opportunity of reevaluating our original committment?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, in that sense I think we are in a much better posture on this series of bills than we have been under the IBA. There was only the appropriations ah... every three, I mean authorizations every three years required by the General Assembly, whereas under this program the authorizations would be, the appropriations will be annually."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "May I ask a few questions in reference to the Capitol Development Bond Board itself under House bill 4617? I received a copy of a letter from Norman Beaty, the executive vice-president of the Chicago Civic Federation, and he sent this letter to John McCarter and in turn he sent me a copy of it and if I may I'd like to pose some of the questions he raised to John McCarter to the sponsor of the bill. First item I believe he mentioned was as far as the greater centralization of control and selection of architects and contractors could lead to a failure to consider as broad



a spectrum of possibilities as might be desirable and might create a situation where a mistake or error of judgement could have a far greater ramification. And in my reply to him I asked him if he was concerned whether it was going to be a bidding process as far as the architects, as far as the contractors are concerned, I assured him in my opinion, I thought there was. I'd like to have a comment from the sponsor. if he has the same fears, or Director McCarter has showed you the letter from ah...Norman Beaty and have a reply."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Let's see if I understand your question.

Ah....We specifically provide in the bills that the board itself is under the provisions of the state purchasing act. We are centralizing control over architects and contractors through the utilization of the board. The main reason that, one of the main reasons that we are going this route is that the historic track record at these various institutions on cost per square foot has been considerably higher than it is thought, on the basis of making comparisons, than it should be. We are hopeful that we are going to be able to save the taxpayers of this state considerable number of dollars by this centralization. In other words, we'll be getting more bang for the buck as a result of the utilization of the board."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "The next point he raises, is what specific benefit is intended from a new board, that could not be obtained from modifying the IBA board with the authority and the procedures of this agency?"



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, the IBA, the answer to that is simple, the IBA was simply a financing vehicle. This is a construction management approach, which is really putting teeth into the field of construction of Capitol Improvements in one centralized authority, rather than this proliferation that we have had."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Another question he raised is, who establishes the priorities if a situation should develop where once bonds were sold and the board says let's build project A, and the Governor said no let's build project B, which would prevail from the legal standpoint, and what is the statutory language clarifying this point?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, within each department, of course, the departments themselves will be setting their priorities. As between departments the board will be setting the priorities."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Doesn't answer my question. Priority A is established by the Board, priority B is established by the Governor. Which prevails, and where is the statutory language clarifying this point?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, number one the board is an independent board ah...once the Governor sets the priorities, not priorities, but once the Governor releases the funds then the board will be determining the priorities as between the various departments. Then within the Departments the Departments themselves will be determining their priorities."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Well according to that answer then project B comes before project A."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "No necessarily."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Well, all he has to do is hold the funds."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, we're really not changing that facet of the operation ah....from what it has been in years before, regardless of who may have been Governor."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Well, I'd like to know what are the qualifi....."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "We still, I think this is important, we still have, in the General Assembly, the final say in so far as the appropriations for these various projects within the Department's appropriation bills. And if, for some reason, this General Assembly decides that it does not want this project done, we can delete it ah...from the appropriation."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "What are the qualifications for the membership of the board?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "There are no qualifications ah...established ah...in the ah...in the act."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Do you think there should be?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, we, what we're after here is a lay board, they are non-paying jobs."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Well, do you think in order to insure knowledgeable representation that we should have certain qualifications? Because looking at the break down as far as the functions of the board, its a pretty strong agency,



in fact, what I'd like to do is ask every member of this House to take a look at the bill, 4617, and see exactly what the functions of the board are. It says; 'to aid state agencies, boards, and institutions in the preparation of program statements and construction cost guidelines of such capitol projects as would fall under their jurisdiction. What is their jurisdiction, is it outlined in the bill? number two, to enter into and except an assignment of architectural and engineering contracts. Is that on a bid basis? three, to review plans and specifications as submitted by associate architects to assure that the basic economies of designed materials have been exercised. I would be hoping that the state is doing that now. To assist in construction management procedures including scheduling of bid openings, the award of contracts, supervision of construction process, and approval of construction change orders. I think that's part of engineering and purchasing. But there is a new area that the board is going to be looking into, to research new materials and new construction processes in order to reduce initial cost of maintenance under proposed facilities. I agree with the concept, but I think that the board members should have some expertise, in these areas and I'm wondering why there aren't qualifications spelled out in the bill?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, the proposal ah...that you are putting forth, it seems to me, that is filled with the possibility of conflict of interest. Ah...if you have persons being placed on the board because of qualification, you want so



from the contracting, so many from the architect, architectural, so many from this area, that's the very kind of trouble that you can get into. Now its my advice that the IBA is a lay board, that the expertise that is necessary as far as the financing aspects, as far as the ah...construction management that that will be provided by staff, which of course in turn, will be responsible to the board."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "What are the provisions for a specific compensation to attract the expertise that this board will require?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "We, of course have a number of boards in which we have been very fortunate in obtaining the services of illustrious citizens in this state who, as a matter of public service, ah...appreciate the opportunity to serve and we have not had trouble with a number of boards where they are in a non-compensated position, in being able to get membership."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this goes back to my original point as far as the qualifications of the membership of the board, and you answered that they would have the technical staff to advise them in these areas, and I was wondering, where in the bill is provision for compensation for this staff. I don't see any."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes, there is \$100,000 in the last bill in the series, and the balance of the money that will be necessary to operate the board, including the salaries of staff will be accomplished by transfers ah...from departmental

appropriations."

ous S. Lechowicz: "Well, I know the \$100,000. My point was, do you think its adequate?"

W. Robert Blair: "I'm advised that the, we are satisfied that the amount of money that we will be putting in to the operation of the board will be adequate to properly man the board."

ous S. Lechowicz: "Will this board conduct a continuous space inventory of State facilities to insure maximum utilization, and inter-agency coordination of existing facilities, we've seen too many times where an area is improperly utilized by as far as the number of people within a given area. We've seen areas in our state of Illinois building, in Chicago, where its not utilized to its full potential, maybe because of the existing structure, which may be through proper ah...review should be changed, but my point is, will this board conduct a continuous space inventory of all the state facilities, or whose responsibility is this?"

W. Robert Blair: "We ah...provided that, in the, in amendment number two, which was adopted yesterday, on page 3, section 10.11, line 2, to conduct and maintain a continuing space inventory of state capitol facilities to insure maximum utilization in inter-agency coordination of existing facilities."

ous S. Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, you made a comment as far as that additional money will be coming into this board as other agencies transfer their responsibilities. And I was

wondering if you're referring to General Services, where they have a house staff of architects. And I know we appropriated the money for this house staff. Now is this staff going to be transferred into this super board, or will we be picking up staff from additional agencies, or what is the situation there?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, specifically, on general services there will be a transfer ah...of personel and that part of their appropriation, that funds those personel will also be being transferred into the board."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "When can we expect this phase out of architectual and engineering out of general services?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, within this coming fiscal year."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "One more question, Mr. Speaker, and this is based upon my original premis, when I asked members of the General Assembly to look at the function of the board, which will supposedly include product testing, research, and new construction processes and consulting servicers for other public bodies not building with state funds. Why is this provision in there? Does that mean that if any agency, whether its local government or county government, well you've covered as far as the state, you can actually come in there and say, well we're going to give you some product testing and research in these new construction methods without their ah...knowledge or without their consent?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "no, ah...this is actually intended, merely



as a clearing House to provide information ah...on such things as cost per square foot, ah...materials, these kinds of helpful information."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "But again this will be upon request?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes, they....."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Only upon request?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Redmond."

William A. Redmond: "Will the speaker yield to a couple of questions? With respect to House Bill 4614, on page 24, line 24 page 5, it specifically says that all earnings received on any investment will be paid into the General Fund. And I think its customary that proceeds received from investements are paid into the fund involved, and this seems to be completely contrary to that factor."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The ah...amendment no. 2 that was adopted yesterday offered by Representative Choate and concurred in by me, provides that the ah...earnings received upon any such investements shall be paid into the capitol development bond retirement and interest fund. And the General Revenue fund is stricking, so... you're right, and the amendment took care of it"

William A. Redmond: "Part of the difficulty when we don't have the amendments. Another question that I have is with respect to the position of the Illinois Building Authority Bond, I

can't quite understand whether some existing bonds are going to be retired from the proceeds to the sale?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "No, we, in amendment no. 1 to that same bill, we did put in language ah...stating that nothing in the bill shall be construed to require or permit the acquisition of facilities financed by the Illinois Building Authority through the issuance of bonds. It will continue in existence merely to accomplish the orderly retirement of its outstanding obligations, and any construction of course that's now under way which it is accomplishing, but it will have no new... and bonded already."

William A. Redmond: "And in your original explanation you said something about the Illinois Toll Bonds, and I don't see any reference in the bill to Illinois Toll bonds, I wonder if you'd explain that."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, that was not in my original explanation, ah...Representative Lechowicz asked what the outstanding dollars of indebtedness were ah...in so far as the state was concerned and included in those figures I gave the millions of dollars involved under issuance of the Illinois Tollroad authority."

William A. Redmond: "Now, this triple A rating that we're talking about, was that received before we issued all of these bonds since the new constitution, or after?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "both before and after."

William A. Redmond: "You mean there has been no diminution of our rating since we've issued something in excess of a billion

going to be necessary for him to have on hand, and then the State Treasurer will proceed to invest what will not be necessary to meet current obligations after the year."

William A. Redmond: "Alright, one further question. That's referring you to page 4, line 16, in most bond issues which I am familiar, the provision for the sale of bonds is that not less than par plus accrued interest. I notice that there is no requirement that accrued interest be paid on the sale of these securities. Is there any reason why that was not included, or do you know?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "well, ah...there is not a necessity to have that language in there, as a practical matter at the time the bonds are delivered ah...the ah....a check for the accrued interest is delivered to the state."

William A. Redmond: "But it does not have to be, is that correct?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, as a practical matter is, because the state's obligation is to...not any greater than that for the time for which its issued the bond."

William A. Redmond: "Thank you very much sir."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from cook, Representative Kosinski."

Roman J. Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, will the sponsor yield to two questions?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Roman J. Kosinski: "Mr. Sponsor, the first of two questions; it is my understanding that revenue bonds, as we know them, are self liquidating in essence as in the situation of tollways



dollars worth of bonds?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "No."

William A. Redmond: "No, another provision that kind of disturbs me is that we've had some criticism in the press recently about idol funds that were not put out at interest. And this bill on page 5 line 2 seems to give the Treasurer discretion as to whether or not he will invest the proceeds of the sale of the bonds. And I've believe we've had some legislation seeking to make it mandatory in some lesser officials. Am I correct in my assumption there?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, as a practical matter, the Treasurer is investing all monies that he has on hand, so there is a return. The ah...matter that your referring to I think, had application particularly with regard to local governments and idol fund considerations. But its my understanding that the state Treasurer ah...keeps his funds invested. And of course, that language that you referred to, I think, spells that out."

William A. Redmond: "Well, isn't it true that a more recent practice, but years gone by they did not invest them and they were idle funds? And this bill does not make it mandatory that he invest the funds, am I correct in that?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, from a technical standpoint your observation is correct, that there is not a mandatory requirement, but the Treasurer will, I am sure, weight advise from the Governor as to what the cash flow is going to be and that particular fiscal year what the dollars are that are

the depositing of coins liquidates the revenue bonds. However, in this instance, I am further informed, that these are not true revenue bonds, but might be termed quasi-revenue bonds which will cost us money to retire. IS this correct?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, the Illinois Building Authority bonds are quasi-revenue bonds, the bonds that would be issued under this series of bills are full faith in credit general obligation bonds of the state of Illinois. And ah...the expert testimony in committee was that these bonds ought to sell somewhere's between 1/2 and 3/4 of one percent less than the revenue bonds which have been being issued by the Illinois Building Authority."

Roman J. Kosinski: "Question number two; it was obvious to me in appropriations committee, when I would put this question I must necessarily give you full premise prior to the question, when I would put this question to directors of the various agencies who would receive capitol improvements, that they had no projection for the cost of staffing, maintaining and equipping these new facilities, should they get them. And in all instances they were not able to satisfy me with such projection. Now it appears to me, Mr. Sponsor, that the costs here in are much like an iceberg, that a great deal of it remains beneath water. Can you tell me, in terms of the projections when I asked that question, how many hundreds of millions of dollars in tax money will be required during the life of the mortgage to sustain these new implemen-
tations?"



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "It's virtually impossible to give you an answer to that because of the variables that are inherent as to the exact time that the bonds will be issues, as to ah...the length of time that we are talking about, its... I can't now, with precision, give you that answer. In any event, I can suggest to you that, in the \$400,000,000 of dollars of bonds that are out of the package that would be being applied towards prior authorizations, that those, if they would have preceeded to have been accomplished under issuance by the Illinois Building Authority, as compared to preceeding the route that we have in these bills, that in the comparing of those two that we will, on our estimates, be saving the taxpayers somewhere between \$45 and \$65 millions of dollars."

Roman J. Kosinski: "I take no exception to that, Mr. Sponsor, and undoubetdly its true. I was attempting to point out, and I repeat the iceberg phrase, the cost tax wise of permitting these new facilities to exist over the 30 year period of the mortgage. In consequence I determine that this is a costly venture for my taxpayer. If not interms of the bond issue, so completely, in terms of sustaining those new eodipuses. This was my point in the light of remarks that were made earlier this session that there would be no new or increases taxation in Illinois and it appears to me that we're projecting taxes for the next 30 years. Would you think this is correct?"



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, Maintenance cost certainly is an important factor in what's necessary in taking care of antiquated ah...facilities. And in the judgement as to whether or not we're going to provide these needed Capitol improvements at our educational institutions is one that is within the providence of this General Assembly to decide. If you do not think, for example, that the University of Illinois, or Southern Illinois University need to have additional capitol improvements on their campuses, then you who serve as a member of the appropriations committee would be able to disagree with that particular appropriation and vote accordingly. We will be having an annual review of these various projects that will be coming through the legislative process and if you don't think that that particular project is necessary then I would assume, if you were supported by sufficient members, the project would not become a reality. And then there would not be an necessity for bonds to pay for it. I think we have to do those on a one at a time basis as they appear before this body."

Roman J. Kosinski: "Of course I'm in agreement, and I took no posture on whether we need those extra facilities, I merely wanted to point out to this general assembly that there are certain other tax costs involved in this bonding issue than meets the eye in the bill as it exists. And thank you for your comments sir."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes, well I do think the significant thing is that we, in this General Assembly in prior years, have



determined that we wanted to build structures ah...through the use of bonds. And we did that through the Illinois Building Authority. Now what we're saying is that we've got a cheaper vehicle to continue to do this kind of construction. A cheaper for the simple reason that the bonds will sell at a lesser interest rate than those of the IBA."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers."

Webber Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the sponsor a question, if I may?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "He indicates he'll yield."

Webber Borchers: "Ah...in relation to the half a billion dollars, this is mostly monies that will be used for capitol assets buildings etc.?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Right."

Webber Borchers: "Well, I'd like to point out, in relation to this, that this building represents, let us say at a 30 year period. Seems obvious that this building today could not be reproduced for many many times the money it took to build it, let's say 1872 I'm not sure of the date of erection. But any monies that is used for a permanent community asset, and this is certainly a permanent community asset, and built in a permanent community asset area, is something that over a period of time will pay for itself. So in relation to the iceberg theory, I want you to consider again this building and that iceberg theory. Obviously there will be hidden costs, there were hidden costs in the building of this building,



but it still stands, its been paid for long ago. All we have to do is maintain the building and modernize it as the years and time goes by. There's no doubt in my mind, that much of this money in capitol assets, will be built and erect eodipuses that will be standing long after the thirty years and possibly two hundred years from now. In which, the iceberg theory has been completed melted and destroyed. So I think that we should consider the long term aspect of this and the need, and what we're doing for the future generations and consider that this in fact, and indeed an investment, not only to the state at present, but in the state and the nation and the coming generations in the future. And therefore, it should be supported."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijeovich."

