

1.

Speaker Telcser: "Now, the House will come to order will the Members please be in their seats. The prayer this morning will be by Dr. Johnson."

Dr. Johnson: "If you remember the human burden each one of us bears in great enough for us this day. Amen."

Speaker Telcser: "The Regular Session, Ladies and Gentlemen and Roll Call for attendance."

Clerk Selcke: "Alsup, Anderson, Arnell, Barnes, Barry, Beatty, Beaupre, Berman, Bluthardt, Borchers, Boyle, Bradley, Brandt, Brinkmeier, Brummet, Caldwell, Calvo, Campbell, Capparelli, Capuzi, Carter, Catania, Chapman, Choate, Clabaugh...."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

Choate: "Mr. Speaker, I would just like for the record to clearly indicate that for once in my life, I've been first on the Roll Call."

Speaker Telcser: "Put the Gentleman first on the Roll Call."

Clerk Selcke: "Clabaugh, Collins, Craig, Cunningham, D'Arco, Davis, Day, Deavers, Dee, Deuster, DiPrima, Douglas, Duff, Ralph Dunn, R.L. Dunne, Dyer, Ebbesen, Epton, Ewell, Farley, Fary, Fennessey, Fleck, Flinn, Friedland, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Gibbs, Giglio, Giorgi, Griesheimer, Grotberg, Hanahan, Harpstrite, Hart, Hill, Hirschfeld, G.L. Hoffman, Ron Hoffman, J. Holloway, R. Holloway, D. Houlihan, J. Houlihan, Hudson, Hunsicker, Huskey, Hyde, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Dave Jones, Juckett, Katz, Keller, Kelly, Kempiners, Kennedy, Kent, Klosak, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Krause, Kriegsman, Kucharski, LaFleur, Lauer, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Lemke, Leon, Londrigan, Lundy, Macdonald, Madigan, Mahar, Mann, Maragos, Martin, Matijevich, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McClain, McCormick, McCourt, McGah, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, McPartlin, Merlo, Kenny Miller, Tom Miller, Molloy, Mugalian, Murphy, Nardulli, Neff,



North, Palmer, Pappas, Patrick, Philip, Peters, Polk, Porter, Randolph, Rayson, Redmond, Rigney, Rose, Ryan, Sangmeister, Schisler, Schlickman, Schneider, Schoeberlein, Schraeder, Sevcik, Sharp, Shea, Shurtz, Tim Simms, Ike Sims, Skinner, Soderstrom, Springer, Stedelin, Stiehl, Stone, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, Thompson, Tipword, Totten, Tuerk, Von Boeckman, Waddell, Wall, R. Walsh, W. Walsh, Walters, Washburn, Washington, Williams, J.J. Wolf, B.B. Wolfe, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh, now moves that the Regular Session stand in recess. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the Regular Session stand in recess until the hour of 9:55, at which time we will have the last crack at overriding veto's and.... total and mandatory."

Speaker Telcser: "The Clerk tells me that he has a couple of messages first before we put your motion... Messages..."

Clerk Selcke: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of the Governor's Amendment to Bill of the following title, House Bill 311, action taken by the Senate November 6, 1973. Edward E. 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 Governor's Amendment to a Bill of the following title, House Bill 660, concurred in by the Senate November 6, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senat has concurred with the House in the adoption of the Governor's Amendment to a Bill of



3.

following title, House Bill 1491, concurred in by the Senate November 6, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. No further messages."

Speaker Telcser: "Introductions of First Reading."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2080, Emil Jones, et al. School Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2081, Huskey. Amends the Meat and Poultry Inspection Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Resolutions."

Clerk Selcke: "Are these Agreed?"

Speaker Telcser: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Selcke: "House Resolution 600, Waddell. House Resolution 601, Lechowicz, et al. House Resolution 602, Lechowicz. House Resolution 603, Kempiners, et al. House Resolution 605, Deavers. House Resolution 606, Walters, et al. House Resolution 607, Choate. House Resolution 608, Leon, et al."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, Bill.... Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House these are the Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 600, congratulates the Chemung United Methodist Church of Chemung, Illinois upon its 100th anniversary. House Resolution 601, by Representative Lechowicz, extends congratulations and best wishes to Mr. & Mrs. Robert E. Pokuta on their 40th wedding anniversary. House Resolution 602, also by Representative Lechowicz, extends congratulations to Mr. & Mrs. Walter Lechowicz on the occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary. House Resolution 603, by Representative Kempiners, congratulates Miss Paula Ann Zahn upon her selection as Miss Teenage Aurora for 1974. House Resolution 605, by Representative Deavers, commends the Lexington High School on their remarkable football season and House Resolution 606, by Representative Walters,



congratulates Mr. & Mrs. John J. Springman on their celebration of their silver wedding anniversary and House Resolution 607, by Representative Choate, congratulates and commends Congressman Kenneth J. Gray on his fine record and upon his retirement just recently announced; and House Resolution 608, by Representative Leon, congratulates Scout Anthony Meyer for the industry and initiative he has demonstrated in being the rank of Eagle Scout and Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of these Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Resolutions. All in favor 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The Resolutions are adopted. Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2082, Lundy et al: Amends the Condominium Property Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2083, Lundy, et al. Amends the Condominium Property Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Death Resolution."

Clerk Selcke: "Death Resolution... House Resolution 604, Terzich, et al. In respect and memory in Mr. John Coulon."

Speaker Telcser: "Is that it?"

Clerk Selcke: "That's it."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich offers and moves the adoption of Death Resolution. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no', the Resolution is adopted. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh, now moves that the Regular Session do stand in recess until the hour of 9:55. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion will signify by saying 'aye' the opposed 'no'. The Regular Session does now stand in recess until the hour of 9:55. Now, as a reminder to those of you who have veto motions on the Calendar in



5.

Regular Session, at 9:55 we're going back to the Regular Session and take up those matters... so, if you want to work on getting your votes present, you ought to start doing that now. Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Matijevich: "For just a point of information, for myself... say we adjourn the Regular Session sometime today and there are no more overrides will we be in Regular Session at all... the rest of next week for Resolutions.... Resolutions and introduction of Bills or not?"

Speaker Telscer: "John, I'm sure... I have to ask Bob, but I can't imagine why we would not come into Regular Session for those very reasons."

Matijevich: "All right, fine."

Speaker Telscer: "I think that we ought to be until we adjourn in the fall."

Matijevich: "Okay."

Speaker Telscer: "Okay, the First Special Session will now come to order, will the Members please be in their seats. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh, asks leave to have the attendance Roll Call of Regular Session serve as the attendance Roll Call for the First Special Session. Are there any objections? Hearing none, the attendance Roll Call for the Regular Session will serve as the Roll Call for the First Special Session. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh, now moves that the First Special Session do stand adjourn until the hour of 9:15 A.M., tomorrow morning. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William... your lights off... okay, this is the First Special Session do stand adjourned until the hour of 9:15 A.M. tomorrow morning. All in favor of the Gentlemans motion signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no', and the First Special Session stands adjourned until the



hour of 9:15 A.M., tomorrow morning. The Second Special Session will now come to order and the Members please be in their seats. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh, ask leave to have the attendance Roll Call for the Second Special Session... use the same Roll Call used in this mornings Regular Session. Are there any objection? Hearing none, the attendance Roll Call from this mornings Regular Session will be used as the attendance Roll Call for the Second Special Session. Committee Reports."

Clerk Selcke: "Second Special Session of House of Representatives of the 78th General Assembly reported the Committee as a whole which sat from 1:50 P.M., Tuesday November 6, 1973, to 4:10 P.M. on Tuesday, November 6, 1973. Members of the House of Representatives of the 78th General Assembly, Committee as a whole before which the Speaker, laid out Bills one in the Second Special Session has concurred the Bill reports and have heard the Bills as follows, Second Special Session, House Bill 1, Schlickman. The Bill was heard in Committee on the whole November 6, 1973, at 1:50 P.M., witnesses Mr. Schlickman, the Sponsor of the Bill... no other witnesses. Second Special Session two, Senate Bill 1, Blair. The Bill was heard in the Committee of the whole, November 6, 1973, at 2:10 P.M., witnesses Mr. Blair, Sponsor of the Bill and Mr. Harold Hovey, Director of the Bureau of the Budget respectfully remitted by Paul Randolph."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I heard the Clerk read the report from the Committee as a whole on two Bills that were heard, I have been furnished a supplemental Calendar for this Special Session that indicates that House Bill 1, and



Senate Bill 1, appear on House Bill, Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Is it the rules of this House that Bills that's laid on the... laid before a Committee of a whole and then reported back automatically go to Second Reading, First Legislative Day."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh, do you wish to respond or do you want me too?"

Walsh: "Well, the rules are unclear as to that, the rules say that a Committee shall report and that the Bills will then be treated by the Speaker and the case of these Bills, certainly that's the case, in the case of the Bills that we heard... for the most part, I'm sure that the case."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that we ought to have uniformity and that all Bills or no Bills go on the Calendar and I think a policy question at this juncture, either all Bills or no Bills... or are we back to the old days where in the discussion of the Speaker with an iron hand can determine what moves or what doesn't move. Because I thought that's why we had our new rules that we were having fairness and openness and everything would proceed in an orderly uniformed fashion."

Speaker Telcser: "Well, Representative Shea, I think the Majority Leader answered your question... we have before us the two Bills which you just eluted to, we did this during the so called Regular Session when we had a shortage of days and certainly it is my impression and the feeling that we are obeying the rules of the House."

Shea: "Well, would you point out to me, Mr. Speaker, where in the rules... say they go to Second Legislative Day... automatically."



Speaker Telcser: "Jerry, it's on First Legislative Day."

Shea: "I know, but it's on Second Reading and would you show me where in the rules, a Bill that went to the Committee as a whole... goes to Second Reading."

Speaker Telcser: "Well, the precedent with all Bills, Jerry."

Shea: "Well, are you telling me then that all Bill that go to the Committee on the whole are going to Second Reading."

Speaker Telcser: "No, not all Bills."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that you better show me something in the rules how this one got there then... because I would assume that we had something in the rules, it's going to take 89 votes to get that Bill... or the Speaker is going to start playing games with which goes and which doesn't go and that's what we talked about in the rules... fairness, uniformative, openness..."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Shea, I am going to respond again by saying that these two matters are now before the House, the messages have been properly read..."

Shea: "The messages is on Second Reading, how did they get..."

Speaker Telcser: "First Legislative Day. Representative Shea."

Shea: "How did they get on the order of Second Reading?"

Speaker Telcser: "Well, they are there... the.... because the supplemental Calendar was distributed as a proper..."

Shea: "Well, can you show me in the rules... how those Bills got to Second Reading, First Legislative Day."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the rules are a little unclear as to what the procedure is, following a Committee of the whole... whether there is a report made and it's there I would think to presume that there is a report made by the Committee of the whole, such report resulting in



those Bills that are eligible being on the order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day. I have been here for several years and I can't recall a Committee of the whole meeting on substantive Bills where they have not been referred to the order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day when we had that order and before that, referred to the order of Second Reading so, I really don't get the Gentlemans point... at all."

Speaker Telcser: "Before I call you, Jerry, I would to rule on your question and I would certainly rule that the Speaker... Chair would rule that, it does not take 89 votes to get a Bill out of the Committee of a whole. Now, which is your point? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, if it doesn't take 89 votes to put it on... and the Majority Leader, very cleverly used the word eligible Bills which I would like to have maybe, explained to me, who determines eligibilty. Again I go back to what you... we talked about openness, fairness, unformative... if the Chair will indicate to me that all the Bills would go to Second Reading then it makes much sense. But, the Chair seems to indicate that in some instances at the discretion of the Chair, the Bills will not be put on Second Reading. So, if the Majority Leader says that the rules are unclear... perhaps we ought to have a meeting of the Rules Committee and ask some clarity to that particular section of the rules."

Speaker Telcser: "Well.... the Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, we're doing pretty well around in circles, I would just... if the Gentleman would, if he can in his recollection down here are anyone who is a friend of his... can recall when there has been a Committee of a whole and the Bills from that Committee reported, have



not been on the order of Second Reading First Legislative Day. I wonder if he could do that."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Majority Leader, if you're telling me that the... all Bills that went to a Committee of as a whole that the Chairman of that Committee will report those Bills back, do it in a uniform manner and that all Bills so reported back... will go to Second Reading... I have no objections but, what I want to make sure, Mr. Majority Leader, that somebody doesn't sit there playing, shall we use the word 'hanky panky' or discretionary type gains where they decide... you know, it's this Bill and not that Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, let me assure the Gentleman that there will be absolutely no 'hanky panky'. Let me also point out that the two Bills that are the supplemental Calendar that the Gentleman is referring to, are Bills dealing with tax reliefs... each of them pretty well mutually exclusive both by Republicans indeed but... the Republicans haven't seen eye to eye in this Session and I would think that if there were going to be any 'hanky panky' or discrimination perhaps Representative Schlickman would have been discriminated against."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Majority Leader, could you use your good influences in powers to have a meeting of the Rules Committee, so that we might with clarity put out process right out in the open where we can all look at it and it can be scrutinized and then I think it would be cleared up rather than let it at wimmer capeice of whosever running the gravel."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, Representative Berman, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Berman: "A point of inquiry, Mr. Speaker..."



11.

Speaker Telcser: "State your point, Sir."

Berman: "Could the... could someone explain why House Bill 1, and Senate Bill 1, are shown on the Calendar but under Special Session I, for example, First Special Session... not of the Bills that we've considered are shown."

Speaker Telcser: "Part of that problem was, Representative Berman, as I understand it... there was so many Bills that the Clerks office, that they are working on now... well, Mr. Selcke, will tell you."

Clerk Selcke: "Well we don't have the report..."

Speaker Telcser: "On the First Special. There were twenty-one Bills there, weren't there?"

Clerk Selcke: "Well, the Clerk is still working on as far as I know, they had twenty-one Bills that they heard if you want to know why we got this one yesterday, we only had two Bills with only two witnesses. I don't know... if you want me to stay all night, I'll make her work all night and we'll get it for you. They like to rest to you know."

Berman: "What about the.... Fred... Fred... We don't want you to work all night but we would like a... to have some idea as to when the Bills that we had heard in the Committee of the whole, on all of these Special Session, will be on the Calendar."

Clerk Selcke: "Well, I presume that we should have the report today or in the morning and if they're in there if they come in today, we'll make another supplemental and if they come in tomorrow, we'll make a supplemental tomorrow."

Berman: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Shea: "Would it be proper to make a motion to recess this



Session for about a half an hour while we have a meeting of the Rules Committee, so we can get some authority on this situation."

Speaker Telcser: "Well, Representative Shea, a meeting of the rules would take a proper notice and posting and why don't you and Bill talk about it and we'll take it up a little later."

