

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIFTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

MARCH 13, 1973

10:00 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 John W. Alsup - no reason given;

Representative Richard A. Carter - illness;

Representative Peter C. Granata - illness;

Representative Joseph G. Sevcik - illness;

Representative John F. Wall - illness.



K. Miller: "The House will be in order and prayer by Joe Cary."

Cary: "Let us pray. Give ears to my word, oh Lord. Consider my meditation. Harken unto the voice of my cry, my king and my God, for unto thy I will pray and so almighty God, I pray for our Speaker, for the Leadership and all the Members. Amen."

Miller: "Thank you. Messages from the Senate."

F. B. Selcke: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed a Bill with the following title and passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House. Senate Bill 19, 22, 108 and 226. Passed the Senate March 7, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed a Bill with the following title and passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House. Senate Bills 23, 81, 105, 106, 140, 141, 151, 164, 227. Passed the Senate March 8, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives to pass a Bill with the following title: House Bill 184, together with the following amendments thereto, the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House. Passed the Senate as amended, March 8, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. No further messages."



Miller: "Committee Reports."

F. B. Selcke: "Mr. Washburn from the Committee on Appropriations to which House Bills 54, 70, 84, 164, 253 and 314 were referred, reported sending back with the recommendation the Bills do pass. Mr. Collins from Executive, to which House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment No. 1 was offered, reported sending back with the recommendation the Resolution do pass. Mr. Collins from Executive, to which House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment No. 2 was offered, reported sending back with the recommendation that the Resolution do not pass. Mr. Collins from Executive, to which House Bill 357 was referred, reported sending back with the recommendation the Bill do not pass. Mr. Collins from Executive, to which House Bill 230 was referred, reported sending back with amendments thereto, with the recommendation the amendments be adopted and the Bill as amended do pass. Mr. Collins from Executive, to which House Bills 5, 138 and 139 were referred, reporting sending back with the recommendation that the Bills do pass. Mr. Collins from Executive, to which House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment No. 3 was offered, reported sending back with the recommendation that the Resolution do not pass. Mr. Rose from the Committee on Judiciary I, to which House Bill 93 was referred, reported sending back with Amendments thereto, with the recommendation the Amendments be adopted and the Bill as amended do not pass. Mr. Rose from the Committee on Judiciary I, to which House Bill 129



was referred, reported sending back with amendments thereto, with a recommendation that the amendments be adopted and the Bill as amended do pass. Mr. Pappas from Motor Vehicles, to which House Bill 255 was referred, reported sending back with the recommendation the Bill do not pass. Mr. Neff from Transportation, to which House Bill 305 was referred, reported sending back with amendments thereto, with a recommendation the Amendments be adopted and the Bill as amended do pass. No further Committee Reports."

Miller: "Introduction and First Reading of House Bills."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 603. Flinn. Makes an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Business and Economic Development. First Reading of the Bill. 604. Stedelin. Makes appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Conservation. First Reading of the Bill. 605. Stedelin. Makes appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Mines and Minerals. First Reading of the Bill. 606. Craig et al. Repeals section of Highway Code. First Reading of the Bill. 607. Fennessey et al. Amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 608. Redmond et al. Makes appropriations to the Environmental Protection Agency. First Reading of the Bill. 609. Schneider. Makes an appropriation to the Pollution Control Board. First Reading of the Bill. 610. Pierce. Makes an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Bureau of the Budget. First Reading



of the Bill. 611. Pierce. Amends the Conveyance Act. First Reading of the Bill. 612. Maragos. Amends the Highway Code. First Reading of the Bill. 613. Philip Amends Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. 614 Calvo. Makes an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Institute of Environmental Quality. First Reading of the Bill. Londrigan. Amends the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund. First Reading of the Bill. 616. Kelly. Amends the Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. 617. Matijevich. Amends Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. 618. Stone. Amends Universities Civil Service Act. First Reading of the Bill. 619. Redmond. An Act in relation to the payment of State costs of higher education. First Reading of the Bill. 620. Philip. Amends Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. 621. R. A. Walsh. Amends School Code. First Reading of the Bill. 622. Terzich et al. Amends Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. 623. Gibbs et al. Amends the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. 624. Gibbs. Creates an Act to protect the rights of persons conscientiously opposed to abortion. First Reading of the Bill. 625. Kosinski. Amends Code of Criminal Procedure. First Reading of the Bill. 626. Katz et al. Amends Toll Highway Authority Act. First Reading of the Bill. 627. B. B. Wolfe et al. Removes contributory negligence as a bar to recover in civil actions. First Reading of the Bill. 628. B. B. Wolfe. Creates an Act to assist persons to make voluntary settlement of claims.



First Reading of the Bill. 629. Matijevich. Amends Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. 630. Gibbs et al. Repeals Intoxicating liquor on Trains Act. First Reading of the Bill. 631. Gibbs et al. Creates a division of alcoholism within the Department of Mental Health. First Reading of the Bill."

Miller: "Representative Borchers does now move that the House recess until 10:00 AM."

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

Doctor Johnson: "We pray. Almighty Creator and God of our Father, with thanksgiving, we acknowledge the strength, stability and capacity for work, which we have received from your hand. And now today, we put our hands to the task once more before us and ask that you will add your blessing to all we do. Remind us always that we are stewards of all that has been entrusted to us and when the labors of this day are over, grant that we may place them into your hands, asking you to bless them, where blessing is due, and to remove what has been done amidst. Restore us to your favor, oh Lord, whenever we fail and as new opportunities lie before us, direct us by your purposes to seek and to do those things which are pleasing in your sight and which will bring your continuing benediction upon us and upon our State. And now let the words of our mouths and the meditations of our



hearts be acceptable in your sights. Oh Lord, our strength and our redeemer. Amen."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Roll Call for attendance. Committee Reports."

F. B. Selcke: "Mr. Blades from the Committee on Agricultural and Natural Resources, to which House Bill 264 was referred, reported sending back with the recommendation that the Bill do pass, and be re-referred to the Appropriations Committee."

Mr. Blades from the Committee on Agricultural and Natural Resources, to which House Bill 283 was referred...."

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

Choate: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like for the Journal to indicate that Representative Richard Carter is absent because of illness."

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

William Walsh: "Will the Journal show that Representatives Sevcik, Grananta and Wall are absent because of illness."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Journal will so indicate."

F. B. Selcke: "Mr. Blades from the Committee on Agricultural and Natural Resources, to which House Bill 283 was referred, reported sending back with the recommendation the Bill do pass. Mr. Blades from Agricultural and Natural Resources, to which House Bill 354 was referred, reported sending back with the recommendation the Bill do pass. No further Committee Reports."



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Agreed Resolutions."

F. B. Selcke: "House Resolution 97. Holloway et al. House Resolution 98. Schoeberlein et al."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."
Walsh: "These are the Agreed Resolutions, Mr. Speaker, and House Resolution 97 commends Mr. Gilbert Holmes, who has been named Man of the Year by the Sparta Chamber of Commerce. House Resolution 98 commends the Easter Seal Society of Aurora, who has announced the celebration of its 25th Anniversary, and I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question's on the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor, say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted." All right, in order to expedite the Calendar, I'm going to go to Third Reading before Second Reading today, simply because we worked on Second Reading to Third quite a bit last week, and I think we need to get to Third Reading and move some Bills. So, we'll go to House Bills, Third Reading."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 6. An Act that provides law in relation to promisory notes, bonds, due bills and other instruments in writing. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Harold Washington."



F. B. Selcke: "The Gentleman has asked for it to be taken out of the Record, so we'll go to House Bill 12. An Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Just in case my announcement didn't wasn't heard by all the Members, we're on Third Reading, and we're going down on the automatic roll call. So I would suggest that you take a look at the Bills that are on Third Reading and appreciate that we might be getting to your Bill rather quickly. Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Gibbs."

Gibbs: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 12 is a very simple Bill. It allows a right turn on a red light, after stopping in the State of Illinois. It's patterned after several other States. I believe there are 21 States that have a modified form of this law, and there are 11 States that absolutely allow it. The biggest and largest one, of course, is California, and all of the studies have shown that this has helped the flow of traffic considerably. The National Safety Council has come out in favor of it. The Department of Transportation has come out in favor of it. The Secretary of State for the State of Illinois is in favor of it, and the Chicago Motor Club is not against it. They said they have to look at it to see if there was enough time, more less to implement the Bill for safety sake. So the Bill was amended and put in an effective date of January 1, 1974, which will give plenty



of time for the different governmental bodies and municipalities to post the areas or the intersections where they do not want to allow such a turn. WMAQ out of Chicago has editorialized in favor of this and they ask for response from their listeners, and through the Senior Editor, Dillion Smith, they received something like 5,000 affirmative letters in favor of it, and 8 against it, so we believe it will help the flow of traffic and traffic conditions in Illinois and I ask for your favorable vote."

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

Walsh. "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

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

Walsh: "Do you have any statistics on pedestrian injuries and fatalities in States or Cities where this is permitted as compared to places where it is not permitted?"

Gibbs: "Well, Representative Walsh, this was one of the ah....

I think the number one criteria, the biggest problems they had in trying to determine whether or not it should be supported by the motor club and also the National Safety Council, and I don't have the statistics before me, but they have found that there has been no increase at all. They can't say that there was a decrease, but they can say that there was no increase because of this, and some people, some advocates say that the motorists and the pedestrians when they're aware of this Act, become a little more careful. You can imagine that it certainly wouldn't affect..... let me stop and go back a minute. It does change the



law also, Bill, to the effect that at the present time, the law in Illinois is that you can walk against a red light. This changes that, and this prohibits walking against a red light any further in Illinois, so I think it would help in that area, because I think we're one of the few States that allows people other than you see for a municipal ordinance, which does not prohibit walking against a red light."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, my very unprofessional reaction to this is that a motorist who is looking to his left, trying to determine whether he can make a right turn on a red light, ah.... and looking to his left to see if there's any on-coming traffic, would not be in a position to look to his right to see if there were pedestrians crossing in front of him and it would seem to me that there would be more pedestrians injuries and fatalities as a result of this, so I tend to oppose this Bill."

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

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

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

Wolfe: "Does the ah.... does the Act permit two standards, for example, I notice that a left turn ah.... after, let's see, permits a left turn after a full stop at direct signal, only as authorized by local ordinance. Now that applies to left turns, then is that right?"

Gibbs: "Yes, and that has been amended to the affect that you are allowed a left turn into a one-way street from a one-way



street. So if you're approaching a one-way street on a one-way street and you're in the left lane, after coming to a stop, you can then proceed left into that one way street."

Wolfe: "All right. Now, does the right turn, does the permissive right turn also apply to all municipalities, cities and villages, throughout the State, or can they regulate against that on local option?"

Gibbs: "Under the Act they can come in and post the areas that they want to post and prescribe this type of activity and preclude it if they deem it necessary in their judgment. In other words, if the traffic engineer thinks it would be a safety hazard, he can prohibit it."

Wolfe: "Well, on the Bill itself, Mr. speaker, I support the Bill. I think it has enough of the safeguards in the Bill, with the Amendment to create a situation which is going to effectively move traffic through these intersections at a very safe rate, and I think that the objection interposed by the previous speaker about pedestrians, in those intersections in which there is heavy pedestrian traffic, then the ah.... local municipality or village may restrict any such right-hand turn and ah.... protect that heavy pedestrian flow of traffic. So I would support this Bill, Mr. Speaker."

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

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In answer to the distinguished majority leaders objection, to this Bill, he must realize that the present State law



allows and permits pedestrians to cross against a red light. Now we do not allow motor vehicles to cross an intersection against a red light. The present law does allow pedestrians to do that thing. In other words, if they look both ways, supposedly, they may step off of the curb and they may cross against heavy traffic or no traffic or any kind of traffic. The Bill, as Representative Gibbs has indicated, will make that illegal, so that when a car is making a right turn, against a red light, which would be permitted, there will be no pedestrian traffic if the pedestrians follow the law. So there will not be the pedestrians out there. The cars will not be knocking them over like ten pins, and it has shown in every state where they have allowed this, particularly in California that the pedestrian accident rate does decrease, because the pedestrians just cannot step off that curb, and if they do, they are liable and not this car. It is a good bill, it is a bill which will speed up the traffic. It will reduce the pollution because you won't have long lines of cars waiting to make right-hand turns. So I would urge all of you to support this very fine Bill and you can rest assured that you will be doing something for both the pedestrian and the automobile."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."
 Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, only quickly in support of this Bill, I might say that I talked to Dillon Smith in the corridor a little while ago. They've had a campaign in behalf of the right turn on red, and their mail



has run a little over 5,000 to 14 in favor of right turn on red. So the motoring public does favor this type of legislation, and I would hope that the General Assembly would not drag its feet and do pass this Bill, House Bill 12, send it over to the Senate so that the Governor can sign this Bill."

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

North: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support this particular Bill, and I can attest to the fact that it does move traffic very expeditiously. It is safe. We in the Rockford area have been having this type of a turning movement for over the last year, and we have had no problems whatsoever as far as safety, accidents. It does expedite the traffic and I urge your support of this measure."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

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

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor of the lady's motion, say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Gibbs, to close."