John S. Matijeovich: "Would the speaker respond to a question, Representative Blair, under our new constitution in article 9 section 9 it allows that ah...on state debts for specific purposes, wherein we may pass a law with the three fifths majority in what you now desire, and by reading the news papers and watching the media, which you are going to get, ah...but if this passed with a simple majority we could place this issue before the people in a statewide referendum. Now I think all of us stand for a public referendum in local governments where they issued general obligation bonds. Ah... wouldn't you feel that it would be the more responsible position that since they are general obligation bonds, and



ah...we place the full faith and credit of the taxpayers we say the state of Illinois, the taxpayers, don't you think the better course ought to be that the taxpayers have a voice in it, and that we hold our votes at the 89 majority and then place a amendment that this issue go before the state of Illinois?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "I did not feel that way at all with regard to the Transportation bond package on which I was the chief sponsor. I think that we have a responsibility down here to make these kinds of determinations. This is the reason that our constituents send us here. I have the same feeling with regard to these bonds. I am advocating here a cost savings to the taxpayers of this state that will be between \$45 and \$65 millions of dollars as compared to the tight financing that we are accomplishing through the Illinois Building Authority, which did not go before the people of this state by referendum. It was authorized by this general assembly. So, you have a choice of continuing with the IBA, which is going to cost us more in the long run, than going this route, or going this route which will save money for the taxpayers. And that's the position I'm in and that's the position I intend to stay in."

John S. Matijevich: "Well, my next question, since you mentioned the IBA and you talk about the greater cost. The reason for the greater cost is that they are revenue bonds rather than general obligation bonds. Isn't that true?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Right."



John S. Matijevich: "Then why didn't you and others last year, when we had bills that would make the bonds under the IBA, rather than revenue bonds, general obligation bonds, why didn't you support that?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, simply because the, on the question of these bills that would attempt to place the IBA in a posture of being, if you will, a quasi-full faith in credit situation, the bond experts testified in committee that while it would bolster up slightly, the IBA from a credit stand point, that the bonds still would ah...be being sold for an about a quarter of one per cent greater than the bonds that will be issued under this capitol development authority, and in my judgement this interest rate differential a...is far preferable for us to go this route than to go with the IBA with those bills that you referred to."

John S. Matijevich: "Well, my impression has been that the IBA has actually, its received alot of criticizm, but mostly the criticizm has been because of the fact that the interest rates are naturally higher because of the revenue bonds. But if I had my druthers, I'd rather have the IBA than what will amount to be the general services department, which have a horrible record. But my next question would be; I understand that \$50,000,000 in bond money that is actually a re-appropriation of general revenue that we approved last year, which is going to be used for remodeling and rehabilitation projects. Is that correct? Are we now putting in bond money something that we've already appropriated?"



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The substantial part of the money we're talking about here ah...is for new construction. And those few instances where there's rehabilitation, it is in essence a complete overhaul situation, which is for all intents and purposes, a new construction because of the extent to which the project will be undergoing rehabilitation."

John S. Matijevich: "Well, speaker, I understand that the substantial part is building. However, to many people \$50,000,000 is substantial. Is \$50,000,000 a re-appropriation?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, the figures that we have would indicate that not more than 7 to 10 millions of dollars would be for reconstruction."

John S. Matijevich: "Well, my figures are close to \$50,000,000, but that happens around here. And I don't know who to believe. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to talk briefly to this bill. Speaker, and members of the House. You know, very often we hear about the air plane people who tell us to fly now and pay later. And I guess that's the way of life now a days. But let me tellyou that this series of bills we have now, that we are going to skyrocket the cost of government. All these bills will do in my estimation, will be to encourage reckless and wild spending. Just a moment ago I asked the speaker about the fact that we are actually putting in bond money, monies that we have already appropriated. What we are in effect doing is putting back and releasing more money to general revenues. And we are encouraging a higher spending. Reckless spending in government. This



series of bills, in my estimation ladies and gentlemen, will only mean that we are encouraging easy spending. The people, the taxpayers, believe that we have been spending recklessly the way it is. And they want to more encouragement of reckless spending. And I think that we are being hypocritical when we are telling local governments to put the lids on, and tax freeze, to no longer increase the real estate taxes. Yet, by what we are doing today, we are fostering a state income tax. We are putting the full faith and credit of the state of Illinois with these bonds, and the people of the state of Illinois have not a word to say about it, but by sending us here as Representatives and reading in the newspaper that the deal has already been made, which I think is really a farce in diminishes the dignity of each one of us as Representatives. Before we pass any more bonds in Illinois I think we should take a hard look at how those bonds repayments will effect future abilities to pay for others. In 1971 our total payments were over \$72,000,000. The projected payment for the last year the next Governors termed, are \$247,000,000. How will an increase of \$170,000,000 offset our future abilities to meet new needs in Illinois? Will the state revenues increase by the same 528% in ten years? Not unless the Governor asks for a tax increase. And not only that, he may not have the choice of asking for it, by this series of bills we may have to have a tax increase, a new tax, a state real estate tax. The new and yet no needs of the state may have to go unmet. I don't think any



of us can predict the needs of the state of Illinois in the next ten years. I'm sure I can't. We are putting, in my estimation, the state in a bad financial condition. And the Governor has said that he doesn't want to increase taxes to pay for the obligations that he is now incurring. So much of our fiscal resources will be tied up in the repayment of bonds that we will virtually have no funds available to finance new programs. We are tying up future generations. We are tying up future taxpayers. We are tying up the hands of ourselves and future legislators, and future general assemblies. You know, we often hear about the demands for services, finally we can put it to a test, yes we passed the transportation bond issue, the people voted for the anti-pollution bond issue. Don't you have faith in such an important issue as this that the people wouldn't approve of it? I think it would put the administrations program right on the line, with the people where it belongs. And I think that since they are going to be obligated by it, maybe they ought to have the right to vote for it, or against it. Now we hear much about the IBA. I haven't been a friend of the IBA, but I think the director of the General Services Department, himself, was the best witness of how ridiculous, how utter incapable was the staff of the General Services Department. And let me say that I recall, in the Kerner administration, that when we ah...called for the creation of the General Services Department, they too, like speaker Blair, said that ~~it would be a savings to the people of the state of Illinois.~~



The taxpayers have heard that enough. This isn't going to be a savings to the people of Illinois at all. We are creating a new bureaucracy within the control of the Governor, and I don't care if its a Democratic Governor, or a Republican Governor, its a new bureaucracy that's going to run in tandem for a while with the Illinois, with much waste, much duplication. And I don't think that the people of Illinois are going to have a savings at all, but they are going to have increased obligations that in years to come they cannot meet. Now if your for the real estate tax increase, and you feel that this may incur that in some future date, maybe you ought to vote for this. But I'm afraid of this bill, I'm afraid of it because of what has happened in that past. And because we are releasing monies that we have already appropriated, so that we can have furthur spending in state government. I think that the snow ball is already running down hill, and its going to pass and I know that, but I think its a bad vote for the people of the state of Illinois and I urge as many as possible to vote no on this bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from cock, Representative Hyde."

Henry J. Hyde: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief on this. Ah...I just want to point out, I think a few facts. First of all, of the \$565,000,000 that this program embrasses, \$400,000,000 of it is already authorized and its to construct buildings that are vitally needed by the people of the state of Illinois, ah...that means University buildings, Junior College buildings, the Department of Mental Health needs new



buildings, Corrections needs new buildings, work needs to be done for conservation and every member of this House is for each and every one of those projects. Can anybody say the Jails aren't over crowded? Can anybody say we don't need additional jail facilities, mental health facilities, this has been the human cry for years and years. That our facilities are antiquated and need to be updated. So the purpose of this is certainly a noble one and a good one and a proper one. Now the complaint it made that ah...we're using a bond procedure and therefore we're saddling future generations. The other side of that argument which makes much more sense to me is the use of the bond device to finance necessary projects that, which by the way was well recognized in our new constitution, permits the purchase the contracting for and the building of these vitally new capitol improvements at today's prices, not tomorrow's prices. So that we get a lower cost, initially, and I am not offended by having future generations pay for facilities which future generations are going to use. I am somewhat offended by my generation having to pay for the totality of these improvements, which will be consumed and will be used by future generations. It doesn't seem to me there's anything unfair on the other hand, I think it's very wise to permit future generations to pay for facilities they're going to use. Now what is inescapable is the fact that, by using this device we are going to save at least \$45,000,000 and probably up to \$65,000,000 in financing these projects which the people

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



of the state of Illinois need. Therefore, this is a sensible modern useful device. It will not result in any tax increases, as the gentleman states over there, it is an effort and an attempt to get projects that are badly needed in many areas of the state at today's prices. And I think it is eminently sensible. It will not compound bureaucracy, because the IBA will ah...fade away. It will be absorbed and not used any more and I think this is an up to date look at modern problems with a smart sensible efficient way to finance the, and most importantly, you know your going to build these projects, why not build them at today's prices with a savings by the use of general obligation bonds, rather than revenue bonds of at least \$45,000,000. I think this is progressive legislation, it deserves the support of every member of the House."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from cook, Representative Granata."

Peter C. Granata: "Mr. Speaker, I now move the previous question."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman has moved the previous question, all in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The gentleman's motion prevails. And the gentleman from Will, Speaker Blair to close the debate."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Speaker, these series of bills will result in cost savings to the taxpayers between \$45 and \$65 millions of dollars over the time period that these bonds will be amortized compared to doing it the way it would have to be done under the IBA, I've spelled out clearly that there will be no tax increases required to amortize these bonds."



I have no fears of the past and I have every confidence of the future. I recommend a favorable vote on these bills and we take them one at a time, 4614 to start with."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Question is, shall House Bill 4614 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. It takes 107 votes. Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce to explain his vote."

Daniel M. Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I've listened to this debate today and yesterday on second reading and I've become convinced that we can only build long term improvements out of bond issues. We can't finance long term improvements such as buildings from current revenue. If we think we can do that we're only fooling ourselves. When we go to build a house, we don't pay it out of our current salary, we make a mortgage at the bank, or with an insurance company and we borrow for the future because the House is going to last us for thirty or forty or fifty years. And we make a twenty five or thirty year mortgage. And we must do the same on these long term improvements. After listening to the speaker, I'm convinced that this House, this House will have control over these projects. We've authorized most of the projects, we'll have control over them in the future, we'll have more control under this bill than we have in the past under the IBA. Now the interest rate savings between 1/2 to 3/4 percent is significant. Its significant. We had to go the IBA route in the past because of the restrictive provisions of the 1870 constitution. Under



our 1970 constitution we can avoid the high interest charges of revenue bonds and obtain the good credit of Illinois on general obligation bonds and save the people these high interest rates. The high interest rates are only helping the bankers. They're only helping the financiers who have been collecting from the state of Illinois the high interest rates that will not be necessary under these bills. When we lower the rate from 1/2 to 3/4 percent and save our people between \$45 and \$65 million dollara in interest charges. Now there were some weak nesses in this bill and I'm proud to say, our leader Representative Choate, with his amendment yesterday made sure that the bond procedes would not be used for matters that should come out of current and annual expense. Only for long term capitol improvements. The bond fund will not be used now for soft goods, for mops, for things that should be financed out of our current expense, for maintenance expenses, but only for the long term brick and mortar of these buildings. And that amendment improved this bill and made it a good bill. I will say in conclusion, there are no projects here in by district, you can look at the list, there are no projects in the 32nd district either the old district or the new district, but we've got to have our Junior Colleges built, we've got to have our universities with new buildings these state buildings will be built. Let's build them, let's build them the least expensive way to the taxpayer, let's take some money out of the bankers pocket who have been collecting these high interest charges, and IBA bond

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



bond issues, let's be responsible, let's vote for this package.

I vote aye."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from cook, Representative Mann."

Robert E. Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I would certainly agree with Representative Pierce on one point, and that is that the amendment offered by ah... Minority leader Choate did strengthen the bill. But I can't support the bill because, frankly, I think we are mortgaging away our future without taking care of our present needs. What do I mean by that? This is part of a total agreement which has been reached, part of that agreement as I understand it is to borrow \$35,000,000 from the Re-habilitation fund ah...of the city of Chicago, which I am going to very vigorously oppose. But part of the agreement, it seems to me and I say this only as a member and not intended to be critical of anyone else, should have been a long term educational formular to meet the current and future needs of the school children of the state of Illinois. That's missing from this package. So we are deferring the most pressing need of this state to take on further obligations. We are deferring the need for an educational formular for our children and every session we're going to defer it a little bit more and in the mean time our educational system gets worse. What are we doing? We're borrowing for the future to build structures instead of paying out in the present to meet human needs, such as education, and welfare and others. And



for this reason, because I think we are here sanctioning the wrong priorities, I've got to ah...oppose this bill. I would have hoped that included in some kind of package agreement would have been the most pressing need in this state now, a viable educational formular, rather than some piecemeal attempts to meet a problem which is going to recur and hit us over the head every session. We're going to have to pay for this money sometime for these bonds. And when we pay for them their going to be coming out of money that should have been used to meet human needs. And for this reason, because I think that this is not a long term solution to our problems, but a piecemeal way of doing business, I've got to vote no."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from cook, Representative Jaffe."

Aaron Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I do not agree with Representative Pierce when he says that the legislature will have a roll in what will be constructive. If you take a look at House Bill 4617 and take a look at page 5, you will find that the commission has the right to enter into contract for construction management for supervisions of all projects constructed by or under the supervision of the board. They also have the right to enter into the contract for professional services. Now if you go to bill 4614, under section 4, it says that the bonds shall be issued and sold from time to time in such amounts as directed by the Governor upon recommendation of the Director of the

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



Bureau of the Budget. I think if you look at these two items in these two bills its quite obvious that the legislature has no roll in any of these things, and it's strictly a matter between the Governor and the Board which he will, which he will appoint and appoint directly."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Redmond."

William A. Redmond: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, although I think there are probably some good features to these set of bills, it would seem to me that we're not asking too much if we're going to depart from the previous method of having what amounts to a revenue method of financing through the IBA and replacing that by putting a certain percentage of the debt in the full faith and credit of the State of Illinois on every citizen of this state, its not asking too much to let them have a voice in whether or not they want this done. I would feel that this should go to a referendum of the people, if this was the only method of financing I might feel differently, but there is an alternative method. And I think it is unfair to the people not to let them have a voice. They have told us time and time and time again that they are sick and tired of the high taxes and it seems to me that they should decide whether they want a part of this. And therefore, I vote no."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take....Gentleman from ah...Cook, Representative Leon."



John F. Leon: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to explain my yes vote. I believe that in this area of unemployment, which this nation is now undergoing, a capitol bond improvement program would give work to many needy people. Particular when we have the fair employment practice amendment to it, I believe it would be beneficial to all the people of Illinois, therefore, I'm happy to cast a yes vote."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there.....Representative Redmond, for what purpose do you rise Sir?"

William A. Redmond: "Request a verification of the affirmative vote please?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "O-K, the gentleman has requested a verification of the affirmative roll call. I haven't said what it was yet, The gentleman from cook, Representative Burditt, for what purpose do you rise sir?"

George M. Burditt: "Mr. Speaker, may we have a poll of the absentees before we have a verification of the affirmative?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "I think that would be in order, sir. Now will the clerk please poll the absentees. The roll call stands at 116 'ayes', 32 'nays'."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Barnes, Brandt, Brenne, Carroll,....."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Record Representative Carroll as voting 'no'. Brenne 'aye'."

Frederic B. Selcke: "Connolly, Davis, Ewell, Friedland, Glass, Hall....."

~~Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: Record Representative Glass as voting 'aye'.~~



Record Representative Hall as voting 'aye'."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Henss, Hudson, Kleine, Klosak, Laurino, Maragos....."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Record Representative Maragos as voting 'no'."

Fredric B. Selcke: "McDermott, McDevitt, D. O'Brien, Pappas...."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Record Representative O'Brien as voting 'aye'. "

Fredric B. Selcke: "Pappas, Phillip, Taylor...."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Taylor, 'aye'."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Jack Thompson, VonBoeckman, Williams, Yourell."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Record Representative Henss as voting 'aye'. Now does the gentleman persist in his request for a verification. The gentleman says no. Record Representative Friedland as voting 'aye'. Representative Barnes for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Eugene M. Barnes: "How am I recorded Mr. Speaker?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "How is the gentleman recorded?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Eugene M. Barnes: "Vote me 'no', please."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Record the gentleman as voting 'no'. Representative Brandt, for what purpose do you rise Sir?"

John B. Brandt: "How am I recorded?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "How is Representative Brandt....is recorded as not voting. Record Representative Brandt as voting 'no'. Representative Yourell for what purpose do you rise Sir?"



Harry Yourell: "How am I recorded Mr. Speaker?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "How is the gentleman recorded?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Harry Yourell: "Vote me 'aye'."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Record the gentleman as voting 'aye'.

