

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

FEBRUARY 21, 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 Merle K. Anderson - no reason given;

Representative John B. Brandt - illness;

Representative Richard A. Carter - illness;

Representative Peter C. Granata - illness;

Representative Gene L. Hoffman - illness in family;

Representative James G. Krause - illness;

Representative Joseph G. Sevcik - illness;



Rep. Epton: "The House will be in order. And a prayer by Joe Carey."

Carey: "Please stand and let us pray. Oh, God, of the universe. Look down upon these Members. Help them in their deliberations as You've helped all mankind forever and ever, Amen."

Epton: "After that prayer, we can't help but do better. And now, Mr. Clerk... I wish you'd make up your mind is it First Reading or Introduction of Bills. If we're going to run this thing, let's do it properly. I've been watching your work lately. Now let's get with it. Gentleman, Ladies, please. The House will be in Order. All right. Let's.. There's talking in the back room. I believe it's ah.. Representative Washington. If you've got something to say, I'd just as soon you say it to the entire House. Especially in a perfunctory. Thank you. Now, Mr. Clerk, continue please."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill ah.. 378. Malloy et al. An Act to repeal Act relating to the Upper Mississippi River.. Riverway Compact, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 379. LaFluer, et al. An Act to repeal an Act relating to the Illinois-Indiana Bridge Commission, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 380. LaFluer. Amends Reporters' Privilege Act, First Reading of the Bill. No further introductions."



Epton: "And now Mr. Clerk, we'll see if you know the procedure.

What would you do next in a case like this?"

F. B. Selcke: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Capuzi moves that recess until 10:00 o'clock."

Epton: "Well, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Capuzi doesn't look as if he's following the program. Mr. Capuzi do you have something to say? Fine. Move that we adjourn until 10:00 o'clock. Thank you very much. I wish you'd get that straight Mr. Capuzi. It's recess.. not adjourn. How many times do I have to tell you? The House will recess until 10:00 o'clock."

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

Dr. Johnson: "Ah.. We pray. Merciful Father in Heaven, as we stand before You this morning, we implore your blessings upon us as we think of our own faults and failures and shortcomings. And yet we know that You understand human weakness, O Lord. And inspite of our frailties can nonetheless use us to get done those things that make for the betterment of the human family. We remember those of that family who are burdened and distressed. And we ask You to deal compassionately with them. At the same time we ask that You use us to think and act and speak in such ways that Your name may be glorified as we prove to be of service in aiding the burdened and alleviating the distressed. Grant that what we do in these sessions will serve your glory as the words we speak



and the deeds we do bring forth fruits of concern for those whom we represent and for whom we profess to care. In our Saviour's merciful name, we pray this. Amen."

W. Robert Blair: "Roll call for attendance.. ATTENDANCE. Committee Reports."

F. B. Selcke: "Mr. Duff from the Committee on Judiciary II to which House Bill 77 and 280 were referred, reported the same back with recommendation that the bills do pass. Mr. Soderstrom from the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education to which House Bill 98 was referred reported the same back with amendments thereto with recommendations that the amendment be adopted and the bill as amended do pass. Ah.. no further committee reports."

W. Robert Blair: "Introduction, First Reading, House Bills."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 381. Davis, et al. Bill for an Act to amend the Fair Employment Practices Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill ah.. 382. Deuster. Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Noxious Weed Law. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 383. Maragos, et al. Amends the Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "Agreed Resolutions."

F. B. Selcke: "Ah.. House Resolution 60. Kucharski, et al. House Resolution 61. Matijevich et al. House Resolution 62. R. L. Dunne."



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

W. D. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 60 commends the West Lawn Little League and points out that while there is no joy in Muddville, there is considerable joy in the West Lawn Little League. House Resolution 61 ah.. commends Michael R. Wagner of Lake County for ah.. a tremendous scholastic effort. In House Resolution 62 introduced by R. L. Dunne commends Michael Driscoll, the grandson of a good friend of many of ours, Claire Driscoll, on becoming an Eagle Scout. And I move the adoption of the agreed resolutions."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. The question's on the adoption of the agreed resolutions. Ah.. all those in favor say 'aye'."

Members: "Aye."

W. Robert Blair: "Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the agreed resolutions are adopted. Further Resolutions."

F. B. Selcke: "Ah.. House Bill 384. Hudson, et al. Bill for an Act to amend the School Code, First Reading of the bill."

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

W. D. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recess until one o'clock. And the purpose of this is so that the final details, hopefully, can be agreed upon on the CTA or Mass Transportation package. It is thought that at one o'clock, we'll have a Republican Conference for the purpose of discussing the hoped for agreement. Ah..



I don't know whether the Democrats plan this or not."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, the Democrats will want a caucus also at one or whenever the Republican Caucus is held. I'm sure it will not take very long."

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

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, simply to ask of the leave of the House for the Journal to show that Representative Gene Hoffman is absent due to illness in the family."

W. Robert Blair: "The Journal will so indicate. All right. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh, has moved that the House stand in recess until ah.. the hour of 1 p.m. today. Ah.. at which time there will be a Republican Conference when we come back on the Floor. And in all likelihood we'll be addressing ourselves to the matter ah.. indicated by Mr. Walsh. All right. All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye'."

Members: "Aye."

W. Robert Blair: "Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House will be in recess until the hour of 1 p.m."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. The House will be in session. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move that the House recess for 30 minutes for the purpose of a Republican Conference."



W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone."

Stone: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. We desire a Democratic Conference, too, and will it be in Room M-5?"

W. Robert Blair: "Right."

Stone: "All right. And I'll ask the Democrats to get down as soon as possible so we can be back on the floor within a half an hour. Will that be sufficient time?"

W. Robert Blair: "Yes, I think so. Ah.. we'll be back on the floor at a quarter til two or as close thereto as we can make it. We have to be out of 212 by two o'clock so it won't be any later than that. Republicans to Room 212. The House will be in recess now for purposes of our Conferences."

W. Robert Blair: "Ah.. the House will be in order. All right. When the House recessed, we were on that order of reading that preceded House Bills on Second Reading. There are no House Bills on Second Reading so we now go to House Bills, Third Reading. Ah.. All right. House Bill 89 has been read a third time. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Garmisa who asked leave to have the bill brought back to the Order of Second Reading for purposes of an amendment. Is there leave? Hearing no objections ah.. House Bill 89 will be brought back to the order of Second Reading for the consideration of the amendment. The Clerk will proceed with respect to the amendments."



F. B. Selcke: "Ah.. previously ah.."

W. Robert Blair: "Now, if we could have a little order, please. It would be helpful to all of our colleagues here in the Chamber. And if those persons who are not entitled to the Floor would be so kind as to ah.. ah.. remove themselves therefrom, I'm sure we can proceed in a more orderly fashion."

F. B. Selcke: "Ah.. previously, we had amendments one through ten. We are now on Amendment #11, Deuster. Amend House Bill 89 as amended by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following. An Act to make an appropriation to the Department of Transportation for certain transportation operation grants."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, with respect to Amendment #11. Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, is it working? Yeah, okay."

Deuster: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would ah.. ask leave to withdraw Amendment #11 reserving the right to offer it at a later time."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. Does the Gentleman have leave to withdraw the amendment for ah.. possible consideration at a later date? Ah.. all right. Leave having been granted, 11 is withdrawn. Further amendments."

F. B. Selcke: "Amendment #12. Ebbesen. Amend House Bill 89 as amended on page 1 and so forth."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen. Now, if those persons that are in front of



Mr. Ebbesen in the aisle would clear so that people may see who is talking, it would help a lot to keep the proceeding orderly. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to take this opportunity to explain this amendment even though I realize that we may be moving in a direction that will see this ah.. Mass Transit Emergency Crisis resolved. I want to say this. If it really is dollars that are involved, ah.. the amendment that I am projecting calls for a loan of \$16,000,000 to the City of Chicago for purposes of operating the Chicago Transit Authority ah.. and according to our leadership staff \$16,000,000 should carry them through until June 30th of this year. Now, it provides for a 7% interest rate. I think it's only fair in a loan that the State of Illinois should realize in return the same amount of interest equal to or more than they would have realized in lending this money. I ah.. feel that this.. the overriding issue is something that we are overlooking. This is a realistic and meaningful, practical approach to the problem. And ah.. to me, this whole situation speaking as one from the downstate area, the County of DeKalb in the 37th District, is parallel to one of the shortcomings and overriding issue that took place for many years here relative to



the personal property tax. And without belaboring that point I merely would wish to say that over the years, the General Assembly, whenever it came to downstate versus the City of Chicago, I think it's an understatement to say that in the City of Chicago the personal property tax as submitted was tossed in the waste basket, downstate you either pay it or you have a lien against your property. Now the General Assembly has had bills introduced for many years that would have provided the mechanics in which to collect that personal property tax. Very simply, we know that the personal property tax relate directly to the automobile. The fact that the collection of that tax could have taken place in the City of Chicago and throughout the entire State of Illinois had the mechanics of relating.. relating the collection of that tax to the application for your current Illinois license plates. Ah.. I think it was always Chicago and the County of Cook versus Downstate. The people from ah.. the downstate area always having to pay theirs. And ah.. Cook County did not. I'm sure that there were probably things that sweetened a particular issue that came before the General Assembly, years ago. And this is a similar situation. I feel, now, that we have nothing more to offer than a little bit of something for everyone and an oversimplified solution to a very complex problem. And with that in mind, ah.. Mr. Speaker, it's been under-



stood according to the news media that our Governor if we take this money from General Revenue perhaps will not sign the bill whatever bill would come out. Also the fact that he hasn't presented his budget message and ah.. which would deplete by an outright grant of 'x' millions of dollars, the state treasury. And I think that this is meaningful legislation, this ah.. amendment. It gives us an opportunity to demonstrate our responsibility as a legislative body by adoption of the amendment and ah.. passing it out of the House and over to the Senate and let's get a reaction from them. Thank you very much."

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

Shea: "Well, I would just like to remind the gentleman that in the last session of the General Assembly in the 77th, ah.. that we passed two bills that I think took care of the problem of personal property tax in the State of Illinois, the Agricultural Exemption and a 5,000 exemption on a statewide basis. And I'm sure that many of votes that pass it came from Cook County. I'd also like to say that if \$360,000,000 collected statewide in personal property tax about \$220,000,000 of it comes out of Cook County. And I think the problem that we have here is trying to provide some emergency assistance to keep mass transit going. And I don't think a loan would be the thing. So I would be opposed to this amendment."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen to close."



Ebbesen: "Yes, in responding to that ah.. I realize that we now have something more meaningful and fair to all of the people of the State of Illinois. But my most recent statics prior to that ah.. showed that ah.. the individuals.. noncorporate individuals in the City of Chicago paid perhaps \$3,000,000 in personal property tax.. taxes and people.. downstate individuals paid \$30,000,000. Ah.. roughly 20 to 22, 23% of the personal property tax as income over the years was ah.. that percentage of the total revenue in which to operate our schools. But yet when the income tax was passed, it was the City of Chicago looking for \$27,000,000 as an outright grant from income tax funds to subsidize their schools and run their schools. Which to me, and the people downstate has always looked like we're subsidizing the schools in Chicago. I know that those young people in there are entitled to a good education. We want them to have one. But, we, too, have our problems downstate and as I indicated, this is as just one more illustration of giving money to the City of Chicago and ah.. shot gun basis with a little sweetening in there supposedly for the mass transit, the places downstate, some of whom by the way haven't even asked for it nor do they need it."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. The question is on the adoption of Amendment #12. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and



the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 81 'nays' and 19 'ayes' and the amendment fails. Further amendments."

F. B. Selcke: "Amendment #13. Ebbesen. Amend House Bill 89 on page one by deleting lines one through four and inserting in lieu thereof.."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker. This is exactly the same amendment with ah.. a different wordage and I would like that amendment withdrawn."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. The Gentleman asks for leave to withdraw.. ah.. his amendment. So hearing no objections, his amendment will be withdrawn. Further amendments."

F. B. Selcke: "Amendment #14, Cunningham. Amend House Bill 89 as amended by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following.."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Did the Clerk want to read the amendment, please."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. Read it."

