

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FOURTEENTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

FEBRUARY 14, 1973

9:30 O'CLOCK A.M.

THE HONORABLE W. ROBERT BLAIR, SPEAKER

IN THE CHAIR



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Representative Robert G. Day - no reason given;
Representative Peter C. Granata - illness;
Representative Robert S. Juckett - death in family;
Representative Frank P. North - no reason given;
Representative Peter Pappas - no reason given;
Representative Peter Piotrowicz - illness;
Representative George E. Sangmeister - illness;
Representative Joseph G. Sevcik - illness.



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The ah.. House will be in order. The invocation this morning will be by Mr. Davis."

Corneal A. Davis: "Let us pray. The Holy Spirit leads me. O Lord, Our God, Your name is excellent in all the earth. For out of the mouths of babes and sucklings, Thou does ordain strength. Because of Your enemies, You might still every enemy and every avenger not only of Yourself but of this Nation. But Lord when we consider your helpfulness-- the moon and the stars which Thou has ordained. What is man that Thou would be mindful of him? Or the son of man that Thou would even walk or visit with him, for you created us just a little lower than the angels and You've crowned us with glory and honor. You've given us dominion over the very works of your hands and all things You've placed under our feet. Yea, the beasts of the field, the fowl of the air, the fish of the sea and everything that passes through the paths of the sea. Oh Lord our God, let Your name be excellent throughout all the earth and especially our Nation. We come this morning with child-like simplicity and as we come we ask You to remember those who are not with us; remember our colleagues Pete Granata and his wife, Sevcik, Representative Sevcik, Bud Krause and Frank Wolf. For Thou are the same God who did make the blind see, make the lame to walk, and yea raise the very dead. Touch their feverish brows this morning and let them know that Thou art God. Lord, as we pray here this morning may we be reminded of the responsibilities we owe to the returning Veterans,



their wives and families who come back to us from Viet Nam. May we be ever mindful of the responsibilities we owe not only to those Veterans but to the people of our State and to the people of our Nation. Keep us firm; keep us steadfast, always believing and trusting in the Lord we pray in the name of Jesus. Amen."

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

W. D. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, will the record show that ah.. Representatives Sevcik, Granata and Piotrowicz are absent because of illness? And, Representative Juckett is absent because of the death of his mother."

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

C. L. Choate: "Mr. Speaker, would you please have the Journal to indicate that Representative Krause and Representative Sangmeister are absent due to illness?"

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

W. D. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I move for a Repub... for a recess for the purpose of a Republican Conference immediately in Room 212 and that we reconvene at..."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "One half hour..."

W. D. Walsh: "In a half hour."

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

C. L. Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Democratic Members to have a Conference in Room M5. And, I would appreciate their being there immediately because we do have



things of importance to this General Assembly and the people of the State to discuss. And, I would that we would be back within thirty minutes."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. The House will stand in recess then for purposes of these two Conferences for a period of one half hour, returning to the floor at a quarter of ten... eleven."

RECESS AT 10:12 O'CLOCK A.M.

RETURN AT 12:00 O'CLOCK P.M.

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The House will come to order. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 290, Yourell, et.al. Establishes the Illinois Beverage Container Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 291, Jaffe, et.al. Amends the Environmental Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 292, Kempiners, et.al., creates the Lead Poisoning Substance Control Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 293, Ron Hoffman, et.al., an Act limiting salary increase for State Officers andsoforth. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 294, Matijeovich, et.al., amends the 'Vehicle Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 295, Yourell, et.al., amends 'The School Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 296, Fennessey, et.al., amends an Act authorizing Counties of 150,000 population to incur indebtedness andsoforth. First



Reading of the Bill. House Bill 297, Hart, et.al., amends the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. 298, Mahar, et.al., amends 'The Municipal Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 299, Mahar, et.al., amends 'The Municipal Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 300, Schlickman, et.al., amends the Retailers Occupational Tax. First Reading of the Bill. 301, Neff, et.al., amends 'The Vehicle Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 302, Neff, et.al., amends 'The Vehicle Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 303, Borchers, et.al., amends an Act relating to rivers, lakes and streams. First Reading of the Bill. 304, Yourell, et.al., amends 'The Vehicle Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 305, ah.. Fennessey, et.al., creates the Rural Transportation Assistance Demonstration Project in 1973. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 306, Fennessey, et.al., amends 'The School Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 307, ah.. Hanahan, et.al., amends 'The School Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 308, Campbell, et.al., amends 'The Vehicle Code'. First Reading of the Bill. 309, Bradley, et.al., an Act in relation to the refund of surplus in the State Treasury. First Reading of the Bill. 310, Bradley, et.al., an Act to make an appropriation to the Department of Revenue. First Reading of the Bill. 311, Hanahan, et.al., prohibits the employment of professional strikebreakers. First Reading of the Bill. 312, Hanahan, et.al., amends the Minimum Wage Law. First Reading of the Bill. 313, Hanahan, et.al., an Act regulating contribution by certain employers to benefit funds or fringe



benefit to their employees. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 314, Washburn, et.al., an Act to repeal Section 13.1 of an Act in relation to State Finance. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 315, Murphy, et.al., amends an Act providing for compensation of the Members of the General Assembly. Ah.. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 316, Krause, et.al., amends 'The Vehicle Code'. First Reading of the Bill."

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

C. L. Choate: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, this morning I made a request for the Digest to indicate the absence because of illness of two Members from this side, Representative Sangmeister and Representative Bud Krause. I would like to say to the entire Membership how much it pleases me, and I'm sure it pleases the Members of the House, that I, again, want to correct the Digest to show that Representative Krause has recovered from his illness and is now in attendance on the floor of the House."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "And, the Journal will so show. Representative B. B. Wolfe, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Bernard B. Wolfe: "A point of parliamentary inquiry. On what order of business is the House?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "We're on ah.. order Number 6, ah.. Reading and Introduction of First Bills."

B. B. Wolfe: "Thank you."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "House Bill 317."



Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 317, Grotberg, amends the Metropolitan Transit Authority Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Agreed Resolutions."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 38, DiPrima, et.al. House Resolution 39, Malloy, et.al. House Resolution 40, Kennedy, et.al. Ah.. House Resolution 41, Yourell. House Resolution 42, Yourell."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from ah.. Cook,...Oh! I'm sorry."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Resolution 44, J. David Jones."

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

W. D. Walsh: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Resolution 38 commends Antonette Cozzi on.. on her 100th Birthday today. House Resolution 39, ah.. introduced by Representative Malloy commends Harris Stevens the ah.. Director of Finance for the Village of Oak Park on his retirement and wishes him well in the future. House Resolution 40, ah.. commends John L. Jehle of Alton ah.. who was just elected President of the Illinois Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors Association. House Resolution 41 commends Walter Lysen, a newly-elected President of the Cook County Publishers Association. House Resolution 42 ah.. commends Our Lady of the Ridge Roman Catholic Church on its 25th Anniversary of the Parish. House Resolution 44 which was ah.. just handed to me ah.. suggests that the Gutzon Borglum bronze head of Abraham



Lincoln in front of his tomb in Oak Ridge Cemetery ah.. be ah.. lowered so that ah.. more people could enjoy it and touch the nose. And, Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there discussion? The gentleman has offered to move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', and the opposed 'no' and the Resolutions are adopted. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 318, Fleck, et.al., amends the Limitations Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "House Bills Second Reading. House Bill 89."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 89, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Secretary of Transportation for grants pursuant to the Mass Transportation Emergency Operation Assistance Act of 1973. Second Reading of the Bill. Ah.. one Committee Amendment. Committee Amendment No. 1 was tabled in Committee. Committee Amendment No. 3 was tabled in Committee. Committee Amendment No. 2. Amendment No. 2, amend House Bill 89, by deleting lines 1 through 4 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'An Act to make an appropriation to the Department of Transportation for emergency Mass Transportation grants, andsoforth'."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I have laid on the Clerk's desk an



Amendment to Amendment No. 2. I would now move that Amendment to Amendment No. 2 be adopted prior to the time the adoption of Amendment No. 2 is voted on."

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

W. D. Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think that the gentleman would have to amend the Bill, as amended, ah.. in order to accomplish what he hopes to do. And, he can not amend an Amendment that has not as yet been ah.. ah. adopted by this House."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, if your Parliamentarian is there, I would say that any Rules or any Procedures that are not covered by the Rules of this House are covered by Robert's Rules of Order. And, I read pursuant to Rule 72. I read from Robert's Rules of Order, the newly revised addition on Page 108, Number 12, Amend. And, it talks about when an Amendment is proper to an Amendment. And, I read from Number 6 or.. or what.. or from Number 2 on Page 110. 'Amend can be applied to itself, that is a pending primary Amendment, so that a Secondary Amendment or an Amendment to an Amendment will result, but it can not be applied to a Secondary Amendment. I think that Robert's Rules of Order is very clear, that as long as the Amendment is germane to the main issue, I am allowed to move to amend an Amendment'."

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



tive William Walsh."

W. D. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I call your attention and I call the attention of the gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea, to Rule 34 which says, 'Amendments to a Bill may be adopted only when a Bill is on the order of Second Reading'. Now, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that Rule 34 makes no reference to an Amendment to an Amendment, but only to an Amendment to a Bill. And, I submit that the gentleman's motion to amend an Amendment is out of order. And, I request a Ruling."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative Schlickman, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

E. E. Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, with reference to Rule Number 34 of our Rules, there is Sub-Section B which says, 'No Amendment may be adopted unless it has been reproduced and is on the Member's desk'. I do not have a copy."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Well, Representative Schlickman's point is well taken. For the moment, Amendment No. 2 is on the desks. The Amendment to Amendment No. 2 is not on the Member's desk. The gentleman from ah.. Will, Speaker Blair."

Speaker Blair: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would ah.. first offer and move the adoption of ah.. Committee Amendment ah.. Number 2, to House Bill 89. And ah.., I would like to ah.. take just a few minutes to explain ah.. what ah.. House Bill... this Amendment proposes to do. Now, the original House Bill 89 proposed to spend a total of \$90,000,000, \$60,000,000 in State money and \$30,000,000 in local money. This Committee



Amendment No. 2 calls for only \$22,500,000 and only \$12,250,000 in State money and \$10,500,000 in local money. The Amendment affects a reduction of \$67,000,000 to House Bill 89 as it was introduced. In addition, it has another distinction, the House Bill 89, as introduced, called for a two-thirds State participation and only one-third ah.. local money. Ah.. Committee Amendment No. 2 calls for a fifty-fifty split. The Amendment provides for a six month State-wide freeze on Mass Transit fare structures in effect on January 1, 1973 for those Transit Carriers that apply for grants under the program. And, it also provides for a six month State-wide freeze on Mass Transit Service levels in effect on January 1, 1973 for those Transit Carriers who apply for grants under the Program. Now, the Amendment will cover the Chicago Transit Authority, ah.. Commuter Rail-lines, Suburban Bus Companies and Downstate Bus Companies. Those private and public Mass Transit Carriers are included. The Chicago Transit Authority will receive a maximum of \$16,000,000, and as I've indicated, on the basis of a fifty-fifty split. This would be \$8,000,000 in State money and \$8,000,000 coming from local funds. And, I'm sure that you are aware of the fact that the City of Chicago has appropriated \$10,000,000 and the County of Cook has appropriated \$5,000,000 ah.. with certain conditions ah.. for participation. They've made it clear that they have ah.. sufficient monies to ah.. cover the \$8,000,000 participation required by them under this Bill. The Commuter Rail-...."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative Schraeder, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

F. J. Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, as I understand, we're supposed to have the Amendments on our desk. Is that my understanding? None of us back here have that Amendment."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative Murphy informs us that there in your Bill Books. Representative Blair, do you wish to proceed, Sir? Representative Schraeder, did you seek recognition, Sir? Did you seek further recognition?"

Speaker Blair: "Yes, they're in your Bill Book."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Bill Book..."

Speaker Blair: "If you'll look in your Bill Book, your House Bill Book, you'll see that the Committee Amendment is right in front of House Bill 89."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Proceed, Speaker Blair."

Speaker Blair: "Alright.. The Commuter Rails will receive a maximum of \$4,500,000. This would be divided ah.. \$2,250,000 in State money and \$2,250,000 ah.. from ah.. their sources. Ah.. Downstate and Suburban Bus Companies, both public and private, will receive a maximum of \$2,000,000 in State money with no local match being required. Ah.. it's estimated that in the Chicago Metropolitan Area, the Bus Companies will receive...."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative Barnes, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

E. M. Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, in.. in referring to my Bill Book and going through the things I have on my desk, I find that



that Amendment is not over here, at least not on my desk.

I would like to have a copy of it."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The Clerk has informed me that the Democratic Pages have had copies for some time now, for a number of days. And, it was their responsibility to put them in the Bill Books."

E. M. Barnes: "There not here. I have the Book in my hand, as of right now. And, the Amendment is not here and it's not on my desk."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Well, the Amendments were given to the Pages. They've been distributed. If a Page inadvertently missed one of the Members desk, perhaps, you could look at your seatmate's Bill and we'll send extra copies out now. But, certainly, the ah.. Representative Choate, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

C. L. Choate: "Well, evidently, two Members on this side have raised the point that the Book... that the Bill... that the Amendment is not in their Bill Book. I would think, Mr. Speaker, that ah.. you would have the Clerk or the Pages or someone supply them with a copy of that Amendment. And, you can be assured that I will talk to the Democratic Pages and find out why they are not in there, if they were supplied with the ah.. appropriate number of Amendments. But, until these two Members receive a copy of the Amendment, I would hope that you would hold the explanation of same up until we can intelligently follow the discussion that's taking place on the floor of this House."



Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative Walsh, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

W. D. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, do I understand that there are two Members on the Democratic side who do not have ah.."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Three Members... Three Members."

W. D. Walsh: "Ah.. I.. I would contribute one."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Okay.."

W. D. Walsh: "Can't we... Can't we come up with a few and get underway so that ah..."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Well, I just sent someone back to the Clerk's Office to get extra copies. There going to ah.. Representative Lundy, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

J. R. Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, I have a ah.. point of parliamentary inquiry."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "State your point."

J. R. Lundy: "House Bill 89 is an Appropriation Bill. It was reported to this floor from the Appropriations Committee. Now, as I look at Amendment No. 2, I see that it contains any number of substantive Legislative requirements. Requires the Secretary to make payments. Requires him to make audits. Requires carriers, receiving payments, to enter agreements. It sets up, in short, an entire springwork, an entire new Legislative Program. Now, I refer to Section VIII of Article IV of our State Constitution and specifically to Paragraph D of that Section which reads, in part, 'Appropriation Bills shall be limited to the subject of Appropriations'. And, I request a Ruling from the Chair as to whether Amendment No. 2



does not, in fact, exceed that Constitutional requirement and enact substantive Legislation rather than limiting itself to the subject of Appropriations."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Will, ah.. Speaker Blair."

Speaker Blair: "Well, the gentleman raises a ah.. a good point. We discussed this matter at some length with the ah.. Reference Bureau ah.. and ah.. decided that, on the way it is drawn, that it is ah.. confined to the subject of the Appropriation and would meet the Constitutional test to which the ah.. gentleman refers."

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

J. R. Lundy: "Well, if ah.. if the ah.. Speaker, the gentleman from Cook, ah.. doesn't mind, I would like to disagree. And it seems to be quite clear from the face of the Bill that it imposes any number of substantive requirements. It is not limited to the subject of Appropriations. I.. I grant that, in some cases, the question of when limitations may ah.. properly be placed on Appropriations and the question of substantive Legislation, that area gets very difficult to.. to distinguish. But, it seems to me, that this Amendment goes so far in the area of imposing substantive requirements on both the Secretary of Transportation and the carriers to whom grants are made, that it must be substantive Legislation. And, I would ah.. like a formal ruling from the Chair on that matter."



Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative Lundy, to clearly define ah.. this type of interpretation of the new Constitution and after consultation with the Reference Bureau, the Chair will rule that your ah.. point of order is not well taken and that the Amendment is in order. The gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman."

A. L. Berman: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a point of parliamentary inquiry."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "State your point, Sir."

A. L. Berman: "As to your previous ruling, I see nothing in this Amendment No. 2 that is different than the multitude of Bills that we've always treated in this Legislature that, under past practices, has combined both substantive Law and Appropriations. And, could you delineate, for our benefit, how Amendment No. 2 is different from old Bills that we've treated in the past that combine substantive Law and Appropriations? And, how it changes our past practice to comply with the new Constitutional requirements that Appropriator and substantive Bills are separated? This Bill, to me, doesn't look any different from the old type of Bills that we've ah.. handled under the old Constitution. If that's the Rule, ah.. it seems to me, to be out of order. Could you delineate ah.. your ruling, please?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Well, as the.. as the gentleman, who ah.. who put the parliamentary inquiry indicated, and I concur with him. It's very difficult ah.. delineate... to delineate a personal interpretation. Ah.. I can only say, based on that



and on the interpretation of the Chair, that it does fall within the confine so stated in the Constitution. And, therefore, the Chair has made ah.. that ruling, Representative Berman. Are.. Are the Amendments distributed, ah.. Representative Jaffe, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

A. Jaffe: "A parliamentary inquiry."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "State your point, Sir."

A. Jaffe: "Ah.. how would we go about in making a motion to overrule the Chair at this time?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Put the motion, Sir."

A. Jaffe: "I would like to now move that the ah.. ruling.... Ah.. I hold that for a moment."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Thank you. Have the Amendments been distributed now to the Members? There still... Representative Lundy, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

J. R. Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, one last ah.. comment on the point of order which I raised. And, that is that while the Speaker's ruling ah.., should it be sustained in a vote, would be final as far as this House is concerned, I draw the attention of the Members of this Body to the fact that in the final instance, it will be the Courts which will have the final say about whether what we do here is proper or not. And, it seems to me, that by the simple expedience of waiting for the Transportation Committee, the Committee with substantive jurisdiction over the area in which we are now ah.. legislating, we could avoid any possible Constitutional defect in action we take today. If we do not wait and we do not



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

follow that procedure, then I suggest that any program that we enact today is subject to severe Constitutional question and might possibly ah.. ah.. be simply ah.. an exercise in futility."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Now, have the Members received the Amendments, Representative Schraeder? Barnes? Okay.. The gentleman from Will, Speaker Blair."

Speaker Blair: "Alright.. We were at that point where I was explaining that ah.. the \$2,000,000 for our Bus Companies. Those in the Suburban Areas would be receiving \$650,000 and those Downstate, \$1,350,000 for a total of some \$2,000,000. Now, with all the State's participation, which would be \$12,250,000 will come from the State's General Revenue Fund. None of it would come from the State Road Fund. No category of carrier, from the C.T.A., the Rail or the Bus may receive more than its share of the allocated Fund. That is, for example, the Downstate Bus Companies ah.. and the Suburban Bus Companies would not apply for their \$2,000,000, this money cannot go to the Chicago Transit Authority. And, there is provision for the Auditor General to conduct or to supervise and audit of the Chicago Transit Authority. Now, that's a thumbnail sketch of what ah.. Amendment No. 2 does. And, I would renew my motion ah.. to adopt it."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

G. W. Shea: "Is this substantially, Mr. Speaker, the same Amendment that you offered in Transportation or, I mean, in



Appropriations?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Will, Representative Blair."

Speaker Blair: "Yes.."

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

G. W. Shea: "Now, at the time that you offered this Amendment, there was a provision for a audit, as I believe you called it. 'The Secretary of Transportation, by agreement with the Auditor General, shall cause to be audited and conduct a compliance and efficiency audit of the C.T.A.' Has this Bill any provisions... or the Amendment any provisions for the same type of audit of either the Commuter Railroads and/or other Transportation Systems that accept grants under this proposed Amendment?"

Speaker Blair: "No.."

G. W. Shea: "Could you tell me why that provision is not in there for the Commuter Railroads and the Mass Transportation Areas other than the C.T.A.?"

Speaker Blair: "Because ah.. you indicated in Committee ah.. that you ah.. thought that that ought to be in there. And, I suggested that I had no objections. So, I took it that you would prepare the Amendment."

G. W. Shea: "My understanding was that you were going to prepare those Amendments, Mr. Speaker. After all, you're the moving force here, it seems."

Speaker Blair: "Well, I have no private authorship. And, if you



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

want to audit the Suburban Bus Companies and Suburban Commuter Rail Lines, ah.. you can certainly ah.. draw up the Amendment and offer it. I have no objections."

G. W. Shea: "In other words, you have no private authorship, if we amend this a little bit?"

Speaker Blair: "Well, that depends upon how you define, 'a little bit'."

G. W. Shea: "Well, it's kind of like you defined this Amendment to the original Garmisa proposal, with a scalpel. Now, could you tell me? Have you had any communication with the Commuter Railroads that would be eligible for grants under this Amendment?"

Speaker Blair: "Yes.."

G. W. Shea: "Now, as I understand this and it was raised, I believe in the Transportation Committee, that there is available 2. or two and a quarter million dollars to be matched by two and a quarter million dollars from some other source. Now, the way that this is worded, does that mean that the Commuter Railroads could get a Federal subsidy and not have to put up any of their own money? In other words, can a private carrier use both a State subsidy and a Federal subsidy and not really have to put up any hard matched money of its own under your Amendment?"

Speaker Blair: "Well, the... in the first instance, their very serious question with the language the way it is in ah.. Amendment No. 2, ah.. that the Commuter Rails ah.. would be able to take advantage of the two and a quarter million dol-



lars ah.. that is ah.. proposed from the State. Ah.. for that reason, I have had prepared, and it is on the desks, Amendment No. 4, ah.. which directs itself to that question. And ah.., if ah.. ah.. if we can move along and ah.. adopt ah.. 2, ah.. then I can answer your ah.. ah.. question ah.. when I move for the adoption of 4. Ah.. basically, we are providing that they may use ah.. funds that have ah.. been ah.. assigned to them other than from their operating revenue or income from the Commuter operation of the Railroads. In essence, the freight operations of the Commuter Rails have been subsidizing the passenger operation for some time. In 1972, for example, a total of 9.2 million dollars that was transferred by these ah.. carriers to their passenger operations in order to get them to break even. So, my Amendment No. 4 would propose to allow ah.. the transfers made by the carriers from their freight revenue ah.. to qualify as the match."

G. W. Shea: "Well, I.. I see what Amendment No. 4, you're attempting to do, but I, again, renew my question. Under the language, and even under the language of proposed Amendment No. 4, could the Commuter Railroads get a grant of two and quarter million dollars from the Federal Government and use that for matching funds to get the other two and a quarter million from the State?"

Speaker Blair: "Well, the ah.. I think that, in a purer sense, the answer to that question ah.. would be yes. But, we are..."

G. W. Shea: "Thank you."



Speaker Blair: "Not aware of any ah.. Federal monies that are available for operating expenses of ah.. Mass Transportation. That matter is being argued now at some length ah.. before the U.S. Congress. And ah.., in any event, I think that the question is mute because I am pinpointing, in my Amendment No. 4, a soft match ah.. provision ah.. from these carriers which will allow them ah.. to.. to get this two and a quarter million dollars. And, putting them... it's... it's a soft match, but it's ah.. the only way that ah.. their going to be able to qualify for any subsidy. And, I don't think we ought to put the Commuter Rail Services in a disadvantageous position ah.. with the Chicago Transit Authority. Their out there for fare increases now, two or three of the roads. And ah.., some are being held up. And ah.., the way that we can avoid that until June 30 is by providing this subsidy."

G. W. Shea: "Well,... But, your answer to my question was, 'yes', a Federal subsidy?"

Speaker Blair: "Well, there are no Federal subsidies available, to our knowledge, for operating expenses of Mass Transit ah.. Companies. And, I'm telling you, where... wherefore is going to allow the match to come from. So, that's really loose question. Their going to be able to qualify for the full 2.25 million dollars on the basis of the transfers that ah.. were made ah.. from the freight operations of these private Rail carriers during calendar year 1972."

G. W. Shea: "Well now, as I understand your soft match provision, you're saying that we've got a four and a half million



dollar loss. Ah.. we'll cut that down to two and a half million dollars by a bookkeeping entry of transferring two and a half million dollars from Division A into Division B of the same Company. Is that about it?"

Speaker Blair: "Well, in.. in a very general sense, ah.. that's right. Ah.. the freight operations of these Commuter Railroads ah.. have been subsidizing ah.. in full ah.. the operating deficits of.. of the passenger operations. And, what this would do, would be to ah.. pick up ah.. basically ah.. fifty percent ah.. of.. of this operating deficit which has been... being funded one hundred percent from the ah.. freight ah.. revenues of these carriers."

G. W. Shea: "Well, I.. I just thought that maybe, if we're going to give the Railroads two and a quarter million dollars, in effect, you say that it's a soft match, so it's free money, that, perhaps, the audit provision would be very applicable there so that we could find out how their apportioning their cost between their freight operations and their Suburban ah.. Commuter operations. Perhaps, the service charges or the depreciation charges are much too high on one and not on the other. And, I see Mr. Deuster up. So, maybe he could explain that because, I think, he's pretty knowledgeable when it comes to Railroad problems. Now, I have a further question. Ah.. you limit the hard match for the Chicago Transit Authority only to the City of Chicago and the County of Cook. And, there are some thirty-three Municipalities serviced by the C.T.A. Are you prohibiting them from



participating in this program?"

Speaker Blair: "Well, I.. I think on the.. the percentages that ah.. the overwhelming number ah.. is ah.. within the confines of the City of Chicago, as far as the percentage of operations is concerned by the Chicago Transit Authority. Ah.. secondly, ah.. the City of Chicago and the County of Cook have already responded in a positive fashion to the situation by most of them passing Resolutions ah.. that would appropriate money out of their motor fuel tax fund ah.. to ah.. go into a match situation with the State to assist the C.T.A. in its situation now."

G. W. Shea: "Well,... But, I.. I go back.. You.. You.. Under this Amendment, you've prohibited thirty-three other Municipalities from participating in this program. Is there any particular reason for prohibiting that participation?"

Speaker Blair: "Well, as long as you have the offer on the books ah.. from the City of Chicago and the County of Cook ah.. to cover the matter, I see no reason to get into some ah.. what, on the basis of the percentage of operation, would be a very ah.. small amount, three percent, I believe, ah.. of the C.T.A.'s operations ah.. go to ah.. places other than the City of Chicago. Ninety-seven percent of their operations are within in.. in the City that this adequately covers the situation. I didn't intend to prohibit it. I just didn't see any reason to ah.. get into it as long as we had the money ah.. coming from those two bodies."

G. W. Shea: "Well, the reason I ask that, I represent a District



that ah.. has two of my largest towns, Berwyn and Cicero, where my people are heavily dependent upon the C.T.A. for transportation. And, they might want to help to insure a continuation of service. And, that's why I was curious why you prohibited them from doing it. Now, one further question. As I understand the substance of your proposed Amendment is that you would only fund Mass Transportation on an emergency basis through June 30th of this year. Is that correct, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Blair: "Well, that's right.. We're trying to ah.. We're trying to ah.. see if we can address the State's participation in this problem. Ah.. we've been advised by the C.T.A. and the people in the Inter-city and ah.. out and around the periphery that they have to have these funds by February 18th, which is ah.. next Monday. And ah.., we're trying to do what we can ah.. to expedite ah.. the situation. And frankly, it is an emergency situation, as you are very well aware. And, that really precluded ah.. our trying to get any of those other thirty-three communities into concert on.. on the situation. If they want to voluntarily ah.. make a ah.. contribution to the situation, I.. I'm sure that it would not be turned down by the C.T.A."

G. W. Shea: "Well, I think you and I are in at least accord on that the plight of Mass Transit is an emergency situation. We are in agreement that the Constitutional mandate to we, here in the Legislature, is that we make Mass Transportation one of our Number One priorities. I think where you and I



differ, Mr. Speaker, is the need. We both agree that it's now. But, I would prefer to fund this, at least, through the end of this calendar year. Now, as you know, Mr. Speaker, the Governor of our State will come before us the end of this month and present to this Body his budget message. I know that we will fulfill our duties and work very diligently to do what we can to insure that the programs of this State will go forward. And, I'm sure that the Governor is going to have new and different programs. He's also, I think, mandated this Legislative Body to be a producer of programs, to be an innovator. And, I fully intend to do that in the field of Mass Transportation, not for one Area but for all Areas of this State. And, I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we could, at least, fund this through the end of the year so that we may be able to take a hard look at our problems on a State-wide basis."

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

D. E. Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to ah.. ask about three short questions which are of a clarifying nature of the Sponsor of this Amendment. It's my understanding from reading the ah.. Amendment that the adjective 'emergency' is in here. And ah.., that answers one question. It is an emergency and the Legislation so speaks. Ah.. there was a ah.. a word that was in or a phrase that was in the original Bill, House Bill 83, which is a companion to this that said it was also temporary. And, I wanted to inquire of the Spon-



sor of this Amendment whether he also regards Amendment No. 2 as temporary."

Speaker Blair: "Well, it's been... In answering your question and the gentleman from Cook's ah.. ah.. question that he stated just prior to your remarks, ah.. it has been the thought of a number of people that it is essential we address ourselves to the adoption a Regional Mass Transportation Plan, a Regional Transportation Plan in the Northeastern Region of the State of Illinois. And, for that reason, there are a number of Bills that are in this House right now on that subject, it was my feeling and a number of peoples feelings that we ought to only provide ah.. that amount of money or that would give us the operating time ah.. within which to address ourselves to the adoption of such a plan and that was to June ah.. 30, and it was my fault, that we would then have an opportunity to address ourselves to ah.. that plan and ah.. the question of a continuous ah.. State ah.. operating subsidy."

D. E. Deuster: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the answer. It's my understanding that the object of this Legislation is to keep the ah.. Chicago Transit Authority ah.. running and functioning and to avoid any ah.. ah.. cutbacks or restrictions in service or any undue increases in fare and that we want to hold this system together long enough for us to adopt a long-range solution. And, I'm just wondering. Most Members are going to ask the question, 'How long?'... 'How long are we going to hold them together?'. The dis-



tinguished Assistant Minority Leader said, 'Let's hold them together all year'. Ah.. the ah.. distinguished Speaker said, 'Let's hold them together until the end of June'. And, I'm greatly concerned that at the end of June, we'll all be going home. And, I wanted to inquire of the Sponsor of the Amendment and the distinguished Speaker ah.. whether he has in mind a timetable for considering the long-range solution. Ah.. bearing in mind, in my case, I have House Bill 131 which is in the Committee and our new Rules require it to be adopted in forty-five days or acted upon. And so, I simply inquire, what is the timetable? What can we expect? What is the answer to the question, how long?"

Speaker Blair: "Well, ah.. each Member will have to ah.. proceed in his own way ah.. that has a Regional Plan Bill to have it ah.. considered by the Committee. And ah.., the Committee will either act favorably or unfavorably with regard to each one of these proposals. I.. I think that there is sufficient time between now and ah.. June 30th to ah.. adopt a.. a Regional Plan ah.. in this Body."

