

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-EIGHTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

MARCH 20, 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 Ken Boyle - illness;

Representative Richard A. Carter - illness;

Representative Peter C. Granata - illness;

Representative James T. Londrigan - death in family;

Representative Peggy Smith Martin - illness;

Representative John F. Wall - illness.



Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "The House will be in order and we will have prayer by John Hughes."

John Hughes: "Heavenly Father, Grant to the Legislature and the People who work for and with them, the right to do good so that no evil may befall them. Amen."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Messages from the Senate."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the following Joint Resolution. House Joint Resolution No. 20. Concurred in by the Senate March 15, 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 the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence by the House. Senate Bill 177. Passed by the Senate, March 15, 1972, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the following preamble and Joint Resolution, the adoption in which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House. Senate Joint Resolution 24. Adopted by the Senate March 15, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker - I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the Preamble and Joint Resolution. House Joint Resolution 13. Concurred in by the Senate, March 15, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform



the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the following Preamble and Joint Resolution. House Joint Resolution 21. Concurred in by the Senate, March 15, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the following preamble and Joint Resolution. House Joint Resolution 22 concurred in by the Senate, March 15, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the following Conference Committee Report, an... Conference Committee Report on House Bill 89. Adopted by the Senate, March 15, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary.

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Do we have any Committee Reports."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Mr. Rose from the Committee on Judiciary to which House Bills 180, 233, 417 were reported with amendments thereto directing that the amendments to adopted and then do passed. Mr. Rose from Judiciary to which House Bills 267 and 428 were reported and came back with the recommendation that the Bills do not pass. Mr. Rose from the Committee on Judiciary to which House Bill 499 were reported to send back with the recommendation that the Bill do pass. Mr. Blades from Committee on Agricultural and Natural Resources to which House Bill 285 was referred was sent back with amendments hereto with recommendations that amendments be adopted and Bill amended do pass to be referred to Appropriations. Mr. Blades from Agricultural and Natural Resources



to which House Bill 391 and 442 are referred, reported sent back with the recommendation that the Bills do pass. Mr. Blades from Agricultural and Natural Resources to which House Bill 439 was referred, reported sent back with the recommendation that the Bill do pass and be re-referred to the Committee on Appropriations. Mr. Blades from Agricultural and Natural Resources to which House Resolution Number 67 was referred, reported that sent back with the recommendation the Resolution be adopted. Mr. Blades from Agricultural and Natural Resources to which House Joint Resolution 14 was referred, reported sent back with the recommendation that the Resolution be adopted. Mr. McMaster from the Committee on Counties and Townships to which House Bill 13 and 382 were referred, reports sent back with the recommendation that the Bills do pass. Mr. McMaster from Counties and Townships, to which House Bills 244 and 265 were referred, reported sent back with amendments thereto with the recommendation the Amendments be adopted, and the Bills as amended do pass. Mr. Pappas, Motor Vehicles, to which House Bills 26 and 183 were referred, reported sent back with the recommendation the Bills do not pass. Mr. Pappas from Motor Vehicles, to which House Bills 58 and 412 were referred, reported sent back with the recommendation the Bill do pass. Mr. Pappas from Motor Vehicles to which House Bill 63 was referred, reported sent back with amendments thereto with recommendation that the amendments be adopted and the Bill as adopted do pass. Mr. Pappas from Motor Vehicles, to which House 182 is referred,



reported sent back with amendments with the recommendation the amendments be adopted and the Bill as adopted do not pass. Mr. Pappas, Motor Vehicles, to which House Bill 342 was referred, reported sent back with amendments thereto with the recommendation that the amendments be adopted and the Bill as amended do pass. Mr. McMaster from the Committee on Counties and Townships to which House Bill 49 was referred reported sent back and pursuant to Rule 23D, the Bill was ordered tabled. Mr. Collins from Executive to which House Bills 27, 36 were referred, reported sent back and pursuant to Rule 23D, the Bills were ordered tabled. Mr. Duff from Judiciary II, to which House Bill 72 was referred, reported sent back and pursuant to Rule 23D, the Bill was ordered tabled. Mr. Pappas from Committee on Motor Vehicles, to which House Bill 31 was referred, reported sent back and pursuant to Rule 23D, the Bill was ordered tabled. Mr. Blades from the Committee on Agricultural and Natural Resources, to which House Bill 44 was referred, reported sent back and pursuant to Rule 23D, the Bill was ordered tabled. Mr. Randolph from Revenue to which House Bill 30 was referred, reported sent back and pursuant to Rule 23D, the Bill was ordered tabled. No further Committee Reports."

Rep. Kenneth W. Miller: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Nardulli, now moves that we stand in recess until 10:00 O'Clock. All in favor, say 'aye', opposed 'no'. Ayes, so we are recessed until 10:00."



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

Doctor Johnson: "We pray. We pray this morning, oh God, for the gift of physical strength and well being. Give us health for the day's work before us. Grant us wisdom neither to overdrive our bodies until we exhaust them nor to allow them to grown weak and flabby through too much ease. Grant us wise discipline in all of our habits that we desist from those things which can harm and injure and rob us of the full capacity of vigor for our labors. Grant us sound and health minds as well. Give us minds that are at peace and rest, undistressed by anxiety and free from the bitterness and resentfulness which can intervate and destory our own effectiveness. Finally, oh Lord, keep us from becoming so immerced in these things, the things that occupy both mind and body, that we become insentitive to the things of the Spirit. We commit to your special care this day, Representative James Londrigan, upon the death of his Father, be to him a heavenly Father, who sustains and cares for his Children, in such times of needs. Bless us now, therefore, in Body, Mind and spirit, oh God, our creator, our Redeemer, and our Sanctifier. Amen."

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

W. D. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, will the record show that Representatives Granata and Wall are not here but that Representative and Sevcik has returned and we are delighted to see him."



W. Robert Blair: "Gentelman from Union, Mr. Choate."

C. L. Choate: "Mr. Speaker, would you please have the official Record indicate that Representative Londrigan is absent because of the death of his father. Representative Boyle is absent because ah.. he's undergoing a physical checkup. Representative Carter, Richard Carter, is absent because of illness. Representative Krause will probably, I hope, show at a later moment, if not record him as being ill! Ah.. Representative Martin absent because of Illiness."

W. Robert Blair: "The Journal will so indicate. Ah.. Messages."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Ah.. Message from the Governor. 'To the Honorable Members of the House of Representatives, 78th General Assembly. I am returning House Bill 89 entitled An Act making an appropriation to the Department of Transportation for certain emergency transportation operation grants. Pursuant to Article IV, Section 9-E, of the Constitution, I have made specific recommendations for change. With these changes the bill will have my approval since I concur with the General Assembly that a subsidy is desirable to avoid further fare increases and a service.. and service cutbacks. Local units of government should provide more funds than this bill requires to meet the operating deficit of the Chicago Transit Authority. In the current circumstances, local funds should match state funds on a one-to-one basis. One local dollar for every state dollar. Since the General Assembly has determined that in order to avoid a fare increase and a service cutback the Chicago Transit Authority will need 18.9 million dollars to meet its operating



deficit to June 30, 1973, I am recommending that units of local government be required to pay \$9,450,000 and that the State then match that amount. Accordingly, the following specific changes should be made in House Bill 89: Section 1, line 8, change \$17,850,000 to \$14,700,000; Section 2, line 14, change \$12,600,000 to \$9,450,000; Section 2, line 17, change 50% to 100%. I am recommending one other change. Strictly interpreted, Section 11 could lead to the conclusion that the contingent repayment provisions in Section 10 were unenforceable. To remedy this I recommend that Section 11 be amended to read as follows: Section 11. Sections 1-6 and Section 8 of this Act are repealed July 1, 1973. With the specific changes set forth in this letter, I would approve House Bill 89. Respectfully Submitted, Daniel Walker."

W. Robert Blair: "Committee Reports."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Mr. Collins from Executive to which House Bill 38 was referred, reported same back with Recommendation Bill Do Not Pass. Mr. Collins from Executive to which House Bill 246 was referred reported same back with Amendments thereto with the Recommendation that the Amendments be adopted and the Bill as Amended Do Pass. Mr. Collins from Executive to which House Bills 51, 90, 91, 92, 350, 380 and 475 were referred reported same back with Recommendation the Bills Do Pass. Mr. Collins from Executive to which House Bill 16 was referred reported the same back with Amendments thereto with the Recommendation that the Amendments be adopted and the Bill as Amended Do Pass. Mr. Collins from Executive to which House Joint Resolution 2 was referred



reported the same back with the Recommendation that the Resolution be adopted. Mr. Collins from Executive to which House Resolution, Constitutional Amendment, Resolution Number 4 was referred reported same back with Recommendation that the Resolution Do Not Pass. Mr. Collins from Executive to which House Joint Resolution, Constitutional Amendment 6 was referred same back with Recommendation that the Resolution Do Not Pass. Mr. Collins from Executive to which House Joint Resolution, Constitutional Amendment Number 12. was referred reported same back with the Recommendation that the Resolution Do Pass. Mr. Collins from Executive to which House Joint Resolution, Constitutional Amendment Number 13 was referred reported the same back with the Recommendation that the Resolution Do Pass. No further Committee Reports. Could I have your attention for a moment, please. Through inadvertence the Calendar fails to show that Cities and Villages will meet this afternoon at 2:00 in M-3. The Cities and Villages Committee will meet this afternoon at 2:00 in Room M-3."

W. Robert Blair: "Introductions, First Reading."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 270, Pappas et al, appropriates \$120,000 to the Department of Transportation, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 721, Leinenweber, Amends the Vehicle Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 722, Leinenweber, Amends The County Recorder's Act, First Reading of the Bill. That's it."

W. Robert Blair: "House Bills Second Reading. Oh, ah..

Agreed Resolutions."



Fredric B. Selcke: "House Resolution 114, Boyle, et al.; House Resolution 115, Choate, et al.; House Resolution 116, Choate et al."

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

W. D. Walsh: "Ah.. the Agreed Resolutions, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution Number 114 ah.. introduced by Representative Boyle commends Major Philip E. Smith, United States Air Force, ah.. for being released as a Prisoner of War. And House Resolution 115 commends the Eagles of Ridgeway who have ah.. earned the coveted ah.. title of Champions of the Class A Division in basketball. And House Resolution Number 116 is a Birthday Resolution for Representative James M. Houlihan who has reached a milestone in his life. He's ah.. 30 today. I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, discussion. Questions on the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say Aye."

Members: "Aye."

W. Robert Blair: "Opposed No. The Ayes have it and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Now, House Bills, Second Reading."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bills Second Reading. House Bill 1, A Bill for an Act to.."

W. Robert Blair: "Whoa, take.. take that out of the Record. Leave it in? Alright, hold.. hold 29, Mr. Jaffe says."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 48, Caldwell, A Bill for an Act to amend Section 2 of the Fair Employment Practices Act, Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee.."



W. Robert Blair: "Ah.. take it out? Alright, take it out of the Record. Ah.. Mr. Hirshfeld not here? Take 125 out, then. Mr. Hart's here. 129."

Fredric B. Selcke: "129 will be held."

W. Robert Blair: "No, he wants it read. You want it read? Mr. Hart, Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

R. O. Hart: "Ah.. ah.. ah.. I just filed ah.. another amendment on it, it'll have to be circulated, so, thank you, I'll hold it."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, take it out."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Ah.. House.. is Berman here? Mr. Berman, House Bill 185?"

W. Robert Blair: "He's not here. Take it out. Is Mr. Katz here? Does he want these ah.. Well, pull them out until he gets here."

Fredric B. Selcke: "188 and 189. House Bill 238, Mr. Ewell, A Bill for an Act prohibiting any home rule unit or other unit of local government from charging a fee for the use of beaches which border on Lake Michigan, Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amendment No. 1, Amend House Bill 238, on page 1, line 7, ah.. by striking the word 'may' and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'shall'; and by striking line 10 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'or unit of local government except uniform fees for both residents and non-residents may be charged on a daily basis.'"

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



R. W. Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think that the.. the first Amendment is simply a clarifying amendment, but the second one is going to be essentially changed by an amendment to be offered by Mr. Lundy ah.. and so, at this point, if we could just hear Mr. Lundy's amendment, I'm sure it would eliminate the effects of the second half of the Committee Amendment."

J. R. Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.."

W. Robert Blair: "Wait.. wait just a minute. We'd better address ourselves to ah.. Committee Amendment No. 1 before we take action on 2."

R. W. Ewell: "Alright, well I would ah.. say that Committee Amendment No. 1, the first part is simply a change of a word from shall to may which was suggested by the committee. The second part of the amendment makes it possible on.. for the beaches to charge only on a daily basis and I would move the adoption of this amendment.. this Committee Amendment."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, is there discussion on Committee Amendment No. 1. All those in favor say Aye."

Members : "Aye."

W. Robert Blair: "Opposed No. The Ayes have it and the amendment's adopted. Now, ah.. Amendment No. .."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment No. 2, Lundy, Amend House Bill 238..."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy."

J. R. Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 238, as amended by Amendment No. 1, would prohibit the imposition by any unit of local government or home rule



unit of any user fee for the use of a Lake Michigan beach except a non-discriminatory daily user fee. Non-discriminatory, that is as between residents of the unit involved and non-residents. The obvious intent of the amendment is to open Lake Michigan beaches equally to all residents of the State. Now, this is a worthy objective, but I think before we in the Legislature mandate.. Before we in the Legislature mandate to any local communities, including communities along the shore of Lake Michigan, that they must provide equal access at equal rates, to all citizens of the State, we must consider, in all fairness, the expenditures which those local communities have made and will continue to make to support those resources. To support those facilities. Now, in this particular case, what my amendment, Amendment No. 2, will do is to say that since Lake Michigan beaches will be open equally to all citizens of the State, then all citizens of the State should participate equally in the cost of operating and maintaining those beaches. Seems to me that this in only fair. Seems to me it gives recognition to the improvements which have been made in ah.. Lake Michigan beaches over the years by the local communities in which those beaches are located. Improvements which now, under the present bill, will be equally accessible ah.. which will be available at equal rates to all citizens of the State. And, I urge adoption of Amendment No. 2."

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



W. D. Walsh: "Well, will the gentleman yeild to a question. Could you tell me what the cost of this will be."

W. Robert Blair: "He indicates he'll yeild. Mr. Lundy."

J. R. Lundy: "I have been diligently attempting to obtain from the various lake shore communities the annual costs of beach operation and maintenance by each of those communities. Unfortunately, I have not been able to get replies from all of the lake shore communities. Those from which I have heard are the following.."

W. D. Walsh: "I was interested in a total cost. Have you consulted ah.. the ah.. Chicago Park District."

J. R. Lundy: "I have had a request in to the Chicago Park District for three days to give me a figure on the annual cost of operation and maintenance of the Chicago beaches and I have received no answer from them. I have received answers from about 80% of the remaining communities along the shore of Lake Michigan. And I can give the gentleman a figure for those remaining communities. It would not exceed \$100,000 based on the costs expended from local funds for the most recent fiscal year."

W. D. Walsh: "Now, \$100,000, you're not taking the City of Chicago into consideration, are you?"

J. R. Lundy: "That is correct. As I told the gentleman, I have requested from the Chicago Park District a figure on the cost of operating and maintaining Chicago beaches and I have not yet received any word from the District."

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



W. D. Walsh: "If I may speak to this Amendment, Mr. Speaker, I would first of all request a fiscal note if this.. for this bill if this ah.. Amendment is adopted. I would hope, however, that the amendment was not adopted because what it does is it changes this bill entirely.) It introduces an entirely different concept to the bill and would have the effect of making every beach bordering Lake Michigan in the State of Illinois a State Park and make the State responsible for cleaning, maintaining, for life guard services, and for every other service attendant to a beach. So, I would suggest to you that this may be the proper subject for another bill, but is not the proper subject for an amendment to this bill. And I would hope, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the sponsor of the bill, Representative Ewell, would join me in opposing this amendment."

W. Robert Blair: "Further discussion. The Gentleman ah.. from Cook, Mr. McCourt."

J. F. McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the Majority Leader in opposition to this amendment. Coming from a community that borders Lake Michigan, I know the City of Evanston would be very much appreciative of receiving somewhere in excess of \$55,000 a year from the State, but I wish to remind you that this is not a State Park it's a small beach area and it cannot accommodate people like a normal State Park can and I would hope that the amendment would be defeated."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."