F. B. Selcke: "Amendment #14. Amend House Bill 89 as amended by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following: An Act making an appropriation to the Department of Transportation for the construction of a certain highway and for certain transportation operation grant. And by inserting before Section 12 the following:



Section 12. The sum of \$25,000,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary to be appropriated to the Department Transportation for Fiscal Year 1974 to be expended by the Secretary of Transportation with equal federal matching funds in the construction of a separated, dual-lane, limited access freeway from the east intersection of I-57 and I-70, Effingham County, to the western terminus of dual-lane section of U. S. Highway 50, Lawrence County. That highway to be constructed in accordance with Federal Interstate Highway Construction Standards along the most direct route engineering feasibility permits. This is to be commenced forthwith and diligently pursued to completion at the earliest possible date. This highway with the connecting portion of U. S. Highway 50 eastward to the Wabash River shall be known as the Abraham Lincoln Freeway and by renumbering the Section 12 and Section 13."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, I'm pleased to advise that Representative Blades and Keller have joined with me in Amendment #14. I want to say to the outset that the good people that reside in the 54th District recognize the crisis that presently confronts the users of CTA. Our hearts go out to these dartless people in their hour of trial. But the fact remains that we have a crisis in the 54th District. The name of that crisis is too few, inadequate highways.



Happily, there is a way that we can solve this problem. Any of you who have traveled through the 54th know what I'm talking about. Somebody wrote in this book, maybe it was Robert Howard in his fine book, that the Route 33 between Effingham and Newton, that the buffalo that walked over that land two centuries ago had a wider, smoother trace than Route 33. I have to drive across that highway six times a week. I have the dubious distinction of driving the farthest on one lane highway of any Member of this House. Now it's time that we did something about our crisis. I ask you to join with me in building a bridge across the misunderstanding that exists between Cook County and downstate. We can put to rest that old saw about Cook is Cook and Downstate is Downstate and ne'er the twain shall meet. We ask you to give us your heart, your hand and your vote in this particular amendment. It is feasible from an engineering standpoint. I have consulted with the Department of Transportation. The distance involved is approximately 50 miles. The cost would not exceed \$50,000,000. There are federal matching funds available for the share for the state. We'd only have to put up \$25,000,000. It would be a blessing.. if I could have your ears on this.. it would be a blessing for every downstate community in the whole State of Illinois. It's just a coincidence that it happens to be the terminous



counties of two of the sponsors of this bill. It would offer and access to a wide, neglected section of southeastern Illinois to super-highways that would make life more easy for each of them. These super-highways can bring the commerce, the safety and the hope that our people deserve. Now we do not wish your condolences. We do not wish your good wishes. What we want here, what we need and what we deserve are your votes. You come along with us in this, we will join with you when there is an opportunity to repay your kindness. We do not want a token vote up here on the board. To quote my great friend Lew Caldwell, 'We're in this for real and this deserves your careful, favorable consideration.' Thank you for your green lights."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. Is there any further discussion. Gentleman from ah.. Cook, Mr. Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think this amendment is very poorly put together. It does not get to the real point of what we're trying to do here today. And I am very much opposed to the adoption of this amendment."

W. Robert Blair: "Any further.. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Ah.. and I would move, Mr. Speaker, to table this amendment. Never mind. Never mind."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. Motion was put.. But it wasn't quite put so it's not there. Ah.. Gentleman.. Any further



discussion? Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, to close."

Cunningham: "Just for another moment in this matter. Now, I realize that it's difficult to get the votes that are required. But open your hearts and examine them and see if you can't give us a green light. In a few days, I propose to lead a delegation of the good people from our district into see the man they call Dan. And you mustn't send us in there with just a hand full of votes. Let's have a majority of the votes that are cast here. Vote green. You'll be glad tomorrow you did."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. All those who support the Gentleman's amendment will vote 'aye' and those opposed 'no'. Gentleman from ah.. Effingham, Mr. Keller."

Keller: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my yes vote here. And I'd like to remind my good colleague from my district too, that if he'd do as I'd do and vote for the appropriations to build these roads that we would have good roads in Southern Illinois and that we wouldn't have to worry about having to go through such a measure as this and I'm going to vote 'aye' for this, too."

W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "To explain my vote. I'm very happy to vote for this proposal. I think that it is a very good proposal and it's not getting the number of green lights that it deserves. Representative Keller and Blades



deserve more green lights than they're getting up there and we urge everyone to get on here. It can affect your district. We're setting a precedent here that will live with us happily for years to come. And that is that we move forward together.. Cook County and Downstate. We will help them and they will help us. And we'll march forward together into a better tomorrow for all Illinois. Let's have more green lights."

W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted.. Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the sponsor of this amendment if it's a constitutional amendment."

W. Robert Blair: "I'm glad you asked him that question. It's a little unusual on the explanation of votes, but we'll allow it."

VonBoeckman: "If he can't answer it, I suggest he read the new constitution."

Cunningham: "My lawyers tell me that there's no question about it. I have great confidence in my lawyers."

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

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, Fellow Members of the House, in explaining my vote.. I have traveled this road, unfortunately, once or twice a year, unfortunately, and there is still a slight bit of Indian trouble with a Kickapoo down. I think this would help solve that problem. So vote 'aye'."



W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 84 'nays' and 45 'yeas' and this amendment fails." Further amendments."

F. B. Selcke: "Amendment 15. Grotberg. Amend House Bill 89 as amended on page 1, line 14 by deleting.."

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

Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have leave of the House to withdraw Amendment #15."

W. Robert Blair: "Does the Gentleman have leave to withdraw? All right. Amendment #15 is withdrawn. Further Amendments."

F. B. Selcke: "Amendment 16. Mugalian. Amend House Bill 89 as amended by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof.."

W. Robert Blair: "All right. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian.. Mugalian.. I'm sorry."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my amendment would make a \$10,000,000 appropriation to the Chicago Transit Authority and to the transit authority alone. It requires a one-to-one local match which would make a total of \$20,000,000 available for emergency purposes. And it is intended to cover the period ending June 30, 1973. This amendment is not offered as a compromise for the sake of compromise. It is, however, a facing up to the CTA crisis which I believe



is the only true emergency in the mass transit situation at this time that contemplates a prompt attention to a comprehensive long-term answer to mass transit. It might be helpful to my colleagues to compare my bill with Amendment #2 which was offered by Speaker Blair and Amendment #6 which was offered by Representative Shea. As contracted to the Blair Amendment, Number 2, Blair's amendment offers \$8,000,000 to the transit authority. And in his remarks supporting his amendment, he talked about fiscal responsibility. My bill provides for \$10,000,000. I think that that is still fiscally responsible. However, my amendment eliminates \$4,000,000 that was appropriated by Amendment #2 half of which would go to the commuter line and half of which would go to local mass transit districts. As is the same with Amendment #2, mine is a one-to-one matching basis. As to Amendment #6, the Shea Amendment, that amendment would have offered a total of \$22,500,000. Fifteen dollars from the state.. \$15,000,000 from the State and \$7,500,000 from local sources for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973. I have serious reservation about the formula.. the matching formula in Amendment #6, which I think is also repeated in Amendment #17 which I've had a chance to peruse. There seems to be no rhyme or reason to the various matching formulas. The CTA is matched two to one. Two states to one local. As far as the commuter railroads are concerned, the matching it one to one. But,



it only applies to commuter roads that have a deficit. It penalizes the well-managed line. Further, I still have grave doubts even though I've had some purported explanations as to what kind of matching we'll get from the railroads. The term 'soft-match' is now used. It seems to me that when they talk about a soft match they really mean that the commuter railroads will merely reduced their deficit so that in effect, no contribution is being made from a local source from a commuter railroad. Finally, on the appropriation to the local mass transit systems, which I'll refer to as bus systems, we have no matching at all. We have a 100% state grant. Moreover, there is no distinction made in local mass transit subsidies as between public carriers and private carriers. We seem to be establishing a very dangerous precedent of giving a complete tax subsidy. A 100% subsidy to privately-owned companies. We are treating private companies the same as public companies. And I think this is a feature of Amendment #6 which is highly questionable if not unconstitutional. Finally, Amendment #6 and I believe #17 makes an appropriation to the Rural Transportation Assistant Demonstration Project. This is a program that has not even yet been created by legislation. If my amendment were adopted, there would be no constitutional questions of any kind. Many of us have been put in the position of weighing our commitment to the Chicago Transit Authority. And my



commitment is strong. Although I live in a district in which the CTA gives no service and most of my district is non-Cook County. But I have a strong commitment to it. But we have this problem as against what's now being proposed which has been characterized as a Christmas Tree. And the establishment of dangerous precedence. Let this be the last time that we bail out the CTA. Let us resolve to create a constructive program for the entire six-county area of Metropolitan Chicago where approximately 2/3 of the State's population resides. Let us come up with a sound, permanent formula for the assistance of mass transit throughout the State. We must carefully consider the extent of subsidy, the sources of the subsidy whether it will be general funds or motor fuel tax and the relative taxpayer contribution as between state, county and local. I do not see this as a partisan issue I do not see it as a choice between Chicago and downstate or Cook County and downstate. It's not even a question of the six Chicago region counties as against the balance of the State. I'm sure that the downstaters and my district includes downstate because it includes three counties out of Cook, recognize the additional costs and obligations of the State of Illinois if the CTA should be allowed to collapse. Unemployment alone from those laid-off by CTA would be significant and tens of thousands of persons will be unemployed if they couldn't get to work. My amendment has no extreme or



questionable precedence and I believe it is fiscally moderate and constitutional. Thank you."

A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to rise in support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague on the other side of the aisle. I think that ah.. his amendment is not only statesmanlike and ah.. proper but it's fiscally sound. Ah.. whereas a little later in the afternoon a compromise measure will be offered that ah.. has been hammered out by our distinguished leaders ah.. providing 12,000,000 for the CTA. Ah.. Mr. Mugalian's amendment offers 10,000,000. Now, ah.. 10,000,000 and 12,000,000 you know, you say what's a million dollars. And, of course, those in the legislature, we are stewards of the taxpayers' money and I think if we have a reasonable opportunity to distinguish between 12,000,000 and 10,000,000 and if we can do the job with 10 then we ought to accept and put the green light on for this amendment and give the Chicago Transit Authority 10,000,000. Now I am told that the 12,000,000 the ah.. will be offered a little later will take them through June 30 at a time when we'll be adjourning and leaving town. Ah.. whereas 10,000,000 will take them just to a period a little shorter than that so we'll be able to respond and act and do what's required at that time. Now all of us know that we're here not because



the railroads have been in here asking for money. And not because the downstate school districts have been asking for money, but because there's a problem in Chicago with which we sympathize. And, of course, we understand that all these many dollars and millions ah.. tossed around and around the state are simply in order to convert the minority party into a majority party on this issue. I think that it might be politically nice to give.. ah.. pass money all around the State of Illinois but I think we ought to face up to the fact that we've just got a problem involving the CTA. That's all. Just the CTA. So let's focus and concentrate on that. And let's give them enough money to last through to the later stages of the session. \$10,000,000 ought to do it. And every Member on this Floor who puts the green light on for the gentleman's amendment from the other side of the aisle will be saving the taxpayers \$2,000,000. And with that sentiment, I respectfully urge everybody to vote 'yes' on the amendment. Thank you."

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

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise to.. as much as I dislike to oppose one of my Members from this side of the aisle's amendment. But, I personally don't think that it addresses itself to the problem that confronts all mass transportation in the State of Illinois. And contrary to what the previous speaker just said. If he will look at the record, I only cited last week where this bus line went



out of business in the Elgin-Aurora area. And my colleague sitting right by me here, Representative Hill, has just told me that over the weekend he has been deluged with personal visits, phone calls and people who are concerned about these small areas of transportation in downstate not being able to make it. And it is working a hardship. And I think that in the plan that we have proposed, we are addressing ourselves not only to the problem that confronts CTA but to all, all public transportation in the confines of the State of Illinois. And regardless of what you say about the school districts, I'm telling you that it's in the interest of the taxpayer and I would urge the defeat of this amendment."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dunne."

Dunne: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I, too, rise to oppose this amendment. And I suggest to the gentleman who proposed and to the gentleman who spoke for it that ah.. they're in error when they say the only real crisis is with the CTA. They have not listened or read the testimony of the precedence of the Rock Island and the IC Railroad who have told us that they have now appealed for fare increases. They tell us that even with these proposed fare increases they are in serious difficulty and will have to shut down their service. Now the South Shore Railroad for example although it does not.. will not be subsidized by our bill, they are about to go



out of business. The railroads are in just as serious trouble as the CTA. And therefore I oppose this amendment."