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

E. F. Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor of this Amendment yield for a couple of questions?"

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

E. F. Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, it's been stated, now on the floor but prior to our being on the floor, that none of the State monies will be used to settle any potential or real



labor disputes. Now, we know that...."

Speaker Blair: "Yeah.. There's no provision in the sixteen million dollars. For example, with the C.T.A. for any wage increases between now and June 30th."

E. F. Schlickman: "We have, in the past, been confronted with the situation that State monies were used by the Chicago Public School Districts to solve labor disputes, not in the support of programming ah.. for the children of the Public School Districts of Chicago. And, I'm wondering, in the support of the representation made that none of these monies will be used to increase wage rates, what provision is there to prevent the use of the eight million dollars to settle labor disputes and exellorate the second phase, wherever that may be?"

Speaker Blair: "Well, there's no provision as such ah.. in Amendment ah.. No. 2. It's ah.. It's just ah.. tied to ah.. the dollars, the barebone dollars to keep the C.T.A. operating between now and June 30th, is sixteen million dollars. Ah.. so, if they would attempt ah.. to use any of these funds ah.. for any wage increases that might be negotiated, they would absolutely ah.. run themselves ah.. out of operational funds prior to ah.. June 30th."

E. F. Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, question number two. It has been stated that this is Phase I, that there will be a Phase II. And, I'm wondering what is and when will be Phase II?"

Speaker Blair: "Well, Phase II is a.. a general situation. The original 89 ah.. provided for a funding situation for the



entire calendar year of 1973. Ah.. it was ah.. thought that, if we were to break that down and only provide the barebones ah.. subsidy until June 30, ah.. that we would be able to ah.. motivate ah.. very serious consideration of.. of the adoption of some type of comprehensive regional transportation plan in the Northeastern part of the State. Because, we know, from the basis of the figures we have, that the C.T.A. will not be able to continue ah.. after June 30th without further monies being made available. It was felt that the political persuasions that might ah.. come on Phase II with regard to continuation of a subsidy would be very meaningful ah.. in helping to adopt some type of regional plan."

E. F. Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, last year, Governor Ogilvie appointed a Transportation Task Force. We, Members of the General Assembly, recently received copies entitled, 'Crisis and Solution'. In this Report, there is a discussion on the financing by the State of Public Transportation within the State of Illinois. And, the study indicates that there are three primary or basic sources: One is motor fuel tax. One is sales tax. One is income tax. As I read the discussion and the analysis, I imply or infer that the recommendation is that motor fuel tax funds be used for the financing of public transportation. Also, Governor Ogilvie's successor, Governor Walker, in his State of the State Address, indicated his support of motor fuel tax funds in the support of public transportation."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative Shea, for what purpose



do you rise, Sir?"

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if we might get a little order in the Chamber and maybe turn up the mikes. I think that this is going to be one of the most meaningful things that we do during this Session. I think that it's critical that Members of this House know precisely the issues involved."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Proceed, Representative Schlickman."

E. F. Schlickman: "The appropriation in House Bill 89 is from the General Revenue Fund of the State, not from motor fuel tax. And, I inquire as to why we are discounting the suggestions of two Governors to use motor fuel tax in support of transportation?"

Speaker Blair: "Well, I think, in the first instance, it's ah.. most unpolitical ah.. to consider ah.. utilization of motor fuel tax for a Mass Transit. Ah.. motor fuel tax is.. is.. The only way we build our roads in the State of Illinois is through user taxes. That's the motor fuel tax, and our automobile license plates and our truck ah.. plates. And ah.., we've never used any monies out of General Revenue for road building in this State and we've just finally gotten ourselves in a position where we, hopefully, with the infusion of the six-hundred million dollars worth of ah.. capital improvement bonds, that we passed in 1971, that ah.. we're getting our roads once again back up out of the mud. Ah.. I don't know that ah.. that, when you referred to the Governor's Task Force ah.. their recommendations with regard to utiliza-



tion of motor fuel taxes, as I recall, that was a suggestion only within the six County Region and not a State-wide situation at all. And I, for one, would be opposed even to that kind of situation because, I think, they were talking in terms of two cents, ah.. that that just would put the peoples that live in those six Counties ah.. ah.. in a disadvantageous situation ah.. relative to their roads."

E. F. Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I do raise a parliamentary inquiry at this time. As was mentioned previously, House Bill 89, as it was introduced, was an Appropriation Bill. By Amendment No. 2, substance is added, substance that, I believe, Mr. Speaker, invokes the fiscal note requirement. I specifically refer you to that Section of the Bill that states that the Secretary of the Department of Transportation in agreement with the Auditor General is to conduct an audit of the Chicago Transit Authority activities. And, I'm anticipating an Amendment by the discussion previously had that the audit will be extended to private and public transportation carriers. Now, this imposes an additional burden cost-wise or fiscal-wise upon the Auditor General. And, I would ask a Ruling from you if House Bill 89, as amended by Amendment No. 2, does invoke the fiscal note. And, if it does, I request a fiscal note."

Speaker Blair: "The ah.. The Auditor General does have a contingency fund ah.. which he ah.. utilizes for ah.. this kind of audit situation. And, I'm quite sure that ah.., if there is an Amendment and it's adopted, they would extend



ah.. the situation to the... to these other Companies, that we would have to ah... that we would want to provide supplemental appropriation to the Auditor General. I would also suggest that, if this Amendment is adopted, ah.. that ah.. the Rule ah.. that... that the point that you're raising can be addressed on the subject of advancing ah.. the matter off of Second Reading. And, the Bill is not my Bill. It's ah.. Mr. Garmisa's Bill."

E. F. Schlickman: "May I have a Ruling from the Chair?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Well, the Chair.... Representative Duff, did you seek recognition, Sir, before I rule? The gentleman from Cook, Representative Duff."

B. B. Duff: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "State your point."

B. B. Duff: "I really believe that the inquiry, at this point in time, is out of order. Ah.. this is not directed toward the Amendment, but towards the Bill. And, it's not directed towards the debate at this time on this Amendment. Ah.. it is a point that should be raised on Second Reading of the Sponsor of the Bill and not the Sponsor of this Amendment."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Well, the Chair would rule that ah.. the point is not timely. First of all, the Amendment is not adopted yet. Should the Amendment be adopted before the Bill moves to ah.. the next order, which would be the order of Third Reading, that would the time in which to put that question. And then, we could make a ruling on that question. The gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."



D. M. Pierce: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Will, ah.. yield to a question?"

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

D. M. Pierce: "Ah.. the Sponsor of this Amendment, one thing bothers me here, and that is, the Amendment calls for ah.. reimbursement of Suburban ah.. Railroads for part of their operating deficit. Now, the largest Suburban Railroad has received such generous rate increases, fare increases, from the Commerce Commission each and every year, that it has a very moderate... a very modest ah.. return of one percent or so on its Suburban operations. And, I don't believe has an operating deficit. Isn't it true that the Chicago Northwestern Railroad, because of their large fare increases, received every year for the last five years, can't show an operating deficit last? And, therefore, will not be eligible for one penny of aid under your Amendment."

Speaker Blair: "That's right. As a matter of fact, the Chicago Northwestern ah.. last year, shows ah.. a ah.. 1.3 million dollar profit."

D. M. Pierce: "Yes, Sir. That seems to be punishment then for efficient operation or for raising fares and for the riders having to pay such high fares. Those Railroads that have been either deficient in operation ah.. or have wasted money or have not gone before the Commerce Commission and gotten big fare hikes, they get the aid. And, the Railroad, that is run efficiently, whose riders are paying all kinds of fare increases each and every year, gets no help. This



seems to perpetuate the inefficiency of certain Railroads like the I.C. and punish the more efficient Railroads like the Northwestern and its riders."

Speaker Blair: "Well, I think that your point is well taken.

But ah.., quite frankly, what we're addressing ourselves to here is an emergency situation. And, I think, that when we get into Phase II, ah.. this inequity that you're referring to ah.. ought to ah.. be cleared up. Ah.. but, when you're faced with a deadline, like February the 18th, ah.. and you.. you want to find some formula ah.. to keep any further fare increases ah.. from going into effect ah.. like with the C.T.A. or the other Suburban Rail Commuters. Ah.. the only one ah.. that we could devise, the Staff could come up with, was this operating loss because we actually ah.. have the facts ah.. on that situation."

D. M. Pierce: "Well, as long as this is confined to an emergency piece of Legislation, I can see ah.. why you've done it this way. But, I hope in the future that efficient operation and high fares will be recognized just as we recognize the upper in certain School Districts and taxing themselves more than other School Districts in a State Aid Formula ah.. for Education. We should recognize those riders who pay more when we come to Phase II and who have high rates on the Railroads and whose Railroads operate at a small profit and give them some help too so that there also covered by the freeze in increased fares that the inefficient operators are covered by."



Speaker Blair: "I agree with you."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Gibbs."

W. J. Gibbs: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

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

W. J. Gibbs: "Ah.. Mr. Blair, in reference to ah.. on Page 3, as I understand this Bill, it's a 12,250,000 dollar appropriation, \$8,000,000 to C.T.A., ah.. \$2,250,000 to Commuter Services and then \$2,000,000 for the ah.. Downstate ah.. Transit Authority. And, it goes on to say that this money shall be distributed, 'it shall be distributed to these Downstate Districts, providing that they have a loss'. But, you cannot take into consideration in determining the loss ah.. whether or not they received any funds from public sources. Now, my question is, is Springfield here, we have the Springfield Mass Transit Authority and we receive ah.., as a result of a ah.. Bill in 1968 that we... or a referendum that we passed, we received about a five mill tax which gives us a hundred and twenty-three thousand. Now, those would be public sources. So, if you took away those funds, we would certainly have a deficit. And, the way that I interpret this Bill then would mean that we must receive the hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars whether we want it or not. And ah.., we don't want it. Do I interpret it right?"

Speaker Blair: "No.. You have to apply. And ah.., if ah.. if.."



if Springfield ah.. does not ah.. want their participation ah.. in this program, they simply would not apply."

W. J. Gibbs: "Well, the way that I read the Bill here, 'the payments shall be distributed'. But, prior to the time that they shall be distributed then, you say, they have to make an application for the fund. I don't see the ah.. the provision calling for an application, unless it's in another Amendment. Let me just ask you two questions, ah.. Mr. Blair. Number one would be... First of all, do I interpret it right that ah.. in determining the deficit, you take away the public funds that we have as a result of our tax?"

Speaker Blair: "That's right because ah.. we did not want to ah.. penalize local effort. And so ah.., you have, in Springfield, a 1972 operating deficit of \$188,000 before you apply to that the proceeds from the tax ah.. source that you referred to. So ah.., under this formula, ah.. ah.. you would then receive the \$135,200 that you referred to."

W. J. Gibbs: "Then, my second question is, what provision of the Bill says that you have to or that ah.. an application has to be made up? Would that be the provision which says that, 'You shall enter into an agreement'?"

Speaker Blair: "Well, I can... I can ah.. There's no question that there has to be an agreement ah.. with regard to ah.. fare rates and the level of service. And ah.., very simply, they do not ah.. desire... if the people of Springfield do not desire ah.. this money, then they just simply would not enter into any agreement with the Secretary of Transportation.



Then, they would not have to take it."

W. J. Gibbs: "I see. Thank you."

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

W. A. Redmond: "Will the gentleman yield?"

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

W. A. Redmond: "The.. The assistance to the Suburban Commuter Railroads, that Section of the Amendment is the one that intrigues me. I'm wondering if.. if the gentleman could advise me. The mechanics of the I.C. in South Cook County, as I remember, they created a Mass Transit District down there and enter into some kind of agreement with the I.C. Railroad. And, who is actually operating that system? Is it the Mass Transit District or is it the Railroad?"

Speaker Blair: "Well, the advise that we have is that the Illinois Central is actually ah.. operating it, but ah.. the District itself was set up in order to provide the rolling stock ah.. which is owned by the District, the new cars, etc."

W. A. Redmond: "There's a similar situation in the Milwaukee Rail and the Burlington. Is that also the same ah.. system?"

Speaker Blair: "I'm advised that that's correct. The operations are actually still conducted by all of the roads that these Districts were set up with regard to funding a capital improvements. And, the Districts themselves own the rolling stock."

W. A. Redmond: "The thing that bothers me, is what is the source of the matching funds of the Commuter Railroads? Is that



only the fare box receipts?"

Speaker Blair: "No.. Ah.. I have an Amendment No. 4 ah.. which we will be prepared to offer ah.. which would allow the Rail Carriers ah.. to match on the basis of revenues or monies coming from sources other than the operating revenues or income of their Commuter operation. Each of these Lines ah.. has been subsidizing from their freight operations the Commuter Passenger operations. In calendar year 1972, that was 9.2 million dollars. So, for a half a year, you're talking about 4.6 million. And ah.., of that amount, 2.25 ah.. would be ah.. available for match to obtain this 2.25."

W. A. Redmond: "In other words, it's the profit, if any, from the freight operations rather than the Commuter operations. Is that correct?"

Speaker Blair: "That is.. That is the ah.. the way the ah.. thing is designed."

W. A. Redmond: "I wonder if you could explain the rationale of requiring a match from the Commuter Railroads from sources other than the fare box receipts and the out-right grant to a Bus Company that doesn't have to ah.. match anything and the two to one match for the C.T.A. that, as I understand it, does have revenue-sharing and part of the income tax. Whereas the Commuter Railroad has nothing except the profits of the operation of its freight line. Now, what is the rationale?"

Speaker Blair: "Well ah.., our Capital Grant Program actually was a one-third, two-thirds situation with ah.. the local



ah.. having the smaller amount of the formula. There are a variety of formulas in the various Federal and State Grant Programs. But, this is the first venture ah.. by the State into subsidizing ah.. Mass Transportation Carriers in the operating end. We've... We've made the venture into the capital improvement with that ah.. two hundred million dollar ah.. Capital Improvement Bond Issue for Mass Transportation. So ah.., it was felt that, in the first place, we know that the City and the County of Cook... of Chicago have the monies available for the matching situation, that the.. the Suburban Areas and the Downstate Areas right now, in any event, would not be able to come up with a match to get their two million. So, we thought that we would not require a match from them. Since, in some areas, the private Rail Commuters are competing with the C.T.A., we felt that some type of match requirement ought to be ah.. put in insofar as their monies were concerned. And then, we found out that there... there just was not ah.. hard match available. So, we went into a situation of.. of looking at this contribution that's being made to keep these Commuters ah.. afloat ah.. from the freight revenues of the various Rails. And, that's what we're proposing to do in our Amendment No. 4. This is a temporary situation. And, I think we would want to take a very, very careful look ah.. at any formula ah.. in our Phase II with respect to fifty-fifty, one-third, two-thirds, no match at all, ah.. that kind of thing. I.. We... I.. I think that that is going to require some study.



But, in order to try to move the Program along to help in the emergency situation, this is the best that we could devise. I'm not claiming that is in any way perfect."

D. M. Pierce: "Thank you, Sir."

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

R. Dunn: "I have a question for the proposer of...."

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

R. Dunn: "Ah.. Representative Pierce and ah.. Representative ah.. Representative Pierce and Representative Gibbs have ah.. raised ah.. an interesting point. And, I'd like to inquire. The.. The Amendment proposes that there would be a freeze on any fare increases. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if ah.. Mr. ah.. Mr. Pierce has pointed out that the Northwestern is operating at a profit. And, Representative Gibbs has pointed out that the Springfield Bus Line is operating at a profit. Would it behoove them to immediately, if this Amendment were to pass, to immediately reduce their fares, show an operating deficit immediately so that they could qualify for ah.. funds? And, might this happen? And, could they do this under the Amendment?"

Speaker Blair: "Yeah.. It's ah.. I don't think they would be able to do that because the formula directs itself specifically to operating losses that.. that were incurred in calendar year 1972."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The gentleman from ah.. Cook, Representative Kosinski."



R. J. Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

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

R. J. Kosinski: "With apologies, Mr. Sponsor, this is redundant to something that we went over in the Appropriations Committee. Inasmuch as a Member of your side of the House has brought up a point which is not fully explored in my mind. And, his point was, that with a cutoff date of June 31st, we might well be left with the same problem just about the time we leave this House for our annual vacation. Now, the peg on which this Amendment was held in Appropriations Committee, was your feeling that in the ensuing three and a half months, an equitable package, a transportation package could be legislated to satisfy every portion of this State. Now, if my memory serves me correctly, it's been a matter of a great number of years that the State of Illinois has been attempting to establish just that kind.. that sort of a package. In the event, Mr. Spe... Mr. Sponsor, you are incorrect in the assumption that this will become a total picture in the three and a half months, what happens on June 31st, when we're right back in the same position? What is your remedial attitude?"

Speaker Blair: "Well, I ah.. "

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative Pierce, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

D. M. Pierce: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. May I suggest to the gentleman, if there's a June 31st on his calen-



dar, he'd better buy a new calendar."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "He stands corrected." The gentleman from Will, Speaker Blair."

Speaker Blair: "Well, I think we have to ah.. address ourselves and give our very best effort to attempt to come up with this plan. I.. It has ramifications that go beyond ah.. just ah.. Mass Transportation because there are very serious ah.. considerations being given ah.. to Federal Funding for a variety of ah.. situations in that Northeastern Region because we don't have ah.. Regional Plan. Ah.. so, I think, that the leverage, if you will, of negotiating ah.. for any additional ah.. State operating monies beyond ah.. June 30th, ah.. will go far away towards, perhaps, helping us in getting a ah.. Master Plan through the Assembly. And ah.., if we.. if we don't,.. if we're not able to get there, I guess, we'll ah.. have to ah.., once again, consider ah.. the question of some further but limited ah.. subsidy until such time as we are able to come up with that Plan."

R. J. Kosinski: "Does the Sponsor mean that in the event, and I stand corrected to the date, on June 30th, we are again out of funds, we will then very quickly legislate some additional funds to hold us over to the December 31st period?"

Speaker Blair: "Well, I'm say that ah.. on our calculations, the C.T.A. will..will ah.. be out of money by that date. And, they are going.. would have to get some funds from some place if they were to continue on that date. Now, quite obviously, we'll know ah.., I would think, well before June



30th whether or not we were going to be able to ah.. have a Regional Plan adopted. There are Bills in Committee right now that have to have action taken on them within the next forty-five days. So, we'll certainly have on the floor ah.. one or more of these Regional Plans for consideration."

R. J. Kosinski: "Then, Mr. Sponsor, wouldn't it be expedient to extend the limit of the period that your Amendment infers to the period of December 31st? And, fund adequately to that period, on the assumption that we'll not have a complete package and on the assumption that there would be a period of vacation ensuing, which would ah.. cripple us considerably."

Speaker Blair: "Well, there are two problems with it. One, I think, holding at the June 30th, does give us some leverage in trying to hammer out the Regional Plan. Ah.. secondly, you're talking about ah.. double the amount of money ah.. from the State's standpoint ah.. that we would have to come up with. And, it just seems to me that, when we're starting off in a brand-new area for State Government, that is, subsidizing operating expenses of local ah.. Mass Transportation Carriers, that we ought to move, at least, in the first step ah.. cautiously. And ah.... And secondly, I don't think that we really have the amount of time ah. that.. that we should have had with regard to the various refinements ah.. that have been brought out here on the floor today. For example, but, trying.. trying to work within the time ah.. framework ah.. that we were given, February 18. I think we're in a posture now of at least having something where



we can keep everything operating at the same level of service and at the same rate, ah.. no higher ah.. rates for this period of five or six months, which is a breathing spell to accomplish this other matter. And then, give us some further sophistication of, perhaps, ah.. with regard to how these operating subsidies ought to be devised ah.. for application after June 30th."

R. J. Kosinski: "Ah.. I am not in agreement, Mr. Sponsor, on the basis of jam-ups which occur just before adjournment which we've both experienced. Ah.. but, I rest you there."

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

H. Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, ah.. I feel that Representative Blair's Amendment shows responsibility to the public office of these elected. But, I do have a couple of questions on the inequities of the distribution of the monies for the Bus Companies. Now, different Companies use different bookkeeping systems. A lot of times they use a bookkeeping system so their credit... so they can still purchase merchandise without having a bad credit rating. Ah.. not being a C.P.A., I couldn't go into all of the various types of bookkeeping systems there is but I would like to ask ah.. the Sponsor of the Amendment if there couldn't be some ah.. solution made either to put it on a mileage basis of these Bus Lines who serve the public or on the passenger miles of these Bus Lines who serve the public."

Speaker Blair: "Well, on a very quick basis, what we were trying to do is to provide some monies for our Suburban and



Downstate ah.. Bus Companies that reflected exactly what the fiscal situations were. And, the only way that we could do that quickly and be sure that our facts were right, was to go to the Office of Mass Transportation in the Department of Transportation and.. and get the reports that were filed by the various ah.. Bus Companies ah.. that would be receiving ah.. monies under this proposal. Ah.. what I would... It.. It well could be that the situation you point out ah.. ah.. does exist, but it was ah... it was ah.. it was the best and quickest formula we could come up with to.. to meet this February 18th deadline. And, I would think that what we ought to address ourselves to is on the continuing subsidy situation which would be the Phase II, ah.. the sophistication that you are referring to ah.. so that any.. any qualities that.. that would exist with regard to the distributing on pure ah.. operating deficits as reflected in these reports ah.. would be ironed out. Ah.. if there is any other.. if there is a quicker... If there is a better quicker way to make the distribution, I certainly ah.. would not in opposition to that... to that kind of formula within the framework of the \$2,000,000."

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

B. Garmisa: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Speaker, in offering this Amendment ah.. referred to this as the Garmisa Bill. If this Amendment were adopted, Mr. Speaker, I would not recognize it as such. I have heard



the Speaker make the statement that there was some minor surgery applied to this Bill. If there was, it certainly was not a surgeon wielding a scalpel but rather a butcher wielding a meat axe. And, it got to the point where this Bill, as mutilated as it would be, if this Amendment were adopted, would be absolutely unrecognizable to me. And, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I urge the defeat of this Amendment."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Does the gentleman wish to close the debate? The gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment No. 2, to House Bill 89. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. The gentleman from Cook, Representative.... The gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

C. L. Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I first would like to inform the House of a very appreciative note that is directed to the attention of all the House. With your leave, Mr. Speaker, I would read it. It's addressed to me because I was the chief Sponsor of the Resolution. It says, 'February 8th, 1973... Dear Representative Choate: I deeply appreciate the Resolution adopted by the House of Representatives in the State of Illinois in memory of my husband. I have read the kind sentiments and generous comments contained in the Resolution and wish to convey to each of the Members of the House my grateful thanks. Sincerely, Bess Truman'. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain my 'no' vote on this Amendment. The reason I'm



voting 'no' is because I don't feel that, in some areas, this Amendment does what the Sponsor truthfully intends for it to do. I don't feel that it does what many Members of this House intend for it to do. But, the real reason that I'm voting 'no' is simply because there will be another Amendment offered to this Bill that will be new and it will be revolutionary and it will pay attention to the Transit needs of all of the people of the State of Illinois. I would hope... I would hope that we will have an opportunity in just the next few minutes to explain to the entire Membership of this House, to the Media covering the actions of this House today, and yes, to the entire public of the State of Illinois, the revolutionary program that we're going to offer in the form of an Amendment to House Bill 89, which I'm going to say at this time, without fear of contradiction, is going to be one of the first times in the history of this House, that the Legislature will have an opportunity to devote its attention to a problem that is not... that is not segregated to the extent that it could only apply to a few people of this State, but applies to all of the people of this State. And, I anxiously look forward to explaining the Amendment which we will propose shortly. And, I vote 'no' on this Amendment."

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

E. F. Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in explaining my vote, I find a number of features in this



Amendment No. 2 to be either of concern or objectionable. The one that I find most objectionable is that provision which appropriates the money from the General Revenue Fund of the State of Illinois. Those are sales taxes and income taxes. Now, indicated previously, Governor Ogilvie's Task Force on Transportation, by implication, at least, recommends the use of Motor Fuel Tax Funds in subsidizing public trans... public and private ah.. transportation acitivities. I also reminded the House that Governor Walker, Governor Ogilvie's successor, is recommending.. has recommended the use of Motor Fuel Tax Funds. And, I point out to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that it's my understanding that the match required of the City of Chicago and the County of Cook is anticipated in coming from Motor Fuel Tax, their share of Motor Fuel Tax. And, I also point out to you that the proposed Federal Funds for operating expenses of public transportation will come from Motor Fuel Tax, the Federal Gas Tax. Now, in Governor Ogilvie's Task Force, this is what's said in support of using Motor Fuel Tax Funds for the support of public transportation. The use of these revenues Motor Fuel Tax, for alternative transit modes represent an allocation of the non-pecuniary benefits of Mass Transit which accrued to the motorists. The existence of a Mass Transit System should provide the individual motorist with more road space and it should reduce wear and tear upon, and hence, reduce maintenance costs for the Metropolitan Area highways. Thus, allowing more lower Motor Fuel Taxes



in the area that would exist if the highways were more heavily used. In addition, a Mass Transit System serves as a backup system when a motorists car breaks down or when the weather makes automobile travel impossible'. This report goes on to say, 'that a Motor Fuel Tax can also be regarded as an exacting a premium from automobile users in exchange for inefficient use of space by automobiles in areas of intensive land use. This tax revenue is then transferred to Mass Transit patrons who are willing to forego the convenience of the automobile in favor of a means of transportation which conserves space for riders. Finally, imposition of a M.F.T. can be regarded as a penalty payment for the contribution that the automobile makes toward air pollution'. Now, the only justification that I've been given for use of the General Revenue Funds of the State of Illinois is political expediency. I think that what we ought to do is what is right in the interest of the public. And because, the monies for this appropriation come from the General Revenue Fund, I must vote 'no'."

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

W. D. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to.. to respond briefly to the last two gentlemen. First of all, the distinguished Minority Leader spend five and a half hours last Thursday in the Appropriations Committee. I spent those five and a half hours with him. At the time, he didn't come up with a bold new approach to solving



the transportation problems of this State. Ah.. I don't know what he has in mind now, but we certainly had better get off the dime. It was our considered opinion in the Appropriations Committee, and this crossed party lines, that this approach, the Speaker's approach, which uses a minimum of money and an amount just necessary to get the C.T.A. and the other Transit Authorities, private bus operators and the private railroads, over the hump to June 30th. And, this time would give us an opportunity to work out a Mass or a Regional Transportation System. That's all this does. Now, let me suggest to you that we're under the gun. The C.T.A. themselves sat in the Appropriations Committee's Staff and others who looked at the C.T.A. Books agreed that there was going to have to be either a drastic cut-down in service or a fare increase or both in the C.T.A. immediately or almost immediately unless they got the money. Now, we're... we're under the gun here. And, these ideas proposed, for example, by the last gentlemen, the Motor Fuel Tax Fund should be used and not General Revenue for operating subsidies for Transit Authorities. I tend to agree with them, but I'm not prepared here today to argue that point. We've got to solve this problem. We've got today to do it. And, this is the only responsible approach to it. So, I urge, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to support this Amendment."

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

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,



I would remind the distinguished Majority Leader that I, too, sat through five and a half hours of hearing. And, that I, too, heard the problems of Transit, not only of the C.T.A., but throughout the State of Illinois. And, that I think we are prepared to take a responsible approach. And, if you will look at Amendment No. 6 to this Bill, that is our answer to a responsible approach, an immediate solution to a terrible crisis that faces this State. And, it is so postured that it will carry Transit of this State through December 31st so that we may answer in a responsible manner. And, if you'll look at it, my friend, it is postured that part of it comes out of fiscal '73 and is carried through July 1, that part of it comes out of fiscal '74 and carries us through December 31st. You'll find that, if we do act.. if we do act by July 1st, and I will do everything that I can and I pledge you the support of my side of the aisle, that we will do everything that we can to solve this problem now. Then, if we do, it will be a simple matter of deleting the appropriation in fiscal '74. And, if this Amendment is not adopted, I will ask my friends across the aisle that I know are responsible Legislators, to join with me in Amendment No. 6 so that we can solve the crisis problems of this State."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

T. J. Hanahan: "In explaining my vote, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have not a passing interest but a very deep interest in the needs of the C.T.A., the needs of the people



of the Thirty-Third District. We don't have a Chicago Transit Authority running through McHenry County or Kane County or up in the Winnebago County. But, I'm certainly aware and, I think, most Members are aware of the problems the Chicago Transit Authority has. We're not ah.. saying that the answer lies in just the amounts of money, but there is a political question here too. A political question lies in the fact, why should we support any need by the C.T.A. unless we could go back home and say what we've done for all the people. We're elected to represent all of the people of Illinois. And I, join with our Minority Leader, Clyde Choate, in saying that defeating this Amendment, that we have another Amendment that will be revolutionary and other Bills that would be of the best interests of not only the Downstate Democrats and Republicans, but even those Republicans and Members from Chicago to support the other Bills and the other Amendment than this Amendment here. And, I urge its defeat."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? The gentleman from Will, Speaker Blair."

Speaker Blair: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, ah.. looking at that board, it doesn't appear that ah.. the votes are there to adopt ah.. this Amendment. Ah.. I would suggest to you that ah.. Amendment No. 6 ah.., which the distinguished ah.. Assistant Minority Leader ah.. referred to, ah.. simply would have the State appropriating \$40,500,000. Now, we have conscientiously and seriously and sincerely addressed ourselves ah.. to what has been adequately described as an emergency in a crisis



situation. And, I am absolutely convinced, on the basis of a statement made by the acting Chairman of the Board of the C.T.A., that the C.T.A. only needs ah.. \$16,000,000 to operate until June the 30th. And, our figures are right with regard to Suburban and Downstate Bus Company operations and with regard to the Commuter Railroads. And so, on that basis, ah.. I, for one, ah.. would not ah.. want to place ah.. the State into a situation where it would be appropriating any more money than is contained in Amendment No. 2 because that is all that is necessary to do the job. And so, I would not be in support of ah.. this Bill, if it is amended, ah.. for example, with Amendment No. 6 or any other Amendment that going to provide for more money than is actually necessary to meet the operating deficits."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question, there are 90 'Nays', 72 'Ayes' and the gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment No. 2 fails. Are there further Amendments?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment No. 3 was tabled in Committee. Amendment No. 4, Blair,..."

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

Speaker Blair: "Well, Mr. Speaker, ah.. Amendment No. 4 addresses itself to House Bill 89 with Amendment No... No. 2 having been adopted. But, since that has not taken place, then I would ah.. offer and move the adoption of Amendment No. 5. And ah.., then I would move ah.. to table."



Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Okay.. The gentleman ah.. has asked leave to table Amendment No. 4. Hearing no objections, Amendment No. 4 will be tabled. Are there further Amendments?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment No. 5, Blair, amend House Bill 89...."