Gibbs: "The biggest problem seems to be the safety factor, and as one of the previous speakers stated in his unprofessional opinion, it would create a safety problem. However, the National Council has certainly looked into this, as has the Secretary of State and the Department of Transportation and they do not feel it is a problem, and I ask for your



favorable vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the question is, shall House Bill 12 pass? All those in favor, will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, may I raise to explain my vote? I've heard the proponents of this legislation mention that this will help to move traffic. I've listened to the editorials on WBBM, telling that this will help to unfrustrate certain drivers. I ask you, when you're voting for this Bill, are we here to be psychiatrists, to help frustrated drivers, or are we here to protect people's safety. There are no statistics, no statistics to show that this Bill or this particular change in our Vehicle Code will help the safety of pedestrians. The National Code is contrary to this at the present time and I would urge a 'no' vote for all those who prefer safety over unfrustrating certain drivers."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further explanation of votes? All right, the Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 146 'ayes', 3 'nays', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 35. An Act...."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, if we could have a ah... little order in the House and if the Members in the aisles would ah... be in their seats, because I have the pleasure of introducing a distinguished person to the Assembly today. So if we could have a little order. The Maharishee is here



today to extend his greetings to the Illinois House of Representatives in appreciation for the passage of House Resolution 677 in May of 1972. As you will recall, that Resolution recognized and recommended the investigation by People throughout Illinois on the contributions of the Science of Creative Intelligence and Transidental meditation.

It is my pleasure to present to you a man of love and peace, the Maharishee, Mahesh Yogi."

Mahesh Yogi: "It's my joy to come congratulate all the Members here who have pass the Resolution in favor of Science of Creative Intelligence, which is a very simple national means to unfold full potential of flesh, and when I heard this Resolution was passed here, it thrilled my heart. It was Abraham Lincoln, who in the long history of this great nation, most creative nation in the world, stood for unity and freedom. I wish all the People of this State through the wise leadership of this House of Representatives, the powerful government, will rise to full potential of its knowledge and we'll create a society free from suffering first and then in fulfillment in peace and harmony. And thank you again for allowing me to come to this alter of freedom and service of mankind. Thank you very much."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "House Bill 35."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 35. An Act to revise the law in relation to marriages. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."



Simms: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 35 amends the marriage act repealing the requirements that an affidavit indicating the woman's immunity to Rubella be filed before the issuance of a marriage license, in the State of Illinois. On October 4, 1972, the County Clerk of Cook County filed a suit in the Circuit Court and a temporary injunction was issued against not requiring that the Rubella immunization be required. In the Court's decision, it was found that it is discriminatory in that it forces women to be required to submit to an inconvenience and discomfort not required on their intended spouses. No provision in the law is made for the exemption of law for those females who cannot, because of age, surgery or congenital defects become pregnant. Also, it's clear that the present act has resulted in an increase in the number of pregnant women erroneously receiving Rubella immunization. This Bill has the support of the Illinois Medical Society, the Department of Public Health and received no opposition in Committee. I would solicit the favorable vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion? All right the question is, shall House Bill 35 pass? All those in favor, will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Mann 'aye'. The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 120 'ayes', 1 'nay', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Schoeberlein 'aye'. Dyer 'aye'. Polk 'aye'.



Maragos 'aye'."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 39. Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook. Mr. Leon."

Leon: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 39 provides for a six man jury to try civil cases, with the option of either party to request an additional six if they wish a twelve man jury. The ah.... Bill calls for an additional fee, where fees are required, for a request for a twelve man jury. I will appreciate your support of this Bill."

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

Hart: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Hart: "In what ah.... John, in what instances is a fee required for a jury?"

Leon: "A feel in Illinois, the only county that has jury fees is the County of Cook. The rest of the counties in Illinois do not require a jury fee, and this Bill does not impose a jury fee in those counties."

Hart: "Thank you very much."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer."

Palmer: "If the Sponsor will yield for a question." John, I'm going to vote for the Bill, ah... I think we'd have to admit, it's a revenue measure for Cook County, but I'd like to know ah... how much MFT money ah... that Cook County got in the last ah... auditing period. I ask that question in Committee and I didn't get an answer; if you



know that."

19.

Leon: "Mr. Shea will answer the question."

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

Shea: "I don't understand your question, Mr. Palmer. The County of Cook gets 32 million dollars for their MFT money per year."

Palmer: "Well, how much of that is transferred to the Circuit Court System in Cook County."

Shea: "Zero."

Palmer: "When it use to be though, this, was this law changed?"

Ah.... money transferred on motor fuel tax into the ... for the traffic on the basis, the theory of traffic courts."

Shea: "Governor Ogilvie, ah... asked when he was President of the County Board to use up the six million dollars of motor fuel tax money for the operation of the highway department and the circuit court. In 1968, it was changed to 10 million dollars and then Representative Pollack, as I remember, put in a Bill to do away with any dollar amount so that the County Board can now use all of the MFT for any purposes it wants, corporate purposes."

Palmer: "Including the MFT money, but has there been any transfers?"

Shea: "I don't follow you by any transfer."

Palmer: "Well, from the General Fund over to the Circuit Court system."

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



Shea: "In order to make this year's appropriation ordinance, there was the use of MFT for corporate purposes."

Palmer: "And how much was that?"

Shea: "I have no idea of the dollar amount."

Palmer: "You see, this was the question I was asking. Thank you."

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

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm one of the co-sponsors of House Bill 39 and my only argument with this Bill is that it does not go far enough. This is a permissive Bill that allows six man juries, except in those cases where one of the parties wants a jury of twelve. Since the case of William Vs. Florida in 1970, where the Supreme Court of the United States held the trial by jury does not necessarily mean a trial by twelve persons, there has been a rapidly growing trend toward six man juries in the United States. This DA U.S. District Court, including the District Courts of the Northern, Southern and Eastern District of Illinois have adopted a rule allowing for six man juries in all cases. Twenty-eight States, including California, Colorado, Connecticut, Minnesota, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Florida, Michigan, New York, all of these States have adopted this same law that is proposed here. I think the savings in citizen and court time and public money and in energy is evident, and in view of the great backlog of civil cases, particularly in Cook County, I urge a favorable vote on this Bill. Thank you."



K. Miller: "The gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I hope that it is not presumptuous for a downstater to vote and speak against this Bill which is admittedly applicable to only Cook County. I shall vote in the way that I am indicated, because that was the way that I voted in the Committee, and also the way I believe in this particular case. It is a pernicious thing to restrict the traditional liberties of the people. Since time began in this Country, we've had twelve man juries. It's the false economy that says that we can expedite justice by cutting off six of those jurors. Logically, if you would follow that reasoning to its next step, we would cut off all the jurors and then we would have the guilt, innocence or civil rights of individuals determined by judges who now, thanks to the tendency of the legislature to abandon traditional value, do not have to run against live opponents for re-election, but are in there for life. I say that it's safer, Members of the General Assembly, to stick to tried and true values that we have known. Let this false economy be denied in this instance and let's leave the situation as we find it for a little while longer. I will vote no in the hopes a few more will do likewise."

K. Miller: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe."

Wolfe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm amazed to hear my colleague oppose a Bill which is purely permissive and permits a lawyer to select



twelve jurors if he feels that twelve jurors can best determine his civil case. I've been trying jury cases for a number of years. I originally introduced a bill when I was a freshman in this House, allowing the six man jury. Nobody has been deprived of any rights. As a matter of fact, a party who does not have the cost of a twelve man jury can get a jury trial for half that cost. And I don't care if you have six man in the jury box or twelve, the problem is always the same. You've got to convince somebody that you're right. A six man jury is a good way to ah.... to provide jury service for all, and particularly in those jurisdictions that have a difficult time getting twelve men to servce on a civil jury. So I would support this Bill as a step forward in our modern jurisprudence ah.... system and allow permissively a man to select whether he wants six or twelve. You want to take twelve men and further confuse the issue, be my guest, but I would support this Bill, because it's a step forward."

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

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Leon: "Yes."

Schlickman: "How are fees for jury demands determined now?"

Leon: "There is a salary and fee schedule for the County of Cook, which provides fifty dollars for a twelve man jury."

Schlickman: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear that."

Leon: "There is a statutory schedule of fees, which determines the amount of money that is paid for a jury in Cook County."



Schlickman: "Section 64, which you are amending, provides as it presently stands, provides that the fee shall be determined by Statute or by rule of Court, order of court. Now, this Section does not provide a fee, and I'm wondering which Section of the Statute does prescribe the fee for jury demands?"

Leon: "I believe it's Chapter 51, Section 43, which provides for fees for juries in Cook County."

Schlickman: "And what is the fee that is prescribed there?"

Leon: "Fifty dollars."

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

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I may, Mr. Speaker, ah.... since I'll be speaking to the problem that Cook County creates for downstate jury attorneys I would like the record clarified that I am from Lake County and not Cook County."

K. Miller: "I'm sorry, Sir."

Griesheimer: "I am speaking in opposition of this Bill, with regard to the fees section of the Bill. Presently, very few downstate counties require a fee for a jury demand, and I personally feel by imposing an arbitrary fee on juries we're doing nothing but putting the courts further away from the average person on the street. It's very expensive to go into courts now. Everybody recognizes this and by placing a mandatory fee, that does nothing than codify by statute an existing rule of court in Cook County, we are



jeopardizing the interest of downstate Illinois. And I would point out again for the record, that Lake County is a downstate county and we do not make any charge for our juries, whether they be six man or twelve man juries. I think it is basically a bad idea when you have to charge people for justice. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

K. Miller: "Is there further discussion? All right, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holloway."

Holloway: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker, I rise to ah... in opposition to this Bill, and I agree with ah.... Representative Cunningham and Representative Griesheimer, that there should not be a price on justice. In essence, this is a Revenue bill. It's an effort by the ah... Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County to limit the money expended for jurors. The theory being that ah.... it would cut the fees paid to jurors per day at least 50 percent in Cook County, which is the largest ah... in the State, is a City where the largest concentration of poor people happens to be, and I don't think that these people should have to pay an extra fifty dollars for a twelve man jury. Now the idea that six man juries will reduce the backlog of cases is a fallacy. In Cook County, we find that approximately 70 to 80% of jury cases are handled by less than 100 lawyers, and these lawyers cannot try anymore cases than they are trying now, whether the juries are six man or twelve man juries, so for that reason, I oppose this and I solicit the Assembly to do likewise."



K. Miller: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support this measure. In the last seven or eight years, there's been a substantial reduction in the number of jury backlogged cases in the Circuit Court of Cook County. In 1964, with the advent of the new judicial article, there was a seven or eight year delay. That delay is now down to approximately four years. In fact, as of this morning, there are no more sixty-eight cases left on the court's calendar and they're starting on the 69 cases. And this would, in my opinion, substantially reduce that delay and help speed up the ah... disposition of those cases and if we're talking about how that's going to affect poor people, I think it's tragic that people that are without funds and are involved in injuries had to wait even the four years and I think this would help substantially reduce that amount of time."

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

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy to agree with the statements of the distinguished assistant minority leader, along with my running mate, Representative Porter, and with so many others, that have said that this Bill has a very good purpose and a very good result. It will reduce delay, it will save costs, it will help the little guy, it is a well thought out step forward toward improving the judicial process. I hope we'll see plenty of green lights up there."



K. Miller: "All right, is there further discussion? All right the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leon, to close the debate."

Leon: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 39 is purely a permissive Bill. Many of you who were here last year, will recall, that I had a six man jury Bill in and the opposition of the attorneys trying jury cases was so severe, I was compelled to table it. This is strictly a compromise. I believe that the experience that will be gained by the use of six man jurors will bring to us an opportunity to further amend this law so that all civil cases will be tried by six man jurors. Now when I get to downstate, there is not a county in the State of Illinois that charges fees for a jury. The only difference it will make downstate is that a jury demand will be for a six man jury and if anyone desires twelve, all they have to do is make a request and they'll have 12 men in their jury. I certainly will appreciate the support of the Body in passing this Bill. Thank you."

K. Miller: "The question is, shall House Bill 39 pass? Those in favor, vote 'aye'. Those opposed 'nay'. The gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber, to explain his vote."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would like to be recorded as voting 'present' on this Bill. And the reason I would like to be so recorded is because I do not oppose this Bill in principle. I think if the plaintiff and the defendant and litigation can agree to a six man



jury, that is fine. They should be commended for doing so. However, to sack a person for a hundred dollars for exercising their rights to a twelve man jury is in my opinion, outrageous. However, insofar as this is a Revenue bill, and the sponsor has indicated it applies only to Cook County in the hundred dollar department, I'm going to vote 'present.'

K. Miller: "Vote the gentleman 'present'. Have all voted who wish? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, to explain his vote."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to explain my 'yes' vote on the bill. When this Bill was introduced at the last session, by Representative Leon, I opposed it last time, because it had a provision on it that made a six man jury mandatory unless both parties were in favor of a six man jury. It seemed to me that that was unfair, that traditionally in the United States, we have enjoyed twelve man juries. In Illinois at the the time of our present constitution, we had a twelve man jury and it seems to me that a citizen ought to be able to have one if he wants one. This Bill by Representative Leon does permit the citizen to have a twelve man jury. At the same time, it takes account of one important fact. That if we clog up our court calendars with many small cases, we deprive people with serious litigation of the opportunity to litigate except by waiting three or four or five years. I think this is a good Bill, it preserves the jury system, and at the same



time, it does permit expeditious handling of small matters through the use of six man juries. I think it is an excellent Bill, that has the support of Defense Lawyers, of Trial Lawyers and of all People who believe that we must preserve the jury system as one of the most important rights of a free and democratic society."

K. Miller: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

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

K. Miller: "I'm sorry, Lake."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my vote of 'no' against the Bill. It seems to me there are 100...."

K. Miller: "Just a moment, please. The noise level is very high. Will you please hold it down so we can hear what the Lady is saying."

Geo-Karis: "There are 102 counties in the State of Illinois. This Bill in essence is to help one major county. We love that major county, but I think we, in the 101 other counties, should be considered. I do feel like, Representative Cunningham, that we are throwing away our right to have a proper jury trial. Therefore I rise to explain my vote of 'no' against this Bill."

K. Miller: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question, there are 99 'ayes', 37 'nays' and one 'present'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed." For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos, arise?"



Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side,

I move that the count by this measure be reconsidered."

K. Miller: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leon."

Leon: "Lay it on the Table. Lay that Motion on the Table, please."