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

Rayson: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I will certainly support the amendment to come, Amendment #17 and it embraces many of these crises we've been talking about. But short of that and not knowing what we're getting, I think that this is a realistic, honest amendment to try to help resolve the problem immediately. I'm intrigued by it for two reasons. One, the matching fund formula gives us \$20,000,000 for the CTA now. Number Two, a match on an equal basis suggest something better than a two to one formula as seemingly the case here to for. These two reasons suggests that this amendment should be supported because if we don't get Amendment 17 we might not have anything today and I want to hedge by supporting this amendment. Thank you."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in opposition to the amendment. And I would just like to bring the House's attention to the fact of the operating deficit of the State of Illinois. I'll just quote to you three figures and I think it'll show the need of having a overall transportation system for the state. True, CTA is in a financial dilemma. And the CTA 1973 operating deficit is \$33,667,000. The commuter railroads in 1972 their operating deficit was



\$8,400,000. Bus lines, 1972, operating deficits throughout the State is \$3,700,000. These figures were supplied by the Department of Transportation and they've been verified. I would hope that the House cognizant of this fact in support Amendment No. 17, and defeat this amendment."

A. Telcser: "Is there further discussion? If not,... the gentleman from Cook, Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am in opposition to this Amendment. For one thing, it does not address itself to all the mass transit problems throughout the State. Another thing, I think it is poorly conceived, and third the dollar amounts provided are totally inadequate. I am very much opposed to this amendment."

A. Telcser: "Does the gentleman from Cook, wish to close the debate? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "I'll waive a close."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment No. 16 to House Bill 89. All those in favor of adoption, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. This question, there are 83 'nays', 17 'ayes'. Record Representative Hudson as voting 'no'. And this Amendment having failed to receive the majority votes cast is hereby declared lost. Our there further amendments?"

F. Selcke: "Amendment 17. Blair. Amend House Bill 89 as amended by striking line 1 through 3 and inserting in lieu thereof



the following: 'An Act making an appropriation to the Department of Transportation for certain emergency transportation operation grants....'

A. Telcser: "The Gentleman from Will, Speaker Blair."

Blair: "Mr. Speaker, ah.... Amendment No. 17 is the result of a lot of very hard and intense and deliberative negotiation and study by ah.... the leadership on this side of the aisle of this House and ah.... while it might not be pleasing to everyone, I certainly think that it provides the where-with-all to see that on this first time that we're putting state government into the business of providing operating subsidies for mass transportation throughout the State of Illinois; that we're making sure that ah... we're providing the minimal amount ah.... that is necessary so that we can then proceed to ah... devise a somewhat more permanent structure perhaps than we have in this proposal. Now in quick summary, this Amendment will provide for \$26,400,000 of which \$17,950,000 will be ir. State money from the State General Revenue Fund. There will be no monies taken from the State Road Fund or from the Motor Fuel Tax, of course, which goes into the State Road Fund and \$8,550,000 in local money. The Amendment does provide sufficient funds to support state-wide mass transportation operations through June 30, 1973, and it does provides that there will be a state-wide freeze on mass transit fare structures in effect on January 1 of this year and that it will provide for a state-wide freeze for the mass transit



service levels in effect on February 1, for those transit carriers who apply for and receive grants under the amendment. Now, the Amendment covers the Chicago Transit Authority, the amount of money that they will be receiving upon applications during the period from now until June 30, will be \$12,600,000. It provides monies for the commuter rail lines in the amount of \$2,250,000 ah... from the State. For our suburban bus companies, both private and public, \$650,000 and for downstate bus in the amount of \$1,350,000, the distribution to be predicated upon the relationship of those carriers deficits to the total operating deficits of the ah... downstate and suburban bus carriers for calendar year 1972, and ah... last, but far from least, certainly, the Gentleman from ah... Union, Mr. Choate's proposal to provide ah... \$1,000,000 to begin implementation of the rural transportation assistance demonstration project of 1973. The total money that the CTA will be receiving under this program, combining the local share of \$6,300,000, will be \$18,900,000; that is basically \$3,000,000 than the \$16,000,000 that we were addressing ourselves to just last week, and that is to make sure that they are maintained in a working cash position, so that they will not have to raise their fares or reduce their level of service. The commuter rail match that they'll have to come up with, which is 50%, is a soft match predicated upon contributions that will have to be made in the amount of \$2,250,000 from the operation of their



freight lines, and of course there is no match provided for suburban and downstate buses with regard to the Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate's, demonstration project. I ah.... think this is the best possible ah.... quick action solution that could be devised ah.... and address itself responsibly to the situation and I would urge the adoption of this amendment."

A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Cook Representative Douglas."

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is far from easy for me as a Chicagoian to stand up and oppose this Amendment, but I shall do so. I cannot accept after all the weeks and months and yes years that this house has spent arguing the question of mass transit in the State of Illinois, that this is the solution even to the immediate situation. First of all, contrary to what many people say, the CTA is not about to collapse. That is a mistake that many members of this House are allowing themselves to be affected by. I do not believe and the offers of support from Cook County and Chicago have clearly demonstrated that, that the City of Chicago or Cook County during this crisis is going to allow the CTA to be eliminated. Now I recognize, and I will have to account to my constituents in one area of Chicago that there may well be in the very near future, some cutbacks, but I do not feel that we can, by dealing with the symptoms of a very serious disease, deal effectively with the major



problem. This is a bandaid approach, and let us not kid ourselves. The little pittences we are handing out to suburban Cook County and downstate are also solutions to nothing. I was tempted to even to vote for Representative Cunningham's Bill on a protest basis because that's just as much of a solution as what we're coming up here today. Furthermore, I admonish my Cook County colleagues to recognize that we are also not dealing effectively with the basic issue of motor fuel tax funds. We, in giving in now, to dealing with this situation on a systematic basis, are only going to have to come back, hat in hand, to this legislature sometime soon, June 30th or whenever it may be, and God only knows, I wonder what's going to happen here when the Clock reaches midnight on June 30th on this issue and we're going to be begging once again. We're giving out a small amount of money from the General Revenue Fund, which I also think is a questionable move. At this moment, I think Governor Walker's position is a sound one. I think that this issue on this systematic basis should be dealt with by Cook County and by the City of Chicago, even though as I recognize, I'm going to have to account for this position when I go home. I have said on this Floor before, and I repeat it again, I do not trust the Chicago Transit Authority's operational techniques. I don't care if it is the best, and I doubt that, but I don't care if it is the best local urban transit system in the United States. If it is, I wonder what in the world happens in Cleveland and



Detroit and Los Angeles and a lot of other places. I want it to be the best, and I want us to work to make it the best, but we're not going to be doing it by putting a band-aid on this very, very serious festering wound. I am disappointed, terribly disappointed after all these years that with all of the effort that has gone into the question of mass transit, that was still dealing with this question on the basis of the immediate situation. I'm disappointed as we apparently are going to pass this Bill out today and go home to our districts and say we have done our job, that we're not dealing effectively yet with the real issue at hand and that is, how we're going to get about the job of resolving the entire mass transit problem in the State of Illinois. There may be those who say that's not relevant now; to me they are relevant. I will not vote for this Bill. It may simply be a minority protest vote, but I urge others of you who feel the same way, to join with me and put a red light up there and let everyone know that we're not solving anything with this small amount of money now in dealing with what is a very serious problem in the State of Illinois."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I am in support of Amendment No. 17 to House Bill 89. I don't think anyone in this hall believes that this is a permanent solution or this is the solution to our mass transit problems. This Bill deals with an emergency problem that is Representative Garmisa's Bill,



as amended by the Speaker's Amendment No. 17. I don't think Representative Garmisa or the Speaker intended the Bill or this Amendment to be any type of permanent solution. We're only talking about from now until June 30 on an emergency basis, aiding the CTA, Waukegan North Shore Chicago Bus Company and the rail commuter lines and the downstate bus lines in the State of Illinois on an emergency basis for this six month period only. Sure there are flaws in this Amendment. The Chicago, Northwestern Railroad the largest carrier of commuters in the Metropolitan area, can't receive a dime under this. Why? Because they have no deficit. You only get reimbursed for deficits, so they've been so fortunate with the Illinois Commerce Commission in getting raises every year, everytime they've gone in, they have a slight profit. They have a 1% or 2% return on their investment, and have no deficit. So their fares won't be frozen because it won't apply for any aid. Sure there are flaws in this program, but I'm willing to buy this program, while we study the six county metropolitan transit district, which I hope we will enact before June 30th, because I am convinced that the CTA needs this money and needs it now, or at least in the next three or four weeks, and even though I'm from Lake County and no part of my district is in Cook County, or directly served by the Chicago Transit Authority, and even though the Northwestern Railroad, which serves my district, can't receive any money under this because they have no deficits, I think this is a honest



attempt and a honest compromise between Representative Garmisa and Speaker Blair to solve the problem, not on a permanent, not on any kind of lasting basis, but the immediate emergency problem between now and June 30th, and I will vote for Amendment No. 17."

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

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support this Amendment. It is an emergency operating subsidy for mass transportation on a State-wide basis. It will give us the time to address ourselves to the problem of regional transportation. It does give us the opportunity to keep a viable City of Chicago, a viable economic part of this State, going until June 30th. Hopefully by that time we will have solved once and for all the problem of transportation and how to keep it going on a permanent basis."

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

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. speaker. I was wondering if I might ask a question of the Sponsor of Amendment No. 17?"

A. Telcser: "He indicates a yield."

Bradley: "Thank you. I have a concern ah.... on Section 4, that the ah.... language would allow the Secretary of Transportation to make payment to a municipality who has been subsidizing a mass transportation system that now no longer exists. If ah.... I make myself clear, now, let me explain. The municipality, as of this year, is taking over the operation or they do now have a transportation district. Last year, when the \$2,000,000 was made available to them, the language



reads, 'the Secretary of Transportation shall make payment from the appropriation to mass transportation carriers'.

I would like to, in your opinion, would a municipality who last year was subsidizing a private carrier, be eligible for payment from the Department of Transportation?"

Blair: "All right, the ah.... the language ah.... as far as the distribution feature is concerned, it's predicated upon ah.... the ah.... operating ratios that were devised during 1972, so as long as they are a carrier now, they would be able to receive monies under this proposal predicated upon the construction of the loss ah... that existed in 1972. Ah.... the loss is not determinative on the loss in 1972, it's that part of it is just the allocation of the \$2,000,000 that's provided. And as a matter of fact, that's the legislative intent and the are you talking about Bloomington-Normal?"

Bradley: "Yes, Sir."

Blair: "O'kay, we ah.... have a fact sheet, which ah.... would indicate that, for example, ah.... the Secretary, upon application of that carrier, ah.... the operating deficit in 1972 is ah.... from the office of mass transportation figures, was \$55,500. This Bill would provide from the.... ah.... by the State \$38,000 to that carrier in the Bloomington-Normal area."

Bradley: "You're saying to that carrier, the present carrier? You see, the 72 was a private carrier, no longer in existence. and, therefore, we won't necessarily now go to the private carrier, it will go as a \$38,000 loss that has been



incurred by the two city councils of Bloomington-Normal and in your opinion, then, they can make application and be paid from the Department of Transportation, the \$38,000, loss?"

Blair: "That's right. That's the intent of this legislation, and ah.... that's..... even though they were a private carrier, during the period, would make no difference, because that's just determines how the money, the \$2,000, 000 is going to be distributed, and it will.... it would be distributed to now... to what is now a public carrier, if I understand your question."

Bradley: "Yes, that's the question I just wanted to clarify it, if that was your opinion and get it in the record. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in support of Amendment No. 17. I think it's a moderate approach to a very serious problem. And I would also like to advise my colleague from Cook who made the Statement that the CTA, which has been publicly stated in the newspapers that it's being the best transit system within the United States. We attended a meeting at the Merchandise Mart. In fact, all the colleagues from both the House and Senate were invited to attend, and hear the justification for their initial budget request. At that time, many of us stayed through the entire presentation



and there were a series of questions and answers period afterward. I would like the public to be aware of the fact that the first person on his feet was a member that just spoke previously and asked that the CTA be investigated, packed his bag and left. I would like to also point out the fact that Commissioner Johnson and ah... Commissioner Sussey, two management consultants, put many, many man hours of their personal time in looking into the operations of the CTA. I personally would recommend that if a person has a recommendation or suggestion to improve the operating ah... transit authority, put it in writing, follow it through. If you've got the man hours to spend, do it."

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

Douglas: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, since I was mentioned in debate, not by name, but obviously by intent, I would like to rise on a point of personal privilege."