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

Speaker Blair: "And, I would make the same request ah.. with respect to Amendment No. 5 inasmuch as it is tied to the Bill, having been amended, with Amendment No. ah.. 2."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Hearing no objection, Amendment No. 5 will be tabled. Are there further Amendments?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment No. 6, Shea, amend House Bill 89 as amended, by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following:.. "

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

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, share with the Colleagues on my side of the aisle with the Speaker and his Colleagues, the problems of Mass Transportation in the State of Illinois on a State-wide basis. Amendment No. 6, to House Bill 89, I believe, puts the Bill in a responsible posture and on a State-wide basis. It appropriates, in fiscal '73, \$19,950,000 for Mass Transit needs, \$15,000,000 to the Chicago Transit Authority when and if it's matched by Local Funds in the amount of seven and a half million dollars. We, too, appropriate, in this fiscal



year, \$2,000,000 to Bus and Mass Transit outside of the C.T.A. Area on a State-wide basis. We appropriate two and a quarter million dollars in fiscal '73 to the Commuter Railroads on a hard match basis. And, I'm sure that the Railroads, and I've been informed, they will find a way to come up with the money to subsidize their part of the program and to insure that fares will not be increased or that services will be cut. There is a new program in here in the amount of \$2,000,000 is appropriated and Representative Choate will go into that and other facets. A like amount is appropriated for fiscal '74 to carry on an emergency basis Mass Transit through the first part of fiscal '74 to and including December 31st. We, on the Democratic side, and I'm sure we'll be joined by many of our Republican Colleagues, feel that this is a responsible approach to the problems of Government. We, too, will join with you to try to find a permanent solution to the problem of Mass Transportation. And, if I might, Mr. Speaker, could I ask that Representative Choate be given an opportunity to explain the entire package that we propose to this General Assembly?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from ah.. Union, Representative Choate."

C. L. Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I first want to respond to the Majority Leader that, 'yes', we did stay some five hours in the Appropriations Committee last week and we listened to the previous Amendments debated thoroughly. And, as an outgrowth of some of the things



that was said in that Committee that brought about the working of the Democratic Staff the entire weekend and Members of the House Appropriations Committee from this side that brought about the working of the Leadership and others from this side that, in turn, brought about the drafting of this Amendment. Now, let me say this to you, that the Governor has said that he believes in the Executive Branch of Government being strong, that he also believes in the Legislative Branch of Government being strong and that he believes in the Legislative Branch coming up with programs beneficial to the people of the State of Illinois. I want to make one thing clear from the start here today, that the Amendments we are offering to the House is only part and parcel of an entire package of Legislation which has been introduced here today. This Amendment and the Bills which have been offered by Representative Hanahan, Representative Fennessey, Tipsword, Barry and others on the House Appropriations Committee, do basically six things. First, they provide, as my Colleague and Assistant Leader has said, some \$30,000,000 in State Aid to C.T.A. when matched by \$15,000,000 in local funds. Number two, it provides four and a half million dollars in State Aid to Commuter Rail Carriers on a fifty-fifty matching basis. Three, provides for four million dollars in State Aid for the Suburban and Downstate Bus Districts with no match required. And, if read today's Chicago Tribune, you'll find that there was a Bus Line went out of business up and around Aurora, up there some place, that quote from the Article

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

says, 'about five hundred people, many of them severely handicapped and crippled, needed that Bus Line. Without it, they would lose their jobs'. If we had of had the foresight, ... Oh! If we'd only had the foresight to bring about Legislation like we're attempting to bring about today, these five hundred handicapped people wouldn't of been worried about a way to go to work and honestly earn their days living. Number four, and this is the thing that I want you to pay strict attention to, creates an entirely new program for assistance to Rural, down where I live, where many Members of this House live, in the Rural Areas of this State, a Rural Transportation System. We've provided an appropriation to the Secretary of Transportation for some \$2,000,000 for a demonstration project called a 'Rural Transportation Assistance Demonstration Project', a separate Bill, as I mentioned, has been filed which creates the enabling Legislation. The Bill provides for payments from the Secretary or for the... from the Director of the Board for one hundred percent of the operating cost of contracting with private carriers and School Districts for providing transportation for the aged, the handicapped and the disabled. I want to emphasize, at this time, that this is a Demonstration Project which we will review again in January of 1974. I do expect, however, because upon reliable authority, I've been told this, that Federal Funds would be immediately available, should we decide to continue this project on a permanent basis. Number five, and I know that Representative Hanahan and Tips-



word and Barry and others are going to talk about this, would increase to ninety-five percent the State's reimbursement for the cost of public school transportation. Number six, creates a special House Committee to do three things, . . . to do three things so that we can act in an intelligent and put ourselves in a position of responsibility with the people of the State of Illinois. And, Representative Barry will talk about this. Develops a proposal for creating a Metropolitan Transportation District for the Chicago and surrounding Area, to develop a formula for ongoing State Aid to Mass Transportation and it'll study and make recommendations on the continuance of the Rural Area Transportation Project. This package that we're introducing in the form of an Amendment and companion Bills, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Memb... Gentlemen of this House, I want to reemphasize, will help solve the problems, not only of C.T.A. but will also benefit the residents of Downstate Illinois. I've been coming to this House for some twenty-six years. And, in every Session, Mass Transportation rears its ugly head and says, 'Please Help. We need emergency funding. We've got to have help to keep the Lines going'. What we want to do is find a permanent solution. We want to find a way that we will provide the Transportation on a Mass Transportation basis, not only for the major Metropolitan Areas of the Northern part of this State but, 'yes', we will treat Downstaters equally and we will provide the same assistance for them. Mr. Speaker, I say to you that this is a good Amend-



ment. I say to you that this is an Amendment, the things contained in this Amendment, is the way that the Legislature should act, in a bold and forthright action to attempt to solve these problems once and for all, but solve them on a basis of equality for all of the people of the great State of Illinois."

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

Speaker Blair: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I can quickly answer both of these gentlemen by saying that this proposal is absolutely and totally fiscally irresponsible. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman from ah.. ah.. Cook, the Assistant Minority Leader, some questions ah.. concerning his proposal if he'll yield."

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

Speaker Blair: "Alright.. Let's get the figures straight. As I understand it, for the balance of this fiscal year, you'd be appropriating out of the State's General Revenue, \$19,950,000."

G. W. Shea: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Blair: "And, out of fiscal year '74, \$20,550,000."

G. W. Shea: "That's correct."

Speaker Blair: "Alright.. So, we've got a total now of ah.. an appropriation of \$40,500,000 out of the State's General Revenue, if this Amendment were to be adopted and the Bill passed."

G. W. Shea: "Part in this fiscal year and part in the next



fiscal year so that if we do act,.. if we do act by July 1st, that we will no.. no problem at all with the ah.. splitting it and then we will not have to use the appropriation for fiscal '74."

Speaker Blair: "But, the fact of the matter is, you're appropriating that amount of money for calendar year 1973."

G. W. Shea: "That's correct. In two parts."

Speaker Blair: "Alright.. Now, let's address ourselves to how you're ah.. constructing your formula. Ah.. for the C.T.A., as I see it, you're providing the State with two-thirds of the \$45,000,000 and the local governments ah.. with only one-third, which is the original ah.. 89 Formula. Is that correct?"

G. W. Shea: "I provide, in my Amendment, that the State would, when there is seven and a half million dollars in local funds deposited with the C.T.A., that the State would then deposit \$15,000,000 for a total of twenty-two and a half million dollars to take it through August the 1st. Now, Mr. Speaker, I took your \$16,000,000 figure or we were talking about 17.2 million and the loss of the C.T.A. is approximately eight to nine hundred thousand dollars a week. If I take four and a third weeks times the nine hundred thousand dollars and add it to the 16.2 that I get up to about the 22.5 figure that I have in the first part to take them through August the 1st, not July 1st."

Speaker Blair: "Alright.. But, our reading the Bill shows that you're appropriating from the State, \$30,000,000 to be matched



by \$15,000,000 ah.. from ah.. local governments. And ah.., that is a two-thirds, one-third ah.. formula."

G. W. Shea: "That... That's correct, Mr. Speaker. And, I've done it in two parts so that, if we both joined together and do what you say we should do in Phase II, and as I said, we're prepared to help you, I'm sure that you're prepared to help us and as responsible people, we'll work together. And, as you said, there are proposals now. And, if those proposals pass, then we will have no need to use that part of the money that is appropriated in fiscal '74."

Speaker Blair: "You wouldn't want to make a commitment on that, would ya? That you won't use ah.. this money....."

G. W. Shea: "It is there, Mr. Speaker. It is there, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Blair: "It's there, but you might not use it. Okay.."

G. W. Shea: "It's there. Perhaps...."

Speaker Blair: "Alright.."

G. W. Shea: "Perhaps, if we don't act...."

Speaker Blair: "O... Okay..."

G. W. Shea: "That we don't face the crisis on June 29th."

Speaker Blair: "Alright.. Let's talk about the Rails now. You're providing ah.. ah.. a fifty-fifty formula there. You've got four and a half million and four and a half million in that situation. Now, is there any basis for your changing ah.. your formula on the C.T.A. ah.. situation, two-thirds, one-third, but ah.. leaving the private Rail Commuters ah.. on a fifty-fifty basis? What was your reasoning behind that?"

G. W. Shea: "I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Constitution addresses



itself, that, 'We, in the General Assembly, should do something for Mass Transportation'. The C.T.A. is not a privately owned Corporation with bondholders and shareholders, but it's held in the public trust for the people of this State. And, I feel that, if local governments and the State subsidize that, we are, in effect, subsidizing something that we own. The Legislature created the C.T.A. A Senator by the name of Richard J. Daley created the C.T.A. back in 1946 with the help of the Senate, with the help of the House for the people of this State. And, I feel that the two-thirds, one-third formula is an adequate way to fund that. Now, when we get to the private Rail Carriers that are owned by bondholders, by shareholders, we are, in effect, subsidizing private industry, very similar to what the Nixon Administration did with Boeing Aircraft. What I'm saying is that, 'yes', we do want to keep private Carriers business, that we do want to help them. But, I don't think that we have to do for private business that which we do for a public company. I.. I go further and I follow your formula that those Areas in Downstate and outside of the Metropolitan Area that are not part of the C.T.A. have no funds available for match, so we make it a soft match or almost a no-match provision. You, in your own Bill, had differences. This Amendment addresses itself to the same problem with a different approach."

Speaker Blair: "Ah.. how do you explain the distinction ah.. between fifty-fifty requirement on private Rail Carriers, but no ah.. requirement at all with regard to private Bus Companies?"



Is there some way you distinguish ah.. on your rationale, that situation?"

G. W. Shea: "It is the same rationale you used in your Amendment No. 2, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Blair: "Well, I understand that. But ah.., you seem to have some ah.. great problem about ah.. the question of a public subsidy for ah.. private operations. And, the Constitution, as you well know, makes it clear ah.. that we can do this. And, that's what we were addressing our question to. And, it seem to me, ah.. you have a private and public ah.. competition with these Rail Commuters and the C.T.A. And ah.., I'm intrigued with the thought that you want to ah.. come up with a ah.. formula ah.. that would change that relationship. In the proposal, if I had advanced, I had both the C.T.A. and the private Rails on the fifty-fifty basis. Now, on your Downstate ah.. and Suburban Bus..."

G. W. Shea: "Could I... Could I answer....."

Speaker Blair: "On your Downstate and Suburban...."

G. W. Shea: "Could I answer part of that, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Blair: "On your Downstate and ah.. ah.. and Suburban Bus situation, ah.. basically, you're just doubling the amount of money ah.. that was in my proposal, making that \$4,000,000 with no match required."

G. W. Shea: "I used the same figures that you did. We discussed the problems on many occasions trying to ah.. get together. The figure is 3.8 last year and I'm sure that the \$200,000, from what I heard in Transportation, will be there. Now, I



might go one step further when we talk about why a hard match for Railroads and why a no-match provision for Bus Companies. Bus Companies are primarily in the job of transporting people. Almost all... Almost all of the Railroads, that run Commuter Lines, also run freight businesses. Now, I don't know the apportionment, the accounting of.. of how we run off our depreciation, how we run off our charges on.. on Rail mileage of track use and station use, of all these things. And, I have tried to accommodate that situation. I have also tried to accommodate the situation where it says, 'may' where 'the Auditor General, the Secretary of Transportation may enter into agreements to audit the C.T.A.' and we welcome, from what I hear, the C.T.A. welcomes an audit on efficiency and how it spends its money. And, I would hope that the Railroads and the Bus Companies, that utilize these subsidies, would also welcome a similar audit."

Speaker Blair: "Alright.. I have one further question and ah.. I would address it to the Minority Leader. Ah.. I see a proposal for some \$2,000,000 under Section XIII for the Rural Transportation Assistance Demonstration Project of 1973. And, it's my understanding ah.. that that particular project is contained in a Bill which has just now been introduced. Is that correct?"

C. L. Choate: "That is correct. The enabling Legislation to bring about the expenditure of the \$2,000,000, supervised by the County Boards of each County to put this Demonstration Project into effect, the enabling Legislation, has been intro-



duced by Representative Fennessey today."

Speaker Blair: "And so, what you're going to do is to appropriate the money first and then see whether or not you get the ah.. the proposal in Bill form ah.. through Committee and ah.. off and ah.. out of the House."

C. L. Choate: "You and I realize, Mr. Speaker, as we've seen it done in the past, that if the enabling Legislation is not passed for the expenditure of that \$2,000,000, the Governor can take it out, if he desires or it simply returns to the Treasurer."

Speaker Blair: "Yeah.. I'm just curious to why you didn't introduce a separate Appropriation Bill ah...."

C. L. Choate: "Simply because...."

Speaker Blair: "As a companion Bill to your substantive Bill ah.. for other than putting the cart before the horses, it seems to ah... Well, here you're asking us to vote on an Appropriation ah.. for something that we know really nothing of, just described as the Rural Transportation Assistance Demonstration Project."

C. L. Choate: "Well, for two reasons.. Number one, is that with accordance to the Constitution, we wanted to be as Constitutional as possible and we feel that we are, because we didn't put the substantive matters in an Appropriation Bill. Number two, we put the Appropriation in here to indicate to the people and to this Legislature that although, we do have the enabling Legislation in another Bill, that we are sincere in our attempts to provide transportation to all of the



people of this State, not just a few in the Metropolitan Areas. Consequently, we have the appropriation here to positively insure the Members of this House, the Senate, the Media and the People, that we are sincere in our effort to provide and bring about Mass Transportation in all of these Areas."

Speaker Blair: "Alright now, I'll conclude by just making this observation. As I started out, I think that this approach is ah.. totally, fiscally ah.. irresponsible. Ah.. here we are moving the State into the area of subsidizing operating expenses of local Carriers instead of moving cautiously and slowly and meeting the emergency situation. You're coming up with the proposal that involves the State in forty millions of dollars, that kind of commitment. That's too much at this time when we're going into what can be a bottomless barrel as far as operating subsidy is concerned. And secondly, I charge you with total irresponsibility with regard to the development of a Mass Transportation Plan in Northeastern Illinois. If you were serious about out being able to address ourselves to that question prior to June 30th, you would not be providing monies to operate Mass Transportation from now through the end of this year. And so, with regard to this proposal, I'm going to ah.. ah.. oppose it. And, if.. if it is adopted, of course, I'm going to vote against the Bill ah.. solely on the basis that it is fiscally irresponsible."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from ah.. McHenry, Representative Hanahan."



T. J. Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the question of fiscal irresponsibility is a 'not phrase'. When we had a Republican Governor, it behooved me and Representative Lechowicz, who ah.. use it occasionally in the House Appropriations Committee. We were talking about, in the last year, about \$358,000,000 a fiscal irresponsibility in spending on the Appropriation process where we have pointed out in a one-sided Committee, that is unfair in its real representation of what the floor of the House looks like. And, the fact that our Amendments, that would have saved the taxpayers three hundred and some million dollars, were not listened to. So, fiscal responsibility, it seems to me, seems only to be invoked in who has the Governorship. I don't think, when we're talking about spending in the area of \$40,000,000 to \$61,000,000, that we could really point a finger and say that we're being fiscally responsible... or irresponsible just by that statement. We have presently, sitting in a bank account, \$88,000,000 to be expended in any manner the Governor so wishes, called Revenue Sharing. This would be a good area for maybe the Governor of this State to consider where the money should come from to aid this crisis that we're under concerning Mass Transportation. And, I might point out to the Majority Leader, ah.. Representative Walsh, when he pointed out why we didn't come up with this last week in Committee, that once again in Committee, the vote was thirteen to eleven. That's a hell of a way to run a Railroad when I'm going to tip my mitt in Committee



about some future ideas when I don't have a fair-shake of passing it. I think that here on the floor, it's very evident that the thirteen to eleven Committee did not represent the viewpoints of the Membership of this House in the last vote on the last Roll Call. So, therefore, it behooves the Minority Party, the Democratic Party, to unfold its proposals on the floor of the House and take up all the Member's time with innovated, progressive ideas concerning solving the problems of Mass Transportation. Thirdly, ah.. I'd like to see... bring up the point of how we come around with some of these ideas. It's a very difficult thing, for both Democrats and Republican outside the City, to vote for any Bill that even may be sweetened a little bit with aids to the Railroads or maybe aids to some Downstate Transit District, to vote any great maj... amounts of money to the C.T.A., even though we're aware of the problems, it's just not an easy trick to do, to go back home and explain to your constituents why you're relieving a crisis in Chicago when we have so many Downstate. So, we came up with a program. And one of the Bills and one of the appropriation processes, which are not in this Amendment, but is committed, and I'd like to point this out, because Representative McCormick, I hope, hears this. We have a commitment that this is part of this package and part of my vote and my commitment to vote for the aid to the C.T.A., is predicated on the fact that in House Bill 307, 306 and 308, that was introduced, or 305 that were introduced today, is considered as part of this package.



And, that is to relieve the Real Estate Taxpayers, around the State of Illinois and the areas of Suburban Cook County, from the obligation of having a tax levy placed on them for transportation, and specifically, for the transportation of school kids. We now provide about \$30,000,000 to local School Districts around the State for the transportation of school children. The other \$21,000,000 is made up by Real Estate Taxes. It's part of this package. And, the reason why I'm supporting this Amendment is because House Bill 307 will relieve the Real Estate Taxpayers burden on transportation around the State of some approximately \$20,000,000. And, with that commitment, I am supporting the aid to the C.T.A. so that I can go back home and say to the people in the Thirty-Third District, that we, the Members of the Legislature, made our responsible vote by helping out a crisis in Chicago, trying to provide some format towards solving the problems of Mass Transportation in the Northeastern part of Illinois and at the same time, relieve Real Estate Taxes in our District in the area of Bus Transportation. I think ah. that Representative Matijevich specifically point out, this is a responsible vote by responsible Legislators. And, I urge an 'aye' vote on this Amendment."

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

D. E. Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Fellow Members, ah.. when we get to the end of the day and I've looked over all of the Amendments, we are essentially going to have made a choice



between three ways of answering this need. And, there are two questions that we have to ask ourselves. The one question is, how much money? And, the second question is, how long? Now, the real question is, how long are we going to support and sustain and subsidize and bail out the C.T.A. until we get to a Regional long-range solution? Now, we've had Speaker Blair's proposal, that we give them \$8,000,000 which would last until the first of July. We now have before us an Amendment which I oppose to give them \$30,000,000 to go all year long. In a few minutes, we'll get to an Amendment that I have, Amendment No. 6, which will give them \$4,000,000 to go to Mayday. Now, on the opening of our House, we adopted some new Rules. Those new Rules were designed to make us bite the bullet and avoid this obnoxious practice of waiting until Midnight in June sometime, when everybody wants to go on vacation with their children. And, we have a log jam. We have forty-five days. I have been studying this problem for a year. I came up with a solution. It's not perfect, but it's going to Committee. And, the Committee has got forty-five days to take care of that. And, I say... I say this, the C.T.A., the City of Chicago, the Commuter Railroads and all of us could solve this problem tomorrow or next week, if we had the will. And, I'm going to offer, a little later, an Amendment to give them just \$4,000,000, out of the charity and openness of my heart, to keep the people of Chicago riding, to keep them going until May 1st when we're going to be in Session and not next year, but in



just a couple of months and that will conform with our Rules and give us adequate time to bite that bullet and adopt a long-range solution. And, I want to say this, in conclusion and in opposition to this Amendment, if the proponents of the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution, ah.. we're talking about equality, we have the same notion of equality, that the distinguished Minority Leader just expressed. I'm greatly concerned because several Speakers on the other side of the aisle said that they want equal treatment for Downstate, and I just want to remind you, that in this Bill, that equal treatment means \$30,000,000 for the C.T.A., \$4,500,000 for the Chicago Area Suburban Railroads and a measly \$4,000,000 for the Downstate fellas. And, if that's equality, I don't believe in it. Thank you."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipword."

R. F. Tipword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd like to address myself to this Amendment, if I might, and at the same time, perhaps, ah.. address myself to some of the arguments that have just been presented. I think that those, who have been here on the floor of the House in the years past, know that I have not been a proponent of Legislation which provided funds for the C.T.A. Not because I haven't realized, as, I think, every Member of this House, that transportation is vital to the Metropolitan Area. And, the people that live in that Area, if they cannot travel back and forth to their job or travel from the Suburbs into the City to their jobs



or.. or in the other direction, if that is the way in which they travel, they're going to be another added burden to the Public Welfare System of the State of Illinois. And, it's something that we must solve. I've opposed the Bills because they did not solve that problem equitably for all of the people of the State of Illinois. This Bill, as it is originally proposed, the Amendment that have been offered heretofore, forgot about about two and a half to three million people in the State of Illinois who were called upon to help provide the funds, but were not provided with any of the benefits. I am very pleased that this package has been put together and I would remind you that this is a package. And, as Representative Hanahan has indicated that his vote as well as mine would only be available if all of the packages available to all of the people of the State of Illinois, including help to the C.T.A., help to the Railroads, the Commuter Railroads, help to all of the Bus Districts in the State of Illinois and for a Transportation System in the Rural Areas of this State, for our senior citizens, our disabled, handicapped people throughout the State of Illinois. Any of you, who have attended in the last year meetings of the senior citizens of the State of Illinois subsequent to the President's meetings in Washington for the aged and on the problems of aging, will recall that the prime requisite that those senior citizens brought back from Washington and which they all agreed with was that citizens in the Metropolitan Area and in the Rural Areas could not get to places



where they could buy their groceries. They could not get to a hospital. They could not get to a Doctor. They could not get to Church. They could not go visit their children simply because they had no means of transportation to get anywhere. No means was available to them, and especially, in the Rural Areas and in the small town Areas in the State of Illinois. This package will provide them. The \$21,000,000, that is provided for our Schools, is in a separate Appropriation, but a part of the package that must be totally provided or it's not going to receive my support. I would remind you also that this package provides absolutely no funds from the Motor Fuel Taxes of the State of Illinois. The Motor Fuel Taxes will remain in tact and used solely and only for the purposes for which we have heretofore specified that they should be used. There's been some objection that there's no provision to provide for curing the Metropolitan Transit ills before June. I would remind you that that is not necessarily true. The Commissions that are set up in the Resolution, offered by Representative Barry and others, provide a reporting date for these Commissions... ah.. Committee, not Commissions, of October 1, 1973. But, there is no reason, if those Committees can complete their work any earlier, that they could not file that report any earlier. And if, as people have suggested that we should have a report within two months, if that is feasibly possible, certainly this Committee could then come in with their report in the next few months. This does offer a solution up to the end of the year, in case there is



not a permanent solution during this first six months of the year. And then, when we would come back, the first of next year, we could provide that permanent solution. I'm sick and tired of the C.T.A. having to come in here for funds and being asked for them. I'm sick and tired of many of the other programs that come before us each year with their hands out, and you know what they are, time and time again. It's time that we, in the Legislature, provide a solution. And, I'm very pleased and very happy that the Appropriations Committee on this side of the aisle had met and worked and come up with a solution that can afford all of us the opportunity to support these Bills because this will not take money from our highways and because the entire package will provide for the needs of the people all over the State of Illinois and not just solely in a portion of the Metropolitan Area. Thank you very much."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham."

R. D. Cunningham: "Will the... Will the Sponsor yield to a couple of questions?"

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

R. D. Cunningham: "I would inquire whether the C.T.A. and those responsible have given any thought for a long-range solution to this problem by a fare increase, ah.. Representative Shea?"

G. W. Shea: "Yes.."

R. D. Cunningham: "And, what was their decision in that regard?"

G. W. Shea: "Unless there was help forthcoming, services would



have to be drastically reduced and fares increased."

R. D. Cunningham: "Has the Commerce Commission ever denied a request for a fare increase by the C.T.A.?"

G. W. Shea: "I don't think they have to go to the Commerce Commission, number one. But, I think, ... I think, in all fairness that many many people, the old, the aged, the poor, just can't afford that fare increase at this time, those people that send their tax dollars to Springfield. There are many poor, that are on welfare, that use the buses, the L's. We're trying to get those people off of welfare. And, if we make it so impossible for them to find jobs, we'll be down here with another crisis. I think the purpose here is to try to help those people get through. And, all we want to do here, Representative Cunningham, is to fund it in a two-part program, one through July 1st, and the second part from July 1st to December 31st. And, if we do what the Speaker says and Mr. Deuster says, if we solve the problem by July 1st, the second part of this Appropriation Bill will not have to be used. And, I stand shoulder to shoulder with you, prepared to solve the problem."

R. D. Cunningham: "But, isn't it true that the emergency has not the calendar significance indicated February 18th? We know here in the prior Amendment that there is \$30,000,000 available, at the present time, to be thrown into the need of the City if it shows to do so. And then, later when the final solution, as it has been described, has been adopted, we can have this so called soft match come into the scene of



things. Would you agree with that conclusion?"

G. W. Shea: "I didn't understand it."

R. D. Cunningham: "Well, we're told that the City has \$30,000,000 now available, if they can....."

G. W. Shea: "I.. I don't think that's right, Representative."

R. D. Cunningham: "Oh! That was the whole basis of the original Bill that was produced. Facts are stubborn things. My final question....."

G. W. Shea: "No.. No.. I think.. I think, perhap,... perhaps, you ought to look at the Bill again. It was \$30,000,000 in local funds."

R. D. Cunningham: "Both of us should look at it. But, my final question is this, are you philosophically opposed to the concept that the users should pay what the services cost, and conversely, they should not demand more services than their fares pay for?"

G. W. Shea: "There... There are times... There are times, I guess, when we.. we spend more than we collect in certain areas. Like Representative Ben Blades was talking about, Motor Fuel Tax, and in his County, he gets back \$2.28 in Motor Fuel Tax for every dollar he produces. Now, that's coming from my Area, that additional User Taxes coming from my Area and I certainly would not want to do anything to deprive you people of the additional money that you need for your roads because you need hard roads, because you need the hard roads Downstate to get the people to employment. You need hard roads to get your farm produce to market. You need



hard roads and I'm prepared to do that. And, I ask you to join with me and responsibly help me with my problems."

R. D. Cunningham: "And, we will join with you when the hard roads are provided for in the same Bill. Thank you for your answers."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Gibbs."

W. J. Gibbs: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

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

W. J. Gibbs: "Representative Shea, does the C.T.A. have the authority or the right to levy any taxes at all?"

G. W. Shea: "No..."

W. J. Gibbs: "Well, you're aware that the Springfield Mass Transit District has a tax and we tax the people in our District here for the Mass Transit. You're aware of that, aren't you?"

G. W. Shea: "Yes, I am. And, I was delighted to see the question you had for the Speaker because if you take the money that's available under this Bill for Springfield, then you could abate the Real Estate Taxes on the people here. And, I'm sure they'd be happy to have some of their Real Estate Taxes abated, if you so chose."

W. J. Gibbs: "Well, my question that I have to you is, if you don't levy a tax up there and we levy a tax here to support our Mass Transit District, is that fair to the people in my District to pay for it here on the Real Estate Taxes,



but you don't have to up there?"

G. W. Shea: "Well, you know, if we.. if we go into the hard facts...."

W. J. Gibbs: "Well, it is a fact...."

G. W. Shea: "Well, I.. I.. I.. I would like to respond, if I might, Mr. Gibbs. The City of Chicago put \$125,000,000 in the Transit System, \$125,000,000 of local money, just recently to complete the Dan Ryan, to complete the ah.. the Northwest, hopefully, to get it out to O'Hare Airport. There's been millions and millions of dollars by the City of Chicago into the C.T.A. It provides the C.T.A. with two hundred and fifty police officers for security purposes at a cost of over \$3,000,000 a year. So that, in effect, the property tax payers in Chicago are helping to subsidize the C.T.A. But, it's a problem. And, I know you understand it. It's a problem that we must face in this General Assembly. It's our responsibility to do something. And, all these Bills do is say is that we act in a responsible manner. If we do it by July 1st, we have no need for the second part of the appropriation. If we act... If we don't act by July 1st, we can act by December 1st or December 31st."

W. J. Gibbs: "Would you support a tax up there to support the C.T.A. on Real Estate?"

G. W. Shea: "Are you suggesting that we raise taxes some twelve and a half percent?"

W. J. Gibbs: "Whatever it takes, I suggest you raise them. As long as the people in my District are paying here to sup-



port their Transit District, I think, you should do the same thing."

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

C. J. Fleck: "Ah.. would the Sponsor yield for some brief questions, as I find, what may be, some errors in the form of this Bill?"

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

C. J. Fleck: "Gerry, you know my position on this. I've got to vote for a particular subsidy one way or another. There's no question about that. However, Section I of this Bill appropriates \$41,300,000 to the Department of Transportation. Now, as you go through this Bill, Section by Section, you get \$30,000,000 to the Chicago Transit Authority, I believe, \$4,500,000 to the Commuter Railroads, \$4,000,000, I guess, to the Buses. And then, you have 2.7 million dollars to the Rural Transportation Assistance Demonstration Project. That totals \$4... wait.., 41.3 million. The total appropriation is only \$40,500,000. Now ah.., how do you balance these figures?"

G. W. Shea: "It's only two million to ah.. the Rural Assistance Act."

C. J. Fleck: "Well, what's the \$700,000 ah.. "

G. W. Shea: "Only \$700,000 of the two million is used in the first part."

C. J. Fleck: "Well, we still then have ah.. a hundred thousand dollars that doesn't jive with the appropriation in Section



I. There's... There's...."

G. W. Shea: "Char... Charlie, I... I... You know, I'm.. I'm here now. I'll go through the figures. I.. I think I'm right.. If I'm wrong, I'll change it."

C. J. Fleck: "Well, I just was bringing this to your attention. That's all."

G. W. Shea: "Thank you very much."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from ah.. Vermilion, Representative Craig." You're on, Representative Craig."