J. S. Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the last speaker, if he talked to the people of his area, he might find that they would support this amendment because actually what this amendment does is really make the State responsible. If ah.. Ray Ewell's bill passes, somebody had better pay the bill. Ah.. I come from an area where we have a park district and the poor taxpayers are paying more than their share ah.. to maintain this beach property, to maintain a park on the beachfront and I ah.. I'll say to you that we have the Illinois State Beach Park that has adequate facilities for the people of the State of Illinois in the northeast Illinois district. Not only that, the ah.. Conservation Department has made plans to ah.. take up more property in the Illinois State Beach Park, but really what you're putting is a great burden on the local taxpayer. And I think the last Gentleman from Evanston, if he talked to the people in his area, they would support this amendment. Ah.. I rise in support of the Lundy amendment and I would say that all of you who support the local taxpayer paying his share and his share only ah.. support the Lundy amendment. I will agree that this amendment makes Ray Ewell's ah.. bill more difficult to pass and I would be less than honest ah.. if I didn't say that I'm not going to support the bill in its final form. But I would ask you to support this amendment."

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

J. E. Porter: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we have to realize the nature of Representative



Ewell's bill which would provide that all the beaches bordering Lake Michigan would be open to all members of the State of Illinois and I think this is a proper purpose, but at an equal rate of cost. We.. if we look at the costs of the beaches along the Lake and we see how much of that is deferred by user fees, we can see that in almost all the communities in the First District that only a very small part, no more than possibly 50% in most communities, is in fact deferred by user fees. If we do not pass the Lundy amendment, then it seems to me that Representative Ewell's bill cannot be acceptable because the cost to all users, not only resident users , but not-resident users, will be prohibitively high. I would ask that the Members of the House give their support to the Lundy amendment to make this bill one that is reasonable, not only to the communities along the Lake, but to all the citizens of Illinois. Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "Further discussion. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell, care to close. Well, wait a minute, it's not yours it's Mr. Lundy's. Mr. Lundy indicates Mr. Ewell will use his closing time."

R. W. Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentelmen, ah.. my position on the amendment is I'm not an all authority on the particular bill. I only seek to have the bill in its best form and accepted by the majority of the Members of the House. I told him I had no objections to this amendment, but I can't say that I'm going to super strongly support it. I wish to throw it out to the members of the House for their considera-



tion. However, there is no objection to the amendment."

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

J. E. Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as a member of the ah.. committee who addressed themselves to this bill in the first place, I must confess that this adds a whole new dimension to Mr. Ewell's bill at which time the fiscal note application was addressed simply to those beaches that were charging various and sundry fees for local and out of town residents and the bill did not apply to the wide open public beaches of the City of Chicago. I would urge you to vote No on Amendment No. 2."

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

H. A. Katz: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wanted to rise in support of Representative Lundy's amendment and to ah.. echo the views expressed by the distinguished gentleman from North Chicago. The fact is that I have been looking into the question as it relates to my district ah.. some of which is along the lake shore and I find that the amount of money that is collected in terms of user fees ah.. may really be as little as 14% of the total cost of maintaining the beach. All that Representative Lundy's bill does is to say to the taxpayers of that area that if you in fact through your taxes support this beach and you have been using your tax money for the purpose of supporting the beach that you will be entitled if you make your beach available .. You will be entitled, if you make your beach available to others so that everybody shares in that beach, to have your costs shared. That is an eminently



fair way of dealing with the problem. There is no reason why a small area, a small little village, of 10,000 people in my district or someone else's district should not be entitled, if they open their beach in a non-discriminatory treatment of everyone, to have everyone shoulder and pay the cost of that beach. If we were, in fact, in my area, to increase our fees for the use of the beach to the amount of money that would be required to support the beach without any taxes it would make the cost of running beach prohibitive. The amount of money that would be required to purchase and admission to that beach would be so great that everyone would be deprived of the opportunity of being able to go to the beach. So that the bulk of the money comes from tax funds and if those tax funds are going to be used for the support of everyone, then everyone ought to contribute to it. And I say the Lundy amendment is fair and I do urge this House to support it."

W. Robert Blair: "Now, Mr. Lundy."

J. R. Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the suggestions that this amendment is a radical departure or that it changes significantly the nature of this bill simply aren't correct. The bill says that the beaches of the State of Illinois, regardless of what community they happen to be located in, really belong to all of the people of the State of Illinois and all of the people of the state should have equal access to them. And I think that's probably right. Indeed there have been court decisions in other states that have said as much. But those court decisions



have also been careful to say that the local communities in which beaches are located bear some extraordinary costs related to developing and maintaining and guarding those beaches. And all we are asking with this amendment is that since the beaches are hereafter to be equally accessible to all citizens of the state then all citizens of the state should share equally in supporting those beaches. Now, let me suggest to some of the Downstate members and some of the members whose districts do not border on the Lake that we are dealing with a very important principle here. Ask any of your local park districts which charge user fees whether they want the state to mandate to them that your local parks must be open to all citizens of the state on an equal basis without charging a higher user fee to non-residents and I will wager that your local park district will tell you that, no, since the park is partially supported by local tax dollars, we ought to be able to charge a lower user fee to residents. And I would imagine that if you told them that a bill had been proposed to make their local park, your local park, equally accessible at equal cost to all citizens of the state their reaction would be exactly what the reaction of the taxpayers in my district and the city officials in my district was, if it's going to be equally accessible to all citizens of the state then let all citizens of the state share in paying the costs of maintaining and operating that facility. And I ask your favorable vote on Amendment No. 2."

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



- H. Washington: "Mr. Speaker, I have a Parliamentary Inquiry."
- W. Robert Blair: "Alright."
- H. Washington: "Mr. Speaker, since the amendment.. proposed Amendment No. 2, requires the expenditure of funds by the Department of Confer.. Conservation, my question is if this amendment is adopted will the bill then require a Fiscal Note."
- W. Robert Blair: "Yes, it would have an impact on State revenues and that's ah.. what the Fiscal Note Act addresses itself to. And so, ah.. it would.. if it is adopted then the ah.. bill would have to remain on Second Reading as requested by the Gentleman from Cook, ah.. Mr. William Walsh, until the Fiscal Note is furnished."
- H. Washington: "Well, Mr.. I don't have any idea how long it would take to get a Fiscal Note, but in light of the fact that the sponsor has indicated to me that he wanted his bill through here, I would suggest to Representative Lundy that perhaps he should withdraw his amendment, let the bill out and perhaps put the Amendment on in the Senate in order to save time."
- W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy."
- J. R. Lundy: "Seems to me like I've been here before once. Well I appreciate the gentleman's suggestion, but with the understanding that a Fiscal Note may be required or will be required if the amendment passes and with the further understanding, as I indicated earlier to the Majority Leader, that the amount of money involved is really relatively small, and



with the further understanding that ah.. leaving the amendment in will not cause any insuperable constitutional problems with this bill ah.. I think I will decline to withdraw the amendment and again ask for a favorable vote on it."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, ah.. the question is on the adoption of Amendment No. 2. Ah.. maybe we ought to have a Roll Call. All those in favor then will vote Aye and the Opposed No. Yes, just the amendment, Amendment No. 2. That's the question. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

R. E. Mann: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to explain my No vote. I was always under the impression that the beaches and land on Lake Michigan were public property. This was always my impression. I know the Gentleman ah.. from Cook, Mr. Lundy, ah.. is certainly not one who would suggest ah.. that the beaches be exclusive and I understand your position, Joe, but I've got to vote the other way because while the local communities may need money, I can't encourage the local communities to be exclusive with public property and public lands. I think it's against public policy. The beaches belong to all of the people of the State of Illinois and therefore I'm voting No."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

J. S. Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think if the membership would think about this particular amendment that they would be voting for the amendment because all of you can bring this amendment home to your particular



area. It just happens to be that there aren't too many ah.. people that this affects on the shoreline. If all of your districts were on the shoreline I can bet that all of you would be voting green, but to bring it home to your particular area, most of you have a local park district. Now, we're not saying that the beach area isn't open to the public, but we're saying that if those who aren't residents of that particular district do use the beach that they ought to pay some share above the local taxpayer so that they pay for the maintenance. Now this is a very important principle that is actually going to the heart of every park district in this state. So, if you're voting against this amendment you're going to vote for a principle that can come back to haunt you someday. So, I would urge all of you who want to ah.. protect your particular park districts in your local area, whether your Upstate, Downstate or where, that you vote for this amendment."

W. Robert Blair: "All voted who wished. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy."

J. R. Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, I.. I'll take just one more brief moment of the House's time to explain my vote because I'm afraid from the remarks of my good friend from ah.. Chicago, Mr. Mann, that there may be some misunderstanding about the thrust of this amendment. This is not an exclusionary amendment. This does not close any beaches. Indeed this amendment will open up the beaches because it would allow local municipalities to charge non-discriminatory user fees,



the same user fees for non-residents as they now charge to residents, or, indeed, to lower their user fees, because the difference between what they get in user fees and the total cost of the beaches would be made up from the State Parks Fund. So, then ah.. again this doesn't exclude anybody from the beaches, it's a recognition of precisely what Mr. Mann said and that is that the beaches belong to everybody in the state and we are trying to recognize the recurrent responsibility of everybody in the state to help pay to operate and maintain those beaches."

W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wish. Clerk will take the Record. On this question there are 71 Nays, Huskey No, and ah.. 57 Yeas and Amendment No. 2 fails."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Amendment No. 3, Porter, Amend House Bill 238 as amended on page 1, line 1, and support."

J. E. Porter: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah.. Amendment No. 3 ah.. to House Bill 238 does only one thing basically and that is allow municipalities to charge residents and non-residents on not only a daily basis, but also, if they wish, any other periodic basis, such as a seasonal fee. That's the.. that's the only thing that the amendment does and I urge each of you to ah.. vote in favor of it."

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

R. W. Ewell: "There's ah.. only one consideration is we don't want to have the possibility of the seasonal fee being so high that it would make it prohibitive in contrast to the



daily fee. Does your amendment still allow for a daily fee."

J. E. Porter: "Ah.. yes it does, ah.. Representative Ewell, the only thing it does is add the right to have a seasonal fee in addition to a daily fee. I can see people lined up at the beaches if your bill were to pass. Ah.. each one having to come up with some change out of their pocket and it would take all day just to get in. Seems to me we have to have some alternatives if it's going to pass."

R. W. Ewell: "Well, as long as they're collecting money I'm sure they wouldn't mind being there all day."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the question.. Mr. Ewell have anything further? Mr. Porter, care to close? Do you care to close?"

J. E. Porter: "I would just urge that each member ah.. support the amendment to allow collection of other than daily fees in addition to daily fees."

W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the question is on the adoption of Amendment No. 3. All those in favor say Aye."

Members: "Aye."

W. Robert Blair: "Opposed No. The Ayes have it and the amendment's adopted. Further amendments? Third Reading."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Ah.. House Bill 253, Friedland, A Bill for An Act making an appropriation to the Department of Transportation for a feasibility report on Otter Creek Watershed in Elgin, in Kane County, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

W. Robert Blair: "Any from the Floor. Third Reading. Oh, Mr. ah.. Mr. Katz want ah.. do you want yours called. Alright."



Oh, wait a minute, they say your amendment's not printed, Mr. Katz. Hold it. Is that true on both of them? He's got two. Take them both out."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Yeh, both out of the Record."

W. Robert Blair: "What about Mr. Berman?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "He's not in his seat."

W. Robert Blair: "Oh, he doesn't want it called. Alright, House Bills Third Reading. All right, we quit at 205 and we're starting at 211."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 211, Skinner, A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act of 1939, Third Reading of the Bill."

W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner. All right, no hurry. All right."

C. L. Skinner: "Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I thought that you were going to go in numerical order."

W. Robert Blair: "No.. no.. we've got.. Well, no we, under that rule we're suppose to start where we stopped. Ah.. that's why we picked up 211, but ah.. we're not in a rush right now."

C. L. Skinner: "House Bill 211 is an attempt.."

W. Robert Blair: "We're on Third Reading now ah.. if you would give the gentleman the courtesy of your attention, why I'm sure he'll do likewise when you have a bill up."

C. L. Skinner: "Last Thursday I thought this bill was going to be called for the last bill of the day and so I passed out these yellow sheets. If you still have them, I would suggest that you pull them out and if you would like more the Pages,



I'm sure, will be happy to bring them to you. The purpose of House Bill 211 is to define the means of assessing agricultural land in the State of Illinois. At the present time the state law says that all property shall be assessed at fair market value and this results in an assessment on a farm which is greater than the individual farmer can pay out of his cash flow that is generated from the crops. House Bill 211 would allow the farms throughout the state to be assessed according to productivity until the use changed. At that point the assessment would be the difference between the assessment according to fair market value and the assessment according to productivity would be taxed for a three year period. Ah.. if this bill is not passed, taxes throughout Illinois on farm land will skyrocket. Ah.. you name the County and I can tell you how much they will go up. If there are any questions I would be happy to answer them."

- W. Robert Blair: "Any further discussion. Ah.. the Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."
- A. T. McMaster: "Ah.. Mr... would the Sponsor yeild to a question."
- W. Robert Blair: "Yes, he indicates he will."
- A. T. McMaster: "Mr. Skinner, ah.. you made the statement that the.. in the event the ah.. farm land is sold ah.. then ah.. someone will ah.. did you say pay the difference in taxes for a three year period. Do you mean you go back three years to ah.. pick up that difference."
- C. L. Skinner: "What I said was that when the use changes, not



when the property is sold, and there's a significant difference. When the use changes then there will be an.. a tax roll back of three years."

A. T. McMaster: "Now, in other words, someone will pay the extra amount of taxes for a three year back period."

C. L. Skinner: "That is correct. Someone.. this.. this bill extends to all counties the right now enjoyed by counties of over 200,000."

A. T. McMaster: "Ah.. who is responsible for paying that. Let's say ah.., in effect, that ah.. I have land on the edge of a city that's ah.. is an agricultural use value ah.. I turn around and sell it to someone for development and ah.. who is going to pay the ah.. that back amount of taxes for the three year period."

C. L. Skinner: "The Seller is technically required to make the payment. However, any Seller with a good lawyer will put.. will build that right into the sale price."

A. T. McMaster: "But it is not built into the bill. I mean ah.. just the Seller is the one that's responsible for paying that back amount of money."

C. L. Skinner: "The.. it is not in the bill that you have before you, but when you go several sections down it is there."

A. T. McMaster: "It is there as the responsibility of the Seller."

C. L. Skinner: "Yes."

A. T. McMaster: "All right, thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "The Gentleman from ah.. Logan, Mr. Lauer."



- J. R. Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"
- W. Robert Blair: "He indicates he will."
- J. R. Lauer: "Mr.. ah.. Representative Skinner, by what productivity standard ah.. will this land be judged and who will set that standard?"
- C. L. Skinner: "Ah.. that would be left up to the Department of Local Governmental Affairs. I mean it would be determined I would hope according to ah.. you know whatever.. let's say the university department.. ah.. University of Illinois' extension service. Whatever they would ah.. recommend."
- J. R. Lauer: "But it has not been spelled out in.."
- C. L. Skinner: "No, it is not spelled out in the bill."
- J. R. Lauer: "I see. Thank you."
- W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."
- J. E. Grotberg: "Mr. Skinner, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah.. Cal, you only changed the numerical number of that bill ah.. \$200,000. The existing language does everything that it always did, is that correct? The assessors are now operating on ah.. the best guess they can get as to productivity for land, is that correct?"
- C. L. Skinner: "As a matter of fact they are. In every county in the state, apparently, or in every county I can figure out, they are assessing according to productivity right now. And the Ladies and Gentlemen in this General Assembly have the choice of sanctifying this present illegal procedure of assessing farm land below marked value or else they will



be telling the local assessors if this Bill is defeated that indeed they want the farm land assessed at market value, which will mean that farm land will rise and virtually the assessment on farm land will rise in every county in Illinois."

J. E. Grotberg: "I'm going to vote for your Bill, but the.... my question still arises. We need a formula for productivity worse than we need anything. Is that correct? A State-wide formula so that the assessors can deal uniformly with the concept of productivity versus fair market value for land around your district and mine that's under the population pressure and developmental rates."

C. L. Skinner: "Generally the productivity assessments are tied to soil types and they assume average management and average amounts of fertilizer being put on the land...."