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

Douglas: "When my good friend, Representative Lechowicz, said I packed by bag and left, ah... it's true. It was because I had a commitment that could possibly not have been avoided at that moment. I teach at the University of Illinois and I had a class waiting, that I was already a half hour late for. But more important than that, Representative Lechowicz, is the fact as you well know, again on your point, that you raise. I have not only ask for an investigation of the CTA , but there will be a hearing next Thursday morning before the Executive Committee, at which



I will appear with information that I think will be available and important to this House, and there will be others there who, on the basis of hard data, that they have come up with about the Chicago Transit Authority, will present their side, and I certainly hope that the CTA, itself, will be represented so that this House, once and for all, will get out into the open many of the allegations which we have heard for years about it, and that we can then in our efforts to help the CTA do so on the basis of information that has been brought to us through sources that fit right into our own operating program."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Houlihan."

Jim Houlihan: "I would like to ask the sponsor a few questions."

A. Telcser: "He indicates a yield."

Jim Houlihan: "Speaker Blair, I have... I feel that this is a good Bill, and I'm incline to support it. I have a few questions, really, as to explanations of this Bill. Some details. First question I was really interested in, related to Section 3, and it dealt with the ratio. You mention the ratio there. I was interested in how we determine that. I see that it's determined by the Mass Transportation Department, as I understand the Bill, but is it possible or feasible or do you have any opinion from them, as to the difficulty in determining that ratio? You know, the aspects of that ratio?"

Blair: "Well, for 19.... ah.... calendar year 1972, ah... the ah.... the operating deficit figure that we have is 9.2



million dollars for the commuter ah.... for five out of the six commuter lines. Ah.... if you take half of that you got 4.5 and if you take half of that, you've got two and a quarter. Ah.... that's ah... the simplest I can make it now."

Jim Houlihan: "Fine. The second question is related to that same Section about carrier. This is really for clarification purposes. Ah.... what does that refer.... does that refer to everything, that is, mass transit districts and private carrier, or just private carriers, or what's the definition of that term?"

Blair: "The Carrier refers to the operating entity, not to the District, and it's our understanding that even though we have those transportation districts, that the operational aspects are still the carriers, the Illinois Central, the Rock Island, etc. and they are the ones who would be making the application."

Jim Houlihan: "That clarifies it for me. Does that mean, then, that ah... under that Section, private railroads, plus public bus services like Evanston and service that is operating service from smaller transportation districts, all qualify under the term carrier?"

Blair: "Well, 3 is carriers providing commuter rail service, 4 addresses itself to the suburban and downstate bus situation."

Jim Houlihan: "I understand. Then when you use carriers in 4, it's limited by other language in that Section, is that right?"



Blair: "In 4. Well, yes."

Houlihan: "On Page 3, I have a question. When you talk about matching funds for suburban transportation, really, I think that section refers generally to our funding suburban carriers, and I'll give you the Section Number. It's Section 4. When we're talking about funds there, we're talking about making it available for suburban, basically suburban problems?"

Blair: "No, ah... figures that I have indicated earlier, based upon the figures taken from the Office of Mass Transportation was \$650,000 of the \$2,000,000 provided in that Section would be for application to the suburban bus lines and \$1,350,000 would be to application to downstate bus lines."

Houlihan: "I see. When we're talking about ah..."

Blair: "Those include both private and public."

Houlihan: "Sorry this takes some time, but.... I think the solution is good, but I'm unclear of some of the explanation. When you talk about this matching, we're not referring to the CTA, but in referring to the suburbs and to the downstate areas?"

Blair: "Four has no application to ah.... the Chicago Transit Authority...."

Houlihan: "I'm aware of that. I'm asking the question about downstate and suburbs, not CTA."

Blair: "O'kay."



Houlihan: "Are we requiring in that provision for suburbs in downstate, some sort of match?"

Blair: "No, we are not."

Houlihan: "Why would that be? If we require a match for CTA?"

Blair: "Simply because ah... our investigations revealed that they were not in a position to ah... provide a match, and ah... so if we were going to ah... give them monies to help them maintain a no rate increase and no reduction in level of service, we're going to have to do it on no-match basis."

Houlihan: "Ah... Speaker Blair, I was working on an Amendment, which I think it addresses itself to that problem, that's why I asked the question. Ah... what the Amendment would suggest is that we ah... somehow try to draft legislation which will, shall we say, give incentive to the county board to not use their five million, which publicly they say they have available, but would use that money to set up two matches, half of that match to be given to the City, the other half if we use the figures that they talk about publicly, 2.5, to the suburbs, and then the suburbs, suburban communities and rail services would have a pool of 2.5 million dollars to apply to to use as matching funds for the funds that we are going to appropriate to them. I think basically that is a sound idea because it maintains a consistent position throughout the Bill that we have a principal of matching funds from local districts, and I think it addressed itself to the problem you raise that



it's not possible because many of these Districts are too small and don't have the capital to do it, and I have that idea in somewhat legislative form, and I'm just asking you if you'd be interested in that idea when we.... if we approve it, or can we amend it. I know we have problems amending things now, but it's a suggestion. Are do you like that suggestion?"

Blair: "Well, I certainly think it would be worthy of full discussion ah.... for our Phase II situation. Ah... Phase II is ah.... frankly going to becoming upon us within the next ah.... two or two-and-a-half, three months. Ah.... I think a lot of us will be giving a lot of thought because we will be looking at an appropriation that will be for more than five months. I would take it, ah.... probably for the entire fiscal year, 1974. And here we are addressing ourselves to an emergency situation, the sophistication on formulas, on local match and so forth. ah.... We just haven't..... This is the best job we could do within the time stand that we were trying to work in, so we could keep these carriers operating and moving people to their work. I would be happy and sit down with ah... the Members of the Transportation committee, and to ah..... see if we couldn't look into what you're proposing at that time. At this time, I think ah.... within the time frame work, I would suggest that it would be practical to see if we couldn't wait until the second phase."



Houlihan: "I can understand the time pressure we're under, and could I make a suggestion, that possibly this idea, we might consider, and if the Bill doesn't work under the timeframe that we're talking about; that is, moving quickly through the House and the Senate, that the leadership consider this, if it is practical, and I can give you material, that I think suggests it is practical."

Blair: "Let me say this, you see, once you get into the questions about the Cook County Board, we can't require them to do any particular thing. We can make it as conditions, but you've got to work out those ramifications of your proposal as to whether the Cook County would address themselves to ah... an allocation feature that would be in essence providing the local suburban governments or buses or trains with a mass situation, and I think we are going to have to look in the ah... next Phase II, which will be for fiscal 74, review the whole question of the formula and of the allocation, and I think that's when you ought to bring up your proposal for discussion."

Houlihan: "I'm aware of that. I'm suggesting that... is, I'm not thinking that we can require County Boards to do that, but what I'm suggesting is that we can write the legislation in such a way for a great incentive for them to do that, and that is what I am suggesting. But I think we can do that later, but I think it could be worked out within the crisis situation if the politics could be worked out."

Blair: "I understand what you mean."



Houlihan: "I have two more questions. I'm sorry to take so long, but it's an issue that's very important. The question is, when you talk about matching funds and you talk about renting of facilities and that, is that only related to"

A. Telcser: "Representative Simms, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, in fairness to the other Members, I believe that the gentleman from the County of Cook, has more than had his ample time to question the Sponsor of this Amendment. I would like to move the previous question."

A. Telcser: "He has a little more time left. He indicates he's going to conclude quickly, and then we'll get back to your motion."

Houlihan: "The fact that I have five questions left, I'll just ask two. The two, are when you talk about matching funds, you're only talking about really the an... suburban and downstate districts, and not the CTA. Is that correct, when you talk about rentals being an aspect of match?"

Blair: "I'm only talking about the commuter rail when we talk about allowing them a soft match, which in essence would be the dollar that have been put into their commuter passenger operations for calendar year 72."

Houlihan: "I understand. Now, the last question that I was interested in was, in your proposal, previously and in Representative Shea's proposal previously, there seemed to be some disagreement about time, and there's nothing in



here about time, how did time become no problem, or what's the solution with time now?"

Blair: "I think your question is why is this proposal limited to 6 months and ah.... the proposal that ah... we have been considering earlier address itself to a January 1 of 74?"

Houlihan: "Yes."

Blair: "Well, ah...."

Houlihan: "Because of the emergency aspect of it?"

Blair: "That's certainly one ah... reason. Ah.... the second reason, we have a feeling that's just not over here, it's a general feeling. The leadership on your side is ah... in agreement with us that we've got to make a conscientious and dedicated effort to see if we can at least put into law by June 30 a regional transportation plan, and ah.... there are funding requirements that would ah.... obviously have to be involved ah.... in that consideration, so we should ah.... wait until we get a little closer and go through the orderly appropriations for fiscal year 1974, with regard to any further ah.... operating subsidies which obviously we're going to have to provide."

Houlihan: "I understand that part of it. Let me ask you a question. What happens if we go....."

A. Telcser: "Would you conclude your remarks, Representatives Houlihan?"

Houlihan: "What happens if we go for the six months and aren't about to come up with a solution?"



Blair: Ah.... by solution, you mean the recent plan?"

Houlihan: "A long range regional plan, that we're not able to come up with an adequate solution in that short time frame."

Blair: "I certainly wouldn't want to admit on this floor that we wouldn't be able to do that. There are at least two or three plans in existence now. I'll be.... if you'll let me finish.... I'll be putting in myself a regional plan sometime within the next two to three weeks, but there is no question, ah.... that we will have to ah.... with or without the regional transportation plan, by placing the State in the situation of a continuing subsidy for mass transportation throughout the State of Illinois, that we will have to address ourselves to a funding situation with or without that regional authority ah.... for fiscal year 1974."

Houlihan: "Thank you, I think you answered all my questions. I appreciate that, except the last one, I don't quite know the answer you gave me. I think we ought to think about what happens if we don't solve it then, and that's what I would like to suggest."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Simms."

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

Telcser: "The gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor, signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no', and the gentleman's motion prevails, and the gentleman from Will, Representative Blair, to close the debate."



Blair: "I move we adopt the Amendment."

Telcser: "Gentleman has offered to move the adoption of Amendment No. 17 to House Bill 89. All those in favor of adoption, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

Choate: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to explain my 'aye' vote. It appears that the Amendment is adopted. It appears that maybe I would use good legislative ah... judgement and not explain my vote, but I do feel that I must say a couple of things. I've heard said here today that maybe the emergency situation does not exist as far as certain segments of public transportation in the State of Illinois is concerned, maybe it doesn't exist. Well, I'll be the very first to admit that I do not retain all of the expertise to probably dig in and give this the indepth study that maybe I, as the conscientious legislator should do. But let me point out to you what I have done, and what other members have done as far as public transportation is concerned. I have drawn on the advice and the integrity and the ability of people who do retain expertise in this important field, and they've told me that regardless of the much slow down, as far as the curtailment of services, as far as the possibility of increase in fares, are concerned on CTA, that the emergency does exist just as much as it ever existed. And I suggest to the Members of this House, that this is not the first time that we've had this problem confront us. I said on



the Floor of this House some two weeks ago that I would hope that we could come to a legislative session in the future where mass transit authorities in this state did not rear their ugly heads everytime we took our seats. I would hope that we could come up with a permanent and long-range solution so that we can operate in the best interest of all of the people of this state. And I think that this legislature is going to dedicate itself to these efforts in the very near future more than it has ever done in the past. But, still, while we're doing that the emergency does exist. The lack of funding to provide a feasible operation does exist. So we must address ourselves to this position.. to this question. I'd prepared to work day and night with a committee, a commission or interested people to bring about the solution which we all hopefully think might be brought about. I am also realistic enough to know that while we're doing this, we must provide some type of subsidy so that they can continue operation. These are my reasons for voting 'aye', Mr. Speaker."

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

Katz: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah.. I'm supporting the proposal in view of the emergency situation that we have. But, I would want to comment briefly about the source of the funds that are provided here. It seems to me that in fact a more appropriate source of the funds would be motor fuel tax



funds. The fact is that Chicago has for a long period of time contributed far more in motor fuel tax funds than it has ever gotten back from the State of Illinois. The fact also is that Cook County contributes at least 50% of the motor fuel tax funds of the state. And if you take the six counties in notheastern Illinois, they contribute far more than a majority. Now, we are all committed as I understand it, both political parties.. to not having any increases in taxes. And we're all in favor of that here in Illinois. But we know the problems with reference to schools. We know the problems with reference to all of the other major areas that we're going to be called upon to fund. And I frankly have grave doubts as to whether or not it is responsible for us to put the costs of transportation upon the General Revenue of the State of Illinois. Now, sister state of Michigan and many other states have in fact gone to the use of motor fuel tax funds for transportation. I would point out that Congress is about to authorize the use of motor fuel tax funds. There is nothing sacred about motor fuel tax funds. Why do we have one policy in Washington and a different policy here in Illinois? If Congress can as it is about to do authorize the use of motor fuel tax funds to deal with the critical problems of transportation, why do we here in Illinois refuse to face up to that fact. However, that will remain for another day. I will be supporting the bill but I do not



approve of the choice that has been made with reference to the source of the funds."

A. Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Walters."

Walters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to explain my 'no' vote if I may, please."

A. Telcser: "Proceed, sir."

Walters: "I am not against this moment the CTA bill or Chicago or Cook County, but I am very concerned about the sweeteners that are in this amendment. We talk about no matching funds for downstate. And in my particular area, I represent the bi-state area which is a unique transportation situation between the State of Missouri and the State of Illinois. Most of the time the State of Missouri assumes responsibility for 80% of the cost in Illinois, 20% this is the amount of service we have. Under this amendment, I have been told that the State of Illinois will give or make available to bi-state some \$530,000. I'd like for this body to know that 2 days ago in Jefferson City, Missouri, the Missouri House of Representatives voted on an appropriation for bi-state which was in the amount of \$253,000. And it was voted down by that legislation two to one. Nineteen legislators from the St. Louis and St. Louis County area voted it down. And this particular amendment we are giving to bi-state some \$530,000 and I'm not at this



time willing to vote money from the taxpayers of Illinois to support the people in Missouri. Thank you Mr. Speaker."

A. Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Barry." Record Representative Barry as voting present. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I'd like to explain my 'yes' vote."

A. Telcser: "Proceed, sir."

Houlihan: "I believe and realize it's a time problem, it's an urgency problem. But I think there are other matters that ought to be considered in this solution. And I vote 'aye' with the understanding that I think the leadership will consider all good suggestions and evaluate them based on their merits whether they can in fact be done in the emergency period. And with that understanding in my mind, I vote 'aye' and think it's a good resolution."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "Would you record me as voting 'present' Mr. Speaker."

A. Telcser: "Record Representative Boyle as voting present. Calvo, present. Representative McClain, do you wish to be voted as 'present'? Tipsword, 'present'. Schisler, 'present'. Sharp, 'present'. Now have all voted who wish? Take the record. Lauer, present. Is that right? On this question there are 125 'ayes', 27 'nays', six answering 'present' and Amendment #17 to House Bill 89 is adopted. VonBoeckman wishes to be recorded as voting present. Are there further amendments?"



F. B. Selcke: "Ah.. Amendment #18. Deuster. Amend House Bill 89 as amended by inserting after Section 5 the following and so forth."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, and ah.. Members of the House, I think I have an amendment here that's simple, that's reasonable, that's modest. It's even harmless. And I think that it'll be helpful and useful and will improve this bill a little bit. Ah.. the distinguished leaders on both sides of the aisle as all of us do, I think recognize that ah.. the bill that we happen to have before us is temporary and emergency. And all of us of course are concerned about the question, what is the long-term solution. Ah... where do we go after June 30. And I think that we should ah.. being humble gentlemen as the distinguished minority leader stated. Ah.. we're not experts but we like to consult the experts and we like to ask everybody for their advise and help. My amendment simply requires that ah.. on May 1, 1973, ah.. every carrier receiving money or grants under this act shall try and help us by filing a statement with the Clerk of the House, Secretary of the Senate. I'd like to quote the language although all the distinguished Members can read. But I want to quote the language because I think it's simple and easy to comply with. Ah.. the report ought to simply incorporate the recommendations and comments of these



carriers concerning the establishment of a Regional Mass Transit System to serve the entire metropolitan area and ah.. furthermore, that the statement ought to include their comments and recommendations and views, if any, and I emphasize the two little words, if any. If they don't have any thoughts, they don't have any views why they can just say that. Ah.. but file a report on the tough questions that are confronting us. That is, how are we going to finance a regional agency and who is going to manage it or run it? Now, there is a bill in the Senate that does not include financing. And, of course, many of us don't know how it should be financed. But this amendment providing a new Section 6 would simply call upon those who receive the benefits of the grants to come in and file a statement. Now I recognize that this will be in addition to and to supplement the normal ah.. orderly, legislative process. But I think it's useful as long as we're putting the money out here to put up a simple requirement. And ah.. I do speak, I think with some humility because in one hand I have my idea of a long-range solution, House Bill 131 and I'm sure many, many other members have ideas on what the solution would be. But I simply solicit your support for this amendment so that we have in a statutory form the recommendations of the carriers in the Chicago region ah.. to help us reach this well-known long-range objective, the solution of the Regional



Mass Transit problems in the six counties of northeastern Illinois. Thank you."

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

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if you'd rule according to Rule 26 whether this amendment is in its proper form and if it contains sustance in an appropriation matter."

A. Telcser: "Can you just wait a moment and we'll look it over? Representative B. B. Wolfe, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Wolfe: "Well, ah.. first of all a point of ah.. personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that every Member of this House wishes Ann Lousin a very happy birthday today and I promised her that in honor of her birthday I would not rise to any points of order but I'm sure that other Members of the House can easily ascertain that the amendment violates Rule 426 and 36 that if they would like to make the point, Ann, I will keep my committment to you, Ann. And a happy birthday."

A. Telcser: "The Chair will ah.. rule that the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz's point is well-taken. That under Rule 26f, I believe, the amendment goes far beyond the context of the appropriation. Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Ah.. yes, Mr. Speaker, you've already ruled. Ah.. I might point out that ah.. Section 5 requires that carriers eligible ah.. and I would ask if you might reserve



the ruling. I was not given an opportunity to participate in your ah.. consideration, but Section 5 requires that carriers may enter agreements or must, shall enter into agreements with the Secretary of Transportation saying that they can't raise their fares, lower their fares, increase service, decrease service. And think in view of the context, ah.. in Section 5 that that is certainly more substantive and more serious and more of a stricture on the carrier ah.. than the Section 6. And I would ask that the ruling of the Chair be reconsidered and if not, I will respectfully ask that ah.. the ruling of the Chair be appealed."

A. Telcser: "Well, ah.. Representative Deuster, in order to further explain the ruling of the Chair, it seems to the Chair that when discussing appropriations they ah.. means operating the transit system to which you may be referring to or anyone may.. And that that has a direct relationship to fares and to the services which that money may or may not be able to provide. However, to ask for a transit district, private or otherwise to come up with a new plan, ah.. by such a date seems to the Chair to be far beyond the context of the appropriation. And so the Chair would persist in ruling that the amendment is out of order."

Deuster: "Yes, I respect the position of the Chair and I will withdraw my suggestion that the ah.. ruling be overruled or deal.. Thank you."



- A. Telcser: "All right. The Gentleman has asked that the amendment be withdrawn. Ah.. Are there any objections? Hearing none Amendment #18 will be withdrawn. Are there further amendments?" Third Reading. "The Introduction and First Reading of Bills."
- F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 385. Palmer et al. Amends the Downstate Police Pension Fund Article, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 386, Alsup et al. Amends the Revenue Act, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 387. Friedland. Authorizes the Department of Mental Health to sell land to Kane County, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 388. B. B. Wolfe. Amends the Revenue Act, First Reading of the Bill. 389. Giorgi, et al. An Act to change the time of election and methods of nomination of county board members, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 390. J. J. Wolf. Provides for the compensation of \$50 for each month an Illinois resident was held as a prisoner of war, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 391. J. J. Hill. Repeals an Act ratifying the Illinois-Indiana Air Pollution Act, Third.. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 392, Pierce, et al. Amends the Election Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 393. Pierce, et al. Amends the Revenue Act, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 394, Rayson, et al. Creates an Act to provide for the licensed regulation of hand guns, First Reading of the Bill.



House Bill 395. Hart et al. Amend the Professional Service Corporation Act. First Reading of the Bill. 396. Hart. Amends the Township Act. First Reading of the Bill. 397. Hart. Amends the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. 398. Hart. Amends Section of Counties Act. First Reading of the Bill. 399. Hart. Adds Sections to 1969 Act of Election of County Boards and Downstate Counties. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 400. Catania et al. An Act imposing certain conditions upon carriers receiving payments from appropriations for emergency transportation. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 401. Catania et al. Makes an appropriation to the Auditor General. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 402. B. B. Wolfe. Amends uniform child custody jurisdiction act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 403. B. B. Wolfe. Creates comprehensive dissolution of marriage, legal separation, parental responsibility and marital rights Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 404. B. B. Wolfe. Amends the Paternity Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "Committee..... Committee Reports."

F. B. Selcke: "Mr. Bluthardt from Committee on Elections which House Bill 17 was reported being sent back with recommendations the Bill do pass. Mr. Soderstrom from Committee on Elementary and Secondary, to which House Bill 32 was referred, reported as sending back with amendments thereto, with recommendation amendments be adopted and Bill as amended do pass and be re-referred to Appropriations. No further



Committee Reports."

Arthur Telcser: "Messages from the..... Messages from the Senate."

F. B. Selcke: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the following Preamble and Joint Resolution: House Joint Resolution No. 8. Concurred in by the Senate February 21, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the following Joint Resolution. House Joint Resolution 7. Concurred in by the Senate February 21, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives....."

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

Jaffe: "Did I hear correctly what House Bill 32, re-referred to the Committee on Appropriations?"

Arthur Telcser: "Yes Sir, that's what the message read."

Jaffe: "Well, I don't know why, because it's not an appropriation's Bill."

Arthur Telcser: "The Committee ah..... according to the message the Committee moved to re-refer that Bill back to the Appropriations."



Jaffe: "Well, that was not the recommendation of the Committee."

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

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that that Bill probably should be referred to appropriations, because it requires that there be hired State hearing officers to hear school board dismissal cases. This would be at State expense, and ah.... it would seem reasonable to me that the Appropriations Committee hear this Bill."

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

Berman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that regarding House Bill 32, that was heard in the Education Committee yesterday, ah.... the Appropriation for the hearing officers will be included in the OSPI budget, and I think that the ah.... question as to any expense that might be involved would more properly ah.... be addressed by request for a fiscal note, but I don't think inasmuch as it doesn't involve a direct appropriation, that it ought to be referred."

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

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, the Bill came out of Committee, and I heard you reassign it, and I thought we had a Committee on re-assignments."

Arthur Telcser: "The Speaker didn't reassign it. It was in a message from the Committee Report."

Shea: "Well, I.... I think that it might just sit there, and Representative Klosak and Cox and myself, ah....., I



think would determine whether it would go there. I might also point out one further thing, there is no appropriation in that Bill, that it should come on the calendar, and if somebody wants to find out how much money it costs, ask for a fiscal note. There is not an appropriation in that Bill."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that we've been going through this process of determining whether Bills are constitutional or not. As I see it, you're going to make a constitutional Bill, unconstitutional, by attacking an appropriation on a Bill that isn't an appropriation bill. And I can't see that Bill going to Appropriations Committee because by doing so, you're going to make it unconstitutional. Or the Committee is going to rather."

Arthur Telcser: "Well, ah.... I think there's a matter of procedure that's involved here. As you know, ah.... when we send Bills that are of a substantive nature, the committee on assignments or the Speaker in the old days, ah.... would send them to the Substantive Committee and after there was action on the substantive committee, the Bill would automatically be re-referred by the Clerk of that Committee over to the Appropriations Committee, so it then.....the appropriations feature or the expenditure of money feature would be considered by the Appropriations Committee, and then come out on the Floor. Now, the Rule to which ah.... they were referring is 31E, which provides that all Bills



providing for an expenditure of Public funds, an expenditure of public funds, shall be referred or re-referred to the Committee on Appropriations before final action is taken in the House. Now, that's the problem. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, what you're saying is that any Bill that needs a fiscal note has to go to appropriations now?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The Chair's not saying that. I refer you to the Rule."

Jaffe: "We can be very cute about it, but that's exactly what you're saying, Mr. Speaker, because this Bill perhaps requires a fiscal note, the funds are being appropriated by the Office of the OSPI, and the Committee did not, in fact, as Mr. Telcser said, recommend that this be re-referred to Appropriations. So I think what you're saying is that anytime we have a fiscal note on a Bill, we're going to have to go to appropriations, and appropriations is going to pass on anything."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "What do you suggest we do with 31E?"

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that that is not applicable and I think that you know that it is not applicable."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Wait a minute. Well, wait a minute! That rule says and listen, 'all Bills providing for an expenditure of public funds shall be referred or re-referred to the Committee on Appropriations before final action is taken by the House'. Now, the question is, does the Bill provide for an expenditure of public funds? If



it doesn't, then it shouldn't go to Appropriations."