K. Miller: "The question is on the motion to table, all those in favor, say 'aye'. Those opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Motion prevails."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 40. Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Chairman and fellow Members of the House. This Bill is really very simple. It removes a power of the EPA in the State of Illinois and the Pollution Control Board to place any rules and regulations on farmers who raise grain. However, there was an amendment, which we passed just the other day, which puts the rules subject to whatever rules the Federal Government may provide. In other words, Federal government rules will be the ultimate rule of the State of Illinois. The EPA, the ah.... Control Board cannot exceed those Federal Regulations. Now this may not seem too important to some of the people in Chicago, upstate, perhaps, but to us downstate, it is of vital importance. I want to state at the outset, none of us here are trying to destroy the power and the direction, the logical basic direction of flow of the EPA. We all recognize we



must do something to better our air, our water, our land. We're not fighting that. We're fighting those fringes of rules that will increase the cost of bread to people and this is exactly what it will do. I want to read to you from a WGN editorial, February 5, 1973. Just a couple of the paragraphs. 'There is a growing tendency.... and Mr. Speaker, I want the Legislature to listen to this, because it is important, so will you just tap your gavel a couple of times?'"

K. Miller: "I sure will Mr. Borchers. The noise level is quite high this morning. This is an important Bill and the gentleman is entitled to speak for his Bill. Proceed, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Now, the WGN took this from the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, so it does not exist just in our State. It is across the land. Now reading, 'There is a growing tendency for elected law-makers to pass laws giving broad powers to regulatory agencies, allowing them to prepare detailed and sometimes far-reaching rules governing both business and private citizens. Nowhere, are the affects of government by regulation more evident than in agriculture. Regulations have been adopted covering water pollution from farms, fertilizer used is questioned. Agriculture chemicals are closely regulated and feed activities are scrutinized. Occupational health and safety standards are being extended to agriculture. The Farmers right to use his property for the crops he may choose is questioned, as part of the new



ethic on land use and now regulations are proposed to require farmers to control the inevitable odors arising from hog and cattle production.* I would like to add that this will be up on another Bill, and I just want to get it in right now. It belongs to a Bill that we'll hear in just a few minutes. The point is, there is a need to weigh more carefully the impact to regulations being written by food people who are insulated from the ballot box, and all too often, insulated from experience with the industry they try to regulate. And if God only knows the truth, that is the true statement. When they come to the point, now at the Committee hearing the other day, it was stated, I believe by one of the Representatives of the EPA perhaps, Mrs. Leahy herself, that they were now listening. Well, here in my hand is the latest listening. Tomorrow, March 14, at the University of Illinois, is one of the hearings on the farm grain driers regulations. I want to tell you folks from the City, that we are on the farm, we're not trying to dry a million bushels like you may do in Chicago or one of the great grain elevators, a farmer is doing nothing but drying maybe five to ten thousand bushels on his own land. A quarter of a mile perhaps away from even another House, or two miles away. But it varies. I want to tell you that every one of you, most of you in this room, have ah... heat your houses with gas. The amount of gas used to heat a grain dryer is far less than what you use in your own house. Far less. It's only existed maybe a couple of weeks



at the most in the fall and maybe into December. A couple of weeks, a week. Seven days, eight days. That's all. You run your gas furnances from maybe late September until April and even later. Why should the farmer be discriminated against of the little bit of gas that he uses, organized, harassed, made to get permits from a bureaucracy in Springfield and you don't have to. You need us. You need what we're trying to do and I'm not speaking just of grain dryers. It amounts to all phases of farm activity which will come up in due time in other Bills. But I solicit your support on passing this Bill. Your own cost of living in partly dependent upon the freedom of the farmer to use his land, as he best knows how."

K. Miller: "Is ther discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "DuPage."

K. Miller: "I'm wrong all the time this morning. I'm sorry."

Schneider: "You're doing a good job. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 40, along with a series of other Bills, that we will be considering, regarding restrictions on the Pollution Control Board and the Environmental Protection Agencies are going to require a lot of analysis and I think much of our information and much of the comments that I made the other day regarding the amendment are pertinent at this point as well as they were the other day. When we're talking about regulating farm land



or growing or activities on farm land, we're talking about things that do not necessarily relate to the property welfare of the farmers. We're talking about a series of ideas that come close to dealing with the concepts of whether or not we can control some of the negative aspects of farming with pesticides and other ah.... things like nitrates. Now last week, we spoke in a specific way about that. I talked a little bit about the fact that there are public health agencies that will be affected by nitrates which are in the water. We're talking about a general concept of whether or not Federal Government should be involved in the areas over and above the States interest and involvement. We're considering whether or not the appeal aspects of any of the ah.... problems that farmers face as they are confronted with these ah.... requirements are seriously impeded, and I think in all those case, what we have to look at, is the fact that we do ourselves against a disservice. We are assuming that as a legislature, we can define specifically what is indeed good for the farmer from the Illinois House. We're saying for example, that if we take away the authority of the EPA to make regulations on pesticides, then the House and the Senate are going to have to sit down and determine what percent of ah... pesticide control can be employed in Illinois, rather than letting technicians and technologists, who are trained in that area, to make a decision that is not a blanket decision. The



EPA is concerned about making applications that are ah... established in areas where they can function and work. Not about the whole state of Illinois. And I think we ought to give that a serious consideration. When Webber talks about a bureaucracy from Illinois, he wants for the convenience of the Bill, to apparently overlook the bureaucracy of the Federal government. I don't know how he can support a Bill like this. If we are really serious about striking a balance between the welfare of the farmer and regulating effectively, efficiently, sincerely and honestly the problems of the environment, then I think that we've got to allow that to occur through an agency that we establish. There is no way that I can draft a Bill which is going to regulate... determine pesticides. It's like for me saying you... to all of you that you support a bill on noise pollution if it is higher than 80 decimals on the A scale if it comes from a lawn mower. I don't think we can do that. So I think you ought to take a good look at the Bill. I appreciate Webber's position and his disgruntlement, but I think we ought to take an opportunity at this time to realize that the EPA serves the whole state and that we cannot blanket the State of Illinois with regulations that are instituted from the House of Representatives or from the Senate, so I oppose the Bill as I did in the past. Thank you."

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



Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As House Bill 40 was introduced, it provided that the State could not regulate farming operations relating to the growing and production of grain crop. As amended, the Bill provides that the State can regulate, but that the regulations can be no more stringent than those regulations adopted by the Federal Government. This kind of law, in my opinion, would establish a very, very bad precedent. What it says, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, is that a State can do no better, can do no more than the Federal government, when there is concurrent jurisdiction. The beauty of our Federal system is that the State has been able to experiment on a State by State basis. And that those States that have not experimented can gain from the benefit of those who have and that the Federal government, without engaging in experimentation that would be nation-wide can gain benefit from the individual experimentation among the individual state. If this precedent becomes established, we will find that the regulation within the environmental field is going to be actually controlled by the Federal government and that the States will have no opportunity to participate and to do what's good for an individual state. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, respectfully suggest that House Bill 40, as amended, should be defeated."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."



Hart: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the trouble with the Environmental Protection Act that we passed here a couple of years ago, was that ah... not enough attention was given to some of the provisions of it and it went too far in many places and I commend Representative Borchers for the amendment. I think absolute prohibitions or absolute exemptions, probably both, go too far. But ah.... if you went into and tried to find out.... if you had a feed lot if you're a farmer and you went in and tried to find out what can I do to comply with the law, you couldn't get any answers. They just said you got to quit doing what you're doing, but they don't give you any alternatives and no farmer, no beef grower with any degree of certainty make provisions, make expenses, which would comply with the Act. So it's definitely true that the Federal government now is backing away from some of its requirements or proposed requirements with regard to beef cattle, and I think the State should do the same thing and take a better look at this. After all, if there's a whole lot more money going to be involved in the growing of the beef, the end result is going to be that it's going to cost more money when it gets into the grocery store, and it's already costing too much money. There's a great demand for reducing beef prices. There's even demands for meatless Tuesdays and meatless Thursdays and that sort of thing. And I encourage it. I think that's the way the people ought to go fight back. I would encourage



not only a meatless Thursday, but a taxless Tuesday. I think we ought to have that too. But I think Representative Borchers has got a good Bill here. I think its a workable plan. There ought to be some uniformity which will be provided by the Federal Act and certainly the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency can live with this and so can the people of the State of Illinois and I urge the support of this Bill."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I sat in on the hearings as a Member of the Agricultural and Natural Committee, when all of these Bills were heard. I said at the time, and I would urge the House right now, that these Bills put the cart before the horse. Representative Borchers has another Bill, Bill Number 170, House Bill 170, which proposes to create the Environmental Protection Agency Legislative Study Commission. I think we are proceeding today to emasculate the EPA without sufficient study and consideration. I raised that point in Committee. The answer was there is no study needed of this problem. That is not good enough for me. There was evidence submitted that there are pollution problems with grain farming. I don't know personally whether or not this is true or not. I say it needs study. I suggest that many of you don't know this. I would say this, that I will support the Study Commission, but I oppose this wholesale emasculation of the Environmental Protection Act and therefore request that



the House of Representatives vote 'no' on this Bill."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from MacCoupin, Mr. Boyle."

Boyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if Representative Borchers would yield to a question?"

K. Miller: "He indicates he would. Proceed."

Boyle: "Representative Borchers, I wonder if you would tell us what position, if any, the Illinois Agricultural Association and Farm Bureau has with respect to your Bill?"

Borchers: "I have no idea what the Agricultural Association... I think I can state that the Members of the Farm Bureau, of which I'm a Member, are for it."

Boyle: "Well, let me say this, Representative Borchers, that I have talked to Members of the Farm Bureau and I've talked to representatives of the Farm Bureau and they have advised me that they will not support your Bill."

Borchers: "With Amendments?"

Boyle: "That is correct. Now, I helped you to support this legislation when it was before the Agricultural Committee, but I understand that subsequent thereto, regulations... proposed regulations have been ah... Mr. Speaker, can we have a little order in the House? It's my understanding that subsequent to the time that these bills were reported out of the Agricultural and Conservation Committee, that proposed regulations have been made by the Environmental Protection Agency, and that these regulations are now in conformance with the thinking of the Farm Bureau and the



Illinois Agricultural Association."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, am I to answer that since, I believe I was asked. They haven't told me anything about that position, and I would like them to inform me and let me talk to them about it, because I believe I'm as close to Agriculture as they are. And I have no knowledge of any farming ailment anywhere in my area, as far as that's concerned, the letters I've received are all for that Bill. I suggest that these gentlemen, if this is so, that they check their own constituents and find out how they feel about this. They may not know what the people are thinking and I think I do."

Boyle: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address myself to the Bill. I have.... originally, I supported Representative Borchers on these Bills. Now I think we have given the Environmental Protection Agency the message, and I think they've heard the message. And I believe they have changed their regulations to respect to grain farmers. I don't believe there's any member of this House that has anymore farmers in his district than I do, and I think now, that we've reached the point where we are going too far. I think that administratively, they have corrected the problem, and if we pass these bills to exempt agriculture from the provision of the Act, we're setting a bad precedence in this House. Next time, the Steel Industry is liable to be in here asking to be exempted. And we're going to have more exceptions than the rule. I think this



is now a bad bill. I think that the problem has been corrected. I will be glad to follow the leadership and the Farm Bureau on this Bill, and I'm going to oppose the same, and I'd urge the other downstate rural members to do the same."

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

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

K. Miller: "The previous question has been moved. All those in favor, say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Motion is carried. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to close the debate."

Borchers: "It has been said that the Regulations have been fairly carried out and that they have no intentions of adding unnecessary rules and regulations that would control the farmers. Well, perhaps this is what they say at the moment. Perhaps they have come to agreement and think the rules they are proposing will no longer hurt the farmer of the State of Illinois. But I don't want to take their word for it. The records I have of the countless injustices to industry, landfills, farmers, grain elevators, municipalities, sanitary districts as such, that I do not trust their reasonableness, even under a new Director. There are too many individuals connected with this organization, who are too easily carried far afield. I might point out to you that the only reason they begin to back up, was the meetings in relation to feed lots.



When the farmers for the first time and feed lot raisers, first time became aware of the dangers inherited in this dictatorial, arrogant agency, they turned down I understand 3500 of them in ah.... Jacksonville. They also had a great turnout in Carbondale and other areas of the State. Before this time, nobody realized the direction in which these people were going. I think we have to fight it out right now and put some limitations. I, for one, don't want.... I personally don't care to have people in our State, say that we are leaders, we're the leaders of the United States, all following us. If we're leaders in wrong, and excessive power, that is no honor, that we should consider. I don't consider this an honorable thing that we should be the leaders in this particular agency of government. There are too many aspects of this that fall short of what we should truly be considering and that is liberty and right of the People themselves. I can tell you right now that people are not for what they're doing. They are for only the basic things. They are not for the fringe, such as the proposed rules, which they may now discard, but imagine this, you people, who may be from Chicago, and this can be easily understood by people downstate and people in the farming industry, when they were seriously proposing rule that if you're plowing and the dust is blowing across the road, you either have to stop plowing or go into another part of the road, Ah.... part of the field. This is the extreme to which these people were thinking, until I'm



positive that they have changed their tactics, I don't think we should take a risk. We have another crop coming up right now, soon to be into the ground. We're... you're talking about a legislative commission, which that Bill will come up shortly. I want to point out to you that the report of this Legislative Commission won't even be until next January, the beginning of a new Crop year. We've got to protect them now. These people had to start to slowly. For all of what they say, I want to remind you again that tomorrow, the University of Illinois will have a hearing on grain driers. Who knows what will come out of that. I don't know. But I do know that I don't want to have to have to get permits on our farms, a permit from the State and harrassment of State inspectors on the grain driers. Maybe they're not going to do that now, but I have no assurances of this. I want to make certain of it. And I think every farmer in the State will want to be certain also. Well, I hope you people who understand our problem and realize what this can do to the bread baskets, to the cost of living, will vote for this Bill and vote 'aye'."