R. Craig: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it's rather disturbing to see, be here and hear a lot of Downstaters talk about ah.. money going to the C.T.A. in the City of Chicago. I've been here for a little while and I can remember back when we voted a half cent sales tax here marked for the supporting of education. And, at that time, the City of Chicago had raised \$40,000,000 on a half cent sales tax to support education. And, if you'll just go back and check the records, out of that \$40,000,000, they used \$24,000,000 for the support of the schools in Chicago. That other \$16,000,000 came to Downstate Illinois in support of education for their schools. And, also would like to say the sales tax, which is a large amount of revenue that makes up the General Revenue Fund, and I think, they collect, in the City of Chicago, about seventy percent of the sales tax that's collected in Illinois. And, I don't hear anybody from Downstate say, 'we don't want that money for the benefit of the things that it helps us people in Downstate Illinois'."



So, just because they're having a problem here with C.T.A., which is no different than any large Metropolitan Area has, I can't see a thing wrong in trying to be a half way decently and look at the problems that are facing this General Assembly without trying to divide Downstate, Upstate, and things like that. And, I've heard the far cry of how to make Chicago or Cook County a State of its own. And, I'm here to tell you that we wouldn't rank any higher in Arkansas, if they did that. And, I'm very happy to see the people of Downstate Illinois support these Bills. And, I think, it's high time that we realize that a lot of the revenue that we get from the City of Chicago for our schools and other things that we have that we like to participate in such as lakes, reservoirs and other things. Thank you."

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

R. J. Palmer: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield for a question or two?"

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

G. W. Shea: "Art, you could look at me. I might want to say 'no' like some of my prior Colleagues have done."

R. J. Palmer: "I don't think that I've ever said 'no', Gerry. Ah.. in Section II, you provide that ah.. fifteen million dollars is to paid upon certification by the Chicago Transit Authority, that units of Govern... of Local Government have cause to be deposited, etc. What do you mean by 'Units of Local Government'? Specifically, what Units of Local Govern-



ment?"

G. W. Shea: "Ah.. it could be the City of Chicago, the County. It could be the Village of Oak Park. It could be the City of Berwyn. It could be the Town of Cicero. It's those Units of Local Government."

R. J. Palmer: "It could be any unit of Local Government in which the C.T.A. Bus goes through. Would that right?"

G. W. Shea: "I.. I suppose you could hold it that way, Representative Palmer."

R. J. Palmer: "This means Evergreen Park, Cicero, Berwyn. And, if you extended the service or by buying out a local transit Bus Line, it would mean also those in espouse. Is that correct?"

G. W. Shea: "It.. It would mean anybody who wanted to participate. It's not mandatory."

R. J. Palmer: "Well, it.. it says though that when the Units of Local Government have come up with seven and a half million dollars. My question is, how do you know that they're going to come up? What in this Bill compels them...."

G. W. Shea: "Nothing.."

R. J. Palmer: "To come up with seven and a half million dollars?"

G. W. Shea: "Nothing.."

R. J. Palmer: "Well, isn't this a condition precedent to the paying out of a million dollars?"

G. W. Shea: "The fifteen million dollars can not be paid out until there's deposited by Units of Local Government, seven and a half million dollars. The City Council of the City



of Chicago has made part of that money available. The ah.. County Government has made part of it available. There is a commitment right now from two Units of Local Government of the \$15,000,000 in matching funds for this Bill. And, I assure you that, if this Legis... Legislation is passed, that those Units of Local Government will keep their commitment to the people."

R. J. Palmer: "Well, that would be for this fiscal year, I believe. What about in '74, fiscal '74?"

G. W. Shea: "The County and the City are on calendar years and the money would be available on a calendar year basis. And, if you see this, that there would be deposited upon this Bill, becoming Law, I'm told by the Mayor of the City of Chicago, by the President of the County Board, that they would immediately deposit seven and a half million dollars with C.T.A. so that the funds could come immediately available. They have told me that they would deposit seven and a half million dollars with C.T.A. on August the 1st, if this Bill is passed."

R. J. Palmer: "How much of that money comes from the County of Cook?"

G. W. Shea: "\$5,000,000."

R. J. Palmer: "And, \$2,500,000 from the City of Chicago. Is that correct?"

G. W. Shea: "No.. \$10,000,000."

R. J. Palmer: "\$10,000,000. On Section IV, you have... you make on the third line or the ninth line there, you make



reference to Mass Transportation Carriers. This language is somewhat new, ah.. doesn't fit, I don't believe, any previous expression of terms that you've used in it.. in this Bill. Now, the question is whether or not this means Mass Transit Districts."

G. W. Shea: "Where are you... Where are you specifically?"

R. J. Palmer: "Ah.. Page 3, Line 9, Section IV.."

G. W. Shea: "I.. I believe that ah.., when we researched the problem and used the word, 'Mass Transportation Carriers', we use it in such a way that it is all Carriers, Mass Transportation Carriers who are not eligible under two and three of this Act other than the Chicago Urban Transportation District or AMTRAK. We have tried to include everybody by excluding from the total whole, four groups, those that receive help under Section II, those that receive help under Section III, AMTRAK Carriers and the Downtown Subway System."

R. J. Palmer: "Then, that does mean the Mass Transit Districts?"

G. W. Shea: "Yes.."

R. J. Palmer: "Ah.. I want to ask the question then, what amount of money does the C.T.A. pay to the City of Chicago in the form of rent, subsidies or any other form?"

G. W. Shea: "I believe that there was a rental payment of about a million something, but that's been waived for the last three years."

R. J. Palmer: "Is that rental for the facility of the use of streets, etc.?"

G. W. Shea: "Ah.. it's.. it's ah.. Representative Palmer, I



can't give you the exact usage of what it is for. When Mr. Johnson, Mr. Roderick and Mr. Suzzi were down here, they did say that the City had waived those payments and the City is presently supplying at least, that I know of, \$3,000,000 a year in a subsidy, if you want to call it that, ah.. providing police work and providing many other subsidies ah.. for the C.T.A. at this time."

R. J. Palmer: "So, the lack of ah.. payment from the C.T.A. to the City of Chicago would then be made up by the subsidy that you...."

G. W. Shea: "No... No... There is no... There is no room in the figures that we're using here today for any payments. And, I've been assured that there will not be any push for those payments. The City of Chicago is vitally concerned with keeping the transportation system alive and so we take and ah.. formulate a permanent plan."

R. J. Palmer: "Alright.. What's ah.. What is the rationale of the C.T.A. in reducing the fares for senior citizens ah.. I think, it's now twenty cents?"

G. W. Shea: "I think that, perhaps, the Board followed the mandate of this Legislature. As you know, and I think you voted for it, I was checking the record last night on the vote down here some two and a half years ago on a Bill, sponsored, I think it was by Representative Zlatnik, mandating the C.T.A.,.. mandating the C.T.A. to carry our senior citizens at a reduced fare during certain hours. Now, I think, that we mandated... we mandated the C.T.A. to reduce their



income to help the senior citizens. It did nothing to make up for that loss. Alright.. Now, the C.T.A. has only followed our mandate and extended it for the senior citizens to all hours instead of just off hours."

R. J. Palmer: "Was it ah.. I'll strike that question. Mr. Speaker, I think, that I have one or two comments. It seems to me that the failure of the C.T.A., and I'm from a Suburban Area that has very little use or that the ah.. citizens within the District make very little use of the C.T.A. They do make use of ah.. some of the Suburban Transit Systems ah.. Bus Lines as well as some of the Commuter Railroads. But, it seems to me that the ah.. it would be politically... politically palatable ah.. to the C.T.A. and to others that they not raise the fare which ah.. ah.. they, perhaps, could have done so, that they did consider it and backed away from it because it wasn't political to the Democratic Party in the City of Chicago and the County of Cook. The other being that..."

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Palmer... Mr. Palmer..."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise?"

G. W. Shea: "I ah.. I understand that I was in error. It wasn't Representative Zlatnik's Bill. I understand that it was Representative Telcser's Bill. And, I would just like to get the record straight that you were the chief Sponsor. Were you not of the reduced fares in off hours?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "I was a principal Sponsor of ah.. a



Bill to ah.. give senior citizens half fare. However,...
However, if ah.. ah.. my memory serves me correct, I'm not
sure that Representative Palmer was even serving then."

G. W. Shea: "He... He's been here as long as you and I, Repre-
sentative Telcser."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Okay.. Then ah.., the C.T.A. ah..
gave half fares administratively. The Bill never passed or
was signed into Law. It was simply because the C.T.A. did
it on their own."

G. W. Shea: "Well, I know that you were a great Sponsor of
that type of Legislation. And, I.. I might also, ah.. if
you think that something is politically motivated, Mr. Palmer,
I would ask you to check with a great number of Members on
your aisle including the temporary Speaker and see how he
feels about a fare increase for the people of his District."

R. J. Palmer: "Well, I would say this, that where money is
plentiful, certainly we should consider ah.. the type of
thing that the ah.. C.T.A. has done so far as the senior
citizens for the City of Chicago and so far as the people
of the City of Chicago or others that use that Bus Line or
ah.. the C.T.A. System, in not raising the fare. Yet, the
action in doing this certainly allures to some political
benefit. This benefit has not been obtained by the Mass
Transit Areas outside of the City of Chicago neither has it
been done by the ah..obtained by the Commuter System. And,
I would point out this to you, Mr. Speaker, that, if this
type of thing keeps going, that there is no good and logical



reason for the C.T.A. to have these advantages and the people of the rest of the State not to have these advantages. And finally, we're not talking about \$40,000,000, we're talking about something that can grow and grow and grow and really bankrupt this State. And, I think, it's pretty important right now that at the beginning of the Session, that we point out that there have been Bills introduced in this House to take these taxes off of Sales ah.. Food,... Sales Tax off of Food and Drugs which then will reduce, if passed, the amount of revenue that this State will have. You can't have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. And, I think that the Bill is bad. I agree with the Speaker one hundred percent that the only thing we're doing here is creating a monster. Now, if the people Downstate feel that their getting a bonanza by this, I think, they should reconsider the statement by Representative Deuster, that \$30,000,000 goes to the C.T.A. in the City of Chicago. And, Downstate, their only going to get four to eight million dollars. I think that this is an unconscionable thing. I think that the people Downstate should get more money than that if.. if ah.. in so far as this Bill is concerned. I urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Bureau, Representative Barry."

T. Barry: "I'd like to make a comment and, I think, I can answer the gentleman that last spoke. At the same time, what we have in mind with this package, ah.. it's long overdue and



has me as the Co-Sponsor of all the Bills because it is some-
thing for Downstate. Finally, while we're talking about
C.T.A. year after year after year, this package includes
the \$21,000,000 savings in Transportation Funds for Down-
state School Districts mandated, and as we now know it,
will mandate it by reducing the rate for transportation
from twelve percent to six percent. So, don't give us this
baloney about Downstate getting shorted or it wouldn't
have me with it. Downstate is going to get \$21,000,000
in that direction alone. Now, as to overall planning, if
this problem had been able to be solved through the years,
it would have been a long time ago. We talked earlier today,
and lot of us remember, that this kind of problem has existed
since about 1945 or 1946 if not prior to that. If we can
solve it with the Committee we have proposed in forty-five
days, we'll do so. But, I respectfully suggest that we'd
better have something in the nature of six months or to a
date of about October the 1st, just in case we need that
kind of time to solve all of the problems involved for both
Upstate and Downstate."

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

J. J. Wolf: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, ah..
if I'm out of order on this, ah.. the remarks I'd like to
make don't necessarily concern this Amendment only, ah.. but
the Amendment that we just did not pass a short while ago
and also the Bill. I would like to address a few remarks



in response to the gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Gibbs, who just spoke a few minutes ago, who alluded to the people of Springfield ah.. who have a tax base for public transportation as does Peoria, I understand. And, I do sympathize with him ah.. because it does present a valid argument to some degree and, I repeat, to some degree. I would like to point out that Springfield has a population of approximately 91,000. Now, if you compare that with the City of Chicago, which has nearly 3,500,000 and nearly 2,000,000 more people in Suburban Cook County, there's just no way possible that we can move 5,000,000 around within the confines of the border of Cook County by using an automobile as you can in Sangamon County. We have to have public Mass Transportation in order to move these people around. Now, if you'll recall, we passed a \$900,000,000 Transportation Bond Act. Downstate got \$700,000,000 of that and Cook County got \$200,000,000. And, when we appropriate hundreds of thousands of dollars over the years that I've been in this Legislature for Downstate, and even if you want to include some of the Suburban Areas, for your bridge, and your creek and your dams and everything else that is not in line with the population that you serve, I.. I would think that we have to give some consideration to this. And, I have never complained because I regard the State of Illinois as a single entity. And, I wish that Members would quite getting up and trying to drive a wedge between Up and Downstate."

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



tive Yourell."

H. Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to comment as a Suburban Legislator because several of my Colleagues who are interested in this particular Area have made certain statements that I must take exception to. I don't think that one of the Suburban Legislators, who spoke to this Amendment, really believes that his own local bus service takes people to a certain area and then dumps them off and they walk the rest of their.. of the way to work. What they're doing is taking a local bus service to a termination of the C.T.A. and then boarding the C.T.A. to get to their place of employment in the City of Chicago. Now, if anybody thinks that Suburban people, the citizenry of suburbia in Cook County, doesn't have a vital need for the C.T.A., they should be supporting, not only this Amendment, but any Mass Transit ah.. Amendments that will provide that subsidy so that a tax ah.. ah.. or a fare raise is not made possible, then they're kidding themselves. According to the last Federal Census, and I point this out to my two Colleagues from my own District, according to the last Federal Census, fifty-seven percent of the people in the Village of Oak Lawn ride the C.T.A. three or more days a week. So, if you're saying that we, in Suburbia Cook County, don't need the C.T.A., then I would go back to Representative Gibb's suggestion, would they be willing to vote locally for a tax to be placed on their local bus service and that Transit System to provide that service to their constituents? And,



you'd see right off that that would be not to their liking because they wouldn't dare... they wouldn't dare vote for a tax increase for this purpose or for any other purpose. So, just to set the record straight, there is vital need in Suburbia Cook County to see that the C.T.A. does continue to exist without a fare increase and that it is properly run. Thank you."

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

W. J. Murphy: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have made ah.. a friend over there on the Downstate side that, I think, you're really being sold a real bill of goods on this. In the first place, you've got \$4,000,000. And ah.., Representative Tipsword was talking about furnishing rides to the Doctor and rides shopping and everything for the old people, all of the State of Illinois' retired people that have no transportation. And, \$4,000,000 for little towns all over the State is absolutely ridiculous because this will not come to pass with any \$4,000,000 or anything close to \$4,000,000. On top of that, it is vindicated upon the fact that you are going to pass a Bill that the County Units of Government can use this money. And, that's a prediction that may not come to pass. Another thing about this Amendment here is the discrimination against the Commuter Railroads that serve the Suburban and the Metropolitan Areas of the ah.. State of Illinois, around Chicago, when you're making them come up with half and giving the C.T.A. only



one-third match. And so, you're using tax dollars to compete against private industry that is trying to furnish transportation. It's also predicated upon the fact that you're going to pass House Bill 307, which is going to cost \$21,000,000, to restore the money that you take out of Real Estate Tax. So, the package that you're talking about is not forty million dollars, it's sixty million dollars that you're going to spend of the taxpayer's money. And, I want to remind of what your own Governor said in his message. He says, 'Today, I can say this about my budget. The State's present source of revenues are adequate to meet the needs of Illinois. There will be no tax increase and no additional taxes'. You're putting him in the position of spending sixty-one million dollars and he will not be able to keep his word, if you go ahead with this plan and adopt this Bill the way it is. He also says that, 'We must have the same concern for the taxpayer's dollar as we do for the problems which confront us'. I think this Amendment is in complete contradiction to what his statement was, in complete contradiction to his hope to keep taxes down. And, I think you're going to regret the trap, that you've let yourself be put in this day, with this Amendment."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from ah.. Macoupin, Representative Boyle."

K. Boyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hour is growing late. And, at this time, I think, we've debated this long enough and I move the previous question."



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

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask for the adoption of Amendment No. 6, to House Bill 89. I think this is the Democratic proposal and, I hope it's a proposal of all the Members of this House, that we can join together to do the job for the people of the State of Illinois. It's a innovative program. It provides money for the Rural Demonstration Act that, I'm sure, we'll do what we can to get it out of the House. I'm sure that we'll be joined by many, many people in that Legislation. It does afford relieve to the property tax payer. It does afford relieve to the Bus Companies in Rural Illinois and Northern Illinois in Suburban Cook County. It provides a relieve to the Railroads and to the hard-pressed C.T.A. And, I would ask for a favorable Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment No. 6, to House Bill 89. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. The gentleman from Cook, Representative Bill Walsh."

W. D. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah.. before I'd seen this, ah.. ah.. and heard that it was bold and innovative and ah.. a lot of other things, ah.. I didn't think that I'd heard of it before. But, really we



talked about these ideas in the Appropriation Committee last Thursday at some length. And really, all we're doing here is we're changing the formula and we're providing that the State is coming up with two-thirds of the match rather than one-third for the C.T.A. and we're funding the C.T.A. for a lot longer period of time through December 31st, instead of June 30th. Now, let me tell you what that does, Mr. Speaker. Everybody interested in the C.T.A. is all set to turn on the tap. They're ready to get the State money. This is the first operating subsidy that the State will provide for Mass Transportation and don't think that the C.T.A. operating Unions don't have this in mind. Even without... Even without an operating subsidy, the Bus Operators have had their salaries increased by forty-three percent in the last four years, roughly twice what the cost of living has gone up in the last four years. Now, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that as long as we provide this money for Mass Transportation, we're not going to have a Regional Transportation Authority, we'll never have it. This is totally irresponsible. And, I'd like to suggest to my Suburban Colleagues that this Bill is written exactly the way the Speaker's Bill was written before he found out that, under his Bill, the Suburban Rail Carriers had no way. There is just no way that Suburban Rail Carriers can participate under this Bill. It says that they can not use operating revenues, either from freight or any other source, for matching funds. And, if they can't do that, they can't participate. This is a.. an.. ill.



thought idea, hastily drawn, a very poor idea. And, I urge you to vote 'no'."

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

B. B. Duff: "Mr. Speaker, to explain my vote, I think that this Amendment, as proposed, is going to probably be one of the most irresponsible acts to deprive the people of Illinois ultimately of any reasonable Mass Transportation facilities at a point in time when this Legislature will be able to function before there is such chaos in Northeastern Illinois and other parts of the State, that it will be unsolvable. Ah.. the proposal made earlier by the Speaker's Amendment, it seemed to me, was rational, hard worked out, and even in itself extraordinary in terms of giving operating funds to the C.T.A. which is manifestly mismanaged, which has clearly shown that it will not continue function as an Authority under this Legislature successfully in the future. We will be forced to come back over and over and over again in the future years to bail out the C.T.A. constantly and there will never be an adequate solution to Mass Transportation if we proceed with this. This Amendment is an irresponsible raid on the Treasury of Illinois. It's a foot in the door. It's a rejection of all reasonable compromise. And, if we are, in fact, going to attempt to accomplish any Legislation, something has to come out of this House which the other Chamber can reasonably accept and consider, which the Governor can look at with some reasonable degree of.. of approval."



This Amendment is just simply irresponsible."

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

W. Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and Fellow Members of the House, just a comment or two in explaining my vote. This has been pretty well covered. I'd just like to say that Downstate, there are very poor people in this status in Chicago. There's absolutely no reason why those poor people in Downstate have to support the poor people of Chicago in their use of the C.T.A. The Welfare was mentioned. I'd like to point out that we have Welfare Downstate too. I would like also to point out there must be something wrong in Chicago because most of our Welfare people have cars to use. What's the matter with those in Chicago? You'd better look into that. They won't have to use the C.T.A. I'm being a little fictitious on that one. Nevertheless, ... Nevertheless, I can't imagine some of the Downstate Legislators, looking at this Board, voting against the best interests of their own people. And, that's exactly what we're doing. So, I vote 'no'."

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

J. E. Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my vote, a 'nay' vote. I, like each Member of this House, was innovated by friendly, helpful mail from the great employees of the Chicago Transit Authority. I am well experienced in Chicago Transit riding for a lifetime of commuting. I appreciate the good job that



they do. Yet, I understand that; right in the heat of this battle, at least two and, perhaps, four of the Unions involved in the Chicago Transit Authority, are making strike rumbles. That is, point one. Second point, this Bill does not have, and in all due credence to this side of the aisle, neither did their Bill have, a single item getting at the gut issue of Mass Transit, how do you get people out of cars onto Mass Transit. Neither Amendment deals with that subject. And, until the creative skills of this House and its Staff begin to nibble at that problem, we will be financing. My vote is 'nay'."

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

H. Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, in order to explain my vote, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I appeared on the Transportation Committee and in quizzing the Official of the C.T.A., in 1948 they were hauling two and a half times as many passengers as they were hauling in 1972. They had 24,000 employees in 1948 on a two-man streetcar. Some of you don't remember this two-man streetcar. Today, they have modern buses, with one man on a bus, and they still 12,500 employees, one man on a vehicle which means, today, you're taking about a man and a half to haul the passengers that they hauled by one man ah.. in 1948 which, when they came to us with their hat in hand with an austerity program, what... what are they doing adding this extra half man per hour to their payroll. And then, they come to us and say, 'We're broke. And, we run a good,



clean operation and.. and how thrifty we are', and, when they have 12,500 employees on the City's payroll or the C.T.A.'s payroll. Now, you're taking, where in House Bill 8... the Amendment to House Bill 88 was a responsibility, that was placing the money directly where it belongs in the Suburban Bus Lines. Now, they want to place this money with the Cook County Board so that they can control more votes. So, Mr... Mr. Speaker, this is nothing but a political patronage Bill. So, I vote 'no'."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Have all... The gentleman from ah.. Cook, Representative Collins, to explain his vote."

P. W. Collins: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry,.. a point of order."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "State your point."

P. W. Collins: "Didn't ah.. Representative James Carter resign ah.. retire after the last Session? I.. I ah.. noticed that he's voting."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "That's a rhetorical question. The gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

G. W. Shea: "There's just no chance of leaving Collins without a Carter."

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

J. D. Jones: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've had many ah.. types of discussion this afternoon about ah.. the Springfield Mass Transit District. And ah..., we just want to say to you, 'Try it. You'll like it'. We



even have a ten cent fare, shuttle service, from the State House to Downtown at the noon hour. And, you might, for the record, know that five years ago, the people voted a tax levy, a five mill tax levy ah.. what's supporting the Bus System. And, it went from 700 passengers on the old system to last year, 2,500,000 fares and this year will be even more. So ah.., we think you might.. as a solution to this problem, you might try the Springfield Plan."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Simms."

W. T. Simms: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in rising to explain my vote, we've listened to the debate today from those that have been proponents and opponents of this Legislation. And, I can appreciate the.. the interest and the hard work that the Assistant Minority Leader has placed into solving the problems of the Chicago Transit Authority, as he is representing his District. But, I must vote against this proposal because of the extreme expense to the City.. to the State of Illinois. But, I think that one thing is very significant. I can't remember a time in the History of the State when we've had crisis when there has been no direction from the floor of the Executive Branch of Government, namely the Office of the Governor, giving recommendations and advise as to their solutions to a crisis problem in Illinois. It seems as if the Governor is lacking in his Office in giving some type of direction to trying to solve the Chicago Transit Authority problem. And, I think,



perhaps, that this is something that his Office might take into consideration of the large expense that the State is now being asked to... to take part in and also of placing the sole burden and responsibility of solving these problems strictly with those of the Speaker and Minority Leader because, I think, they're doing the job, perhaps, in solving this problem that the Executive Branch might do. It might be interesting to hear what our new Governor has in mind in the areas of Mass Transportation."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster, to explain his vote."

D. E. Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I would like to suggest that ah.. there is a certain degree of total irresponsibility on the part of the Board of the Chicago Transit Authority. And, I want all of the Members to know that, if the time in November when the Chicago Transit Authority knew they were on the brink of bankruptcy, they consciously embarked on a policy and a program to ah.. demonstrate their social responsibility to senior citizens by letting everybody, who is a little older, ride at half fare. And, the day before... Well, yesterday, the Newspapers had this account. It says, 'The Chicago Transit Authority expects to lose approximately \$9,500,000 this year because of its new social policy of letting folks, 65 years of age and older, ride'. And, I asked one of the witnesses, who represented a Suburban Bus Company, I said, 'Have you done this with your Bus Company, let the old folks ride



free? It's really nice'. And, he said, 'No, I can't afford it'. And yet, the C.T.A. is down here asking to run off with \$30,000,000 from the Illinois Treasury at the same time they're embarking on policies like this and cause themselves another \$9,500,000 deficit.) I think that's absolutely irresponsible. If we're going to help the senior citizens, let's do it after we've put the C.T.A. and Mass Transit in the Northern Region of Illinois on a sound long-term basis."

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

B. Garmisa: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the last Speaker referred to the Transit Authority Board of being irresponsible because they are riding the senior citizens of our Town at half fares. If this is the approach that this gentleman is going to take towards whatever Legislation he may have in mind, I would like to suggest that he is way off target. And, I would further suggest that, if at any time along the line we can be of some help to the senior citizens of that State, and, I think, it's the responsible action of any Board, be it Transit or any other kind in this State, to take on some of the responsibilities of providing for the aged of this State. And further, Mr. Speaker, if we adopt this Amendment to House Bill 89, it will put this Bill back into the shape that I hoped it would be in. I urgently urge every Member of this House to come up with a 'green' light on this very fine Amendment."



Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question, there are 87 'Ayes', 72 'Nays' and the gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment No. 6, to House Bill 89 prevails. Are there further Amendments?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment No. 7, Schlickman, amend House Bill 89, as amended, in the Section directing the Secretary of Transportation to make payments, andsoforth."

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

E. F. Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

G. W. Shea: "Is Mr. Schlickman's Amendment now in ah.. the correct, I think it's, what do we want to us, numerical or ah.. is it now amend this Amendment in the right posture?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, let's take a look at it. Yes.. Proceed."

E. F. Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, let me read the Amendment to you. It states as follows: 'All payments made to the Chicago Transit Authority by the Secretary of Transportation, under this Act, shall be refunded to the State Treasury by the Chicago Transit Authority no later than August 1, 1973, unless Legislation is passed by the Seventy-Eighth General Assembly by July 1, 1973, creating a Metropolitan Transit System, whether denominated the Chicago Urban Transportation District or otherwise for the Counties of Cook, DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry and Will and succeeding to the powers and duties of the Transit Authority'. As you've



heard in your listening to this Amendment, it's simple. And, it does not go to the substance of Amendment No. 6, to House Bill 89. What it is, is a test of good faith. There is a growing concern for the plight of public transportation in the Northeastern Illinois Area. That Area, Mr. speaker and Members of the House, is composed of seventy percent of the population of the State of Illinois and the plight is one that includes a reduction in service, an increase in fares and a reduction in passengers. The plight is so substantial that a Governor's Task Force stated, 'that creation of a regional public transportation system in Northeastern Illinois is one of the most important issues facing the State at this time'. I was disappointed, very disappointed to read in the news media recently that the Mayor of the City of Chicago stated, 'that the Chicago Transit Authority will not become a part of a Regional Transportation System for the Northeastern Illinois Counties Area'. Chicago is a part of the region and it's a vital part. But, the region is no longer dependent upon the City of Chicago as it has been. The City of Chicago, the remainder of the region, are inter-related and they're interdependent. The Chicago Transit Authority is not the private domain of any one person or any one Organization. To the public, it's the vocal point of transportation in the Northeast Illinois Counties Area. As such, it must be the basis for a Regional Transportation System. By the adoption of this Amendment, we simply insure that a Regional Transportation Agency for the Northeastern

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Illinois Counties Area will be created when it's needed, now. I respectfully solicit your support of this Amendment."

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

G. W. Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would oppose this Amendment.

And, I would remind my Colleague across the aisle that they are the Majority Party and the Transportation Committee, that they are the Majority Party in the House. And, I assure you we stand as the Minority Party ready, willing and able to help in solving the transportation problems on a State-wide basis, particularly in the six County Area, Representative Schlickman. If we were to pass this Bill, there just isn't any money there, Gene. I.. I mean that sincerely. There just isn't any money. With the passage of House Bill 89, we are giving C.T.A. the minimum dollars to get by on until August the 1st. On August the 1st, we will give them the minimum dollars to get by on until December the 31st, if we have enacted. We.. We try to accommodate you and many Members that felt that they didn't want it funded for a full year. And, funding it for a full year in a two-part program. And, Gene, I'd.. I'd ask you to withdraw your Amendment because it just totally emasculates what we're trying to do here."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ah.. the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dunn."

R. Dunn: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, ah.. I am glad to speak in favor of this Amendment. In fact, my name is on it. It seems that all the action turned out to be in the Appropriations Committee. And, however, we did have last week a five.. five hour Session in the Transportation Com-



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

mittee and another hour yesterday. And, I ask ah.. each of the gentleman, who appeared before us, Representatives of the ah.. Suburban and Downstate Bus Lines, Representatives of the Railroads and Representative of the C.T.A., as to their attitude in support of a Mass Transit System. And, the gentlemen from Downstate and the gentlemen from the Suburbs and the gentlemen from the Railroad said, 'Let's get about a Mass Transportation System immediately. We're for it and we want to get into it'. But, the gentlemen from the C.T.A. were a bit evasive. And, I join in Gene Schlickman's comments. This is a test of good faith, gentlemen on the other side of the aisle. Ah.. if we're really not going to need this 1974 appropriation, if you really are going get to ah.. ah.. to ah.. a Mass Transit Bill, I think, this will kind of bind to it. So, I speak in favor of this Amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe."

B. B. Wolfe: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment No. 7, although introduced with good motive ah.. does not say what it really means and does not mean what it says. Ah.. my good Colleague, Gene Schlickman, I know, introduces this Amendment ah.. because he believes in it and he wants to accomplish a Mass Transportation Authority for the six Counties mentioned. But, what this Amendment says is this. Mass Transportation has been kicking around this State for fifteen years and nothing constructive has



been done. We have more reports from Commissions than we have Members in this House. And, what he's now saying that between now, a late starting... a late starting Legislative Body, before June the 30th, has got to pass a Mass Transportation Bill, something that we have not been able to do in fifteen years. We got to do it now in about four months with all of the other Legislation that we have facing us. And, if we don't do it, as a Legislative Body, then we're going to play Russian roulette with the ah.. C.T.A. and tell them, 'You can blow your brains out now and return the money that the Assembly gave you ah.. during this emergency period ah.. because.. because the ah.. Members of this Legislative Body, and that includes the Senate, we're speaking for the Senate, did not pass a Mass Transit Authority'. Now I don't think Gene Schlickman wants to ah.. do exactly that. I think what he's telling the Members of this House is that the time to act is now. And, we'd better get busy and pass some long-range ah.. Legislation. But, I don't think we ought to penalize an authority that has no control over this Legislative Body and no control over the Senate. And, I think that the ah.. Amendment ought to be withdrawn or tabled at this time."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Blades."