Jaffe: "It does not, Mr. Speaker, and it should not go to Appropriations. The committee did not say that. If your ruling is as it is, at this particular moment, and if you rule the way I think you're going to rule, then any Bill that has a fiscal note in it, has to go to Appropriations and you know that's correct."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the suggestion's made, in order to expedite the matter that we asked the Chairman of the Committee to withdraw the Committee Report until we can sit down and get the thing ironed out, and we can report that back in then, as soon as we get it ironed. In any event, it will not be going over to the Appropriations Committee right now. Gentleman from ah.... Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Soderstrom."

Soderstrom: "Mr. Speaker, in accordance with your suggestion, I move if necessary that the Committee Report be withdrawn at this time, so we can straighten out the matter."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "O'kay, so now we'll withdraw it and the the Bill is ah.... awaiting report from Committee on whatever the Committee action was. Gentleman from DuPage Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a matter of parliamentary inquiry, as to future problems, like this. It seems to me.... Does the Committee make that decision and suggest to the Chairman of the Committee that the Bill be re-referred to Appropriations, in this case, or is that something the



Chairman decides, or did I hear you say the Clerk?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I suggest.... We're going to have a Rules Committee meeting at four o'clock. It's a matter of procedure. Whenever there's been clear cut cases, where there is an appropriation, it's automatically been re-referred by the Substantive Committee to the Committee on Appropriations, and the Rules require that. I take it that the only problem here, is that there's no line item appropriation, but the question is on whether or not it provides for expenditure of funds. Now, we can resolve that in the Rules Committee, and ah... in any event, no damage is done as I see in the situation if we ah... just withhold that Committee Report on a re-referral. We'll get it ironed out and ah... if it should come to the Floor, we'll see that it comes direct to the Floor rather than going to appropriations. O'okay? Gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to point out, first of all, that not only does this not include an appropriation, the Bill doesn't even....."

Arthur Telcser: "The matter's already been referred, Sir."

McGrew: "I was just going to point out though, Sir, it doesn't even say that the person has to be paid. Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 89."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 89. An Act to make an Appropriation to the Department of Transportation for certain emergency transportation operation grants. Third Reading of the Bill."



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

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill has been thoroughly debated in this House, and I am sure the Members are well acquainted with all the provisions of House Bill 89, as it's been amended. However, very briefly, I would like to state that I am making no claims that this Bill or anyother solution, we may propose in this General Assembly, will service as a panacea to cure the financial ills of all mass transit systems in Illinois. However, this Bill, is in a shape so that it will provide the financial support that we are so sorely in need of to keep all mass transit rolling in our State. And I would certainly appreciate an affirmative vote for House Bill 89."

Arthur Telcser: "The Gentleman from Will, Speaker Blair."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Mr. Speaker, ah.... I think this is a significant day in the State of Illinois with respect to putting State government in the position for the first time, ah.... providing operating subsidies for mass transportation. We took a compatible step to this some two years ago, in 1971, when the State of Illinois, made provision for two hundred million dollars for capital improvement bonds for mass transportation, and I want to emphasize, and I can't emphasize this too strongly, that the funding for that capital improvement bond issue in the amount of two hundred million dollars came from the State General Revenue Fund, not from the State Road Fund, so I would say ah... that we



are, priority wise, addressing ourselves to the right place in this question, when we look at this money coming from the State General Revenue Fund and not from the State Road Fund, and I would certainly hope that on that question, the gentleman on the Second Floor, recognizes the intent of the remarks that are being made by the Gentleman that is now speaking. I think this is a modest program until June 30. It is not a bandaid approach, as was suggested by somebody. The figures have been agreed to by the acting board of the chairman of the CTA, Mr. Claire Roderick and by Miltor Pikarsky, who's going to be the next Chairman of the Board, that this provides sufficient monies for the Chicago Transit Authority to operate from now until June 30, without any increase in their rates or any reduction in their level of service. It provides sufficient funds for the commuter rail carriers to continue to do the same thing without any increase in their rates or reduction level of service and identical with the suburban and down-state bus companies. I think it's a... ah.... fiscally responsible move. It does give us the time necessary to work hard and to adopt a... a regional transportation plan prior to June 30, and ah... we will have to be considering, of course, the continuing subsidy situation for the entire fiscal year, 1974, as we move on down ah... towards the appropriation part of this Session, and I would appreciate a favorable vote from those Members who respond to the question of mass transportation in their



particular areas." Gentlema

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe somebody from downstates should say something in opposition to this Bill, before we vote thereon. I think most of us can agree with the concepts that the users should not pay everything on the CTA or any other mass transportation system. A subsidy is in order, but the subsidy should come from the CTA District. It should not come from the State of Illinois. The State of Illinois has no obligation to support the CTA, and I want to tell you, that the People in my district of Montgomery County and Sangamon County feel no obligation, whatsoever, to support the CTA. Now, we have asked for Home Rule. Home Rule has obligations to tax yourself. The CTA District, whether it uses its gas tax, sales tax, property tax, wherever they want to get the money, it is there responsibility to get the money, and it's about time we put all of the responsibility on their shoulders. Other Cities, other large cities have subsidized themselves. They do not run to the State. The City of Springfield is one of them. Now, in the original Bill, they ask for sixty million. Thirty million they said they would come up with themselves. If they can pony up thirty million, then why are they seeking twelve million now? Why don't they carry the twelve million and be done with it. Now if the State of Illinois



has so much money to give away, let's give it back to the People where we promised. We told the People, both parties, that we are abolishing sales tax on food and medicine. If we give it away in such things as this, we'll hear the same cry as we heard from the Ogilvie Administration, we're clean out of money, and we have nothing left to give you, to rebate or refund your sales tax from food or medicine. Now, the CTA is like a big fat hog. Every year it gets greedier and greedier. I for one want you to know that I am tired of slopping the hogs. It's.... I think it is time for us to put them on notice that they are going to support the CTA themselves and the free rides are over with, and I hope we vote to show them that."

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

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow members of this House. I would be remiss in my duties if I didn't say a word or two in behalf of every farmer and landowner downstate, outside of Chicago who have nothing to do with the CTA and using the bus lines. All the small towns and I'll just name a few - such as Paris, Illinois, Shelbyville, Pana, Mattoon, well, Mattoon may have a bus or two. Ah.... Taylorville, ah... Litchfield, Pontiac and many, many others in this State will... the People thereof will be expected through their taxes to support bus lines that they never will use. If this isn't taxation without representation, what is it. I would like to ask you? I



am rather curious about a point that I haven't heard mentioned. Ah... in this particular discussion. About three years ago, I checked into one facet of the ah... of the CTA in Chicago, and I discovered there were two hundred and forty-three attorneys on the payroll at that time. I wonder if they are still there? Most of them, X-political hacks. Now, do the People downstate have an obligation to support this payroll, if they're still there? I don't say they still are, I simply don't know. But they were some three years ago. The other administrative leaders who sit with the CTA, up to \$33,000, \$33,500 dollar a year salary. The whole salary schedule, as I checked it a few years ago, was completely out of line. I wonder if they've done anything to reduce that. I seriously doubt it. I think it's time that we downstate stand up and vote 'no', 100% in behalf of our constituency, who are going to be paying the freight for something we have nothing to do with and cannot influence in one way or the other."

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

Hyde: "Thank you.... Thank you, Mr. speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't think anybody was hanging on a cliff waiting for the agreement to be reached between the leaderships of both sides of the aisles. We all know that they agreed, and we all knew that they would agree and I'm very happy to support what I think is an excellent resolution of the very conflicting interests in this legislature. But I think the over-riding feature of this



bit of Legislation, is the outspoken Leadership that the Governor has provided this Legislature in ah... letting us know.... letting us know where he stands on this most important issue. I am reminded of no other public figure in recent history, except, perhaps, Calvin Coolidge. And, I look forward ah... I look forward...."

Arthur Telcser: "Repre.... Representative.... One moment.

Representative Lechowicz, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Lechowicz: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe that the Governor... In fact, he made his position quite clear on when he addressed the First Session of the General Assembly, that he went in for M.F.T. Funds. And, if the Speaker has a.... The Speaker who speaks on this think now has a thing that he'd like to offer that proposal within this Bill, we'll consider it."

H. J. Hyde: "Ah.... if I...."

Arthur Telcser: "Proceed, Representative Hyde."

H. J. Hyde: "I... I didn't quite understand those last remarks.

But, I'll talk to Representative Lechowicz privately. Ah... I... I would like to say, though, Mr. Speaker, that I do look forward to other ah... fearless and detailed pronouncements on the other vital questions such as Welfare, Mental Health and Revenue that will face this Legislature. Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Madison, Representative Kennedy."



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

I rise in support of House Bill 89. And I've heard several speakers talk against it coming from downstate, but my belief of the parliamentary body is that we owe allegiance to the State of Illinois. Obviously, we owe allegiance to our District. But you owe allegiance to the People who have no automobiles, have no other means of transportation. The CTA comes down here every session seeking money. I don't know why they do, but I still say, that what you do everytime you build a highway, you take hi-rise apartments off the tax assessors rolls and put highways on them, and you owe an obligation to the poor people who have to pay higher taxes. You owe them an obligation of giving them a means of transportation, and I think everybody in this General Assembly should support this Bill, because you have an obligation to the Senior Citizens of this State, whether they come from Madison County or Cook County, or Christian County, or St. Clair County, or what county they come from, you've got to give them some means of transportation, and House Bill 89, while it's not an answer to everything, it does help alleviate a situation that gives people a chance to ride a transportation system who have no automobiles. And I'm going to support the Bill."

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

Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to just say a few words in reference to this



Legislation. I listened intently last week as debate on Amendments was taking place and also this afternoon, As far as aid for the ailing CTA is concerned. There has been crisis after crisis in the CTA ever since I've been in the General Assembly, and I imagine there always will be as long as the Unions allow it to be milked dry. I just have one or two points I want to mention, and here's legislation we're asked to approve, appropriating some eighteen million dollars of public funds from Mass transportation. Some 12-1/2 of this to help maintain the CTA until July 1, 1973. The other million is included in the Legislation, of course, is for downstate mass transportation, and this is to sweeten the bitter medicine just a little bit, so that the Downstate Members will vote for it. It was stated in debate a week ago, that Chicago pays 70% of the sales tax and for this reason, should be entitled to this Revenue as a favor. I would like to correct that statement just a little bit. The citizens of Chicago do not pay all of the 70% of sales tax. Chicago merely collects it and sends it to Springfield, if you please. Takes credit for it, of course, but a huge amount of this sales tax, is paid from the People from outside of Chicago and those who go there to shop, those who order by mail and those who go there to attend the many hundreds of conventions that are held there each year. This Legislation allows millions of dollars to a transportation system that only



announced a 50% cut in fares to people from Chicago, who are over 65 years of age. On a 24 hour basis if you please, and it was stated that this cut is a cut in Revenue of some nine million dollars per year. Now Senior Citizens from other areas of Illinois are going to have to pay their full fare when they ride this system, but they also have to help pay the freight, so the Senior Citizens in Chicago can ride for half fare. This by chance wouldn't be discrimination, would it? Was this cut in fare purposely made to create a financial crisis to prod the General Assembly into voting funds for the CTA? I have my own ideas. Former Governor Ogilvie, when directing this legislature on last June the 15th, said that if fares of the CTA went up to fifty cents, they would be the highest in the Nation. Now I ask you what's wrong with this? The teachers in Chicago are the highest salaried in the nation, and Mayor Daley says the Chicago truckers are entitled to more pay per hour than any other truckers anywhere in the Nation, so what's wrong with having the highest transportation fares? It was stated that if fares went to fifty cents, the poor riders would use their cars. I ask you in all sincerity, where can you park your car for fifty cents in Chicago for thirty minutes, let alone the gasoline and the wear and tear it takes to get there in. State of Illinois is not in a position to kiss every financial ill in the State of Illinois and make it well and it's time the CTA learns to stand on its own two feet. Where are



the loud voices that we heard... that we hear everytime to remind us when legislation is proposed for the entire State of Illinois. Let us in Chicago out, we're a home rule unit. We'll take care of ourselves. I heard nothing of this last week or today. It appears to me that if Chicago wants to be a Home Rule unit and run their own show, except when it's possible to tap the State Treasurer for assistance.. I am sure that the People in my district do not relish the idea of being taken on this sort of a ride, so I'm going to vote 'no'"

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Christian, Representative
Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if Speaker Blair, who first spoke to this, would answer a question. I have a question about something I'm not sure that I understood in his presentation."

Arthur Telcser: "It's a little out of order, but the gentleman indicates he will."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, you said something about a continuing subsidy, as a result of this. What... what did you mean. I'm.... I'm not sure that I understood you. I don't believe the Bill itself provides for any continuing subsidization of mass transit system, but did you say that you contemplated that that was a result or a necessity?"