Representative Pappas for what purpose do you rise Sir?"

Peter Pappas: "Vote me 'aye', Please."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Record Representative Pappas as voting

'aye'. On this question there are 125 'ayes', 36 'nays'.

And this bill having received a constitutional majority is

hereby declared passed. Now the question is shall House

Bill 4615 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting

'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who

wish? Take the record. On this question there are 125 'ayes',

29 'nays'. And this bill having received a constitutional

majority is hereby declared passed. Question is shall House

Bill 4616 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye',

the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish?

Take the record. On this question there are 129 'ayes',

29 'nays'. And this bill having received a constitutional

majority is hereby declared passed. Question is shall House

bill 4617 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting

'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish?

Take the record. On this question there are 128 'ayes',

31 'nays'. And this bill having received a constitutional

majority is hereby declared passed. The question is shall

House Bill 4683 pass? All those in favor will signify by



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 128 'ayes', 28 'nays'...Record Representative Choate as voting 'aye'. And this bill having received a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Granata, for what purpose do you rise Sir?"

Peter C. Granata: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I now move that this series of bills be reconsidered."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from cook, Representative Randolph."

Paul J. Randolph: "Mr. Speaker, I move that motion lie upon the table."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman has moved the motion lie upon the table. All those in favor of the gentleman's motion to table signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The gentleman's motion prevails. House Bill's second reading. House bill 4264."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 4264. Bill for an act to add Section 18.8.2 to the school code. Second reading of the bill. One committee amendment. Amend House Bill 4264 on page 1, by deleting line 1 and inserting in lieu thereof the following; etc.?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Lee, Representative Shapiro."

David C. Shapiro: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House I move that committee amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4264 be tabled."



Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "O-K, procedurally, we've been moving for adoptions, so the Gentleman from Lee, Representative Shapiro, moves that amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4264 be adopted. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. And the gentleman now moves that the amendment be tabled, all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. And the amendment is tabled. Are there further amendments?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment no. 2, Shapiro, Amend House Bill 4264 on page 1, by deleting line 1 and inserting in lieu thereof the following; an act to add section 10-19.2 etc."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Lee, Representative Shapiro."

David C. Shapiro: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 4264 is a bill that allows for feasibilities for those school districts that are contemplating going to a full year school. The floor amendment which I have to offer strikes everything after the enacting clause and places in that bill the Senate version of a fullyear feasibility school study. I move its adoption."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman."

Arthur L. Berman: "Will the sponsor yield. Dave is this the ah...same feasibility study bill in essence that OSPI had? "

David C. Shapiro: "Ah...yes, Representative Berman, ah...identical."

Arthur L. Berman: "Thank you."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman



has offered to move the adoption of amendment no. 2 to House Bill 4264. All in favor of the adoption signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments. Third reading. On the order of concurrences appears House Bill 3078, for which purpose the gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman is recognized.

G.L. Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I move that we concur in Senate amendment to House Bill 3078. This is a bill which dealt with the relationship between vocational technical centers in the school building commission and some of these are with joint agreement in which the regional superintendent acts as the administrative authority rather than an administrative district. And Senate amendment no. 1 puts the language in to include the regional superintendent acting pursuant to section 3-15.4 or administrative district, whichever the case may be. And I move we concur in Senate amendment to House Bill 3978."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has moved the House concur with Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 3078. All in favor of concurrence signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 105 'ayes', Douglas 'aye', Leon 'aye', Barry 'no'. Fleck 'aye', Maragos 'aye', Choate 'aye', Neff 'aye', J. Carter 'aye'. John Brandt 'aye', Merlo 'aye', Kennedy 'aye', Shea 'aye', On this question there are 116 'ayes', 1 'nay'. And the House concurs with Senate amendment no. 1 to House



Bill 3078. On the order of concurrences appears House Bill 4260, for which purpose the gentleman from cook, Representative Bluthardt is recognized."

Edward E. Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, Senate amendments 1 to House Bill 4260 ah...removed the sum of \$200,000 from the incentive program for local governments, and I would move to non-concur."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman has moved to non-concur with Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4260. All in favor of the gentleman's motion to non-concur signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. And the House non-concurs with Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 4260. On the order of concurrences appears House Bill 3557, for which purpose the gentleman from cook, Representative Regner is recognized."

David J. Regner: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, There are two amendments, this amendment no. 1 is a ah...just specifying that this Bill applies to residential subdivisions and developemants only. And I move that the House do concur in Senate amendment no. 1 to House Bill 3557."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has moved the House Concur with Senate amendment no. 1 and 2 to House Bill 3557. All in favor of concurrence signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 127 'ayes', no 'nays', And the House



concur with Senate amendments no.1 and 2 to House Bill 3557. On the order of Conference Committee Reports appears House Bill 3736, for which purpose the gentlemen from Wayne, Representative Blades is recognized."

Ben C. Blades: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, differences between the House and Senate have been resolved and the copy of the Conference Committee is on your desk on House Bill 3736. I now move that we adopt the Conference Committee report on House Bill 3736."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman has moved the Conference Committee Report relative to House Bill 3736. All in favor of the adoption signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative R.D. Cunningham."

R.D. Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, and members of the House, I wanted to explain my vote on this particular issue. Rare indeed to I find myself in the embarrassing position of thinking that the compensation for a public official is too modest, but it should be observed in this instance the minimum salary fixed for Corinors in the 13 counties of the 54th district, where each of the jobs is filled by an influential citizen, is indeed minimal. It should be observed further that the majistrates, that we're going to raise their salaries in a few days \$5,000, we're fixing minimum salaries for 11 out of the 13 corinors in our district in amount of \$2500. Now the position is quasi-judicial so the comparison is valid. I would hope accordingly that the county board would show



somewhat more generosity in fixing the salary of these important people than this legislature is showing. But I did not want to be, thought to be in any way objecting to the action of my esteemed running mate, Ben Blades. I admire him greatly and I...but I doubt that he'll be running for Corinor rather than legislative race in view of the amount of money thats offered for this job."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 94 'ayes', 3 'nays'. And the House adopts the Conference Committee Report relative to House bill 3736. On consideration postponed.....On the order of consideration postponed appears House Bill 4550, has been read a third time. And the gentlemen from cook, Representative Shea, will handle the bill."

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, House Bill 4550 will let the Chicago Board of Education make a supplemental appropriation and ordinance. This will allow the board to take advantage of the increases assessments in this quadrannial. I'd ask for the support of the House."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Question is shall House Bill 4550 pass. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Campbell 'aye'. Take the record. On this question there are 125 'ayes', 5 'nays'. And this bill having received a constitutional majority is hereby delcared passed. On the order of house Bills third reading. ~~House Bill 4579.~~"

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'shall House Bill 4550 pass?'. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', and the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Campbell.. 'aye'. Take the record. On this question, there are 125 'Ayes', 5 'Nays', and this Bill having received a Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Ah.. let's see. On the order of House Bills Third Reading. House Bill 4679."

Fredric B. Selcker: "House Bill 4679, a Bill for an Act to amend 'The School Code'. Third Reading of the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 4679 permits the Chicago Board of Education to borrow 35,000,000 dollars from a Rehabilitation Bond Fund and repay the same within five years. When this Bond Fund was originally set up, it was set up at 250,000,000 dollars to be sold in increments of 50,000,000 dollars a year for five years. In effect, what we're doing with this Bill is allowing the Board of Education to sell 50,000,000 dollars that would probably be considered the fifth year now and to use 35,000,000 dollars of that to pay for current financing of schools. Ladies and Gentlemen, I would be the first to agree with anybody in this room that this is not the most fiscally sound way to run Government. But, we find ourselves in a dilemma where we do not have the money in the



General Revenue Fund in this State to adequately finance schools at a level that I think we'd all like to. So, in order to avert a crisis to keep the schools open within the City of Chicago, I would ask for the help of both sides of the aisle on this Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Hyde."

Henry J. Hyde: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Henry J. Hyde: "Ah.. Representative Shea, what plans exist for the repayment of this money?"

Gerald W. Shea: "There is a requirement in the Bill that the money be paid back within five years. Hopefully, the Governor's Revenue Committee for Schools ah.. will have a report by then. And, hopefully, the State will be in a position where it can follow the Constitutional mandate and fund 50% of our local schools."

Henry J. Hyde: "Well ah.., if I may just briefly comment ah.., Mr. Speaker, on that last point. Ah.. I think the Constitution, what it mandates ah.. support by the State of Education ah.. it talks about public education and that includes higher education. And, I think, when you add the contribution of ah.. the taxpayers of the entire State of Illinois to education and you include higher education, ah.. you find that ah.. the contribution fully complies with the mandate ah.. of the ah.. Constitution. Thank you."



rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf."

Jacob John Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, last Session, I was a member of the Lanigan Committee which studied the Chicago Board of Education. As a member of that Committee, I learned of the poor management practices of the Chicago Board of Education, bargain leases, long-term leases, some as long as 99 years, poor bidding practices and construction, a school system that's overloaded with Supervisors, Assistant Supervisors and a host of other non-teaching positions that amount to nearly one half of the employees hired by the Board of Education. It's a system that has as many janitors working in the Chicago Board of Education as the City of New York does with double the population. The Chicago Board of Education, it seems, which are the political appointees of the Mayor, are not accountable for their actions.. They come down here asking for more money each term and despite the fact that the Chicago Schools have received increases that amounted to 120 percent under the Ogilvie administration, the truth of the matter is that the education of our children is worse than ever. Now, the City of Chicago netted about 24,000,000 dollars in 1971 from the State Income Tax which was provided by this General Assembly. But, the Mayor of Chicago hasn't seen fit to give any of that money to the Chicago Board of Education for the children. Now, they use propaganda tactics. They're going to cut out the night school programs. They're going to stop Art, Physi-

cal Education and Music Programs because they figure that way they can get the teachers stirred up, get the students and the parents worked up over this fear of curtailing these programs to put more pressure on this Legislature to supply more money. And, having failed to intimidate the Members into giving them a blank check, now they've come up with a new approach. And, that is to put a raid, and I say a raid, on the Bond Rehabilitation money that was given to the Chicago Schools to rehabilitate some of the old buildings that are fifty, sixty and seventy-five years old. This money is to cover up the mistakes of the Chicago Board of Education so that they can put it off. It's only a temporary thing to get them over the hump. But, Gentlemen and Ladies of this Assembly, I say the Chicago Board of Education must be accountable for the money that we give them. Every other State Agency has to come before the Appropriations Committee and get a drilling and explain how they spend the money and what they do with it. We should get the same kind of cooperation from the Chicago Board of Education. If they want us to give money, they should explain or call in the Legislative Leaders at the time that they're making out their budget to see what we can realistically work out. Now, as far as this loan goes, they'll be back here next Session with another Bill trying to get some more money out of this General Assembly to pay back the \$35,000,000 dollars. And, I think that we ought to vote 'no'."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representa-



tive Douglas."

Bruce L. Douglas: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's not easy for me to stand up and speak against the Bill which many of my constituents, in all good faith, have written to me and asked me to support. And, I feel compelled in voting 'no' on this Bill to speak to my constituents through this Legislative Body and explain to them that first of all, I question the legality of this approach. Secondly, I feel that there would be enormous hypocrisy for me, as a Co-sponsor of a Bill last year which brought about the availability of 250,000,000 dollars in bond money for rehabilitation of the schools, to go back on what I feel was the intent of that original Bill. I, with others, question where the money is going to come from to repay to that source of funding, the 35,000,000 dollars that we are requesting. I feel that it is an abrogation of the good faith that this General Assembly showed in making that money available, for us to be taking 35,000,000 dollars away when the money that was appropriated is desperately needed for the rehabilitation of many schools, some of which are in my District and some of which are so bad that the children can not benefit from the educations that they're supposed to be receiving. I think that it is an injustice. I think that it's going back on the intent of the original Bill which provided this funds. And, I feel that this is an inappropriate way for us to be coming up with money as desperately as it is needed. And, I will be voting 'no' on this Bill."



Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Lake, Representative Murphy."

W. L. Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question, if he would, please?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "He indicates he'll yield."

W. J. Murphy: "Representative Shea, nothing directly connected with this Bill, but, insofar as the repayment provision, I have a question that I want to ask. And, that is some five years ago, I believe it was, we loaned the County of Cook, I believe it was 17 or 18,000,000 dollars. Has that money been paid back?"

Gerald W. Shea: "You're talking about a Bill that was sponsored by then, Representative Pollack for then President of the County Board, Ogilvie, to borrow ah.., I think, it was 22,500,000 dollars out of the Motor Fuel Tax Fund."

W. J. Murphy: "That's correct."

Gerald W. Shea: "Subsequent to that, there was legislation introduced in this General Assembly allowing the County of Cook to use its Motor Fuel Tax Fund for nonroad purposes, to use it in its General Revenue. And, I think that there was ah.. ah.. an Attorney General's opinion saying to take and pay from the General Revenue Fund or the Corporate Fund into the Motor Fuel Tax Fund, and then, be able to use the Motor Fuel Tax Fund for Corporate purposes would make the payment provision a nullity."

W. J. Murphy: "And so, in fact, we didn't really get it paid back. And so, I have the same wonder now if we are going



to get this paid back." Although, I do know that it is a necessity at this time."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Glass."

Bradley M. Glass: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Bradley M. Glass: "Ah.. Gerry, it seems to me that the reason Chicago Schools are in the position that they are is as a result of a contract entered into by the Chicago Teachers' Union and the Chicago Board of Education with full knowledge that the money to fund that contract wasn't there. And now, they're turning to us in the Legislature to provide some means for ah.. providing those funds. And, we are giving the authority to borrow money from... from a fund that supposed to be rehabilitating school buildings. Now, many of the Members have already asked whether that money is going to be repaid. I would like to ah... and from what source? I'm interested in what source, but I'm also interested in whether the Bill provides any specific requirement that it is repaid. And, if it isn't repaid, what ah.. what would happen?"

Gerald W. Shea: "I think that there's an obligation for the School Board at the time that it borrows these funds to repay them. As I stated, what you're in effect doing is letting the School Board borrow its own money, money that it was not going to go public with and sell until 1976. You're



letting them sell it now and.. and borrow it for the Educational Fund. As you know, there's been unprecedented growth within the City of Chicago with new buildings and new assessments. And, I think there's going to be enough growth to have five or six million dollars a year available to pay this loan. Now, certainly, if the loan is not repaid, any citizen, taxpayer of the City of Chicago can file a mandamus suit against the School Board and force them to pay it out of the Educational Fund. You're a good enough Lawyer to know that, Brad."

Bradley M. Glass: "Well, I.. ah.. I just wanted to be sure not having seen the Bill whether there is.. there will be that specific obligation to repay these monies."

Gerald W. Shea: "There's a specific obligation of repayment. And, I want to emphasize again that there's no State Funds involved.. You're allowing the City.. or the School Board of the City of Chicago to borrow its own money that it would've not sold these bonds for another five years, you're allowing them to sell it now, sell those bonds now, to use the proceeds from that bond sale now and to pay back over the next few years out of what I consider anticipated growth and assessments within the City of Chicago, such assessments as the new Sears Tower ah.. buildings of this nature."

Bradley M. Glass: "Thank you."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Granata."

Peter C. Granata: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, listen-



ing to Representative Shea, I feel like he does. This isn't the best way to do the job. But, when conditions get desperate and we get to the crossroads of giving our children an education and shutting down schools, we've got to meet the emergencies. There should be a better way. But, we don't know one now. I think that we all ought to vote for this Bill and then come back next year and try to find other ways to finance this thing. But, at this time, we are at the crossroads of giving our children an education or no education. I think that we ought to vote for this Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Moore."

Don A. Moore: "Will the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Don A. Moore: "Ah.. Representative Shea, who in the City of Chicago was responsible for the tax levy for education?"

Gerald W. Shea: "Ah.. the School Board."

Don A. Moore: "Ah.. the School Board and then what? It is ultimately passed by the City Council?"

Gerald W. Shea: "Yes, it is."

Don A. Moore: "And, it's ultimately the.. the amount of money that is ah.. levied for school purposes is done by the City Council and the City of Chicago."

Gerald W. Shea: "The City Council is mandated by this Legislature to adopt an Appropriation Ordinance which includes whatever figure the Board of Education supplies to them. That s the mandate of this Legislative Body."

Don A. Moore: "Does the City Council have the authority to increase or decrease that budget?"