B. C. Blades: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He indicates he'll yield."

B. C. Blades: "Gene, if I understand your Amendment right, all your Amendment does is assure that the C.T.A. will sit



down and work out some long-range program. Is that right?"

E. F. Schlickman: "Within a reasonable period of time, yes, Sir."

B. C. Blades: "Yes. Okay."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman."

A. L. Berman: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, ah.. I rise in opposition to Amendment No. 7. If this was a Bill ah.. dealing with ah.. retailing, I think, it would be called ah.. ah.. illegal because it's ah.. contrary to the anti-trust Laws. It's what we call a tie-in. And, just as it disturbs me when the Federal Government tries to blackjack us into passing certain Legislation by threatening to withhold funds from the Federal Department of Transportation. It disturbs me just as greatly when we are urged to adopt a Resolution which seeks to do the same thing on the level of mandating certain types of Legislation before we've had an opportunity to look at it. I'm not sure what approach I want to take to the total area's Mass Transit problems. And yet, this Amendment requires that there be some system set up that will succeed to the powers and duties of the Chicago Transit Authority. I want to make sure that, before I commit myself to any pro.. program, that I know that whatever is going to succeed to those powers is, hopefully, going to do a better job. And, I haven't seen the substantive Legislation that, so far, can guarantee that that's going to be the case. And, for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge a 'no' vote on Representative



Schlickman's Amendment No. 7."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? The gentleman from Cook,... Oh! The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy."

J. R. Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Mr. Schlickman's Amendment. I do that, not because I really think that it is an effective way to force this Body to take any action. Assume for a moment that this Amendment is adopted. It gives us a July 1st deadline. If we get to July 1st, and it's clear that we're near a solution, but not at a solution, we'd simply amend this paragraph to extend the deadline. In fact, there is no effective way, Legislatively, to bind a Legislature to take future action. We all recognize that. However, this Amendment is a statement of intent. It is a statement of good will. It is a state of our commitment to finding a regional solution to a regional problem. And, for that reason, I support the Amendment. And, I suggest to the Members that they can support it without binding themselves to do a single thing because we can amend this paragraph at any time that the deadline becomes unrealistic or that it becomes apparent that the C.T.A. can not repay the monies ah.. which they are granted under the Act."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any... Any further discussion? The gentleman from... The gentleman from Cook,... Does the Lady want to speak? Alright.. The Lady from ah.. Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

J. Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to speak in favor of Amendment No. 7 because



I was under the impression that there was a real emergency in the C.T.A. that would be resolved by the various parties between the C.T.A. and Cook and the City of Chicago, if we could help them now. I cannot, in good conscience, vote for any Bill for the C.T.A. without a restricting Amendment like this one, which I see would be healthy and would move the C.T.A. to take action. I, therefore, speak in favor of Amendment No. 7."

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

H. Huskey: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah.. I rise to support Amendment No. 7. I couldn't help but think when Mr. Wolfe made his statement. For fifteen years, he's sat in this House and nothing has been done about Mass Transportation except talk about it. And, he opposes the Bill. Well, there will be another fifteen years, if he takes this same stand and this same attitude before you'll have a Bill supporting Mass Transportation. So, therefore, I support House Bill Number 7 to get something started anyway."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from ah.. Bureau, Mr. Barry."

T. Barry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and the last Speaker, particularly, I have a resolution on the desk that has a reporting date of October 1st, this year. Now, I would feel that, perhaps, I could support Mr. Schlickman's Amendment if it was dated somewhere out in the future, like perhaps, July 1st, 1974. At this time, I certainly can't support that because we do plan to do



something about this entire situation by October 1st, hopefully long before that time. And, I would suggest that the ah.. last Speaker vote for the resolution at the proper time."

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

D. E. Deuster: "Ah.. I rise in support of Amendment No. 7 and I do so ah.. because, particularly, this Amendment ah.. conforms the Bill to the originally Bill introduced by the gentleman from Cook County, Mr. Garmisa, in that the original House Bill 88.... said that this is just a temporary problem. We're just going to support the C.T.A. and the Chicago Area Services until June 30th. And, so ah.., this deadline in here is perfectly consistent with the deadline that was in the original Bill, House 89. And, I think, therefore, it ought to be supported on both sides of the aisle because it's absolutely consistent with the deadline that we've all envisioned. And, I support Amendment No. 7 for that reason."

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

B. Garmisa: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Toby Barry's resolution addresses itself directly to the Amendment that Mr. Schlickman is trying to pass here this afternoon. And, I think, that he has the proper approach. I think that he, through this Committee approach, will come up with the answers that we need and have to have in the near future. And, I think, that if we're to pass this Amendment that we would further delay the nature of this Bill and we would then not be able to come up with the



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

emergency funds that are required right now. I would, therefore, urge the defeat of Amendment No. 7."

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

P. J. Randolph: "Mr. Speaker, I now move the previous question."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it and the previous question has been moved. And now, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, to close."

E. F. Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is my fifth term in the General Assembly. And, I've seen this Body act expeditiously when there's a will. This Body has found the way. As I've stated before, creation of a Regional Public Transportation System in Northeastern Illinois is one of the most important issues facing this State now. We must sit down. We must cooperatively, in the spirit of good will, direct ourselves to this objective. By this Amendment, C.T.A. is provided with the subsidies that it needs. But, by this Amendment, we are tying the short-run and the long-run together. It makes absolutely no sense to provide a subsidy to any public or private Transportation System within the Northeastern Illinois Area if we don't create or assure ourselves of a far better overall Transportation System. We've got the time. There's the way. And, with your will, we'll do it. I respectfully solicit your adoption approval of Amendment No. 7, to House Bill 89, so that we can serve the public interest."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. The question is on the adop-



tion of ah.. Amendment No. 7. All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. The gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

C. L. Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the sentiments expressed by the seatmate and Colleague, Representative Tobias Barry, that, if the resolution which he is introducing did not call for a full and complete and explicit mandatory retirement of all of these matters in future Sessions of the General Assembly, a report to be filed by.. to this Legislature by October 1, then I would consider the merits of the Amendment. I say to the Membership, though, that inasmuch as this resolution, creating the Commission to study the ending of this important question once and for all, is going to placed into the hands of a certain number of Members of the Legislature that the Amendment is not germane to the particular subject at the present time. If was dated, as Representative Barry suggested, a year from now or sometime after October, then I... then it would be much more germane and would be much more worthy of consideration by this Body. And, that's my reason for voting 'no'."

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

H. A. Katz: "Ah.. I have voted along here today with a series of Bills designed to take care of the immediate problems of the C.T.A. and of Mass Transportation in the State. But I share with Representative Schlickman a believe that in terms of the long-run ah.. handling of this problem, the



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

long-run requires that we, in fact, do have a Mass Transportation System with a overall governing Body in that Area of Northeastern Illinois. And, I would want, by voting for this, for it to be perfectly clear that I'm not sure that all of the political entities within the City of Chicago and even in the Suburban Area have quite faced up to the fact that, in order to have an intelligent Transportation System, they're going to have to become part of a Body which functions on the same basis as Transportation functions which does not respect the limits of the City of Chicago or each of thirty or so Suburban Areas. Ah.. I am voting for this, as Representative Lundy said, and I want to make perfectly clear that I'm not in any way attempting to penalize the C.T.A. We will, by the end of the Session, be coming up with the appropriate Legislation. But, I share very much the feeling that the only way that we are going to have the support of all of the forces, ah.. who are trying to ah.. make the C.T.A. continue to be solvent, the only way that we will have their votes, in my opinion, is if we do tie it in with the long-run solution of this problem on a Northeastern Illinois basis. And, accordingly, I'm voting 'aye' on the Amendment."

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

D. M. Pierce: "Thank you. Ah.. Mr. Speaker, Oh! I agree with Mr. Katz's sentiments that we should have a six County ah.. Mass Transit System and, hopefully, by July 1st, 1973, I think that it's unreasonable to put an Amendment on this Bill penalizing ah.. the Chicago Transit Authority and its riders



if we, in the Legislature, don't do something. In other words, it's not something that they can do, it's something that we have to do. We're dictating here, the Legislature, that we have to pass a Bill by a certain date and that includes the State Senate which even ah.. which even the Speaker and I don't control. And, it also includes the Governor ah.. we ah.. don't control that he signs the Bill. Otherwise, all of this money... all of this money that we're agreeing is needed, and is vitally needed just to keep the C.T.A. operating, has to be paid back. Well, they're not going to have the money to pay back. That's obvious. And, they can't control what we do in the General Assembly. So, let's do it. If we should do it by July 1st, let's do it. It's a difficult task. But, this Amendment is not reasonable and it's not rational in requiring them to pay back the money. It's going to hurt their credit rating. Ah.. who's going to ah.. Who's going to do business with the C.T.A. on credit if they know that if this General Assembly fails to do something by July 1st, they've got to pay back money.. all this money and bankrupt the C.T.A. after that date. I'ts a counterproductive Amendment. It's for a good cause. And, I know that Representative Schlickman is trying to help Mass Transit and I agree with Representative Katz's sentiments. But, this is a bad Amendment. It should be defeated. It's not reasonable. It states a certain point of view. I don't even think that it could be a serious Amendment because we can't ah.. penalize the C.T.A. for something we've failed



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

to do in the House and in the Senate and something, perhaps, we do and then the Governor--ah.. vetoes. So, I'm voting 'no' on this Amendment."

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

B. B. Wolfe: "Briefly explaining my vote, Mr. Speaker, this is the first time in five terms that I have seen an Amendment or a piece of Legislation of ah.. of a two-gun natured type that tells this General Assembly... that tells this General Assembly, 'We have got to accept an unknown Mass Transportation Bill. We have got to act before June the 30th, no matter what happens in the Senate, that we have got to pass something out'. Otherwise, we're compelling an authority that we're attempting to help to return funds because of a deficiency of either the House or the Senate with respect to Mass Transportation Legislation. And, the first time that we're violating a known fact in this House. That is, we haven't passed this kind of Legislation in fifteen years. How are we going to do it in four months when you've got all of these reports facing you from the various authorities and when no Bill is before this House, considered by any Committee that has passed out, that is acceptable to either the House or the Senate. And, to point a gun at an authority and say, 'you're going to return it', and there's a question as to whether they can, will or should, as a condition in a Bill, to me, is an absolute negation of our responsibility as Lawmakers. And, a position that we're taking now that's



going to really, in my opinion, ah.. emasculate the image of this House. I don't think that this Amendment should pass. I think it's a violation of our duty as a Lawmaker to vote as we see fit and not to vote with conditions."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted.... The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson."

L. H. Rayson: "Well, Mr... Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't like this Amendment. It disturbs me. But, I do think that there is this need for this overall Transportation System. And I, for one, would be very much willing to have this deficit for '72 paid to the C.T.A. and have other deficits spread. But, at the same time, I feel that we should make a prohibition against future funds and not against deficits that have already occurred and the need is still there. So, I'd like to ah.. change my vote and be recorded as 'present'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Record the gentleman as 'present'. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

G. W. Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies.. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't quite understand the Amendment, but I tell you that what is being done here is emasculating the Amendment that we just put on this Bill. It says, 'Unless the C.T.A. becomes part of a Transit Authority that they have to pay back the money'. Lord! Let me tell you that there's no way that they can pay back the money, if we don't act. And, as I've said, we're willing, we're able. We want to sit down and talk about doing this. The Governor's own Task



Force has come out with something that he calls R.T.A. If we passed R.T.A. in the form, the former Governor wanted it, this Amendment would still provide that the C.T.A. would have to pay back the \$19,500,000. Now, I don't know how it could ever get it. You know, I just ask you, please. Please leave the Bill so that we can provide the aid to the people in the State. We specifically... specifically split the appropriation in two parts to try to show our good faith that we'd sit down and work and work together to solve this problem. And, I ask you, please don't emasculate the Legislation because what you're doing is, in effect, is prohibiting the C.T.A. from using any of this money because there's no assurance that any of us will act, that the Senate will act, that the Governor will sign the Bill. Lord! Give us some... some room to move. Gene, I'm telling you that I've got... you've got my assurance that I'll sit down. I assure you that the Mayor of the City of Chicago wants to cooperate in this."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

J. S. Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah.. this, in my four terms in the Legislature, is the first time that I've seen a Member of this House use the Amendment procedure to try to put a hammer over all of us to pass his Legislation. And, I don't think it's the proper way to proceed in passing Legislation. I think that on Third Reading, we ought to vote for or against C.T.A."



aid on the merits of that particular Legislation. This Bill should not be the vehicle on whether you are for or against Regional Mass Transit Districts. I think that all of us have an obligation ah.. to Representative Garmisa because many of us, and I might say this to first-termers, that sometime ah.. along your Legislative career, you will have Legislation and you will want your Bill to be in the ah.. in the form that you desire it to be on Third Reading. It's sort of been a Legislative courtesy that we allow that. And then, on Third Reading, if you are for or against the issue, you so vote. But, to hamper this Legislation with a side issue, and I might add that ah.. that this ah.. particular procedure that ah.. the Sponsor of this Amendment has introduced here, ah.. if I can sort of make an analogy, is something like, and we've... and I think all of us have seen it last Session when the Federal Government has said, 'You pass this Legislation or else'. None of us like that procedure. In this particular process, we are introducing a similar vein, a Legislative saying, 'I have legislation and by this Amendment.....'

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "You have to bring your remarks to a close. Your time is up."

J. S. Matijevich: "I think I've made it clear, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen that I think that this is an improper procedure. And, I would hope that the Members would so do and vote against the Amend... the Amendment."

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



H. A. Katz: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've always believed that two wrongs do not make a right. I am persuaded, in hearing the debate and considering the problem, that while it is true that the overall problem of the Northeastern Metropolitan ah.. Transportation Authority of some sort is the overriding issue, that there will be opportunities to express that which do not, in my opinion, follow good Legislative procedures. Accordingly, I'm going to change my vote from 'yes' to 'no'. But, to make very clear to everyone here, that. in my view, the overriding issue remains the same and we will take care of that problem at a proper time."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Didn't you explain your vote once, Mr. Katz?"

H. A. Katz: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker,...."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I'm... I'm sorry...."

H. A. Katz: "Mr. Speaker,...."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "I didn't.. I.. I didn't... That is.. That was for your 'yes' vote and this was for your 'no'.."

H. A. Katz: "That's... That's right."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "I.. I get it. Alright.. Okay.. Alright.. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk... The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Garmisa."

B. Garmisa: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all those with a 'green' light up there are voting to, perhaps, in the very near future send the C.T.A. into a downspin that could very well result in a bankrupt C.T.A."



I am fearful that with the passage of this Amendment that we will find the City of Chicago in a tight bind where there won't be no C.T.A. I would like to have a lot more 'red' votes up there and knock this Amendment down. It doesn't belong. It is not germane to this Bill. Thank you very much."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted... Now, for what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. ah.. Lundy, rise? Did you explain your vote before?"

J. R. Lundy: "Yes, Sir."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well,.. Oh! You did not explain your vote. Alright.. Proceed."

J. R. Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, I earlier made a statement in support of this Amendment. Ah.. I do favor the Regional solution. I think it is the only solution. But, let me say that I have been assured by my Leadership that the commitment on this side of the aisle to finding a Regional solution is absolutely firm, that there will a Regional solution if our Leadership has anything to say about it. And, I take the Leadership at its worth that that commitment is firm and that we will be moving toward a Regional solution. Accordingly, I change my vote to 'no' on this Amendment."

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

E. F. Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I've been accused of not knowing what I'm doing. I've been accused of acting in bad faith. I've been accused of being self-



serving. You gentlemen on the other side of the aisle know that, in four terms previous to now, I have voted for every appropriation, every program for the Chicago Transit Authority. I match my record with my words. I am committed personally to a Regional Transportation Agency in the Northeastern Illinois Counties Area. And, the purpose for this Amendment is to bring it about now when it's needed. I'm reminded of something that I've been told quite frequently in observation to those that object to something. Me thinketh they protesteth too much. Where is your good will? Where is your commitment to the public interests and the public's need? By your voting for the adoption of this Amendment, you will be telling the people of the State of Illinois, 'We are going to serve you. We are going to serve you today. We are going to serve you tomorrow and in the future'. I plead with you. I ask you respectfully to adopt this Amendment. It's vital."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Now, have all voted who wished? Mr. Huskey, do you want to talk? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey."

H. Huskey: "Yes, ... Yes, Mr. Speaker, ah.. I'm ah.. I'm a freshman Legislator. I.. I don't know if I'm confused or whether I'm just learning sort of fast. A few minutes ago, I heard the gentleman on the other side of the aisle talk about what it takes to be a responsible Legislator. So, I ah.. it kind of touched my heart because I was probably not looking at it in a responsible way. So then, I decided that



I had better be a responsible Legislator. But, now I am confused. Like the old Indian used to say, 'The white man speak with a forked tongue'. I heard a gentleman get up and say that for fifteen years, they've talked about Mass Transportation and they haven't done anything. And now, they have a chance to do something and they won't. But, I feel that I am a responsible citizen and a responsible Legislator, so I'm going to vote 'yes'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, rise?"

E. F. Schlickman: "I request a poll of the absentees."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Ah.. at this point, we stand 85 'Nays' and 78 'Yeas' and the gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. The Clerk will proceed to do that."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Capuzi.. Day.. Douglas.. Hirschfeld.."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Wait a minute. The gentleman from Cook Mr. Douglas."

B. L. Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ah.. as 'not voting', Mr. Clerk?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Yes, Sir."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "As 'not voting'."

B. L. Douglas: "Would you please record my 'protest present' vote?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Record the gentleman's 'protest present' vote."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Juckett.. McAvoy.. North.. Pappas.. Piotrowicz.."



Sangmeister.. Schoeberlein.. Sevcik.. Wall.."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Now, on this question, there are 78 'Ayes', 85 'Nays', 2 'Present' and the ah.. Amendment No. 7 fails. Are there further Amendments?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Ah.. Amendment No. 8, Deuster, amend House Bill 89 be deleting lines 1 through 4 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: andsoforth."

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

D. E. Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I call off Amendment No. 8.

And ah.., in calling up Amendment No. 8, ah.. I want to bring to the attention of the House the fact that I pointed out earlier, that it was my desire, in offering this Amendment, to give the Membership of this distinguished Body a three way choice by way of time and money. You could either give the C.T.A. \$30,000,000 and let them go all year. You could give them \$8,000,000 and let them go into the Summer, July 1st or you could do as my Amendment suggests and give them \$4,000,000 which would enable them to continue until Mayday. And ah.., that would certainly conform with the Rules of this House ah.. in that we do have to consider Bills in our Committees in forty-five days. And ah.., certainly Mayday, May 1st, would be enough time for us to allow the distinguished gentlemen on both sides of the aisle to live up to the firm commitment, this firm and sincere commitment, expressed today on this floor that we're going to work together in harmony toward the adoption of a Regional Mass Transportation System for the six Northeastern Counties of Illinois. So, it is



simply to give the Membership an opportunity to ah.. help the C.T.A. keep running until May 1st rather than all year or next year or ten years or as a hymn, which we sing in our Church ah.. repeats over and over again, forever.. forever.. forever.. because that's what it is going to be. It's going to be forever unless we put a limit on it and we put a fairly, early, yet reasonable limit. And so, my Amendment, No. 8 is offered to let them go until May 1st. I see the distinguished Sponsor of the principal Bill, Mr. Garmisa, seeking recognition and I'm happy to yield."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, right now, we're Deuster to Garmisa... For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe, rise?"

B. B. Wolfe: "On a point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "State your point."

B. B. Wolfe: "Ah.. Amendment No. 8, is that now consistent with the amended Bill, on the Amendment which was adopted, Amendment No. 6?" And, with two apologies to Art Simmons."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ah.. it is not. You're right."

B. B. Wolfe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

D. E. Deuster: "Mr. Speaker...."

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

D. E. Deuster: "Yes,.. Ah.. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to move to reconsider the vote on Amendment No. 6 and adopt Amendment No. 8 in lieu thereof."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The ah.. gentleman from ah.. ah.. Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe."



B. B. Wolfe: "Ah.. the gentleman ah.. did not vote on the prevailing side on any motion to reconsider at this time. And, I'd like the Chair to Rule on that point."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman's point is well taken. You did not vote on the.... Well, let me ask the gentleman. How did you vote on 6, on the prevailing side?"

D. E. Deuster: "I.. I voted..."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The prevailing side was 'aye'."

D. E. Deuster: "I voted on the ah.. on.. not on the prevailing side on Number 6. His point is well taken."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Al... Alright.. So, the gentleman has raised a point of order concerning the fact that the form in which your Amendment is now ah.. is inconsistent with the shape that ah.. House Bill is in."

D. E. Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to request of the Sponsor, the principal Sponsor of this Legislation, House Bill 89, ah.. whether he would be willing to consent ah.. to allow leave tomorrow when we are on the order of Third Reading, to ah.. return to the order of Second Reading so that this Amendment could be adopted or be considered."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Garmisa."
Ah.. He's shaking his head, 'no'."

B. Garmisa: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my answer is a very definite 'no'."

D. E. Deuster: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, in view of the Sponsor's unwillingness to have the will of the House worked on Amend-



ment No. 8, I ah.. at this time, ah.. will simply indicate that tomorrow, in the appropriate order, I will ah.. seek the leave of the House to ah.. have a return to Second Reading so that Amendment No. 8 can be considered and so that the, and I do this as a sincere friend of the C.T.A., because I would like to have ah.. or the Membership of this Body have an opportunity ah.. not just to give the C.T.A. \$30,000, 000 or zero, but to have a reasonable figure in between. And so, I shall do that tomorrow. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment No. 9, Catania, amends House Bill 89, as amended, by inserting after 'Section VI' the following: andsoforth."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ah.. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania. But,.... Just a moment. The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

J. S. Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I raise the same point of order ah.. since the passage of Amendment No. 6, I believe, ah.. that Amendment No. 9 is now not in the proper form. And, I ask you to rule on that point."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, your point ah.. is ah.. well taken. It's not ah.. It's not consistent with the ah.. House Bill 89 in the form that it is now before the House."

S. Catania (Mrs.): "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, may I ask leave of the House to make this Amendment consistent with Amendment No. 6 simply by changing the numbers in Lines 3 and 4 and 22?"

Voices: "Leave...."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, the ah.. Alright.. The ah.. Lady is asking ah.. for leave to have the ah.. written or the printed ah.. proposed Amendment No. 9 amended in some fashion, orally, I take it, to ah.. ah.. make it consistent with the shape that 89 is now in. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

G. W. Shea: "Ah.. I.. I certainly would like to help the Lady and I want to help her get it on, but she's attempting to amend an Amendment. And, I think, I tried to do that with Amendment No. 2 and it was ruled out of order. Now, if the Chair wants to change its posture, we can ah.. we can help the Lady."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, you're... You're wrong. I think that ah.. if.. that what could be ah.. done here is ah.. if ah.. this Bill moves onto Third Reading today, then it could be brought back tomorrow ah.. for ah.. purposes of ah.. ah.. considering the ah.. the Lady's proposal. The gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. Shea."

G. W. Shea: "I think, all she has to do is amend it on its face. I don't think she needs leave of the House to do that. If she'd just go up and amend it on its face, I think, it would probably conform."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, you know, we say that these Amendments have to be printed and on the Member's desk ah.. prior to their adoption. And, I don't think that the procedure that you're suggesting is in compliance with the Rule that I..."

G. W. Shea: "If.. If the Speaker can't accommodate her, I will assure the Lady that I will do everything in the world to



get it on in the Senate for her."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "No.. No.. Wait a minute. It's not a question of the Speaker accommodating anybody. Ah.. I'm speaking with respect to the House Rules. And ah.., you can't unilaterally ah.. just stand out there and suggest a procedure which is in direct conflict with the Rules unless you get consent of this Body to do it. The gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. Ewell."

R. W. Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry. Ah.. it appears to me that we're putting ourselves in an absurd posture. Ah.. it appears that, if we're following the present course, that anytime any Bill receives the first Amendment, all other Amendments are going to be out of order simply because they do not conform. That is, if we add one line to the first sentence and every other line is identical but must be relabeled, it would be impossible for any Member ever to amend a Bill once it receives one Amendment. Now, I'm suggesting that, perhaps, this is an intolerable position. And, I was wondering if the Chair or the Body had some idea or methods whereby Members, who have bonified Amendments, can put them in. Now, it's always possible for us to put so many Amendments on a Bill that enables the Sponsor to have enough time to go down and get it run off and have a copy for every Member's desk. That's no problem. We can keep printed additions here in the drawer for that purpose. But, that simply delays the parliamentary procedure. And, I was wondering isn't there some way that we, as Members, could



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

have reasonable opportunities to amend a Bill that gets amended the first time."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Absolutely.. All we have to do is just hold the Bill on Second Reading and ah.. those, who have Amendments that ah.. they want to address, can ah.. have them in the form in which the ah.. Bill, as amended, is."

R. W. Ewell: "The... The one question with that is, if we get one Amendment today and you don't call my Amendment first, it's out of order if somebody else puts another Amendment in."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, that is the process. Ah.. if you have an Amendment and then... and that is adopted, and we don't know at the time whether any Amendment is going to be adopted or not. So, once that's adopted, that does change the format of the Bill. And then, you're simply going to have to, if you've got an Amendment that you want to address, you are going to have to come up here, find out exactly the shape that that is in, and under the Rules, you're going to have to have your Amendment printed up and put out on the desks. Now, the only way that you can accomplish that, as I see it, is to just simply take more time on Second Reading. And ah.. ah.., that ah.. is the one thing that I suggested. Or, you could ah.. bring the Bill back ah.. tomorrow ah.. for the purpose of the Lady's ah.. Amendment. It's a very simple Amendment as a matter of fact. She ah.. does have to change about three lines ah.. so that the Section can be put in there."



R. W. Ewell: "Well, could we get leave of the House to amend it on its face?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ah.. what he's asking for now is unanimous consent ah.. so that the Rule, which requires that the ah.. measure be ah.. printed and on the Members' desks ah.. in the form that it is to be considered, ah.. be waived so that... be suspended so that the Lady may ah.. do it orally. I guess you could then make the changes on.. on the proposal on your desk. The gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe."

B. B. Wolfe: "Ah.. in connection, Mr. Speaker, with your ah.. point on Rule 34, 'Amendments', I think that the Lady has complied with the Rule, at this point, that each of the Members have their respective desks a copy of Amendment No. 9. Now,...."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, that's not so.. No, because ah.. you asked me or somebody over there asked me whether or not Amendment No. 9 was consistent with the shape that 89 ah.. is in. And, my response to that point was that it was well taken, that it was not in that condition. So, what is on the Members' desks is the very point that I ruled on that was not consistent. Ah..and so, it's been ruled out of order as far as consistency is concerned so that the Chamber can not consider it. Now ah....."

B. B. Wolfe: "But, the second point that you made that I want to come to is that ah.. the Lady could amend on the face ah.. ah.. which is just a question of renumbering, as you pointed out, three lines on the face without changing the



concept ah.. of the Amendment nor requiring another written Amendment to amend this. And, I think, that in that context that you could probably rule that that could be done in order to place the.. the Bill with the figures in the proper numerical order."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, that's the question that I put when you ah.. when I recognized you. I asked if there was unanimous consent to suspend the provisions of the Rule so the Lady may do what she's requesting to do. Now, if anybody objects to that, obviously, ah.. there would have to be a suspension of the Rules and ah.. by a Roll Call vote. Alright.. Hearing.... Is there objection? Alright.. Hearing none, then I take it that on Line 3 of your Amendment, you want to change Section VI to Section VIX? You're going to insert it between VIX and X, I take it so that you would be changing ah.., in line 3, Section VI to Section VIX?"

S. Catania (Mrs.): "That's right. And, on Line 4, Section VII to Section VIX, on Line 22, Section...."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Wait.. Wait a minute. And then, on Line 4, Section VII...."

S. Catania (Mrs.): "To Section X..."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "To Section X. And then, on Line 22, VII to X..."

S. Catania (Mrs.): "VII to X and...."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "VIII to XI...."

S. Catania (Mrs.): "VIII to XI. That's right."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Now, those are the changes that are being ah.. put on the original Amendment pursuant to the unanimous consent to suspend the provisions of Rule 34. What purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh, rise?"

W. D. Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I.. I certainly agree that we should ah.. accommodate the Lady from Cook, but I.. I, however, feel badly about not being able to accommodate the gentle.... the gentleman from Lake and anyone else who may have an Amendment to this Bill. And I, therefore, move, Mr. Speaker, that ah.. Senate... or House Bili 89 remain on the order of Second Reading ah.. overnight ah.. so that Members can ah.. draw up Amendments ah.. to fit the Bill as it exists now."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ah.. the gentleman has asked that ah.. the ah.. Bill be left on the order of ah.. Second Reading so other people, who have ah.. Amendments that they want to have considered ah.., should also do that. And, he points out that that was certainly the case with Mr. Deuster. Ah.. and his point, seems to me, to be well taken. Ah.. Alright.. Mr. Shea, what's your point?"

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I think, that Rule 35 clearly states, 'that after Second Reading of a Bill, the Speaker shall order the Bill and Amendments, transcribed, typed in advance to the order of Third Reading. Now, if the gentleman, the distinguished Majority Leader, is asking to suspend that Rule, I'm sure he knows how to do it and it takes 89 votes. Now,



we will do everything we can to accommodate anybody who wants an Amendment. Ah.. as you know, this Legislation is vital, vital and we hope that we can move it out of this House tomorrow, if there are 89 affirmative votes, that it can be read a first time in the Senate tomorrow and, hopefully, passed by February the 18th to insure that there will be no fare increases and that there will be no diminution of service by any of the Mass Transportation Carriers of this State. And, I don't think any...."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Wait... Wait a minute. Is this a point of order?"

G. W. Shea: "I'm trying to raise it. If I'm doing it....."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I.. I.."

G. W. Shea: "Correctly.. correctly, you know, I can correct it."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: " You.. You.. I.. I.. Well, I thought that you ah.. raised it in your first two sentences. But, when you got into all the rest of it, I.. I.. I really lost track. You are... Are you.... Are you.... Are you changing your original ah.. posture there on...."