Blair: "Well, ah... that answer ah... was given in regard to a question from the Gentleman from Cook, as to ah... he noted that this proposal only provides monies to keep the



present rate level and level of service in existence until June 30, and what would the situation be after that? And I suggested that we were, for the first time, taking the State of Illinois into the posture of providing monies for subsidizing operating expenses of mass transportation all over the State of Illinois, and that in counter distinction to capital improvements, which is a one shot thing, that we did in 1971, that the likelihood was strong that we will have to proceed to take a good look at providing ah.... monies for operating ah.... expenses and deficits of these various mass transportation systems over the State of Illinois for fiscal year 1974, and that undoubtedly, that legislation would be going through the regular appropriation process, and ah.... could well be before this Body prior to June 30, whether or not a regional plan is adopted, although we are definitely going to be looking at a regional transportation plan, which I am confident we will be able to adopt."

Tipword: "You didn't, therefore, ah.... you didn't say therefore, that you contemplated an absolute continuing subsidy to all mass transit in the State by virtue of starting this procedure, did you?"

Blair: "Well, no, I just make the observation that we certainly were placing the State into a position of recognizing that ah we do have a responsibility in the area of providing operating ah... monies ah... for our mass transit system, so this matter comes back before us again, we will in



my judgement at least, have provided a public policy, as far as the State of Illinois is concerned about recognizing that we have a responsibility in this area, and that it would not... And I would think that we would have to be looking at some further subsidy situation for fiscal year 1974, but that matter will have to stand or fall as this House, in its wisdom, determines in its appropriations committee and substantive committees determine."

Tipsword: "Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf."

J. J. Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I know we're all hanging with baited breathe, waiting the outcome of this, so therefore I move the previous question."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor, signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'nay'. The gentleman's motion prevails, and the gentleman from Cook, Representative Garmisa, to close the debate."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I strongly urge the passage of this legislation in order to keep our urban areas viable and economically sound. And without such support, transit in our state, cities and towns, will inevitably be abandoned. We cannot permit this to happen in Illinois. I believe it is inevitable that the concept of government providing freedom of mobility shall be achieved in the not to distant future, but until then, Mr. speaker, I would appreciate the affirmative vote



of every member of this House."

Arthur Telcser: "Question is, shall House Bill 89 pass? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative R. D. Cunningham."

R. D. Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As has been mentioned by prior speakers, the clues of the chief executive's position in this matter, have neither been numerous nor uniform, but we can, by careful study and gleaning of all his pronouncements, come to certain conclusions. One was, that communities must do their very best on their own, before having the right to tap the Treasury throughout the State of Illinois, and when we consider all of these things and having talked with all of the Harris specs, who predict that the Governor can only veto this Bill, I say to you, that those are rushing in to cast a green light, will look very foolish if that should be the outcome. You have a right to wait and have more leadership guidance, so you should be voting red. Now there's a second reason that I'm voting red, and that is that there isn't a dime in there for any of the People or any of the communities in the 54th District. My constituents are all very tolerant, but they're not that tolerant, so we urge you, if your constituents are similarly minded, to vote red also."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from ah.... McLean, Representative Bradley."



Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain my vote. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think it is significant today on the 20th anniversary of the discontinuation of passenger service of the interurban railroad between East St. Louis, Jacksonville, Springfield, Decatur, Bloomington and Peoria, that we would be addressing ourselves to a transportation bill that effects all of the State of Illinois, and if twenty years ago this Bill would have been contemplated by the House of Representatives at that time, we might still have that transportation system providing passenger service for the People of Central and Downstate Illinois. In explaining my 'yes' vote, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the cities, the two cities in my district, have met the obligation of providing funds and reimbursement for the Bloomington-Normal City Bus Lines, and I don't know for how long, they will be able to subsidize and provide passenger service and much needed service to the People in that particular area. It's going to cost them, this year, approximately ten thousand dollars per month, and I'm wondering where we are going to get that ten thousand, or that hundred and twenty thousand dollars for that particular year. It is a small amount some thirty five thousand dollars, that we can expect to be returned to the taxpayers of the City of Bloomington and Normal and from this particular package, but I'm very happy to support this piece of legislation, because it will help the downstate transportation system. Also, my reasons for voting



'yes', is the high expectations of three other Bills that were... that will be moving along through this Legislature very shortly, and one of those Bills provides some transportation funds to our school systems, some 95% of the total cost of the transportation of our students to our schools will be provided if that piece of legislation passes, thereby enabling the reduction of our local taxes for the purposes of transportation. Also, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to say that this money is not coming from the motor fuel taxes, as was originally provides, but now is going to be coming from the General Revenue Fund. So I know it is not a popular thing to be doing for downstate Members of the House of Representatives, but I think there are enough good reasons and reasons to vote 'yes', and I'm very happy to put my green light up there, and very happy to see that we have 91 votes for this measure. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, So that I'm not misunderstood by my 'no' vote, I'm compelled to explain it. I don't think there's a Member of this House that questions my concern for public transportation and private transportation. Both within the northeastern Illinois Counties area, as well as in the State of Illinois as a whole. But what concerns me, and what does concern me, is that House Bill, as amended, is no solution. It's a stop gap measure and what concerns me about this stop gap



measure is that while today, it's print on paper, I'm fearful that the folly and fallacies that are contained in this Bill ultimately will become engraving and granted, which we shall never be able to erase. Now, there's four things about this Bill as amended that constitute, in my opinion, folly and fallacy. Number one, we have three different formulæ. One affecting the City of Chicago, one affecting the suburban area, and one affecting downstate. I don't know the rationale for any of these formulæ or any of these ratios. Number two, while I may be in the minority, in my opinion, the State money for the support of mass transportation should come from the Road Fund, because the motoring public that will benefit directly and indirectly from a healthy transportation system. Number three, I have to object to the indiscriminate appropriation of money outside the Chicago transit area. What we are doing is simply giving money away elsewhere, so that we can give money to the Chicago Transit Authority. And finally, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I respectfully suggest that in this Bill, we have an unconstitutional form. We do violate the constitution which requires that appropriation bills be restricted to appropriation. And if this is not the case, why were House Bills 88 and 89 introduced at the outset by the Sponsor of the Bills. House Bill 88, having the formula. House Bill 89, having the appropriation. That was good form. That was constitutional form, but what we have here is a consolidation of the



two, which I respectfully suggest constitutes bad policy, practice and is unconstitutional. And for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I regretfully vote 'no', not because I'm anti CTA. I am for CTA. I am for other forms of mass transportation, but I do think we should do it the right way, and we should come about with a formula, with a program that will be successful now, as well as in the future."

Arthur Telcser: "Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, the thought is from the tally, that my vote isn't needed, but I think being a responsible legislator is a duty of all of us, and while this Bill certainly takes care of the temporary problem in the greater Chicago area, it also helps or will help to alleviate the... or some of the problems we face downstate. And I might add my constituents have communicated to me to great extent in regard to this, but basically only on one issue, and that was where the funds were going to come from. They were diametrically opposed to the Motor Tax Fuel monies being used for this appropriation. That was the only objection I've had from any of my constituents, and I think being responsible, not only to my People in my district, but also the People over the whole State of Illinois, I don't go to Chicago too often, but I do know they have problems with Transportation, because I've had them when I've been there. I stay away as much



as I possibly can. But they do have problems and I'm willing to recognize that problem to do what I can to support their problems as well as they will when I have issues downstate and I'm sure they're going to support us downstate on our problems. And I vote yes."

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

Brochers: "Mr. Speaker and Fellow Members of the House.

just in explaining my vote I'd like to remind the representatives of Rockford of ah.. Rock Island, Danville, Springfield, Decatur, Matoon, the towns that have small bus lines and all that's been happening here is a little crumb being thrown out to get our votes. You're taking it right down to Macon County, my district, which I know very well.. Decatur is the only one with a bus line. All the other communities are without any bus lines. Neither do they desire them. We have here a perfect example of taxation without transportation or desire of the people to be transported. And this affected my opinion perhaps 50, 40%, 45% of the people of the State of Illinois. Even in Decatur, only a few use the bus lines. The majority of the people-do not want to use the bus lines. And I do not feel these people should be taxed for this cause so I vote no."

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

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise Number one, and I think I ought to do this, to thank all of those who are voting the green light. I



want to remind you when you talk about the General Revenue Fund that as a Member of the Committee on Public Aid and Welfare, it's over a billion dollars now. Way up over a billion dollars. I don't know what it'll be for the next biennium, but I know this. That if we don't keep public transportation running, there'll be a tremendous increase. A lot of the industries moved outside the limits of Chicago and said that they'll need public transportation. And this money, any increase except the money we get from the federal government as matching funds will certainly come out of the General Revenue Fund. One of our daily newspapers carried an article not long ago in which it reminded us that there were only two major cities in our nation that didn't get some kind of a subsidy for mass transportation. One of them was Chicago and one of them was Cleveland. But more than that, just recently.. just recently, this is why I want to thank you, over 400,000 senior citizens in Chicago were given permits if you please, permits for reduced fare. Certainly the fares would have to be raised again on these senior citizens and more than that if the service was cut down, they would be forced to walk perhaps several miles before they would be able to ride any public transportation. I have out there now over 1,500 letters reminding me of the fact that if there is a reduction of service, the undue hardship that will be worked on the people. I don't know whether you received



this but I just received this letter which says from the Veteran's Administration, the recent announcement of elimination of bus routes from the CTA system is of great concern to the Veteran's Administration.

Approximately 250,000 Illinois veterans and their beneficiaries visit the Veteran's Administration Regional Office and the adjoining VA West Side Hospital and Health Patient Clinic each year. Many of these veterans are elderly, many of them are disabled, and about.."

A. Telcser: "Representative Washington, could you bring your remarks to a close?"

Washington: ".. 60% of them.. about 60% of these veterans use public transportation. With due consideration for the veterans, we hope you will give careful consideration. I rise to thank all of those who are voting green here because you're doing a great service to the people not only of Chicago but when we think about our veterans, we're doing a great service to the people of this nation."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Kane, Representative Grothberg."

Grothberg: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my no vote. While complimenting the leadership of this astute body on getting an agreement, I must say it does nothing for the people in District 38 except on the expense side of the ledger. Number two, I have spoken before that the hard working employees of the Chicago Transit Authority have indicated their grave concern that they would lose jobs while making



rumbles that they are ready to begin to pick up whatever we have done here and negate our efforts in the form of labor negotiations. And third and last, the missing ingredient in this bill must find a way into its successor bill.. how do we get people out of cars on to public transportation. I vote 'no', Mr. Speaker."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd like to explain my vote. I am going to request that I be permitted to vote 'present' upon this bill. I'm voting present for the reason that I'd like to be in support of this bill. I think that we have an obligation to the mass transit district in the State of Illinois under the CTA. And I think we need to see that those districts flourish and the people who depend upon them can get to their employment. Regrettably, this bill has been presented in some quarters as a package of bills. The other bills being House Bill 305, 306 and 307. I think that the emergency, the dire emergency, was relieved over this past weekend. The bills are set for hearing next week. If those bills were out here on the floor to receive consideration today and in those bills giving to all the people in all of our districts downstate. And equality and a part of this package of transportation so that it would be a thing which all of the people of the State of Illinois would share in in an equitable proportion that I



could vote for this bill and know that everyone was being served by the package of bills. Regrettably the package is being split up and not knowing what's going to happen, consequently I would request that I would be permitted to vote 'present' on this bill."