Shea: "Well, I think that we could get 89 Members out here to support that or I think that we could try. Because I think that most of the Members would like some clarity and fairness or the Speaker, I think could call a meeting of the Rules Committee, could he not?"

Speaker Telcser: "Representative William Walsh, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Walsh: "Well, let's take that under advisement, we've got a lot of work to do... really a lot of total veto motions some reduction veto, amendatory vetos... let's talk about this together and not take the time of everybody... Mr. Assistant Minority Leader, and let's at this time adjourn this Second Special Session so that we can... we'll be in this order... we'll be in the Second Special Session tomorrow."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Instead of adjourning it, might we recess it until we get some clarity with regards to where the Bills go, by the rules. If you withdraw these two Bills..."

Walsh: "Well of course, we'll handle... these two Bills will be withdrawn because they have been report as.... the procedure has been exactly the same as the procedure in every previous Committee of the whole. This is what happens. Now, I don't think you can deny that, now whatever questions you have, maybe we can sit down and talk about it without taking the time of everyone in the House. And, without taking valuable time from the



the other business that we have to do. We're going to be back on this order of business tomorrow, we can talk certainly now and tomorrow on this."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Majority Leader, will you just leave these Bills report back and not on a Calendar until such time as we have clarity or sir..."

Walsh: "I insist that we have clarity with respect to these two Bills, if there is some question in your mind as to other Bills and from what I get what you're saying, that is the question not really on these two Bills but on what happens to other Bills. Now, we can take that up... there is absolutely no question and I don't think there can be in your mind or anyone else's mind that the procedure followed with respect to these two Bills is correct."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Majority Leader, if you'll give me your word that the rest of the Bills will be treated exactly as these two Bills in the Special Session, I'll have no question at all about it, but all I want to do is make sure that these two Bills receive no special treatment or the other Bills are treated similar to these. Now, if you'll give me your word and I think that would suffice for every Member of this Chamber, that if you'll make a commitment as the Majority Leader, that all Bills will be treated like these two Bills. I think that's all we need."

Walsh: "Other substantive Bills will be treated as these two Bills have been treated. What I will assure you of is that we will do everything in accordance with the rules and if you want to get together and discuss your interpretation of the pliable rules, we'll be glad to do this as I say, I think we ought to get going."

Shea: "Would your good offices to ask the Speaker to call a meeting of the Rules Committee, so we may do it with



clarity."

Walsh: "I don't think a meeting of the Rules Committee is necessary and I don't think we have the time to have a meeting of the Rules Committee... at this time. I think that we can get together and talk this thing over and if it then appears that we need a meeting of the Rules Committee, then maybe we can have one... at this time I don't think it is appropriate."

Shea: "Well, Bill, I think from what you've said here, that you have given your... at least your moral commitment to the Members of this House that you will treat everything fairly and honestly and I think that's good enough for us."

Walsh: "Well, let me say that things as far as I'm concerned will be, what I have said is that everything will be treated in accordance with the rules that every substantive Bill will be treated in the same way that these two Bills have been treated."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, again Mr. Speaker, the Majority Leader... I know he is a man of honor and integrity, keeps fudging with the words all and eligible... you know, I get confused. I thought that the new posture of the House, the Speaker's press releases and all were open, honesty, frankness, clarity, no one man rule and all of a sudden I find ourselves when we get down to the nitty gritty of a special that we sit back with the one man rule again, determining who's going to move the Bills or not. And, Mr. Speaker, I don't think your that kind of a fellow, Art, and you know... here you are, I don't think you want to be super judge do you are or super judges assistant, we went through that it seems to me a couple of years ago."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Shea, your my friend and I



want you to know that."

Shea: "You're my friend, Art, but we're not in a friendship type of situation now."

Speaker Telcser: "Yes, we are. We are all working for the common good, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well good, if that's what we're working for... then I know that you'll treat everybody fairly and that you will move all Bills in accordance with the policy you've set on these two Bills."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, is there discussion, if not the Gentleman... Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Matijevich: "Like everybody else, I wasn't too alert here yesterday but, Mr. Speaker as a point of order because this relates to what the Speaker said about all Bills. In the Third Special Session on the RTA, House Bill, Second Reading... House Bill 38, is on Second Reading. Was that by agreement of everybody or how did that Bill get there?"

Speaker Telcser: "Fred will answer that, John."

Clerk Selcke: "Yesterday the motion was made to advance House Bill 38, to the order of Second Reading without reference to a Committee and it was so advanced."

Matijevich: "All right, I told you that I wasn't alert. My only comment to what's going on, Mr. Speaker, I don't know why the Majority Leader just can't specifically say all Bills, when he says all substantive Bills, were not sure that somebody is going to judge whether something substantive or not and I think that every Member of this House ought to have the same courtesy under our rules and that's what all the new rules have been about. I think that every Member, as long as we went into a Committee as a whole ought to be assured that his Bills is going to Second Reading. I don't think



we ought to have preference towards any Bills and I think that if we can't have that assurance by the Majority Leader... Mr. Majority Leader... Mr. Majority Leader, could we have the assurance that... and forget about all the other language... not all substantive Bills... all Bills will go on to Second Reading. That's what we want to hear from you, all Bills."

Walsh: "John, we've gone over and over this to a point..."

Matijevich: "No we..."

Walsh: "... and I would reply to you in the same way that I replied to Representative Shea, that we will operate strictly in accordance with the rules as we have operated this entire Session, beginning in January. That we will do, and that's the only assurance that I can give you or Representative Shea. Why don't we talk about it privately and get on with the business."

Matijevich: "We don't operate privately here, every thing we do is publicly... in the interest of the public. You've already said that the rules are not clear... as long as they are not clear, let's make them clear or give the assurance that all Bills... all Bills will be treated alike. All you have to do... Majority Leader, is a simple answer to this, will all Bills be... will all Bills go to Second Reading that have been heard in the Committee of the whole in all Special Sessions. That is a 'yes' or 'no', question. Can you answer that 'yes' or 'no'?"

Walsh: "Well, if you insist, 'yes' or 'no'."

Matijevich: "Can you answer that by a 'yes' or 'no'? And, I insist on that."

Walsh: "Again, we're going around in a circle... I can't answer it in any other way than the way that I have answered it before."

Matijevich: "You can answer it by a... that is a 'yes' or



'no' question. You can answer that by a 'yes' or 'no'."

Speaker Telcser: "Wait a second now, Representative Matijevich,

I think the conversation is getting a little irrelevant..."

Matijevich: "We are an Minority Party and we ought to have some assurances."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman has answered your question that.... the Bills will be referred according to the rules of the House and if there is need for a Rules Committee meeting at some point, he will seek a Rules Committee as the Minority Leader requested... or the Assistant Minority Leader, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well then, Mr. Speaker, I will object to these Bills going on the Calendar until there clarity and assurance to all Members of the House, that all Members will be treated the same way."

Speaker Telcser: "I'm sure that your objection will be noted in the Journal as you wish."

Shea: "Can I finish, please?"

Speaker Telcser: "Sure."

Shea: "I would object to any recess or adjournment of this Session until such time as this point is clarified because I can see it now... super judge and his assistant with a fast gavel is about getting ready to adjourn on a motion without a Roll Call or anything else. And, we... you know, I thought we had enough of the fast gavels before. So, until we get some assurance, I would like to recess this Session and leave this in abeyance today and then if the Majority Leader says that we can... you know, sit and chat if he wants to, I would rather do it publicly with a nice meeting... so, we can see where we go."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, Representative Shea, to what time do you want to recess this... what would your suggestion be, Sir? This evening... tonight?"



Shea: "I think that you and the Speaker, know the schedules for today... let's make it until 12 o'clock..."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Shea, your changing a schedule and we got continue to hold for the Third Special Session today, you want to recess it until tonight. Would be glad... you know, I..."

Shea: "Well, why don't we recess it, if you want to until the Third Special Session gets through and reports back as a Committee as a whole."

Speaker Telcser: "The Third Special Session this year is... a number of Bills that have to be heard on Committee of the whole. We've got thirty-four Bills, now do you want to come back tonight."

Shea: "What time is this Third Special Session set for, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Telcser: "Ten o'clock, Sir." It's on your Calendar."

Shea: "All right, why don't we adjourn from this one... or recess this one until 12 o'clock noon."

Speaker Telcser: "Well, no... because we're still going to be in the Third Special Session. You can't do that."

Shea: "We can interupe this..."

Speaker Telcser: "We'll do it at 8 o'clock tonight."

Shea: "If that's what you want to do..."

Speaker Telcser: "You want to do it."

Shea: "No, I'm asking to be..."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Shea, you want to do it..."

Shea: "No, I'm asking for it to be recessed... but you're making it inconvenient for the Members."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Shea, your point is really... not well taken and irrelevant now, I'm trying to accommodate you, Sir."

Shea: "All right..."

Speaker Telcser: "When do you want to recess it?"

Shea: "Let's make it until 5 o'clock."

Speaker Telcser: "Well, the feeling of the Chair, we're not



going to be done at 5 o'clock."

Shea: "Well, what time does the Chair feel that we're going to be done?"

Speaker Telcser: "6 or 7 o'clock this evening with the Committee of the whole."

Shea: "All right, why don't we make it at 6, Mr. Speaker, if you feel that we're going done..."

Speaker Telcser: "Oh, now wait a second... wait, the Clerk... Oh, wait a second.... the Clerk has just pointed out to me Jerry, that the Third Special Session... Committee of the whole Bills that are scheduled for two days, so I don't know when we'll get out of here. You want to recess this until the Third Special Session is over?"

Shea: "Today."

Speaker Telcser: "You know, when it's over... if it's over today, fine if it's over tomorrow... tomorrow but whenever it's over we will call for recess."

Shea: "Art, you confuse me. In other words, we will recess this one..."

Speaker Telcser: "Recess this one at your request until the Third Special, is completed."

Shea: "Arises today."

Speaker Telcser: "Well, until it arises... I can't predict when it is going to arise. If you want to inhibit the Members of the House from asking questions and making inquiry of witnesses as an important issue as RTA, I know that I don't and I don't think that you do."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, the procedure that has been followed up until now in the Special Sessions, has been the Chair has called them to order... formed the Committee... laid the Bills before the Committee, the Committee would arise and the Chairman of the Committee turn the gavel back to the Speaker and the Session would then be adjourned until the next day or a time certain. So, that if we could... we could recess this one until the Third



Special Session today, is adjourned and immediately upon the adjournment of the Third Special Session today, we could call this recessed Session back into being. By that time we could clarify of the rules on how the Bills are going to be advanced, could we not?"

Speaker Telcser: "Well, Jerry, I would sure like to accommodate your request... if you want to recess the Second Special Session... the only time to which we can logically recess it, because time is already running out on us for today's business... is when we carry the whole, arises in the Third Special Session and the Third Special Session adjourns we can then recess the Second Special Session to that time, whatever it may be."

Shea: "Well, I get confused but, if you want to put the Second Special off until tomorrow..."

Speaker Telcser: "No, I don't want to put it off, you want to put it off."

Shea: "I want get some clarity, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "Well, that's what Bill wants to do."

Shea: "Okay. I'm just going to ask a procedural question.

If we put it off until tomorrow, if we recess it until tomorrow, when we convene it tomorrow the Bills will be in the exact same spot that they are in today. It's a question of whether they will be on the Calendar or not and they will be in the order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day, when we convene the recessed Session tomorrow?"

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, how things is the Gentleman asking for. Is he asking that we recess this Session and meet following the important business of the Third Special Session?"

Shea: "That would be fine, Mr. Walsh, if we could do that."

Walsh: "I think that maybe we can do that..."

Speaker Telcser: "Would you say that again Bill, I didn't hear it."



Walsh: "Well, recess this Session until the Committee... until the Third Special Session adjourns today. Now, that would follow the Committee of the whole for the Third Special Session at which there are a great many witnesses that wish to be heard and it bring us late into the night. Now, if the Gentleman feels that that is necessary I have no objections to it."

Shea: "That's fine."

Speaker Telcser: "All right, okay..."

Shea: "Then your motion, Mr. Majority Leader would be to recess the Second Special Session today until the adjournment of the Third Special Session today and that these Bills that have been put on supplemental Calendar will be discussed at that point. Is that correct?"

Walsh: "Well, I have no idea what will be discussed at that... that's up to you, you're the wants to... who is asking for this procedure. Let me make this perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, that this motion is by request."

Shea: "Absolutely."

Speaker Telcser: "Well then, as I see it... the motion... that the request of the Minority.... Assistant Minority Leader is, that the Second Special Session do stand adjourn until... recessed until such time that the Third Special Session adjourns for the day, is that correct?"

Shea: "That's correct. Today."

Speaker Telcser: "Today. Representative Walsh, is that correct?"

Walsh: "That's my understanding."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, all in favor of the Gentlemans motion signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no' and the Second Special Session stands in recess until such time as the Third Special Session adjourns for the day. Okay, Fourth Special Session will now come to order, will the Members please be in their seats. The Gentleman from Cook,



Representative Walsh, asked leave of the attendance Roll Call of the Regular Session be used as the Fourth Session. All... are there any objections? Hearing none, the attendance Roll Call for the Fourth Special Session will be the same as the Regular Session this morning. Messages."

Clerk 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 adoption of the following Joint Resolution. House Joint Resolution #1, concurred in by the Senate October 31, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh, now moves that the Fourth Special Session do stand adjourn until the hour of 9:45 A.M. tomorrow morning. All in favor of the Gentlemans motion signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no' and the Fourth Special Session now stands adjourned. Now, the hour of 9:55 now having arrived the Regular Session which was in recess until this time will now come to order, will the Members please be in their seats. We're back into Regular Session and on the order of total veto motion appears Senate Bill 501, is Representative J.J. Wolf, on the floor? Representative Wolf... well if the seatmates will try to find him, today is the last day he can call that message... call that veto message. On the order of total veto motions... Jack, Representative Merlo on the floor? Representative Merlo... well you better find him, this is the last shot. I'm looking for J.J., and I told his seatmates to find him or... oh, here's Jack. Okay, total veto motion of Senate Bill 501. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 501 amends the Medical Practice Act by providing a method for Illinois residents who are graduates of a foreign



medical school to intern in Illinois hospitals. I think there was some misunderstanding about this when the Governor was advised to veto this message... veto this Bill and as you know the Illinois Medical Society supports this and I think most of you should have gotten a notice from them yesterday asking your support in overriding. Now do to a student capacity level of our Illinois medical schools a number of our residents have to go to foreign schools in order to become doctors. Now what's happened there are about 80 Illinois residents now going to school in Guadalajara, Mexico and in Mexico they require that in order to become a doctor you have to serve one year..."