G. W. Shea: "No, I.. I sometimes take a little longer to explain."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. With regard to your point, if I don't think that ah.. ah.. ah... that it's well taken insofar as the advancement ah.. to the order of Third Reading, ah.. as far as its being self-executing. And, I've ruled that way in the past. Now ah.., the gentleman is not asking for the suspension of that Rule, as you suggest. All he asked



was that he thought that we ought to, in fairness, to, for example, Representative Deuster, ah.. hold ah.. the Bill on Second so he would have an opportunity to have his Amendment restructured for his idea for the Chamber to consider. And, that doesn't seem unreasonable to me. Ah.. we were giving unanimous consent to the ah.. to the Lady to address her situation that way. Ah.. I.. I guess the only other thing we could do is stay here and let them have all of these Amendments that people have, ah.. let them have the time to get them in shape, like Mr. Ewell talked about. And, then we could ah.. vote... And then, we could ah.. vote ah.. on it later this evening...."

G. W. Shea: "Could we dispose of the Lady's Amendment now. And, I think, that Representative Deuster certainly could get his Amendment to conform with '6' in a very few minutes with the adequate Staff of the Majority Leadership. And, it ah.. I've noticed that the Clerk's Office can get Amendments put together in a very short order ah.. as far as the service unit goes. And, I suppose, by the time we get through with the Lady's ah.. Amendment, ah.. Mr. Deuster's Amendment could be in shape."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, was that a suggestive procedure or what?"

G. W. Shea: "I always try to accommodate everybody, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Now, let's see where we are. Ah.. the gentleman's... We're back on the gentleman's point from ah.. Cook, Mr. William Walsh, on his request



concerning the other.. the other Amendments."

W. D. Walsh: "Mr... Mr. Speaker, I.. I think it is unreasonable for the Assistant Minority Leader to expect the Members to draw up Amendments, under the gun or in fifteen minutes notice or coming back in an hour or two hours ah.. when the best efforts of the Minority Leadership Staff ah.. took a week about to get this ah.. Amendment together. I think it's ah.. only reasonable that the Members be given ah.., at least, a day so that they can look at the Bill, as amended, and ah.. can draw Amendments of their own. And I, renew my motion."

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

A. L. Berman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order. I think that the Majority Leader's motion is out of order. I though we were in the process of determining whether the ah.. Lady from Cook had leave to amend.. ah. to waive the Rule and to amend on its face. I did not hear any disposition of that motion. And I, therefore, think that ah.. we did not finish that point of business to proceed any.. anywhere else."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I take it that ah.. the form of his motion is ah.., in essence, to postpone to a ah.. to a time certain which is ah.. not until tomorrow for further consideration of this matter on Second Reading. And ah....."

A. L. Berman: "Ah.. the matter that is in under consideration, Mr. Speaker, is Amendment No. 9. And, I thought we were in



the process of changing that on its face. Now, until that's disposed of, I don't think that anything else, at the moment, is in order."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Well, I.. I think ah.., from a procedural standpoint, the.. the ah.. the House had, by unanimous consent, agreed to suspend... Wait a minute... Agreed to suspend the provisions of Rule 34 ah.. so that the Lady could have ah.. her Amendment ah.. changed on the face and the Speaker and the Lady actually went through that procedure and amended ah.. 9 on its face. And, it was given back to the Clerk ah.. at that time and I was about to recognize the Lady to proceed with explanation of her Number 9 when Mr. Walsh got up and ah.. raised this question which he has now put into ah.. a motion ah.. which the Chair is construing as a motion to postpone further consideration of 89 on Second Reading until tomorrow. And I,.. It would be the Chair's ruling that that motion ah.. does have precedence over the consideration of Amendment No. 9. In other words, I think it's ah.., you know, under Rule 63 on Precedence of Motion, that, if his motion is a motion to postpone further consideration of.. of House Bill 89 on Second Reading, that would have precedence as far as discussion is concerned. Ah.. The gentleman from ah.. Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

W. T. Simms: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, just a suggestion. Perhaps, Representative Garmisa might like to change his posture and agree to have the Bill brought back to Second Reading tomorrow."



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

B. Garmisa: "Ah.. well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I consider the Majority Leader's motion dilatory. And, I move that that motion lie on the table."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Lake, Mr. Murphy, rise?"

W. J. Murphy: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest that there is no motion needed to hold this Bill on Second Reading. It stays on Second Reading until we're through the Amendment stage and we are not through the Amendment stage."

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

W. J. Murphy: "And, consequently, it sits on Second Reading."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, that's correct. The Chair would certainly not want to allow ah.. the House to be foreclosed from the consideration of any and all Amendments ah.. that would be offered on the matter on Second Reading. I think that a reading of Rule 34... 35, 'after the Second Reading of a Bill, the Speaker shall order the Bill and Amendments transcribed, typed and advanced to the order of Third Reading'. And, as long as there are Amendments ah.. outstanding that the Members desire to have addressed by the House, I don't think that the Speaker, under 35, ah.. that you can advance to ah.., that you can advance to Third. I think that the gentleman's point is.. is well taken. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

B. B. Duff: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. I believe



that there's a motion to adjourn to a time certain on the floor ah.. which motion, am I correct in believing, is neither non-debatable nor subject to a motion to table?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "No.. There's no.. No.. No.. Well, wait a minute. There's no.. There's no motion to adjourn ah.. before the House. There is.. There is.. The gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. Walsh, has moved to postponed further consideration of.. of Amendment of ah.. further consideration of House Bill 89 on Second Reading. And ah.., Mr. Murphy, ah.. raises a point of order ah.. that ah.. so long as ah.. there are Amendments awaiting consideration, ah.. that it would not be proper to advance ah.. a Bill to the order of Second Reading. And, the Chair.... And for that reason, Mr. Walsh's motion ah.. would not be necessary as long as there are Amendments ah.. awaiting ah.. to be addressed to the proposals. And, I.. I think that Mr. Murphy's ah.. point is well taken."

B. B. Duff: "Thank you."

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

C. L. Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to debate the point of.. of whether this point was well taken or not, but I'm going to say this, that if we're going to leave a Bill on Second Reading until such time as everyone has an opportunity to draft Amendments that might want to do so, it certainly isn't treating the ah.. Sponsor of any Bill ah.. fair to do this because the Bill could remain on Second Reading, through dilatory tactics, if this is going to be the Rule or the



posture of this House indefinitely because ah.. the Amendments could be drafted and drafted and drafted and drafted. I would suggest to those, who have Amendments, that it's been some two hours since ah.. Representative ah.. Shea's Amendment was adopted. And, it appears that they could of had them in order by this time, if they had so desired. I would also suggest that ah.., in accordance with what we, on this side of the aisle did, at least, when we went to the Legislative Reference Bureau and had our Amendments adopted, ah.. the Reference Bureau does keep a record of the Amendments that are being drafted. And, we prepared ourself to the extent that we had them drafted in the event that other Amendments was a... adopted or whether they weren't. In other words, we had ah.. Amendments that would be germane and with the ah.. and in order as far as the subject matter was concerned. Ah.. the only thing that concerns me... The only thing that concerns me is the fact that if we find ourselves in the posture of what you've just stated, that ah.. Representative Murphy's point of order is well taken, that we could have a Bill and that it could be left on the order of Second Reading for an indefinite amount of time while Amendments, at the request of various Members of the Legislature who are going some place and having Amendments adopted. Ah.. this does deeply concern me. I.. I would think that the one Amendment that the Sponsor of the Bill ah.. suggested ah.. he had no objections to at all, and that was Representative Catania's Amendment. It appears to me



that ah.. there could be a more feasible way in having that brought about ah.. rather than just leaving the Bill on Second Reading indefinitely until any and all Amendments was heard that any Member might want to have."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ah.. the gentleman from Lake, Mr. Murphy."

W. J. Murphy: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the distinguished Minority Leader ah.. didn't really mean what he stated when he said that ah.. a Sponsor would have to hold his Bill while it's amended, amended and amended. We certainly, as Members, have a right to amend a Bill as many times as we want to amend a Bill. But now, the purpose of this right now is not delaying tactics. We are attempting to delay it. If the Sponsor, ah.. Representative Garmisa, ah.. wants to change his position on 'no' and say that we can bring the Bill back to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment tomorrow, why, I think, it would solve the problem right now."

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

C. L. Choate: "Well, if what the Minority Whip ah.. tells me is true, it appears to me that the Sponsor of the Bill ah.. would certainly agree to bring it back for the purposes of that one Amendment. But, what I was talking about is just opening the door and leaving the Bill on Second Reading indefinitely until anyone had an opportunity to, on second or third guess or fourth guess, say, 'Hey! Wait a minute. I've got an Amendment'."



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

D. E. Deuster: "Ah.. Mr... Mr. Speaker, ah.. I have a suggestion as to procedure that might be reasonable. Actually, we have..."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, now... Wait a minute. Ah.. we're in a situation where I have ruled on Mr. Murphy's ah.. point of order. But, that still leaves Mr. Walsh's motion ah.. before the Body. And ah..., Mr. Murphy suggested that Mr. Walsh's ah.. motion, it did not seem to him, would be necessary. Ah.. I concurred in that but that doesn't mean that the motion ah... ah.. hasn't been heard. So, ah.. Mr. Walsh is entitled to proceed with his motion or to seek ah.. leave to withdraw. Now, I think, we ought to dispose of.. of that piece of business which is before the House right now before we move to what your suggestion might be. Ah.. the gentleman from Cook, ah.. Mr....."

D. E. Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree absolutely with the gentleman from Lake, Representative Murphy. If the Sponsor of the Bill would agree to bring it back for the purposes of an Amendment, why, it would ah.. certainly be alright with me to advance it. However, the Minority Leader indicated that he was willing to bring it back for the purposes of one Amendment. And, that really isn't fair. Now, what we have is a brand-new Bill. Amendment No. 6 makes this a new and different Bill. It is in the words of ah.. the gentleman on the other side, 'a bold new concept'. Now, I think, if we're going to look into this bold new concept, the Mem-



bers ought to have an opportunity and not just one Member or two Members, but all Members have an opportunity to look at the Bill and amend, if they wish, in the form that the Bill is in now and not run into the objections that their Bill is not consistent with the Bill, as amended. And so, Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion to ah.. postpone consideration of this Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. Shea, For what purpose do you rise?"

G. W. Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I.. I know that Representative Walsh and I and other Members hope to get this Bill in the posture....."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "For what purpose did you rise?"

G. W. Shea: "I.. I'm trying to explain something. And, I may be out of order and I.. I...."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I mean, are you rising for... Are you addressing yourself to Mr. Walsh's motion or are you arising on a point of order. That's the only. Because there are two gentleman over here on your side that have been trying to get me on points of order."

G. W. Shea: "Well, I.. I..!"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "I'm recognizing you first because you're the Assistant Minority Leader. Now, are you on the motion or are you on the point of order?"

G. W. Shea: "I guess I'm on the motion, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright then, Mr. Matijevich, were you rising to a point of order? Alright.. The gentleman from



Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

J. S. Matijevich: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry."

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

J. S. Matijevich: "On your interpretation of ah.. Representative Murphy's ah.. comment, ah.. according to the Rules, evidently, we can keep something on Second Reading if any Member has an Amendment. And, my inquiry is this. Because I'm interested, as all of us are, in a smooth operation of the House. I've always meant... ah.. or been led to believe that that means that an Amendments has got to be at the Clerk's table or the Speaker's table ah.. to be offered. But, I think, if your interpretation is that if any Member has further Amendments. And, someone says, 'yes, I have, but they're not ready'. That means that we can keep a Bill on Second Reading. If that's true, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Rules Committee would meet ah.. to change the Rules ah.. so that they really carry out our intent, that when there are no Amendments on the table, that we proceed to Third Reading. Ah.. and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Rules Committee also meet to try to iron out this difficulty that we have in amending Bills on Second Reading. We've got to remember that Art Simmons isn't here any more and Art Simmons caught these defects on Third Reading. Now, I didn't like to raise ah.. that point with Representative Catania but the Bill wouldn't of been in proper form on Third Reading. So, I think, the Rules Committee has got to meet to find out what the answers are so that we have a smooth



operation of the House. But, I'm not sure if you got my inquiry. And, that is, what is this interpretation going to do in future Bills in holding them ah.. for too long a period of time?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, on the specific question that's before the House right now, ah.. that Mr. Murphy addressed himself to, there are, in fact, other Amendments ah.. ah.. on the desk ah.. " For example, Mr. Deuster's was ruled out of order because ah.. it was inconsistent with ah.. Amendment No. 6. And so ah.., for that reason, he could not have the Body consider his proposal. And, that's... That's where we started into the situation with Mrs. Catania. Mr. Deuster felt, 'Well, if we were going to do this for Mrs. Catania, shouldn't he have an opportunity to renumber or restructure his Amendment so, at least, the House would have an opportunity to vote it up or down'. And, that did seem to me to be ah.. consistent with what the House did with regard to Mrs. Catania's request. Ah.. I don't know... Are there any other Amendments besides '9'? Yeah.. Well,... Well, there is a '10' now we understand. And so, there are Amendments ah.. still before the Body on this subject. And, obviously, I think, 35 clearly provides that you.. you cannot advance the Bill to Third Reading unless all Amendments, that are on the Clerk's desk, have been considered by the Body. The gentleman from ah.. Now, are you gentleman raising... rising on points of order? Alright.. Mr... Mr. Garmisa, are you? On.. On a point of order?"



B. Garmisa: "Well, I.. I want to address myself to the question right now, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "On a point of order? Or, Mr. Walsh's motion?"

B. Garmisa; "Yeah.."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "To postpone? Okay.. Mr. Shea is before you on that matter. And, Mr. Wolf... Mr. Wolf,, ah.. are you on a point of order?"

J. J. Wolf: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A parliamentary inquiry and a point of order at the same time. Rule 34 and Rule 35, I believe, have to be read together. And, my point is that in Rule 35, ah.. it states that, 'after the reading'.. 'after the Second Reading of a Bill, the Speaker shall order the Bill and Amendments transcribed, typed and advanced to the order of Third Reading'. Now, that's the only reference to the procedure. After you call a Bill for Second Reading, which is the Amendment Stage, under 34, and that tells you how to put the Amendments on. And, 35 states that, 'after the Second Reading of a Bill, the Speaker shall do this'. In other words, move the Bill ahead to Third Reading. Now, my ah.. point of order is, are... do we have to suspend Rule 35 in order to accomplish what the motion of the Majority Leader wants to do? And, that's to postpone the consideration of the ah.. continuation of the Amendments under the ah... since the Bill has been read a Second time."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "No. The answer to your parliamentary inquiry is 'no'. You see, we're still on Second Reading."



And, if your... if your interpretation would as restrictive as you'd want to make it, then as soon as the Clerk reads ah.. the Bill ah.. a second time, ah.. when we go to that order, he reads it a second time, we'd be precluded from any action at all."

J. J. Wolf: "May I just state what my interpretation of 35 and 36. The Rules were made to facilitate the Legislative process. And, when a Bill is on ah.. Second Reading, First Legislative Day, the Membership is alerted that that Bill is going onto Second Reading for the Amendment Stage. And, you'd better have your Amendments ready because now the Speaker has to go down the list, call the Bills for Second Reading in a certain numerical order. Now, when the Speaker does that and there are Amendments on the Speaker's desk, they're considered by this Assembly. Now, what has happened today will happen again ah.. on other Bills. And, that is, when an Amendment is adopted by this Body, which changes the context of the pages and the numbers, etc., and other Amendments then on the desk of the Speaker for adoption do not fit in with this first Amendment. Is the posture of this House going to be, and I think, we need a Rule change, if it is, to then either hold the Bill or to let the Bill go to Third Reading and bring it back to Second so that those Members, who have filed Amendments, can place those Amendments in a proper form for adoption or rejection consistent with the Amendment that was adopted? I think that is what happened this morning or this afternoon and it will continue to



happen. And, we should have a clarification on that order of business."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, the answer to that inquiry is, 'yes'. Now, let's see, we're back on the main motion which is Mr. Walsh's. And, Mr. Shea was going to address himself to that and then Mr. Garmisa."

G. W. Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I maybe have been misinformed or misunderstanding where we are. But, I think, everybody in this House knows full well that this aid has to be gotten to the C.T.A. by February the 18th. In order to facilitate that, it puts in the posture that, hopefully, we could vote on this Bill tomorrow and get it over to the Senate. And, in three days of hearings over there, ah.. they could put us in a position to have passed some help for Mass Transportation. Now, I know full well that the Majority Leader is not attempting to delay this ah.. except in good faith: But, I would call it to attention of the posture that we will be put in if this Bill is not on Third Reading tomorrow. And, I would respectfully ask him how we might solve that problem."

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

W. D. Walsh: "Ah.. would you repeat your question, please?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Would the gentleman repeat his question?"

G. W. Shea: "Ah.. Mr. Majority Leader, Bill, my problem is that I thought that we were going to try to be in the position to vote House Bill 89 up or down out of this Chamber by tomorrow, hopefully, to get it over to the Senate where it could, in



the next few days, receive extensive hearings, passed, we hope, in the form it leaves what we've decided in this Body so that we could meet the February 18th deadline. Now, you came to me last week and asked me about holding a Bill. And, I sat down with you and certainly have tried to accommodate you in every fashion that I can. I would ask you, Bill, if you would not try to accommodate me, I guess."

W. D. Walsh: "Well, let me... let me say this, that the ah.. February 18th deadline didn't seem to make very much difference to very many people over there when we discussed Amendment No. 2. You promptly shot that down. Now, I submit to you that there are faults with this Bill that have not been corrected or have not attempted to be corrected ah.. with any of the Amendments that have been offered so far. The problem, for example, with Suburban Mass Transit Rail facilities, as, I think, you know and almost everyone knows, who is at all familiar with this, there is no way that they can qualify for these grants because there's no way that they can ah.. come up with matching revenue. Now, ah.. I will not, I refuse absolutely to just forget that, and with a gun at my head, ah.. put this on Third Reading and pass it out tomorrow even though I don't like it. I think it's fiscally irresponsible. It's defective and it should be postponed. And, if it requires that we come back here on Friday or Saturday or Sunday or even do it next week, that's what we ought to do in order to have a good Bill."

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



B. Garmisa: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I can appreciate what you and what Representative Murphy are trying to do here. In order to facilitate the movement and for the orderly passage.. or the orderly working of this House, I would certainly agree to this Bill coming back to Second Reading tomorrow for these two Amendments. Ah.. and ah.., Mr. Speaker, if there are any further Amendments to be offered, I would like to have them heard today and dispose of the Amendments that are yet to be offered. And, tomorrow, I would have no objection to have Mr. Deuster's and Mrs. Catania's Amendments offered. I will certainly agree then to bring it back to Second Reading for the purposes of those two Amendments and those two only, Mr. Speaker."

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

W. D. Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I.. I have the same objection to the gentleman's ah.. willingness to withdraw it for two as I had for one. Everyone is entitled to offer Amendments on Second Reading. And, I don't why we should single out two Members and permit them to offer Amendments but nobody else. And so, I object to that."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis. Alright.. Mr. Garmisa has moved to table. Ah.. Mr. Walsh's motion is not... Now, is that where we are? Yes.. Mr. Garmisa says, 'yes'."

B. Garmisa: "That is my motion."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "That's what I thought. Alright.. Now,..."



For what purpose does the gentleman from Lake, Mr. Murphy, rise?"

W. J. Murphy: "Well, I think, we're making much, Mr. Speaker, out of nothing. The fact remains that ah.. Representative Walsh's statement is absolutely correct, if a Bill comes back to Second Reading, anybody, who has an Amendment has the right to offer it. However, we know of no Amendments. He is stating a point that is a factual point. Anybody, who has an Amendment, would have the right to offer it. But, we don't know of anybody that has an Amendment. This is not a trick. This is not a delaying tactic. He is just stating a fact. And, that is, when it comes back to Second Reading, if there's any other Amendments, they can be offered. But, we know of no other Amendments at this time. So, we're.. I mean if the Sponsor of the Bill wants to ah.. say it can come back, then get leave for it to come back, ah.. I don't think he's even taking a chance."

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

B. Garmisa: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the.. I did express my willingness to bring it back to Second Reading tomorrow for these two Amendments. But, I am fearful that, in the event we're to consider further Amendments tomorrow, that we would be opening up a can of worms, that we could go on indefinitely in the Amendment Stage. Everybody in this House could then bring up an Amendment. And, I further... I am willing to sit here to-night, all night long, and take whatever Amendments that you



have prepared today. This Bill is on Second Reading today. The Amendments should have been prepared today. These two, that were not in proper order, I am willing to consider tomorrow. But, I hesitate, Mr. Speaker, to open up the flood gates so that more than these two Amendments could be considered tomorrow. And, if it were other than that, I would persist with my motion to table ah.. Representative Walsh's motion."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I.. I think that ah.. Mr. Walsh's point is well taken in that there can not be a restricted or limited bringing back of ah.. Bill from Third Reading to the order of Second Reading. Ah.. so, there's nothing in the Rules that ah.., that I'm aware of, that would permit that. So, if it goes ah.. If the Bills goes to Third ah.. and ah.. it's brought back tomorrow, ah.. I think, that any Amendments that were brought back to the order of Second Reading... any Amendments that were offered at that time, would have to be considered. The gentleman from ah.. ah.. Cook, Mr. Duff, for what purpose do you rise?"

B. B. Duff: "Ah.. point of order, Mr. Speaker. Ah.. we have a motion to table on the floor. And, as I understand it, that's not debatable. And ah.., I would like to ah.. ask, if there are no other points of order of parliamentary motion, could I have that recall? And then, I would like, because we've discussed this at great length, to ah.. then ask for recognition from the Chair so that I can move the previous question on Representative Walsh's motion if, in fact, it is not tabled."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well ah.., Mr. Garmisa's motion to table ah.. was put in a holding pattern while he saw whether or not he could ah.. work out ah.. a situation that would permit a recall for the limited purpose of two Amendments. And ah.., there's no way ah.. that I see it that it could be brought back on ah.. a limited situation. If it's back on Second, any Amendments that are on the Clerk's desk and on the Members desks would ah.. would have to be considered at that time. So, I guess we're.. we're back on Mr. Garmisa's motion to table. And, that's not debatable. For what purpose do you rise, Mr. Lechowicz,... Mr. Shea, for what purpose do you rise?"

G. W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to refresh my memory. I think it was House Bill 1575 of Mr. Duff's that was advanced to the order of Third Reading and then brought back for the purposes, to Second Reading. And, I had some Amendments on the desk. And, at that time, you ruled that, although it was back on Second Reading, that it wasn't back for the purposes of my Amendments but for another purpose. And, I think, that the Speaker has ruled in a restrictive fashion before. And, I would ask that, perhaps, you could rule in that restrictive fashion again, keeping your posture the same and could accommodate this situation so we could get on with the business of this House."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I can't keep my posture the same, as you indicate what ah.. you did ah.. about my previous ruling and... and be consistent with the ah.. position that I've



taken with regard to the point made by Mr. Walsh and ah.. Mr. Murphy. Ah.. what purpose does Mr. Murphy rise?"

W. J. Murphy: "Couldn't the motion be made tomorrow that ah.. the Bill be taken back to the order of Second Reading for the purposes of adopting two Amendments? And, if there's anyone else that wants to amend that motion, you would know what you're voting on before you voted, before you gave leave. Otherwise, they can say to take it back to Second Reading for the purpose of two Amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, we're on, let's see, the gentleman's motion to table, which he ah.. No.. He's still got it in holding? Well, Mr. Murphy, though, he's got a motion ah.. that he wants to ah.. restrict ah.. bringing the Bill back tomorrow ah.. to ah.. two Amendments whether that motion is in order. And, it would be the Chair's ruling that there would have to be a suspension of Rule 34, which is the Amendment Section, which clearly provides that when Bills are on the order of Second Reading, ah.. Amendments may be offered. So that, it seems to me, would have to be ah.. a two-pronged approach, one would be the suspension of the Amendment, the other would be ah.. a passage of his motion. But now, what is Mr. ah... Are you rising on a point of order? Because Mr. Wolfe wants to ah.. Well, Mr. Wolfe has got a point of order, Mr. B. B. Wolfe. Yeah..."

B. B. Wolfe: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, we're all ah... we're all confronted with the new Rules and many of us are really not ah.. fully up on some of the changes that were made in the



recent ah.. new order. Ah.. 37(a), 'when ah.. Bills are on order of Second Reading, etc., etc., the Speaker shall call andsoforth the point'. And then, we go on to 37(b) which says, 'the order of business on Second Reading, andsoforth, the Sponsor may request the consideration of the Bill or the Resolution be deferred'. Because, this is a special kind of action under that Rule which penalizes you somewhat. And, it doesn't say the Sponsor or Member may request that consideration of Second Reading be deferred. I'd like your ah.. parliamentarian and yourself to ah.. take a look at that and give the Members of the House your interpretation of that Rule."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I ah.., I think, what that addresses itself to is when.. when we're coming down ah.. the numerical call and ah.. the Sponsor stands up and asks that consideration of that motor... of that matter be postponed or taken out of the record. Now, Mr. Garmisa ah.. has.. has not done that. I mean, that's what that particular Rule refers to. We're on our automatic call, sponsor doesn't want his matter heard at that time, so there's a withdrawal ah.. by him when the matter is called."

B. B. Wolfe: "Well, the ah.. I.. I think the Rule goes further than that. And, it says that, 'the consideration, which is the effect of the Majority Leader's motion, is to postpone consideration on Second Reading of this House Bill 89 for some purpose'. The purpose doesn't make any difference, but the ah...."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, there's.. Well,...."

B. B. Wolfe: "The major thrust of the motion is to postpone consideration which this Rule does not give a Member the right to do with respect to this particular or any House..."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "No. I don't agree with you on that. The Chair's ruling would be that that particular Rule ah.. refers to the Member's right to not have his ah.. Bill heard at the time that it is called by the Clerk. Ah.. he just asks that it be taken out of the record. Ah.. that's what... We've always given the Sponsors the right, under our Rules, ah.. to not be forced to have their proposal heard at a certain time if they want to take it out of the record. That... That's what that is really for. Now ah.., Mr. Walsh's motion ah.. is in order as is Mr. Garmisa's motion to table ah.. his motion and ah.., I guess, we're ready to proceed on the vote on Mr. Garmisa's motion to table. No.. Mr. Garmisa? Garmisa..."

B. Garmisa: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, ah.. would this be in order if I were to ask unanimous consent today to have this Bill brought back tomorrow ah.. and to waive the appropriate Rules so that this Bill could be brought back tomorrow to consider these two Amendments only?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, this is back where we were on ah.. Mr. Murphy's ah.. proposal ah.. of a motion. And, I ah.. And, I stated that it would be the Chair's ruling that you would have to suspend the provisions of ah.. of Rule ah.. 34 ah.. and, of course, that.. that takes 89 affirmative



votes unless you try to get it by unanimous consent. And, then I.. I.. And then, I would.. I would ah.."

B. B. Wolfe: "And then, Mr. Chairman?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "I think you would... Well, the gentleman ah.. You can ah.. attempt to get ah.. unanimous consent on.. on 34 ah.. and so then to attempt to restrict what can be considered on Second.. on Second Reading tomorrow ah.. when it's brought back. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. J. J. Wolf,, for what purpose do you rise?"

J. J. Wolf: "Well, Mr. Chairman, looking at Amendment No. 9, it deals with discrimination. It would seem to me ah.. that it places a condition, if we brought this Bill back tomorrow and only allowed one or two Members to offer Amendments to the exclusion of all others, that would, in itself, be discriminatory. And, I think, we either have to do it one way or another and get this show on the road."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Ah.., let's see, you asked for unanimous consent or are you getting ready to?"

B. Garmisa: "I.. I did ask, but, I believe, I heard some objection."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Oh!.. Alright.."

B. Garmisa: "Were there?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Apparently, there is objection to unanimous consent. The gentleman asked for unanimous consent to bring this matter ah.. or to suspend the provisions of Rule 34 so that ah.. we could have a restrictive bringing back of 89 tomorrow from Third Reading to Second Reading.



Now, Oh! Yeah.. Objection has been registered. Now, we're back on the ah.. Well, we're back on your motion to table now, his motion to postpone?"

B. Garmisa: "Alright.. Let's have ah.. a vote on that then."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "On your motion to table?"

B. Garmisa: "That's correct."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Now, so that the House understands where we are. The question is on the gentleman from Lake's motion to table, the gentleman from ah.. Cook's motion to postpone ah.. further consideration of House Bill 89 until tomorrow on Second, postpone further consideration on Second Reading until tomorrow. All those in favor say 'aye', ah.. opposed say 'no'. Well, the 'no's' have it. Alright.. There.. There are six people over there that are requesting a Roll Call vote. So, all those in favor will of.. of the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Garmisa's motion to table will vote 'aye' and those opposed will vote 'no'. Alright.. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Duff.. 'no'. On this question, there are 81 'Ayes' and 61 'Nays' and the gentleman's motion to table and the gentleman's motion to postpone prevails. Now,... Well now, wait a minute. We'd better see where we are. We're back... No, we're back on the ah.. ah.. consideration of Amendment No. 9. Now ah.., do you want to be recognized for that, Mr. Davis? Well, the Lady hasn't had a chance to explain it yet."

C. A. Davis: "The Lady has never had a chance. She had unanimous consent and that's a hard thing to get in this House."



She had unanimous consent from all of the Membership, even the distinguished Majority Leader added his voice to it. And, I think, she should be permitted to proceed."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Oh! That.. That.. That's.. There's no question about that. Unanimous consent with respect to the ah.. amending on the face of her Number 9 to bring it into conformity with Amendment No. 6. And then, there were motion put that were proper and did have precedence and we've taken the time to ah.. discuss those ah.. and now we are back to the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania, on her motion Number 9.. on her Amendment No. 9."

S. Catania (Mrs.): "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'm introducing this Amendment because I feel that, if we are going to appropriate funds for the use of Mass Transportation Carriers, these are going to be public funds and I feel that we must insure that these Carriers will be responsive, indeed, accountable to the public from whom they are receiving this money. In order to insure a degree of accountability, I propose that we require a program of affirmative action to be submitted for each of these Carriers. I attended the Transportation Committee Meetings and it was rather clear, in those Meetings, that the C.T.A. Board does not now have a particularly effective affirmative action program although they seem to be agreeable to the Transportation Committee Members suggestions that they have such strong programs. Now, I would feel that the C.T.A. is not really exceptional in this. I would think that all Mass Transportation Carriers



should be asked to comply with an affirmative action program so that, for instance, they would not find themselves in the position in which the Greyhound Bus Company found itself two weeks ago when it was found that they had been discriminating on the basis of age. Therefore, I'm asking that you approve this Amendment so that we insure that the Agencies, that are receiving the public funds, are responsive and accountable to the public whose money they are using."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion on the ah.. Lady's ah.. motion. The gentleman from ah.. Lake, Mr. Deuster."