J. E. Grotberg: "That's right, the Federal Government has a factor now."

C. L. Skinner: "There are factors available."

J. E. Grotberg: "Right. Thank you."

W. Robert Blair: "Further discussion? Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to close."

C. L. Skinner: "I have nothing more to add except that if this Bill passes we will be telling the local assessors they can continue to do what they've been doing anyway, except they will now be doing it legally instead of doing it illegally."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman through? All right, the question is, shall House Bill 211 pass? All those in favor, vote



'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Ah.... on this question, there 128 'ayes', no 'nays'.... I'm sorry, Maragos 'aye'. This question there are 128 'ayes', no 'nays', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Go ahead, Jack, call the next Bill."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 226. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Illinois Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

W. D. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 226 is the annual appropriation for the Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation. The Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation tries to make some sense out of the relationship between State and Local and State and Federal governments. The budget this year is a hundred and forty-eight thousand, seven-hundred and fifty dollars, sixty-eight thousand, nine-hundred and thirty dollars of which are dues for the Council of State Governments. The appropriation is up about nine hundred dollars over that for last year. I urge your support."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 226 pass? All those in favor, vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'." Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 138 'ayes' and no



'nays', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 227. A Bill for an Act creating the Day Care Study Commission to define its powers and duties. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

E. M. Barnes: "Take it out of the record."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Take it out of the record? O'kay."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 230. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to meetings. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

R. S. Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 230 will allow for the recording by film, tape or other means of any public meeting which is required to be open according to the open meetings law. In many instances, reporters who go to these meetings would like to be able to record so that they can verify the facts before they write their stories. Ah... the Bill would not apply to the General Assembly even though all of our meetings are required to be open and we do have provision now for the recording. The Bill has passed in past years. We've had some problems over in the Senate, but I don't anticipate that now, and I would urge a favorable vote on House Bill 230."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the discussion. Alright, the question is shall House Bill 230 pass? All those in favor



will vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'.... The question is shall the House pass House Bill 230? All those in favor will vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Neff 'aye'. Barnes 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, 123 'ayes', 15 'nays', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby.... no alright, before I announce it then, Choate 'present'. Maragos 'present'. Lechowicz 'present'. Tipsword 'present'. Hart 'present'. Holloway 'present'. Flinn 'present'. Dunn 'present'. Passed. 125 'ayes', 15 'nays', 9 'present'. Alsup 'present'. We've got it. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."

Fredric B. Selcke: House Bill 231. Juckett. An Act to amend Section 13 of Article 13 to add Section 3.32 to Article 4 of an Act which provides Law in relation to Township Organization. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

R. S. Juckett: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 231 would allow for the funding of Mental Health Activities within Townships. It does not, and I must repeat this, it does not give added Governmental responsibility to the Township, but it does give the ability of the Township form of Government to finance Mental Health ah.... activities. And, it must be done through ah.... an Organization which is recognized by the State, by the State Department of Mental Health as



the provider of Mental Health ah... Activities in that area. It has the support of the State Department of Mental Health. It has the support of all of the Mental Health Associations. If a particular Township is within a Mental Health Taxing District, that Township would not be able to provide funds because that would be a duplication of service, a duplication of tax. And, by Representative Skinner's Amendment, we have eliminated that. It is a good Bill. It will provide and will enable the State Program of Mental Health to proceed. And, I would urge a 'Yes' vote on this very good Bill to advance the cause of Mental Health in the State of Illinois."

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

H. Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the gentleman yield?"

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

H. Yourell: "Ah.... Bob, let me ask this question. If this Bill passes, will it then be necessary to impose or levy a tax on the residence of the Township who desire this authority?"

R. S. Juckett: "Ah.... in answer to that, and I'm certain that you did ask that question because it will not ah.... create an additional tax on the residents. It will not increase the taxing power of the Township. The only thing that it would do would be to allow the Township to expend part of their revenues for Mental Health for



citizens. At the present time, some of the all of 'we can already do it'. Some of the Attorneys 'we can only do it for indigence and that Attorneys come out of the Poor Relief Fund'. And, it could be allowed to come out of the General Fund rather than this and Relief."

H. Yourself Bob, this.... is this ah.... is the Digest when it ah.... in its interpretation of the Bill it says, 'enclosed this purpose among purposes which Board of Town Auditors may raise money by taxation'

R. S. "Yes, this would.... they could.... They would raise through taxation, but it would not be an increase in the rate. It would not be an in.... ah.... a special Town Government."

H. Yourself thank you, Representative Juckett. Mr. Speaker if I may, I would like to speak against this Bill and, call the attention to every Member of the Assembly, if you vote for this Bill in this period of session where everybody I.... I.... I hopefully would support is trying to reduce taxes instead of increasing them in spite of what the Sponsor of this Bill says in order to provide this service, you do have to let government provides no services unless taxes



are levied to provide that service. Now, they may get around that by telling you that this is in lieu of a tax that other services can ah.... be withheld or some kind of gimmity.... gimmi.... gimmickry of subterfuge, but you and I ah.... know, Ladies and Gentlemen, that when Government provides a service, that service is provided only because a tax is levied for that service. So, if you, like I, am opposed to raising taxes in the State of Illinois, regardless of what political subdivision that might come in, I would suggest that you vote 'no' on this Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The ah.... Lady ah.... from Cook, Mrs. Chapman."

E. S. Chapman (Mrs.): "Ah.... Mr. speaker, I would like to joint with Representative Juckett in my support for this piece of Legislation. Ah.... we learned during the years of a former Democratic Governor that the best way to provide for Mental Health needs was to keep people in the Community not to take them away from their family and friends, but to keep them in the Community. But since that time, we are having trouble in order to provide the kind of services to do this for our citiznes. This measure offers an option and that's all it is, is an option. It does not permit any increase in the tax levy. No Township is going to be able to raise



more taxes under this Bill than at the present time. They may raise taxes for one additional reason. And, coming from the Suburbs of Cook County where there isn't much need for fence mending and for thistle cutting, I am happy to see Townships given a good reason for existence. And, I would... I would hope that this Bill will be passed because it will help many voluntary Organizations trying to do a job for Mental Health in their Communities as they seek support from a Local Government, Township Government which then has the option to either ah... go along with them or turn down their request. We hear a lot about home rule and here is an opportunity to permit Township Government to exercise some home rule. I'm voting 'yes' and I hope you will also."

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

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

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

R. J. Kosinski: "Ah.. Bob, was this a Bill of yours or was this a Bill recommended by some Township Agency?"

R. S. Juckett: "No, this was a Bill of mine and it came about for the very simple reason that ah... one year at the Annual Town Meeting when the Town Electors gathered and could pass or reject appropriations. In Maine Township, we had an item which was recommended by the Town Board of Auditors ah.. to expend seventy thousand dollars of Township Funds for Mental Health purposes. And, on my recommendation, we had brought



this out of the General Fund. And, this was the one single item at that Town Meeting that received unanimous support of all of the residents. But, the Town Attorney indicated that, in his opinion, it could only come out of Poor Relief Fund and could only be used for indigence and could not be used for the general population. As a result, I introduced the Bill so that we could correct the situation and we could put the funding on a local basis. As you know, if the State were to expend the same funds, we would get much less for our dollar because the higher you go in the Government, the more expensive the paper work becomes. And, this is why we felt that it would be better to be done on a local level."

R. J. Kosinski: "And, my second question, Bob. Since you've introduced the Bill, what has been the.... what has been the actual response from those entities? Have they supported you?"

R. S. Juckett: "Pardon.. Could you repeat that? I couldn't quite hear all of it."

R. J. Kosinski: "Since you've introduced the Bill, what was the response from the entitites concerned? Have they supported this ah.. precept?"

R. S. Juckett: "Yes, ah.. we had ah.. At the Committee Meeting, we had representatives of local Mental Health Associations and Agencies who actually provide the services. And yes, they are in favor of it. Yes, the Department of Mental Health is in favor of it and all those, who are concerned, are in favor of the Bill."



- R. J. Kosinski: "My third question. Can these entities not put it to referendum within their own Area?"
- R. S. Juckett: "Yes, there is a provision whereby on a County Level, ah.. through the 708 Referendum Procedure, yes, they can do it."
- R. J. Kosinski: "And, they have not even though there is a need?"
- R. S. Juckett: "In this Area, they have not. In many Areas, they have not and that is the reason for the Amendment to the Bill where, if a 708 Referendum had been held and had been successful, ah.. the Township would not have that power."
- Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."
- J. E. Grotberg: "Ah.. will the Gentleman yield to another question?"
- Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ah.. he indicates he will."
- J. E. Grotberg: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Mr. Juckett, I'd like to ask you, is not this an Enabling Act, an Amendment to allow Townships to contract with private Not For Profit Organizations who are very good in the Mental Health Business at a local level?"
- R. S. Juckett: "Yes, it... it would allow for both Not For Profit or Profit Agencies, those Agencies which are designated by the Department of Mental Health as being able to provide the services in that Area. That is correct."
- J. E. Grotberg: "Thank you, Mr. Juckett. But now, I would like to address myself to this Bill itself. As one, who has spent years trying to link private skills through great Not For Profit and Private Organizations, saying that Private Enter-



prise can do it better with the cooperation of even the smallest unit of Government. I urge an 'yes' vote on this Bill to give some heart to our little Township Governments who are our last best in many of our Counties of what it's all about in life. They may very well be able to help on a local level at a lower rate and save any monies that would ordinarily be thrown into a huge State System to accomplish more readily, more quickly, more economically that job that the bureaucracy just seems to... impossible to get accomplished or to find if things go wrong. I urge your support of this Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ready for the vote? Oh! Alright..

The question is, 'shall House Bill 231 pass?'. All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

D. M. Pierce: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, to explain my vote. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've been an opponent of the expansion of Township Government and really seriously believe that in fully incorporated Areas, like my own Township, it should be abolished. But, I'm going to support this Bill and I'll tell you why I'm going to support it. The Administration in Washington in their Revenue Sharing Program determined not to give any money to our Schools that need it, not to give any money ah.. for uses where we're short, but to give hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars to Townships in Illinois, most of whom have no need or purpose for the money. What this Bill does is, at least, gives them



a place, a legitimate place to spend this money. Several Townships in Cook County, I understand, are receiving two, three, four hundred thousand dollars a year that they don't know what to do with while their Schools don't receive a dime. Not only that, the Nixon Administration prevents... prevents the Revenue Sharing Money, that goes to Cities and Townships, from being used for Schools. The Newspapers haven't even pointed this out. I don't think, there's a Chicago Newspaper that's told the people how much the Townships are getting under Federal Revenue Sharing. The Townships right in Cook County and now they have no purpose or need for that money. The Municipalities, Rockford has to have a Meeting to determine what to do with their Revenue Sharing. They don't know what to do with it. Deerfield, Highland Park, getting hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars, no use for the money. Their budget is sound and the same is true of most Townships. What Representative Juckett is doing here, I believe, is providing a legitimate useful outlet for this trickle of Federal Funds that comes back to the Townships. Now, Mr. Yourell tells me that his Township is getting hundreds of thousands a year in Federal Revenue Sharing to be used by Politicians in any way they choose. At least, Representative Juckett gives us a legitimate way to use the Federal Revenue Sharing that is coming back in this unconscionable method from Washington to Townships with prohibition for its use for Schools. And, because of this, I will vote 'aye' and hope that the Townships use

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

the money for Mental Health Facilities."

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

R. J. Palmer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Bill here is a good Bill and provides a needed outlet for monies that are provided to the Townships by Revenue Sharing, one of the priority... ah.. priorities being for this particular type of service. Now, for those of you who have talked on this Floor about helping people and who have voted for Bill after Bill to help people in many different ways and then to turn your back or vote a 'red' light on this one doesn't seem to make a great amount of sense. These monies are not controlled by Politicians as such. Causes happen and it does happen at a Town Meeting where everyone is entitled to ah... come in. And where the Community needs the money, they will, at least, have the opportunity to designate where it goes. It is a good Bill. It provides a.. ah... a legal means by which these monies can.... the Townships can spend the Federal Revenue Sharing money as well as other things. Now, I urge a favorable vote and your favorable consideration."

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

H. Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My Township has less than five percent of the residents living in the unincorporated Areas. The exact figure, according to the Local Governmental Agency, is 4.8 percent. That Township will receive almost three hundred thousand dollars in Federal Revenue Sharing



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Funds in fiscal year 1972, '73. Now, if a Township with four percent, 4.8 percent of the population of the entire Township of over a hundred and fifty-eight thousand people need that kind of money to spend any way that they want, then I am all wet. And, I suggest to you, they don't need that money. They're just trying to find new ways to spend the taxpayer's money. If Townships did not exist, that money would go into local governments where it belongs such as Municipalities. I ask you to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? The gentleman from ah.. ah... Cook, Mr. Huskey. No. Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

A. J. Geo-Karis (Mrs.): "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the fact remains that the Townships do exist. The fact remains that there is a need for services of Mental Health that should be done by a Township where there is no other provision. I rise to speak in favor of the Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Have all voted who wished? Ah.. the Gentleman from Cook,.... or Kane, Mr. Hill."

J. J. Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're faced again with a situation where it is possible, under a Bill of this nature, to either further the taxes on property or increase the real estate tax. And certainly, with all of the opposition we have in our Local Districts against the increase in real estate property taxes, it seems to me that this is not the proper way to handle this problem. The basic



problem I want solved, but certainly I do not want to add to the property taxes in my District with a Bill of this nature. And, I would suggest that you vote in opposition to it."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy.... 'present'. Maragos 'present'. Have all voted who wished? McLendon 'present'. Hudson 'present'. Williams 'present'. Alright.... Take the Record. On this question, there 104 'Ayes' and 28 'Nays', 6 'Present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Fredric B. Selcke: "232 will be out of the record. House Bill 239. Y. Ewell. Bill for an Act Creating the Urban Areas Recreation Land Study Commission, defining its powers and duties. Third Reading of the Bill."

R. W. Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. The Urban Area Recreation Study Commission is an idea that has been about through this House before. It's an idea of creating a Commission to study the needs for urban recreation, not solely recreation throughout the State. This idea was thought of well in the last session of the Assembly and it passed the House by an overwhelming margin. It was supported by the Leadership of both sides of the aisles and it went to the Senate where it finally was tabled on the last day of the session. In addition to this, we also consulted the past Governor, Governor Ogilvie, through his aid, Mr. John Daley, and they thought it was a good idea and suggested



that they would have signed the Bill had it become law. The.... it's a very simple Commission drawn upon standard lines. The only thing we seek to do is go into the urban areas and create a concise study of how we can consolidate some of the recreational areas, not just.... We're not talking about park districts. We're saying, 'how can we get a comprehensive program for the urban areas in order to study recreation?' What can we do, and let's say, using railroad abutments for places which might be basketball courts? Is there any possibility of using some unused sections of the expressway for some form of recreation for the urban areas. Land in the urban areas is scarce. This Commission merely speaks to utilize the present studies that have already been conducted throughout the State and extend them into the urban areas for the purpose of trying to get a comprehensive program for recreation. I would be glad to answer any questions."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 239 pass? All those in favor, vote 'aye', and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, 119 'ayes', no 'nays' and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Duff 'aye'. Barry 'aye'. Choate 'aye' Schoeberlein 'aye'. Palmer 'aye'. Huskey 'aye'. Ebbesen 'aye'. Tuerk 'aye'. Beatty 'aye'. Craig 'aye'. Let me point out one thing. As we get on further down the road in the session, I'm going to be asking those of you



who don't get on the roll call to come up here and put your name down as to how you want to vote on an issue, so that it doesn't take up the floor time, for me to have to stand up here and recognize each of you after the votes all over with as to how you want to vote. So I just want to call that point to your attention. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 241. Borchers. A Bill for an Act to amend Section 22 of the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Webber Borchers: "Mr. Speakers and fellow Members of the House.

A very simple Bill. The new rules project that the EPA require that every land fill have scales. They cost fifteen thousand dollars on up. They're already in use in some of the bigger land fills in the Chicago-St Louis areas. But for small land fills, it will just continue as others have done in relation to having to buy bulldozers and the like, which in my opinion, are necessary and should be have closed up many of the land fills in the State, as a result of which I've named you a episode where township road commissions are being taken into court, because they didn't pick up along the road. Now, scales, costing this amount, will force more land fills to go out of business. They can't comply. I don't think anybody here or ever will care how much it weighs, how much an old refrigerator, an old water heater, or a load of bricks weighs, and is by law, buried in the landfill under



six inches of dirt within eight hours. All of this I concur with. I just do not feel for the best interest of the people of the State, that landfills are forced to buy scales that will set up bureaucracy, new records to be kept. Many of these people are not able to keep these records. They will have to hire people, which to man these scales, which will add to the costs of the operation needlessly. Again, who cares what an old water heater weighs that's buried forever in the landfill? And I would like to have your support on this Bill."

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

G. W. Shea: "Ah... would the Representative yield for question?"

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

G. W. Shea: "Webber, as I read this Bill, it just says that they are by Rules and Regulations can't require that a load be weighed. Is that correct?"

Webber Borchers: "That's right. It's.... If they wish to do it, it's o'okay with me, but to make it mandatory will put many more landfills out of business. They simply can't afford it, and we need them."

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

R. E. Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is another one of the gentleman's bills which is designed to emasculate the Environmental Protection Act. How can we judge the amount of land fill which is appropriate to any



particular location unless we weigh it? What the gentleman in effect is asking the.... us to do is to permit any amount of land fill, which any person desires to use in any given area. And that ah... is counter-productive. Because land fills are sometimes wise and landfills are sometimes unwise. But the basic thrust of the Bill is to prohibit regulatory action by the Environmental Protection Act and if we're going to put all of these strings and restrictions on the Environmental Protection Act, then we're going to render it, chip by chip, block by block, we're going to emasculate it. And, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, if we want to emasculate the Bill, the Gentleman from Macon, ought to do what he really wants to do and that is to introduce a Bill to abolish the Environmental Protection Act. Let's find out what he really wants and let's vote on it, rather than windling away vote by vote until the Environmental Protection Act is nothing but a shell of its former self and Mr. Speaker, I asked that you vote 'no' on this particular Bill, I mean the Membership, Mr. Speaker."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."