K. Miller: "All right, the question is, shall House Bill 40 pass? All those in favor, vote 'aye', opposed 'nay'." The gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I'd like like to say that I think that some of the questions that have been made here is rather ridiculous, that were destroying the EPA. I think there would be no such thing.



I think taking away some of the controls as this series of Bills do, ah.... are certainly going to help the farmer. And we must remember here in Illinois that Illinois is an agricultural state, the most important state in the Nation. We're the leader in beans, soy beans and corn in the Nation. And ah... we must realize that we're affected more by ah.... more by the ah.... ah.... agriculture than many of us might think, because agricultural, farm equipment, etc., Illinois is one of the greatest producers. The biggest producers of agricultural equipment. Now these bills, if they were allowed to continue, without any restrictions on them, and some of the things EPA is talking about, it would reduce a yield in corn, for example, to approximately 50 bushels to acre. This year the average in Illinois corn was 118 bushels. So you can see what that will do, and we better keep in mind that the farmer can go backdoor farming; he knows how. And there would be no problem going back to it, except when he does this and starts raising 50 bushels to acre of corn, that means we should stop and think that they're 50 million people in the Nation that are going to suffer from that. They're not going to be able to get food. Also, on ah.... this production, ah... the cost of food will be tremendous. Now, ah... all of us realize what the cost of food is today, and us folks who live in the cities, in the big cities, should stop and think about the consumer. If these



are allowed to go on, as the present law allows them, meat prices, for example, and I know you think it's high now, you're going to see meat prices double, because there is going to be no way, when you put the price of this beef, that's fed to the livestock, up to where it will be, then there is nothing else, we either won't be able to buy the meat at all, or going to pay double price for it. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will support Webber Borchers' Bills."

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

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, let's not kid ourselves, let's recognize that this is the first bill of a series of bills designed to kill the strongest Environmental Protection Agency in the United States. Let's not kid ourselves about the fact that farmers should not be exempt from their responsibilities to the environment and their responsibilities to the consumers of the State of Illinois. Farmers are the recipients of large amounts of grants, both Federal and State money. They should not be encouraged to use those monies to poison our waters, poison our food and poison our total environment. And Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we all know, that phosphates are used in tremendous abundance in fertilizers across the State of Illinois. We all know that phosphates are a dangerous substance to the environment and to the health and well-being of the citizens of the State of Illinois.



We have in Mary Lee Lahey, one of the outstanding conservationist's in the State of Illinois. We have in our Environmental Protection law, one of the outstanding laws in the country. And I think we all ought to face up to one fact. If either party is responsible for crippling the Environmental Protection Agency, than we might as well kiss our environment good-bye here in the State of Illinois. Our scenic rivers are poisoned from phosphates and other fertilizers and other farm ah.... nutrients. And this affects, not only our drinking water, but the entire use of our water throughout the State of Illinois. Now let's face it, we have flood problems. Floods pour over into our waters. They pour over into Lake Michigan. I do not want to see our environment poisoned. I do not want to see Illinois, retreat to the stone age in this age of environmental protection. We have a responsibility to the consumers. We have a responsibility to see that their food isn't poisoned, there environment isn't poisoned, and their total environment is protected. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I want to remind you that last session, when the Senate was considering this particular Bill, there were large outcries from the other side of the aisle, of sell-out, amending the Environmental Protection Agency to death. Now that there's a change of administration, suddenly we find the other side of the aisle, going after the Environmental Protection Agency with an axe."



K. Miller: "Will the gentleman bring his remarks to a close?"

Mann: "Yes I will, Mr. Speaker. This is a bad bill, it's a dangerous bill. I respect the Sponsor's sincerity, but it is a bill we ought to kill and we ought to kill every-one like it, and I ask you to vote no."

K. Miller: "The Lady from Cook, Mr. Catania."

Catania: "Mr. Speaker, realizing Illinois is a foremost agricultural State, and realizing also that the cost to the consumer increases everytime the cost of the farmer in-creases, ah... as I was brutally reminded yesterday after-noon as I did my grocery shopping, I nevertheless feel that we must put a vote of confidence in the new Director of the Environmental Protection Agency, Mary Lee Lahey. I opposed this Bill and the related Bills in the Agricultural and Natural Resources Committee. I do feel as I said in that Committee that we must remind the Environmental Protection Agency and the Illinois Pollution Control Board that they should proceed with common sense and in-telligence. I think that Mrs. Lahey has indicated here determination to proceed with common sense and intelligence and I would like to reinforce her in that position. I would like to give her a vote of confidence, and that is why I'm opposing these bills."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Boyle."

Boyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my vote, I believe that we have given the Environmental Protection Agency the message. I would hope that, Webber, you would



not get 89 votes up there. You could take your Bill out of the record, or hold it on postponed consideration. Now they've come out with these new Rules and Regulations. If they don't implement them, the newspapers say we're going to be in session until Christmas. You can keep your Bill on postponed consideration and I'll tell you right here and now, if they don't implement these rules that they proposed and promised, I for one will support your Bill, but I believe we owe it to them to give them a chance to clean up their own mess. I believe they've tried to correct their own mess, and at this time, I'm going to vote 'no', but I would hope that your Bills would stay alive."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Know, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that it's time that we simmer down a little bit in regard to these Bills. There have been a number of wild statements made that we are emasculating the EPA and the PCB. We are not doing this. I think ah... the EPA and PCB have not come out with any rules and regulations at this point. They have come out with threats that they intend to impose definite rules and regulations. I think that it is time that we, as the State, sit back and relax a little bit and recognize the fact that Federal rules are going to be published. We can put the State of Illinois in a very awkward position if we have rules on our books so much more stringent than the Federal rules, that we are



an unfair place as far as competition with neighboring states on agricultural products is concerned. We are still the largest producer of agriculture products in the whole country. I think it is time that we recognize this. I happen to be a farmer myself, and whether the IAA does or does not support this legislation, I certainly know what I and what other farmers feel. I think that these bills are necessary. We are not attacking the EPA. I think the ah.... feeling against the programs they have mentioned have been generated over a period of years, not by the current administration. And I certainly recognize the fact that Mrs. Lahey as Director of the EPA, did a very good job of testifying in Committee and she was in a very awkward position. Ladies and Gentlemen, I think these are good Bills, I think they're necessary for agriculture in the State of Illinois, and puts us on the record of having some rules and regulations in effect, rather than having none, and I certainly feel that something must be done as far as regulations on all farming industries. I think that ah.... the farmer, as an individual, is interested in keeping our environment good as anyone, and I certainly urge your support."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Alsup, is recognized."

Alsup: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've had some experience in conservation and have been very interested. But I'll tell you what we're doing, and I hope Mrs. Lahey is smart enough, that if we do or do not pass



this Bill, she adopt or the Board adopt the identical regulations that the Federal government will. If they do not, now I hope all of you have considered this. The farmer is not a lawyer, he's not an accountant, and he's going to have to keep up with two sets of rules and regulations and probably the stronger one is the one that would apply. It would cause an immense amount of confusion, so let the farmers farm, let the Federal government put into the EPA a tremendous amount of research and we can merely adopt whatever they adopt. And that's all that this Bill says. And I think it would relieve we People here in Illinois, the farmers, and everyone concerned this tremendous confusion that might arise in two separate standards and then you don't know whether the State law applies or the Federal law applies and you have to assume that the Federal laws supercedes the State law and it would be a genuine mess, so I can see no harm in this Bill at all. If it's passed as amended, either from the viewpoint of those who are uptight about pollution or the farmer, because the farmer is going to have to comply with the Federal rules and regulations anyway, so in light of reasonableness, I hope you do vote for this. Thank you."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Hunsicker."

Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my 'yes' vote on this. I come from a rural area, and I know one thing, if you impose two stringent rules and regulations on the People who produce the food



in this country, meat and what have you, that you're going to drive them out of business. They've got to have a profit of what they do, the same as a businessman in town or anywhere else. And if you think that meat is high now, you put some of these rules in effect that these series of Bills is going to entail, you ain't seen nothing yet. And you better vote for the Bill."

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

Craig: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. I want to rise and explain my vote on this Bill too. I have had a lot of complaints from the people in my areas about the EPA. Now I have no complaints about the EPA as far as regulating but when they go into the legislative field in legislating that's when I fall out with the EPA. And I've been to several meetings and have heard nothing but complaints from the People that I represent and it rather disturbs me that when I get criticized for something that I didn't do or this General Assembly didn't partake in doing. That a particular agency through their rules and regulations decide that this is what should be done. And I was to a meeting in Decatur, Illinois last fall, where the elevators of the State of Illinois had quite a meeting, and they were going to be closed down, a lot of them, if the EPA went ahead. It got so bad that the Governor of this State had to step in and hold them off until after harvest season. One elevator in particular that I happened to know about the EPA came out and wanted them to get in all this added



equipment. This man went and found out what the equipment would cost and it would cost in the way of a hundred thousand dollars. He called the EPA back and said now if I buy this equipment, will I be in compliance? Do you know what the man said? He said I don't know. You may not be. Now this is why I'm voting for this Bill. I'm getting tired of the EPA legislating things that I think this General Assembly should be doing. If they have proposals that they think should be passed and become a law, I think they should come before this general assembly and ask them to pass"

K. Miller: "Will you bring your remarks to a close?"

Craig: "the legislation that affects the People of this State."

K. Miller: "Will you bring your remarks to a close, please, Mr. Craig?"

Craig: "And that is why I want this Bill to pass is because I feel that we should be the ones to say whether something should be done if we're going to be criticized, not some bureaucracy or agency set aside. Thank you."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Blades, is recognized."

Blades: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wish to explain my vote. These Bills had a good hearing in the Committee and were voted out of the Committee with a do pass recommendation. It was presented in the Committee that the farmers do not feel that this proposed regulations



are necessary. A former speaker here, in explaining his vote, would have you believe that the farmers are polluting all the waters in the State of Illinois and that simply is not true. It hasn't been proven. The pollution is nothing compared to some of the pollution that the municipalities and the cities are doing. So there has been no sufficient proof that ah... the farmers are polluting the streams in the State of Illinois. Now we all know that food costs are high. All you have to do is go to the supermarket to find that out. We've spent the last forty years developing scientific ways in which the farmer could develop the quantity and the quality of the product which he's putting on the market. Today we find he isn't able to put enough. Now, with some regulations, are we going to handstring that farmer to where he can't produce? I submit to you that the Federal regulations are sufficient. And we have State regulations in the past that ah... have been far more stringent upon the farmers and other forms of business than the Federal regulations are. And I just think this is no reflection whatever on the present ah... Director of the Environmental Protection Agency. Unfortunately, she's the whipping boy or the former Director was the whipping boy for the Pollution Control Board. They are the ones that are going out and setting these stringent regulations without looking into the matter to see whether they're necessary or not, and I suggest that you support this Bill."



K. Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty, to explain his vote."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my opposition to this Bill. I voted against almost all of Mr. Borchers Bills in Committee, and I state here the reason for which I voted against them. We have been asked today vote for a Bill, which if we passed it, would make ridiculous the Study Commission Bill, which he has introduced. If there is a need to review the actions of the Pollution Control Board and the Environmental Protection Agency, the distinguished Representative from Lincoln, has a Bill that would permit us to vote to create a Commission or Committee to do that. To pass legislation now which would affect the Environmental Protection Act, or the Pollution Control Board, is incongruous with that Bill. I also point out that the Farm Bureau has not supported this and administrative regulations indicate that there has been a change to accommodate the farmer. For all these reasons, I certainly ask those members which haven't voted yet, to give a 'nay' vote to this Bill."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, notwithstanding my distinguished predecessor on this question, this is too good a bill, too needed of a bill, to receive the fate that is presently indicated. Someone has said Mrs. Lahey is not the issue here. None thinks more highly of her than I, but we need to give her some guidelines



and that's what this Bill does. We make her difficult task a great deal easier. Now it's frustrating to observe at this Board, that this is not a partisan issue. This is that traditional battle between the big city slickers and downstate, and I want to say in friendship to those that I have described as the big city slickers, it's time for you to think of this Bill as though it were a Bill to take the Motor Fuel Tax and spend it for CTA in Chicago or if it were a Bill to confiscate our guns or if it were a Bill to take a way the rights of riparian owners on our rivers. It's time for you to realize that together, in cooperation, we can move forward in the best interests of the entire State and give us this Bill. It doesn't ruin the EPA. It sets the guidelines that are needed. If you will extend the hand, why it will be returned to you many fold. We need more green lights to pass."

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

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise to explain my 'yes' vote on this Bill. You've heard all of the various arguments already in regard to how food prices will go up and they continue to enforce the EPA regulations that they have in the past. And I'll not review those again. I would also like to commend the present director on the action she has taken upon the livestock regulation, not that she has destroyed them, but she said there has to be more study. They've been delayed for a year. But our experience has been very bad, with the Environmental Protection Agency.



We had some important bills here before this legislature two or three years ago, in which we found the necessity, although we were unable to pass the Bills, of preventing corporate farming in the State of Illinois, where the large corporations come in and denude the land. Regrettably, if the actions of the EPA in the past are continued, small family farms are going to be a thing of the past, because they will no longer be able to...."

K. Miller: "Just a minute, Mr. Tipsword, please, let's get you some attention in here. The gentleman has something to say, please listen."

Tipsword: "The small family farm will no longer be able to compete economically if they proceed as they have in the past. And they're going to be right for the large corporations who come in and truly denude the land, who are only interested in the immediate and quick profit and do not care what happens for the future. Farmers have traditionally been conversationists and they are very interested that there not be further pollution of the soil and of the water. And regrettably, the past practices of the EPA have indicated that they just simply going to take them out of business. Representative Craig mentioned the elevator situation. Not only did the EPA during the past year, provide very stringent regulations for the elevators, so that they threatened to go out of business, they wouldn't even listen to elevator operators and grain dealers to find out what the practical solutions were.