D. E. Deuster: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Amendment No. 9. And, I want to inform ah.. the Members that during the time the Transportation Committee ah.. considered ah.. this Bill, I asked one of the Members of the Chicago Transit Authority Board whether there was any problem at all in employing ah.. women. And ah.., in particular, I ah.. asked Mr. Lawrence Suzzi ah.. if there was any danger involved in having Lady Bus Drivers. And ah.., he said, 'absolutely not'. And ah.., they were developing new safety technics in busses which would make this perfectly possible. And ah.., he was not aware of any policy that discriminated against ah.. ah.. anybody and he was perfectly willing, as I understood it, ah.. to have something like this ah.. adopted in that this is perfectly consistent with what, I understood ah.. his understanding of what the policy was. So, with that statement, I support very strongly the adoption of



Amendment No. 9."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The ah.. gentleman from ah.. McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

T. J. Hanahan: "Will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield for a question, Mr. Speaker?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "She.. Will the Lady yield? Alright.. She indicates she will."

T. J. Hanahan: "Representative Catania, is the ah.. Chicago Transit Authority or any Mass Transit Carrier in Illinois exempted from the 'Fair Employment Practices Act'?"

S. Catania (Mrs.): "I don't believe that they are. However, I would like to take this approach, which is rather direct, and insure that they are complying with an affirmative action program."

T. J. Hanahan: "Alright.. Second question, is the Chicago Transit Authority or any other ah.. Transit Carrier exempt from the 'Federal Fair Employment Practices Act'?"

S. Catania (Mrs.): "Again, no. But, it was brought out quite clearly in the questioning by the Transportation Committee Members that, although these Carriers do come under those jurisdictions, they are not in practice meeting the requirements and, perhaps, other Transportation Committee Members would want to speak to that point."

T. J. Hanahan: "Representative Catania, is the Chicago Transit Authority or any other Carrier, public Mass Carrier, exempted from the 'E.O.P. Act', the 'Equal Employment Agencies Act'?"

S. Catania (Mrs.): "I think not."



T. J. Hanahan: "Then, why are you so paranoid to this one area of.. of trying to add language to a Bill that I even doubt if it pertains to the question that were under, when you've got Federal Acts and State Acts doing exactly.. and.. and Commissions that we pay a heck of a lot of taxpayers money to enforce? We.. We spend hundred of thousands of dollars of the taxpayer's money in the area of no discrimination and.. and F.E.P.C. and E.O.P. and.. and all of the other Federal and State Agencies. We are you so paranoid to ask for us to once again add another bunch of sentences that are meaningless if they are not complying with the other Acts?"

S. Catania (Mrs.): "Thank you for asking that question. I am very much against layering Government provision over Government provision over Government provision. However, I have a claim now filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. I filed it January 14, 1971 and they have yet to begin their investigation. I'm taking this step simply to insure that we will, and yet another front, attempt to get affirmative action on, I think, that it is extremely important to those people of this State, who are being discriminated against now unfairly because they are, perhaps, fifty, fifty-five or sixty years old or because they happen to have black skin or because of ah.. any other of these characteristics that are listed in this Amendment."

T. J. Hanahan: "Well, Representative, the question that I've then, as long as we have all sorts of Federal Acts, we have all sorts of State Acts pertaining to outlaw and discrimina-



tion based on race, religion or sex or age, color or national origin, what has happened that ah.. would make you want to come in and once again add some more languages? It does, in fact, the C.T.A. now practice discrimination in sex, color, or religion or origin that you want to offer this Amendment?"

S. Catania (Mrs.): "My impression, as I listened to the testimony given before the Transportation Committee last week, is that there are some apparently discriminatory practices now in the C.T.A. and I would want to insure that this does not continue. And also that other Mass Transportation Carriers are forewarned."

T. J. Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, speaking on the Amendment, I'll vote for the Amendment. I just hate to see mass caesura and paranoia take over this House in the area of whether or not we're discriminating on religion, sex, age, race, color or national origin. I think it's almost stupidity, sheer stupidity that we act just because of the hysteria of a bunch of people who are concerned about something that I'm concerned about too. And, that's discrimination in any form. But, to add to every Bill and add to every Legislative Act that we're going to undertake this Session some form of anti-discriminatory ah.. Amendment, I think, is going to take up a lot of time in this House. And, I just think it's ah.. a moot question today."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, a point of order."

J. S. Matijevich: "Ah.. Yes, Mr. Speaker. And, Representative,



I hate to do this to you. But, I raise this point of order, that, I believe, under the Constitution, Section VIII, Article IV, ah.. 8(c), 'The Passage of Bills', ah.. that this is an Appropriation Bill. And, this Amendment offers substantive language which, I think, is, contrary to our Constitution. So, I raise that point of order that this Amendment is defective. And, I think, if we'll look at Amendment No. 10, that's going to be offered, I'm going to raise that same ah.. point on that Amendment too. And, I think, this type of Legislation has got to be done in some other way than an Appropriation Bill."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "In answer to your point of order, it appears that this ah.. Amendment ah.. is confined to the subject matter of the House Bill 89. And ah.., that it is germane ah.. to that situation and it does not violate the Constitution." Mr. Matijevich."

J. S. Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, could you then answer this? I read from the Constitution, Section 8(c), and this is it, plain and simple. 'Appropriation Bills shall be limited to the subject of Appropriations'. Now, I think, you're putting this Bill in jeopardy ah.. as far as constitutionality, if you put into it substantive matters that aren't the subject of appropriations. And, I raise that point to protect the constitutionality of this Legislation."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "It is the understanding of the temporary Speaker up here that the Speaker of this House has already ruled previously today that Amendments offered to this House



have been proper in line of the interpretation of the Constitution. It would appear to the Chair that this proposed Amendment is in the same category. The gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

W. L. Kempiners: "Will the Lady yield to a question?"

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "She indicates she will. Proceed."

W. L. Kempiners: "Okay.. Now, the first Paragraph, Section X, indicates that ah.. 'no Transportation Carrier is to receive these funds unless an Affirmative Action Program shall be filed'. Now, before I ask this question, I want to assure you that I am in sympathy with what you are trying to do, but I'm concerned about a Bill which does provide money for some Downstate Mass Transit Districts, ah.. that these Districts may not be able to qualify. Could you please ah.. spell out what an Affirmative Action Program is, you know, just what all is included? And, how much personnel will it take to file such a program?"

S. Catania (Mrs.): "Well, actually, I would think that it would require very few people to really file the report as long as the particular Carrier in question is conducting itself as it should. In other words, not discriminating in any of these areas. Then all they would have to do is report that they are not doing that ah.. and then there would be no problem. The problem arises in a large Carrier that has been routinely engaging in some discriminatory practices. And then, it has a lot of situations that it has to remedy."

W. L. Kempiners: "And then, if I understand you correctly, you're



saying that a Downstate Bus Company, the President of the Company may just put on file a letter stating that they are not discriminating in their hiring practices. Is that correct?"

S. Catania (Mrs.): "Actually, it's not spelled out here and it would be left up to the Secretary of Transportation ah.. to compile these reports and give them to the General Assembly. And, it's really not a rigid kind of a stipulation."

W. L. Kempiners: "Okay.. Then, it is... Is it your intent that this could be done in a letter stating that discrimination is not ah.. evident, would be satisfactory?"

S. Catania (Mrs.): "I would think that Downstate Agencies, with a small Staff, would not find themselves greatly inconvenienced by this."

W. L. Kempiners: "Okay.. Thank you.."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holloway."

R. H. Holloway: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in support of this Amendment 9. The distinguished Member, from the rear of the House, I don't know his name nor do I know the District that he represents, ah.. asked a series of questions relative to ah.. whether or not the C.T.A. and other ah.. public utilities were exempt from F.E.P.C., this, that and the other. And I suggest to that ah.. distinguished Member that these Laws are not self-executing. And, I think, what Mrs. Catania is attempting to do here is to make a provision that is self-executing within House Bill 89 itself. And, I think, that the question of public monies being used



to support Mass Transportation most assuredly should carry with it the endorsement of the House, that all employment opportunities be fair and equal. And, for that reason, I urge the House to support Amendment 9."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Is there further discussion? Does the gentleman ah.. Or, does the Lady ah.., Mrs. Catania, care to close? on this Amendment?"

S. Catania (Mrs.): "I'd like to thank Representative Hanahan for his vote. And ah.., I would like to reiterate my point that, I think, that, if we are going to give public monies to Mass Transportation Carriers, we must demand public accountability."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Alright.. The question is, 'shall the House adopt Amendment No. 9 to House Bill 89?'. You want a voice or a Roll Call? All 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. 10, Lundy, amend House Bill 89, as amended, by inserting a new Section to read as follows: andsoforth."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Ah.. the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy, is recognized."

J. R. Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, may I start out by asking leave of the House, in light of the adoption of...."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Just.. Just ah.. Just a moment. The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, for what purpose do you



rise, Sir?"

J. S. Matijevich: "A point of order. I know how'd you rule on one of them, but a point of rule... order. Ah.. I'm going to ask your ruling that this Amendment, in my opinion, is defective on two counts. Ah.. one, because we have passed Amendment No. 6. I think that the Amendment now is not in proper form. Two, I believe, and I know you'll rule against me, that this Amendment does not meet the Constitutional requirement, 'that Appropriation Bills shall be limited to the subject of appropriations'. And, I might say, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that this early in the Session, that we would live up to that Constitutional ah.. requirement. Ah.. I realize that there are Severability Clauses, but I don't think that we are responsible when we violate the Constitution. So, I would ask your ruling on these two points, Mr. Speaker."

J. R. Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, if I may be heard briefly in response to ah.. my Colleague from Lake County?"

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Ah.. proceed, Mr. Lundy."

J. R. Lundy: "With respect to the first objection, I believe, ah.. that that is easily remedied in a manner similar to the objection to ah.. Representative Catania's Amendment. And, I begun to ask leave of the House ah.. to make the changes in Section numbers required in order to conform the Amendment to the ah.. new form of Amendment No. 6. Ah.. that is, Amendment No. 6, as amended, by Amendment No. 9. As to the ah.. second objection, the question of legislating on an Appropriation Bill...."



Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Ah.. just a moment, Mr. Lundy. Ah.. you desire to make a correction then in the Amendment as it's filed up here, which is just a minor correction, to conform it to Amendment No. 6? Is that correct?"

J. R. Lundy: "To.. To conform it ah.. to the adoption of Amendment No. 9, Mr. Speaker."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Ah.. can you do that?"

J. R. Lundy: "Yes, I.. I can..."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "When you're through... When you're through, would you come up to the Clerk's desk? And, would the Clerk do that? You can go ahead on the other point, if you'd like first."

J. R. Lundy: "Ah.. Ah.. Well, I can bring it to the Clerk now. As a matter of fact, I've made the change if you want me to take it to the desk now, I will do that."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Please, do.."

J. R. Lundy: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for the information of the Members who are ah.. trying to keep their Amendments corrected, let me describe the changes that I've just made to the Clerk. On Page 1, Line 4, changed Section IX to read Section X. And, on Page 3, Line 4 of the Amendment, change that entire line to read by renumbering Sections X and XI as XI and XII respectively. Yes, I'll repeat that again. The last line, fourth line of Page 3, should now read by renumbering Section X and XI as XI and XII respectively. Those.. Those are the only minor changes."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Alright.. Mr. Lundy, did you care to



respond to ah.. of what Representative.... the question that Representative Matijevich raised?"

J. R. Lundy: "Ah.. yes. With respect to the question of Legislating on an Appropriation Bill, I am in a somewhat peculiar position, because earlier in this debate, I objected to the consideration of Amendment No. 2 on the grounds that it was Legislating on an Appropriation Bill. Ah.. I lost that question. The Chair ruled against me. And, as a result, we proceeded to, ah.. in my opinion, ah.. Legislate substantively in what is sensibly in an Appropriations Bill. Now ah.., I find myself hardput to disagree with my Colleague from Lake County. And, on the other hand, I would expect that the Chair would rule consistently and fairly in this matter ah.. with in the way in which it ruled on.. on Amendment No. 2."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Ah.. just a moment ah.. before a decision is made on this and then you can make a comment. Would you like to make a comment now? Proceed. The gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

J. S. Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before you make your final decision, even though I disagreed with the Speaker of the House when he made the ah.. decision that he did on Amendment No. 2. In the last Session of the General Assembly, we were very careful in interpreting the new Constitution and be explicitly sure that a Bill that contained an Appropriation does not also contain the substance of the matter. And, for this reason, when these Bills were introduced in the



General Assembly, especially the C.T.A. Bills, there was House Bill 88 and House Bill 89. And, I would hope that with the ruling of the Chair would follow the Constitution whether it may hurt us presently on this Amendment. But, I still think that we should abide by the Constitution and have Appropriation Bills kept in that vein. And, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that you would rule accordingly."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. The Chair understands that questions have been raised concerning whether or not ah.. Amendment No. 10 ah.. is confined to the ah.. subject of the Bill. On that ah.. ah.. question, the Chair would rule ah.. that while ah.. ah.. it, perhaps, strains the question of confinement, I think, it touches on it sufficiently so that ah.. it would ah.. be in order for consideration. And, that point would not be well taken. On the second point, which I understand has been raised, ah.. concerning whether or not this Amendment would be in violation of ah.. the Constitutional prohibition that ah.., 'An Appropriation Bill shall be limited to the subject of Appropriation'. It would be the Chair's ah.. feeling that on that point that it would be well taken. But, I don't think that's a point of order ah.. for the Chair to really decide on or not to decide on, ah.. but that ah.. would be the Chair's feeling concerning whether or not ah.. it would put the Bill in the position of being broader than the question of Appropriations. Again, as I say, it's not a matter to ah.. Now, where are we? Mr. Lundy."

J. R. Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, you'll forgive me if I'm somewhat at



a loss to understand exactly what your interpretation is. Is it your interpretation that the Amendment is in order under the terms of the Constitution or that it is not?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I don't think ah.. that ah.. on the question of whether or not the matter meets the Constitutional prohibition about being limited... about being limited ah.. that the Chair's ah.. conclusion with regard to that subject is determinative of the issue. So, it's not a matter to ah.. really ah.. be ruled upon by the Chair. And, I simply said that, in the Chair's judgement, it is in conflict with the Constitution if you want this Body to consider it and adopt it. And, if this Bill passes and becomes Law, then there will have to be somebody other than the Chair ah.. that determines that question because there's not a clear cut situation in any of these things as to whether or not they're confined to the issue of Appropriations. Alright.. Now, Mr... Mr. Wolfe is about ready for a point of order over here. And so,... Just a minute."

B. B. Wolfe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think you're right..."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Wait.. Now, wait.. Well, now wait a minute. Well, Mr. Lundy..."

B. B. Wolfe: "A point of order..."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, wait a minute. Mr. Lundy is still on his point. I have to ah.. resolve on that. Is there any further question of the Chair with regard to the.. your point of order?"

J. R. Lundy: "Well, Mr. Speaker, is it your ruling that the



Amendment may now be considered by the House?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "It is the ah.. Chair's ruling that on the ah.. solely on the question of whether or not it's confined, which is a new Rule in the ah.. new.. ah.. new word in the Rules this year rather than being germane, but is in ah.. concurrence with the Constitution that it be confined ah.. to the subject matter ah.. of the Bill that your Amendment, in that sense, is germane or is confined ah.. to the subject of the Bill. Now, I understand that Mr. Lechowicz raised a question, when I was not here, concerning the Constitutionality of the Bill, if this Amendment is adopted. And, the Chair is not ruling on that subject other than to say that the Chair's personal judgement is that the adoption of this Amendment would be in conflict with our Constitutional provision. But, that's not a subject. I'm.. I'm saying that the Amendment may be considered on the floor now. Right.."

J. R. Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, may I then ask one further question? That is, what is the Speaker's personal opinion about the fact of attaching this Bill ah.. to the present ah.. attaching this Amendment to the Bill, as amended, before the House? Would it be to invalidate the Amendment or to invalidate, Constitutionally, the entire Bill?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I don't think it's the Chair's ah.. ah.. prerogative to ah.. be determinative ah.. on the issue as to whether or not an Amendment or a Bill ah.. restricts itself to the ah.. question of.. of Appropriation. That's really a matter for the Courts to determine. But, I under-



stood that Mr. Lechowicz wanted to raise that as a point of order. And, I.. I just wanted to respond ah.. to Mr. Lechowicz's ah.. point, but lightly. But now, the gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, what's your point?"

J. S. Matijevich: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, I.. I fear you got to make a ruling, under Rule 26 (f). 26 (f) upholds the Illinois Constitution. It says, 'Appropriation Bills shall be limited to the subject of Appropriations'. So, I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, which, I think, you've got the rule on, that this does.. does not so limit. And, I think, it's your responsibility to so rule."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "I think the question, frankly, is premature at this time. Ah.. the Chair will be prepared ah.. to rule on that at the appropriate time. Ah.. right now, this Amendment is not part of the Bill. And, the rule, to which you refer, says, 'Appropriation Bills shall be limited to the subject of Appropriations'. It doesn't concern itself with Amendments to Appropriation Bills being limited to the subject of Appropriations. So ah.., when the consideration of a Bill is up, ah.. the Chair will be prepared to ah.. rule on that question at that time. Alright.. I guess I've ruled on Mr. Matijevich's point. Now, we're back to Mr. Lundy or is there anybody else that wants to... Back to Mr. Lundy. Yes. Your.. Your Amendment is before the House for consideration."

J. R. Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, in light of your ah.. in light of your ah.. position on ruling or not ruling, I'm not sure



which, on the propriety of considering this Amendment at this point, let me say that I will offer the Amendment. I will attempt very briefly to explain it and I will say to the Members of this House, if they, in their own minds, feel that it is unconstitutional or endangers the constitutionality of the Bill, they should vote against it. Now, if I may explain the Amendment. It is...."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Proceed."

J. R. Lundy: "It is an Amendment which attempts to impose upon public Mass Transit Carriers the same requirement for notice of proposed fare increases and service changes as are now applicable to privately-owned Carriers which are regulated by the Illinois Commerce Commission. That, essentially, is the first paragraph of the new Section X. The remaining paragraphs are simply elaboration on those requirements."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The noise level is up a little bit."

J. R. Lundy: "May I say several things about what the Amendment does not do? The Amendment does not prohibit any fare increase or any service reduction. It simply delays the proposed fare increase or the service reduction until the public, particularly those affected by the proposed action, have had a chance to be heard. And, it requires the Mass Transit Carrier to arrange those hearings. Second, the Amendment would have no affect, prior to December 31, 1973, because the Bill, in its present form, prohibits any fare increases or service cuts prior to that time. So, the Bill would only have affect after the end of this year. Finally, as I've



indicated, the Bill does not apply to the many privately-owned Mass Transit Carriers which will be receiving grants under this Act because they are regulated by the Illinois Commerce Commission. Essentially, what this Bill attempts to do, Mr. Speaker, is to be certain that this Body, the General Assembly, is not, once again, clubbed over the head or intimidated or blackmailed into providing subsidies to Mass Transit Carriers by precipitous unilateral decisions by Governing Boards of those Carriers about service cuts and fare increases. It's an attempt to give the public and the Legislature and the Governor fair notice about what a Mass Transit Carrier intends to do if it can't get assistance from public funds. I think it's a simple Amendment as I've indicated. The substance of it is in Paragraph A. The rest of it is merely elaboration. I would be happy to respond to any question on it."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. Shea.
G. W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I respectfully rise to oppose the Amendment. I think Mr. Lundy's idea is good, that we should have adequate public hearings before any fares are increases. The proposed Amendment 6 does prohibit any fare increases or any reduction in services for the next year for all Carriers in the State that accept Mass Transportation Acts. And, I assured Mr. Lundy that I will work with him in the area he wants and attempt to amend the C.T.A. Bill for adequate public notice. Therefore, I respectfully ask that this Amendment be defeated.



Because, I'll tell you, frankly, I'm.. I wish we could have got a ruling out of you, Mr. Speaker, about the Constitutionality of it."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "It's coming."

G. W. Shea: "I'm just frightened to death that we might put this whole appropriation in jeopardy with an Amendment of this type."

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

T. S. Lechowicz: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, no indeference to the Sponsor, I know the intent of the Amendment and I agree with it. But, in my opinion, if this Amendment is placed on this Bill, it would put the entire package in jeopardy. I'm going to have to opposed the Amendment and assure the Sponsor of the Bill that if it is in a Bill form, then I will support wholeheartedly."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "What's your point, Mr. Shea."

G. W. Shea: "Ah.. when you said, 'the ruling is coming', is it the Chair's intention that, if this Amendment was adopted, that the Chair could then hold this Bill was not Constitutional because there was a subject matter not germane or that, once beyond an Appropriation Bill, then the Chair could then hold the Bill unconstitutional?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "No. You just made the remark ah.. that ah.. you would wish that the Chair ah.. had ruled with regard to the ah.. situation. And ah.., I.. my remark was confined to your ah.. remark on that subject. Further Dis-



cussion? Alright.. The question is on... The gentleman care to close? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy. Alright.. No close. Then, the question is on the adoption.... All those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it... Alright.. Ah.. it ah.. The 'Nays' had it and the Amendment is not adopted. Does anybody want a Roll Call? Mr. Lundy, would you like a Roll Call? Alright.. Mr. Lundy has asked for a Roll Call. So, all those in favor of the gentleman's ah.. Amendment will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Maragos.. 'present'. Campbell.. 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 73 'Ayes', and 67 'Nays' and.... Well, there were so many. Which one wants to be recognized. Mr. Calvo had his hand up earlier. Mr. Calvo.."

H. L. Calvo: "Well, Mr. Speaker, before the.. in the process of the Roll Call, I wanted recognition to explain my vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Oh! I'm sorry. Proceed."

H. L. Calvo: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, by the admission of the Sponsor of this Amendment, he apparently has many doubts about his Constitutionality. I'm certain, of course, the Speaker has expressed his thoughts that this Amendment does make the Bill Unconstitutional. But, in addition to that, the Sponsor says what has no affect and can not have any affect, concerning the matters that are germane to his Amendment, until 1974. I submit to you, that really what he's doing, is amending 'The Chicago Transit



Authority Act'. And, if he wants to amend that Act to make different provisions relative to public notice and rate increases, I think, the place to do it is for him to file a Bill to amend the Act in that manner, not to come with an Amendment on this Appropriation Bill, which has no affect in this year anyway. And, I would ask the ah.. Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, to get some more 'red' lights on the Bill so that the matter can proceed in a proper fashion. And, if he wishes, in a Bill to make such an Amendment, bring us in a Bill to do that. I don't necessarily disagree with what he wants to do, but this isn't the way to do it."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. 74 'Ayes' and 67 'Nays' and the Amendment is.... I'm sorry. Ah.. Mr. Shea, for what purpose do you rise?"

G. W. Shea: "I would first like a Poll of the Absentees and then I would like to verify the Roll Call."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, you are certainly entitled to that, Mr. Shea. Now, if the Members would kindly be in their seats so that we can facilitate the ah.. Clerk in his Poll of the Absentees and also a verification of the Roll Call."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Barry.. Beaupre.."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "No.. No.. Wait a minute. Now, wait a minute. We're ah.. We'd better get straight what we're doing. We're polling the absentees and ah.. read it... read it slowly, Mr. Clerk, so that if we have absentees who want to vote, they can vote."



Fredric B. Selcke: "Barry.. Beaupre.."

J. R. Beaupre: "I vote 'no'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Beaupre votes 'no'."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Bluthardt.. Boyle.. Capuzi.. Day.. Deavers..

Ralph Dunn.. R. L. Dunne.. Ewell.."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ewell.. 'no'?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Fleck.. Giglio.."

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

Fredric B. Selcke: "Granata.. Griesheimer.. Hirschfeld.."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Wait.. Is Griesheimer here? He's not here. Okay.."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Hirschfeld.. Ron Hoffman.. Huskey.. Hyde.. Juckett.. Kennedy.."

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

Fredric B. Selcke: "Klosak.. Londrigan.. McAuliffe.."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "McAuliffe votes 'yes'."

Fredric B. Selcke: "McAvoy.. North.. Pappas.. Pierce.."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Pierce votes 'no'."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Piotrowicz.. Rose.. Sangmeister.. Schoe-berlein.. Sevcik.. Soderstrom.. Springer.. Wall.. R. A. Walsh.."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. We're now... We're now at 75 'Ayes', 72 'Nays', 1 'Present' and the gentleman renew his ah.. motion to verify? Wait a minute. Maragos is recorded 'no'. Oh! I see. Okay.. He's still 'no'. Alright.. So, on this question, there are 75 'Ayes' and 73 'Nays' and the Amendment is ah.. Oh! I'm sorry. 72 'Nays', 75 'Ayes'.."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

McCourt.. How's the gentleman.. McCourt wants to vote? 'No'. That's.. That's better. McCourt votes 'aye'. Oh! He's already recorded as voting 'aye'. I'm back again. Ah. the gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. Huskey."

H. Huskey: "I vote 'aye'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. The gentleman is recorded as 'not voting'. He will be recorded as voting 'aye'. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Harold Washington."

H. Washington: "I know I'm recorded as voting 'aye'. I want to change it to 'no'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Washington is going from 'aye' to 'no'. Alright.. Washington wants to go from 'aye' to 'no'. I think we ought to ah.., you know, get on with the verification. Alright.. Was he an 'absent' too? Okay.. 'an absentee'. Alright ah.. He's... Well, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, asked for a Poll of the Absentees and a verification. And ah.., that's where we ordinarily would be. Mr. Caldwell wants to change his vote from what to what?"

L. A. H. Caldwell: "I vote 'aye'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He votes 'aye'. Alright.. You're recorded as 'aye', so that keeps it there. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell."

L. A. H. Caldwell: "What I was trying to do, Mr. Speaker, I was going to change my vote from ah.. 'aye', to 'no'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Change the gentleman from 'aye' to 'no'. Alright.. Proceed with the verification. Well, yeah.. where is the ah.. count right now? 74 'Ayes' and 74



'Nays'. The gentleman from ah.. Bureau, Mr. Barry."

T. Barry: "How am I recorded?"

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

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

T. Barry: "'Nay'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Record the gentleman as 'nay'. Alright..

Do we have any more before we start the verification? Alright.. Proceed with the verification. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, do you want to change your vote?"

G. W. Shea: "I understand that there are 75 'no' votes and 74 'aye' votes?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, there are at the time being."

G. W. Shea: "Well then, I withdraw my request for a verification:"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Then, Mr. Collins from ah.. Cook, asked for a verification to which he is entitled. So now, we'll proceed to verify the affirmative and then we'll go to the negative."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Anderson.. Arnell.. Berman.. Blades.. Borchers.."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Wait a minute. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, rise?"

G. W. Shea: "I'm might ask if the Members would be in their seats and stand when their name is called because there are lots of people, I don't think, are very familiar with it yet and it would facilitate this."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Ah.. the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, has asked that ah.. the affirmative ah.. vote Members please rise. And, I assume he makes that... I'm sure that he makes that request with regard to the negative also and that seems reasonable. Ah.. the gentleman from Kane, Mr. Schoeberlein as 'not voting'. Record the gentleman 'aye'. Alright.. Here's the gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAvoy, how.. how's he recorded? As 'not voting'? How's the gentleman recorded?"

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

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Record the gentleman as voting....
What, Fred?"

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

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Record the gentleman as 'aye'. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wall, how's he recorded? As 'not voting'? Record the gentleman as 'aye'. Alright.. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Klosak, is recorded as 'not voting'. Record the gentleman as 'aye'. The gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. Phil Collins."

P. W. Collins: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, I'll withdraw my request for a verification."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. That's fine.. On the question now, there is 70 ah.. 78 'Ayes' and 75 'Nays'. And, the gentleman's Amendment is.... For what purpose do you rise, Mr. Shea?"

G. W. Shea: "We're back on the verification again."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. We'll proceed to verify the



affirmative now and then the negative."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Campbell.. Catania.. Chapman.. Clabaugh.. Collins.. Cox.. Cunningham.. Douglas.. Duff.. Dyer.. Ebbesen.. Epton.. Friedland.. Geo-Karis.. Gibbs.. Grotberg.. Harpstrite.. Gene Hoffman.. R. Holloway.. J. Houlihan.. Hudson.. Hunsicker.. Huskey.. Jaffe.. Dave Jones.. Katz.. Kempiners.. Kent.. Klosak.. Kriegsmann.. Kucharski.. LeFleur.. Lauer.. Leinenwever.. Lundy.. Macdonald.. Mahar.. Mann.. Martin.. McAuliffe.. McAvoy.. McCormick.. McCourt.. McMaster.. Kenney Miller.. T. Miller.. Molloy.. Murphy.. Neif.. Palmer.. Philip.. Polk.. Porter.. Randolph.. Rayson.. Rigney.. Ryan.. Schlickman.. Schneider.. Schoeberlein.. Timothy Simms.. Skinner.. Stiehl.. Telcser.. Totten.. Tuerk.. Waddell.. Wall.. W. D. Walsh.. Walters.. Washburn.. J. J. Wolf.. Mr. Speaker.."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Are there ah.. questions of the affirmative vote? Is there question of the affirmative vote? Is there question of the affirmative vote? No, we're.. we're in the middle of ah.. of a verification. And ah.., we've finished the affirmative and I'm now asking if there are any.. Alright.. Ah.. the gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, says that he voted 'aye', but he's recorded 'no'. So, he desires to be recorded 'aye'. Alright.. Now, I'll tell you, we might as well get this procedure. You're Mr. Houlihan? So, you're not in your seat according my schedule. Is that right? Okay.. Well, there is a Rule, I think, that says a Member is sup-



pose to speak ah.. from his seat. And ah.., I can't very well recognize you, if you're not in your seat. So, I suggest you get back there. Now, wait a minute. Do you want to let Mr. Houlihan do his thing? Alright.. "

J. M. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker...."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes, Mr. Houlihan."

J. M. Houlihan: "I apologize for not being in my seat."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Okay.."

J. M. Houlihan: "I'm a new Member and didnt understand that..."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Right.."

J. M. Houlihan: "I'd like to ah.. ask how I'm recorded."

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

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

J. M. Houlihan: "I'd like to change my vote and record it with Dan Houlihan as voting 'no'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Change the gentleman from 'aye' to 'no'. Alright.. Now, are there any further questions of the affirmative Roll Call? Do you have questions of the affirmative Roll Call? Alright.. Question the affirmative."

J. R. Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded as voting?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "How is ah.. Mr. Lundy ah.. recorded as voting?"

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

J. R. Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, would it still be in order to withdraw the Amendment at this point?"



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Only with leave of the House. Will you verify the negative Roll Call now, please? Proceed with the verification of the negative."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Alsup.."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Wait a minute. Wait a minute, Fred. Now, we're trying to do what the Rules call for. And, by-golly, they say, you verify the affirmative and the Clerk then proceeds to verify the negative. Now ah.., I think we ought to go ahead because this is not a, you know, a 89 vote issue. This is one where the negatives are important with the affirmatives. And ah.., so, I think, we've got to verify the negatives. The gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

C. L. Choate: "Ah.. just a point of information, Mr. Speaker. I don't have my Rules in front of me. And, certainly I know that you will interpret them correctly. And, I would like to know, at this juncture, if it would be prior to the announcement of the final vote, if I would be in order to move to table the gentleman's ah.. ah.. Amendment?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, if the gentleman wouldn't mind, so that we could expedite the procedures of the House, I'll have the parliamentarian look up that. I certainly will not rule on the adoption question until after we've verified the negative. Is that...."