J. E. Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?"

Webber Borchert: "Fire away."

J. E. Grotberg: "Fire away. Ah.... what are you trying to get at with the load limits, Webber, on this Bill?"



Webber Borchers: "Actually...."

J. E. Grotberg: "For the removal of the limits?"

Webber Borchers: "Ask that question again."

J. E. Grotberg: "What are we trying to get at here in the removal of the weight requirements?"

Webber Borchers: "All we're trying to do is to keep some land fills in operation that are needed by the people in small communities. I am not trying to destroy the EPA. In fact, I am even trying to keep the logical things, I'm even trying to straighten up the illogical things they are doing and it seems impossible."

J. E. Grotberg: "I'm on some of your Bills, Webber. Don't get all worked up because of that. I'm say this, are we trying to get at load limits going into your land fills and the breaking up of roads and that's my question."

Webber Borchers: "All we are trying to do is stop poor men from having to spend fifteen thousand dollars minimum to buy scales that are not needed. These people, some of these people, simply don't understand that it's hard to earn money. They sit in offices. They can't afford it."

J. E. Grotberg: "You've answered my question. Thank you, Mr. Borchers."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer."

Robert C. Dyer (Mrs.): "Ah.... will the sponsor yield for a question? Ah.... I recognize that the sponsor believes in the free enterprise system and he believes in legitimate fees for services. Now in DuPage County, the County operates



the sanitary land fill, but the private scavengers are permitted to dump there and the only basis they have for making a reasonable charge for this service, is by weighing the load. The charges are based on the load, so my question is, ah...., Representative Borchers, how would you set fees for dumping in the land fill, if you do not allow these weights be be made?"

Webber Borchers: "Very simple, like it's done in practically every land fill of the State. They average around \$2.00 for a pickup truck, three or four dollars for a dump truck, whether it is loaded or half-loaded, even with scales you can't properly judge. You see, suppose you have a refrigerator. You have a certain size. It takes so much dirt to cover it. Now you can have a load of brick with the same amount - it will weigh a lot more, but it still takes the same amount of dirt to cover. The cost is the covering. Not the weight. The cost is the covering, and the weight has nothing to do it. All this is doing is imposing a hardship on practically every downstate landfill in this State for unnecessary expenditure of funds, that they have to pass along to poor people that are already paying all they can for all the services. By the way, it is permissive, this is not mandatory. It just doesn't permit the State to make all these small land fills put on.... put in scales at outrageous costs and it's crossed my mind, who does have an interest in scales and wants to sell scales, because it is of no importance what a load of bricks weighs, and it



has to, by law, be covered by six inches of dirt within eight hours, forever. Who cares?"

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

Harold Washington: "Will the sponsor yield to a question?"

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

Harold Washington: "Representative Borchers, some gentleman came down this morning from Decatur and said that they were in the business of salvaging scrap iron and from these land fills, and they had been prevented from doing so. Now is there any truth to that, and what are the implications of that, Representative Borchers."

Webber Borchers: "Yes, there's truth in it. They have been prevented from.... this, of course, you are talking about scrap iron, and tin and copper. That was a bill the other day. This is about having to buy scales to weigh every load that comes in. These people simply can't afford it."

Harold Washington: "Well, is there some prohibition as to them salvaging any iron or is it a question as to how much they salvage?"

Webber Borchers: "Yes, there's a prohibition. They are not permitted to pick up iron. Again that was another Bill that was defeated, but.... rather postponed consideration, but there is ah.... the State does not require the recovery of brass and copper aluminum of the land fill. They refuse to permit it to be done."



Harold Washington: "Well, what's the rationale behind the State's position in preventing these men from salvaging scrap iron and reselling it and thus making a living? I don't understand it."

Webber Borchers: "I haven't the faintest idea what the logic is, whatsoever. There is not logic. If it's done by a paid employee of the land fill involved, they should be permitted to do it."

Harold Washington: "Well, just how does your Bill deal with that particular...?"

Webber Borchers: "This particular Bill does not. That was a Bill that came up the other day that is on postponed consideration that I'm going to bring up again, Representative Washington."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Stedelin."

H. D. Stedelin: "Will the sponsor yield to a question?"

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

H. D. Stedelin: "Representative Borchers, all this does is deal with scale. It won't change any other of the Rules; it has to be fenced, it has to be covered, it has to have supervision and all that."

Webber Borchers: "It changes nothing except protects many small land fills from having to go out of business. That's all. They must cover, they must have their employees, they must to the same thing as always. All it does is protect some small land fills that otherwise will have to go out of business because they cannot compete in any way. They just



don't have to buy scales. Those in Chicago who want them, are free to do it."

H. D. Stedelin: "O'kay, that's good enough. Thank you."

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

C. L. Skinner: "Would the sponsor yield to a question."

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

C. L. Skinner: "Ah.... Mr. Borchers, what are the regulations right now?"

Webber Borchers: "These are the regulations. I have them in my desk. The new Rules, suppose to go into effect, require that all land fills buy scales. Those who want to, let them. Those who can't afford them, for heaven sakes, protect them. They will go out of business. You'll have more of them scattering junk along the road."

C. L. Skinner: "Thank you."

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

H. A. Katz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to the Bill. I believe that ah... the Bill will not accomplish its purposes and that in fact, it will work contrary to the interest of the very group that Representative Borchers seeks to protect. The fact is, that at the present time, there is no Federal regulation in this particular field. They are considering Federal Regulation. Ah.... if they have Federal Regulation, ah.... here in Illinois, the land fills will be subject to that unless the



Federal government defers to the State of Illinois and to the Pollution Control Board. If, in fact, the.... we, in the General Assembly, have prohibited as this Bill seeks to do, ah.... the wing of any such load, we will not be able to have State Regulations in the field, and the effect of not having State regulations is going to be to have all of the People involved in this, subject to Federal Control. There will be no way the Federal Government will be able to defer it to the State of Illinois. Accordingly, it seems to me to be a misguided effort to prevent something that may turn out later to be useful. As I understand it, the Pollution Control Board has not yet adopted the regulations of the type here. We are very strange here in the General Assembly. We set up administrative agencies with a view to let administrative agencies use their judgement and their common sense. We have a new agency, we have all heard here about the new appointments to the agency and the new orientation of the agency. I think it is a great mistake to tie the hands of the agency if we don't want to have an administrative agency, we shouldn't set it up in the first place. The great advantage of an administrative agency is that they can hear both sides, that they can have reasonable rules and regulations if they want them, and I think to try to come in with a series of Bills to tie their hands really is a mistake in terms of preventing the very agencies we create from being effective and also from making it so that the Federal Government will not be able to defer to Illinois



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

and to let our regulations, rather than the Federal Government's regulation apply in the sanitary land fill, and so, both from the point of view of good administration, from the point of view of the fact that the General Assembly should not be running agency of the State, but should be passing general laws, from the point of view of making it so that the Federal Government can defer to Illinois so that we can meet on special problems, I would urge opposition to this Bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

C. E. Neff: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I feel that this legislation should be supported, for what the sponsor is trying to do here. And I think there is something else that we must keep in mind that somehow or other we've got to get the people over at the Environmental Control and the investigators to use some common sense. On sanitary land fills, I recall just about a year ago, along in February, I got a call from a small town that did have a good sanitary land fill and trying to operate it under this State specifications, but at this time, the inspector came in and the ground was frozen, and they let it go for a few days and hadn't covered it up. And the investigator right away said I'm going to fine you because you're not keeping this covered every day. The City Board tried to explain to the man that ah... with the ground frozen, they.... it was just impossible for them to cover it at that time. But he wouldn't listen to them and ah....



by getting ahold of the Director at that time, I did get this particular thing stopped, but I think this will help teach them a little bit to use a little common sense on the enforcement of the law. Thank you."

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

W. J. Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, I think we've weighed this matter enough without scales, and I move the previous question."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, he's moved the previous question. All those in favor of the gentleman's motion, say 'aye', opposed 'no', the previous question has been moved. Now, the gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to close."

Webber Borchers: "Gentleman, I'd just like to point out a couple of things before I ask you for your vote. One, the Federal Control is not yet. Maybe the Federal Government never requires scales. In the meantime if we make these people buy these scales, it may be for an absolutely no good purpose whatsoever. Now, as far as setting up the agency is concerned; true, we set up the agency, but surely some of you realize that in some directions, they are going way farther than we ever intended. This is one of them. What these people buy and have to spend 15,000 dollars on the scales, there money is gone, and don't force these people to do it. All you're doing is hurting the people. I request your vote."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Alright, the question is, shall House Bill 241 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', and the



opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Webber Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I honestly believe you don't realize that I am not trying to destroy the EPA. This whiddling is not whiddling. Look at the Bills I've presented. They point out a specific thing that they are wrong in. They have gone too far. I want to preserve the EPA. But these things are making people angry, and they are distrubing them throughout the State that will react against the EPA. Truly I'm trying to be a friend of the EPA. Whether some of you believe this or realize this or not, this is so. This is a wrong. And you should support this Bill as a few of the others and I have presented on this matter, and I ask you to reconsider your vote and put on some green lights."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Ah... the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Walters."

R. J. Walters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my vote, I'd like to tell the sponsor that I have supported all of his other Bills that had to do with the Environmental Protection Agency, but in this particular case, when you are dealing with sanitary land fills, we've had some experience in our district. In the City of Alton, we have an outstanding sanitary land fill, which is operated efficiently and very effectively and has done an outstanding job. But we have one in the southern part of our District, which has been indicted by



the EPA on seventy counts and has just been given a new Permit for new land fills, and they've had so many problems. Anything we can do to help the EPA regulate and protect sanitary land fills, I have to be in favor of. And, Mr. Borchers, I will vote no."

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

C. A. Davis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I had some people call on me today from down in the sponsor's area, who tell me that it will cost them fifteen thousand dollars to buy a scale. They don't have that kind of money. All they do is salvage a little scrap iron and they go out and sell the scrap iron. They have no qualms against covering the refill. But to pay fifteen thousand dollars for scales. Now there were four of them here today that tells me that if they have to buy a scale, then they'll have to go out of the scrap iron business, that they don't asked anybody to put food on their table. They use this scrap iron, they resell it to put food on their table. I don't understand why they want to make them buy a scale. I don't know why they want to put them on Public Welfare if they don't buy this scale. I don't know what I can do to help pass this Bill, but I'm going to vote for it, because the Committee called on me and said they don't have the money to buy the scales and if they're prevented from salvaging that metal, they have no jobs down there in the community, they're going to have to go on welfare, and I'm going to



give them a vote to keep them from going on welfare. We have too many on there now."

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

C. W. Clabaugh: "Mr. speaker, I'd like to ask a question of every person in here who is voting no. The question is simply this. Why is it necessary, what end is gained by weighing the refuse that goes into the land fill? I can't see a single reason for it. If anyone can give me a convincing reason why, I'd be glad to vote against it. That's a question to every person who is voting no on that Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers."

Webbert Borchers: "I sorrowfully request a postponed consideration."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, House Bill 241 will be put on the order of postponed consideration. House Bill 254."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Bill 254. J. J. Wolf. A bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Government Ethics Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf."

J. J. Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. I finally got myself a Bill. I think the explanation in the Digest is quite accurate. It's a simple Bill and just



requires that persons who examine our statements of economic interest, ah... if it is not for their purpose, if they are seeking the information, that they shall disclose the name of the actual person, for which they are seeking the information. I would ask your favorable vote."

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

R. A. Mugalian: "I rise in opposition of this Bill. The statement required under the Governmental Ethics Act, is accurate enough. It tells the public very little. I can't see why any elected official, would not be willing to have his statement published over television, reproduced in the newspapers, and available at anytime by any member of the Public or the Press. I just think that this adds another road block to persons who are desirous of find out what our statements contains. We file a statement; we shouldn't be ashamed of it. We should understand that it is available to all members of the Public, and shouldn't be any restrictions as to who their principal is."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf, to close."

J. J. Wolf: "Well, in answer to the last gentleman's remarks, ah... there's no problem in trying to withhold information. As a matter of fact, I'm personally a little embarrassed that I don't have anything more to disclose. All we're asking that if I want to examine your statement, Representative



Mugulian, that I don't get somebody else to go in there for me and do my dirty work so that you get a slip of paper that John Jones wanted to look at your ethics statement, when he is actually doing it in my behalf. I would ask your favorable vote."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Question is, shall House Bill 254? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Have all... Hart 'aye'. Kempiners 'aye'. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mann."

R. E. Mann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the gentleman yield to a question?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Well it's a lit.... Do you wish to yield. It's out of order now, but on the explanation of vote, you could answer it."

R. E. Mann: "Jake, what's the purpose of the Bill? Has this been abused ah....?"

J. J. Wolf: Well, the purpose of the Bill is that, I think it is very accurately described. I can go.... I want to see your economics statement, which is the right of anybody. Instead of going in.... you know they send you a little slip and if I want to examine your statement, you'll get a little pink slip in the mail, saying that I requested to examine your statement, which is your right to know. Now, if I don't want you to know that I'm looking, I can get some, for lack of a better expression, I'll say some 'dummy' to go in there and get the information. You'll get a slip that says that somebody else was looking at your economics statement, and



in fact, they were doing it as my agent. And I just feel that if it's the Public's right to know and it's our right to know the way the law is, as to who is looking at the economic statement, that you really ought to know who is looking at it. That's all the Bill does."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative Mann, do you wish to explain your vote?"

R. E. Mann: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my 'no' vote. I think this Bill does not have any effect. All an agent would have to do is to say he is going to examine the statement himself, and at a later date, show it to someone else. If you want to accomplish your goal, Representative Wolf, it would seem to me, that you ought to say.... you ought to write a Bill or draft a Bill or introduce a Bill that says that one who has access to a financial statement may not show it to anyone else, but I don't see what your Bill accomplishes. If a person goes in and writes his name down, he has a right to see a Bill. The fact that he shows it to.... an ethic statement. The fact that he shows it to someone else at a subsequent date, it seems to me is irrelevant. So, what I would suggest you do, is just say that ah.... a person can examine a statement, but he may not show it to anyone else. You can't stop him from showing it to whomever he wishes. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, ah.... I vote no."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question, there are 131 'ayes', 12 'nays',



1. 1.. Representative Porter.. Record Representative Porter as voting 'present'. Skinner, 'present'. Two answering 'present'. Three answering 'present' and this bill having received a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 259. Yourell. An Act to repeal an Act for the sale of the United States Steel Corporation of the interest in the State of Illinois and certain land. Third reading of the bill."

Rep. A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This bill is a bill to repeal Senate Bill 782 passed in June 1963, ten years ago. What that bill did was simply this. Grant to U. S. Steel Corporation 194.6 acres of land, more or less provided. However, this grant shall not become effective until and I call your attention to the word 'until'. Number a, the sum of \$19, 460 has been paid to the Treasurer of the State of Illinois by United States Steel Corporation or any legal successors thereto. And b, the Chicago Park District has conveyed to the State of Illinois, all its right, title and interest in, and to the real estate described. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I suggest to you this is a great area of concern, not only to the people that live in the ah.. immediate district, but to all of the people of the State of Illinois because you will hear arguments attesting to the fact that U. S. Steel has been laboring for many years, lo these past ten years under a hardship



and that's the reason they didn't provide for the contingency in this bill. And I say to you, Ladies and Gentlemen that what has in effect taken place, is that the State of Illinois has held in trust for U. S. Steel for the last ten years that grant of land, in extent.. in excess of 194 acres so that they would not have to pay any taxes on it and when they got ready to use the facility, they could move forward and comply with the two provisions of the bill. Now, U. S. Steel has admitted to me, personally, that they made a mistake when they failed to get conveyance of title from the Chicago Park District. Now, I ask you Ladies and Gentlemen is \$100 an acre a fair price for land that has a value according to U. S. Steel alone, in a letter from them to me, of \$3 1/2 million. So Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm saying to you that U. S. Steel has not acted in good faith in the last 10 years and this bill, Senate Bill 732, should be repealed. I'm not suggesting Ladies and Gentlemen to you in any way that the sponsors of this legislation back in 1963 had anything to do other than to try to help the people of that district and U. S. Steel. Now, if U. S. Steel hasn't thought this to be so important as to not move on it in ten years, then I suggest to you that that bill should be repealed and those of you who have been against building airports or islands in the Lake, that this is the time to say 'no' to U. S. Steel. Why should public lands be made available for such a price to private vested interests. Now, Ladies and



Gentlemen, it's as simple as that. I know you're going to hear lots of arguments against this bill because U. S. Steel as you all know, has been lobbying very extensively the past 30 days relative to the defeat of this bill. Now, I know that you want to listen to the debate and I'm not going to give you all the reasons why this repealer has been set forth in House Bill 259. I would like to hear the opponents of this bill speak."