A. Telcser: "Would the Clerk please record Representative Tipword voting present. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my vote. Being a Representative from a downstate district, and voting green voting for the bill, I'd like to explain the reasons why. I'm not really fond of this bill. There are many things about it I don't like. I for instance don't like responding to crises. I for instance don't particularly care for the type of matching funds structure that this bill provides for the commuter railroads. And that it appears to me that all we're doing is requiring them to make a bookkeeping entry which may be reversed after the period of time of the emergency is over. I find many things about the bill that I find improper. And on the other hand I would like to point out that I believe that the people in my district are not insensitive to the problems of the poor, to the problems of the elderly, to those who need mass transportation to get to work in the City of Chicago. And I'm also confident from talking with the Members on my side of the aisle and many who are voting for the bill that this will be an



emergency appropriation for.. which will aid all of the people in the State, downstate as well as Cook County and for that reason I vote for the bill."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, am in the same position as Representative Beaupre. The amount that my district would get under this bill is very minimal. However, I do feel that the people involved in the City of Chicago pay taxes also. And I do feel that they do need some help. However, I also feel this is the last time I will vote for an appropriation like this if it isn't resolved more equitably for the whole state with the Mass Transit District after June 30. So, I'll vote yes this time."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, back in 1969 when I served on the Appropriations Committee, the CTA came before that committee with a problem. They were asking for funds. I asked a very significant question as to how the City of Chicago and surrounding areas were attempting to alleviate that problem by helping themselves. I got no answer to that question at that meeting and I have yet to get an answer to that question. In the mean time, Peoria, for example, my home area has had its problems in transit. We took the bull by the horns. Ah.. voted in a transit authority. Voted by referendum to tax our-



selves in order to alleviate the problem. Now I'm not unaware of the fact that by the provisions in this bill Peoria is going to be the recipient of \$215,000 which will help the operating fund deficit. However, until such time as the City of Chicago, the CTA will address itself to the problem of trying to ah.. solve its own problem by taxing itself and it has this power, why I am not about to vote more funds time after time for the CTA even though my home district will get some funds out of this appropriations bill. Until such time, I'm.. I'm compelled to vote no on this particular bill."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to explain my present vote. Although from my constituency it behooves me politically to vote against this particular bill. In good conscience I cannot. I feel very deeply for the 400,000 daily commuters and for the people that Representative Kennedy so ably ah.. stated and so in good conscience I cannot vote 'no'. However, because of the reasons stated by Representative Tipword I do not believe I can support this bill. So I ask you to vote me present."

A. Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting present. The Gentleman from.. There are still members the recognition to explain their votes. The Gentleman from Marion, Rep. Representative Stedelin."

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



the time I was a small boy, I was taught to believe that this is one state. The problems at our end may not be the same as yours. But I've been sent to church and Sunday school all my life and I can't help but believe that I am my brother's keeper. And I'm thinking of those that absolutley need mass transit. I've seen it in Chicago. I've been up there. And I've seen it badly. We are one state. We have different problems. And, now, here's what I want to do now is take the opportunity and you folks downstate better think of this a whole lot, I want to thank you folks from Cook County and Chicago very much for helping us vote the appropriation that helped us out for the Shelbyville Lake, the Carlyle Lake and the Rend Lake. I want to thank you very much for the money that you're helping send to some of our schools in Pulaski County that we could have no schools at all. Let's think ladies and gentlemen. There are many a many lives that need this. We are our brother's keepers and I think we should give this amount and keep CTA going and other mass transits. Thank you."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Kane, Representative Hill.
Excuse me. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be recorded
as voting present. I think I've indicated the reasons
why it's difficult for me to make a vote yes or no on this.



~~He~~ I should also like to adopt the reasons given by
~~the~~ Representative Schlickman for his vote."

A. ~~The~~ Speaker: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'present'.

~~The~~ Gentleman from Macon, Representative Alsup."

Alsup: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
 I want to echo the sentiments that's been expressed by
 several people. But you know we're elected to come down
 here and attend to the people's business. And we're
 here and can study these problems. And I think you
 have to be concerned about the problems of all the
 people in the State and I know that being from downstate
 probably I will be blasted in the press and in my
 district. But I want to remind you that Chicago pays
 over half the taxes and normally gets back less than
 half the benefits or Cook County as a whole. I've looked
 into this several times. And it's been pointed out that
 Chicago's always been willing to help downstate. Now
 if we let CTA fold up and not run for a few months
 it will fall into complete disrepair. That' number one.
 Number two, we're going to spend far more money than
 this on public aid. We're going to lose more money
 than this on the decrease on the state income tax and
 our sales tax. To me it's only good business and I
 vote for this with the confidence that the leadership
 will keep its word. That the other side is honorable.
 That the package providing for transportation for
 approximately 80% to 95% for school buses will be passed.



And in this legislature you have to put some trust in the word of your fellow legislators. I've found very few legislators that will deliberately lie to you. And to me, I have the confidence that all parts of this state will benefit. Think how simple it would be to provide transportation in the rural area. All I have to do is to run an extra bus or two. To have a seat or two available to where the women or someone out in the rural area can for a.. maybe a quarter ride the bus to town and back. So considering all of it, there's about \$20,000,000 involved for the downstate transportation of school pupils. And I don't think downstate's coming down too badly. And therefore I'm going to vote 'yes' because I fell that is the most responsible vote. Thank you."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, by way of explanation I'd like to announce that the Committee on Veteran Affairs and Personnel Attentions will meet immediately following adjournment if we ever adjourn."

A. Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 103 'ayes', 60 'nays' and this bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side I move that the vote be reconsidered."



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

Berman: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, I move that motion lie upon the table."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman's motion lie upon the table." All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. The opposed 'no'. The Gentleman's motion prevails. Representative VonBoeckman wishes to be recording as voting 'aye'. Representative Capuzi, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Capuzi: "Purpose of an announcement, Mr. Speaker. The Committee on Human Resources will be held immediately after adjournment. We have about a dozen people waiting there so I'd appreciate it if you'd all get down there as fast as possible."

A. Telcser: "Agreed resolutions."

F. B. Selcke: "House Resolution 63. Geo-Karis. House Resolution 64. Lechowicz. House Resolution 65. Friedland. House Joint Resolution. W. D. Walsh."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

W. D. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 63 introduced by Mrs. Geo-Karis and many others proclaims January 27 ah.. in the future and all January 27ths thereafter as 'Praise Our Warriors Day'. House Resolution 64 by Representative Lechowicz ah.. suggests that the Chicago Board of Education name a school at Pulaski Road and Ashland Avenue the Marie Currie School. And House Resolution 65 by Representative



LaFleur commends the students of West Chicago Junior High School for their outstanding achievement in providing funds for the victims of the recent Guatemala Earthquake. And if you'll pay attention to House Joint Resolution Number 10, this is the adjournment resolution and ah.. will the Clerk please read the adjournment resolution?"

F. B. Selcke: "House Joint Resolution Number 10. Resolved by the House of Representatives the 78th General Assembly, the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring hereinafter that when the House of Representatives adjourns on Thursday, the 22nd, 1973, it stand adjourn until Tuesday, February 27, 1973 at 9:30 o'clock a. m. And when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, February 22, 1973, it stand adjourn until Wednesday, February 28, 1973 at 11:30 o'clock a. m."

W. D. Walsh: "Ah.. and now Mr. Speaker, there will be a perfunctory session of the House tomorrow morning at 9:00 o'clock. And when the House adjourns from that perfunctory session we will convene in perfunctory session on Tuesday, February 27th, at 9:30 o'clock. We will go into Regular Session on Tuesday, February 27, at noon. And your attendance will be required then. Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of other.. if that takes care of the adjournment resolutions.. I have a couple or one other agreed resolution and I wonder if the Clerk would read that."



F. B. Selcke: "House Resolution 66. Ewell, et al. Whereas February 19th, 1973 marks the 54th birthday, we believe contrary to such usually reliable sources as the 1971-1972 blue book of our illustrious competent, always personable, and usually well-informed colleague in the House for four terms, the Honorable Harry 'Bus' Yourell of Oak Lawn, Illinois. And whereas Representative Yourell is not only a great legislator but a successful restuaranter and insurance brokerage business operator and a leader in community and civic affairs in the Evergreen Park/Oak Lawn area. And whereas he served his country in World War II and was awarded the bronze star and purple heart and whereas he has served the village of Oak Lawn as trustee to the Democrat Party as Delegate to its National Convention and as its Ward Township Committeeman. And whereas we really like him very much and appreciate his warm friendship. Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives, 78th General Assembly, State of Illinois that we extend our hearty congratulations to our highly respected, deeply appreciated colleague serving his fourth term in this House, the Honorable Harry 'Bus' Yourell, Representative from Oak Lawn, Illinois, on the occasion we believe February 19, 1973, of his 54th birthday, that we wish him the best of health, life and legislative blessings on his birth anniversary and for many, many more to come. And that a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution



be presented to him."

A. Telcser: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker may I have consent to add as a co-sponsor.."

A. Telcser: "Representative Jaffe we haven't adopted the resolutions yet. Can we get to the order of business please?" Is there a discussion on the agreed resolutions? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd just like to have unanimous consent of the House to add the names of any Members of the House so desiring to join in on this resolution for Bus Yourell."

A. Telcser: "Okay. If the Members wish to join in, come up to the Clerk's desk. Is there further discussion? Gentleman's offered to move the adoption of the agreed resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. The opposed 'no'. The resolutions are adopted. In order to comply with the House Rules we'll have the Committees meet tomorrow after the perfunct adjourns. How's that? Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I just want to make the announcement.."

A. Telcser: "Representative Tuerk, could you wait a moment? We're not on the order of announcements. Ah.. the order of announcements is number 22 on our list of order of business. On the order of motions. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes."



Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, may I have unanimous consent to add to House Bills 227 and 228 the name of Representative Brinkmeier I'm the prime sponsor of those bills?"

A. Telcser: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections that will be so ordered. The Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I'm the sponsor of House Bills 93, 94, 95 and 96 and may I have unanimous consent to have Representative Alsup as a sponsor of those bills?"

A. Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none the Gentleman's name will be recorded in the Journal as a sponsor. Are there further motions or any.. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to add as a cosponsor to House Bill 291 Representative Berman."

A. Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, Representative Berman will be added. Okay are there further motions. Representative from Madison, Calvo."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to move at this time to have unanimous consent of the House to be shown as cosponsor on House Bill 383."

A. Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none the Gentleman's name will be journalized as a cosponsor. Are there further motions? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."



Yourell: "Ah.. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the chief sponsor of House Bill 295, I would like to add Representative DiPrima's name to that. And I would ask leave of the House for that."

A. Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, the Gentleman's name will be added. Gentleman from Lake, Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the Member's attention to the fact that they should sign themselves in tomorrow on the perfunct session because of the fact that otherwise they will not get their per diem because at the moment that has not been too well clarified. We have a bill in that clarifies that that will be in committee next week. But at the moment they should make sure that they sign the roll call at the perfunct session."

A. Telcser: "Okay. No further motions. On the order of.."
Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Barry."

Barry: "Just an inquiry of the Chair. Has anything been said about Rules immediately after adjournment?"

A. Telcser: "Well, when we get off of the order of motions, I go to announcements. Are there any further motions? If not, on the order of announcements. Okay, now.
The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to announce that Industrial Affairs will meet in M-4 right after adjournment."

A. Telcser: "The Gentleman from Grundy, Representative Washburn."



Washburn: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

The Appropriations Committee will meet immediately after adjournment in Room A-1 for what I hope will be a short meeting."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee will meet immediately after adjournment in Room M-3 instead of Room 212 as is posted. Room M-3."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Rose."

Rose: "AH.. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, Judiciary I Committee will meet immediately after adjournment in D-1, State Office Building. D-1."

A. Telcser: "Are there further announcements? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that all members of the House would listen to this announcement and concur if they thought that something should be forthcoming in the way relief as to what has been taking place. After we adjourn late at five or six o'clock and we're over in the State Office Building or we're in the State Capitol, that many times the tunnel entrance at the State Office Building is open and we walk all the way through the tunnel to find the door on that tunnel on the State Capitol side closed which requires of course that you walk back then again to the State Office Building. Now I would ask the Speaker's Office if they'd try to



alleviate this situation to either have both the doors open or both the doors closed. So that this walk back and forth and at my age I'm not quite sure that I'm ready to take that trip every day. So, Mr. Speaker is something could be done in this area, I think all Members of the House would appreciate it."

A. Telcser: "I've been imformed that Representative Murphy is back on the phone seeing to it right now. Are there further annoucnments? Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to remind the Members of the Counties and Townships Committee that we will meet in Room M-5 as soon as possible. And another thing I'd like to remind the various bill sponsors in the House, the last date for posting bills for next weeks' hearing of Counties and Townships is noon tomorrow. Those of you who have bills that you'd like to have posted, please contact the Vice-Chairman, John Friedland."

A. Telcser: "Are there further annoucnments? Okay. Let's go back for one message from the Senate."

F. B. Selcke: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate's concurred to the House and adopted the following joint resolution. House Joint Resolution 9 concurred in by the Senate February 21, 1973, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary."



A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, ah.. I move now that the House adjourn to the hour of nine o'clock tomorrow morning for perfunctory session at which time as Representative Murphy pointed out, it would be well for the Members of Committee to attend the perfunctory session in order to receive their per diem. Those of us who do not have committees tomorrow will return at 12:00 o'clock noon on Tuesday, February 22. And I move then Mr. Speaker that the House adjourn."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman moves that the House stand adjourn. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. The opposed 'no'. The House stands adjourned."