Speaker Telcser: "One minute, Representative Wolf. Representative Kosinski, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, with respect to this House, this happens to be extremely important to a number of us, I wonder if we could have some order in this House?"

Wolf: "As I was saying the Illinois residents who are attending medical school in Guadalajara, Mexico, for example, in order to qualify for their M.D. have to serve for one year free of charge out in the boondocks. This is very unfair to American citizens and Illinois residents who are there, they don't get paid and what this does... it only applies to Illinois residents, I think that some might have thought that it applied to foreign medical students. This is not foreign students. These are Illinois students who happen to be going to a foreign medical school and will allow them to return to Illinois for their internship, thus creating a new avenue for our students who wish to practice medicine. This is good legislation and I would appreciate the 107 votes necessary."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."



Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's my personal feeling and it's the administrations feeling that in no way do we want to deny the opportunity of having more medical advise available and in no way do we want to penalize a resident of the State of Illinois who might have happened to think that some foreign university is more qualified to further his education in the field of medicine. So consequently, do the shortage of doctors, due to the shortage of personal in the medical field, I would say that I have no personal objection to Senate Bill 501 and I would encourage an affirmative vote in accordance with the wishes of Representative Wolf."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The question is shall Senate Bill 501 pass with the Constitutional 3/5 th's Majority, the Governor's veto notwithstanding. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and the opposed by voting 'no'. The Clerk will take a Moral Roll Call."

Clerk Selcke: "Alsup, Anderson, Arnell, Barnes, Barry, Beatty, Beaupre, Berman, Bluthardt, Borchers, Boyle, Bradley, Brandt, Brinkmeier, Brummet, Caldwell, Calvo, Campbell, Capparelli, Capuzi, Carter, Catania, Chapman, Choate, Clabaugh, Collins, Craig, Cunningham, D'Arco, Davis, Day, Deavers, Dee..."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Dee, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Dee: "To explain my vote on this matter."

Speaker Telcser: "Proceed, Sir."

Dee: "The 20th District has the largest Mexican population in the State of Illinois and we proudly support this measure and vote 'aye'."

Speaker Telcser: "Proceed with the Roll Call."

Clerk Selcke: "Deuster, DiPrima, Douglas, Duff, Ralph Dunn, R. L. Dunne, Dyer, Ebbesen, Epton, Ewell, Farley,



Fary, Fennessey, Fleck, Flinn, Friedland, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Gibbs, Giglio, Giorgi, Griesheimer, Grotberg, Hanahan, Harpstrite, Hart, Hill, Hirschfeld, Gene Hoffman, Ron Hoffman, Jimmy Holloway, R. Holloway, Dee Houlihan, J. Houlihan, Hudson, Hunsicker, Huskey, Hyde, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Dave Jones, Juckett, Katz, Keller, Kelly, Kempiners, Kennedy, Kent, Klosak, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Krause, Kriegsman, Kucharski, LaFleur, Lauer, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Lemke, Leon, Londrigan, Lundy, Macdonald, Madigan, Mahar, Mann, Maragos, Martin, Matijevich, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McClain, McCormick, McCourt, McGah, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, McPartlin, Merlo, Kenny Miller, Tom Miller, Molloy, Mugalian, Murphy, Nardulli, Neff, North, Palmer, Pappas, Patrick, Peters, Philip, Pierce, Polk, Porter, Randolph, Rayson, Redmond, Rigney, Rose, Ryan, Sangmeister, Schisler, Schlickman, Schneider, Schoeberlein, Schraeder, Sevcik, Sharp, Shea, Shurtz, Timmothy Simms, Ike Sims, Skinner, Soderstrom, Springer, Stedelin, Stiehl, Stone, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, Thompson, Tipsword, Totten, Tuerk, Von Boeckman, Waddell, Wall, R. Walsh, W. Walsh, Walters, Washburn, Washington, Williams, J.J. Wolf, B.B. Wolfe, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "On this question there are 133 'ayes' and no 'nays' and none answering 'present' and this motion having received the Constitutional 3/5 th's Majority is hereby declared adopted. Senate Bill 577, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Merlo."

Merlo: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 577, merely clarifies a provision of the Legislation passed in 1971, granting CTA employees the right to purchase private credit.... prior credit. The Governor's veto message alleges that the Bill covers private credit, this is not so... the Illinois Pension Laws



Commission is always opposed to private credit and to date has not changed this position. The Illinois Pension Laws Commission supported Senate Bill 577, as specifically notes that the credit under this Bill is for public not private pensions. In the Commissions judgment the Bill is satisfactory and should be approved. Therefore, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I respectfully ask for your support in sustaining the Senate's action overriding the Governor's veto and if there is no objections I would certainly like leave to have the last Roll Call."

Speaker Telcser: "Now, is there any objections? Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Can we ask questions now? I'm not certain to this. John, the... let's get down to practicals, the practical matters here. The Members of the CTA now have a public pension plan, is that correct? Now, the predecessor of the CTA was the Chicago Transit System, am I not right on that, it was a private system is that correct? Now, what you seek to do here is to allow these private service in the system to be credited towards the public service, am I correct on that?"

Merlo: "No, that is not so, Representative Palmer. The only credit that they would be allowed is the credit that they would have obtained as an employee of the CTA. Nothing prior to that, providing of course if they participate in the CTA pension fund. This would be the only credit that they would be entitled to."

Palmer: "They are not entitled to anything at all then... any rights under the private pension..."

Merlo: "This is correct."

Palmer: "Otherwise we're opening a door to a very serious thing."

Merlo: "Right. The Illinois Pension Laws Commission has



always opposed that and continues to do so. The same-thing like, if you were not participating... so you work for a municipality and you never participated in a fund of that certain municipality now you come in as a Member of the Legislature, you could not get credit for any services rendered to your municipality unless you had participated in one of those funds which they did not have at the time of your employment."

Palmer: "And it is a public fund."

Merlo: "That's correct."

Palmer: "Well now, did the Governor misunderstand this Bill when he veto it or what?"

Merlo: "I would say so because in his veto message he does alledge that...."

Palmer: "I've read the veto message and it seems to me that he has some point."

Merlo: "If it referred to private pensions which the Illinois Pension Laws Commission says it does not. Now, we do have to stand behind the Illinois Pension Laws Commission which is a creation of this very Body.... It is of their interpretation, I would think that... to proceed any others."

Palmer: "All right, your statement then is that it does not retroactive to include service under a private organization."

Merlo: "That's right.... that's correct."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman has asked leave for the last unanimous Roll Call... the Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

Choate: "I hear objections to the last unanimous Roll Call, Mr. Speaker, however I want to point out that after due consideration and study of Senate Bill 577, I think to be quite frank with you... there is still an error of this Bill that is not completely clear in many minds."



However, it's my feeling that if... if we do not sustain Representative Merlo's position along with other Members of the Pension Laws Commission, this morning that there is a possibility of denying certain benefits to people who might desire to come under the Act, between now and the spring Session. It's my feeling also that the Pension Laws Commission and the Executive Branch are going to consider this between now and the spring Session and if inequity exist that is being debated here this morning, that a proper remedial... language and Legislation can be enacted at that time. I'm going to vote with Representative Merlo."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion. Okay, the question is, shall... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, there is considerable doubt as to what this Bill does on this side of the aisle. I wonder if the Gentleman would agree to hold it until we go through some of the other matters... total and amendatory veto's and then come back to it."

Speaker Telcser: "You want to hold this?"

Merlo: "Yes, I'll hold it."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, we'll take it out of the records for now. On the order of total veto motions, Senate Bill 594. I understand that Representative Tuerk, is the Sponsor not Representative Day."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 594, was veto by the Governor on the basis that it was duplicative of House Bill 1491. This is really not the case... Senate Bill 594, sponsored in the Senate by Senator Sours, calls for a total referendum by the voters... on setting up the Peoria Civic Center Act. House Bill 1491, Sponsored by Representative Day and myself and others, including Representative Schraeder, on the other side of the aisle... calls for a referendum



of the floatation of general obligation bonds. It did provide for a non referendum stipulation on feed money... setting up a fund of three hundred thousand for getting the Peoria Civic Center Act off the ground. Now, the Senate Bill calls for a total referendum of all money and that's the reason why the Senate Sponsor help.... it was a superior Bill over the House Bill and therefore, I would move that we override the total veto of Senate Bill 594."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have heard on the floor of this House through the years many Members stand up and talk about duplication of work as far as various Committees and Commissions are concerned. We've heard and we have seen... various Legislative activities as far as reducing the number of Legislative Committees and Commissions, simply because we have felt that the more feasible answer could be found by doing that very thing and reducing Committees and Commissions. Now, as I read... as I read Senate Bill 594, I find that the Governor's message in his veto message as to my way of thinking, absolutely correct. I think that the things that need to be done under the application of Senate Bill 594, will be done under the provisions of House Bill 1491. I would therefore, sustain... I would therefore urge the Membership to sustain the Governor's veto message by attempting to put this in the hands of the provisions House Bill 1491, and avoid the duplication as far as the creation of more Committees are concerned. I would urge the Membership to vote 'no' on the motion to override."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Now, the



Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk to close."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Actually the duplication as was mentioned... is certainly not a duplication, the main thrust of both Bills is to set up a Civic Center Act for the city of Peoria, which is a good concept. I don't argue with either concept on the House Bill verses the Senate Bill, what I am saying here this morning is, that they are not duplicative in so far as the provisions of the Act because the Senate Bill calls for a total referendum for all monies in order to get the Civic Center Act off the ground. Now, as far as the city of Peoria, it can live with either Bill, however the Senator from that area and my area feel that there should be a total referendum for all the monies and I don't disagree with that concept, and therefore, I think the Governor had some bad advise when he vetoed this Bill totally and on the grounds that it was duplicative. Now, the concept of the Bill is, in a sense duplicative but the mechanism for getting the money for the Peoria Civic Center, is certainly not a duplication of effort and therefore, I would recommend to this House that we override the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 594."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further.... the question is, shall Senate Bill 594, pass? The Constitution of 3/5 th's majority, the Governor's veto not withstanding. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. The Clerk will take an oral Roll Call."

Clerk Selcke: "Alsup, Anderson, Arnell, Barnes, Barry, Beatty, Beaupre, Berman, Bluthardt, Borchers, Boyle, Bradley, Brandt, Brinkmeier, Brummet, Caldwell, Calvo, Campbell, Capparelli, Capuzi, Carter, Catania, Chapman, Choate, Clabaugh, Collins, Craig, Cunningham, D'Arco, Davis, Day, Deavers, Dee, Deuster, DiPrima, Douglas, Duff, Ralph



Dunn, R. L. Dunne, Dyer, Ebbesen, Epton, Ewell, Farley, Fary, Fennessey, Fleck, Flinn, Friedland, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Gibbs, Giglio, Giorgi, Griesheimer, Grotberg, Hanahan, Harpstrite, Hart, Hill, Hirschfeld, Gene Hoffman, Ron Hoffman, Jimmy Holloway, Robert Holloway, D. Houlihan, J. Houlihan, Hudson, Hunsicker, Huskey, Hyde, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Dave Jones, Juckett, Katz, Keller, Kelly, Kempiners, Kennedy, Kent, Klosak, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Krause, Kriegsman, Kucharski, LaFleur, Lauer, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Lemke, Leon, Londrigan, Lundy, Macdonald, Madigan, Mahar, Mann, Maragos, Martin, Matijevich, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McClain, McCormick, McCourt, McGah, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, McPartlin, Merlo, Kenny Miller, Tom Miller, Molloy, Mugalian, Murphy, Nardulli, Neff, North, Palmer, Pappas, Patrick, Peters, Philip, Pierce, Polk, Porter, Randolph, Rayson, Redmond, Rigney, Rose, Ryan, Sangmeister, Schisler, Schlickman, Schneider, Schoeberlein, Schraeder, Sevcik, Sharp, Shea, Shurtz, Tim Simms, Ike Sims, Skinner, Soderstrom, Springer, Stedelin, Stiehl, Stone, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, Thompson, Tipsword, Totten, Tuerk..."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Tuerk, for what purpose do you arise?"

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, I want to explain my vote. It seems almost incomprehensible how the people are voting 'no' on this issue can get up from time to time on referendum verses non referendum issues and scream about the fact that they don't give the people back in the area an opportunity to vote on an issue before you levey taxes. This Bill happens to give the people an opportunity to determine whether or not they want a Civic Center and levey a nickle tax for such purpose. The House Bill which we passed and has been passed over in the Senate, gives us an opportunity to provide the



mechanism for this Civic Center Act, but where the Bill differ is, that it gives the people the opportunity to give total referendum on total monies involved in setting up a Civic Center. And, that's why incomprehensible to me to understand how people... particularly those on the other side of the aisle can sustain the Governor's veto on this measure on the basis that it is a duplication. When it is not a duplication of Bills and therefore, I would recommend that they reconsider their vote on this issue."

Speaker Telcser: "Proceed with the Roll Call."

Clerk Selcke: "How did he vote?"

Speaker Telcser: "How did you vote Representative? He voted 'yes', I'm sure, it's his motion."

Clerk Selcke: "VonBoeckman, Waddell, Wall, R. Walsh, W. Walsh, Walters, Washburn, Washington, Williams, J.J. Wolf, B.B. Wolfe, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "Arnell, 'aye'. Representative Day, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Day: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Day: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Ralph Dunn, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Dunn: "I would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. Representative Tuerk, for what purpose do you rise?"

Tuerk: "Well, I hate to take the time of the House this morning but I would before the vote is announced... poll the absentees, please."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman wishes to poll the absentees, would the Clerk please read the names of the absentees and the Members be in their seats."

Clerk Selcke: "Anderson, Barnes, Beatty, Berman, Boyle,



Bradley, Brummet, Caldwell, Calvo, Capparelli, Carter, Catania, Chapman, Clabaugh, Craig, Cunningham, D'Arco, Davis, Dee, DiPrima, Duff, Epton, Farley, Fleck, Flinn, Garmisa, Getty, Giglio, Hanahan, Harpstrite, Hart, Gene Hoffman, Jimmy Holloway, R. Holloway, D. Houlihan, J. Houlihan, Huskey, Jacobs, Emil Jones, Keller, Kucharski, Leinenweber, Londrigan, Madigan, Mann, Maragos, Matijevich, McAuliffe, McCormick, McLendon, McPartlin, Merlo, Murphy, Nardulli, Pappas, Patrick, Philip, Polk, Redmond, Rose, Schlickman, Shea, Ike Sims, Springer, Taylor, Tipsword, Washington, Williams, B.B. Wolfe, Yourell."