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

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. In 1963 I was in my first term in the General Assembly. And this bill was passed in three days without reference to committee in either House on the last or the next to the day of the Session at which time we did not have annual Sessions. I think that my colleague, Bill Murphy, will remember he was the Majority Leader at that time, that that bill did not go to committee. I don't know how you voted, Bill, I'm just citing the fact that that bill was rushed through here like it was greased on a banana peel. Ah.. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is the greatest give away since the sale of Manhattan Island for a few pieces of silver. The U. S. Steel Company has held this land for 10 years, Mr. Speaker. It has done nothing with the land, Mr. Speaker, except hold it as Representative Yourell indicated. It is terrorizing the community by threatening to move and has been threatening for 10 years and yet it hasn't moved. What we are doing here is violating



every legal test now in the State of Illinois for the use of public lands, for the exclusive private use of one of the major polluters of Lake Michigan and the State of Illinois. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the bill which passed the House in 1963 was tested in the case of Drasi v. Kerner. And Judge Schafer said that the conveyance was illegal because it was a dedication of public lands for an illegal use. And then, in a most unusual action, a petition for a rehearing was filed and Judge Sofersburg said that the petitioners had no right to sue even though they were citizens of the State of Illinois concerned with the use of public land. Then in the case of Pepti v. The Chicago Building Commission the Drasi case was overruled. And at the present time, that land is clearly, illegally held by U. S. Steel. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I have received an avalanche of letters from employees and members of the community who really believe that U. S. Steel is going to use this to employ people. Yet, for 10 years, they've done nothing with it. They've got a lot of obsolete land and a lot of obsolete property. Why don't they destroy that instead of using our Lake front and our submerged land. And Mr. Speaker, if we can't succeed with this bill, this is going to be an invitation to every steel company in Illinois and Indiana to build on submerged land, will create a Chinese Wall right in the Lake and will create a stagnation which will further exaserbate all the problems



we're having with Lake Michigan. It isn't bad enough Mr. Speaker that we've got erosion problems, it isn't bad enough Mr. Speaker that we've got algae, it isn't bad enough Mr. Speaker that there's been a recent decision banning the use of phosphates, but now Mr. Speaker we have one of the major polluters and we're saying the State ought to subsidize that polluter. And for the past two weeks, there've been representatives from U. S. Steel down here spending their hard-earned coins, trying to convince an influenced legislator to be with them. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, let's keep that land where it belongs for public use. U. S. Steel can afford its own land. And let's.. let's make it very clear to the minority community people that U. S. Steel is lying in its teeth that it's going to employ more people or it's going to move. If it wants to move, why has it waited 10 years? I'll tell you why. Because they have free access to one of the greatest bodies in the United States and they've been polluting it. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, let's get back the land that belongs to us. \$19,400. You can't even buy a hut for that now. But they bought a hundred acres of submerged land. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill and let's pass it and return that land to the State of Illinois."

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

Collins: "AH.. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the



House. I rise in opposition to House Bill 259. Ah... a Bill that would have an adverse affect on the South Works of U.S. Steel Corporation, which until the recent reapportionment was in my District and certainly would have an adverse affect upon the economy of that District. While the plant is no longer in my District, I would guess that ah... most of the employees of the South Works do reside within the District represented by Representative Maragos, Giglio and me and Senator Daugherty, who was one of the sponsors of the original legislation and you all have received a letter from Senator Daugherty, urging your ah... opposition to House Bill 259. I might add in reference to Senator Daugherty and the allegation of this Bill was rushed through in the 1963. It passed the Senate in the 1963 and had a roll call of 53 to nothing. And then passed the House on a roll call of 142 to 4, so certainly there was no overwhelming opposition; quite the contrary. Ah... the sponsorship, for your information, were Senators Kelly, Daugherty, O'Brien, Arrington, Drach and Hatch, bipartisan leadership in the Senate. As has been pointed out, this was tested in the courts and court test did take up four years of the time it's been alluded to. Finally, in 1967, the United States Supreme Court dismissed the case and ah.... legal remedies were exhausted. But this took four years of ten that it has been alluded to. Now, much has been made about U.S. Steel as a major polluter, but ah... the contrary has been true since 1965 when U.S.



Steel committed themselves to a program of positive program of air and water environmental quality protection. And as a matter of fact have spent in excess of fifty million dollars to clean up the air and water surrounding U.S. Steel. They've put an additional hundred million into updating the old plant that has been referred to and so this is a solid commitment by U.S. Steel to the Community, to the Southside of the City of Chicago, commitment based upon a commitment made by the State of Illinois in 1963. Now this is..... value of this land..... it is valueless to anyone but U.S. Steel, and is submerged, as has already pointed out and is useless as a matter of fact, the park district itself has stated that it has not use for the plant. This is one hundred and ninety-four acres of land that is under water. It's land that is going to cost a hundred thousand dollars an acre to fill, and U.S. Steel is going to spend that hundred thousand dollars to fill that land in and put this land on the tax rolls. This corporation has already been paying sixteen million dollars in property taxes, thirteen million which is ah..... spent at the South Works. This is a hundred and ninety four acres more that will be on the tax rolls, and when U.S. Steel makes their investment in this property, it will be valued at.... at least twenty thousand dollars an acre. This is tax money that will enter into the City of Chicago. It will provide thousands of jobs in additional employment for the citizens of the southside of Chicago. Now it does



not in any way interfere with recreational land. The Chicago plan, as we all know, extends to 79th Street...."

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

Harry Yourell: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker."

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

Harry Yourell: "I.... I see that that red light is on, and that's usually the signal to close debate. Is that not correct?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Well, he started to close his debate, Sir. Proceed, Representative Collins."

P. W. Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will conclude, ah.. by merely saying that U.S. Steel is an employer of ten thousand people in my District. Ah..... in my.... in my... District. This will result in additional employment in the District when they fulfill their commitment to the community of additional jobs. I've mentioned that Senator Daugherty had expressed an interest, but he's not alone in endorsement of the defeat of this Bill. U.S. Steel is anxious to defeat this Bill obviously. The united steel workers have taken a position of opposition to this Bill; The Daily Calumet, which is the leading newspaper in our District; The Chambers of Commerce, both the eastside Chamber of Commerce and LaSalle Shore Chamber of Commerce have unanimously voted their rejection of this Bill. The ah..... legislation itself....."



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

Harry Yourell: "All you have to do, Representative, is ask permission, I'll give you five more minutes, you're selling the Bill for me."

P. W. Collins: "I've had many offers of time, Mr. Speaker, but I think I'm through and I know there are other speakers in opposition to the Bill. I would just say that it's all these organized groups that have urged the rejection of the Bill. So do I. So do all the representatives from our District, and I hope you will join us in our opposition to House Bill 259."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Maragos."

S. C. Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House. You can rest assured that I am... I have no particular axe to grind in behalf of the U.S. Steel Corporation, or any other steel corporation that does business in my district. We have in the thirtieth district, of which Mr. Collins, Mr. Giglio and I represent, three major steel producers, four major steel producers including the U.S. Steel Corporation. In many ways, I have been one of the proponents to get anti-pollution legislation on the books and to see that the City of Chicago enforces many of the pollution ordinances against any of these industries, when they affect the health of our community. This issue here, is not a pollution issue involving the land adjoining the



mill along the lake front. In fact, in the year of 1963, I was President of the South Chicago Chamber of Commerce. I was the only professional lawyer whoever was a Member of that Chamber or active in that Chamber when that Bill was proposed. And at that time, it was not being used by either the park district, it had no present plans to use it. They don't today. They say the park district has not given its approval because of U.S. Steel Corporation made a mistake in not progressing as fast as they should on this issue, but the point is there is no present plan to state that this land is to be used for anything but still swamp land or underwater land as it is at the present time. Now, if the U.S. Steel Corporation wants to improve its facilities, it's going to have to.... if we don't have this land available for them, it's going to have to come west and start demolishing home residential areas around it. We are presently, the union, under the Gemonal Project is putting up wonderful homes, individual homes, and town houses, and apartment buildings. We're trying to eliminate the whole blighted area west of the steel mills, which is on land which belongs to the City of Chicago, which is tax-paying land and now if we take.... and if the Mill wants to expand, it is going to then have to buy this at an exorbitant cost, but most importantly, it is going to cut into our community, it's going to crowd our residential areas even further than it does right now. That was the reason in 1963, we had asked that permission be given



to the U.S. Steel Corporation to expand its facilities on the lake by land that was not presently used by anybody else and neither were any present plans they said at that time in store by the Park District or the City of Chicago or the State of Illinois. And knowing my colleague, Senator Daugherty, who is the chief sponsor, because I was not in the Legislature at that time, I know him to be a man of honor and has only one thing in mind. And that is for the best.... anything for the betterment of his community and his City and his State. And I think it would be a miss at this time, because there has been some delay, in getting this program started and effected, that we should overnight say, over-rule a action that was sponsored by the Legislature ten years ago. I would like to say the sponsor of this particular Bill, his intentions are honorable, I'm sure. However, I think he's misguided as to the full affect of this legislation at this time. He's also misguided because he did not consult any of the people in the 30th District who are involved in this area and who's people work in the mills and who understand these problems much better, anymore than I could say, if I went to Oak Lawn, I would certainly go ask Representative Yourell, what he has in mind, what his thoughts on certain legislation would affect his own community. Therefore, I asked you ladies and gentlemen of the House to vote no on this particular piece of legislation."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Wayne, Rep. Blades."



B. C. Blades: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I rise in opposition to this Bill. This land was sold to United States Steel by an act of the General Assembly about ten years ago. United States Steel has not changed their plans on this. They have had to extend the time element. They still have plans for using ah... this and the proponents ask why haven't they used it in the last ten years. Well, I think the answer is very simple - In the United States Steel has invested fifty million dollars in the air pollution that they hadn't anticipated ten years ago, in cleaning up the air in this area. They're not listening to me, Mr. Speaker. I don't take this floor too often. I don't speak too much when I do take it, but I do think I have a thing or two that many of you might be concerned about. It come out in the evidence ten years ago that ten thousand jobs depended on this plant, to whether or not it would remain there, and it was decided to keep it there. Now I know many of you younger people have seen the day and been living in the day, when you could go out here and pick up a job anytime you wanted to. My life hasn't always been that way. I think we should encourage industry to.... I've just got a couple of things and would appreciate it if they would hear it, then they can vote the way they want to. Life hasn't always been easy for me, to find jobs. And I will always vote to help somebody find a job, or keep a job in the State of Illinois. We must encourage industry to come into Illinois and not try to



drive it out. Thank you."

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

J. R. Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I would like to direct a question to any of the opponents of this Bill and the question is this: Does the present law restrict U.S. Steel from selling this land at a profit? And if there is no answer to that question, then I suggest to the members of this House that we may be voting if we reject this bill, to continue ah.... one of the greatest real estate profit making deals in the history of this State. If there is no restriction on the present use....in the present law on the use of this land, we may be simply giving this land to U.S. Steel for U.S. Steel in turn to sell it to a real estate developer. There is no restriction in the present law that prevents U.S. Steel from doing that and I have to vote in favor of this Bill. I don't think we ought to be in the business of providing land to private companies which they in turn can resell at a profit."

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

W. Joseph Gibbs: "Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield to a question?"

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

W. Joseph Gibbs: "Ah.... I can't tell from the Bill here, and it was probably mentioned earlier, but who's in titled to



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

the ground at the present time?"

Harry Yourell: "Who's entitled to the ground?"

W. Joseph Gibbs: "Yes."

Harry Yourell: "The People of the State of Illinois, eleven million of them."

W. Joseph Gibbs: "What right or what interest does the Chicago Park District have in it?"

Harry Yourell: "They're the custodians of the land, because it fronts in their park district. This land, Representative Gibbs, runs all the way from 79th Street to the Indiana State Line. If you, as a boater, wanted to put your boat in, for example, at 79th Street, in order to get out in the lake, you would have to go across the Indiana State Line. So the Chicago Park District has title to all of that land but in effect, we just passed a Bill here a little while ago that indicated that everybody was interested in the State and its relationship to park districts. So I say to you that this is a park district bill. The land does belong to the People of the State of Illinois and it's being held in trust for them by the Chicago Park District and all of the eleven million people in the State of Illinois."

W. Joseph Gibbs: "So the fee title, then, is in the State of Illinois and it's subject to the use by the Park District. Is that right? Well, if you read Senate Bill 82, you'll see that the Chicago Park District has title to the land because that title has to be conveyed to the State of Illinois before the provisions of Senate Bill 782 become



a reality. So in effect the Chicago Park District has title. U.S. Steel has not asked, has not asked, I repeat, the Chicago Park District to convey that title in ten years, so...."

W. Joseph Gibbs: "So at the present time, then, the Park District has fee title?"

Harry Yourell: "That's correct."

W. Joseph Gibbs: "And what is their position on the Bill? Have they taken a ah.... position as to whether or not it should be sold?"

Harry Yourell: "Well of course they have. They've taken a position that that land should be held for the people of the State of Illinois. And I would recall your attention to the open lands project, the Lake Michigan Federation, the Illinois Wildlife Federation and all of the conservation groups in the State of Illinois that are in support of this Bill. If the Chicago Park District were in favor of conveying title and U.S. Steel was really serious about getting title, acquiring title, then the two of them together could have affected this provision of Senate Bill 82, none of which have been done to the present time, a period of nine years, nine months."

W. Joseph Gibbs: "I'm a little confused then. Is.... As I understand it, in both the State of Illinois and the Chicago Park District... have to approve this sale. Is that right?"



Harry Yourell: "The State of Illinois cannot do anything until they get title from the Chicago Park District and U.S. Steel conveys to them a sum of money totaling nineteen thousand four-hundred and sixty dollars. Neither one of these provisions have been complied with."

W. Joseph Gibbs: "So if the Park District would go against this or be against this type of a transfer, it would be stopped, is that right?"

Harry Yourell: "Well, they have. They have already. They have already by their reluctance to give title to the State. That's obvious."

W. Joseph Gibbs: "Is that the action that was tested in the Court?"

Harry Yourell: "Well, there were many ah.... court decisions relative to this case, and I don't know whether Chicago Park District was ever represented in that suit, other than that it is a governmental entity and involved in it, not directly, but indirectly."

W. Joseph Gibbs: "Well, what we do today, then, if we would prohibit this, then it would stop any action that the Park District would take in Chicago."

Harry Yourell: "That's correct."

W. Joseph Gibbs: "And if we went ahead and didn't pass this, then it would be up to the Park District to ah.... approve this sale. Is this right?"

Harry Yourell: "That's correct."

W. Joseph Gibbs: "Thank you."



Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Caldwell."

L. A. Caldwell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm in a very peculiar position on this particular bill, because I bombarded Buzz Yourell to be a co-sponsor, when I first read it. Since that time, Mr. Speaker, I have received perhaps more mail than Representative Mann and others, in favor of it, and I took it upon myself to do what I could to analyze this Bill and find out how it affected the people in my district. So I'm rising in opposition to this Bill at this time. I'm aware of the fact that if the Park District has title to the land and have had title for the past ten or twelve years, it hasn't done anything about it. I'm also aware of the fact that if U.S. Steel had certain options, it has been indicated that the matter had to be... go through the courts and that took some time, and we're also aware of the fact that pollution suddenly surfaced some six or seven years ago and many of the big industrial ah.... companies had to direct its attention to the problems of pollution. I have received perhaps two or three hundred letters and telegrams during the past three weeks from people who live in the area and who would be affected because in two or three instances there have been first and second and third generations who have spent their entire working lives in U.S. Steel. It is for that reason I haven't seen enough evidence on the part of the Park District. It's questionable to me what the Park District



would do with this land, if they suddenly found themselves in a position to use it and I think U.S. Steel has made a pretty good case. The ten thousand people who would be affected, many of them on the south end of my District, ah.... it is for that reason and the cause of using the.... what abilities I have to analyze the pros and cons of a Bill, in spite of the fact that I asked to be a co-sponsor, I'm rising now in opposition and I would urge my colleagues to vote against this Bill."

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

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

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor, signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The gentleman's motion prevails. Representative Yourell to close."

Harry Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You've heard some convincing argument and debate why this Bill should not be passed. You heard the fact that employment in the minority area would be affected. Well I would asked you this question. They are not being employed at the present time and there's no, no design for the employment of anybody including the figure of ten thousand people, should this land suddenly become the property of U.S. Steel. I would call your attention to the fact that U.S. Steel, last year, reported a net income of one-hundred fifty-seven millions dollars and paid not one



cent, not one cent ladies and gentlemen, in Federal income tax. I would also suggest to you that all of the debate you are hearing now does not reflect any debate that was heard when this Bill was heard in committee. This Bill came out of committee with sixteen 'aye' votes, no 'nay' votes and two voting 'present'. And one of the gentlemen who spoke against the Bill, voted for it in Committee.