Gerald W. Shea: "It does not."

Don A. Moore: "Alright.. One other question. What percentage of the Real Estate Tax Bill in the City of Chicago ah.. goes for education? Approximately?"

Gerald W. Shea: "Approximately, 50 some percent."

Don A. Moore: "Ah.. about 50 percent?"

Gerald W. Shea: "A little better than 50 percent."

Don A. Moore: "Well, if I may just address myself briefly, Mr. Speaker. Out in my District and most of Suburban Cook County, at least 75 to 80 to 81 percent of our Real Estate Tax Bills go for education. And, I think what the proper approach in this matter, ah.. maybe we have better schools in the suburbs, but by golly, the Real Estate taxpayers are the ones that are paying for it. And, I think, the solution to this problem will be to ah.. have the ah.. Board of Education in Chicago and the City Council in Chicago have a little better coordination and increase and raise the money like we do in the Suburban Area and the rest of the Area of the State of Illinois rather than to go on with a program such as this. I would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Meyer."

J. Theodore Meyer: "Ah.. two questions of the Sponsor."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "He indicates he'll yield."

J. Theodore Meyer: "Ah.. Representative Shea, if this Bill is



to be passed, would this provide sufficient funds to prevent the anticipated teachers strike in.. in this coming Fall?"

Gerald W. Shea: "I don't know of any anticipated strike by the teachers this Fall. I do know that I've been told that this would with the ah.. additional money that's available under House Bill 4550 that just passed this Body that there should be more than ample funds to keep the school going for the next fiscal year. Ah.. tie that in with the Bill, House Bill 4551 that this Body passed, allowing that over the next two years the Board of Education to change its fiscal year. And, it's my understanding that there will be more than ample money to run the Board of Education in a way that it'll ensure the schools to stay open."

J. Theodore Meyer: "Is there enough in this 35,000,000 dollar program, and projecting income and expenses, that in the event of another renegotiation of the contract, there would be sufficient funds to provide for the.. ah.. the teacher's salary? Or do we.... Basically, is this... is there enough in there to prevent a teachers strike?"

Gerald W. Shea: "It's my understanding that this will."

J. Theodore Meyer: "Thank you."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative R. Walsh."

Richard A. Walsh: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would just like to make a correction of a statement that was made recently. The percentage of the Chicago Real Estate and Personal Property Tax Bill that goes



for education is 40 percent and not 50 or something in excess^{87.} of 50. There are two levies. One for the Junior College Board and one for the Board of Education and that ah.. total levy is closer to 40 percent or maybe 41 percent of the total Real Estate Tax Bill. So, ah.. the Chicago taxpayers are paying an excessive Real Estate Tax Bill. And, the money that is raised is not going for schools, as it is in Suburban Areas, but it's going for other purposes."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, the tax levy on the City of Chicago is \$.48 ah.. of tax dollar is used for purpose of education. \$.48 cents."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Peoria, Representative Day."

Robert G. Day: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "He indicates he will."

Robert G. Day: "Representative Shea, ah.. reference is made in this Bill to some 37,000,000 dollars in your Bond Fund. Now, how did that ah.. Fund arise? Was it by the vote of the people? Did they approve these Bonds?"

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Day, last year, this Body authorized over a five year period of time the sale of 250,000,000 dollars of nonreferendum bonds for the purpose of rehabilitating the schools in the City of Chicago. What we are attempting to do now is borrow 35,000,000 dollars from that Bond Fund. Hopefully, out of anticipated growth and assessed evaluation,



raise the money to repay it before the last 50,000,000 dollars would have been sold so that we can do two things, to keep the school open now and also to have that money available five years hence for rehabilitation in the schools."

Robert G. Day: "Now, another question. As I understand it, the Chicago Board of Education is not elected. It is appointed by the Mayor. Is that correct?"

Gerald W. Shea: "I.. I'm sorry, I.... My understanding is that the Mayor recommends to the City Council the appointment of the Board... Members."

Robert G. Day: "But... But, they're not elected? It's not an elected Board?"

Gerald W. Shea: "I.. I'm sorry... Mr. Speaker, I can't hear the gentleman."

Robert G. Day: "Well, the question is, is the Chicago Board of Education elected by the people or is it appointed by the Mayor?"

Gerald W. Shea: "It's an appointed Board, Mr. Day."

Robert G. Day: "So, that this Bill will place the final responsibility for the transfer of these funds, not on this Legislature which is merely authorizing such a transfer by this Bill, but, in addition, take a resolution by the Chicago Board in order to actually transfer the funds."

Gerald W. Shea: "I.. I'm sorry...."

Robert G. Day: "The point is that if this Bill passes, the transfer of funds will not be automatic. In addition to the passage of this Bill, it will take a further resolution by



the Chicago Board of Education to actually effect this transfer. Isn't that correct?"

Gerald W. Shea: "Yes, Sir. It is."

Robert G. Day: "Thank you."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Capuzi."

Louis F. Capuzi: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no', and the previous question has been moved. And, the gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea, to close the debate."

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that this Bill has been fully debated. I think that everybody understand what's here. We're asking to let the School Board authorize the borrowing of up to 35,000,000 dollars from its ' Rehabilitation Bond Fund and to repay that money over a five year period of time. It's my understanding from talking to Members of the Board that there will be enough increased assessed evaluation within the City of Chicago certainly to repay this money and keep the schools going. I'd appreciate the support of the House."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The question is, 'shall House Bill 4679 pass?'. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', and the opposed by voting 'no'. The gentleman from Cook, Representative Fleck."



Charles J. Fleck: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Grammar School that I attended in Chicago was built in the year 1881 and is still functioning and operating on a daily basis. And, if anybody ever took a tour of the interior of that school and took a tour of the tower along, they would have a very difficult time discriminating the two of them. Now, when Representative Wolf said that this was a raid upon the Bond Rehabilitation Fund, he was absolutely correct. All they're going to be doing up in Chicago with the School Board is run a conveyor from the bank vault, throw the money on it and let that conveyor belt run out to the nearest open manhole cover because this money is going to be mismanaged and mis-spent like most of the money has been up in that Board of Education. And, they know that they aren't going to repay it. We know that they're not going to repay it. They say that in five years they're only going to borrow it and repay it. But, you know as well as I do, when the chips are down, they're going to come right back down to Springfield and put the onus on our shoulders where it does not belong. It belongs on the mismanagement of the Board in Chicago. And, I urge every Member to vote against this Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explanation of my 'aye' vote, I too, am concerned with the Board of Education and its mis-



management of money. In turn, I think, it's the responsibility of this General Assembly to appropriate the necessary funds for education throughout the State of Illinois. This is why we offered the Bakalis formula. And, unfortunately, it was defeated by a mere three or four votes. But, we do have a responsibility, the responsibility to the students within an educational system. It's unfortunate, it's unfortunate that the State at this time, according to the Governor and his Bureau of the Budget, does not have the necessary finances available to provide the necessary money. This is, in my opinion, a poor route to follow, but it's the only route that we have available. And, Gentlemen, I ask you for an 'aye' vote."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Phil Collins."

Philip W. Collins: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, I would just like to say that here we go again, bailing out the Chicago Board of Education from their own mismanagement and misadministration. I, too, was a Member of the Lanigan Commission referred to by Representative Wolf. And, what Representative Wolf didn't mention is that our report was entitled, 'Collapse', and rightfully so, because here and anywhere is a system in a state of collapse. But, he made reference to the Board, the top-heavy Board, full of high paid Administrators doing what we... we could not ascertain, building buildings as a cost of millions of dollars in excess of projected cost and



buildings, upon completion, were falling apart before they were occupied. We found the leases, leases that have been referred to recently in Newspaper Reports, ah.. Reports that have been ah.. made by Independent Agencies, ah.. Sweetheart Leases of Board of Education and ah.. property that could have ah.. resulted in ah.. in many, many millions of dollars more to the Board of Education. And then, too, every year, they negotiate Union Contracts with funds they do not have, sign contracts and then say, 'Alright, go to Springfield and get the money'. I think that it's time that we said to the Board, 'Wake up and look at your own house. It's time that you cleaned house'. We've got an un.. uninformed Board ah.. with a Superintendent who ah.. ah.. regularly sticks his head in the sand and will blame everyone else except himself for his own mistakes. I think that this is ridiculous. It's time that we cut it... put an end to this kind of raid, as Representative ah.. Wolf referred to, a raid on this Fund. We have no right to do this. And, I would urge that defeat this Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Kane, Representative Hill."

John Jerome Hill: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to vote for this piece of legislation. I'm going to tell you why. These are the funds that are coming from the taxpayers of Chicago only. And, if we don't do something like this, there's going to be a Bill in here some day, in the very near future, to do it with State



Funds, the taxes that are collected from all of the citizens of the State of Illinois. And, it seems to me that this is one of the Bills that I can vote for because all of the money is coming from the Chicago taxpayers. And, for once, it is not coming from the pockets of the taxpayers of my Area.

And, I appreciate voting for it."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."

Daniel M. Pierce: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, if we don't pass this Bill, it's not Superintendent Redmond that's going to suffer. He's going to collect his salary. It's not the School Board that's going to suffer. It's the school children of Chicago, the teachers and the school children of Chicago. Now, this is.. this is very bad financial policy and I agree to borrow these funds from a Bond Fund for an Educational Fund. But, it's a necessity, it's a necessity. We must do it. We must do it to keep these schools open. And, having a feeling for the need of the school children of Chicago to receive an education, even though I may not agree with the economic theory of borrowing Bond money for current expenses, I'm willing to make an exception in this case on the understanding that the money will be repaid. And, therefore, I will vote 'aye'."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Mann."

Robert E. Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House,



this is not only the best way, it's the worse possible way. Now, as I understand it, fifty percent of the Chicago Schools are more than fifty years old, a hundred and seven buildings are over seventy-five years old. And, what we are doing is telling the Chicago Board of Education to borrow from one of its own funds in order to meet the deficit of another fund, while requiring the Board to repay itself for the loan. Now, I wish Doctor Redmond were here to tell us exactly how this 35,000,000 dollars is going to be spent. Is it going to be spent to perpetuate his own bureaucracy? I have never in my ten years voted against a Bill for aid to education anywhere. And, I have four kids in the Chicago Public School System. But, I'm convinced, on the basis of the past performances of the Chicago Public School System, that this 35,000,000 dollars is not going to do one thing to increase the quality of education for my four school children. All they are doing is condoning the present method of operation of the Superintendent of the Chicago Board of Education. I think that he should have come down here and told us how he is going to spend this 35,000,000 dollars. I want to know whether or not it's going to feather the bureaucratic nest downtown or whether it's going for programs, whether it's going for quality education, whether it's going for ghetto schools. There's some schools in the ghetto that don't even have toilet paper. And, I think that this will continue even after we give them this 35,000,000 dollars. Now, our responsibility, under the Constitution as



a State, is to finance Public Education. This will not cost us a cent. And, what we are doing is advocating our State responsibility. I think that it's a bad policy move. I think that it will do nothing for public education in Chicago. I think that we ought to hold this Bill until Mr. Redmond comes down and tells us exactly how he's going to spend this 35,000,000 dollars."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Hyde."

Henry J. Hyde: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ah.. am not a practitioner of transcendental meditation such as Representative Murphy espouses and I know that it would do me and the rest of us a lot of good. But, I have just had an intuitive flash. Ah.. I ah.. the answer to Representative Mann's question has suddenly appeared before me. How is this money going to be spent? And, two words loom out at me, 'Teachers Salaries'. Thank you."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Granata."

Peter C. Granata: "Mr. Speaker, in reply to Representative Mann, I know that this money is absolutely going to go to school teachers and for the students. If not, I'll be the first one next Session to introduce a Resolution investigating the Board of Education. I've never... never in my thirty-eight years in the Legislature introduced an investigation of any kind. But, if the Superintendent of school in Chicago does not follow what we give them this money for, I..



I'll introduce the Resolution. And, I think that we ought to give him this chance and vote for the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Garmisa."

Benedict Garmisa: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that the... that this Bill can boil down to one concept as to whether or not we can equate the education of our children and our Chicago Public School children in our Chicago Public Schools with brick and stone. Now, Mr. Chairman or Mr. Speaker, when it comes down to the equating the education of those children or mortar brick and stones, there's only one way that we can vote. And, that would be with a 'green' light. The education of our children is paramount to everybody of the City of Chicago. And, I urgently urge a 'yes' vote on this issue."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Gene L. Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, in reference first to some discrepancy which appeared in the debate in terms of what percentage of the Chicago tax dollars went to the schools. I'd like to quote from a ah.. Chicago Public Schools ah.. 1971 - 1972 Facts and Figures Booklet ah.. which points out that the Chicago Board of Education gets 39.3 cents out of every dollar. The City of Chicago gets 38.5 cents out of every dollar and the Junior College, which was apparently lumped in with it, ah.. gets 3.1. So, even if you put the



two together, you're talking about ah.. \$.42 cents. I think, however, that they may not be ah.. the significant point in regard to this Bill. I think that the significant point in regards to this Bill is that the Chicago School Board find themselves in this rather peculiar position in which I would be the first to say that they have put themselves in. There's been a great deal of discussion about the State Finance Committees coming up with ways of saving the schools in the years to come in terms of coming up with more State Aid. Gentlemen, it's very obvious to me that the State is going to continually come up with more and more and more of how the schools are going to be supported or the wherewithal. We're also going to have more and more to say about how that money is spent. I think that this particular Bill is indicative of the need for us to get more deeply involved in this type of decision making process. I'm going to support this Bill, not because I like it, not because I think it's right, but, because I think under these circumstances that we ah.. have no other choice but to do so."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes."

Eugene M. Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, with much reluctance, I'm going to support this Bill. I come from a District in Chicago that, I think, has some of the most overcrowded schools in the City of Chicago. We have some of the oldest buildings in the City of Chicago. I heard my Colleague on the other side of the aisle say how old



the school was that he attended. Well, I graduated from a school in the City of Chicago, from Elementary School back in 1945, that, at that time, at that time, the auditorium was condemned. That school is still being used. And, children are still there trying to get an education. Just a short time ago, many Members of this House, had no regrets in voting for a Bill, a bond issue, that would mortgage the future lives of the young people that.. that are in the school system today. But, right now, a short time later, it seems that some of these same Members do not feel that these children should be given the equipment to be able to go out and gain the type of employment that will enable them to pay off those bonds. As I said before, I will support this Bill. But, I.. I think that the School Board in the City of Chicago has got a lot of soul-searching to do. I know in my District, the children of that District have been mistreated. The educational ah.. ah.. quality is so poor. It is worse than bad. But, to ensure that they at least have something in some way, in some manner to try to pay off that mortgage that you Gentlemen here today saddle them around their neck with. I will support this Bill for that and that alone."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Champaign, Representative Clabaugh."

Charles W. Clabaugh: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, a year ago, the Superintendent of Schools, upon the direction of his Board in Chicago, came before the School Problems Commission with the recommendation that we... Mr. Speaker.."



Superintendent, upon recommendation of his Board in Chicago, came to the School Problems Commission and among the various recommendations that he made was the recommendation for this 250,000,000 dollar bond issue for the rehabilitation ah.. for the school buildings in Chicago. We were convinced then with the Commission Members both in the City and Downstate that it was necessary. And, we voted it although some of ah.. my ah.. Republican Colleagues then thought that we were just a little free with their money. Now, we've listened to them for another year about their problems. And, I agree with most of the things that have been said here, that the Chicago Board of Education has brought most of the problems upon itself. But, nevertheless, that's a situation they're in. They have been just as conscientious and they have been as convincing to me that, at this time, conditions have changed to such an extent that some of this money would be more wisely and prudently spent, if it was spent in the operations of the schools. And, with that reason and for that reason only, I'm going to vote 'aye'. And, I hope that there's enough votes to pass this Bill."

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

J. Theodore Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to point out that some of the most vocal supporters on the other side of the aisle from the City of Chicago aren't voting for this Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? The gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. Arrigo."