Speaker Telcser: "On this question there are 75 'ayes', 33 'nays' and one ansering 'present' and the Gentleman's motion in respect to Senate Bill 594, fails. On the order of total veto motions appears Senate Bill 620. For which purpose does the Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Bradley is recognized."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I didn't want to move to Champaign... I'll stay in McLean."

Speaker Telcser: "I'm sorry, Sir."

Bradley: "That's alright. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to call your attention to Senate Bill 620, in the by-partisan sponsorship of this Legislation. The Bill was Sponsored in the Senate by a former Member of the House, Senator Bradley Glass, who is on the other side of the aisle from where sit and Brad and I, are co-chairman of the Urban Education Commission of where this Bill came from. But Senate Bill 620, is a Bill that will provide for distribution of State funds to local public educational units based on the added differential cost of occupational education programs compared to academic programs. The apportion borned by the State would be increased from



year to year until the State and Federal Funds pay the entire difference in fiscal year 1972... or 1976. The State has not increased its funds for vocational education... in the last three years and despite the lack of funding as we well know, vocational costs has risen and the State has encouraged new vocational education programs and as they resolve of our encouragement, there has been a dramatic increase in the enrollment of our vocational education programs. I submit to you for your consideration... in 1969, in our secondary schools we had a total of seventy-seven thousand vocational ed. students, in 1970, it arouse to four hundred and nineteen thousand students, in 1972, it rose to four hundred and seventy-nine thousand students. The plain fact is that the State support has dropped to 50% of what reimbursement requires it now threatens seriously to drop to a level so low as to cause the closing of many of our vocational education programs and this is exactly contrary to what should be happening. Many students as we well know... are not qualified or do not care to go to college and with the rising cost... of college education of vocational schools must continue to be in operation. We have a real opportunity to take a gaint step forward in vocational ed., in Illinois and I think that the mandate of the... of this General Assembly in 1969, in bring about our vocational schools as we know them today, we should now realize that we've got to fund those programs. There was an appropriation Bill. 621, that was defeated in the Senate on seven point two million, and that is about what we think the difference would be for this year between our academic programs in our vocational programs. I now move then, Mr. Speaker, that the House concur with the Senate in the passage of Senate Bill 620, over the veto of the Governor, not



withstanding. Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

Choate: "Okay, Fred, if you can get the electrician off of the telephone and running the switches... Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know that you're going to join with me when I say, that this is an extremely important piece of Legislation that we're considering under the officers of Senate Bill 620. I know that you're going to agree with me when I say, that the motions again could run rampant as far as the context of this Bill is concerned. I know that you would agree with me if you looked at my past records that there has been no one who sustains and supports vocational education more than my record will indicate through the years that I have been here. However, I want to point out that by paying the added differential cost of vocational education beyond... regular educational cost, the State would move to assume all cost... schools need only implement vocational education programs to receive this aid. In other words what we would do, is that we would place the whole thrust of the cost on the State. Now, it's the Administration feeling and it is my feeling that our educational picture is no different than other pictures when it comes to cutting administrative cost, when it comes to erasing duplication as far as administration is concerned... in other words what we need to do with vocational education... is that it should be... we should make it a part of the entire school aid formula. We should make it a part of the total educational package that we looked at in the State and I dare say that if we do this we will find reasoning, we will find ways and we will find the proper avenues to reduce duplication and to assure ourselves that the State is only going to assume its rightful cost



as far as these educational problems are concerned. I would also say to you, that I don't personally believe... I don't personally believe that by enacting this Bill today and overriding the Governor's veto, and we know that he took into consideration the very things that I've mentioned here today... that by overriding his veto, that we would be on the spur of the moment doing other things other than committing the State to somewhere between seven and eight million dollars. Now, I don't fine it today, I don't find it today within the realms of my thinking to throw another seven or eight million dollars on the shoulder of the State when we can have the superintendant of public instruction... when we can have the various task forces that are at work, when we can have the schools problem Commission studying this problem and coming back to the next Session of the General Assembly and doing what I have suggested. Give us an educational picture of the entire State of all phases... of all phases of education so that we can take a good close, hard look, so that we can make sure that the State only assumes its rightful duty as far as costs are concerned. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we do not vote to override, that we do not vote to override... that we wait until such time as all of these reports do come back and we have the educational problem where we can look at it as one total package."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative McGrew, for what purpose... Sam, the Gentleman from... Representative McGrew, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

McGrew: "Mr. Speaker, I was trying to get your attention to rise on a point of order. I have the appropriation Bill for the Department of Vocational Education, Rehabilitation, this time that included seventy-seven million dollars and I think this is a very important



Bill on its dispersement and I would just like to have a little bit of order in the House..."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? If not, the Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley to close."

Bradley: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I appreciate the remarks of the Minority Leader and I'm sure that he has supported vocational education in this General Assembly for many years, and that's one of the points that I would like to make... is that we have mandated... that we have vocational education programs in the State of Illinois and I think that it is time that we met our obligation to these schools and refund these programs in the State of Illinois. We added almost a hundred million dollars to the school formula last year... all we're asking for here if this Bill pass... if it does pass, next spring we'll probably have to put in a supplemental appropriation of about 7.2 million dollars to properly fund the program. As far as the school formula is concerned and I talked with the Chairman of the School Problem Commission, Representative Hoffman, he informs me that they are going to include into the formula... a special education they are going to plug the formula with the special education formula built into it so that the proper district will be funded where needed. Now, he... I did ask him if he would do this for vocational ed., he said, he would at least call the attention of the Commission and see if something couldn't be done along the same lines. But, as I said... from 1969 until 1972, we have added over four hundred thousand vocational students in our secondary schools and it is an expensive operation and it cost between the academic cost and a vocational cost, should be paid for by the State of Illinois and that what we will be starting and initiating



through the passage of 620, and so I again renew my motion to override the... or to concur with the Senate in the passage of Senate Bill 620.... the veto or the Governor not withstanding. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 620, pass? The Constitutional 3/5 th's majority, the Governor's veto now withstanding. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. The Clerk will take an oral Roll Call."

Clerk Selcke: "Alsup, Anderson, Arnell, Barnes, Barry, Beatty, Beaupre, Berman, Bluthardt, Borchers, Boyle, Bradley, Brändt, Brinkmeier, Brummet, Caldwell, Calvo, Campbell, Capparelli, Capuzi, Carter, Catania, Chapman, Choate, Clabaugh, Collins, Craig, Cunningham, D'Arco, Davis, Day, Deavers, Dee, Deuster, DiPrima, Douglas, Duff, Ralph Dunn, R. L. Dunne, Dyer, Ebbesen, Epton, Ewell, Farley, Fary, Fennessey, Fleck, Flinn, Friedland, Garmisa, Geo-Karis..."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise?"

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to speak... to explain my vote, we have an over abundants of college degrees and not enough vocational education training and certainly we're committed to it and we need it in this State and I urge everyone to vote with it."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Lady as voting 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "Getty, Gibbs, Giglio, Giorgi, Griesheimer, Grotberg, Hanahan, Harpstrite, Hart, Hill, Hirschfeld, Gene Hoffman, Ron Hoffman, Jimmy Holloway, R. Holloway, D. Houlihan, J. Houlihan, Hudson, Hunsicker, Huskey, Hyde, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Dave Jones, Juckett, Katz, Keller, Kelly, Kempiners, Kennedy, Klosak, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Krause, Kriegsman, Kucharski, LaFleur,



Lauer, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Lemke, Leon, Londrigan, Lundy, Macdonald, Madigan, Mahar, Mann, Maragos, Martin, Matijevich, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McClain, McCormick, McCourt, McGah, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, McPartlin, Merlo, Kenny Miller, Tom Miller, Molloy, Mugalian, Murphy, Nardulli, Neff, North, Palmer, Pappas, Patrick, Peters, Philip, Pierce, Polk, Porter, Randolph, Rayson, Redmond, Rigney, Rose, Ryan, Sangmeister, Schlisler, Schlickman, Schneider, Schoeberlein, Schraeder, Sevcik, Sharp, Shea, Shurtz, Tim Simms, Ike Sims, Skinner, Soderstrom, Springer, Stedelin, Stiehl, Stone, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, Thompson, Tipsword, Totten, Tuerk, Von Boeckman, Waddell, Wall, R. Walsh, W. Walsh, Walters, Washburn, Washington, Williams, J.J. Wolf, B.B. Wolfe, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "There is a lot of them down here, John. Representative Bradley, for what purpose do you rise? Sir?"

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I just going to call your attention... I think there are many Members who want to get on the Roll Call and when that's completed I would respectfully request a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, let's see what we've got. I think that if you want to get on the Roll Call... Fred, you want them to come down here don't you? Yes, come on up to the Clerk's desk..."

Clerk Selcke: "Okay, Molloy from 'aye' to 'present'."

Speaker Telcser: "Record Representative William Walsh, as voting 'aye', Mr. Clerk. Mr. Bradley, do you wish to poll the absentees?"

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I've checked with the Clerk and I know how many votes we have and we're a long way from being close to overriding and I hate to take the time of the House so I'm going to withdraw that motion,



if it was closer, we have 69 votes... we need 107, we're obviously a long way away... I withdraw that motion... I just don't think we have votes here today, so I won't take the time of the House."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, what is the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 74 'ayes', 11 'nays', 11 answering 'present' and the Gentlemans motion with respect to Senate Bill 620, failed. Okay... Representative Merlo, on the floor? Jack, what are you going to be... are you going to call yours again? Okay, Representative Bluthardt... now, Representative Bluthardt, informs me that Senate Bill 276, which is listed on the Calendar as amendatory veto motion, it was in fact filed as a total veto motion, is that right, Ed?"

Bluthardt: "That's correct."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, on the order of total veto motions appears Senate Bill 276, for which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bluthardt, is recognized."

Bluthardt: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 276, amends the Illinois Municipal Code to allow municipalities to provide ordinance for the appointment of chiefs of police and chiefs of the fire department by the Mayor by and with the consent of the City Council. This is an authority or a power exercised by the Mayors in City Councils since the time of the beginning of this State, it is a traditional power and it was felt that the right to exercise this was implicit in the law until about three years ago when the court decided that... no, that's not what the law is, it is necessary that appointments of a chief of a fire department or chief of police be made by the Police and Fire Commission and that any removal of those parties should be made after charges and a hearing before the Police and Fire Commission. This has imposed



41.

a tremendous hardship on Mayor's, City Councils throughout the State because these chiefs, these heads of these two most important departments should reflect the policies of the administration. It should be the right of the Mayor, with the consent of his Board... to make these appointments and if he finds that his chief is not following the policies of his administration if he's inapt, inefficient, then he ought to be removed. I think the Governor in his mandatory veto saw part of the picture when he said, yes, I'll permit the law to be amended to allow the appointment by the Mayor and City Council but, he cannot be discharged... he cannot be discharged unless there are charges pressed and hearings held before the Police and Fire Commission. I think erred here because I don't think he understands that in most instances a chief of a department holds a permanent rank... Civil Service in kind, of Captain and when a chief is removed he is not removed from the department, he is merely removed from the function as chief of that department and he reverts back to his permanent rank as captain. He cannot be removed from that rank as Captain except upon charges and for cause after a full and impartial hearing before the Fire and Police Commission. I am asking that we concur with the action of the Senate, that voted to override by a vote of 47 to 1. I think that it is necessary... if you are to ask your elected local officials to be responsible for the activities and the efficiency of their Fire Department or their Police Department, that you ought to empower that City Council and that Mayor to remove a person for inaptness or for other reason rather than just for some... after a full hearing. I would move to override the amendatory veto of the Governor."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative



Mahar."

Mahar: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

Would the Sponsor yield for one question?"

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates, he will."

Mahar: "Ed... does this affect Chapter... Section 5, of Chapter 24, that council of manager form of government?"

Bluthardt: "Where is this question coming from?"

Mahar: "Does this affect the council of manager form of government which allows the council of manager form of government by referendum for the city manager to still appoint the chief of police and fire chief as he has in the past?"

Bluthardt: "Well, no this Bill does not, it will take an additional Bill to cover that for you on the...."

Mahar: "In other words, this just takes it back on council forms... the way it was prior to the court discussion."

Bluthardt: "The way it was prior to the 1970, discussion. However, since then... there has been an additional discussion which rules the same way where appointments are made by city managers. A manager may not dismiss a chief of the fire or police department without a full hearing before the Police and Fire Commission. That's a recent... it's only about a year old and it will take additional Legislation to cover that."

Mahar: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson."

Rayson: "Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield for another question?"

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Rayson: "Sir, you mention this court decision that's that 'Musscata' case, if supreme court."

Bluthardt: "Well, there are two decisions... what did you call that first case?"



Rayson: "Well...."

Bluthardt: "The most recent case if 'Vonabetta' verses the City 'Musscata'."

Rayson: "Right, that's the case which held that a city manager... once an ordinance is established who hires a police chief, has no right to fire a police chief due to the fact that the statutes requires substance due process and have the hearing before the board of Police and Fire Commission, am I correct?"

Bluthardt: "You're correct."

Rayson: "All right, so in a sense the importance of overriding this Amendatory veto, is to restore the right of the city manager who has the right to hire, to restore his concommet power to the right to fire."

Bluthardt: "That unfortunately is not covered by this proposed Act. That is a more recent case and that case the city manager did exercise that authority. That is, he would appoint and he would remove."

Rayson: "Well...."

Bluthardt: "This Bill was designed merely to cover those municipalities not under city manager form or under the..."

Rayson: "Well, I understand that but I'm raising this point because I think it does cover that decision by reason of the... if the override the amendatory veto and put in that language... that article 5, applies or does not apply to that Section on the right of the Board to hold hearing for firing. In other words, does not.... if we override this veto... do we not have a situation where the city managers and then fire police chief... for cause."

Bluthardt: "We have a situation, my understanding is that it does not cover the city manager form of government. We have a situation of non city managers form of government and non Commission forms of government that by this Act,



would empower the Mayor and the City Council to dismiss a chief of police or chief of the fire department, without requiring a hearing before the Police and Fire Committee... or Commission."

Rayson: "Well, then your saying that whether we override this thing or not... the Bill doesn't really apply to the right of a city manager if an ordinance is established to fire a police chief on cause."

Bluthardt: "That's my understanding, yes."