I would also suggest to you that U.S. Steel, is in effect, in the real estate business because just recently in January of 1973, they sold in Clear Water, Florida, ah... some acreage of land for three million dollars. They just turned over to the Great Northern Trust Company, five hundred and seventy-five shares in a real estate holding corporation. I suggest to you as Representative Lundy did, that there is no provision in Senate Bill 782 that would prevent U.S. Steel from filling in the land and then selling the land to the highest bidder. You've heard also that this land is valueless. Land is only of a value, a certain value, to those who can use it the most, and I submit to you the figure of three and a half million dollars as submitted to me by Mr. McGabe from U.S. Steel, is a proper figure, and that is, in effect, what this land is worth. With the addition of fill into this two hundred acres of land, Ladies and Gentlemen, the total cost after the land has been made available for construction, for whatever construction U.S. Steel would like to put it, the total cost then would be less than six hundred dollars a acre. Now if this land



is so valueless that it's only worth six hundred dollars an acre, then I submit to you that U.S. Steel would do well to give it back to the people of the State of Illinois where it has a very significant value for all of the eleven million people in the State and not for a special vested interest. I say to you, and ask you to consider that this was special legislation back in the 1963 and nothing has happened since that time to change it. Agains I say to you, this Bill passed out of Committee with only two present voting and the rest all voting 'aye'. I ask your support in this legislation and call your attention to the fact that over one-hundred - one-hundred environmental groups and conservation groups in the State of Illinois including those involved in the Chicago Lake Front Plan, have been in favor of this Bill. I think it is proper and right that U.S. Steel be denied the right of two hundred acres of public land that as you know rightfully belongs to the People of the State of Illinois. What happens, Ladies and Gentlemen, when the two-hundred acres, if it is, if your vote is to reject this Bill today, and this two-hundred acres becomes the property of the U.S. Steel, that U.S. Steel then will not come to this General Assembly and say we need two hundred more acres, co-terminous, co-extensive, adjacent to the two-hundred acres that they might get. And I say now is the time to stop them Ladies and Gentlemen. Now is the time to stop them polluting our air and water, and I suggest to you the arguments made in their behalf as



far as expending, not fifty million dollars as was stated, but 36.2 million dollars by their own figures again, not fifty million, that if they complied with the standards as set forth by the Environmental Protection Agency, and all of the other Federal Rules and Regulations controlling our environment, the protection of our ecology, that because they've been good boys, they should not be padded on the head and say 'here, U.S. Steel, for being a good boy and obeying the law, that now we, the State of Illinois, are going to give you two-hundred acres of prime lake front land.' This land is not a swamp land as one speaker would have you believe. If you're to believe U.S. Steel did clean up this land, then I say to you, that it's either a lie, that it is not a swamp land, or else they did not clean it up as they would have you believe. Ladies and gentlemen, the issue is quite clear. Either you vote for the environment or you vote for U.S. Steel. Thank you."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Question is, shall House Bill 259 pass. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Randolph, to explain his vote."

P. J. Randolph: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I am voting 'no' on this measure, but I have no desire to impune the motives of the sponsors of this Bill to reclaim land, which we in this Legislature authorized for the use of U.S. Steel, which I supported in 1963; And now are considering taking back for public recreational purposes.



However, I feel very strongly that we must measure the adverse affects of such action in terms of equity and in terms of the economic and social disadvantages which would result. This firm, one of the largest in Illinois, has invested considerable sums in planning for expansion, assuming that the State of Illinois would keep pace with the law that granted them use of that land, and going to the expense of hausty litigation to assure the legality of such a procedure. If we play indian giver now, we are adversely affecting the families of over ten thousand employees of the South Works, impairing the tax base of Southeast Chicago and jeopardizing our national as well as our State economy. I must earnestly oppose this Bill and vote no and urge others to vote no."

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

C. A. Davis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to explain my vote. In fact, I don't feel very good about opposing the men who are sponsoring this Bill. They are my friends. I have the utmost respect for them. Because many times, in this House, when I've needed votes, they've come to my rescue. They've come to my defense. And I really have the utmost respect, but the steelworkers, the United States steelworkers, insofar as I know, is one of the larger unions and they have more representation of people in my District than in any other union I know. They are there. They're out here. They bring them down here.



They don't try to hide them. They don't try to put them in the corner. They're definitely against this Bill. And then they sent out this notice here from the Daily Calumet telling what they're doing for environmental control. Goes on to say 'the United States Steel is investing in South Chicago.' But more than that, they say that the survival of South Works depends on the defeat of this Bill. This is what they say. I cannot take the chance, gentlemen, because my people are the last people, they're still the last people hired and the first people fired. I cannot conscientiously take the chance on seeing them loose their jobs, because they're leaving their employment open for them. And for this reason, somebody said, they're frightening you about talking about loosing jobs. Well, if you want to see me frightened, just talk about some people loosing their jobs, I get excited. And for this reason, I'm going to vote 'no'."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cunningham, Representative Cunningham."

R. D. Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm voting 'yes' for this Bill and it is not entirely because of the high regard in which I hold the sponsor, and I'm anxious that I not be thought to have joined the environmentalist click or the anti-industry click, but I feel that United States Steel has had too long to sieze an opportunity that was granted to them years ago under the guides of helping industry. Coming



from the 54th District where we cry for industry, I want to personally assure every member of this General Assembly, if you give any of the businesses the plants, the employers in our community a bonanza of even a fraction the size in value that you gave to U.S. Steel, ten years ago, you won't have to wait ten years to see the grateful recipients of such gifts sieze it up. We will grab it in center. The point I'm trying to make is that there are so many points throughout this State and particularly the fifty-fourth district, where we need a helping hand from the General Assembly to permit a gift such as this to remain so long unaccepted. If you believe that I'm in error of this, I'd be beseech you somewhere before we quit next Christmas, make a gift to the fifty-fourth district and see how fast we sieze it to give opportunities and jobs to our people."

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

R. E. Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. First of all, I would like to say that I do not believe that necessarily that what is good for U.S Steel is good for the lake the people on the southeast side. I'd like to clear up some half truths which were uttered, I believe in sincerity, by the opponents to this Bill. First of all, the Park District did not convey the property to the United States Steel, because the Corporation council of the City of Chicago told them they would be committing an illegal act. Under the case of Pepke Vs. Chicago Building



Commission, the unfettered dedication of public lands without any restrictions for private use is specifically prohibited. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, and I say this to the lawyers and the non-lawyers in this House, if you do not pass this Bill, you are perpetuating an illegal act and a law suit will result in upsetting this sale. Why should we be so embarrassed? With regard to 1963, I too have a high regard for Senator Daugherty. I want to repeat what I said. I was one of the four 'no' votes. That Bill went through this Legislature in three days without reference to a Committee on either side. I recall it very, very well. Now with regard to the question of employment. If U.S. Steel really wants to employ people, let them take that millions of dollars that they spend on media advertising in which they tell the people 'we're involved'. Yes, they're involved in filling land that belongs to the State of Illinois. Let them spend that money on hiring people in the community. They are terrozing the southeast side with their false and phoney propaganda. They've been saying it for ten years and they haven't hired a person for ten years. If they want to really hire people, let them institute a training program. Let them institute selection, on the basis of need on the southeast side. There are many members in this House, who are always voting against welfare, because they call it give away, but yet today, they are voting in effect for a great give away. If that land were to be used for residential purposes, it would be worth



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

at least a million dollars. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I know that Representative Randolph said that he was not impuning the integrity of the sponsors of this Bill, but I am impuning the integrity of U.S. Steel. I challenge one lawyer for U.S. Steel to tell me and ah... write me that this is a legal transaction. It is not a legal transaction and it is to the credit of the Chicago Park District that they never sold the land..."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Representative Mann, could you conclude? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Washington."

Harold Washington: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Based on some of the remarks of the previous speakers, one would have to assume that those who are voting green are voting against the expansion and opportunity for labor. Well, I'm not voting against expanded jobs for people in this State. Obviously not. What I'm voting green for, is because I'm opposed to false promises to people about jobs in this State and above all, I'm opposed to the type of intimidation brought about by U.S. Steel in implying that unless we defeat this Bill, they're going to pick up their marbles and go home. They're not going anyplace. They're doing better out there than they could do anyplace in the world and they're not about to move those plans. Now ten years ago, they promised if they got that land, they would expand job opportunities in the State of Illinois. Ten years later, they're making the same promise. Why are they making that promise? Only



because Buzz Yourell got them off their caucus and made them remake that promise. I have no faith in that promise. Based on what I've heard, it will take ten or fifteen years to fill in that land before they can even begin to build anything to employ people. To me, that's a rather mythical fague kind of promise about employing people in the State. Not only that, what they have done is resorted to what I call the ultimate in conhesion. They've got to some of their employees and forced them to write letters to the Legislature telling us that unless we defeat this Bill, they're going to lose their jobs. I resent, I strongly resent that kind of intimidation brought down on the heads from hardworking people. If you're really concerned about the workers, what you'll tell U.S. Steel is that if you ever resort to that kind of cohesion again, you're going to get it right in the neck. Now, with this House Bill. I oppose it, that kind of operation. I do not have faith in U.S. Steel living up to this promise, which incidently, they're going to renew every ten years. I'm proud to vote green and I think I don't have to prove to anyone in here that I spend a good deal of my time concerned about expanding labor opportunities for the People in this State. I want to commend Buzz Yourell for forcing U.S. Steel to display their real hand."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Giglio."

Frank Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House."



I haven't been able to use this mike much, except for my first Bill, but this is to important of a Bill to let go. So I don't want to take up too much of your time from what you've heard from all sides, but I think you should hear some of the sidestthat Maragos, Daugherty, Collins and myself are concerned with. As far as the pollution bit over there, I swam in the lake, and I continue to swim in the lake. They've got a crib out there, just right in the middle of U.S. Steel, and the people in the southside of Chicago, plus the people in the suburbs, where I live and a lot of us live, are still getting pottable water from there. As far as the jobs are concerned, it is vital to the community. You've heard Representative Collins tell you what U.S. Steel has done and what they haven't done. They've spent over fifty million dollars clearing that land, plus what they've done. They had to comply with the pollution laws and the EPA regulations for the past ten years. Plus they had to comply with the new oxygen furnances to compete with the foreign competition which is infiltrating our country today. We need it all. And I'm here as a representative of this District and I'm sure you people know, who are living in other parts of the State, Moline, Rock Island, those of you who come from Granite City, Alton, Peoria, Decatur, you know what steel does down there, look around. My fellow colleagues from the University of Chicago, the Liming Hospital, where surgical instruments come from, stainless steel, right just a couple of miles



south of you. It's not only vital for the state, but it's vital for the country that we keep these steel mills rolling and we keep the employment going. I urge all of you to come and support Collins, Daugherty, Maragos and myself. And as far as, I want to say one other thing about the pollution or the beautification, U. S. Steel is going to surround that area with 5,500 trees. And they anticipate on putting a new rolling mill when they get this ready to go. I urge a 'no' vote from all my colleagues. Thank you."

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

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to explain my vote.

I, too, represent the south side of Chicago. I have lived on the south side of Chicago all my life. The district that I represent has unemployment rates as high as 30% in some areas. And jobs are certainly a top priority with me. But, I would like to point out that U. S. Steel has promised us jobs before. When U. S. Steel was talking to 'Save the Dunes' people, it promised us thousands of jobs. As you all know, automation is taking over in the steel mills and by the time U. S. Steel has filled in this submerged land 15 or 20 years from now with the slag that it now pays to ship out. Automation will have taken over a great many more jobs in the steel mills. I am voting 'aye' on this bill because I would like to see the title clear for the Chicago Park District to go ahead and have public hearings to see how the people of the City of Chicago



and the people of the State of Illinois would like to use that land. I don't want to give it away to you as steel. I want the people to have the voice to see how it should really be used. I ask that you join me in voting 'aye'."

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

Duff: "Mr. Speaker. I rise to explain my vote. I am disturbed by the balance of equities as many of us are here in this bill.

Ah.. I can only approve of the environmental effort of the sponsor, Representative Yourell, and yet the State did grant this land or the option to take this land some years back. I am distressed by the fact that U. S. Steel has apparently given us figures which grossly underestimate the value of the land at the same time. And I'm aware of the fact that over the last six years if this land has been assessed at only 50% valuation. It could have accrued on a.. on a tax basis, some \$20,000,000 which is an awful lot of school rooms and an awful lot of roads, and an awful lot of aid to ah.. our revenue picture. However, looks like the bill is in trouble. And I would like to make the suggestion if I could, that Representative Yourell might consider putting this bill on postponed consideration and considering the suggestion that U. S. Steel has not exercised this option and they be given a short period of time, like 6 months, in order to exercise the option and get the land on the tax rolls."

A. Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record.
Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."



Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I certainly don't want to delabor this issue because I know there are many other important issues to come before this House today and subsequent days. But I want to assure you that I have no intention of harming the employment situation in the State of Illinois. But, you've heard the arguments that if this 200 acres is not forthcoming that employment will suddenly hit a new low in the south.. ah side.. southwe.. ah.. southeast section of the City of Chicago. You all know that isn't true. You all know that there is no provisions in this bill to provide for anything other than holding this land. Now, Representative Duff has indicated a desire on his part to put this bill on postponed consideration so we can work something out with U... U. S. Steel. When he made that suggestion, I looked over at certain individuals who have been debating this bill and the grimace that came over their face indicated to me that there is no intention of their doing anything of this nature. But just so that they have the opportunity to do this, I'm going to comply with Representative Duff and ask for amendments to be put to this bill that'll provide for something to be done within six years.. six months or a year to this bill. Mr. Speaker, I ask for postponed consideration."

A. Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, House Bill 259 will be put on the order of postponed consideration."



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

Collins: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, you didn't see me. I was trying to explain my vote. Ah.. I just wanted to correct some misinformation that I think Representative Mann unintentionally made... if I may. Ah.. I traced the legislative history of Senate Bill 782 which was introduced in 1963 on April 23. It went to the Committee on Industrial Affairs. It was amended in the Senate. It came to the House on May 16th and went to the Industrial Affairs Committee in the House. Passed the House June 14th and was approved June 26th. Now, I know Representative Mann didn't intend to mislead, but this is the legislative history of the bill."

A. Telcser: "Introduction and first reading of bills."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 723. Murphy. Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning compensation for County Officers. First reading of the bill. House Bill 724.."

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

Murphy: "AH.. Mr. Speaker, I have a bill on the calendar, House Bill 315 that is a housekeeping amendment to allow us to pay the per diem pay to people without a perfunctory session and due to the second reading the bill is moving in, has been sitting there for two weeks now, and I'd like to take it back to second reading for the purpose of amending and I would like to ask leave of the House to do that at this time."

A. Telcser: "Representative Murphy, could you withhold your



request until we finish first reading and we can go back to it."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 724, W. D. Walsh, et al. Creates the Illinois Development Disabilities Act, first reading of the bill. House Bill 725, W. D. Walsh, et al."

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

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, for the first time in my legislative career, I am rising to say a word about a bill that ah.. I am the principle sponsor of. And the reason that I arise, I am, at the conclusion of my remarks, going to solicit the ah.. support and sponsorship of every member of the House who wishes to be a sponsor. I suppose the reason that I have not arisen before is that I never had a bill before that I've been able to find one cosponsor of much less many. But, thanks to the Illinois Association for the Mentally Retarded as well as other interested groups, there is considerably.. considerable interest in this bill which is the Committee on Developmental Disabilities recommendation to create a separate department of Developmental Disabilities and developmental disabilities for those of you who don't know and I didn't know until a few months ago, are mental retardation, epilepsy, and cerebral palsy. This bill then would mostly create a separate department and separate these afflictions from the Department of Mental Health, and put them where in the opinion of the Committee and in the opinion of many other



people, they belong and that is with separate, concentrated attention. Ah, the Committee.. just to give credit where credit is due, consisted of Representative Brennie who was the Chairman and did Yeoman service, Representative Don Brummet, Representative Chuck Keller, Representative Carl Soderstrom and Representative Jim Taylor... and myself. And I urge anyone who is interested to cosponsor ah.. House Bill 724."