Victor A. Arrigo: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't know whether my good friend, Representative Meyer, was referring to my abstention and my being one of the most vocal Members of this House. I was the principal Sponsor of House Bill 2466 that passed... that passed the.. by a hundred and three votes. That was the Bill that created the 250,000,000 dollar bond issue. At the time that I appeared before the Committee with Representative Red... with Superintendent Redmond and Members of the Chicago Board of Education, I assured the Members of the Committee that the sole purpose of that Bill was the rehabilitation of the Chicago Schools. On the debates on this Bill, I also gave my assurance that this Bill was introduced solely for the purpose of rehabilitating the Chicago Schools. I have been sitting here watching a mass defloration of House Bill 2466. I regret exceedingly that I have to go back on my word. I, too, wanted to remain 'not voting', but inasmuch as this Bill merely needs, one or two more votes, I hope that my Colleagues will excuse me if I violate the promise I gave a year ago, and vote 'aye' on this Bill. Because I believe that the Chicago School Teachers urgently need help and assistance. And, I trust that a few others could go on this Bill with me."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Madison, Mr. Kennedy."

Leland J. Kennedy: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I'm in order; I'll move the previous question."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk



will take the record. The gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Barry " Tobias Barry: "Mr. Speaker, the switches were locked and I couldn't switch my vote from 'no' to 'aye'. Record me 'aye', please."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Record the ah.. gentleman as 'aye'. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Douglas."

Bruce L. Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, in light of many of the comments that were made during the explanation of votes, I feel compelled to explain my vote. It has been stated by some people on this floor quite bluntly that a vote against this Bill is a vote against the education and the improvement of educational systems of the children in Chicago. And, I wish, obviously not taking that position, to make it abundantly clear that my vote, my negative vote, is a protest vote, a protest vote against the behavior of the Chicago Board of Education, a protest vote against the Superintendent of that Board, Dr. Redmond, who remains unaccountable to this Legislature and unaccountable to the people of the City of Chicago. I recognize that I will probably receive many inquiries about voting 'no', but I wanted it to be clear, and I'm sure that I speak for others from the City who are voting 'no', that we protest the way in which the Chicago Board of Education has handled its money, the unaccountability of its Superintendent. And, in general, the way in which the Chicago Board of Education operates independently of the people and independently of the Chicago City Council."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "On this question, there are 98 'Ayes',



and ah.. 49 'Nays', and ah.. this Bill having received a Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Alright. On the order of Senate Bills Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1589."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1589. An act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. Senate Bill's third reading. 1475."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1475. A bill for an act to amend the school code. Third reading of the bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from cook, Mr. Shea."

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take that bill out of the record."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Take it out of the record. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell rise?"

R. Bruce Waddell: "Point of clarification Sir. They have Senate Bill 1435 up there instead of 75, which was it?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, it was taken out of the record. 1475, but it was taken out of the record, yea. Ah...the Chair recognizes the gentleman from cook, Mr. Carroll."

Howard W. Carroll: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of asking that Senate Bill 915, which was inadvertently placed upon the table, since it did have an appropriation in the bill and should be on the calendar, I ask that it be taken from the table and put on the calendar so that we can return it to second for purposes of an amendment."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman's point is well taken, ah. that bill does have an appropriation and when those bills were tabled it was included inadvertently as one of the tabled bills. Now in order to technically handle than there'll have to be a motion to take it from the table. And I take it that that's what your doing. Alright, gentleman from cook, Mr. Ron Hoffman."

R.K. Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to have Senate Bill 1494 in the same status."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, we're going to do these one at a time so....The question is on the gentleman's motion to take Senate Bill 915 from the table. All those in favor will say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the bill is taken from the table and it is now on the calendar on the order of consideration postponed, for which the Chair recognizes the gentleman from cook, Mr. Carroll who asked leave it be brought back to the order of second reading, for purposes of offering an amendment. Is there objection. Alright hearing no....."

Howard W. Carroll: "Mr. Speaker, first, if I might, because of a conflict in the drafting, I would ask to table amendment no. 3 which is on there and then ask to offer this amendment which will pick up the initial language."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, does the gentleman have leave to table amendment no. 3 to Senate Bill 915. Hearing no objection the amendment is tabled. Further amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment no. 4, Carroll, amend Senate Bill 915"



as amended in the House on page 1, line 1 by striking section and inserting in lieu thereof; section 3.1 and, and on page 1 by striking line 4 and inserting in lieu thereof the following....."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from cook, Mr. Carroll."

Howard W. Carroll: "If I may explain the amendment. The ah... effect of this amendment to 915, to Senate Bill 915, we did use this as a vehicle to clarify the language on the fees and salaries. With no changes in the compensation to the other offices. But merely brought it into language so that each type of judicial office has its own paragraph explaining what they are to get. The only change made is in that of associate judges and I would move for the adoption of the amendment. Yea, that's on associates judges who are lawyers a \$5,000 increase, on non lawyers is a \$3,000 increase."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is it 5 or 5500 on that?"

Howard W. Carroll: "\$5,000 on the associates who are lawyers, \$3,000 on the non-lawyers."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from cook, Mr. Simmons."

Arthur E. Simmons: "What is the number of this new amendment?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, it should be amendment #7, according to the clerk."

Arthur E. Simmons: "And how many of the other amendments were tabled?"

Howard W. Carroll: "I believe Mr. Speaker, 1 and 2 were tabled a long time ago, we just tabled 3."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the indication is that....Alright,



that they're on the bill now, 4,5,6 and now 7. Gentleman from cook, Mr. Lechowicz, for what purpose do you Rise?"

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Representative Giorgi has some amendments on this bill. I see him off the floor at the time. I know there is a discrepancy as far as his thoughts on this bill, especially this amendment as far as the differential between the non-lawyer and the lawyer, associate judges. And I was wondering if the sponsor would take the bill out of the record until Representative Giorgi gets back on the House floor?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the gentleman's asking to...is asking that we take it out of the record for a few minutes to allow...to allow a conference of some type. Gentleman from cook, Mr. Simmons."

Arthur E. Simmons: "Ah....this matter's been taken out of the record, but before I got out; did we table number 3 and number 7 is pending?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "That's right. We tabled 3, we did not act on 7. Alright....on the order of House Bills third reading appears House Bill 4510, on which the Chair recognizes the gentleman from cook, Mr. Duff."

Brian B. Duff: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, the principle sponsor of this bill, Representative McDevitt is unable to be here and has asked me to handle the bill for him. House Bill 4510 makes several changes in the court of claims. It increases the salary of the three judges, from \$9,000 to \$16,000 per annum. The jurisdiction



of this court was increases, last session, by the legislature causing a considerable increase in the case load as they have been handling, and a great deal more time involved. They've gone from 594 cases before, to 998 now ah...and since July 1st they've gone up even further. Because of this increase work load their time involved has been considerably added to. There's a fiscal note available on it. There are other effects in the bill as well. For example, there are claims against the state for time unjustly served in prison in this state is changed to conform with the New York Court of Claims Act. This will reduce the liability of this state. The fiscal note will infer that the bill in that effect will save over \$100,000 a year. I would ask support of the House."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I've been around here a few terms and I think I know a little bit about pay increases....."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Just a moment, the clerk advises us that through inadvertence we didn't actually read the bill, so read the bill so we meet that requirement...."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 4510. A bill for an act to amend the court of claims act. Third reading of the bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, in serving 8 years here, I've been here when we started as a legislative branch of Government at a salary of \$6,000 a year in 1965 and now we receive a salary of \$17,500 a year."



And I know now lawyers and now judges gave us this increase. I know it was hard earned and had pressed in order to achieve, but if I ever saw a back door way of trying to get a pay increase for a few judges in this state, this is it. This bill not only increases the salaries, but very cutely raises the ceilings on awards against the state. It provides for the jurisdiction of claims based on unjust imprisonment where a person is entitled to a pardoning by the Government. Well I commend those two actions, but in order to get the pay raise, did they have to tie it into this type of legislation? I say to you, members of this General Assembly, that if we have a commission studying salary increases and just rewards of those in the public service, whether they be in the executive branch, legislative branch or judicial branch, these court of claims judges no more need this salary increase than the Governor does, or the Secretary of State, or the State Treasurer or members of this General Assembly. I say to you, you give this salary increase and your neglecting the commitment in the bill that we passed out of this House asking for a commission to be set up to set down compensation for those in the public service. This would be bad faith that we single out three judges and award them a salary increase tied into a bill that does a couple of good things. I think if this bill should be passed it should be amended so it took out the salary increases for the judges and passed that we could raise the ceiling of awards and also to allow the jurisdiction of claims to be expanded for unjust imprisonment.



But just to raise the salaries of three judges, I say to you members of the General Assembly I haven't let any one down in the past when it came to pay raises, I say to you right now. Just don't vote on this bill, don't give it 89 votes and you'll be doing yourself a favor and including these three judges. Because I think the commission should recommend exactly where their salary should be on a very logical basis, not on a matter of emotion of three judges needing pay raises. So I ask you not to vote no, but just withhold your vote so that 89 votes are not cast, let the bill be brought back to second reading and delete it, and delete the statements of increasing salaries for the judges. Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from cook, Mr. Hyde."

Henry J. Hyde: "Well, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House ah...I guess it would be inappropriate to ask the last speaker a question or two because he is not a proponent of the bill or sponsor of the bill, he's an opponent, but I dare say there are operating engineers which are high class janitors, making in the thousands of dollars salary and I don't begrudge them that ah....goodness knows their training and their responsibilities ah...require that, but here we have three judges sitting on the court of claims who's work low has burgent and who are paid really a pittance for what they do and ah...who are going to fall within the proscriptions wage price freeze and I think simple justice requires that they get this increase. We're only talking



about three judges, and again these are not elected, these are appointed judges ah...and this of course makes a difference under the wage price situation. A fair days pay for a fair days work has always been the hall mark of organized labor and I certainly subscribe to that. I think the important question is; do these judges earn the pay that they seek? And I think, in the case of the court of claims, it should be a resounding yes. So under these circumstances I think this situation ah...with these three appointed judges deserve special consideration. I would like to point out, and emphasize, that the inclusion of these three judges in a pay raise in no way militance against the rest of the commission that was thought to be set up and hopefully if the senate reconsiders will be set up to review all salaries of executive ah....and legislative personnel and elected officials because that will cover all of those who are elected and that will include the regular circuit court judges and appellate judges and supreme court judges. These three men, and there are only three, are appointed their work load has increased tremendously and I think a simple justice for which the gentleman from McHenry has been a long and loud spokesman in which effort I encourage him, ah...I think deserves that this bill pass."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz. "Thank you Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I have to concur with Representative Hanahan's remarks. The purpose of the commission was to have a blue



ribbon committee, make a thorough study and a complete evaluation on all executive of elected officials covered by state government. I think this House passed, in good judgement, this commission and in turn we should give it the mandate to fulfill its obligation to this general assembly. I think its very inopportune at this time to say, well we're not going to be all treated equally, we're not all going to be treated fairly, we're going to make an exception for three judges. Fine, I thought the basic premise of this general assembly was to try to provide equal and fair treatment to all of the people in the state of Illinois. If the commission recommends the pay raise for these three people or anyone else, I will be the first to subscribe for it. If they deny it I'll be the first to subscribe to that, I think we have a mandate to be fulfilled and I think we should vote accordingly, I think that probably, I'm not asking a no vote, please just restrain from voting on this bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Lindberg."

George W. Lindberg: "Mr. Speaker, who is the sponsor of this bill so I might direct my,...."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ah...Mr. Duff is handling it for Mr. McDevitt."

George W. Lindberg: "Oh...Ah...is it not correct, Representative Duff, that although we call these gentlemen judges, and they serve in the court of claims that as a matter of fact they are a member of the executive department and not part of the judicial system of the state of Illinois?"



Brian B. Duff: "As a matter of fact, they are not judges in the judicial sense, (this is a quasi-judicial department and in fact, they are the arms of the legislative branch of government. They are responsible to this general assembly."

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

Daniel M. Pierce: "Will the acting sponsor yield to a question? Isn't it true, Representative Duff, that the three judges, and they are called judges in the statute and I agree with you that they are not part of the judicial system, that these three judges are allowed to practice law while acting as judges?"

Brian B. Duff: "Well, I guess I could perhaps draw an analogy to the General Assembly itself, where we are said to be, I suppose, part time ah...and yet we have seen a tremendous increase in our workload. The same situation is true here. These three gentlemen, who are in fact responsible to the legislature, have had more than twice the case load increase in the last year than they've had before."

Daniel M. Pierce: "You said that once, but you haven't answered my question. Are they allowed to practice law, be members and partners in law firm, charge fees to clients? Are they allowed to do that under the statute in your bill? And your bill doesn't change that at all even though it does reform the court of claims to a certain extent?"

Brian B. Duff: "No the bill does not make it full time."

Daniel M. Pierce: "Alright; thank you. I think that should be pointed out. That these three judges, and they do maintain



full time law practices, one I think is a well compensated Union Official, and these three men are part time officials. And therefore, have no crying need for the increase today. They may well obtain the increase from the commission that Representative Hanahan ah...proposes and that Representative Lechowicz has spoken about, they may be entitled to a raise, and I wouldn't be surprised if they were entitled to a substantial raise based on the increased work loads, but certainly there is no crying need today, because they all are allowed to practice law, to charge fees, to represent private clients, in every way except before their own court. And therefore, there is no reason why this can't wait. And I agree with the gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan, that we should vote present on this bill, and let this raise go with the other judicial raises, legislative, and executive raises through the commission, which will report back later this year to the General Assembly."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe."

B. B. Wolfe: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, will the sponsor yield for a question please? Brian, does the ah...act creating the court of claims require the judges sitting have law degrees? You said it was an executive Branch of Government and I'm..."

Brian B. Duff: "No I didn't say executive Branch, ah...Bernie, that was said by one of the other speakers. I said the legislative Branch."



B. B. Wolfe: "Oh. Are they required to have law degrees in order to sit as a judge of the court of claims?"

Brian B. Duff : "I don't believe they are."

B. B. Wolfe: "Alright, so it could apply to executive or any citizen of the state of Illinois, is that correct?"

Brian B. Duff: "Ah...to the best of my knowledge."

B. B. Wolfe: "Now, how long is the ah...\$9,000 wage level been in effect?"

Brian B. Duff: "I don't understand the question?"

B. B. Wolfe: "Ah...you said it was an increase from \$9,000 to \$16,000, or am I wrong on that?"

Brian B. Duff: "That's right. The total cost of this in terms of the pay raise portion would be, the total cost to the state would be \$21,000."

B. B. Wolfe: "What....How long has the old pay level been in effect? For the members of the court of claims, judges?"

Brian B. Duff: "Ah...the only way I can say that is, I don't recall far enough back to tell you when it was lower, ah.. this figure has been in effect, I believe, for quite some long time. You see the reason the work load has increased here is that there have been a great number of increases expecting a flood of welfare claims for cost of living increases. They have new cases that are being filed at the rate of 45 a month since July 1st of 1971 and 77 in February and on the way up, you see. And as Representative Hyde, pointed out ah...if this doesn't go through these persons will be effected by the cost of living increase because there will



not be a change in their status."

Mr. Wolfe: "That was my question, in other words if they had an increase last year, there was a cost of living increase. If they haven't had one for eight or ten years then...."

Mr. B. Duff: "No they have not come under that, and they'll have to get it now."

Mr. Wolfe: "Thank you."

Mr. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the gentlemen from cook, Mr. Duff to close."

Mr. B. Duff: "Well, ladies and gentlemen of the House this bill has several effects, as Representative Hanahan pointed out there are some good factors in it. The one part of the bill which is apparently contended is the question of whether or not the state should spend \$21,000 for an arm of the General Assembly, in effect which handles the claims against the state of Illinois. Ah...These three gentlemen do have a work load which involved the handling of claims against the State totalling annually \$1 billion dollars. Now this is a very large responsibility and its very clear, as I have shown from the facts, that the work load within this Department has doubled in one year, in fact over the last three years it has quadrupled in terms of the number of staff that is necessary to handle their business. I recognize, of course, the problem related to the commission, but as Representative Hyde so ably pointed out, the commission is going to deal with the elected officials at a much higher level than this. ~~I think only justice has indicated that these three~~

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

gentlemen, who are very heavily burdened with the responsibility to the state, do deserve this consideration. I would also point out again that the two other aspects to the bill relative to the limit of liability to the state are quite important and I would appreciate an affirmative vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the question is shall House bill 4510 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Gentleman from McHenry Mr. Hanahan."