Rayson: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I realize and I'm sure that the Sponsor of this motion would agree with me, that there is arguments that can be made on either side of this question. It happens to be one of those question where if a debate team was debating the merits of this Bill that I think that you could take either side and bring violent arguments as far as your team would be concerned. Now, I'm not confident in my mind that if we overrode here this morning that we would really be doing anything of an emergency nature that would apply to the smaller municipalities that would be applicable under the language of this Bill, the ones that do not have the home rule units of government. So, consequently I think that this is really a problem that needs to be resolved through a wee bit more study as far as the municipal problems Commission is concerned, as far as other Commissions who are studying at this time probably... this very problem. It says simply one thing, that the Mayor or City Manager or who ever are the council or the Board of Trustees of a village who ever does the appointment that the people who would be discharged then, would



have the right of a hearing that's no more than you have in your executive branch of government to a certain degree today, because although you have the right of appointment in many instances you still then have a right if you're discharged for a hearing under the officers of the Civil Service Commission or under the officers of the Personnel Code. So, consequently I would suggest that we defeat this motion this morning that we take it up in the next Regular Session of the General Assembly which technically starts in January and attempt to resolve this question once and for all. So, I would suggest that we defeat the motion for the override."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? If not, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bluthardt, to close."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, all I want to say is, gee thanks Clyde... but there is an emergency, you do have local elections coming up next year, you also have new administrations who have the authority to chose their own leaders, chose their own chief and not be tied down by those of the Police and Fire Commissions. When we talk about executives giving fair hearings on the dismissal of appointee, let me point out... I don't recall any fair hearing or any hearing at all being given to Don Adams, when he was removed from the Liquor Control Board or did I hear of any hearings given to Mr. Johnson when he was removed from the Liquor Control Board or have I heard of hearings given to Al Plicer when he was removed as Director of the Vocational Rehabilitation. Nobody questions the power of the chief executive to replace those that he wishes to replace with or without cause, I can't understand why that chief executive now would take this authority away from Mayor's who act in their executive capacity and say, you can not... you



can not remove an inapt chief of police, you can only remove him for cause and you know how difficult it is to remove any member who is covered by Civil Service or by Fire and Police Commission Act. There has to be hearings... you have to hire lawyers, it disrupts the entire community. It's much better for the community it's much better a good competent administration to have harmony on the police department, on the fire department... and to have the head of that department reflect the policies of that administration. I'm only asking that you return these powers to your city council to your village boards... let that Mayor... let that city council select those whom they want to head their department. Don't tie their hands and remember again, as I mentioned earlier, these men do hold permanent ranks when they are discharged... the chiefs... they go back to their permanent ranks. They cannot be removed from that permanent rank without a full hearing and only for cause after a hearing before the Police or Fire Commission. I would ask you to join me and join the Senate in my motion to override."

Speaker Telcser: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 276. The Constitutional 3/5 th's majority... the Governors veto notwithstanding. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Okay, the Clerk says, please sing out loud and clear because he wants to pick up the pace of the Roll Call if he can get away with it."

Clerk Selcke: "Alsup, Anderson, Arnell, Barnes, Barry, Beatty, Beaupre, Berman, Bluthardt, Borchers, Boyle, Bradley, Brandt, Brinkmeier, Brummet, Caldwell, Calvo, Campbell, Capparelli, Capuzi, Cater, Catania, Chapman, Choate, Clabaugh, Collins, Craig, Cunningham, D'Arco, Davis, Day..."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Day, for what purpose do



you rise, Sir?"

Day: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my vote. I think that we ought to take a real hard look at this matter because... with the emphasis that there is today, on local government, I think that if we're going hold the Mayor and the City Council responsible for the administration of police matters at the local level, we've got to give them authority to appoint heads of departments who will carry out their policy. Now, I can't imagine the problem that they would have in a big city like Chicago... if Mayor Daly, had to have a hearing.... an extended hearing in order to fire chief Connelly. This just simply not practical and when it comes to department heads... policy setting matters... it seems to me that it's just good government and good policy to give the elected official the right to appoint those who they see as qualified and capable of carrying out their policies and I vote 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "Deavers, Dee, Deuster, DiPrima, Douglas, Duff, Ralph Dunn, R.L. Dunne, Dyer, Ebbesen, Epton, Ewell, Farley, Fary, Fennessey, Fleck, Flinn, Friedland, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Gibbs, Giglio, Giorgi, Griesheimer, Grotberg, Hanahan, Harpstrite, Hart, Hill, Hirschfeld, Gene Hoffman, Ron Hoffman, Jimmy Holloway, Robert Holloway, D. Houlihan, J. Houlihan, Hudson, Hunsicker, Huskey, Hyde, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Dave Jones, Juckett, Katz, Keller, Kelly, Kempiners, Kennedy, Klosak, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Krause, Kriegsman, Kucharski, LeFleur, Lauer, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Lemke, Leon, Londrigan, Lundy, Macdonald, Madigan, Mahar, Mann, Maragos, Marting Matijevich, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McClain, McCormick, McCourt, McGah, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, McPartlin, Merlo, Kenny Miller, Tom Miller, Molloy, Mugalian, Murphy, Nardulli, Neff,



North, Palmer, Pappas, Patrick, Peters, Philip, Pierce, Polk, Porter, Randolph, Rayson, Redmond, Rigney, Rose, Ryan, Sangmeister, Schisler, Schlickman, Schneider, Schoeberlein, Schraeder, Sevick, Sharp, Shea, Shurtz, Timmy Simms, Ike Sims, Skinner, Soderstrom, Springer, Stedelin, Stiehl, Stone, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, Thompson, Tipsword, Totten, Tuerk, Von Boeckman, Waddell, Wall, R. Walsh, W. Walsh, Walters, Washburn, Washington, Williams, J.J. Wolf, B.B. Wolfe, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "Speaker, votes 'aye'. And record Representative Duff and Geo-Karis, as voting 'aye'. Now, what's easier Fred, for me to give you the names or have them come here? Okay, they'll get you... come on up here to the Clerk's desk.... Get Duff and Geo-Karis, as 'aye'. Record Representative Sangmeister, as voting 'aye'. Mr. Sangmeister, 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "Patrick, 'aye'."

Speaker Telcser: "While the Clerk is tallying up the results I would like to welcome a former colleague of ours standing in back of the Chambers... a good friend, a long time colleague former Mayor of Pekin, the honorable Norman Shade. Norm, do you want to say something to the Members?"

Clerk Selcke: "Timothy Simms... Sharp, 'aye'."

Speaker Telcser: "Any other Members wished to be recorded? On this question there are 92 'ayes',... Representative Bluthardt, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Bluthardt: "I moving around... soliciting. I would ask that you poll the absentees."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman has asked for a poll of the absentees. Will the Members please be in their seats and the Clerk will read the names of the absentees."

Clerk Selcke: "Anderson, now wait a minute, that wasn't..."



Speaker Telcser: "Now wait a second, now... someone just answered the Roll Call for Representative Anderson, will he rise and wave his hand if he wants to vote 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "If they want to imitate M.K., be sure to talk like him."

Speaker Telcser: "Boy, it even sounds like him...."

Clerk Selcke: "Barnes, Beatty, Berman, Boyle, Bradley, Brandt, Brinkmeier, Calvo, Capparelli, Carter, Catania, Chapman, Clabaugh, Davis, Craig, Dee, Ebbesen..."

Speaker Telcser: "Record Representative Ebbesen, as voting 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "Epton, Ewell, Farley, Fennessey, Flinn, Friedland, Garmisa, Giorgi, Hanahan, Harpstrite, Hill, Gene Hoffman, D. Houlihan, J. Houlihan, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Keller, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leon, Londrigan, Lundy, Macdonald, Madigan, Mann, Maragos, Martin, McCormick, McPartlin, Mugalian, Murphy, Pappas, Pierce, Porter, Redmond, Rose, Schisler, Schlickman, Shea, Springer, Stone, Taylor, Thompson, Tip sword..."

Speaker Telcser: "Record Representative Thompson, as voting 'aye'. Porter, 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "Von Boeckman, Walters..."

Speaker Telcser: "Record Representative Walters, as voting 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "B.B. Wolfe, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Merlo, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Merlo: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Telcser: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Merlo: "Okay."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay."

Clerk Selcke: "What?"



Speaker Telcser: "He said, okay, leave it the way that it is. Representative Huskey, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Huskey: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Telcser: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Yourell, wants to know how he is recorded, Yourell."

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'."

Representative Lundy, wants to know how he's recorded."

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Lundy: "Please vote me 'no'."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Any other inquiries of this Roll Call?"

Clerk Selcke: "Miss Martin, you are recorded as not voting."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Schisler, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Telcser: "How is Representative Schisler, recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Schisler: "Please record me as voting 'no'."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Representative Dee, for what purpose do you rise, Sir? Did you seek recognition, Sir?"

Clerk Selcke: "You want to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Telcser: "Record Representative Dee, as voting 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "What did Lundy, say... he wanted to vote 'no'?"

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Ryan, for what purpose do you rise?"

Ryan: "How am I recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative McAvoyn, record Representative



McAvoy, as voting 'aye'... is that right? McAvoy, 'aye'. Representative Barry, for what purpose do you rise?"

Barry: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Telcser: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Barry: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "How is... record Representative Jack Hill, 'no'. Record Brinkmeier, as 'no'. Mr. Clerk... how is Representative Hirschfeld, recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Telcser: "Are there any other inquiries of the Roll Call or change of votes.... or whatever? Last call... While the Clerk is making his final tally and changes, are there any other people who want to vote or what have you.... then let's have it, Fred. On the question there are 105 'ayes', 18 'nays'... Representative Bluthardt, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Bluthardt: "I think maybe the machine broke down, could we take another Roll. I would ask a postponed consideration, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, the Gentleman has ask for postponed consideration... as today is the last day you have... okay, Ed.... today will be your last day."

Bluthardt: "Why don't... maybe, you know..."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, all right..."

Bluthardt: "I would like to have maybe, Representative Jacobs, has some experience along this line... I wonder if he would..."

Speaker Telcser: "Two more Members get a little religion and.... Okay, Representative Choate, for what purpose do you rise?"

Choate: "I think we've kind of lenient here this morning, in fact we haven't done a whole lot except kill a little



time, why don't we just let him go along with his postponed consideration..."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, you're right..."

Choate: "... do something else."

Speaker Telcser: "All right, this question referring to order of post... Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "I'm serious when I ask, would you recognize Representative Jacobs, please?"

Speaker Telcser: "I'm sorry, Representative Jacobs, for what purpose do rise, Sir?"

Jacobs: "Mr. Speaker, is it too late for me to explain my vote?"

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Choate, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Jacobs: "It has a bearing on the case."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, Representative Choate, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Choate: "Mr. Speaker, now I'm serious about this matter... now we've been real lenient, I realize that Representative Jacobs, wants to explain his vote but I also realize he has already voted. The motion has been made to postpone, I concur in that motion... let's postpone it and go on about some things and then, you'll always get your next shot."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, Representative Kucharski, do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Kucharski: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Telcser: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Kucharski: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Telcser: "Record him as voting 'aye'. This question there are 106 'ayes', 18 'nays'... you asked for postponed consideration, I'm sorry. The Gentleman has asked for postponed consideration. Representative Bluthardt, for what purpose do you rise?"



Bluthardt: "I was wondering, am I recorded?"

Speaker Telcser: "Well, Representative Choate, for what purpose do you rise?"

Choate: "Now, there is an end to all patiences... so, I'll just tell you know, if we don't proceed with the postponement which I have agreed for you to do, that I will make a motion to verify the Roll Call. So, I would suggest that we proceed with the motion to postpone..."

Bluthardt: "I thought that I had made that motion."

Choate: "Well, okay let's do it."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, placed on the postponed consideration.

On the order of reduction veto motions appears Senate Bill 698, for which purpose the Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen, is recognized."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 698, reduction veto motion... I'll make this just as brief as possible it's realitive to the Junior College appropriation and if the House overrides the Governor's... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you hit that again, please, Mr. Speaker. This... Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an extremely important attempt to override the Governor's veto, I would appreciate your..."

Speaker Telcser: "All right, will the Members please be in their seats and the Chair has noted that there are a number of people on the floor who are not authorized to be on the floor... I understand that you're waiting for the Committee of the whole but the noise level is distrubing the work which we can't accomplish this morning.... so, those of you who are not entitled to the floor, if you would retire to seats in the rear of the gallery or out in the corridor, would help reduce that noise level. Now, will the Members please be in their seats."

Ebbesen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the House does override



the Governor's reduction veto of Senate Bill 698, the Illinois of public community colleges will have an appropriation of sixty-three thousand..... sixty-three million, eight hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars for fiscal year of '74. Now, this means that that would be based on a eighteen dollar and fifty cent per semester hour for a hundred and fifteen thousand full time equivalent student. Now, this flat rate grant level has been supported by the community colleges trustees association and keep in mind that the General Assembly voted 46 to nothing in the Senate on this eighteen, fifty flat rate and the House voted 163 to nothing during the spring Session. Now, also when the Governor reduced the rates from eighteen fifty, to seventeen, sixty-one.... the Attorney General has rendered an opinion that he has the right to reduce the appropriation but not to change that rate. Now, if an override of the Governor's reduction veto fails, the community colleges are faced with a loss of four million, one hundred and twenty-seven thousand dollars. I would encourage everyone to support this override because the Junior Colleges enrollments throughout this State has increased... comparing '73 to '72, in the summer months... some 11% in and also in the fall enrollment an increase of 8%, if we do not have this override, I'm certain that we're going to be faced in the spring of the year with a deficiency in appropriation and I just think that this is a terrible way in which to have to run our important community colleges... Junior Colleges. I would encourage a favorable vote for this override."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would hope... I would hope that we could



listen attentively to some of the things, at least... that I want to point out this morning as far as the community colleges are concerned. And, let me preface my remarks by simply saying, that I doubt very much if there is a single Member of this Legislature that has more numerically speaking, more junior colleges in their district than I do. There is no Member of this General Assembly that took a greater interest in the formation of the junior college system than I have in my ten years in this Legislature. But, let me bring some very salient facts to the attention of you, Membership and I want you to listen closely. According to the most recent cost studies for baccalaureate programs that the Illinois Community Colleges are 15%, more expensive than the similar programs at the lower division of Senior Universities. For 1971, and '72, cost per student was eleven hundred and sixty-four dollars at Senior Universities and thirteen hundred and fifty dollars at Community Colleges. In addition a Board of Bureau of the budget survey of community colleges cost in other States as displayed in the economic and fiscal commission report, which is composed of Members of this House and Senate of the Illinois Junior College System, indicates the cost per full time students in Illinois exceeded reported cost in all other State participating, including California, Connecticut, Florida and Iowa. Now, we're attempting to operate to the best of our ability on a tight budget. I know and you know, that it is popular today to say, well we should not curtail the cost of education in this State. I have at half end and will continue to be in the forefront as far as our Junior College System is concerned... but, we must be aware at all times of the affects of all phases of State government on the taxpayers