Finally, they did meet with them, and they sued them and said we're not going to proceed. We going to give you more time and they backed away. As soon as the elevator operators really sorted of disbanded and no longer were meeting together and no longer a viable force, they moved back in on the one elevator that was their example, immediately moved in and slapped a fine well over a hundred thousand dollars upon this elevator for a dust pollution problem they had had. Instead of trying to cure the problems, they're trying to kill the problems, and unfortunately, in the process, we may wind up, all of us, without anything to eat."

K. Miller: "Have all voted who wished? The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to explain his vote."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow members of the House. I realize that it looks bad for this Bill, although a tremendous vote is showing as to how we are thinking downstate. I would like to refute the idea that we, any of us, are anti-EPA or the Pollution Control Board. I am a strong environmentalist and a strong conservationist. I believe in it. But there are some things that these people are doing that are against the best interests of our People of this State. Your bread basket is in danger by them. We cannot wait. A new crop is coming in. A legislative commission will come up. It's true, but it'll report next spring. We need some reassurance and help now."



I would like to point out to you that the increased... rules and regulations that have been proposed, and there is no certainty that they will not be imposed on us, could well put our own farmers in our State out of business in relation to the cost of operation of other states. That is why it is necessary to take a national guideline. You can hurt us severely. It has been said by someone about the phosphate. I want to remind you that just the other day or so, the Courts held that the phosphates did not poison and were not a poisonous material that came off the farms. Now, I'd like to point out, before I close, one other thing. Mrs. Lahey is not being attacked. You're all going on the assumption that she can do this or that. She cannot.... the Environmental Protection Agency is not the unit that makes and rules and regulations. It's the Pollution Control Board, the same people we're having trouble with all along. Mrs. Lahey has to follow their regulations, what they say to do. And this is what she is going to have to do no matter what she says she wants to be reasonable. She can't be reasonable. She has to obey the rules, by law, of the Pollution Control Board. And they're the ones that make these rules, not Mrs. Lahey, not Environmental Protection Agency....."

K. Miller: "Will the gentleman please bring his remarks to a close?"

Borchers: "I think you should consider what I've said and vote 'aye' on this Bill."



K. Miller: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will please take the record." The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "I rise for the purpose of requesting this Bill be put on postponed consideration."

K. Miller: "Does the gentleman have leave? Bill is placed on postponed consideration. Call the next Bill, Mr. Clerk."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 41. An Act to amend Section 10 of the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, is recognized on House Bill 41."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House. You have already heard mentioned one of the matters concerning one of the grain elevators, I believe by Representative Craig. I was going to bring that up, but I will not touch on it further. I would like to read to you, a bit concerning the cost of one grain elevator, and their estimates. I assure you that if the Rules and Regulations that the Pollution Control Board is considering for the elevators of the State of Illinois are enforced, we will lose half of the grain elevators in the State of Illinois. Now some of you in Chicago may seem to think that this is not important, considering your last vote, but it is very important. It's our heart's blood that's being affected by these rules and regulations. Whether you care to accept it now or not, it's your bread basket that's being affected by these Rules and Regulations. Illinois is one of the



greatest, if not the greatest agriculture producing state, in the United States. And your action here in closing your eyes will seriously endanger the agricultural community. I will not read the whole letter. It's too long, but I will just read that part to control the dust from an additional truck dump area costs \$35,000. To control the dust in beans from two grain driers - \$140,000. To control the dust in two elevators - \$70,000. Total cost of the above installation for one elevator in one small town, one of the principal businesses of that town is \$280,000. You don't understand what this is doing to us. They have.... Mrs. Lahey can't do anything about this. This is the Pollution Control Board. I do think you should give us relief upon this matter. Now the same amendment was put onto this Bill as on the previous Bill. That is, if subject to the rules and regulations of the United States government. This is something that if it goes too far, we have to fight out in Congress. It may well be that we have to fight it out in Congress. I accept that this is a possibility, but let's don't, for heaven sake, make our State, on the idea of pride, which is ridiculous, make rules and regulations that destroy the people and destroy the industry, destroy the principal backbone of the businesses of small communities in our area. Well, I think the thing to do, I'd like to have if you don't mind, when the time comes, ah.... we'll see how the vote runs on this, but I do believe you people in Chicago that do not understand our



problems down here should seriously consider what we're saying about this. It's of vital importance to you and the people you will have to feed, whether you care to accept this thought or not. Thank you."

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

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I oppose this particular Bill, because I do not think it is in the best long-run interest of the farmers themselves, and I do want to retrack one statement that I made earlier about the Republican party trying to put the death nil to the Environmental Protection Agency, because I notice that Speaker Blair voted against House Bill 40 and I commend him for that vote, because he is a man of vision and he understands the peril of..... Thank you, I'll say it again, he is a man of vision. Ah... The Minority Leader just informed me that he voted for it, and I'm in real trouble now. Well in any event, Mr. Speaker, ah... this is too serious of matter to laugh at, and the gentleman from Decatur is, of course, sincere in pursuing this objective, but it seems to me if we're interested in the farmers and we're interested in agricultural produce, we've got to be interested in our environment. The farmers cannot thrive if we kill the soil and we kill the land. The farmers cannot thrive if we kill their water supply. And neither can any of the ten million consumers who live in the State of Illinois. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Illinois can take pride in leading the Environmental



Protection sector of the country. There's not another State that has a Bill like ours, and once more I say to you that I trust Mary Lee Lahey. I do not think she will be unfair. I do not think that she's anti-agriculture anymore than any other member of this House. Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, let's kill this Bill now and I would hope, that although the Sponsor is, of course, is free to control his own Bill, that he would recognize the handwriting on the wall and let's move on to other matters in which we can help the agricultural economy of Illinois and I will certainly, as I have in the past, vote for such Bills. Please vote 'no!.'

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Kriegsman."

Kriegsman: "Mr. Speaker, I vote in support of Webber Borchers Bill. I believe that Representative Mann was erroneous in assuming that the farmers don't know anything about farming. I attended the hearing of the elevator in question on this Bill. It was a flagrant violation of power by the Environmental Protection Agency. They had an engineer there, who had at that time, only seen a grain dryer one week before he was testifying as to the merits against the elevator. The proposition was all based on hearsay back in 1968. They took no consideration as to the improvements that were made by the elevator since 1968. The people that were witnesses against the elevator lived off of taxes. They had no compassion for the source of the taxes of that town. We are not against environmental protection, but the



agency uses its power to no good. And I vote in favor of Webber Borchers Bill."

K. Miller: "Is there further discussion? If not the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to close the debate."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, my thoughts were slightly disarrayed by my good friend, Representative Blades, but I just would like to say that this is vital to us. Remember, I mentioned one elevatorm, \$280,000, for one elevator. I assure you that very few elevators in small towns can afford this kind of money. They can't add it to the cost of grain. That's controlled up there in.... a the Board and it's going on right now in Chicago, the grain pits. They can't add it on. Our grain will be taken elsewhere. We are going to be hurt by this Rules and Regulations. Again, I repeat, Mrs. Lahey has nothing to do except to carry out the rules and regulations pulmagated and being formed right now by the Pollution Control Board. Most of them who come from Chicago. I think we should have your help on this, because we are in danger. So therefore, I request your vote."

K. Miller: "All right, the question is, shall House Bill 41 pass? Those in favor, vote 'aye'. Those opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Hanahan 'aye'. Polk 'aye'. The Clerk will take the record. Clabaugh 'aye'. The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."



Borchers: "I would like permission for postponed consideration."

K. Miller: "Gentleman have leave? Bill will be placed on postponed consideration. The Clerk will read the next Bill."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 42. Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I hate to take time, when I see that I see how this is, but I would like to present a few facts. Now, again, where are opposition is coming, it seems from the City of Chicago. Perhaps you've lost your livestock center of the world, but there are plenty of people downstate that still raise livestock. When these people, the Pollution Control Board, indicates and promotes rules that a man with livestock in a pasture that has some running stream, no matter if it's the width of my finger, has to fence off his stream so the cows can't do you know what in the stream, it's getting to be a little ridiculous. This is one of the rules they are proposing, in relation to manure, that you have to put the manure and put it inside of a trench, not a trench, but a dike. Now, of course, the water won't go into the dike, I suppose and run over the dike, with all the manure in it, I don't know if they think about those things or not, but to me, it simply incredible that the EPA, or rather the Pollution Control Board can promote some of the rules and regulations that



they propose. Now on the matter of the amendment, again, there is an amendment that would set up the idea of Federal control. Here it happens to be something of the idea of a farmer's thoughts. This is not mine. It was given me. It's the idea of a young man, who knows nothing about a hog or probably wouldn't know a horse from a cow frankly, who is getting ready to be hung standing on a pig and a farmer is saying to him, o'kay young fellow, now let's talk about livestock waste regulations. This is a thought. This is a idea. This is a belief of the people downstate in the farming industry. They go to the extent of even making cartoons. You all may or may not know, of the extent in Oregon. You talk about you want to be first. Well thank God, we're not first. Oregon is worst. I will remind you, and I have here the picture in the newspaper from Oregon, and their rules and their regulations, wherein a forest area..... Mr. Speaker, I want them to hear this. Will you please hammer that podium a little bit with that gavel. I have a picture from Oregon, where it is the rule that horses in a logging camp have to wear diapers. Now, let's if we're so proud of our wonderful position, our outstanding leadership, let's all put into a Bill that our horses too, can wear diapers and our cows and our pigs and the birds flying overhead and fishes in the stream. This is the extent to which some of these radical, environmental nuts can go. So let's take one roll call, see what happens. If anybody has anything to add to it, add it now."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would suggest that the gentleman's eyesight is suffering a little because we've already had two roll calls, which ought to indicate what the sentiments of this House are, and once more I do not want to belittle his convictions, I just want to point out, when he speaks of Federal Regulations and Controls, he's talking a bout minimal Federal Regulations and controls and he's talking about regulations and controls which are not even yet in effect. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I did not suggest as one gentleman indicated, that the farmers did not know what they were doing. I do not know how many farmers are in favor of this legislation. I've not heard the gentleman from Decatur indicate that he has polled his constituency or the agricultural community here in the State of Illinois to find out. All I'm saying is that People who have a little vision, regardless of whether they're from the City or downstate or from the suburbs, will recognize that our environment is in terrible peril, and that we cannot avoid our environment forever without some diminishing effects in return, and we can poison cattle as well as we can poison fish. We can poison cattle as well as we can poison water. And we can poison cattle as well as we can poison the air. We all know that we've had difficulties and problems with our meat standards in this country. Why do we want to multiply and proliferate those problems. Mr. Speaker and



Members of the House, this is another one of a very bad Bill, which will cripple EPA and I ask you to vote 'no'."

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

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I once again want to oppose another one of Webber's Bills, partly because feed lots have yet to be considered for regulation, either in Illinois or in the Federal government, and I think we ought to note, out of the 87,000 farms in Illinois, that raise some kind of livestock, according to some figures that I have, three to six thousand might possibly be affected by some form of feed lot regulation. So a lot of it could be simple common sense cooperation between farmers who live downstream from one another. Remember the society is changing. Farmers a hundred years ago, did not have neighbors as close as they are now and we have to be concerned about their relationships to one another, and I think some of the problems that we have to be concerned about just simply on a cooperative basis, have to deal with the question of the storage of the solid waste during the winter, the question of how we are going to clean feed lots, the question of location of surface draining on areas in the farming and cattle raising areas. I think we have to be concerned about the stagnant water levels which might overflow in the event of a heavy rain where a farmer has created a pool to collect excessive waste run-off. I think we have to be concerned about using waste substance for fertilizer.



in an area where it has a high water level and ah.... the waste does not decompose properly and it runs off into a stream. So I think there are a lot of possibilities for cooperation between farmers as well as suggestions - suggestions from the EPA and the Pollution Control Board which would deal with the number of animals on a feed lot and would also deal with planning of green belts between the pollution source and the water that it may run into. So I think we have a long way to go in investigating this question of feed lot waste and runoff, and I think we ought to once again oppose the Bill until some kinds of technological and skillful studies are done on the problem and then we can vote rationally on it Webber, and I think it would be a good Bill, once we have that information."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Ogle, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

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

Brinkmeier: "O'kay, Webber, I'm wondering, has this Bill been amended to change the ah... 20 head disbursed over at least ten acres. We talked about that in Committee, but I'm not aware if that has been changed."

Borchers: "No it has not been changed."

Brinkmeier: "Thank you."

Borchers: "I was waiting for an amendment, but it never came up. We went right on ahead and put the Bill through the Committee."



whether it comes from a horse or a man or cow or what-ever and recycle it, put it through the necessary chemical tests and preparation and you can redrink it. It's absolutely pure. You've even seen, I'm sure, on TV, the materials put into that tank in the west, where it comes out that you can drink it. So I suppose since I am going to loose my voice over this, due to the remains of the flu, we might as well put this to the vote, but I do want to bring it out to you, I do want to bring it out to you, and I hope that perhaps on the next Bill, you will vote 'yes', and as far as my friend over on the other side of the aisle, Representative Mann, is concerned, we are not destroying the power of the EPA or even attempting to. I think all of us here are for it. All we want to do is correct some of the things that are wrong that they don't have enough knowledge to correct. As was pointed out, one man, who testified on grain elevators, didn't even... hadn't even seen a corn dryer until a week before, and he was one of the experts so-called of the EPA. Thank you."

K. Miller: "The question is, shall House Bill 42 pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Blades, to explain his vote."