Thomas J. Hanahan: "I would like to be recorded as voted present, and in no way is this vote meant that I don't believe that the three judges of the court of claims don't deserve a pay raise. I'm just saying that it would be hypocritical of this House to vote for a pay raise for three appointed officials of this state, when just recently we passed out a bill authorizing a commission to study salary increases and salary compensation for state officers and state co-directors and all the other elected officials and appointed officials of this House. I say to you members of the House, that in the past my word has been good, and what we have done concerning pay raises and I ask you on that word if you'd give a present vote today. I don't believe you'll ever be sorry in the future on what is concerning pay raises for any elected official. I think I stood in the forefront when it came to pay raises and just compensation for a days work for a days pay. And if you pass this bill out it will be hypocritical of every think we've stood for in the past. I urge a present vote on this bill."



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

Richard O. Hart: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, the constitutional convention gave this House, this General Assembly the opportunity to get the court of claims abolished. It did away with sovereign immunity. I believe strongly as I believe anything that we ought to abolish the court of claims and that we ought to ah...allow suits against the state of Illinois, in the same manner as we have suits against individuals and so forth. And for that reason, if the failure of the passage of this bill would do anything to ah...speed up the ultimate enacting of legislation in that regard, to implement the constitution, then I'll want to vote no."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, gentleman from cook, Mr. Glass."

Bradley M. Glass: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote I think Representative Hart has just stated a reason, one of my main reasons for voting for the bill. While it is possible to abolish sovereign immunity we have not done so, and ah...the state is subject to claims which ah...according to the sponsor of the bill, a pproximate a billion dollars a year. Now if that's the case, I think its incumbent upon us to provide the best quality ah...of judges ah...that we can, consistent with the work that they do, to listen to and decide these claims. These are very significant claims and its a large amount of money that the state is involved with. So I think ah...we should not keep these gentlemen at ah...\$9,000 a year, these three judges who hear all of the claims against the state of Illinois. I think its been



brought out also, while they are not full time judges, neither are we full time. The fact that they have outside compensations should not ah...keep us from seeing to it that they are paid a decent and satisfactory salary consistent with the amount of work that they do and am therefore voting 'aye'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright. Have all voted who wished? Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Boyle."

Ken Boyle: "Mr. Speaker, I agree with Representative Hanahan on this. I think we either ought to have the blue ribbon commission or not, and I think if we have it we shouldn't be making all these exception to it, and I would like to be recorded as voting present."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? The gentleman from Will, Mr. O'Brien."

G. M. O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, members of the House with reference to the remarks of Representatives Boyle and Hanahan I find them incredible. These people are judges who are performing the function of judge. They are a creature of our creation. They have no body looking out for them from the judiciary side with the possible exception of the Representative here at my left and one who is absent. They're doing the job, they're paid very modest and I think they deserve the money."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the gentleman from cook, Mr. Schlickman:"

Eugene F. Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House in explaining my vote, and in a way responding to the statement of Representative Hanahan, I was unimpressed



by it. I don't recall in the eight years that I have been in the General Assembly that the National Labor Relations Board has held an election to determine whether or not we were to be a bargaining unit or had made a determination that he was to be our representative. I do know, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, that the commission bill that he was referring to was defeated by the Senate and I do recall, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, that that commission bill did not take into account appointed judges. What I do know also, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, that we have a very vital agency of government here. We have three men whose work load has quadrupled recently and that they are entitled to the increase that is provided for them in this bill. And this is the only mechanism for these men to be adequately compensated for the responsibilities that they have assumed and the duties that they are performing and I urge that the additional four votes be given to assure the passage of this bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 89 'ayes', and 14 'nays'. And the chair recognizes the gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Thomas J. Hanahan: "I hate to do this Mr. Speaker to take up the time of the House, I know we have many other things to do but I will respectfully request a verification because I know personally of many members who are voted 'aye' on that board that are not in their seats."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the members will be in their seats....Oh, alright the Gentleman from cook, Mr. Duff asked if he might poll the absentees prior to the verification and we usually extend that courtesy so the clerk will proceed to poll the absentees."

Jack O'Brien: "Alsup, Barry, Bartulis, Boyle, Bradley, Brandt, Brenna, Brummet, Calvo, Capparelli, Carrigan, R.A. Carter, Coate, Conolly, Craig, DiPrima, Douglas, Ewell, Fary, Fennessey, Flinn, Hall, Hamilton, Hanahan, Hill, Holloway, Houlihan, Munsicker, Jacobs, Kahoun, Katz, Keller, Kennedy, Kleine, Klosak, Kosinski, Krause, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leon, M.J. Madigan, Mann, Markert, Matijeovich,...."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Matijeovich 'no'."

Jack O'Brien: "McClain, McCormick, McDermott, McDevitt, McMaster, Merlo, Meyer, Pierce, Regner, Ropa, Schisler, Schneider, Ike Simms, Stedelin, Taylor, Terzich, J. W. Thompson, R.L. Thompson, Tipwork, Tuerk, VonBoeckman, Waddell, G. Washington, K. Welsh, Williams, Frank Wolf, J. J. Wolf,."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The roll call now is 89 'ayes', and 15 'nays'. Alright, now the gentleman from McHenry renews his request for the verification of the affirmative. For what purpose does the gentleman from cook, Mr. Palmer rise?"

Romie J. Palmer: "Point of parliamentary inquiry. I understand that ah...the gentleman from McHenry voted present. The question is whether or not he is the person that can ask for the verification?"



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The rule provides any member. Well if you'll refer me to a rule ah...to back up your position I'll be happy to rule on that. Rule 63 provides any member may demand a verification of a roll call vote, Mr. Hanahan is a member and under the rule would be entitled to ask for a verification."

Romie J. Palmer: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not challenging what the chair has to say about it I only wanted to know whether or not it could be done."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Right, and that's the way I ruled. Proceed to verify."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Anderson....."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Logan Mr. Madigan rise."

E. R. Madigan: "How am I recorded?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "How's the gentleman recorded?"

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

E. R. Madigan: "Alright, I am here Mr. Speaker, may I be excused from the verification?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Clerk says he'll be at your name in a couple of minutes."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Barnes, Berman, Blades, Bluthardt, Burditt, Caldwell, Campbell, Capuzi, Carroll, Jimmy Carter, Chapman, Clabaugh, Colitz, Otis Collins, Phil Collins, Cox, L. Cunningham, W. Cunningham, Davis, Day, Downes, Duff, Dyer, Epton, Fleck, Garmisa, Glass, Graham, Granata, Harpstrite, Henss, Hirschfeld, Gene Hoffman, Houde, Hudson, Hyde, Jaffe, Janczak, Jones,



Karmazyn, Kipley, Lauterbach, Lehman, Lenard, Lindberg, Ed Madigan, Maragos, McAvoy, McGah, McLendon, McPartlin, Kenny Miller, Peter Miller, Moore, Murphy, North, Nowlan D. O'Brien, G. O'Brien, OHallaren, Palmer, Pappas, Philip, Randolph, Rayson, Redmond, Rose, Scariano, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Sevcik, Shapiro, Shea, Simmons, Smith, Soderstrom, Stone, Telcser, Wall, R. Walsh, W. Walsh, Walters, Washburn, Harold Washington, B. B. Wolfe, Yourell, Zlatnik, and Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the gentleman from McHenry Mr. Hanahan on the verification."

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, O.G. Collins?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He's not in his seat, how's he recorded?"

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

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

Thomas J. Hanahan: "J. Y. Carter?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "How's he recorded?"

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

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

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Schoeberlein?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "How's he recorded?"

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

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

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Pappas!"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "How's the gentleman recorded?"

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

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



Thomas J. Hanahan: "North."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "How's he voted?"

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

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, take him off the record."

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Bill Cunningham?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "How's he recorded?"

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

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

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Jones, David Jones."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "How's he recorded?"

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

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

Thomas J. Hanahan: "McGah."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "How's he recorded?"

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

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the gentleman from cook, Mr.

Duff, for what purpose do you rise.....He's there so leave him on. Gentleman from cook, Mr. Duff, for what purpose do you rise?"

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Representative Washburn, Yourell?"

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

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "O-k, take him off the record."

Thomas H. Hanahan: "Representative Maragos."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "How's he recorded?"

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

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Take him out of the record."

Thomas J. Hanahan: "Representative Randolph."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "How's....he's there. Alright, put Yourell, back on."

Thomas J. Hanahan: "That's all, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, now. The gentleman from cook, Mr. Regner."

David J. Regner: "Mr. Speaker, would you record me as voting 'aye'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, record him as voting 'aye'. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Henss."

Donald A. Henss: "Mr. Speaker, am I recorded on this roll call?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "How's the gentleman recorded?"

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

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from cook, Mr. J. J. Wolf."

J. J. Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I was off the floor, I'd like to be recorded as voting 'aye', please?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, record him as 'aye'. Any further questions of the affirmative. Alright, give me the roll call. Roll call now stands at 83 'ayes', 15 'nays'. Two present. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from cook, Mr. Duff."

Brian B. Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to request postponed consideration."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, is there objection? Hearing none the bill will be placed on postponed consideration. Alright, now we'll go back to the order of second reading where we left momentarily Senate Bill 915." On which the gentleman

from cook, Mr. Carroll is recognized with respect to amendment # 7."

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



Howard W. Carroll: "Thank you Mr. Speaker ah...apparently there was some confusion and even a typographical error. The ah...amount of increase for all associate judges across the board is a \$5,000 figure, would bring the non-lawyers up to 20 the lawyers up to 23,5 and no other increases for any of the other elected members of the judiciary. It just rewords that to bring it into a clarification. I move the adoption of the amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Is there discussion. All those in favor of the adoption of the amendment say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment #8, Philip. Amend Senate Bill 915 as amended by inserting after...."

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

James Philip: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, amendment #8 provides that all associate judges in one county circuits shall be paid by the county an additional salary of \$4,500. I move the adoption of amendment #8 to Senate Bill 915."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it the amendment is adopted. Further amendments? Third reading. Alright, back to House Bills Second reading. House Bill 3794."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 3794. An act making a supplemental appropriation to the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Second reading of the bill. One committee amendment. Amend



House Bill 3794 on page 1, section 1 and after line 11 by adding the following; 'for reimbursement to school districts and so forth.'

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

Arthur L. Berman: "Mr. Speaker, this is the ah...deficiency appropriation for all FBI and I believe the proper procedure, I want to ah...table amendment no. 1 and offer amendment no. 2. So I would move for the adoption of Committee Amendment no. 1 ah...at this time and then I'll move for it to be tabled."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the gentleman moves to adopt the amendment no. 1 and then moves to table. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it the amendment is tabled."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment no. 2, Berman, Amend House Bill 3794 on page 1, section 1, after line 11 by adding the following' for reimbursement to school districts for services and materials for programs etc."

Arthur L. Berman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, amendment no. 2 is an agreed amendment reducing the deficiency appropriation dealing with the ah...gifted program, and giving recognition to the other areas, ah...previously addressed in the bill for special education and ah...the ah...and for handicapped children. I move the adoption of amendment no. 2."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further ah...Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

G. L. Hoffman: "Will the sponsor yield to a question? What,



Representative Berman, what is the total effect in terms of dollars with this amendment compared to the original appropriation? Or the original request."

Arthur L. Berman: "The original request was \$6,301,644. With amendment no. 2 its decreased to \$5,708,644 which is approximately ah...\$600,000 decrease."

G. L. Hoffman: "Is that entire amount in gifted factor?"

Arthur L. Berman: "No. ah...the gifted originally ah...amendment no. 1 had the gifted in there at \$1,350,000, amendment no. 2 decreased it to half of that, \$675,000. Transportation reimbursements stayed the same in all three phases, the original, amendment 1 and amendment 2. And the third appropriation was for reimbursement for services and materials for programs of the handicapped, in the original bill it was \$4,140,000. In amendment no. 2 its \$2,000,00...amendment 1 it was \$2,872,000 and the same figure under amendment no. 2."

G. L. Hoffman: "Thank you very much."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from cook, Mr. Regner."

David J. Regner: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I just wanted to concur with Representative Berman said, this is an agreed amendment, it was worked out with our staff and the staff on the other side. And also the officers of public instruction. I would urge the adoption of amendment no. 2 to House Bill 3794."

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

Arthur L. Berman: "I renew my motion to adopt amendment no. 2, Mr. Speaker."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, ah...the question is on the adoption of the amendment. All those in favor will say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it the amendment is adopted. Further amendments. Third reading. House..... 4664."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 4664. Bill for an act to amend the school code. Second reading of the bill. No committee amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any amendments from the floor? Third reading. House Bills third reading. 4182."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 4182. Bill for an act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of General Services. Third reading of the bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from cook, Mr. J. J. Wolf."

J. J. Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker members of the House, this is the appropriation for the Department of General Services. I believe the information we have been looking for has been supplied, and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the question shall House Bill 4182 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there areTelcser 'aye', Laurino 'aye', Rayson 'aye'. On this question there are 124 'ayes', no 'nays'. And this bill having received a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4386."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 4386. Bill for an act to amend



the Chicago Sanitary District Act. Third reading of the bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. House Bill 4386, it increases the Calumet Navigation Bond Authorization from 6 to 8 million dollars. The Calumet Navigation Project is a Federal Program constructed by the Army Corps of Engineers for the widening and dredging of the Cal-Sec Canal. Federal law requires that the cost of side acquisition adhesements, right of way, and location facilities be paid by the local sponsor. The Metropolitan Sanitary District is designated as the local sponsor and in 1957 was authorized to issue bonds in the amount of 6 million dollars. Unfortunately this dollar amount is not adequate and their asking for a 2 million dollar increase."

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

W. D. Walsh: "Gentleman yield to a question? What was the authorization the legislature gave ah... 2 or 3 years ago to the Chicago Sanitary District to issue bonds without referendum?"

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "This is a 1957 authorization for a total dollar amount of 6 million dollars. As I stated this is a federally advised project. It is for the dredging of the Cal-Sec Canal. As far as the other bond issues that were passes in this General Assembly two years ago, in no way have anything to do with this project."

W.D. Walsh: "Do you know what the amount was?"



Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: " This ah...the one that was passed in 1957 was \$6,000,000."

W. D. Walsh: "I mean the one ah...two or three years ago."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "There were quite a few of them, I don't remember the total dollar amount."

W. D. Walsh: "\$340,000,000 is, could that be right. One of the people around me said \$340,000,000."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "But that's not for this project. IF you recall those projects were for the underground tunnels to prevent the flooding within, not only the city of Chicago, but six additional areas. This is for the Cal-Sec Canal. Drudging and widening for the Cal-Sec Canal as required by the Federal Government."

W. D. Walsh: "My point was that the Chicago Sanitary District has been down here, in my memory, a number of times looking for authority to issue bonds without referendum. The one two years ago was \$340,000,000 and that's the one that I really find fault with, but I, in addition will find fault with this two million dollar one. Obviously you couldn't put a two million dollar bond issue to referendum in the Chicago Sanitary District. But you could put a \$342,00,000 Bond issue to referendum within the Area embraced by the Chicago Sanitary District, and in my opinion that's what should have been done. Now I think Mr. Speaker that the Chicago Sanitary district ought to save up projects such as this and submit these projects in one referendum to issue these bonds, and let the people decide it. I'm not qualified

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



to speak on whether this is ah...very necessary at this moment and has got to be done now or never, but it seems to me that most of these things can be stored up and I think perhaps we ought to strike a blow for the taxpayer on vote no on this bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Further discussion? Gentleman from cook, Mr. Palmer."

Romie J. Palmer: "Will the sponsor yield for a question? Ted, ah...what is that Calumet Sag Navigation project, What is the Calumet Sag Navigation Project, they just completed the widening on the Canal."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Well, unfortunately, now only does this six million dollars that they've expended since 1957 under the authorization under this general assembly cover the widening, Romie, but also covers the drudging of that Chanel as well. According to the testimony that was heard in this building committee said that unfortunately they do not have thenecessary funds to continue this type of work. That's why they're asking for an increase of two million dollars for this type of a project."

Rommie J. Palmer: "Well, then principally it would be for drudging, is that correct?"

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Drudging and for what ever the....you know, the Army Corps of Engineers has a unique position where they change their requirements occasionally."

Rommie J. Palmer: "I realize that."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Further discussion? Gentleman from cook, Mr. Lechowicz to close."

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. This is a two million dollar authorizaiton for the widening and drudging of the Cal-Sag Canal, I ask for your favorable consideration."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Question is shall this bill pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 121 'ayes', and 14 'nays'. And this bill having received a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bills third reading. 1552."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate bill 1552. An act making an appropriation to Metropolitan Fair and Exposition Authority. Third reading of the bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from cook, Mr. Shea."