pocketbooks and when unbasis surveys are carried on to the extent that they compare our educational system in this instance, the Junior College System, with our senior places of higher education such as your Senior Universities and yes, in comparison to other states similar to the State of Illinois and our cost per student and our cost for Universities and what have you, exceeds all other peoples in this area, then we must take a good close hard look at what the administrators of our junior college systems are doing and if you will look at the veto, you will find that some of it comes out of administration cost. I have the figure here if you want to look at it, I for one do not believe... I for one do not believe that the suggested cuts here today are going to curtail one iota, of the educational opportunities and possibilities afforded under our program. I for one do not believe that it is physically going to hurt the growth, the operation and yes, the teaching in a single one of our Junior College System. I think that this suggested cut is in the interest of the taxpayer and I say to you today, to look at the statistic look at the findings of these unbasis Boards look at the cost of operation of our Community and Junior College System compared to others, throughout our fifty States and you will find that this suggested cut is in the interest of the taxpayer of the State of Illinois. I would suggest that we do not... I would suggest that we do not substain the motion to override, I would suggest that we that we vote 'no' and I would suggest as I suggested earlier, that this General Assembly and this Executive Branch of government is going to take... have to take in the future, a closer, tighter long range look at all phases of education in this State to the extent that we will know why the taxpayers dollars is



being spent in the manner in which it is, and in this instance is being spent at a greater cost per student than other similar institutions."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have tried to reframe from speaking in the Special Session but, the distinguished Minority Leader always seems to get to me one way or another. It is very interesting... very interesting to hear the Minority Leader support the Governor's veto on this matter. I would suggest to the Members of the Assembly... if the former Governor, who I think was a much better administrator, was still the Governor of this State and had veto this particular Bill, you would hear that side of the aisle doing everything they could to override the veto. At least, I'm consistent I voted override in both instances, when Governor Ogilvie was Governor and of course when the current Gentleman occupies the House. Now, I wish that Representative Choate, had sat in the Higher Education Committee and heard the pleas of the junior college and I believe then, that even though he believes himself personally... he would understand that there is a crying need for eighteen dollars and fifty cents per student. What has happened in this General Assembly in the past year and a half, is that we developed a very sadly mistaken sense of priority. The welfare budget with the sufficiency appropriations is going to be a billion seven hundred million dollars, higher education is getting a very small piece of the pie and frankly, if we spent more money in educating students we would have fewer people on welfare later. It's not hard to understand.... I might point out to the distinguished Minority Leader, that junior colleges are ex-



pensive per student than higher education, the simple matter is, junior colleges are spending much of their time in the area of vocational training and vocational training because of the equipment it must use, is necessarily more expensive than the first two years of the higher education system. And, frankly... once again when we look at the welfare situation in the State of Illinois, I think that it behooves us to spend more time in the area of vocational training having set on Higher Education Committee for some three years now, it seems to me that the future of higher education in the State of Illinois is exactly what we're talking about today and that's the junior college system. I don't care how hard you fought for junior colleges in the past, you can't go around patting yourself on the back for putting a junior college system in the State of Illinois if you are not willing to fund it. And, I must say in watching Governor Walker, parade through this State during his campaign and promise higher education... that he would support them, that I'm personally not only disenchanted but completely dissatisfied with his performance to date, I do not believe that the Governor supports education or higher education and I think that it is a disgrace... that the type of money that is being appropriated by the Governor's Office this year in higher education and I hope we do vote to override this particular veto."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Choate, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Choate: "Well, in as much... and I think it is the first time in my history that I have availed myself of the privilege of this particular rule of the House, but in as much as my name was only used by title but was used specifically I do think that I do want to make a very short and



brief reply to my learned friend..."

Speaker Telcser: "State your point, Sir."

Choate: "... somewhere east of here. Now, in the first place when he was referring to the program... let's not confuse the facts. I did not... mention the vocational training programs that he mentioned, I was talking about the baccalaureate programs and he knows it. Now... when he talks about the present administration traveling through the State as far as higher education is concerned, only two points that I want to make.... and when he said that the former Governor should be here, as the administrator and that he wouldn't have done something of this nature, let me bring out one little bittry point for his information that he has evidently overlooked and forgot, because I want to site to him that the seventeen and sixty-one flat rate grant is still effective and I'm going to site to him, Governor Ogilvie's simular veto action in House Bill 1676, 1677, in 1971. I think that takes care of that little question. And the third little answer is simply this, that the Board of Higher Education supports... supports the Executive reduction that we're talking about in Senate Bill 698, and the Higher Board of Higher Education has recommended the seventeen dollars and sixty-one cent rate."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. While the distinguish Minority Leader is on his feet he may as well stay there... the point has already been made that the Governor's projection with respect to enrollment in junior colleges is all wrong, there has been a substantial increase instead of a slight decrease as they projected. But, let me tell



how the two principal characters as far as we're concerned, in this matter... conducted themselves a short time ago with respect to this very question. And it it's publication of the American Association of Universities Professors, Governor Walker, said in response to the question, do you believe that the State has an obligation to fund public community college operations at 50% level. As I understand it, the State did make assurances to many local districts that it would fund 50% of the operating cost of junior colleges in the State, although they have not done so to date. I think that we should move in the direction of 50% funding, not only to help the junior colleges but also to relieve pressure on the local property tax. Governor Ogilvie, apparently does not feel the same obligation... although the State had appropriated nineteen dollars per semester hour for junior college support in the 1971, '72, school year and I add here, that this was substantially more in the 1972, '73, school year, it was about what we're at now despite the tremendous increases in revenue. College support the 1971, '72, school year, Ogilvie, used his line item veto to cut back to fifteen, fifty per semester hour. And, now that we have the Governor firmly committed to do that which he did not do in one other instance and of course if we were to detail all of the instances in which the Governor said one thing and did another, we'd be here indeed until christmas and we would never get out for lunch. Now, let me point out what the distinguish Minority Leader had to say on a fly around, I suppose it was a fly around... it's a press statement in any case. He says, we propose action to help the State make good on two promises to local taxpayers by increasing the State aid grant from fifteen fifty to nineteen dollars, the State will move closer to the



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

50% funding commitment, the increase funds will relieve the local tax dollar bring the measure of relief to hard press property tax roll and at this time, Mr. Speaker, I think we all ought to fight back a tear... sufficient as the initiative will be however, it still will not provide full 50% funding, average semester hour cost are forty to forty-five dollars so, the distinguished Minority Leader joins with the Governor in wanting to provide 50% funding and it indeed says, that the nineteen dollars that he avocates is short of what it should be. Now, two years later he is back here and saying something absolutely contrary and I point out to you Mr. Speaker, that the public is generally concerned with credibility in government, credibility from the local government all the way up to the national government and I think that the Minority Leader and the Governor do nothing to help the credibility in State government with they take the position that they are taking on this Bill and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and urge you... the Members to forget about what the Minority Leader said now and what the Governor did on this Bill and restore this amount, it's the fair equabile thing to do."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Minority Leader needs no desent from me because he has a demonstrated capacity to bamboozle this House without parallel in the history of it. But, everyone is right once in a while and though the Minority Leader has been tragically wrong week on highways and this morning on Senate Bill 620, he is right in this particular instances. I always feel a little bit uneasy when I find myself in the same position of the Minority



Leader but to thy own self be true and in this particular instance everyone who has examined the facts objectively must conclude that like the blind sow, he stumbled upon an acorn and he is right in this instance. Now, I don't want to quarrel, I don't want to quarrel with the distinguished Representative from Champaign, who incidentally who is my candidate to oppose Senator Stevendon, but he couldn't be wronger in this issue if tried... all that would be accomplished by perpetuating the Bill as originally passed would be that the rich get richer and the poor gets poorer. Most of the junior colleges throughout the State of Illinois are not dependant for life sustenance upon the flat grant rates but on a factor called equalization so, those of you who would be friends of education at the junior college level be it reassured that you are not attacking education by supporting the Governor's position. Happily in this instance you can support the Governor, earn some brownie points in the black book that he keeps of his friends and at the same time strike a good lick for junior colleges. I am very proud to recommend that you vote with the Governor, this one time only."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."

Katz: "... mentioned to the distinguished Majority Leader who believes that we should have a rational consideration of all of these competing demands that we created the Board of Higher Education, that we are not really in a position to know all of the details of all of these State Universities and all of the Junior Colleges... that we have this Board that is suppose to consider the realative priorities and needs in the field of education. The Board of Higher Education has recommended that the Governor's position be sustained... that is good enough



for me and I'm going to vote to sustain the Governor's veto and like Roscoe Cunningham, I also think I'm a friend of education."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "There is one thing sufficient about all three people who are supporting the Governor's position on this issue... that is, eight they don't have a junior college or they are part of the Southern Illinois rip-off plan on equalization for junior colleges. Back in the last week... back in the last week of the General Assembly, the Regular Session, I had an Amendment that would have given every junior college in this State an extra sixty-four cents a credit hour by transferring two million dollars that goes predominantly to those colleges that are south of a east west line, one hundred miles north of Cairo, Illinois as much as four hundred thousand dollars per student, it would redistribute to the other junior colleges in this State. Now, that Amendment failed because the... shall I say the defection of some Chicago Democrats, it almost passed, now the Chicago Democrats who have been reading the papers this morning will realize that the Cook... that the Chicago Junior College System is raising its tuition from zero to five dollars per credit hour and part of the reason is, is that that Amendment didn't pass. Now, this is another flat rate distribution of funds which will help all but eleven junior college districts in this State and those eleven junior college districts are largely represented by the first two negative speakers. Now, I think we ought to look at self interest in this thing and self interest says we ought to vote 'yes', incidentally three junior colleges campuses in my district and five junior college districts... I have five, I don't know about you."



Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Logan, Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the distinguish Minority Leader and the remarks of the Gentleman from Cook, are probably the most cogent arguement I know of, to vote in favor of an override. They fight the recommendation of the Board of Higher Education, and when we talk about credibility, I would like to point out Mr. Speaker, that of all of the institutions of government that have lost creditibility, the Board of Higher Education probably stands preambtant. I have been in position to watch that Board go from a distinguished institution of higher education and this is not through any single administration, it has nothing to do with the current administration... but I have seen it become nothing more than an arm, a political arm of the Governor's office. It as a case that BHE, no longer has creditibility with regards to master planning at higher education in this State. It is a case rather, Mr. Speaker, that the individual college boards are now going to have to fight their own fight and recognize that the funding that this State has as an obligation under a Constitutional mandate, will not come except as it is politically expediant if we allow BHE, to speak. I strongly recommend that you vote for this motion to override the veto."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Maragos." Did you want recognition, Representative Maragos?"

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

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no' and Representative Ebbesen, to close."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.



I think enough has been said, about this particular attempt to override and I certainly would encourage everyone to search their soul carefully and cast a 'yes' vote in favor this override. Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question here, this takes but 89 votes is that correct?"

Speaker Telcser: "89 votes, correct."

Ebbesen: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "The question is, shall the appropriation be restore to Senate Bill 698, all in favor of the Gentlemans motion signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. It will take 89 votes and the Clerk will call the Roll."

Clerk Selcke: "Aldup,..."

Speaker Telcser: "Wait a second, Representative Choate, for what purpose do you rise?... Representative Shea."

Shea: "What takes 89 votes, Sir?"

Speaker Telcser: "To restore the appropriation."

Shea: "It is an item reduction being restored."

Speaker Telcser: "Right."

Shea: "There is another portion of that that the Chair has previously ruled, the Amendment reducing the hourly flat rate from eighteen fifty, to seventeen, sixty-one an hour, doesn't that take 107 votes to change?"

Speaker Telcser: "Lets see his motion, Fred. Well, Representative Shea, we have an opinion from the Attorney General.... is this the date, November 6?... we received last month, which indicate such as this... 89 votes would be required to restore the appropriation reduction and the point which you put relative to the other part, as it were, of the motion or veto... would be included in the 89 votes."

Shea: "Well, the..."

Speaker Telcser: "And, I'm following the Attorney Generals opinion."



Shea: "No, I don't think that's what the Attorney General's opinion says, Mr. Speaker. What the Attorney General's opinion attempts to say, is that a chief legal officer of the State... he's saying that the action of the Governor, was not legal and I'm not so sure that the statement by the Attorney General saying that the Governor's veto power was limited in some form or fashion as binding on this House. If so, then perhaps the Attorney General will start writing the rules for us. But, we are treating a Bill that had two things happen to it, the Governor reduced the appropriation by some four million dollars and then he changed eighteen dollars and fifty cents to seventeen dollars and sixty-one cents and the Session before this, when Governor Ogilvie, did that with Bills that Miss Chapman handled it was the ruling of the Chair at that time, that it took 107 votes to change that. Now, I would respectfully urge the Chair to rule the same way it has previously and require 107 votes to restore this Bill to the position it was when it passed both Houses."

Speaker Telcser: "Well, Representative Shea, as both of us well know... we have been on very very new ground in the last two or three years and because of the new State Constitution, and as I indicated when you first put your inquiry... we had just received the opinion from the Attorney General, within the last thirty days, as I understand. Now, of course we're constrained in the Chair's opinion to make ruling within the framework of the Attorney General's opinion, as opinion as they relate to matters coming before this Body. The motion which is before us today, is an item of reduction of veto which the Governor sent back to the Legislator, he in fact did not send back an amendatory veto which would have a substance of dealing with... as you term



second part of the Legislation. So, because of those facts and those constrained ruling which we have with the Attorney General, the Chair would persist into... this question would take 89 votes prior rulings which you elude to, now withstanding... simply because they were made, one in the absents of Attorney General opinion...."

Shea: "Might I ask the Chair this, would they read the motion put by the Gentleman, please."

Speaker Telcser: "Would the Clerk read the motion, please."

Clerk Selcke: "Motion... I move that the item on page 2, line 1 through 7, in Senate Bill 698, be restored. The item reduction of the Governor of the contrary notwithstanding."

Shea: "Is it then the opinion of the Chair, that the item reductions are the only part of this motion and that the Gentleman does not wish to change the flat grant rate from seventeen sixty-one to eighteen fifty and if this is the Gentlemans motion, might I ask... if the total dollars are restored are we then bound by the seventeen sixty-one and hour?"

Speaker Telcser: "Well, Representative Shea, the Chair is in no position to look behind the record as it were as to what the thoughts are of the Gentleman who has put the motion. So, the Chair would not of course even attempt to answer the sustenance of the question you are currently putting."

Shea: "Well, I think that it become critical at this juncture because as you know these debates are now being recorded and speedily typed and we may get this one next year, I'm informed about this time."

Speaker Telcser: "Well, Representative Shea, as I indicated I would not try and go behind the record as it were as to what Representative Ebbesen, wishes.... well, to do in his mind however, I would once again elude to the



Attorney Generals opinion which in my judgment would... should be... which would mandate that should the reduction be restored and since the Governor has not in his message dealt with an amendatory veto, that's the larger dollar amount in the original Bill would of course be funded with the increased appropriation should be restored."