Blades: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to explain my vote, first I want to say that I am not against the Environmental Protection Agency. There does seem to be some on this floor of the House that seems to be against amending any acts of the Environmental Protection Act.



Brinkmeier: "Well my contention, Webber, is that this is not grazing land, when it's this densely population. It is more feeding lot than grazing land."

Borchers: "I suspect you might say this is more for grazing land than it would be for feed lots."

Brinkmeier: "Thank you."

K. Miller: "Is there further discussion? All right, the gentleman from Macon to close the debate, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Well, gentlemen, I'd like to point out just a couple of facts. Ten thousand buffalo for ten thousand years have polluted, if you want to call it that, our streams and continue to live. There are deer lots wher deer congregate in the winter that continue to live. We've had our livestock and our pastures for 140 years, and we'll continue to have them. The cities downstream have never been affected by them. They have waterworks. Every one of you this morning drank some water at breakfast, I'm sure. Every one of you drank waters, come through a city waterworks to purify that water and part of that water somewhere passed through the body of another living creature, whatever it may have been, and you're still here. It doesn't worry me, or the thought doesn't worry me in the bit. They've already perfected that you use, to go to Mars, over a year trip, and that you recycle the same water that you go to Mars and back. So why the need of the extreme rules and regulations as proposed by the Pollution Control Board. They could take that same water



Now, I... I propose to you that ah.... they are overboard as far as the Environmental Protection Agency's concerned. Maybe they think I'm overboard the other way. I'd like to think I'm neutral. Now... they are against any act that would amend the EPA Act. I voted for the EPA Act a few years ago and if I had it to do over, I think I would request some changes in it, because I think we made a mistake at that time, in giving the Agency too much leverage or too much power. I would much rather that the environmental protection Act or the Pollution Control Board which is the one that calls all the shots, would operate as an Agency of the Government and their appeal from them would have to be channeled through the Administrative Review Act. But nevertheless, the in the Act we have given them a lot of authority. Now I want you to look at this particular Bill. This particular Bill proposes... is in relation to our feed lots. This particular bill proposes that ah... generally no more than 20 head per acre be disbursed over at least 10 acres. That is, 20 head of cattle, I presume or 20 head of hogs or whatever you might be frating. Now I've seen some unreasonable regulations put out by the Pollution Control Board and they have changed some, and I propose to you that this is unreasonable. This is hurting the ah.... industry, the farm industry, the ah... animal industry in the State of Illinois. Not too long ago, I returned from the State of Texas. They're taking



advantage of it. It isn't unusual to see a feed lot in the State of Texas with 20,000 or even 30,000 head of cattle on the feed lot. And they're handling the situation in a sufficient matter. We have driven and we are driving that industry out of the State of Illinois. And I propose to you, I would rather pass legislation that is favorable to industry in Illinois, than I would to drive industry out of the State of Illinois."

K. Miller: "Have all voted who wished? Mrs. Dyer is 'no'.

Take the Record. The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I request permission to postpone consideration."

K. Miller: "Does the gentleman have leave? This Bill is placed on postponed consideration." Call the next Bill, Mr. Clerk."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 43. Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

K. Miller: "Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow members of the House, I'm sorry indeed that I have to take up so much valuable time, but if you would check the people which I'm positive some of you are not doing and not knowing what they think, you will know that they want the next Bill that I am proposing. And they will not only want it, they will want it overwhelmingly, and that is, that the Pollution Control Board no longer has the power to control the burning of leaves and brush and shrubbery. That instead it goes to



the local political entity, whether it be a municipality, a township or a county. If such a local, legal entity, does not pass any ordinances, controlling the ah.... the burning of leaves, brush and ah.... shrubbery, than the EPA rules and regulations will prevail. Now, in my hometown, well, first, I want to tell you I've had countless letters, all over the State of Illinois, concerning this Bill and supporting this Bill. Now in my particular town, of Decatur, Illinois, Mr. Sands, in charge of our planning, and our purchasing of equipment told me that it will cost a minimum for one piece of machinery for Decatur of a hundred thousand dollars. That's a considerable amount of money for the City of Decatur to have to put up for one piece of machinery to take care of leaves, brush and shrubbery, which is still lying in our streets. I have here the Governor's statement which says this Agency will do more than fine technical violations. It will enforce unrealistic deadlines and the dissipation of our efforts on low priority projects. I'm much more concerned about the fact that belching smoke in a major industrial air than an farmer burning branches on the south 40. Here in my hands is a resolution supporting this Bill from the City Council of Danville signed by every Member of that City Council, including, of course, the Mayor. Here's from the City of Mattoon, and the letter accompanying it says, we are vitally concerned about the leaf burning problem and to



put the financial burden on every community to the expense of picking up leaves, disposal of them, the tying up of equipment, plus the manpower costs. The ban is not popular with the citizens. We have received many complaints since the ban was issued. Here is... here is just one typical letter, I didn't want to bring very many of them, but this says something about what so many of them said. First we can't burn leaves. The environment is so much better with mountains of plastic bags, of trash, of plastic bags of trash, lying around our streets. Ah... they say about fertilizer, now you must have a permit for a household incinerator. What is not, et cetera, et cetera. The cost to the poor is excessive in relation to these plastic bags. It has crossed my mind, in fact, I wonder who owns the stock now in the plastic bag factory. I wish I did. It must be a real income producing stock. Here is another letter and I won't read it from the City of South Beloit in Illinois. explaining their position of what they think and they state among other things about arbitrary and unnecessary unreasonable hardships placed upon their community. And they say we feel a ray of hope in the Bill that is now being presented before this House. Collinsville, the Mayor of Collinsville testified that it cost their City for the first time, \$28,000 just to clear the leaves out of their sewer system, that they had never had to do before. Here in my area is a newspaper clipping



in relation to a sewer project in our community. The Rules by EPA and the Pollution Control Board mandated where this went through a forest brush area, that instead of being able to burn this brush on the spot, it had to be carried 10 miles to 12 miles to be buried. The cost the increased cost, the headline in the paper said \$50,000 increased cost of the sewer line because all of this material had to be moved and buried instead of burned in place. This is perfectly ridiculous. What right, if we are the representatives of the People, have any of us to impose on the People this additional cost that could be easily solved. I didn't mention it before, but I will tell you know, I wrote Cambridge University. I asked them two questions. One, and I might mention Cambridge is over 600 years old. I said how long do your records go back in relation to the chemical composition of the earth atmosphere, and two, is there any change? I want to tell you People, that in 143 years, no change in the atmospheric composition of the earth, that it's the same today as 143 years ago. However, in the cities of London, in New York, in Chicago, Los Angeles, where there's special problems, because of the carbon monoxide and the concentration of industry, there are problems there which we can . . . it is our duty to try to help them control. But for us, for People in Chicago, who had the rules and regulations for the Pollution Control Board not to go after the big polluter and to come down in a small area and mandate this



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

kind of rule and regulation, where it is not needed for other facts and factors are involved is ridiculous. What does Pana, Shelbyville, Litchfield have need of such a rule and regulation? None whatsoever. I repeat, all this does is give to the local control to pass the ordinances necessary for their local need. Chicago already has ordinances in relation to leaf burning, and shrubbery. And that's well and good. I have no quarrel with local self-government. I'm entirely for it. But I beg of you to stop trying to put Chicago rules on the communities of downstate and in the rest of Illinois. Next fall will soon be upon us. The spring cleanup is on us now, and we have a right to be relieved of an irresponsible actions of the excessive costs of the EPA, and the final statement, I would like to tell you how I and others are being discriminated against who don't smoke, and it's your right to smoke. I have no quarrel with it. I have no right to interfere with your life, but you're interfering with mine, and People like me downstate. The cigarettes you smoke, the cigars you smoke are tobacco, which are leaves. What gives you the right to freely smoke leaves in defiance of the same law that says that once a year or once a year or evening a year or two, in the fall, I cannot burn my leaves, when you burn them the whole year round to my annoyance. I accept... I would like to have your support on this vote."

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



Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the gentlemen from Decatur would have us believe that while air in Chicago should be pure and while poison air in Chicago can harm our citizens, poison air downstate cannot. Well the gentlemen ought to know that farmers breathe just like the rest of us breathe, and poison air downstate is just as damaging to the environment as poison air in the city. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that there is no such thing as a closed atmosphere. What poisons the atmosphere in Decatur will surely poison the atmosphere in Chicago, and for the gentleman to suggest that in the past a hundred and forty some years, there's been no change in the atmosphere, it's a fly in the face of all the scientific evidence to the contrary which indicate that our atmosphere is very much troubled by burning and smoking and all the other harmful impurities that go up into the air. Mr. speaker, Members of the House, this is perhaps the most pernicious of all the bills. And as a citizen of Illinois, not anti-farmer, not anti-suburban, not anti-Chicago, but pro-pure air, I ask you to oppose this Bill. If you want to help the farmers, let's appropriate money for them to purchase the machinery necessary to dispose of the leaves and the other brush. Another bad bill, Mr. Speaker, let's vote no."

K. Miller: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Will Mr. Borchers yield to a question, please?"

Borchers: "I would."



K. Miller: "He indicates he will."

Kosinski: "Have you investigated, Mr. Borchers, how many municipalities, large or small, would be included under this Bill or excluded under this Bill, and what the ratio proportion is?"

Borchers: "The all municipalities would make their own rules. That would be total. Chicago, Cook County could make their own ordinance...."

Kosinski: "How about the little municipalities?"

Borchers: "They, too, would be able to make their own ordinances subject to their need, or county, or township."

Kosinski: "Do I understand there predetermination would be on the availability of trucks to haul this stuff out or places to burn it properly. Is that how they would determine it?"

Borchers: "They could, for example, designate a certain day in their community, by perhaps the recommendation of the EPA that certain days the leaves and brush would be burned."

Kosinski: "And you would subscribe to this being a very small portion of climate pollution? A very tiny portion in the State?"

Borchers: "I believe that Representative Pappas, who is on the Committee, I believe I heard him say of some sort, who made investigation, I believe in the Rock Island area, found that the leaf burning did not affect or cause any pollution."

Kosinski: "And principally, some of the communities of which you speak, how are they stifled by our voting with or



against such a Bill?"

Borchers: "I didn't understand that question?"

Kosinski: "Some of your little communities, for which you're evidently fighting are injured by not permitting this to occur, is that correct?"

Borchers: "They are not permitted."

Kosinski: "And how are the injured?"

Borchers: "How are they injured?" If they don't have the money for the equipment, some of them downstate have to carry their leaves for 20 or 30 miles to landfills because the landfills have been closed up by the EPA. They dump them along the roads. I have a letter here from of a..... where they dumped leaves and garbage along the road, because their landfill was closed up in the north part of the State. And the ah... the EPA is going to go against the Township Road Commissioner because they're holding him responsible for what other people did in dumping along the road."

Kosinski: "It would appear, Mr. Borchers, in this one, you modified very little, something which I hold dear, EPA, and I think possibly you have an elequent plead."

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

Mahar: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. I would like to say a few words in opposition of this Bill. Maybe a couple of points that haven't been covered, if that's possible. One is, as far as the costs to municipalities is concerned. It seems to me that one of the functions of a municipality today is that they must provide for the



welfare of their people. Whether it be in police, in fire or streets or whatever. Now the Environmental Protection is necessary. And it just seems to me that if a community, a small community in Cook County, say 1500 people or less, can afford to pass a leaf burning ordinance and require people to pick up their ... have their leaves picked up and disposed of, then a municipality of 5 or 10 thousand people downstate can do likewise, because they have the same basis or revenue that all of us have. Another point is the fact that the protection of environment starts at home. It seems to me that each and every one of us has to get in the habit of protecting our environment. We have to do a little bit as far as each and every one of us is concerned. The thing that seems to me, that this is a good place to start, by not burning our leaves. Getting in the habit around our homes to provide a way in which we're not going to pollute the environment. It seems to me that we'd be making a very backward move to allow this to happen, and to allow the burning of leaves on a local option basis."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support this piece of legislation. It's the last and best of the series. Now I have been a constant supporter of EPA, but along with the authority we have given the EPA is the obligation to use reason. They have failed to do so in the leaf burning area. Here in



Springfield, when the people in the small communities, called up to complain about leaf burning, they said the Legislature passed a law that you cannot leaf burn. That of course, is an outright fabrication. It was their rules and regulations and not our law. But we are taking the blame for these types of rules and regulations. And I think it's time we put the EPA on notice that they must be reasonable in their rules and regulations. We give them the authority and we must hold them to this obligation. I think we should pass this law to put them on notice that we will not continue to tolerate unreasonable rules and regulations and if they insist on them, that we will take away the authority in that area. Now it's been made a point about leaf burning in the big cities and leaf burning in the little cities, and that there's no difference. Well, there's a world of difference in the City of Chicago to add leaf burning to the pollution that's already there, and in a small country town where leaf burning will not add any significant or worthwhile contamination of the air. We must use our good, common sense. What must be necessary in the City of Chicago, is not necessary downstate in many areas. It is unreasonable and unwarranted costs and imposition on the people, and I therefore think, in this one area, that we should put the EPA on notice that we will not tolerate the continued, unreasonable rules and regulations, and let's vote for this bill."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. J. J. Wolf."