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1552 is a million dollar appropriation to the Metropolitan Fair and Exposition Association to pay for the bonds of McCormick place. The principle and interest for this year. I'd appreciate the support of the House."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? Question is shall House Bill 1552....Senate Bill 1552. All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 133 'ayes', no 'nays'. And this bill having received a constitutional majority is hereby delcared passed. 1325."



Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1325. Bill for an act to make an appropriation for the expenses of the Military and Naval Departments. Third reading of the bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

R. D. Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, and members of the House. Senate bill 1325 is one of the most important bills that will come before this House this session. It makes an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Military and Naval Affairs in the amount of \$3,700,000 which is approximately the same amount as last year. I shall be particularly grateful if you give this bill more favorable consideration than you've given some of my bills, because my most important constituents is in the rear balcony." Thank you for an 'aye', vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from cook, Mr. Mann."

Robert E. Mann: "Because your ah...most important constituent is in the rear balcony, I'll give you an opportunity to talk, Representative Cunningham. What does this Department do. Would you mind telling me?"

R. D. Cunningham: "Representative Mann, I'm delighted that you asked that. The most important function of the Department seems to be the rental of armory space throughout the state, and it has to do with the National Guard. Very essential to the well being of an orderly state government."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Question is shall Senate Bill 1325 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record."



Barry 'aye', Bradley 'aye', B. B. Wolfe 'aye', Scariano 'aye', Tipsword 'aye', Yourell, 'aye'. Well we'd better do it over again. Dump that one. Question is shall Senate Bill 1325 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Gentleman from cook, Mr. Richard Walsh."

R. A. Walsh: "I was just going to say, I was waiting for you to say those magic words; 'have all voted who wished?'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Take the record. On this question there are 147 'ayes', no 'nays'. And this bill having received a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1500. Granata 'aye', and Capuzi 'aye'. Senate Bill 1500."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1500. An act to amend Section 7 to acts 13 etc. To support the Junior College Act. Third reading of the bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from cook, Mr. Shea."

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1500 allows a Chicago Junior Colleges to have a supplemental appropriation bill and utilize the increase in assessment in cook county. I'd appreciate the support of the House."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? Question is shall this bill pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished. Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 142 'ayes', and 3 'nays'. And this bill having recieved a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Gentleman from cook, Mr. Granata,



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

for what purpose do you rise?!

Peter C. Granata: "Having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which this bill was passed."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor of reconsidering... Gentleman from cook, Mr. Shea."

Gerald W. Shea: "I move that motion lay upon the table."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Wait a minute we're ahead of ourselves. On this question there are 142 'ayes', and 3 'nays'. And this bill having received a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. And the gentleman from cook, Mr. Granata moves to reconsider the vote by which that bill passed and Mr. Shea moved that that motion be placed upon the table. All those in favor of the motion to be tabled say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the bill is tabled, I mean the motion is tabled. 1553."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1553. Bill for an act to make a supplemental appropriation to the Illinois Veterans Commission, third reading of the bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

R. D. Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1553 is the second most important bill that will come before this House this session. It makes a supplemental appropriation of \$45,000 to the Illinois Veterans' commission to finish out the state's commitment of \$5,000 to each veteran's home to adapt it to use or paraplegic veterans'. You will recall that in the prior session \$100,000 dollars was appropriated for this purpose,



and the additional \$45,000 dollars is now required to finish that good work. We shall be appreciative for an 'aye' vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? Question is shall this bill pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 148 'ayes', no 'nays'. And this bill having received a constitutional majority is hereby duly passed. Senate Bill 1475."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1475. Bill for an act to amend the school code. Third reading of the bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from cook, Mr. Shea."

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1475 is an identical bill to House Bill 4679, which is the borrowing of \$35,000,000 by the Chicago Board of Education, for the bond rehabilitation fund. I'd appreciate a favorable roll call."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? Question is shall this bill pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are....Gentleman from cook, Mr. Hyde."

Henry J. Hyde: "Well, Mr. Speaker, its a little late to ask the sponsor a question. I wondered if this bill provides for \$35,000,000 to be borrowed by the Chicago Board of Education from the school rehabilitation bond fund, if this will be added to the other \$35,000,000 they got in the earlier

House Bill thus to make a total of \$70,000,000 or if these

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



bills are ah...not you know, if this is to be lumped together?" However, since we're on explanation of votes, I won't ask that question, but I will say that in my time down here I've learn to follow the lead of Mr. Berman, who is the spokesman for the Chicago School Interests, and I see that he is not supporting this, and I certainly want to follow his lead."

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

Arthur L. Berman: "On the previous bill, I thought the better part of valour was discretion and I didn't comment. But I think that in as much as the majority leader ah...calls attention to the question of my position on this bill, I think that some of the speakers on the previous bill talked about their being no alternative to this approach of keeping ah...the ah...providing adequate funds to the Chicago School Board. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, one week ago today you had the opportunity. And except for one person on this side of the aisle, everyone on this side of the aisle showed the way that this side of the aisle thought was the proper way, to provide adequate funds for schools throughout the state of Illinois by keeping in conformity with the mandate of the State Constitution of increasing the obligation of the state towards local school financing, towards giving recognition to the consequences of school districts throughout the state of Illinois. By an increase of the formular for all the schools. The formular that was passed out provides no new cash for the Chicago School Board. This bill provides



No new cash for the Chicago school board because next year the bond holders are protected but the Chicago school children are not. And for those reasons, and because of an absence of responsibility on the other side of the aisle, I'm voting no."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from cook, Mr. Fleck."

Charles J. Fleck: "Well, Mr. Speaker ladies and gentlemen of the House, I'm having a very difficult time understanding the apparent inconsistency. On one hand we are told that the schools must stay open and this is a form of financing them so they do stay open. Then we are reminded that last week a particular amendment to a bill that we all know about did not pass. Well we're discussing ancient history. I would like to remind the previous speaker that if he's concerned about the Chicago school system and keeping the schools open he shouldn't discuss ancient history but should vote for this bill so that they do stay open."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from cook, Mr. Epton."

Bernard E. Epton: "Mr. Speaker ladies and gentlemen of the House ordinarily I would agree with Representative Berman that in a situation like this it is best to refrain from any comment. I can't help but reflect however, that some of the arguments used in discussing why this bill should not pass previously could have been utilized in indicating why the Bikalis formula likewise should not have been passed. I think that some of the speakers on the other side of the aisle were quite eloquent in indicating that Chicago Board of Education was not a responsible



body. How they could suggest that we should give them \$129 million dollars last week and then suggest that they can't responsibly repay \$35,000,000 this week is an inconsistency not only to us but to them as well. I don't badger them with that comment, I join then with a problem that's common to all of us. I know of their predicament and I think its unfortunate the school children are not being whipped about by the members of the legislature. I think its the Chicago Board of Education who has made an abismal failure of the task they have. And for that reason this help should not be forthcoming."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Murphy."

W. J. Murphy: "Mr. Speaker and Representatives, Majority leader Henry Hyde, I want to tell you I don't have to meditate, I don't have to transcend to know that's going to get 89 votes. Let's quit fooling and give it the 89 votes."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all.....Have all voted who wished? The clerk will take the record. On this question there are 98 'ayes', 47 'nays'. And this bill having received a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Gentleman from ah... cook, Mr. Capuzi."

Louis F. Capuzi: "Mr. Speaker, Having voted on the prevailing side, I now reconsider the vote that it was passed by."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman ah...from ah...cook, Mr. Richard Carter."

R. A. Carter: "Mr. Speaker, I move that motion lie upon the table."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor of the motion to table say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it the motion to



table prevails. On Senate bills second reading appears Senate bill 1581."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 1581. An act appropriating funds to the Department of Transportation for the Division of Water Resources and Management of Capitol Improvement Projects.. Second reading of the bill. One....One committee amendment. Amend Senate Bill 1581 on page 4, by inserting between lines 18 and 19 the following; '19 drudging equipment, andsoforth.'"

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "The Gentleman from Vermillion. Mr. Campbell on the Committee Amendment."

Charles M. Campbell: "Ah...yes Mr. Speaker, this ah...committee amendment provides for \$100,000 for the purchase a drudger for the State of Illinois to be used for draining ponds and various lakes throughout the state to be used on a rental basis by municipalities and various forms of Government. And I move for the adoption of committee amendment no. 1."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Is there discussion? The question is shall committee amendment no. 1 be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment no. 2, Campbell. Amend Senate Bill 1581 in the House on page 1, line 7 by striking the figure \$6,314,000 and inserting in lieu thereof; \$6,564,000 etc."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "The gentleman from Vermillion, Mr. Campbell."

Charles M. Campbell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this provides for a



reduction in line ah...32 on page 2 of \$31,000, and on page 4 line 1 of \$35,000. Then there's a change of a description a h...and the reason for this was because of the fact that the work that was done didn't get up to that particular area and ah...there is also an addition for dry run creek in Peoria. There's an addition for Peoria Lake in Tazwell County, and there's an addition for Rockdale and Will County. Also for Crestwood Estates in Cook County, and for Fox River in Kane County and Rattrun in LaSalle. And I would move for the adoption of committee amendment.....or ah.....amendment no. 2."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Is there discussion? Hearing none the question is shall amendment no. 2 be adopted to Senate Bill 1581? Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment no. 3, Clabaugh, et. al. Amend Senate Bill 1581 on page 4, by deleting line 13 and inserting in lieu thereof the following; 'design and land acquisition in'."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "The gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Clabaugh is recognized."

Charles W. Clabaugh: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House I know there's at least 30, 31 I think, other projects in this bill that many of you are interested in other than the one that we're interested in in our district and so if we adopt this amendment its not going to effect any of the rest of your projects in here. I'm dealing, this amendment actually on



page 4 strikes the words, three words 'and sight improvement', from line 13. This number 17 item in this bill provides, on the Middlefork River in Vermillion County, which is just outside of our district, but many of our people are very much interested in this project, it calls for engineering design, #1, #2 for land acquisition and sight improvement to be done this year out of this \$200,000 that's involved. What we would hope to do by this amendment is to strike the sight improvements provision that's in the bill for reasons that I shall give you. It also mentions in the bill that the purpose of this reservoir and damn is to provide water oriented recreation, actually it should say lake oriented water recreation and water supply capabilities for that area in Vermillion County. Now the purposes of this, as I suggested, was to provide for water recreation and we usually think of it in terms, water recreation in terms of lake recreation. Motor Boats on the lake, and lake fishing and so on. But I submit to you that there are other kinds of water recreation that is very dear to the people who enjoy it and that we are rapidly destroying those kinds of recreation and that's river water recreation, canoeing and ah...river fishing. It also asks, says that its to provide water supply for Danville, Illinois. Now let's look at these reasons and purposes and see ah...why we, in adjoining district are interested in them. This middlefork river is one of the two, if not the only two streams in eastern Illinois in which people still enjoy canoeing and water ah...river



fishing. We have several hundred very enthusiastic canoe enthusiasts in our district and this is the place that they go. And when and if a damn is built on a river, then that river is dead from that time on as a place for canoes and for river fishing. Now I know the attraction that lake water recreation has, but should we completely destroy and do away with the sources of recreation of these other people. The Middlefork and the Ambroll River are probably the only two of that kind of streams that are left. And I say, must all of our natural streams be damned for motor boating and lake fishing, and leaving none for river water enthusiasts and for river fishing? On the 31st day of last month in May, the Sun Times sent a man down there and in that issue of the paper he wrote a very cogent article in favor of doing exactly what we're suggesting in this amendment. I quote one or two paragraphs; 'the reservoir would supply Danville and its environments with water. The interstate water company which provides the city's water now has its own reservoir on the North Fork of Vermillion, and sees no impending shortage and disclaims any intention of buying water from the state.' I further quote; 'the only other water consumer in site is the Illinois Power Company which has a coal burning plant in the middlefork Valley. The plant now draws a million gallons of water a day from the river, which to make up for the water evaporating from their cooling towers. The company, however, insists that it has no interest in this project other than to preserve its existing water right. That



reservoir,' so the article goes on, 'will be of no advantage to us asserts Johnson, Kennedy whom many of the older members here remembers. Mr. Speaker, I...I just would like to have just a little bit of order. I'll make this as short as I can. Johnson, Kennedy the assistant to the President of the Illinois Power Company said, 'We plan ten to fifteen years ahead and we have no plans involving this reservoir.' And from an editorial that that newspaper used the next day it says; 'all this', meaning the work on the damn, 'would occur in order to produce thirty million gallons of water a day which no one seems to want or to need.' In answer to an inquiry written by a resident of a near by community, William C. Ackerman, who is the respected head of the Illinois Water Surveys said in answer to this letter when one asking something about what the water need would be in the year 2000 or 2020, he said, and I quote; 'I would go so far as to agree that the natural flow of the Vermillion and Danville as augmented by the treated affluent of water originating in the burried mohammed valley would exceed the probable water of Danville within the period of time that you estimate.' Two authorities that have been in this area who have made a study of this and certainly none should carry anymore weight than Doctor Ackerman, who has said that there is no need of this from the standpoint of water. Now I have never been an enthusiast or a...one of those far out people in the question of ecology, but I think that the time has come when we should, at least, give some thought to these



little streams that are now in their natural state. Now we recall in this House passed by a top heavy vote a bill to establish the scenic river system in the State of Illinois. It bogged down in the Senate and very probably because of the opposition....because of the opposition of the farmers that lie along those streams. Now the State of Illinois owns most of the land for a 16 mile stretch along the ah...Vermillion river on the Middlefork where...close to where and along the area where this dam is suppose to be and a good many of these people who have given it a good deal of study both to the ecological side of this question as well as the other, have suggested that if we hold off this one part, adopt this amendment, don't do any work on this stream this year that probably we can work the middle-fork 16 miles, I believe it is, into a natural state owned pilot project for the scenic rivers. And that's why I'm suggesting that we go ahead with the bill, go ahead with the acquisition of the land, the engineering design, but adopt this amendment and don't do any work on it, and maybe we can work out something that will be of a great deal of value to the people in the State of Illinois."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "The gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Hirschfeld is recognized."

John C. Hirschfeld: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House. I think the sponsor of the bill knows that I hold him and his district in great respect. As do I hold Senator Merritt, who's the principle sponsor in the



Senate. But ladies and gentlemen of the House, I strongly suggest to each and everyone of you that you take a look at what is happening to the State of Illinois with regard to these reservoirs. Now this bill contains appropriations for Oakley and many other reservoirs which do not immediately effect me or my district, but when you start looking at Oakley and Shelbyville and Lincoln and Helm and Louisville and the whole gammit of reservoirs that we are getting in this state you begin to see a system. And its a system which is destroying out rivers. I think its extremely important, apart from partisan interest, and what I will call porkbarrell projects in the districts, to take a broader look at these scenic rivers. This is a scenic river. It has life there, both fish and plant that can be found no where else in the state of Illinois. If this reservoir is constructed, as this appropriation will begin to permit it will be the end of certain flora and fona life that exists along the Middlefork River. There's another importan consideration, we have a very excellent reservoir at Shelbyville. And ladies and gentlemen, over the Memorial Day weekend two hundred and fifty thousand people came to that reservoir and the newspaper articles that appears afterwords referred to the camping grounds at the Shelbyville reservoir as ghetto areas. There were no restroom facilities, there were no place for campers, what we need to do ladies and gentlemen instead of spending more money on new reservoirs is take some of this money that we're spending here and build up Shelbyville so that it can reach its true potential, as can some of the

GENERAL ASSEMBLY



ones that are already constructed. Now I would like to just point out one other feature. Everywhere we get into these reservoirs we find an organization that's known as the Wabash Valley Association. They are up and down the length and breadth of these rivers. Ladies and Gentlemen, certain members of this association are buying up land very very cheaply either in the take area, or immediately adjacent thereto.....Thank you Mr. Speaker, they're buying up land very cheaply for \$100.00 an acre from the farmers in the area and they intend to have the land condemned and sell it quite dearly for 3, 4. 5 hundred dollars an acre. What they have said, when we raised this and we did raise this in the Sun Times and on Midwest Television and we pointed out the people that had conflicts of interests, they're answers were, 'well we have to pay taxes on this. But ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you, as a lawyer, they aren't going to pay taxes on this at all. If they reinvest that money in like land, which means in similar farm land, any where else throughout this state, the money can be reinvested tax free. I think this is a horrible waste of the taxpayers money. I think we are contributing to the delinquency of people who have conflicts of interest. And despite my respect for the sponsors and for my neighboring district, I think that this amendment of Representative Clabaugh's should be supported and this particular appropriation should be deleted from the bill."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."