- A. Telcser: "Are there any objections? Ah.. hearing none leave will be granted. Will the Clerk please proceed with first reading?"
- F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 725. W. D. Walsh, et al. Creates an Act creating the prevention of Developmental Disabilities, first reading of the bill. House Bill 726, Palmer, et al. Amends the Downstate Policemen's Pension Fund, first reading of the bill. House Bill 727. McCormick, et al. Directs the Department of Transportation to make an examination study of the Little Saline River, first reading of the bill. House Bill 728. Philip, et al. Amends the Revenue Act of 39. First reading of the bill. House Bill 739, Merlo. Ah.. et al. Provides that security be given.. security deposit given a landlord holding over 25 units or residential or real property must be returned in full upon the tenant vacating the premises, first reading of the bill. Ah.. House Bill 730.."
- A. Telcser: "Representative Choate, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"



Choate: "Mr. Speaker, I rise.. if you.. if I might have leave for the purpose of an announcement because some members evidently think that the session is about over and are leaving."

A. Telcser: "Proceed, Sir."

Choate: "I would like, if I can have the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the Democratic members.. I would like to advise the Democratic members that although it appears the House is rapidly drawing to a close for today and some of you might be leaving to get a bite of lunch and/or to go to your office thinking that session is about over, that it's my intention to ask for a Democratic Conference immediately after the House adjourns. And ah.. at that time, I will announce the room number Mr. Speaker, but I did want them to know prior to them leaving the floor that we are going to have a Democratic Conference immediately after adjournment."

F. B. Seicke: "AH.. House Bill 730, Schraeder. Appropriates \$47,000,000 to the State Employees Retirement System, first reading of the bill. House Bill 731, Leon, et al. Appropriates \$250 to Robert Berman, first reading of the bill. House Bill 732, Stedelin, et al. Amends Civil Administrative Code, first reading of the bill. House Bill 733, Sharp, et al. Appropriates \$20,000 to the Department of Transportation, first reading of the bill. House Bill 734, Polk, et al. Vacates right-of-way easement in Rock Island County, first reading of the bill. House Bill 735,



Hart, et al. Amends the School Code, first reading of the bill. House Bill 736, Williams, et al. Amends the Park District Code, first reading of the bill. 737, Getty, et al. Amends the Criminal Code, First reading of the bill. 738, Ralph Dunn, provides when the office of Coroner is eliminated by referendum, that such proposition shall provide that such duties be taken over by another county officer, first reading of the bill. House Bill 739, McMaster, et al. Adds section to the Township Act, first reading of the bill. 740, LaFleur, et al. Amends County Airport Act, first reading of the bill. 741, Ron Hoffman, et al. Amends the Consumer Fraud Act, first reading of the bill. 742, Waddell, et al. Appropriates ah.. \$100,000 to the Department of Transportation for flood control along the Fox River in Kane County, first reading of the bill. 743, Waddell, et al. Creates Data Information Study Commission, first reading of the bill. 744, Waddell, et al. Appropriates \$12,500 to Data Information Study Commission, first reading of the bill. 748, 745, excuse me, Ewell, amends the Unified Code of Corrections, first reading of the bill. 746, Ebbesen, et al. Appropriates \$16,000,000 to the Department of Transportation, first reading of the bill. House Bill 747, Lempke, et al. Amends the Election Code, first reading of the bill. House Bill 748, Brinkmeier, et al. Amends School Code, first reading of the bill. House Bill 749, Catania, et al. An Act imposing certain conditions upon requiring an audit of



Mass Transportation Carriers, first reading of the bill. House Bill 750, Catania, et al. Makes an appropriation to the Auditor General, first reading of the bill."

A. Telcser: "House Bills, third reading. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Murphy. Ah.."

Murphy: "Mr. Speaker, I ask again now to take House Bill 315 from the order of third reading back to the order of second reading for the purpose of amendment. And I just want to say that this is only a housekeeping bill that allows us to pay per diem without a perfunctory session when you are attending committee meetings and Representative Hart has an additional amendment to put on it that says if you have a bill in Committee that ah.. you are also entitled to per diem. So, I yield to Representative Hart."

A. Telcser: "Okay, the Parliamentarian informs that we need affirmative action of 107 votes to do.. to do this. So the gentleman moves.. has moved that the ah.. has moved... that House Bill 315 ah.. be heard on third reading out of its regular order. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. It takes 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, 126 'ayes' no 'nays', the Gentleman's motion prevails.. Collins 'aye'. House Bill 315. House Bill 3.. 1.. 5."

F. B. Selcke: "House Bill 315, third reading of the bill."

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

Murphy: "Representative Hart."

A. Telcser: "Well, now, Bill, did you want to bring it back



to second? Or would you ask leave now?"

Murphy: "I move now, I ask leave of the House to take it back to the order of second reading for purposes of amendment."

A. Telcser: "The Gentleman has asked leave to return House Bill 315 to the order of second reading for the purpose of amendment? Are there any objections? Hearing none House Bill 315 will be on the order of second reading. Are there any amendments?"

F. B. Selcke: "Ah.. amendment number 1, Hart.."

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

Hart: "AH.. ah.. I would like to ah.. withdraw amendment number 1 and go to amendment number 2. Ah.. there similar but ah.. amendment number 2 is the one we want to put on."

A. Telcser: "Okay, the Gentleman has moved that amendment number one be tabled. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion to table, signify by saying 'aye' the opposed 'no'. Amendment number 1 is tabled."

F. B. Selcke: "Ah.. amendment number 2, Hart."

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

Hart: "Amendment number 2, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, would provide that in the event a committee meeting is held and there is no session that day, ah.. the sponsor of a bill who appears before the committee on that day when his bill is set, would be entitled to per diem for attending that committee. And I move for the adoption of that amendment."



A. Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman offer is to move the adoption of Amendment 2 to House bill 315. All in favor of adoption signify by saying 'aye' opposed 'no'. Amendment is adopted. Are there further amendments? Third reading. Motions.. on the order of motions the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Redmond. Representative Redmond, did you file a motion, Sir? On the order of motions, did you have a motion filed, Sir?"

Redmond: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'd like to ask leave to be removed as chief sponsor of House Bill 608 and have Representative Calvo shown as chief sponsor."

A. Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, it'll be journalized. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman on the order of motions."

Berman: "Mr. Speaker ah.. I would ask leave to add Representative Jaffee as a cosponsor on House Bill 475 of which I'm the principle sponsor. And.. and Representative Nardulli and Yourell as cosponsors on House Bill 643 of which I'm the cosponsor.. the principle sponsor."

A. Telcser: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, it'll be so journalized. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter."

Porter: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion and with the consent of Representative Mugalian, I would like to be added as a cosponsor to House Bills 545, and 546. I ask unanimous leave for that purpose."

A. Telcser: "Are there any objections? Okay, it'll be journalized."



Gentleman from Cook, Representative W. D. Walsh."

W. D. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent to have the names of Representative Madigan and Beatty to ah.. as cosponsors of 372."

A. Telcser: "Are there any objections? Representative B. B. Wolfe, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

B. B. Wolfe: "Point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

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

B. B. Wolfe: "Have we changed the rules yet concerning this procedure of putting a member on the Bill, like giving a memo to the Clerk of the House that would indicate that the Chief Sponsor is in favor of it, and would list the names of those other members who wish to get on a Bill?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The form is being prepared, Representative Wolfe, although I'm not sure that we've even changed the rules yet."

B. B. Wolfe: "Thank you."

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

B. B. Duff: "Mr. Speaker, ah.... I've been... it's been brought to my attention that a number of persons on Judiciary Committee are not aware of the fact that the committee meeting room has been changed today to make room for a Revenue Committee, which has got to use the room. So the Judiciary Committee will meet this afternoon in Room D-1."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Alright, that's an announcement."



we're on the order of motion, now. Are there further motions? Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham?

R. D. Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, the incomparable Chairman of our Insurance Committee, Representative Bernard Epton has two excellent Bills, House Bill 150 and 225. It has been physically impossible to hear those bills in Committee illness, fire and flood. As the first assistant to Bernie, and his humble servant, it is my honor to ask this House to unanimously waive Rule 23."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "O'kay, is there further discussion? Does the gentleman.... This will take 107 affirmative votes on the form by the parliamentarian. All those in favor of the gentleman's motion to waive the provision of Rule 23, so that the Bills to which he refers can be heard, in Committee, signify by voting 'aye'.... Representative Choate, for what purpose do you rise, Sir."

C. L. Choate: "Is that the ah... Rule that pertains to the deadline as far as committee action is concerned?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Yes, it is so."

C. L. Choate: "I would only like to advise the gentleman that ah.... also pertaining to fire, flood, and anything else that might happen, that the Minority Leader lost a Bill in Committee on the week before last and did not ask for the suspension of that Rule."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Gentleman has moved that the provisions of Rule 23 be suspended."



All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. It will take 107 affirmative votes.

Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."

H. A. Katz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hate to vote against my good friend from the Hyde Park area, but I do not know how if we start suspending the rules for one member, we will not suspend it for everybody. It's not fair to do it for one, and have the Minority Leader lose the Bill, so I think we better decide we're going to live by the Rules and Mr. Epton will simply have to follow the rules just like the rest of us. And so I vote no."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Epton."

B. E. Epton: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was not aware that the Minority Leader had lost a Bill because of this. I would remind the House, however, this is the first time this has come up. These Bills were delayed not because of the sponsor, but was an attempt to accommodate the various witnesses. I have no particular overwhelming breed for these bills, but the fact remains it was through no fault of the Committee, no fault of the Chairman. It was an attempt to provide the witnesses who had come from long distances. Now I realize that this rule will have to be treated with ah..... great severity, but the fact remains that when this Bill is completed..... when this vote is completed, we will again have the similar



situation of no-fault bills. So all I can assure the House is this request is not made without due consideration. It's not an attempt to impede the purpose of the House. As a matter of fact, I would simply remind you that if we fail to do this, it will probably simply call for the refiling of some of these Bills which will only add to our problem. So I respectfully urge you to approve this particular procedure."

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

A. L. Berman: "I ah.... wanted to know, one Bill is House Bill 150, and what's the other one?"

B. E. Epton: "One Bill is House Bill 150 and the second Bill is 225 and the Department of Insurance on 225 was trying to meet with the previous sponsor, Senator Carroll, and was unable to contact you. The sponsor was ready at all times, but because of Department of Insurance and Senator Howard Carroll's request, the matter was postponed on three separate occasions."

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

R. D. Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I recognize the reluctance to set aside the rules and basically that theory is correct, but there has to be a rhyme and reason in these things. Now all you're forcing by this position is a reintroducing of the Bill and the expense that is involved. I wish to pledge to the honorable



Minority Leader, that we will do anything we can to save him from the unjust faith that has been his Bill so far. But in this instance, we ask you to be merciful, to be reasonable. Give Bernie a chance on these Bills. The Bills are both meritorious? They will pass when there has been a chance for them to be heard. They deserve your support. We, as members of this Legislative Body, should not feel so obligated to the rules that we lose sight of reason. The other evening, the Executive Committee was in session at 10:30. We fool only ourselves when we become such slaves of the rules. We respectfully submit in this instance, it's where you should be voting green and ask that you reconsider and do so."

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

C. L. Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, let me advise my distinguished colleague from Lawrence that in this particular instance, the only way in the world I needed help is for him to vote for my Bill in Committee if he happens to be on that Committee, because, as I stated, I did not ask for a suspension of the rules, because I voted for the Rule and I happen to think it's a good rule or I wouldn't have voted for it. But I have already resubmitted my bill and have a Committee hearing set on it. So, ah... Representative Cunningham, if you want to help me, you don't need to help me by suspending the rule, just give me a vote in Committee."



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

B. L. Douglas: "Representative Epton, my green light is up there, because instinctively when I knew you needed help, I put it up, but Bernie it would seem to me since you and I are together right now, that it would be in the best interest of this House, there being adequate time for this Bill to be reintroduced and there being an immense potential problem with setting this precedent for you to go along with what Representative Choate has done himself in resubmitting the Bill and I would like to remove my green light out of respect for you, but also knowing that it is not going to kill your Bill, but that you can introduce them again."

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

J. R. Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Point of parliamentary inquiry."

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

J. R. Lundy: "If we vote to suspend the rule in this case, do I understand that there will then be no time limit, whatsoever, applicable to these bills? That they could, for example, stay in the committee until mid-June?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "I would say that's a good interpretation of it."

J. R. Lundy: "Thank you."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative



Bluthardt."

E. E. Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think that if we're going to live by this particular 45 day rule, that we're going to find ourselves in one heck of a jam as time goes by. I see nothing wrong with being realistic in extending the time, if we make a definite and exact date by which these bills must be heard. I feel rather embarrassed because I have three Bills of Buss Yourell's in Elections Committee and I find out that he will be out of time by three days, so I hoped that Buss was going to get up and move to suspend this rule so that his three rules, at least, could be heard next Tuesday. That's only three days difference. And I think Rules should be bent. They shouldn't be so strong and so ah... ungiving that ah.... that we have to force the sponsor back to have his Bills redrafted at the expense of a taxpayer and re-filed. I don't know how much that's going to cost this State, but it's going to cost a pretty penny, when this time expires, unless we give a little and allow a few extra days to allow the posting and hearing of those Bills."

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

B. B. Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I am incline to agree with what the previous gentleman just said. We had to meet for seven hours in our Committee last week to do justice to people under the 45 day rule, and I'm conscious to the fact that



we're going to have two weeks off, a week before Easter and a week after Easter, which if the 45 day rule applies to that, we're going to have a pretty terrible jam up in the next two weeks, trying to get Bills out that would pertain to the next five weeks. I really think under extraordinary exceptions that it's reasonable and fair to give the Committee Chairman, as in the case of Representative Epton, some leave way, in accomplishing what he intends to do."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question, there are 62 'ayes', 10 'nays' and the gentleman's motion to suspend the provision of Rule 23, fails. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Epton."

B. E. Epton: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am not to chagrin by that. I think that ah.... perhaps it's an unfortunate situation. What bothers me, and the reason I ask my colleague to advance the rule is because my motion at this time is to waive the 45 day rule insofar as two house bills are concerned, 243 and 383. Both of those Bills have to do with the no-fault. Now if you don't want to waive them, it's perfectly all right with me. It simply means that this House will be tied up for about two months, debating the no-fault bills on the floor of the House. Now the Insurance Committee thought that there was some reason on this floor, and that we would try and keep all of the Bills in Committee. Two Bills already, one is



Representative Barry's and the other is Representative Maragos' Bill, automatically will fail to be heard in that time limit, so at this time, I again ask for a 107 votes to suspend the particular rule, so that these two Bills can be heard on a date certain, which is April 30 at Noon in the Capitol Building."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "O'kay, the gentleman has moved that the provisions of Rule 23 be suspended so that House Bills 150.... No, House Bills 243 and 383, so that House Bills 243 and 383 could be heard on a date.... April 30. All those in favor, will signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. This will take 107 affirmative votes."
Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

C. L. Choate: "I realize, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House that many people now find themselves in a posture of denying a waiver of the rules for some Bills that maybe do not have the ah.... importance that the news media would attach to them, that the Bills that the sponsor has now made practically the same request on. I realize that probably many members will now support the motion, simply because of the coverage that the media might give to these two particular bills. I still say to you that the Rules, everyone was aware of them, I don't know of anyone who voted against this particular rule. I would vote 'present' on this myself, Mr. Speaker."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Record Representative Choate as 'present'. Gentleman from Livingston, Representative



Hunsicker."

C. T. Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, here is a shining example of the hole we worked ourselves into by consolidating the committees when we reduced them from 26 to 20. You have a certain amount of Bills to hear before different committees and when you put three or four committees together and make it one, this is one of the problems it insues, and we have nobody to blame for this but ourselves. I voted for these rules, I'm going to stick with them. I'm going to vote 'present'.

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners."

W. L. Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, voted for these rules, but I also realize that we provided a provision... we put a provision in these rules to give them flexibility and what we're doing now is exercising one of those rules we voted for. But what I think is important is something I've talked about before and that is the Committee System here in the House of Representatives. As Representative Epton mentioned, we've got no-fault bills now. I serve on the Insurance Committee, and I'll tell you something, I don't know much about insurance, and part of the purposes of this committee, is to evaluate different Bills when we've got more than one bill on the same subject, and hopefully come out on the floor of the House with one solid bill which could be debated, instead of confusing the issue for those of us who do not have an expertise.



And I urge some of you who are voting 'present' and who also would like to stream-line some of the procedures that we have to operate with to put a green light on that board and vote 'yes' on this issue."

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

F. J. Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. It just so happens, I'm interested in no-fault but I'm also interested in the orderly procedure in the House of Representatives. And I think when we start changing the rules because the situation such as this, then we become very confused and in trouble. And while I support no-fault, I have to vote 'no' to maintain that decorum and the orderly procedure. And if it matters of bringing a Bill to the House and having going to Committee so that we may hear no-fault I would be in favor of that, but I do not believe we should suspend the rules just because of a particular Bill we may be interested in. And I would just urge you to vote 'no'."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative B. B. Wolfe."