J. J. Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think many words have already been uttered on this subject, and although I did not support any of the other Bills, I'm definitely going to support this one. I think the EPA has to make some strong distinction in the question, over the question of burning leaves in a metropolitan area that is heavily populated and a small rural county, which say a population of 10 or 15 thousand. It just doesn't make sense to have the same type of regulation for heavy populated counties in rural areas and I think they should have addressed themselves to this problem a long time ago and I believe the majority of the Members of this House agree, and I think if we get to a roll call, it'll prove that fact out. And I'm going to vote 'aye'."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is one piece of legislation that I would hope we'd all support. I am certainly giving it my full support and I'll just mention some of the problems that we run into and I'm sure that many Legislators have had these same complaints, in regards to leaves, to burning of leaves I had ah... a complaint just recently, ah... that was related to me from here in Springfield. On a particular street, just quit raking their leaves. And what happened? They blowed out in the streets, they've plugged up the gutters and so forth and this street today, is a street that isn't traveled too much and many of these people who



live on this street are complaining about the leaves out there. They cause certain amount of problems on driving, from slickness and so forth. Also, I might mention the City of Knoxville, Knox County, Illinois, contacted me sometime ago. They had quite a severe ice storm over a year ago, and this ended up with a large amount of brush, almost a mountain of brush piled out at the edge of town. They were given orders that they would have to bury this. Well, it was one of those almost impossible tasks, and ah... after contacting the Environmental Control Board, we did get permission for them to apply for a variance to burn this, but this took over a year to get rid of this pile of brush. This is some of the problems we've run into on burning, and I'm sure the Governor of the State of Illinois, Governor Walker, would advocate the passage of this, because last week, you recall, in his ah.... budget message, he mentioned about.... that one of his least worries was this form of burning ah... a pile of brush on that northwest 40 acres, and so I think that this is a Bill that the Governor would like to see passed and I think we, from the downstate area and rural areas, and our People would like to have it passed. Thank you."

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

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Bill from southern Cook County. The various cities of Evergreen Park, Oak Lawn, Aurora, Chicago Ridge, all pick up their tree branches and their leaves and take it to the bordering areas of the



forest preserves in Cook County and burn them there. Now I would like for the experts to tell me if it makes the air any cleaner to burn this inside the forest preserves than it does on the perimeter? If they can answer this question, then maybe I would have a different opinion, but I think we're putting out People in a big disservice, by the existing law and I urge that everyone vote 'yes'."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is really a home rule amendment and takes some of the arbitrariness out of the present regulations of the Environmental Protection Agency. They come through with regulations attempting to soften some of the opposition to leaf burning and they come up with the regulation such as this one, that you can burn in towns or villages of 2500 or less, except if you're adjacent to a city of over 2500. But we happen to have a suburb of Benton called West City. The two towns abutt each other. West City has about 800 people. Benton has about 7000, so the people at west city now can't burn leaves because they happened to be located immediately adjacent to Benton. And that's just the kind of arbitrary regulations that they have adopted without particular meaning. I think the people at home, the local people, know more about whether or not it would be proper and permissible and not obnoxious to burn leaves than the people in the Environmental Protection Agency and that's all this Bill requires. So



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

I like to smell leaves. I think it's one of the pleasures of the fall, and I don't see anything wrong with it if the People in a particular area, such as Chicago, E. St. Louis or other places have some problems, which ah.... override these, then they can decide that for themselves. But for the rest of us who ah.... have no problem with leaf burning, actually polluting the air, to an extent that it would be dangerous, we would ask you to support this Bill. Thank you very much."

K. Miller: "Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker, in the interest of regaining the pleasurable smell of burning leaves, I move the previous question."

K. Miller: "All right, the previous question has been moved. All those in favor, say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion is carried. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to close the debate."

Borchers: "As to the importance of ah.... the so-called pollution of the air, last year, last fall, the Conservation Department of the United States of America, on their own burned off some 15,000 to 50,000 acres per state in all the western states, plus other areas of the country. It's our responsibility, we represent the people here. And the people do want to have the right to burn their leaves. I would just like to say one thing in relation to what this means. Whether you all realize it or not, upon this



particular bill could hang the fate of the EPA. Of all things that anger the people, against the EPA, this is a prime bill. The prime act of the EPA. Correcting this will relieve a tremendous amount of ah... pressure against them. In the Committees, at various times, the Mayors of Collinsville, Pekin, ah... Mattoon, ah... Danville and others have testified in favor of this Bill or one like it a year ago, so I respectfully request your support. I assure you again, the People want this right. Please give it a 'yes' vote."

K. Miller: "The question is, shall House Bill 43 pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The gentleman from Dupage, Mr. Schneider, to explain his vote."

Schneider: "Thank you, again, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I might point out in a request for a variation on the burning leaf regulation, in which one of our former Members, Don Hence, was involved and who wrote the variation statement, which allowed the 2500 municipality exemption, points out that one of his concerns was that the principal... one of the principal problems was that we're going to violate Federal air standards, and I wonder, Webber, in regard to this consideration, in the previous Bills, where you've talked about minimum standards as they affect the State of Illinois and as they're regulated by the Federal government, if you've really taken into consideration now, the proposal as it would affect Federal standards. I suggest that it does not, and I suggest that Don Hence's statement



on the open burning leaves is going to create some clear problems for us if we support the measure like this. It may very well violate Federal standards in some areas of the State of Illinois, and once again, we're making a blanket statement about leaf burning and we're going to be in trouble with other agencies. I think those of us who are downstate, would rather deal with the State than they would with the Federal government, so I suggest that ah.... some of the green lights change their mine and we get some 'no' votes up there."

K. Miller: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. I've opposed all of the other Bills to cut back on the Environmental Protection Agency and the Pollution Control Board, and some years back, I was the first proponent in my own village to push for the adoption of a leaf burning ordinance on a local basis. But I feel that the EPA has got its priorities out of line, and I think being a new agency, which must nuture the confidence of the People in order to be able to have the strength to accomplish this more important tasks, that they must not pass bills... ordinances like this, which promote a disrespect for the law and a disobedience to the law, much the same as laws on prohibition. I think the EPA has got to be told that we admire it, we support it, we consider it significant, but it has got to be responsive to the will of the People of Illinois, who elect everybody here in the General Assembly. I vote



no. I vote 'aye'. I'm sorry."

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

Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, let me point out to the Members of this House, that we are not talking about restricting small municipalities. As has been pointed out here, an opinion was issued last year in November, which exempts from the leaf burning regulation, municipalities of under 2500 residences. Now that exemption to the regulation has been in effect less than six months. We really have had no opportunities to see what effect it will have, whether it will in fact, lessen the burden of small municipalities, which are the municipalities most concerned about this problem. Therefore, I urge that we vote 'no' on this Bill and give the exemption that was written into the regulations last year, an opportunity to be effective and give ourselves an opportunity to see its effect before we pass a sweeping prohibition such as this."

K. Miller: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones."

Jones: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as a Co-sponsor of this legislation, I want to report to you that no one item of concern to the People of my district exceeds that of the leaf burning issue, which would be resolved by this proposed legislation. It even transcends our 7 and 1/2 billion dollar budget, if I may say so. From the President of a large insurance company, with a lake home and dozens of trees, to a little old lady who said



she couldn't afford to buy the bags to put the leaves in, to folks in some community areas, where the leaves must be transported some 25 miles to the nearest dump, there is opposition to the current regulations by the People of this District. We have said that the Public is in general support of the objectives of the EPA, but as I've stated in the press, its objectives must be tempered with common sense. I'm voting 'yes' on this Bill, as a common sense response, to the voice of the people in this District, and I urge more green lights to make it pass on 89 votes."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from MacCoupin, Mr. Boyle."

Boyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I like Representative Duff, was opposed to the other Bills in Webber's package, but I do feel as though this is an area that should be left to the local units of government to control. I believe that we would be better off to let the people rule themselves at home, and I do think that this is a proper area that should be removed from the jurisdiction of the EPA, and so I'm happy to vote 'yes' on this, your last bill, Webber."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Richard Walsh, desire to explain his vote?"

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, oppose the ah... other Bills in this series if you could call it that, but I do not see any objection to this Bill, and I would suggest the Membership ah.... refer to the last paragraph of the Bill, which does not prohibit municipalities from controlling the burning of leaves ah..."



by ordinance themselves. As a matter of fact, from ah... being from suburban Cook County, I live in a village which does not permit the burning of leaves. However, I do not see anything objectionable to letting every area determine that for themselves. To me, this is an area that ah.... the Pollution Control Board probably should not concern itself with. I think its something that the ah.... local areas can determine from themselves and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of a similar piece of legislation, I want to express my wholehearted support for this Bill. There are some subjects that are best regulated on the Federal level of government, there are some that by their nature are best regulated on the State level, and there are some, if you're interested in strengthening local government, that are best appropriately regulated on the local level. Leaf burning is one. And I support this Bill because I want to strengthen the Environmental Protection Agency's good name and I want to promote the cause of cleaning up the air and the environment. Unfortunately, in my district, the EPA has a bad name because of the ridiculous nature of the regulations on leaf burning. The regulations, in the event none of you have read them, have no relation to the number of trees you've got or to the number of leaves and they have an arbitrary reference to how far you live from a sound of



a certain population. This is a good Bill. It will strengthen local government. It will allow the banning of leaf burning, where it needs to be banned, and it will allow some discretion and flexibility of enforcing the laws designed to protect our environment, and I vote 'yes' and urge all of you to turn on the green light for this Bill."

K. Miller: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Well Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I want to apologize for taking a lot of time of the House on this series of Bills. But I feel very strongly that if you pass this Bill, you are knuckling under to the special interests of this State who want to wipe out the entire EPA. You were knuckling under to the People who consider dollars more important than our environment. You are knuckling under to people who want to use this Bill as a wedge to destroy the strongest Environmental Protection Agency in the World. Now the issue here is not local government. The issue is, what is more important, dollars or human life? And let's lay it right on the line, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we're talking about human lives. We happen to need air in order to live, and if the gentleman from Decatur will introduce a Bill providing for gas masks for everybody in the State of Illinois, including those in Decatur, I will gladly support it, but the fact of the matter is that this Bill will poison our atmosphere, poison our lungs and poison our animal life. Now let's face up



to what we're doing here. This Bill was a product of the Ogilvie Administration. We now have one of the fine legal minds and Conservationists in the State of Illinois, Mary Lee Lahey, as the Chairman of EPA. I want to give Mary Lee Lahey an opportunity to do her job. And I'm selfish about the lives of not only my constituents, but everyone in this State. Mr. Chairman, you can rationalize all you want about the right of a few people to rake a few leaves, but we're talking about our air and this Bill will poison our air. It's a bad bill and I ask you to vote 'no', and Mr. Chairman, I'd ask one more thing, before you announce the vote, I would like to be recognized for a motion."

K. Miller: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson."

Rayson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I sat in contrained silence up to now, and these series of measures, but in light of the votes on the board, I think I should explain my vote by saying this. First, this may be one of the most important bills that we might vote on in this Session of the General Assembly. Because its a critical battle between the Environmental Protection Agency and local interests. Now we're all inviewed with various philosophies of home rule and local people can do their thing the best, but in this Area where our environment is perhaps our highest priority that I suggest we should keep and protect the right of the EPA to govern these kinds of regulations. It doesn't throw out the window of local concurrent power, whether its municipal



or county or whatever. It merely suggests that open burning is open fatality and in some areas of life, it can best be controlled through our State agency, which is doing a job. Second, let me give you a brief example of what I mean. This morning, we were requested by the trustees of the Mark Prairie, 115 acres of fine prairie property, which is now in the hands of the Northern Illinois University Trustees, to safeguard this for future historical and proper environmental use. The kind of vegetation on this prairie requires burning your leaves. They sent me a letter yesterday already this morning we went to the EPA and got a permit. They're the guardian of our environment. I ask of this vote, I vote 'no', and that others might follow the leader."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Madison, Mr. Walters."

Walters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my vote, I think Representative Mann is correct when he said the issue is not the metropolitan areas. The issue is the rights of the People of the State of Illinois, and I would like to commend the gentleman from Macon for hanging in there. I voted for the other Bills, primarily to let the EPA know that they do not have carte blanche in this legislature anymore, but on this Bill, I think it's a Peoples Bill, and I want to congratulate Representative Borchers. Before I turn my green light on, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to tell everyone if they want tickets for the basketball game tonight between Quincy and Lincoln, they



should see Representative Joe Gibbs, Mike McClain or Mary Lou Kent. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd just like to point out one fact, that when this Bill was introduced last year in the General Assembly, it never came out of the Environment Committee. And there was testimony both pro and con on this Bill. The distinguished Member pointed out there were a few mayors from downstate that came and testified in behalf of the Bill. But he also failed to mention that the Environmental Protection Agency was opposed to it, and the Members of that Committee were also opposed to it because it was the first of a series of Bills to remove the powers of the Environmental Protection Agency. Ladies and Gentlemen, when you rake leaves and you burn, it creates smoke and smoke is pollution. Depending upon the Rendleman Chart to the degree of pollution. Air pollution does not know any boundaries. What you do in Decatur or Chicago or vice versa, once it gets in the air stream, it requires the consistent application of all the People in the State of Illinois. What you do is really what everyone does to one another, its a series of degrees of controlling pollution, and this Bill will remove this control, and I would hope that the Members would vote against it."

K. Miller: "Have all voted who wished?" The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."



Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, will you please record me as voting 'present'."

K. Miller: "Record the Lady as voting 'present'. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, arise?"

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I desire to make a motion. I've been here 12 years and I want the Sponsor, for whom I have a high personal regard, to understand that this motion has no personal reference to him, and I do recognize the right of a sponsor to control his own bills, but I do think that this matter is so important that I would like to bring to the attention of the House, some scientific evidence which sprang from the hearings which resulted in this particular part of the EPA being enacted. Therefore, with almost an apology to the gentleman from Macon, but with consideration...."

K. Miller: "Just a moment, do you want to make a motion?"

Mann: "Yes, I want to move that this Bill be placed on postponed consideration."

K. Miller: "The Chair is going to rule, Mr. Mann, that under Rule 38, which is the one that is involved in postponed consideration, that only the Sponsor can make such a motion. Therefore, your motion is hereby declared out of order. On this question, there were 114 'ayes', 42 'nays', 2 'present', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, is recognized."



Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side,
I move that we reconsider the vote on this Bill."