C. L. Choate: "Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Proceed to verify the negative now."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Alsup.. Arrigo.. Barnes.. Barry.."



Beatty.. Beaupre.. Bradley.. Brandt.."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Oh! The gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. William Walsh makes a request, that Mr. Shea made, with regard to the verification of the affirmative, that ah.. the Members, ah.. that voted on the negative, if they would so kind as to stand ah.. so that we can see where they are. Now, Mr. Clerk, proceed slowly."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Brinkmeier.. Brummet.. Caldwell.. Calvo.. Capparelli.. Carter.. Choate.. Craig.. Davis.. DiPrima.. Ewell.. Farley.. Fary.. Fennessey.. Flinn.. Garmisa.. Getty.. Giglio.. Giorgi.. Hanahan.. Hart.. Hill.. J. Holloway.. D. Houlihan.. J. Houlihan.. Jacobs.. Emil Jones.. Keller.. Kelley.. Kennedy.. Kosinski.. Kozubowski.. Krause.. Laurino.. Lechowicz.. Lemke.. Leon.. Madigan.. Maragos.. Matijevich.. McClain.. McGah.. McGrew.. McLendon.. McPartlin.. Merlo.. Mugalian.. Nardulli.. Patrick.. Pierce.. Redmond.. Schisler.. Schraeder.. Sharp.. Shea.. Ike Sims.. Stedelin.. Stone.. Taylor.. Terzich.. Thompson.. Tipsword.. VonBoeckman.. Washington.. Williams.. B. B. Wolfe.. Yourell.."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Are there question of the negative? The gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. William Walsh.. on ah.. or whoever is going to handle it. Murphy? Phil Collins? Mur... Okay.. The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Murphy.."

W. J. Murphy: "Representative Bradley?"

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

Fredric B. Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I don't see him. Take him off the Roll Call."

W. J. Murphy: "Representative Flinn?"

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

Fredric B. Selcke: "Representative Flinn is recorded as voting 'no'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Take him off the Roll Call."

W. J. Murphy: "Representative Hill?"

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

W. J. Murphy: "Representative Keller?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Keller is back there."

W. J. Murphy: "Representative Jones?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Jones.. Yes, he's back there."

W. J. Murphy: "Ah.. Representative Von Boeckman?"

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

Fredric B. Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Take him off the Roll Call."

... Are there any further ah.. questions of the negative? Ah..

Giglio is here. We're still verifying the negative. On this question, there are 78 'Ayes' and 72 'Nays' and Amendment No. 10 is adopted. The gentleman from ah.. Cook, ah.. Mr. William Walsh."

W. D. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 10 was adopted."

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



R. J. Palmer: "I move to table the Amendment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. He.. He moves to table. All those in favor vote 'aye', the opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh, rise?"

W. D. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, that's a normally non-controversial motion...."

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

W. D. Walsh: "And, I therefore, withdraw the motion."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Yes.. He's withdrawn the motion. Any further Amendments?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "No.. No further Amendments. Third Reading. Ah.. The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Webber Borchers: "Members of the House, I move we adjourn."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well now, wait a minute. I always clear that with the Minority Leader. I do. The gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate. I would not let this House adjourn against the wishes of the Minority Leader and Mr. Choate full well knows that."

C. L. Choate: "Well, I'm glad that you've got that one thing that you clear with me, Mr. Speaker. Because, if I recall my, just a moment ago, previous actions, I very quietly asked you for an opinion. And you very candidly told me that you would let me know after checking with your parliamentarian. prior to the announcement of the vote. And, Mr. Speaker, you violated....."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "No, I certainly did and I'm glad that



you refreshed my memory, Mr. Choate. That's right. I did make ah.. that ah.. thing that I would recognize you for the purpose at the end of the verification of the negative on.. on that ah.. on that question."

C. L. Choate: "That's right. Prior to the announcement of the vote is what I had requested."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, that's alright.. I'm prepared to rule on your question that it's not in order. And ah...,

C. L. Choate: "But, it's not prior to the vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, that's alright. I'll go back and I'll rule that your motion is ah.. to table is ah.. not in order, number one. Number two, that the ah.. matter passed by a vote of 78 'Ayes' and.. and 72 'Nays' and...."

C. L. Choate: "Mr... Mr. Speaker,"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "And, I now... And, I now... And, I now move the Bill to Third Reading."

C. L. Choate: "Mr. Speaker,...."

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

C. L. Choate: "We have sat around here all afternoon and we have debated the merits of this Bill. We have debated the merits of various Amendments. We have been here for many hours. And, as a second thought, you come back and make ah.. ruling to me after the vote has been announced. Then, you quite candidly retract your statement as far as the announcement was concerned. Then, you give me a ruling. Now, how do you know, Mr. Speaker, that that was the last Amendment that we might have?"



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Because, I asked the Clerk that question."

C. L. Choate: "You don't know but what I am having an Amendment prepared like we gave those people ample time to prepare Amendments."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "I'm not quite clear on that point. Ah, you're having an Amendment prepared now?"

C. L. Choate: "I am."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Oh! I see. Ah.. Well, do you want to get Mr. Garmisa.. something about Mr... Mr. Garmisa is the Sponsor of the Bill. And, all he has to do is bring it back from Third to Second tomorrow."

C. L. Choate: "Mr. Garmisa quite.. quite candidly held the Bill to have two Members of yours give them ample time to prepare an Amendment which they had that was not ah.. in compliance with the ah.. Bill, as it stood at that present.. at that time. And, the only thing I'm saying to you, Mr. Speaker, is that I'm in the process, at the present time, of having a Bill... of having an Amendment prepared that will be in compliance with the present wording of the Bill. And, if Mr. Garmisa wants to hold it as he did earlier then I can see why.. I can so no reason why you would object."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "You mean, to hold it on Second?"

C. L. Choate: "To hold it for just a few minutes until I complete the Amendment or, if he wants to give me the agreement which he offered ah.. the Republican Side of the aisle, that he will call it back for the purpose of my one Amendment, I



would buy that."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Okay.. On both of those issues, ah.. I previously ruled. Ah.. Mr. Matijevich raised a question with me ah.. on the interpretation of 35, ah.. whether if there were any more ah.. Amendments up here, would then, it would automatically go to Third Reading. And, I answered in the affirmative on that question. There were no more Amendments here so I moved it to Third Reading. On ah.. On.. On ah.. the second...."

C. L. Choate: "Well, maybe ah.. maybe ah.., as you know, you and I both leave the floor of the House on given occasions, and not always together. I was off of the floor evidently when that conversation was taking place because I did not hear that particular conversation. The only thing I'm suggesting to this House is the fact that I'm in the process of having an Amendment prepared and I would ask that Representative Garmisa, as the principal Sponsor, give me the same courtesy that he gave to two Republican Members."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Now, wait a minute. So, we understand where we are. House Bill 89... I'm going to recognize everybody. Now, we're not going to adjourn until everybody is ready to go. Ah.. but, I think, we ought to find out where we are. Ah.. on House Bill 89, I have, under the provisions of Rule 34 or 35, ah.. advanced it to the order of Third Reading. Now ah.. Now, we certainly want to ah.. have everybody to have an opportunity to say whatever they want to say. Mr. Schlickman is up. Ah.. Mr. Schlickman."



E. F. Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day, I inquired of the temporary Speaker as to whether or not the Fiscal Note Law was applicable to this Bill, as amended. I was advised at the time that my inquiry was not timely. I've been sitting here hoping to raise that issue prior to this Bills.. yes, this Bills being advanced to Third Reading. Ah.. I do inquire as to whether or not the Fiscal Note Act is applicable."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. The parliamentarian advises me that the Fiscal Note Act and the Rule, which is drafted in conformity with that Act, provides that ah.. it is not applicable to Appropriation ah.. Bills. And ah.., it has been the ah.. understanding up until this time that ah.. that this Bill ah.. was directed toward the question of Appropriation at the time that you made that.. that request, Mr. Schlickman. Ah.. You want to be heard on that further? I mean I... For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, rise?"

T. S. Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Originally, when I brought up the question, under 20.. under Rule 26(f), and you gave a slight interpretation to Representative Lundy, and in turn, you stated to him that you would announce your decision, whether it is an appropriation matter with substance or not prior to the announcement of the Roll Call. And, that's what I've been waiting for. What's your decision under 26(f)?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, 26(f) question, when it's timely raised, will be determined by the Speaker. And, that would



be ah.. when ah.. this Bill is up for consideration on Third Reading. I don't know, when we go to that order of Reading tomorrow, whether or not the Sponsor will want to take it out of the record or not. I really can't ah.. prematurely ah.. make ah.. that ruling. But, I'll be prepared to make it at the time. If it is raised, I'll be prepared to make that ruling."

T. S. Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, isn't normal as far as... instead of the item being on Third Reading, that in the years past, it.. the Speaker would make this ruling so that the Member would know whether he was in order or not? And, I was wondering where have these Rules been changed? Normally, it's been a custom. And, this ruling has been in an edification process to many of the Members, especially new Members, to know whether it's within the guidelines of the Rule or not."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Okay.. Well, the point is that that Rule says that, 'Appropriation Bills shall be limited to the subject of Appropriation'. This is the language which is in the Constitution. And ah.., when that Bill is up for Third Passage and ah.. Consideration on that order of business, if that point is put to me, the Chair will be prepared to rule at that time."

T. S. Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, in your opinion, does that meet the guidelines of Amendment No. 10?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, the Rule only is confined to the ah.. Bills, not to Amendments. And, it simply says, 'Appropriation Bills'. So, I will.. I'll have to peruse. Ah..



there's been a lot of action with regard to this Bill today. And, I'll have to have my Staff and my Parliamentarian peruse ah.. House Bill 89 as it will be up for consideration tomorrow. And, at that time, if that question is raised, the Chair will be prepared to rule with regard to the application of 26(f)."

T. S. Lechowicz: "That's what we're afraid of, Mr. Speaker. And, I was wondering if you could have your Staff and your Parliamentarian peruse Amendment No. 10 now?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, no. I don't think that it's a timely ah.. request. We really have to see the Enrolled and Engrossed Bill. And, that's what we'll have tomorrow."

T. S. Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Your welcome. Okay. May I move over to my side for one? Okay.. Mr. William Walsh."

W. D. Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, there's some indication that there is, at least, one more Amendment that ah.. a Member would want to offer to this Bill. And, there's also some indication that the Sponsor would be willing to take the Bill back to Second Reading for purposes of consideration of ah.. Amendments. The Bill is on Third Reading now. Ah.. those of you, who are concerned about it, ah.. know that there is an opportunity to amend tomorrow because, if the Sponsor requests it, why, it will be brought back to Second Reading. Ah.. now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill is on Third Reading and that is not the order of business in which we're considering. And, if we were, we couldn't consider this



Bill. So, if could get on with ah.. another order of business."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, you point is quite well taken.

We've just had a Second Reading of that Bill today. There's no way in the world I could read it again a Third time.

That surely would be in violation of the Constitution and I would so rule. The gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. Shea."

G. W. Shea: "I'm ah.. bit confused by your ruling and I'm wondering if you would straighten me out?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Which ruling?"

G. W. Shea: "The one that there was a request of the Speaker, who by the Rules, rules on the Constitutional or Parliamentary Procedure. Now, as I understand the posture that you are putting Members of this House in by the Rules as they are now drafted. When the question of whether an Amendment is Constitutional on the order of Second Reading, you will not take a position on whether that Amendment is Constitutional or not with regards to an Appropriation Bill, whether it is putting substantive matter in an Appropriation Bill. And, if that Amendment is adopted, although there was a question raised, as there was in this case by Mr. Matijevich, that you will then take a vote on the Amendment if the Amendment is adopted and the Bill moves to Third Reading with the Amendment in question, that you will then rule on Third Reading if the question is raised about the Constitutionality of the proposed Amendment. Is that.. Is that the posture, I think, we're finding ourselves in as Members of this House?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, you know, I never make generalized



rulings. If you have a particular point that you're asking me rule on, I'll rule on that, but I'm not going to make a generalized ruling. And ah...."

G. W. Shea: "Well, I.. I.. I will make a specific request of the Chair and...."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "You're raising a point of order?"

G. W. Shea: "I.. I am raising a question of the Chair with regards to procedure as a Member of this House."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.."

G. W. Shea: "Amendment No. 10 was offered by Mr. Lundy on House Bill 89. Mr. Matijevich raised the point, if that Bill fit within... or that Amendment fit within the Constitutional mandate, that there could not be both an Appropriation and Legislation within a Bill subsidence Legislation. My understanding of your Ruling was, you did not rule on that question."

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

G. W. Shea: "That Bill was then amended by the Amendment, in question and now has been ordered to the Third Reading Stage."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Un.. Under... Well, not ordered. It moves automatically, under the provisions of Rule...."

G. W. Shea: "It was kind of ordered, I thought."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, it's self-executing. And, the Rule says...."

G. W. Shea: "Well, Mrs. Chapman....."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, wait a minute. The Speak... The Rule says that, 'The Speaker shall advance it to the order



of Third Reading'. And, I have to merely repeat that that happened. Ah.. that Rule is mandatory and I have no choice about it."

G. W. Shea: "Now, when the Bill is on Third Reading tomorrow and it calls for a Roll Call vote, is it the position of the Speaker that he could then say that Amendment No. 10 added Legislation... subsidence Legislation to an Appropriation Bill? And that, that Bill is then Unconstitutional?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "That's the same question that Mr. Lechowicz has been trying to ah.. ah.. ask me....."

G. W. Shea: "Well, I think,.... I think.. I think my...."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "You want me to answer your question or not?"

G. W. Shea: "I would like you to..."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Then, let me have the courtesy of.. of giving you an answer. Mr. Lechowicz has been asking that question all the time. That particular Rule, ah.. Section in that Rule says, 'That Appropriation Bills shall be confined ah.. to the subject of Appropriations'. When the time is appropriate for that matter to be raised is when that Bill is up for Consideration on Third Reading and Passage. If we get to that point tomorrow, and if somebody raises that question on the floor, I will be prepared, at that time, to rule on that. Now, I have to look at that entire Enrolled and Engrossed Bill, as it is on Third Reading. And ah.., all of these Amendment, at that time, you know, I won't be able to tell whether it was 10 or 6 or whatever or 9 that's involved.



I mean, we'll be looking at that Bill from one end to the other end. And, if that question is raised tomorrow, ah.. we'll make ah.. our ah.. our ruling on the basis of how we read that Bill tomorrow."

G. W. Shea: "Alright.. Now, can I ask this question, Mr. Speaker? If the point were raised and the Speaker so held that it violated the Constitutional mandate, what would be the posture of the Bill?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I suggest ah.. that again, you're asking for premature rulings of the Chair. I don't how I'm going to rule on that question, if it is raised. So ah.., I think it's unfair....."

G. W. Shea: "No. I.. I'm not asking you how you're going to rule, Mr. Speaker. I wouldn't want to do that....."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well then, I... You're asking a generalized situation and I've kept myself from ruling on that particular point. There's not a subject of business before this House on which you're asking for a parliamentary ah.. point of order. And ah..., I.. I can't... I.. I just.. I just can't help you out there. Alright.. Next order of business. Alright.. Mr. ah.. Barry from Bureau."

T. Barry: "A parliamentary inquiry."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Sure.."

T. Barry: "You ruled, a little while ago, against Mr. Choate, his motion to table, as I recall. And, I wonder whether the Parliamentarian took into consideration the last phrase of Rule 62(e)? I think that Rule suggests that that motion must



be adopted by a majority of the voters.. pardon me, a majority of the Members voting on the motion."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yes. Well, you know, any question of the ruling of the Chair should have been timely made. And, it was not. And ah.., we went on to another order of business. And ah.., the ah...."

T. Barry: "Well,... Well ah.., what.. what would your ruling be if that were the case?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, again, you're asking me to generalize. I don't know that we have ever entertained a.. a question of after we've had a Roll Call and we have Polled the Absentees and we've verified both sides, ah.. that we would have any motions ah.. to table. So, I simply ah.. ruled that out of order and we're really beyond ah.. that point right now. The gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

C. L. Choate: "What you said is partially true, Mr. Speaker, as far as I'm personally concerned. But, I think, that everyone in this House agrees that the request for information from you as to whether the motion would be in order or not was in plenty of time prior to the announcement of the actual vote that was taken, at which time you announced the vote, and then, come back and ruled.. and ruled the motion out of order. And, when you made that motion, that the Rule... ah.. ruling that the motion was out of order, I did ask for recognition because, I think, that under the Rules of this House, the motion was, in its entirety, in.. in order. And, I humbly suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Speaker made a mistake. He



made a mistake by not recognizing the question prior to the announcement of the vote. And, as far as I'm concerned, in my interpretation of the Rules, the Speaker also made a mistake in ruling the motion out of order because, I think, it is clearly defined, in the Rule which Representative Barry has just suggested here, that the motion was in order. And, I'm confident that the recordings of these proceedings will be ah.. adequate to indicate that this is a fact."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Okay.. On the ah.. Calendar on the order business on Speaker's table, appears House Resolution 20 and on which the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

R. D. Cunningham: "Oh! Mr. Speaker and Mem....."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Wait.. Wait a minute. The gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

T. S. Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Choate addressed a statement of fact. And, I think, he made the statement in plenty of time. I'd like to have a reply from the Speaker. What's your position on it?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I've already ruled on that, Mr. Lechowicz. I was certainly letting the gentleman from Union restate something that I'd already ruled on. It requires no further ruling on my part. I went back... I took that Bill back from Third to Second to accommodate ah.. the gentleman's request. Ah.. I then told him ah.. what the ah.. Chair's decision was on whether or not he could put a motion to table at that point in.. in the vote procedures.



And, I said that ah.. the Chair's ruling was that he could not ah.. And, therefore, I ruled that out of order. I announced the Roll Call on the vote. And ah.., then ah.. moved the Bill, under 35, to Third Reading. Now, I don't know if ah.. he called that fact to my attention. And, he was quite right and I said that. And then, I... The best thing that I could do then was to go back ah.. to where we were and to ah.. ah.. give him my ruling with regard to that situation. So, I.. I.. I moved right on since."

T. S. Lechowicz: "Well, I'll just tell you this, Mr. Speaker. He's been trying to seek recognition and so has Toby Barry. I remember when we first started this Session, they went from side to another....."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I've spent almost all afternoon on this side, I'll tell you that. I've spent almost all afternoon over here because ah.. I haven't had people up over here. Ah.. we now are on the order of business of Speaker's table, H.R. 20. Now, is there a point of order on that question? Now, wait a minute. The gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

C. L. Choate: "Again, I feel compelled to respond, Mr. Speaker, to your remarks to Representative Lechowicz and the inquiry which he proposed. And, up to a degree again, I've got to admit that the Speaker was absolutely right. However, the fact still remains, Mr. Speaker, that when you ruled my motion out of order, you neglected to give me an opportunity to query you as to why the motion is out of order. And again,



I.. I say that the Rules clearly indicate that the Rules were in... that we were following the Rules and my motion was in order. And ah.., by simply announcing the vote without recognizing me and without ah.. advising my why the motion was out of order. I don't think that we followed the Rules of this House when you handed down that decision."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The Rules of the House do not require the Chair to state the reasons for his rulings as you quite well know. The Chair has done that as a matter of accommodation and information. Alright.. The gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, with respect to ah.. H.R. 20."

R. D. Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Resolution is non-controversial. When it was discussed the other day, it was gently suggested that it was merely a public reaffirmation of our faith in the Personnel Code, the Merit System and the position that we do not believe that it's a proper use of human resources, that people would be fired and then other untrained people hired. So, at this time, I would respectfully ask that all of you give me a 'green' light on the proposition that we set aside the Rules. We need 107 as I understand the new Rules that we might vote today on this issue."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well now, wait a minute. You don't need 107."

R. D. Cunningham: "Well, I thought....."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well now, wait a minute. Yes, you're.. you're asking to bypass Committee?"



R. D. Cunningham: "Yes. That's correct, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Now ah.. procedurally, Mr. Ewell raised the question last week as to just what our posture would be when we got back to this subject. And, I said ah.. He asked me if a Member could speak on ah.. subject twice. And, I said 'no' you couldn't. But, we always allow the Sponsor of a proposal to open and close. So, what Mr. Cunningham has done now is to close. Ah.. and so, we are ready for the question. Mr. Mann, for what purpose do you rise?"

R. E. Mann: "Mr. Speaker, would the Clerk read the Resolution?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, since it has been ah.. a little time ah.. since we ah.. had this before us, ah.. the Sponsor indicates that he'll be happy to have the Resolution read."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Resolution 20, Cunningham, WHEREAS, it is in the interest of efficient State Government that there be no wholesale turnover of State Employees as the result of the vicissitudes of political fortune and, WHEREAS, State Employees should not be relegated to the status of Second Class Citizens, but should enjoy the same right as other Citizens to participate in the political processes; therefore be it RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SEVENTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that it is the assent of the House that no State Employee, regardless of whether subject to the Personnel Code, should be dismissed because of political party affiliation or off-duty political activity."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. The question is on the gentleman's ah.. motion to suspend the provisions of Rule 41(a) for the immediate consideration and adoption of the gentleman's Resolution. For what purpose does the gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. Yourell, rise?"

H. Yourell: "A question of the Sponsor of the ah.. Resolution."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. He was closing but ah.. Mr. Cunningham."

H. Yourell: "Yes, ah.. I would ask the Sponsor of this ah.. Resolution how he voted on the.. on the Rules last week, on the final version of the Rules just as a matter of information?"

R. D. Cunningham: "Well, I voted for them."

H. Yourell: "You voted for the Rules?"

R. D. Cunningham: "Yes."

H. Yourell: "Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. The question then is on the adoption of.. or ah.. on the suspension of the Rule. All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Alright.. The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 67 'Ayes' and 52 'Nays' and the ah.. gentleman's motion fails so it will have to be referred now ah.. to Committee for consideration. We'll go back to the order of Motions. The gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe, had a motion that he wanted to address."

B. B. Wolfe: "Ah.. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a very brief motion. Ah.. having filed House Bill 97, which is an Abortion



Reform Bill and which Bill was prepared prior to the Supreme Court's opinions and having just completed the full reading of both Supreme Court opinions in the Texas Case and the Georgia Cases, I find that House Bill 97 can only add presently to the confusion in Illinois concerning ah.. this entire subject matter. Although the Bill substantially follows the guidelines set forth by the Supreme Court, it can not materially add to the Court's statement of the Law. And, in view of that fact, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask that I be given leave to table ah.. House Bill 97."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Ah.. hearing no objections, consent will be given and the ah.. Bill is tabled. Alright.. We're on the order of Motions. The gentleman from Madison, Mr. Sharp."

J. F. Sharp: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask leave of the House to have the names of Representative Boyle and Representative Rose added to House Bill 285 which I'm chief Sponsor."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Is there leave? Alright.. Then, they'll be added, Boyle and Rose. Yeah.. Alright.. Now ah.., on ah.. Mr. Maragos on Announcements, I guess."

S. C. Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I notice that ah.. House Bill 33 in the Digest is erroneously stated. And, it shows that ah.. it has been recalled and tabled. There's been no such action. I'd like to have the record.. the Digest records ah.. corrected and that the Executive Committee hear that at next weeks Session."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, certainly ah.. your comment with regard to getting in the Journal ah.. the fact that there is an error in the Digest ah.. will be duly noted in the Journal. Now, as far as ah.. setting of the ah.. of the proposal, you'll simply have to meet with the Chairman."

S. C. Maragos: The Chairman said that he would meet as soon as this is corrected. Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "He'll... I'm sure he'll handle. Mr. Maragos has a request for the setting of a Bill and I suggested that he talk with you about it. Now, Announcements. Ah.. Committee Chairman for this afternoons Committees. First, Mr. Washburn ah.. on Appropriations."

J. R. Washburn: "Thank you ah.., Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As we have had witnesses waiting since 2:00 O'clock this afternoon, the Appropriations Committee will convene in A1 at 7:30. Please be present."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. The Appropriations Committee in A1 at 7:30. The gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. J. J. Wolf."

J. J. Wolf: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, Members of the Veteran ah.. Affairs Personnel and Pension, we're having a brief Meeting, very short in M5 immediately after adjournment."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Veterans Affairs Personnel and Pension in Room M5 immediately following adjournment. The gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."

A. T. McMaster: "Ah.. Mr. Chairman, ah.. since the Meeting scheduled by Counties and Townships was informal, with no



witnesses to be here to testify, I would like to have that Meeting postponed until the regular time next week at which time we will hear several Bills."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. The gentleman is saying that ah.. there are no witnesses to hear any of the Bills that have been posted. So, you're advising us that you will want leave to postpone until next week. So, no objection, we'll accommodate that. For what purpose does the gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Washburn, rise?"

J. R. Washburn: "I've been ah.. surrounded by Committee Members since the last ah.. announcement. And ah.., apparently, it's a consensus of opinion by Members that we should meet shortly after 7:00 in Al."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. At 7:00 O'clock or as soon thereafter as there is a quorum, I guess. The gentleman from ah.. Wayne, Mr. Blades."

B. C. Blades: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, especially the Members of the Agriculture and the Natural Resources Committee, the Committee Meeting that was scheduled for 8:30 in the morning has been cancelled. There will be no Committee Meeting in the morning. Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from ah.. DuPage, Mr. Gene Hoffman."

G. L. Hoffman: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there is a School Problems Commission Meeting scheduled for 7:30 in Room M5. And, I'm inquiring of Representative Wolf if that will be in conflict with his ah.. with his



Meeting. We've had this scheduled for some time. If his Meeting will be concluded by 7:30 because we have a School Problems Commission Meeting scheduled in M5."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. J. J. Wolf on the gentleman's question. He says the School Problems has ah.. Meeting set for what? 7:30?"

G. L. Hoffman: "In Room M5."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yeah.."

J. J. Wolf: "We'll be out of there. Our Meeting shouldn't last more than ah.. 10, 12 or 15 minutes at the very most."

G. L. Hoffman: "Fine. Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Okay. The gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

F. Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Industrial Affairs Committee was set to have an organizational Meeting at 2:00 P.M. That Meeting has been duly cancelled. And, we shall meet next week at the regular time."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Phil Collins."

P. W. Collins: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, inquiry of the Chair. Ah.. what time are we meeting tomorrow? Mr. Speaker, are we meeting at 9:00 O'clock tomorrow in Session?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yeah.. I thought we'd start the Committees at 10:00 and we'd take up a Session at 9:00. I think that's what the Majority Leader was going to suggest."

P. W. Collins: "The Executive Committee was scheduled 10:00. I will see that it would be immediately after adjournment."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, yeah.. I expect that'll be 10:00. Ah.. Alright.. Now, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

W. D. Walsh: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee Meeting that was set for immediately after adjournment today has been postponed to immediately after adjournment one week from today, February the 21st. And, while I'm talking, I would like to apologize to the Members of the Republican Conference for ah.. hurrying them through the Meeting, especially those who were seeking recognition. Ah.. we were, at that time, twenty minutes beyond the time that was announced on the floor that we were due back on the floor. I ah.. thought that we had an obligation to get back. It turned out that we had a long time after we got back ah.. to wait. And, I'm very sorry that happened. Ah.. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there's no further business, I move to adjourn the hour of 9:00 A.M."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Wait a minute. Mr. DiPrima, back to general Resolutions.. Further Resolutions.. Agreed Resolutions and an Agreed Resolution of a Birthday Resolution."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Ah.. House Resolution 46, DiPrima, et.al., WHEREAS, Exactly fifty-nine years ago today, a miracle occurred in Chicago and such miracle was called Isaac; and WHEREAS, Isaac duly attended Brown Elementary School, McKinley High School and Northwestern School of Commerce and then energetically put his training to use as owner and operator of a supermarket; and WHEREAS, After 10 years in meeting the public, he moved into the public relations field thence into the



political arena; and WHEREAS, A civic-minded man, he is a thirty-second degree Mason and a member of Arabic Temple No. 44 of Chicago and Past Grand Exalted Ruler Elks I.B.O.E. of W.; therefore be it RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SEVENTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we heartily welcome this opportunity to congratulate our esteemed and Honorable Colleague, Isaac R. Sims, on his 59th Birthday; that we thank him on behalf of the people of the State of Illinois for his invaluable services to his State and to this Body; and that we wish him many more such happy occasions; and be it further RESOLVED, that a copy of this preamble and resolution be presented to him."

Voice: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have ah.. Tipsword lead us in 'Happy Birthday'. Tipsword...."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Rolland says he has a good voice. Okay.. Turn on the gentleman from Christian."

R. F. Tipsword: "HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO YOU. HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO YOU. HAPPY BIRTHDAY DEAR IKE. HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO YOU."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. Douglas, for what purpose do you rise?"

B. L. Douglas: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, I would like, on a point of information, on that Resolution, I wasn't sure I understood the beginning about the miracle that took place. Ike, were you an Immaculate Conception?"

I. R. Sims: "Ah.. yes." Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you very much."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. The gentleman from ah.. from Cook, ah.. Oh! So, the question is on the Agreed Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it and the Agreed Resolution is adopted. Are there.... Alright.. I understand that the gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, wants to move his H.R. 35 on the Birthday... Yeah.. The gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

R. D. Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought that the people across the aisle, upon reflection, had agreed that that was part of the Agreed Resolutions also. Was I incorrect in that ah.. information? Mr. Barry, are you still opposed to wishing a 'Happy Birthday' to.. to.. What is your posture on it then?"

T. Barry: "Up."

R. D. Cunningham: "Is it on the Agreed Resolution List that ah.. charming young lady that we honored the other day, Nancy Ramey, will be glad to.. to be tardily wished 'Happy Birthday'."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Al.. Alright.. Now, here we are back on Agreed Resolutions."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Resolution 35, Cunningham."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright.. Then, Mr. Walsh says that this is a Resolution relating to the Birthday Anniversary of Nancy Ramey. And, it's an Agreed Resolution. So, all those in favor of its adoption say 'aye', and the opposed 'no' and the Resolution is adopted. Alright.. Unless ah.. Is there any other item of business that anybody wants to ah.. bring before us before we adjourn? If not, then the gentleman from



Cook, Mr. William Walsh, renews his motion that the House adjourn until the hour of 9:00 A.M. tomorrow and ah.., Committees, I guess, starting at 10:00 tomorrow. The House is adjourned."

ADJOURNMENT AT 6:52 O'CLOCK P.M.

2/14/73
mes.