B. B. Wolfe: "Mr. Speaker, briefly. I don't care what the Bill is that's before the House. I think we've abandoned good common sense and good reasoning with respect to the rules. And I voted for the rules and most of you know I'm a pretty hard stickler on the following of those rules, but there's no rule that's not suspendable by a vote of



this House for good cause shown. Now what is the point of our burdening the reference bureau that can't turn the work out now with a refiling of bills that are date lined for filing bills in this House April 14. And these sponsors have an opportunity to refile these bills, and I don't see why this House should put the taxpayers to the cost and to put the Reference Bureau to the cost and the burden of refiling bills that are presently committee. I think that when they designate a final date for hearing, which the previous motion did not, then we know that that extension is only a ten, or a fifteen or a twenty day extension and that there is good reason for it. Now when you are treating a no-fault bill such as is before the House, you're dealing with a very complex subject and the Committee, in order to exhaust the ah... survey and study on this subject and to permit other members to file bills on the same subject and to hear them altogether is doing in my opinion a good thing. And I think we should support this motion and support that Committee and help the committee out."

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

A. J. Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think we have much to do about nothing. We're here not to waste time but to get things done, and I think this is one time we can afford to be flexible about the rules. I think our common sense should dictate to allow



the suspension of the rules and proceed with business."

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

G. L. Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, if the rule isn't right, then let's change the rule. Let's not be going around playing flip-flop the mop with the rule. Now, if this won't work, then get the Rules Committee together; we have, I understand, capable people on that Committee, and let's change the rule if it won't work."

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

R. G. Day: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. When we were talking about the time and expense of redrafting bills and refiling them, I think we should keep in mind the time that this House is going to devote in the future to debating questions such as this, because every man or Representative who fails to get his Bill out of the Committee within the time prescribed by the rules, is going to have a motion just like this and we're going to be sitting here debating and arguing on whether a particular bill merits our consideration to the point where we should suspend the rules. Actually, we won't know anything about those Bills. Most of the members won't because we have never had an opportunity to hear witnesses on them. And certainly we should not ah.... bend the rule or suspend the rule, because of ah.... our feelings with respect to the



particular sponsor. I don't know, how important these no-fault bills are, nor do I know how important the other two bills are that Representative Cunningham spoke about, but I'm certain of this, that the sponsor of those bills that Representative Cunningham spoke about feels that they are just as important as the two bills we have under consideration at this time. And it seems to me that we've got to speed up the Committee procedure. We've got to speed up these hearings if we're going to abide by our deadlines that the Rules Committee has set after diligent study and it seems to me that we're getting into a bad practice as soon as we suspend the bill... the rule for one sponsor but not for another."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record." On this question, there are 67 'ayes', 5 'nays' three answering 'present', and the gentleman's motion fails. Are there further motions? The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania."

Susan Catania: "I move to table House Bills 400 and 401. Today I have filed House 749 and 750, which deal with the subject matter that was dealt with House Bills 400 and 401 and my two new bills have been stamped by the Legislative Reference Bureau, thanks to the Assistant Minority Leader, bringing to my attention the fact I neglected to get the others stamped."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "The Lady has moved that House Bills 400 and 401 be tabled. Are there any objections. Hearing



none, they will be so ordered. Are there further motions?
General Resolutions."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Resolution 113. Ah.... Robert Dunne et al. House Resolution 117. Douglas et al. House Joint Resolution 23, Matijevich et al."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "O'kay announcements. The gentleman from Cook, Representative Bluthardt."

E. E. Bluthardt: "There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on elections concerning the primary dates immediately following adjournment at Carl Hunsicker's desk. It should take only about five minutes."

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

L. F. Capuzi: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Traditionally, we in this House, annually or every year, that is, have had a St. Patrick Day' dinner. This year, because of the illness of the honorary chairman, Representative Granata, who incidently was the originator, or one of the originators of our St. Patrick Day dinner, we haven't had one. But now, after speaking to the Leadership, we have decided to have ah... a legislative dinner or a St. Patrick Day dinner. I also have before me the financial report of how much money we do have in our savings and in our checking account. Now to date, in our savings, we have \$8,655.66, and in our checking account, we have \$793.69. Now in this last session, we did spend quite a bit of money because of the fact that we did



have five deaths, members of our house who have died. Many of our members were in the hospital and members of their family were in the hospital and we did send flowers and so on, but now for the members who are left; that is, the former members of the committee.... St. Patrick Day dinner committee, who are here present here tonight or this afternoon, I would like to announce a meeting immediately, for five minutes, at least today, immediately after adjournment and then they can go into their conferences and so forth. Right here at my desk is where the meeting will be. It will only take five minutes."

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

B. L. Douglas: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I rise on a point of personal privilege, because the time is over due in this session for someone to stand up on this floor and begin to return some of the garbage that is thrown to us by some of the newspapers. I don't mean to take Representative Yourell's place away from him, but for those of you who are new in this session, Representative Yourell often takes the position that I am going to take right now. I'd like to make reference to some articles that have appeared in an illustrative newspaper in Chicago called the Chicago Tribune during the last couple of weeks. The articles have either been written by or have been stimulated by a gentleman who often sits up there on the far right where the Tribune seat is, the seat that he occupies. He



wears a vest and he acts very esteemed and know it all. The seat that he occupies to the far right, sybolically fits him very well. As a matter of fact....."

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

E. F. Schlickman: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. On what basis does the gentleman arise? Was his name taken or used in debate?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "We're on the order of announcements. I assumed he had an announcement to make."

E. F. Schlickman: "Point of personal privilege is what I heard him say, and I suggest he's out of order, Mr. Speaker."

B. L. Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this session, I asked you....."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "A point of personal privilege is always in order, Representative Schlickman."

E. F. Schlickman: "Well, what is the basis for it?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "I'm trying to determine that. He's leading up to it."

B. L. Douglas: "You'll get a chance to vote no in just a moment, Mr. Schlickman." The basis, Mr. Speaker, as I said is a number of articles that have appeared in the paper which have referred to a committee, of which I'm a member, the Judiciary II Committee. The articles that have appeared editorializing under the disguise of reporting, have taken pokes at members of that Committee, have frequently referred



I think, erroneously to what the ah.... reporter and the editorial writers of the Chicago Tribune referred to as the doctrinare liberals on the Judiciary II Committee. Now I think in referring, for example, in very poor taste, to Representative Michael Getty, whom I would like to rise and support, as Brian Duff, the Chairman of that Committee did in today's newspaper, I think it's appropriate to say

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

B. B. Duff: "Mr. Speaker, my name was used in the contrivention of the House Rules and I would appropriate it being disassociated with the Speaker's remarks."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman wishes to be disassociated from your remarks, Representative Douglas. Does he have leave?' Representative Pierce, for what purpose do you arise?"

D. M. Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I was offended.... Mr. Speaker, what's wrong with being a doctrinare liberal?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Well, Representative Douglas has mentioned....."

D. M. Pierce: "I think my philosophy was insulted by the Speaker."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Well, Representative Douglas was the one who made the remarks, Sir, so...."

B. L. Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, my thunder is being very effectively stolen from me. I think that I will end by.... by saying



that this is what happens when you try to defend your friends. I will end by saying, and I mean this in the greatest of seriousness, that the Judiciary II Committee has met as the Chairman of the Committee, who's name I don't recall at this moment, mentioned earlier, for seven hours last week, we discussed stop and frisk, the death penalty and gun control in one afternoon in the most democratic way imaginable. The following day, in the paper I referred to, the Committee was picked at, Members of the Committee were picked at. I think that erroneous ideological labels were put on members of this Committee, and I rise only because there are rare occasions when we can get back when the newspapers, in a picky kind of way, I think erroneously referred to us individually and collectively, and in support of the Judiciary II Committee, not for the Chairman, who wishes to be disassociated from the Committee for the moment, I would like to say that I think that these are remarks in the Tribune were inappropriate, that these remarks in the Tribune were inappropriate and that this Committee should be thanked for the work it's done, not criticized."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Roll Call. Is there..... I don't know, the representative might want to vote, I don't know. Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

C. L. Choate: "Mr. Speaker, I would ah.... just before we adjourn, I would ask the Democratic members to come to a Democratic conference in Room 212 in Room 212 immediately



after adjournment."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from Kane, Representative Schoeberlein. "

A. L. Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker, I have two bills, 45 and 46. They are Caldwell Bills that we've tried to hear in the last two weeks. Now because the CTA and the Conference Committee ah.... report taking three or four hours or five hours, we have not had a quorum present. Witnesses came down from Chicago and one of them had to fly back. Now the deadline of 45 days is passed on these two Bills and Mr. Caldwell... Representative Caldwell, do you want to submit new bids? I'd like to hear from you. New Bills."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Gentleman from LaSalle, Representative Soderstrom."

C. W. Soderstrom: "Well, ah.... ah.... it's obvious I haven't had an opportunity to have these Bills heard. I realize that I'm at the mercy of the Committee and I just want ah.... I want justice. I haven't done anything.... I wasn't playing around when I introduced these Bills, and I'd appreciate an opportunity of having them heard."

L. A. Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, I want them heard also. I sat around here Thursday night. I did not have a quorum. I got home at quarter to twelve at night and I don't think it's fair for anyone to have them stick around here for Bills and lose a ride and everything else. Now we did not have a quorum. We attempted to hear the witnesses once, one went back to Chicago, the other was here. I want to



be fair to them regardless whether they are on that side of the aisle or this side of the aisle, but now after what I've heard this morning, when you couldn't get 107 votes for the insurance bills, I don't think we can get 50 votes for these two bills. So, are they automatically dead or not?"

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Well, yes, if they are not heard within the 45 days, as prescribed by the rules, and the gentleman does not put in a motion to suspend the rules, I would say that they would be dead." Representative Capuzi, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

L. F. Capuzi: "Mr. Speaker, ah.... I was in the Committee of Public Utilities last week and we stayed there quite late. We did hear House Bill 45, I think it was, and 46. It was Caldwell's Bill. We heard one witness and one witness had to leave because it was quite late, but in all fairness, these other witnesses are coming in here today to listen to these two bills, and I don't think it's right that these bills should be killed, regardless of whether we are for them or against them."

Rep. Arthur A. Telcser: "Well, as the Chair understands the issue, ah.... you are going to be beyond the 45 days? Is that correct? Alright, the Chairman indicates that is correct, so someone will have to put a motion to suspend Rule 23 and receive 107 affirmative votes that the Committee can act upon their Bills. We just went through that issue. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes."



Barnes: "Mr. Chairman, point of clarification."

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

Barnes: "I believe the other day.. I believe it was Thursday, that the Chairman of this Committee asked for.. ah.. to suspend the rules so that ah.. these bills could be heard this week in conjunction at the same time that the Chairman of the Executive Committee asked for ah.. the same privilege. I believe it was given at that time, if I'm not correct."

A. Telcser: "Oh, well. Representative Schoeberlein, did you receive permission to suspend the rules?"

Schoeberlein: "Yes, I did. Last week."

A. Telcser: "Oh, if you received permission then you.. Rule 23 if that's in the record. Well, now, the Parliamentarian tells me no."

Schoeberlein: "All right then, Mr. Chair.. Mr. Speaker. There will be a meeting of the Public Utilities Committee 30 minutes after adjournment, and I would like all Members to be present."

A. Telcser: "Representative Choate, what purpose do you rise? In Kennedys seat?"

Choate: "Ah, Mr. Speaker. Only to ah.. make a request of the Republican Committee Chairmen. As they well know, ah.. many committee meetings are scheduled for 2 o'clock. As they well know, the House has stayed in Session longer than we normally do. As they well know, I have requested a Democratic Conference for room 212 immediately after adjournment. So, my request of the chairman would simply be to bear with us. It appears that we're not.. the Democratic



are going to be a wee bit late in getting to the 2 o'clock meetings. I would hope that they would defray or delay any action on bills until such time as the Democratic members are able to ah.. get to the Committee meetings."

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

W. D. Walsh: "Well, I was going to announce that the Committee meetings that were scheduled for 2 o'clock will be held at 2:30. And Chairman Randolph told me to announce or remind the members of the Revenue Committee that they will meet in 212."

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

Murphy: "Mr. Speaker just so a couple of bills are not lost that ah.. I don't believe it was the intent to lose them. I think the leave the House gave the head of the Public Utilities Committee last week was to hear the bills on Monday, not to extend the time. And I still think if he want to extend the time, he has to have a motion to do that."

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

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like you to have your Parliamentarian at least look at the rule. As I remember reading it, it says 'If a bill is not reported out of committee within 45 days after it's assigned to that committee, that bill is dead'."

A. Telcser: "The bill is Tabled."

Shea: "The bill is automatically tabled if it's not reported out so that unless the rules are suspended, and it's past



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

45 days, the only way that bill can be saved is to take from the table. And put back in committee. Is that correct?"

A. Telcser: "Clearly, Representative Shea. Ah.. Section d of rule 23 indicates what you just said. However, someone informed me that last week the rule was suspended. I was not on the podium. Representative Hoffman, did you seek recognition? No, you did not. Now, if you did not receive 107 affirmative votes last week, ah.. you may have a problem. You may want to make that motion tomorrow. Or take it from the table. You have that choice, Sir. Representative Soderstrom, do you seek recognition?"

Soderstrom: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, only to go along with the announcement that Representative Walsh made. The Education Committee will now meet at 2:30 in Room C-1 of the Office Building."

A Telcser: "Are there further announcements? Death Resolutions."

F. B. Selcke: "House Joint Resolution 24, Choate, et al. Whereas Members of this House are deeply saddened by the death of Representative James T. Londrigan's father, Attorney James E. Londrigan, of Springfield, who died Monday, March 19, 1973, at St. John's Hospital, Springfield. And whereas Mr. Londrigan, a life long resident of Springfield was a distinguished resident of the Capitol City where he practiced law for 50 years. And whereas Mr. Londrigan was the father of three outstanding sons, Representative Londrigan of Springfield, Paul Londrigan a teacher at Newtrier High School,



and Robert Londrigan a chemical engineer with Shell Oil Company. And whereas Mr. Londrigan served his country his country in World War I and was an active member of his community holding membership in the Blessed Sacrament Church, the Holy Name Society, The Knights of Columbus Post 364, American Legion Post 372, The Illinois Bar Association, and the Sangamon County Bar Association. Whereas Mr. Londrigan will be missed by the Springfield community and all his friends throughout the State, be it therefore resolved by the House of Representatives 78th General Assembly, State of Illinois and Members of this House express their respect for the late James E. Londrigan and extend their deepest sympathy to his widow, Mrs. Sophie Londrigan and to his sons, Representative James Londrigan, Paul Londrigan and Robert Londrigan and to all the Londrigan Family. And be it further resolved that suitable copies of this preamble be forwarded to Mrs. Londrigan, Representative Londrigan, Robert Londrigan and Paul Londrigan."

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

Choate: "Well, certainly Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

I know that the entire citizenry of the fine Capitol City of Springfield was saddened to learn of the death of Mr. Londrigan. I would ah.. say to all membership, Mr. Speaker, that if they desire to be cosponsors of this resolution, that I welcome them cosponsoring ah.. the death resolution of one of colleagues fathers. I would



now Mr. Speaker move that the appropriate rules be suspended for the immediate consideration and adoption of the resolution."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman has moved that the House adopt the death resolution. All in favor of adoption signify by saying 'aye' opposed 'no'."

Members: "AYE."

A. Telcser: "The resolution is adopted."

F. B. Selcke: "Ah.. House Resolution 118, Lechowicz, et al.

Whereas the members of this House are deeply saddened to learn of the death of Mrs. Helen Jablonski Wosak, mother of Judge Joseph M. Wosak, Jr. of the Circuit Court of Cook County, Law/Jury Division, and whereas Mrs. Wosak was the mother of two outstanding citizens, Judge Wosak and his sister Mrs. Mildred Shuh, and whereas Mrs. Wosak will be missed by her children and her sister, Genevieve Delly, her grandchildren and her five great-grandchildren. And whereas Mrs. Wosak showed great devotion to her family, her church and her community, be it therefore resolved by the House of Representatives 78th General Assembly, State of Illinois, that members of this House express their deepest sympathies to Judge Joseph Wosak, Jr. and the rest of his family on the loss of their beloved mother, sister and grandmother, Mrs. Helen Jablonski Wosak, and be it further resolved that suitable copies of this preamble be presented to the Wosak family."

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



Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move that the appropriate be adopted."

A. Telcser: "Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the resolution. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'."

Members: "Aye."

A. Telcser: "Opposed 'no'. The resolution is adopted. Are there further resolutions? Gentleman from Cook, Representative W. D. Walsh."

W. D. Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn until 9:30 tomorrow morning for Perfunctory Session and 10:00 o'clock for Regular Session. All those in favor, signify by saying 'aye'. The opposed 'no'."

Members: "Aye."

A. Telcser: "The House stands adjourned until 9:30 Perfunct, 10:00 Regular Session." (Gavel)

Choate: "Ah.. I would ask the Democratic members, Mr. Speaker, to come to room 212 immediately so that we can get to the Committee Hearings."