Shea: "But, Mr. Speaker, I... when you talk that the Governor has not dealt with an amendatory veto, that if you look at page 2, line 5, where it says flat grant rates the Governor changed that from eighteen fifty and hour to seventeen sixty-one an hour which is amendatory veto, now if the Gentleman motion is, as I understand it... read by the Clerk, the motion is to restore dollar amount but not to change the seventeen sixty-one so that, as I understand it... by voting on this we would vote to return the dollar amounts to the original appropriation and leave the seventeen sixty-one stand as the amount per hour to be reimbursed to the Junior Colleges."

Speaker Telcser: "Well, Representative Shea, as I indicated earlier we are on very new grounds because of our new Constitution and once again I can simply say that, had the Governor wanted to make those substantively changes which you just eluted to, they should have been made with an amendatory veto..."

Shea: "But, he did make out an amendatory veto..."

Speaker Telcser: "No, he made a reduction of the Bill..."

Shea: "No, I think if the parliamentarian...."

Speaker Telcser: "And, that is the substance of the difference which I'm striding based on the Attorney Generals opinion and based on that, I would make that ruling and perhaps this would be a case for further interperatation by the court.... I don't know."



Shea: "Might I ask the Sponsor of the motion if he would explain to me... for the purposes of this Legislative record, how we treat the fact that we return the dollars to the amount appropriation passed but we can only pay seventeen sixty-one an hour, not eighteen fifty an hour."

Speaker Telcser: "All right, the Gentleman indicates that he will be happy to yield to your question."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The motion is, to restore the total amount of the appropriation and in the opinion of the Attorney General that it's an illegal act to reduce the flat rate from eighteen fifty to seventeen sixty-one, this is the same motion that was filed over in the Senate."

Shea: "Well, my question is, the Attorney General may have thought that the amendatory veto was not illegal act but assume for a minute a court... if by chance there is a court case filed on this by some interested citizen, if the language of the Bill was such that you have returned the dollar amount which I think your motion goes to, and yet you don't attempt to change the seventeen sixty-one back to eighteen fifty in a court that it was a proper amendatory veto then we're stuck with the seventeen sixty-one an hour, is that correct?"

Ebbesen: "Well, I think we should let the court resolve that problem. My motion is for restoration of the four million, one hundred twenty-seven thousand dollars."

Shea: "In other words your motion goes to restoring the appropriation it does not touch upon the amendatory veto as the Governor reducing the dollar amount, is that correct?"

Ebbesen: "If that's your interpretation... the motion would be interpreted by someone... Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "Yes."

Ebbesen: "One point I would like to make here, is all this



discussion really in order... the motion I think is... well it is the same motion that pasted out of the Senate, voted favorably and came over to the House as an override, I don't... is this questioning in order... challenging the..."

Speaker Telcser: "Well, if you do not wish to yield any further to questions, the Chair believes that it has made its ruling and proceed with the...."

Shea: "The ruling of the Chair, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, is that the Gentlemans motion goes to restore the appropriation to the original amount and is being treated as an item reduction and there is no mention with regards to the amendatory veto of the seventeen sixty-one an hour from eighteen fifty."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Shea, the ruling of the Chair is, that the matter before us now is the item reduction veto which is contained in the Gentlemans motion... the question of the sustance of the so much per hour in the Bill, whatever that may be... is not a relevant question for the Chair to even address itself to. Representative Shea."

Shea: "In other words, we're... as I understand your ruling Mr. Speaker, is all that we have before us is restoring the item of reduction and the amendatory veto in the reduction of the hourly amount is not before us now."

Speaker Telcser: "Well, there is.... amendatory veto, Jerry, we have an item reduction veto with which we are dealing with."

Shea: "But, we're not dealing with the change in the seventeen sixty-one to the eighteen fifty. That's not part of this motion... because if it is part of it, you've got to rule..."

Speaker Telcser: "Whatever is in the motion is all that we're dealing with, Representative Shea, and we are neither dealing...."



Shea: "Well, the motion only goes direct...."

Speaker Telcser: "We're not directly dealing with the substance to which you elude..."

Shea: "That fine..."

Speaker Telcser: "Whether the increase will have an indirect effect... that may be determined at some future date."

Shea: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, Representative Ebbesen, do you wish to..."

Clerk Selcke: "Anderson, Arnell, Barnes, Barry, Beatty...."

Speaker Telcser: "One second, Representative Barry, for what purpose do you rise?"

Barry: "To explain my vote. Now, we've heard what the Board of Higher Education wants and it's awful easy to spend money that may not be available but in order to set my own mind straight on this vote, because it is important. We created a Junior College System that we want to work and the fact is, that our Commission, our Economic and Fiscal Commission has determined that in many instances that money is wasted, we know that our constituents don't like paying more and more property tax, to run those Junior Colleges and they look to us to supply the money. Now, I decided the only way I could determine my vote on this, is to talk to one or more... Presidents of the Junior Boards in my area. Last week-end I was able to talk to one of those fellows and he said, very honestly we don't need more than nineteen dollars, we'll take all we can get generally but very honestly, in the area that I live in and the area that's served by Junior College, the President tells me, he really doesn't need the money and he would take whatever he could get and certainly it doesn't need to exceed nineteen dollars, so for that reason I vote 'no'."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'."



Clerk Selcke: "Recognize Alsup."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Alsup, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Alsup: "Well, it appears to me now that if we vote to increase the money but can't spend it..."

Speaker Telcser: "No, that's not the case, Sir."

Alsup: "There is some discussion about this... I want to change my vote from 'aye' to 'present', I don't want..."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Beaupre, Berman, Bluthardt, Borchers, Boyle, Bradley..."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Bradley, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Bradley: "I would like to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "Proceed, Sir."

Bradley: "This is a very difficult vote for me to cast in light of the fact that I had a Bill earlier today that addressed itself to the vocational training and the elementary and secondary education in this State. However, it has been said on the floor that the Junior Colleges are committed to vocational training... well actually we have only... out of the two hundred and ten thousand students in Junior Colleges, a total of fifty-five thousand in vocation which is only 26% of the total enrollment in our Junior Colleges that are actually involved in vocational education. We have some seventy thousand in the baccalaureate curriculum which is about 33%, and the rest are in general studies generally leans towards the baccalaureate curriculum also. So, we have a very small percentage of those students who are in the vocational training and that's what Junior Colleges were initially set up for and I heard that time after time, on the floor of this House for the past five years, that this is what they should be doing. They are not doing that, if they were I would



be supporting this Legislation to pay them for the job that they are suppose to do, they simply don't do it. In fact what I think they are doing... is eroding the effectness of our Senior Institutions in the State of Illinois and I think that it is very evident if you would look at the enrollment of our Senior Colleges throughout this State, with the exception of Institution... the enrollment has dropped dramatically at all of the rest of our Senior Institutions and I believe this is a result of our Junior Colleges getting into a curriculum area that they shouldn't be in and they are not supposed to be in. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly vote 'no' on this proposition.

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'."

Clerk Selcke: "Brandt, Brinkmeier, Brummet, Caldwell, Calvo, Campbell, Capparelli, Capuzi, Carter, Catania, Chapman, Choate, Clabaugh, Collins, Craig, Cunningham, D'Arco, Davis, Day, Deavers, Dee, Deuster, DiPrima, Douglas, Duff..."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Duff, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my vote."

Speaker Telcser: "Proceed, Sir."

Duff: "This year, my district and a number of other districts have forced to join Junior College District. We had two referendums in my district... against it, and yet this august Body saw fit to force us to agree that we all should spend lots of money on Junior College Districts and now a happy member of a Junior College District, I would like to spend some money on it, so I will vote 'aye'."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. Mr. Clerk, record Representative Duff, as voting 'aye', and proceed with the Roll Call."

Clerk Selcke: "Ralph Dunn, R.L. Dunne, Dyer..."



Speaker Telcser: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief... but as Chairman of Higher Education Committee, I feel that I should point out a couple of things. Several speakers both pro and con, have pointed out that at the moment... right now when many of the Senior Institutions are losing enrollment or enrollments are leveling off, the enrollment in the Community Colleges is rising. Obviously they are meeting our needs, they're doing something right. Now, we have two points... for those of you fail to vote 'yes' on this, you're doing two things... one, your thought of throwing a burden back on your local property taxpayer because of a certain cost that must be met to educating students. And, secondly... no one has mention the fact that in the enabling Legislation that set up the Community College System, we mandated that a certain percentage of the curriculum be devoted to career education, vocational courses. Now, if you vote 'no' on this, you're in a position of having mandated local district to preform a duty under State law and then you're not giving the money to do the job. I think that would be a cop-out and I'm very proud to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Telcser: "Would you record the Lady as voting 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "Ebbesen, Epton, Ewell..."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, it's true that there are a great number of colleges in my area and district which might benefit from the passage or the overriding of the Governor's veto on this Bill. However, those who live by the sword... die by the sword, those who live by the dollar will die by the dollar and I suggest to you that we cannot take the moral import



of saying that if we do not raise the money, we don't want to vote to raise... we cannot vote to spend for these sources. I do not believe that either the Junior Colleges, the Senior Colleges, the Elementary Education the road for any other fascist of our State government is a sacred idol which cannot be cut down to size. And, I say if we want to be responsible we must ignore... the feasibility of always being popular... always voting for those things which in our district, might be best in terms of turning a bolt or two, but against the general welfare of the State and I think that we ought to stick with the Governor on this and unless we're willing to get out and as they say, raise the taxes, then we'd better be a little leery as to how we spend the money. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'."

Clerk Selcke: "Farley, Fary, Fennessey, Fleck, Flinn, Friedland, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Gibbs, Giglio, Giorgi, Griesheimer, Grotberg, Hanahan, Harpstrite, Hart, Hill, Hirschfeld..."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't want to get engaged in the great repartee with the distinguished Minority Leader but, I do find it very amusing that he has injected the subject of Board of Higher Education recommendations into this particular discussion. Now, if there was one fault that the Board of Higher Education had under the last Republican administration... it was that it was almost completely under the thumb of the Bureau of the Budget which meant of course it was under the thumb of the Republicans. It wasn't bad enough... now the current Governor has moved the Board of Education



out of... Board of Higher Education out of Chicago and down to Springfield, where he can keep a little better control on it. I'm not surprised frankly that the Board of Higher Education would support the Governor, so far as I'm concerned the Board of Higher Education and the Governor are one and the same person. I oppose the Board of Higher Education in the last Session, I oppose them in this Session and I think we are doing a great disservice to the young people who want vocational training, if we do not vote to override this veto."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "Gene Hoffman, Ron Hoffman, Jimmy Holloway, R. Holloway, D. Houlihan, J. Houlihan, Hudson, Hunalcker, Huskey, Hyde, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Dave Jones, Juckett..."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Juckett."

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It would appear that Democratic administration now in power... had move love for those who do not want safe roads, that do not want a good mass-transit system, that do not want special education, they do not want vocational education and especially do not want a good viable Junior College System and he has told all his Democrat colleagues that they have got to support his veto's in order that they will be able to give a lousy ten bucks to each of the residents of the State of Illinois to encourage the Governor bid for the Presidency in '76. I think that we ought to face the problems of Illinois in '73 and '74, rather than looking on to the Democrat mavricks and his appeal to the nation in '76... and we've got to go with our Junior Education our Junior Colleges, our Community Colleges, my own particular Community College recives less than 30% State



support and its enrollment is rising all the time. So, we give a vast amount of money to our Senior Colleges and their enrollment is going down, so forget about the political nature... forget about the bread and circuses, Dandy Dan's, ten dollar to every resident of Illinois and let's help the kids who are trying to help themselves. Let's give them a chance and vote 'aye'."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "Katz, Keller, Kelly, Kempiners, Kennedy, Kent, Klosak, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Krause, Kriegsman, Kucharski, LaFleur, Lauer, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Lemke, Leon, Londrigan, Lundy, Macdonald, Madigan, Mahar, Mann, Maragos, Martin, Matijevich, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McClain..."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative McClain, for what purpose do rise, Sir?"

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, if I can take the time of the House for a second... Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I really cannot vote for this piece of Legislation... Adams County, right now... where I come from we do not have a Junior College District. It would increase the charge back to our real estate owners and I... can not support this piece of Legislation, I vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Mr. Clerk, record Representative McClain, as voting 'no' and proceed with the Roll Call."

Clerk Selcke: "McCormich, McCourt, McGah, McGrew..."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative McGrew, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

McGrew: "Mr. Speaker, I briefly would like to explain my vote. As one of the Representatives from the distinguished State of Forgotonia..... Forgotonia University, commonly known as Western... but... higher education that



is at this time funded at the lowest rate of any State Institution in the State of Illinois and does not have any projected future any better for funding. The same institution that is now educating students at the lowest cost for the taxpayers... overall, I think the money is much more need there and I'm more than happy to vote 'no'."

Clerk Selcek: "McLendon, McMaster, McPartlin, Merlo, Kenny Miller, Tom Miller, Molloy, Mugalian, Murphy, Nardulli, Neff, North, Palmer, Papas, Patrick, Peters...."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Peters, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Peters: "To explain my vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "Proceed, Sir."

Peters: "The Colleges in the City of Chicago have now raised their tuition to five dollars per hour. The students by enlarge who attend these colleges are those in the lowest income family, we talk on one end about tax help to low income families, we talk about a ten dollar return in terms of the income tax... to low income families and on the other end we sit by while tuitions are being raised which end up hurting every poor family who has a son or a daughter attending the Junior College System in the City of Chicago. I think we are highly inconsistant in what we're doing here... we are playing with the futures of cities, we are playing with a... with a solution to the problems we ought to be developing here in terms of vocational education, special education, preparing people for jobs... to met the rightful place in society and I think it is a horrible price that we are paying here in terms of not approving these pieces of Legislation, all have been named as Representative Juckett, indicated... a ten dollar return of somebody. I'm happy to vote 'aye' for the people of my district for the people in the City of Chicago in terms of a



decent educational system for those families who can not end up affording the univeristy tuition."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "Philip, Pierce, Polk, Porter, Randolph, Rayson, Redmond, Rigney, Rose, Ryan, Sangmeister, Schisler, Schlickman, Schneider, Schoeberlein, Schraeder, Sevcik, Sharp, Shea, Shurtz..."

Speaker Telcser: "Pardon me, Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Shea: "Well, I want to explain my 'no' vote. Seeing how we haven't raised what we can pay for an hour and... but we're trying to increase the money... it doesn't make any sense to me so, I'm going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'."

Clerk Selcke: "Timothy Simms, Ike Sims, Skinner..."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Skinner, for what purpose do you rise?"