Webber Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, can I have a little bit of order?"

I would like, Mr. Speaker and fellow members of the House, take up a few of these statements point by point. First, I regret, being of crossed purposes with two people, two Representatives that I generally go with. But I feel that I am a little more experienced in the matters involved here than they are. I bow to Representative Clabaugh in the schools without hesitation. I'd like to state that I have been thousand and thousand of miles by canoe, including the rivers of Illinois. I have put in the, for example, the Lock River and come down the Rock, the Wabash, I've come down the Sangamon, I've come down the...the ah...in Wisconsin I've come down the Wisconsin River. I've had the portage around the dam at Maraboo, for example, and others. There is no trouble about the portaging around the dam on a lake and going on down the river or up a river. I've done it by the hundreds of miles. It makes it more interesting and very type of canoeing experience. Not only have I done this personally, but I've taken 21 groups of scouts at various times as far as Hudson Bay to Harakanala, the Rupert River, James Bay and many other rivers and streams. Personally and with others. I want to bring up the matter of ecology. Since this was mentioned. First, my father was a member of Congress in 1912, was a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee which set up the original plan for the control of the flood stages of the Mississippi Valley and tributaries.

~~It was to be in two phases, first the creation of the lakes,~~

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



which were to control the actual flood stage. The second phase was, starting after world war two incidentally and subject to the budget, was the creation of the ah...lakes and dams for the actual patrol of the waters. The first phase was the levies, dykes, ah....Locks, Dams in relation to the rivers themselves. Now this has been going on since 1912 in the Shawnee Town Flood. Now in relation to Lake Decatur, which my father ran for mayor for the sole purpose of building that lake and built it. Before this lake was built, and we needed it for water supply from Decatur, we have increasing population, increasing industrial needs, so all of Illinois are going to need these lakes for other purposes besides the original one of water supply and ah... for the cities and flood control of the ah...the Mississippi valley and Tributaries. It is now needed also for sewerage control. Now in relation to the ecology. Before lake Decatur was built only ducks we had were flying over from North to South in the Migration period. I have actually had to stop this Spring to allow a mother duck with her ducklings to cross the hard road in front of me along lake shore drive to take her ducklings to water. Right now, there's a mother duck raising her young in the Eisenhower High School yard. Actually we....."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Your time is up Sir. Can you finish in one sentence?"

Webber Borchers: "Yes, Actually we are returning our land to its original ecology by these lakes and dams because we



cannot turn back out corn fields into all the prairie land and the slums and the slues. Thank you."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Ah...for what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh Arise?"

W. D. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, if I may interrupt this discussion for just a moment, it gives me great pleasure to introduce Representative Art Simmons lovely wife, Betty. And her friends, Mrs Ralston from Skokie and Mrs. Pruitt from Dixon. The ladies are in the gallery over here on the right."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "The gentleman from Vermillion Mr. Campbell is recognized."

Charles W. Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House. I would like to have your undivided attention for a moment, because if this amendment were adopted it would personally strike the funds for the Middlefork reservoir for this year. And to give you a wee bit of a background, in 1965 a feasibility study was recommended for this reservoir and the recommendation of that feasibility study for both water use and also for recreation, water supply and recreation, was recommended. In 1966 we had an election in vermilion county to elect a conservation district for the primary purpose of promoting and supporting Vermillion...or the Middlefork Reservoir. That...That conservation district was elected overwhelmingly and as a result of that they taxed the people in Vermillion County and we have put \$1,250,000 of local tax money in land acquisition for the very purpose



of this reservoir. The state has also put in \$1,800,000. This bill had the support of Governor Kerner. It had the support of Governor Shapiro, it has the support of Governor Ogilvie. It also had the support of the conservation department of the state of Illinois under William Lodge, Director Rutherford and Now Director Barkhousen. And I want to remind you that Champaign County is not effected one way or the other by the building of this reservoir since it is not at the upper end nor the lower end. And the only way that it will be effected is that the residents in champaign county will benefit from the recreation benefits by using it. I would further like to remind you that it's not a part of the Representative's district. And not long ago a telephone survey among three counties in this area was conducted by the recreational department of the University of Illinois asking the people of Illinois whether they supported the reservoir. And the overwhelming response was that they were in favor of the reservoir. And believe you me, it would be a rape upon the peoples whose lands we've taken for the very purpose of constructing a reservoir, and not to do so, particularly at this late date. And so far as canoeing is concerned, I was born and raised within five miles of this river and there's never been any canoeing until the last year and a half on that river. And further more it is strip mine land and the ecology was taken care of a long long time ago. And I certainly ask you to vote no on this amendment."



Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "The gentleman from Vermillion, Mr. Craig is recognized."

Robert Craig: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I appreciate your support on this defeat of this amendment. I think it's been well explained. And I'm sure that the people in my district are overwhelmingly in favor of this, since we've already invested about 3 million in state and local conservation. I appreciate a no vote on this amendment."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "The gentleman ah...from Coles, Mr. Cox is recognized." O-K, is there further discussion? Mr. Cox, please."

William D. Cox; "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Alright, the previous question has been moved. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes', have it and now we'll recognize ah...the gentleman from Champaign Mr. Clabaugh to close on the amendment."

Charles W. Clabaugh: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, since the representative from Macon took us on a tour I might, he took us all over the country, I too have canoed on Hudson Bay ah...I have ridden on the dog sled down the Churchill River. I have spent a week out on a trap line when the temperature was from 30 to 60° below zero, but that has nothing to do with this bill and neither did what he said have anything to do with it either because it doesn't make any difference if there's water that runs over a dam when it's only three or four miles from that place to where it goes into another river. I am just making a plea, ladies



and gentlemen, to save one of the beautiful rivers because when you do what this bill suggests you have killed that river for the purposes that these people want to use it for. And in closing I just want to read one other short paragraph which I think should be of great interest to everyone who is interested in maintaining at least some of our ecological streams. This editorial says; 'The dam and its reservoir at best would help shove the state of Illinois nearer to ecological bankruptcy by transforming a natural beautiful and recreational potential into another vast waterlogged engineering exhibit.' And I might say that no very sound proof has been brought forth, that would have any other value than that. Let me say to in answer to the Gentleman from Vermillion about how the people in our district feel about it, I've been down here a little while and I think some of the people in that part of my county knows I'm in the legislature and I have not had one single person, not one single communication asking me to do anything but oppose this project all the way through. So ladies and gentlemen I urge adoption of this amendment, and Mr. Speaker, I ask for a roll call."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: 'Roll call is requested. Is he joined by five members. Alright we'll have a roll call. The question is shall amendment no. 3 be adopted. All those in favor vote 'aye', and opposed 'nay'. The gentleman from Campaign Mr. Hirschfeld is recognized to explain his vote."



John C. Hirschfeld: "Well, very briefly Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, since my distinguished colleague from Vermillion states that he did not feel that Champaign county was effected by this reservoir, let me say to him that I agree with him 100%. My interests are far broader than county interests. What I am concerned about is the Wabash Valley Association officers going in and buying up land cheap from farmers and selling it dear and making a fancy profit without paying income taxes on. What I am concerned about it one more scenic rive going down the drain so that my children and grandchildren won't have the chance to look at the natural beauty of this state. I think that the amendment is going to be soundly defeated, but I think we're taking a step backwards, and I'm sorry that we have so many negative votes up there."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "The gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone."

Paul Stone: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen its quite obvious that anything I might have to say in favor of this amendment will not change enough red votes to green to adopt it. I would like to say however that I believe that we are going overboard in the State of Illinois in our destruction of natural streams and natural areas of the state of Illinois. It won't be long until there....if we go at the rate we're going now, until there will be no natural streams left and no natural areas for our children and our grandchildren to come to and see how things were. This amendment is a very simple amendment. It leaves in the bill, the power to, for



authority to design and to acquire land. It merely strikes the words and it make improvements. So by adopting this amendment all we would do would to say that sight improvements could not be made until next year. I think this is a good amendment, it would preserve some of the things in their natural state that we have. And we're making a mistake when we vote against the amendment."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Have all voted who wished? Gentleman from cook, Mr. Glass."

Bradley M. Glass: "Explaining my vote very briefly, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen I think that the fate of this amendment appears to be sealed. But I would like to add my voice to those of the proponents of the bill and briefly I would like to point out that even though the state does own this river, we all know that the scenic rivers bill is dead. And from what I know about the Vermillion River, it is one, if not the most scenic of the rivers to be protected by the scenic rivers bill. It has been suggested that the state does own the prime stretch of the scenic river. Why not make this middlefork the model scenic river? And I urge more green lights on this amendment."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "ave all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 118 'ayes', and 109 'nays'. Is that right. 18 'ayes', and 109 'nays'. And the gentlemen's motion to adopt amendment no. 3 is lost. Are there further amendments. Bill is advanced to the order of third reading. Committee report."



Fredric B. Selcke: "Mr. Regner from the committee on appropriations which senate bill 1326, 1535, 1555, 1604 were referred reported the same back with amendments thereto, with the recommendation that the amendments be adopted and bills do pps. No further reports."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Barry, with respect to Senate Bill 1598."

Tobias Barry: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make amotion with regard to senate bill 1598 a series of bills, 1598 through 1602. My motion would be to suspend the rules for the purpose for making a motion to discharge the judiciary number 1 committee from consideration of that series of bills. And I should explain that this is a series that has been passed by the Senate which is our state version of the ah...Safety and Health Federal Act. The purpose of the entire series, agreed to by the Department of Labor and in fact written by the Department of Labor, so that we might gleem some \$600,000 in Federal monies to enforce the OCIA, so called Federal OCIA act in Illinois. And I move for the suspension of the rules."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Is there objection? Hearing none, the motion, the rule will be suspended. Now the gentleman from ah...Bureau Mr. Barry."

Tobias Barry: "I would now move to discharge judiciary one from consideration of this series of bills."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "The motion has been made that ah... the rules be suspended with respect to this series of bills starting with Senate Bill 1598."



Tobias Barry: "Motion to discharge Mr. Speaker. Motion to discharge judiciary one for consideration."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Motion to discharge for consideration. Does the gentleman have unanimous consent to take this motion, or do you want a roll call? Is there objection? Roll call. O-k all those in favor of the motion to discharge the committee with respect to These bills vote 'aye', and those opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. The gentleman from cook, Mr. Juckett."

Robert S. Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, according to the Chicago Association of Commerce if these particular bills are put into effect 75% of the industry and plants in the state of Illinois will be closed down by 1980. And I think we ought to have a hearing on it to see if their charges are true. Because if industry and commerce are closed down, I don't know whose going to pay the bills for the state, or for anybody else. And I think its charges are of such a nature that we ought to five heed and at leasst give a hearing before we shut everything down in the gise of doing wonders for everybody else."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "The gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Barry."

Tobias Barry: "This law is Federal Law in effect that we are making a state version of. so to speak, and all we're doing by passing the state version of the Federal OCIA act is cleaning \$600,000. The series has had a hearing in the Senate, we'll gain nothing and we'll have to live with the Federal law with out the money if we do not pass the series."

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 99 'ayes', 17 'nays'. And the gentleman's motion prevails. And these bills are placed on the order of second reading. Agreed Resolutions, just a moment. The gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff, desire recognition?"

Clarence E. Neff: "Ah...yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the appropriate rules suspended and take Senate Bill 1362 that's just been assigned to the Transportation Committee and place it one second reading. I've talked to the leadership on both sides of the aisle, and they are agreeable to this. This really, all this bill does is change the administration of the ah...Transportation of School Children by private bus companies, take it from the Department of Local Governmental affairs and places it into the Transportation Division."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, in order to do that, I think it would be preferable, of course, if I reassigned that bill to the speakers table and recognize you on that motion on the speakers table. to have to placed on the order of second reading without reference to committee. So I put it on the Speaker's table and the Gentleman's now asking leave to have it advanced to the order of second reading without reference to committee. Is there objection? Hearing none, then it will be placed on that order."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Agreed resolutions. Just a moment, Just a moment. Why does the gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Washburn, Mr. Grundy seek recognition?"



James R. Washburn: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I would like to move for the suspension of rule 17 so that the following appropriations bills can be heard by the appropriations committee tomorrow morning. Senate Bills 1319, 1337, 1361, 1406, 1433, 1542, 1550, and 1564."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Does the gentleman have leave? Gentleman from cook, Mr. Shea."

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Washburn, how many House Bills are still left in the appropriations committee?"

James R. Washburn: "None that we know of, is that right Ted, do you have that information?"

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Gentleman from cook, Mr. Lechowicz.

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, the reply for Representative Washburn is correct, the only House Bills that are left in committees are sub-committees."

Gerald W. Shea: "How many are there, do you know, Ted?"

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "I'd say about 51, 52."

Gerald W. Shea: "House Bills?"

Thaddeus S. Lechowicz: "They're in subcommittees and they're not coming out."

Gerald W. Shea: "Thank you."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Does the gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection.....The gentleman from cook Mr. Hoffman does he want to be recognized on this issue? O-k hearing no objections leave is granted. The gentleman from cook, Mr. R. Hoffman."

R.K. Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I would like leave of the House to

have Senate Bills 1494 taken from the table, so that it may be heard, posted and heard in the appropriations committee."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Your' not recognized for that purpose, take it out of the record and we are meeting on this agreed bill, on Senate Bills that are on the table. And we expect to have this accomplished tonight, and tomorrow morning to move those as a list. O-K, Agreed Resolutions. The Gentleman from....."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Resolution 740, Terzich et. al., House Resolution 741, Lenard et. al., 742, Murphy et. al., 743 Jones et. al., 746, Philip et.al.. 747 terzich et. al., 748, Jones et. al., 749, Walters et. al, 750 Karmazyn."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Agreed resolutions. Gentleman from cook, Mr. Hyde."

Henry J. Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. The agreed Resolutions; House Resolution 740 expresses our condolences of the families of the nine brave firemen who died in the tragic Sendome Hotel fire in Bostom Massachusetts. House Resolution 741 commends Maurice R. Marcello on the publication of "Black Coal for White Bread". A book the gentleman is the author of. House Resolution 742 ah... mourns the untimely death of J. Harris Shahnerd. House resolution 743 mourns the untimely death of Robert R. Walsh. A State Police Security officer in the Governors Office. House Resolution 746 ah...recognizes the birthday of our respected Colleague George Lindberg who is 40 years old today, but is on his way campaigning and we wish him a



happy birthday. House Resolution 747 extends our best wishes to Father John Brennen and the members of the Parish of St. Daniels Prophet as they celebrate their 25th anniversary. House Resolution 748 mourns the death of Judge Charles G. Briggles Senior a former judge of the United States district Court in Springfield Illinois. House Resolution 749 congratulates Hammel Township Mutual Fire Insurance Company on its 100th anniversary of its founding. House Resolution 750 congratulates the Allana Girls state and its 500 delegates. I move adoption of the agreed resolutions."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor of the agreed resolutions adoption list, say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the agreed resolutions are adopted. Are there further resolutions?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Resolution 744, Douglas et. Al. House resolution 745, Douglas et. al."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Speaker's table. Gentleman from ah... ah... Grundy, Mr. Washburn."

James R. Washburn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker for the purpose of an announcement. The Appropriations Committee will meet tomorrow morning at 9:00 on the House Floor. Please be prompt because we'll only have a couple of hours available to us. 9:00 a.m. tomorrow on the House floor."

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

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, the House Senate Joint Revenue Study Commission will, or committee will meet at 11:00 tomorrow morning in Room M3."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from cook, Mr. Hyde."

Henry J. Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, ah...an announcement first before we adjourn. I regret that we are unable at this time to state definitively whether we will be going home tomorrow or not. Ah...therefore it is the suggestion that you do not check out of your motels tomorrow, but ah...maintain a ah...posture of being able to do so should it develop later in the day that we do adjourn tomorrow. We can't tell until further conferences with the Senate and its really not the fault of this side of the rotunda. Now I move that, in view of the fact that there are Revenue...I'm Sorry, Appropriations Committee meeting in the morning, and a special meeting of the Revenue Committee that is estimating the Revenue to be received by the State, also in the morning that we will come in at 12:00 noon. So I move now, that this House do stand adjourned until the hour of 12:00 noon tomorrow."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and we stand adjourned."

ADJOURNMENT AT 5:09 p.m. O'CLOCK

6/21/72

mdw