K. Miller: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "I move that motion lie upon the table."

K. Miller: "You've heard the motion. All those in favor,
say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and
the motion's adopted. With leave of the House, we will
now proceed. It's about time to adjourn for the day for
Committee meetings. We will not go to the order of
first reading."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 632. Hart et al. Appropriates
\$40,000 to the Department of Transportation in Williamson
County. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 633. Craig
et al. Amends the ordinary and contingent appropriation
Act for Secretary of State. First Reading of the Bill."

K. Miller: "Just a minute, Mr. Clerk. The gentleman from
Cook, Mr. Mann, desires recognition on a point of personal
privilege. You shall have that right, Sir, for two
minutes."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't know that there was nay
rule limiting the amount of time a gentlemen can speak on
the matter of personal privilege. Now, Mr. Speaker, you
know of my high personal regard for you. We have served
together and therefore what I am about to say has no per-
sonal reference to you, Mr. Speaker, but Mr. Speaker, you've
just run rough-shot over the procedure of this House. We
spent a month, we spent a month, Mr. Speaker, trying to



enact reform legislation, and you refuse to recognize a Member of the House on one of the most important Bills we've had this Session, Mr. Speaker, and I

K. Miller: "Just a moment, Mr. Mann. Mr. Mann, I did recognize you, several times today, and I don't like that offense to the Chair."

Mann: "The vote was taken, Mr. Speaker. You recognized me after the vote was taken."

K. Miller: "I recognized you before. Mr. Clerk, proceed with the Introduction of First Reading of Bills."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 634. Blair et al. Amends Retailers' Occupation Use Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill."

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

Blair: "Mr. Speaker, ah... I hesitate to ah... comment on this particular Bill, following this ah... activity that we've had on the Floor. I was delighted that you were up there handling it in a very fine fashion, Mr. Speaker, and ah... I would like to call the Membership's attention to my remarks. It will just take a couple of minutes. The... last Wednesday, the Governor and his budget message, indicated that he was proposing for the first time, an increase in the exemptions on the State income tax, from \$1,000 per person to \$1,350 per person, and he indicated that that \$350 increase relates to the tax on food and medicine. Now nothing could be further from the truth. There is no relationship between the exemption on the State income tax



and food and drug, in any way whatsoever. Now House Bill 634, which has just been read a first time, is a House Republican Leadership program that is designed to bring immediate, direct release to the beligered taxpayers of Illinois. It will cut the State's share of the sales tax on food purchased at the grocery store and medicine by two cents. The sales tax impacts regressively and it is our opinion that the only way to relieve People of its burden is to cut it directly. The Housewife, the student, the golden ager, will all receive the benefit at the moment the legislation becomes law. There will be no forms to be filled out in April, 1974 or anyother April such as suggested by Governor Walker. No one who purchases food and medecines will be missed because he didn't know...."

K. Miller: "Just a minute, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate, is recognized."

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, temporary Speaker on the rostrum and the Speaker on the floor of the House, that is talking on a Bill that is I guess is on the Order of First Reading, I have been around here a considerable length of time, but this is the first time that I've really seen a press release made publicly on the floor of the House when a Bill is on the Order of First Reading. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Speaker is out of Order, simply because he's talking about the Governor's budget message of a week or so ago and certainly I recognize his right to either agree or disagree with the contents of that message. However,



it is debatable as to whether he is correct when he accused the Governor of not giving tax relief to People of the State of Illinois. I happen to see a television man on the street type of thing last evening, and although the commentator summed up those happenings as it not maybe being the tax relief that he thought should be given, it seemed to me that every person interviewed was in agreement that it was a tax relief program. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we proceed with the order of business on the floor of the House and get about the adjournment so we can have committees and save our news conferences to the proper time."

K. Miller: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is not an unusual procedure at all. We see it very frequently, when People have Bills that ah.... they want to solicit sponsorship for. They tell the Members that they're introducing the Bill and solicit their sponsorship, and that's exactly what the gentleman from Will is doing in this instance. And I might point out.... may I point out, that I didn't interrupt the gentleman, the Minority Leader, because I wanted to let him finish his remarks, but on the question of press releases, I've seen press releases come at some of the darnest times and as recently as about 2 minutes ago when a gentleman did it on a point of personal



privilege."

K. Miller: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I realize that many of us take an opportunity when we introduce bills to try to explain it and I'm sure that's what the Speaker did now. It seems that his party was one upsman by our Governor and ah.... this is an attempt to recoop, but as the Minority Leader says, maybe this isn't the spot to do it."

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

Blair: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker and ah... I certainly in my years here in the General Assembly have watched on a number of occasions, when Bills of ah... great significance were introduced that we allowed ah... the Members an opportunity to make a brief explanation of the content of the Bills so that if there were Members that desired to become co-sponsors, they could do just that. And certainly, in the area of taxpayer relief, I would invite the Members on the other side of the aisle to become co-sponsors with the House Republican Leadership of a Bill that will provide our housewives with immediate relief, 30 days after this Bill is signed by the Governor, the housewife will be able to go into the grocery store and when she buys foods, let's say \$20, instead of having to pay \$1 tax for the sale, she'll only have to pay \$.60. Now no one who purchases food and medecines will be missed, because he didn't know about applying for a negative income tax grant



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

as proposed by Governor Walker. And this proposal has the added recommendation of making good fiscal sense. If a tax is burdensome, discriminatory and regressive, then to relieve its burden, we should act directly, not try the gimmick of using one tax to offset another. We in the House Republican Leadership, believe that the best course of action is to put our present revenue system in order before we attempt to adopt a revolutionary new concept such as a negative income tax proposed by the Governor. During the 77th General Assembly, we initiated and enacted legislation to bring tax relief to the personal property taxpayer, the homeowner, homestead exemption and the elderly and we will shortly reintroduce our property tax freeze legislation and we don't intend to stop here. As soon as it becomes fiscally sound to do it, we will introduce legislation to further cut regressive taxes and our revenue base. At a time when women are organizing and joining meatless Thursday campaigns and when the cost of living in general is so high, we want to devote ourselves to giving the taxpayer relief, he will notice tomorrow in his pocket-book, and we invite you to join with us in the best interest of the taxpayers of Illinois."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate, is recognized."

Choate: "I'd like to ask the ah.... Speaker a question about the contents of his Bill."

Blair: "Well, I'll be happy to yield if you'll provide us with



the vote to advance to Second Reading without reference, because I know you're as anxious as we are to advance on this benefit to the taxpayer."

Choate: "It seems like I was anxious two years before you, Mr. Speaker, because it seems that I was a co-sponsor of Bills to reduce the sales tax on food and medicines which you opposed in previous sessions. But that isn't what I wanted to ask you. I wanted to ask you, is there anything in your Bill ah... to do with property tax relief to bring about the things that you're just talking about a second ago?"

Blair: "No, I was highlighting that those were Republican proposals that we passed out of this Assembly in the last session."

Choate: "Did you have Democratic support?"

Blair: "Well, I'd hope so, just like we expect to have it on this bill."

Choate: "Well, I doubt that, but ah... needless to say, my point of order is, you just heard the Speaker admit that in his explanation of why maybe he would solicit sponsorship to this Bill, which is all right with me, as long as he sticks to the contents of the Bill, and he's just admitted that he wasn't talking about the Bill."

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

Maragos: "May I ask the Sponsor of the Bill a question? For



the purpose of determining whether or not I want to be a Sponsor along with him."

K. Miller: "We're not on that now, but if the Speaker cares to reply...."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, will you please explain to me, what your Bill supposedly does in the area of training the personnel who's going to determine what is food and what is drugs, when they go to a hardware store, when they go to a grocery store that sells hardware."

Blair: "We have looked into that rather closely, and the ah... definition of food, as it would be being applied, ah... in our retail outlets would be those things that are edible solids or nonalcoholic liquids."

Maragos: "And what procedures are you going to use to have persons when a product is delivered by other than the grocery store or a checkout counter?"

Blair: "Other than what?"

Maragos: "The only relief that's provided here is ah... for the sale ah.... where it is taken off the premises for a consumption and it applies only to a food item. It would not be considered with food in other areas where the food is not being.... will be taxed if delivered to your home, only at the time it is checked according to your bill, at the counter."

Blair: "It will not... there is not ah... relief provided for ah... foods served in restaurants because we don't consider that to be a necessity, but certainly the purchase



of food items in a grocery store is a necessity and this will give the relief that we think is so necessary with regard to the regressive features of the sales tax."

Maragos: "Well, I agree with you. I'm a sponsor of bills right now to give relief against sales tax, but it's a more uniform and more constitutional method. I think, Mr. Speaker, that your bill is going to need some hurdles in order to overcome a lot of constitutional hurdles because of uniformity in approach as to whether you're going to give a proper relief, and that's why I'm questioning it and that's why I will think I will not be a sponsor of that Bill."

Blair: "We're satisfied that there is a reasonable classification with regard to the retail occupation of selling food and that this Bill will stand the constitutionality test, Mr. Maragos."

K. Miller: "Gentlemen, the Chair is of the opinion that ah... this discussion should not continue at this stage, because this is on the First Reading of the Bill. The Chair has been inclined to be very lenient in this regard, but it is pass time we should adjourn and I hope you agree with me. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "I notice on the face of a Bill, it says that a fiscal note may be applicable, and I would at this time, request of Mr. Blair for a fiscal note on this Bill."

K. Miller: "I'm sure, in accordance with the rules, a fiscal note will be supplied. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."



F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 635. Taylor. Bill for an Act to create the Funeral Expense Study Commission Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 636. Taylor. Appropriates \$10,000 Funeral Expense Study Commission. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 637. Kozubowski et al. Amends the Liquor Control Act. First Reading of the Bill. 638. Londrigan et al. Amends State Finance Act. First Reading of the Bill. 639. R. A. Walsh et al. Amends Illinois Financial Assistance Act. First Reading of the Bill. 640. Williams et al. Appropriates five million dollars to Department of Transportation. First Reading of the Bill. 641. Williams et al. An Act authorizing the Department of Transportation to make an examination and study for the purpose of flood relief of Silver Creek. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 642. Pappas et al. Directs the Department of Transportation to make an engineering survey. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 643. Berman et al. Amends the Public Utility Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 644. Farley et al. Amends Illinois Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 645. Lemke et al. Amends the Workmen's Occupational Disease Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 64. Lemke et al. Amends the Workmen's Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 647. Stone et al. Amends the Public Junior College Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 648. Harpstrite et al. Amends dog licensing Act.



First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 649. Hart et al. Amends Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 650. Kucharski et al. Creates an Act concerning the right of medical personnel to refuse to perform abortions. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 651. Lemke et al. Amends a negotiable instruments Act. First Reading of the Bill. 652. Griesheimer. Bill for an Act to add a section to the North Shore Sanitary District Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 653. Murphy et al. Establishes the Chain of Lakes Study Commission. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 654. Murphy et al. Appropriates \$25,000 to the Chain of Lakes Study Commission. First Reading of the Bill. 655. Porter. Makes changes enacted to Section 2 of P.A. 77-2062. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 656. Grotberg, et al. Amends County Airports Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 657. Redmond et al. Amends the Local Mass Transit District Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 658. Duff et al. An Act in relation to the idemnification of private citizens who suffer injury or damage in connection with commision of crime. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 659. McGrew. Amends Public Utilities Act. First Reading of the Bill."

K. Miller: "For what purpose does the gentleman from DuPage, Mr. LaFleur, arise?"

LaFleur: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask leave to add Representative Jack Hill to House Joint Resolution No. 17."



K. Miller: "Does gentleman have leave? Leave is granted. Will be so done. Ah... with leave of the House, we'll now go into announcements including announcements of committee meetings. For this purpose, we will first recognize the gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. North."

North: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to announce that the Cities and Villages Committee will be meeting in Room M-3, instead of D-1. We will be meeting in Room M-3 at 2:00."

K. Miller: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and those Members who are on a Revenue subcommittee, which was scheduled to meet in Room 1E at 1:15 PM. We'll meet at 1:45 PM, that is 15 minutes prior to the Revenue Committee meeting in 1E in the State Office Building."

K. Miller: "The gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As chief sponsor of House Bill 511, I would like to ask permission to add Representative Klosak as a co-sponsor."

K. Miller: "Does the gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Randolph."

Randolph: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Revenue Committee will meet today in D1. D1, State Office Building."

K. Miller: "All right, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAvoy."

McAvoy: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, The Banks and Savings and Loan Committee, which is to meet in M-4 at 2:00 will meet at 2:30."



K. Miller: "The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, this is not a committee announcement, but it is an announcement of general interest, if I may make it at this point. Ah.... I wanted to call the attention of every Member of the House to an invitation, which is on your desk, from Representative Chapman and Representative Dyer. You are invited to breakfast tomorrow morning at 9:00 at the First Presbyterian Church, 7th and Capitol in Springfield, on a subject of mutual interest and we'll hope to see you all there."

K. Miller: "All right, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leon."

Leon: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege, please. I heard our Speaker, in explaining his Bill, state that the 77th General Assembly did afford tax relief on personal property taxes, homestead exemption and other matters. For the benefit of those who do not remember that the Illinois Constitutional Convention, the Sixth Illinois Constitutional Convention, made possible tax relief by its members and I want everyone to know that I served on that in that Constitutional Convention, and we did make legal the homestead exemption but was declared unconstitutional. Thank you."

K. Miller: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos, is recognized."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have leave of the House, to add on House 383, of which I'm the chief sponsor, the name of Representative James P. McCourt at his request."



K. Miller: "Does the gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, the same is granted. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn until 9:30 tomorrow morning for perfunctory session and 10:00 for Regular Session."

K. Miller: "Question is on the Motion to adjourn. All those in favor, say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The House stands adjourned until 9:30 tomorrow morning, perfunctory, and 10:00 Regular Session."