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind the Body that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget yesterday, said that we had a hundred and ten million dollars to spend...we haven't spent any of it yet, this is only four million dollars and we weren't even counting the lottery. I think we have here a Roll Call that those who are voting 'aye' can take around the State and speak very favorably to student audiences on and I think those people for instance, those in Lake County who are voting 'no' should realize that the Lake County Junior College Board just raised the tuition by one dollar per credit hour and I wonder how they are going to explain why they didn't vote for a Bill that would roll back that tuition by ninety-one cents. I hope that they will invite me over when they are invited to appear before the College of Lake County and I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "Soderstrom, Springer, Stedelin, Stiehl, Stone,



Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, Thompson, Tipsword, Totten, Tuerk Von Boeckman, Waddell, Wall, R. Walsh, W. Walsh, Walters, Washburn, Washington, Williams, J.J. Wolf, B.B. Wolfe, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, votes 'aye'. Representative Brinkmeier, record Representative Brinkmeier, as voting 'aye'. Husky, 'aye'. How is Representative Hanahan, recorded Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Speaker Telcser: "Record... Representative Hanahan, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Hanahan: "I would like to explain my vote because I..."

Speaker Telcser: "Proceed, Sir."

Hanahan: "Two years ago when Governor Ogilvie, did almost identical the action that Governor Walker did, there is only one Republican Member that had the guts to vote against Governor Ogilvie's, amendatory veto... reduction veto and to day it's coming home to roost, I don't like to make a partison issue out of the fact that we vote for or against an issue in this amendatory Session basis on who's for who. I'm going to vote 'yes' on this measure but not because I don't agree with Governor Walker on other issues but because this issue is what some Republicans pointed out, is for the future of our children. But, I don't like to hear some Republicans say... that all of a sudden it's a good time to vote against the Fiscal and Economic Commission recommendation, the Bureau of the Budget recommendations or the anticipated revenue recommendation of this State in the future, just for the exercise of voting for or against a political personality. I think that we ought to be a little truer to ourselves, I know there are a lot of Democrats here that in their hearts should be voting 'aye' but I also know they're a lot



of Republicans that if they were constance to what they did two years ago, would be voting 'no'. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'.

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

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, I hate to take the time of the House but if the Roll call is comeplete, I would like to have a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay... let's see what we've got now... 78 votes right now... There are currently 78 'aye' votes, the Gentleman has asked for poll of the absentees and will the Members please be in their seats and will the Clerk, please read the names of the absentees. 79, right now."

Clerk Selcke: "Anderson, Boyle, Brummet, Calvo, Capparelli, Carter, Clabaugh, Collins, Craig, D'Arco, Davis, Deavers, Dee, DiPrima, Epton, Farley, Fennessey, Fleck, Flinn, Friedland, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Gene Hoffman, Ron Hoffman, R. Holloway, Hudson, Hyde, Emil Jones, Keller, Kennedy, Klosak, Dosinski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Lemke, Londrigan, Madigan, Maragos, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McCormick, McLendon, McPartlin, Merlo, Nardulli, Palmer, Pappas, Patrick, Randolph, Rose, Sangmeister, Sevcik, Sharp, Ike Sims, Stedelin, Stone, Taylor, Thompson, Tipword, Totten, Wall, R. Walsh, Walters, J.J. Wolf, B.B. Wolfe, Yourell."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to put this on postponed consideration."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman has asked leave for postponed consideration. He has that right, and this matter is put on order of postponed consideration. At



this moment, let's take a break in the proceedings this morning and... would Representative Kempiners, come to the podium and introduce to the Members of the House... some distinguished constituents from his district."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this morning we passed House Resolution 81, which honored Miss Paula Ann Dunn, who has been elected 'Miss Teenage, Aurora'. Miss Dunn, will participate on November 24th, in the Miss Teenage America contest in Fort Worth, Texas, and before some of the Lady Members of Legislature get upset, I think that I should tell you some of the qualifications that this young lady possess in addition to her good looks. She is a Senior at Napleville Senior High School and a member of the Spanish Club and of the American Foreign Students Club. She is treasurer of the Senior Council and get this... rank first in a class of seventeen hundred and sixty-eight, which I think is a great honor. She is a student of Joanne School of Charm and Modeling in Aurora, and without further ado, I would like to introduce Miss Paula Ann Dunn, from the district represented by Al Schoeberlein, Jack Hill and myself."

Paula Dunn: "Honest farming made history, Gentelman are the tapes on... because if they aren't my mother brought a set with her. I'm not here to throw any Springfield ethics at you, but I am here to tell you about youth involvement in government. If we are to preserve our American Heritage, teenagers as well as adults must become involved. Until recently teenagers have been a part of vocal majority, they were just voices among many... now, just instead of being vocally involved they are becoming actively involved. Young people are assisting in shelter workshops, some are working on



local youth juries and others... to others ecology is their thing. Although I can't speak for all teenagers, most of them feel an obligation to become involved in government, I can insure you... young people are concerned about politics. Napleville Central High School students are becoming more involved in the campaign, one of our teachers, Representative Glenn Schneider, can probably tell you what a positive effect teenagers can have on a campaign. I'm truly thrilled with the opportunity to speak before you but more importantly, let me thank you on the behalf of all the teenagers of our State for providing us with a new voice in government, we won't let you down. Thank you."

Kempiners: "I would also like to introduce Paula's parents to you, they are Mr. and Mrs. Norman Dunn, from Napleville, Illinois."

Speaker Telcser: "All right, let us... the amendatory veto's Senate Bill 699, who is the... is there some action to be taken on that? No motion filed on 699. Representative Merlo... Fred, Representative Choate says there is a motion filed. Mr. Clerk, has there a motion... I'll tell you what... you want to go to Jack Merlo's motion? No... there are only two matters left as I see it... Representative Merlo's.... Okay, on the order of total veto motions appears Senate Bill 577, for which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Merlo, is recognized."

Merlo: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. At the request of Senator Sam Romano, a twenty year member of the Illinois Pension Laws Commission, I would like to proceed with Senate Bill 577. It amends the Act governing municipal employees annuity and benefit... Chicago, it clarifies its provisions with respect to a former employee of the CPA. The Bill would give the employee the



right to purchase credit when he was an employee of the CTA, and would give this credit over to the Pension Fund that he now participates in, which is the municipal annuity and benefits fund. The Governor's veto alleges that the Bill covers private practice but I can assure you this is not so. The Illinois Pension Laws Commission supported the Bill and specifically notes that the credit under the Bill is for public not private pension. I would like to read the report of the Illinois Pension Laws Commission and the report goes as follows; the Bill attempts to clarify the provisions of the law with respect to the pension credits in the aforesaid funds for service rendered for the Chicago Transit Authority. The proposal is clarifying in character and it is intended to more explicitly define certain pension credits accrued to a City of Chicago employee while employed for an instrumentality of the city. In the Commission's judgment the Bill is satisfactory and is approved. This Bill on the override received a vote of 43 to 3, in the Senate and Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House... I respectfully ask your support in sustaining the Senate action overriding the Governor's veto of Senate Bill 577."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Juckett."

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Juckett: "How many employees are affected?"

Merlo: "Bob, it was told to me that it would affect ten to twelve employees."

Juckett: "Now, these are employees who were previously employed by the CTA, who are now working for the City."

Merlo: "That's correct, Bob."

Juckett: "And, does it have a cut-off date when these employees are eligible?"

Merlo: "No, the credit can only be given... since the inception



of the CTA, which I think was in 1945 or '46."

Juckett: "Okay, so this would... even though it affects only ten to twelve employees now, this could affect many employees in the future if they switch from the CTA to the city."

Merlo: "If they have had employment with the CTA, since its inception and have gone over to the city, yes. Since its inception though, Bob."

Juckett: "In other words, they had to be an employee of the CTA..."

Merlo: "Right."

Juckett: "... when CTA began."

Merlo: "And, I might a step futher Bob, and tell you that they must have ten years of service and at least five year with the City of Chicago before they can attempt to get this credit."

Juckett: "Okay, now you indicated that there were no private..."

Merlo: "That's correct."

Juckett: "... employees affected."

Merlo: "Right. Correct."

Juckett: "Is there some sort of discrimination between public employees and private employees?"

Merlo: "Well, I would say so... as I say, the Pension Laws Commission has always taken this position. Even if you were... a former municipality employee but did not participate in any fund of that municipality, you could not get credit if you then became a member of the General Assembly... basically because you never participated in a fund, you see. You would only get credit for the fund that you participated in...."

Juckett: "Are there any other funds which have this reciprocity with the City of Chicago?"

Merlo: "I believe there are many, I think the Master of Chancery was one... I can't recall but..."

Juckett: "With the City of Chicago?"



Merlo: "This is correct, were they have been given credit, yes."

Juckett: "Would this affect..."

Merlo: "Are you saying, can they transfer State... for instance, if they were firemen and became policemen..."

Juckett: "And, then became an employee of the City of Chicago."

Merlo: "Sure."

Juckett: "It is transferable?"

Merlo: "Absolutely... sure, if they participated in a fund."

Juckett: "Are they under the same conditions?"

Merlo: "Under the same conditions."

Juckett: "The ten years."

Merlo: "That's correct."

Juckett: "And, then five years... how does this affect the Chairman of the CTA?"

Merlo: "I have no idea."

Juckett: "Now, he just made the reverse switch. He went from the city to the CTA."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, is there further discussion? Does the Gentleman wish to close the debate?"

Merlo: "Mr. Speaker, if I'm in order I would ask leave of the last unanimous Roll Call."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman has asked leave for the last unanimous Roll Call, are there any objections? There are objections, Jack. Nice try."

Clerk Selcke: "Alsop, Anderson, Arnell, Barnes, Barry, Beatty, Beaupre, Berman, Bluthardt, Borchers, Boyle, Bradley, Brandt, Brinkmeier, Brummet, Caldwell, Calvo, Campbell, Capparelli, Capuzi, Carter, Catania, Chapman, Choate, Clabaugh, Collins, Craig, Cunningham, D'Arco, Davis, Day, Deavers, Dee, Deuster, DiPrima, Douglas, Duff, Ralph Dunn, R.L. Dunne, Dyer, Ebbesen, Epton, Ewell, Farley, Fary, Fennessey, Fleck, Flinn, Friedland, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Gibbs, Giglio, Giorgi, Griesheimer, Grotberg, Hanahan, Harpstrite, Hart, Hill,



Hirschfeld, Gene Hoffman, Ron Hoffman, Jimmy Holloway, Robert Holloway, D. Houlihan, J. Houlihan, Hudson, Hunsicker, Huskey, Hyde, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Dave Jones, Juckett, Katz, Keller, Kelly, Kempiners, Kennedy, Kent, Klosak, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Krause, Kriegsman, Kucharski, LaFleur, Lauer, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Lemke, Leon..."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Leon, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Leon: "I would like to explain my vote please."

Speaker Telcser: "Proceed."

Leon: "It seems rather ridiculous for us not to give the municipal employees the option of transferring to another municipal body their pension rights when recipient agreements have been made. The Pension Laws Commission has recommended this Bill, I feel that those of you who are not voting on this measure should reconsider and give an affirmative vote. I vote 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "Londrigan, Lundy, Macdonald, Madigan, Mahar, Mann, Maragos, Martin, Matijevich, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McClain, McCormick, McCourt, McGah, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, McPartlin, Merlo..."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Merlo, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Merlo: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain my vote and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and I don't mean... any disrespect to any Member. But, you know I was just recently appointed as a Member of the Illinois Pension Laws Commission, it seems ridiculous that we should function as a Commission and it might be taken into consideration the future... that I personally think that we ought to do away with the Commission completely. We are absolutely defying the creditability of the Pension Laws Commission which has members such as



Rubin Comb, from the Illinois University... Peter Barret, Noble Lee... Gentleman like that, I think that it brings discredit to their reputation because every one of these Bills, Ladies and Gentlemen are scrutinized and approved by the members of that Commission. And... not to support them, I think is embarrassing to them and a slap in the face for them and I just say, I don't say this in disrespect but I think that it is wrong. And, I vote 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "Kenney Miller, Tom Miller, Molloy, Mugalian, Murphy, Nardulli, Neff, North, Palmer, Pappas, Patrick, Peters, Philip, Pierce, Polk, Porter, Randolph, Rayson, Redmond, Rigney, Rose, Ryan, Sangmeister, Schisler, Schlickman..."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Schlickman, for what purpose do rise, Sir?"

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. There is still a good deal of confusion about this Bill and each of us are going to have to vote as we see fit. I'm advised that the Bill is more than simply clarifying that it would allow certain municipal employees who previously had worked for the Chicago Transit Authority to get credit for that work plus, work for CTA predecessor... a private corporation. Now, if this is so this is precedent setting... there is no basis elsewhere to give such background benefit wise for private employment... now, in the Governor's message with regards to the policy of this precedented study matter, he said that there is no reason for allowing employees in a State fund to receive pension credit for private employment and he suggested that practices of doubtful constitutionality. On the basis of this information that has been provided to me, I must vote 'no'."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'."



Clerk Selcke: "Schneider, Schoeberlein, Schraeder, Sevcik, Sharp, Shea, Shurtz...."

Speaker Telcser: "One moment... Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise?"

Shea: "Well, I would like to explain my 'yes' vote and answer a question of Mr. Schlickman's. If you will notice that every RTA Bill that's in and I think including yours, when the members of the private companies such as the railroad companies and the suburban bus companies... that they become employees of an RTA, which is a public body, they then may transfer their credit rights from that private company to the RTA and become part of it. Now, I have looked through every RTA Bill that has been put in... in this Session and it has similar language thereto, now all that Mr. Merlo, is attempting to do is say that for those members of... employees of the predecessor companies CTA such as the Surface Lane, the Bus Companies, etc... that they may tie their time in for pension purposes similar to what we're trying to do to present employees in the RTA."

Speaker Telcser: "Record Representative Shea as voting 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "Shurtz, Timothy Simms, Ike Sims, Skinner, Soderstrom, Springer, Stedelin, Stiehl, Stone, Taylor, Telcser, Thompson, Tipword, Totten, Tuerk, Von Boeckman, Waddell, Wall, R. Walsh, W. Walsh..."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Walsh, do you seek recognition Sir? Representative William Walsh." Representative Duff, come up here for a minute please."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The distinguished Assistant Minority Leader, explained absolutely what the fears of the Chairman of the House Pensions Committee and Representative Schlickman, were pointing out... the fears that they have and that I share with them. We're very much afraid that what this



Bill does is not to allow ten or twelve people who have worked for the predecessor companies through the CTA, to become members of the CTA pension fund and to use the service accrued during that time they worked for the private company but that we are establishing a precedent here whereby employment in private business becomes eligible for public pension funds now, the effect of this is going to be devastating to public pension funds if that interpretation is correct and the language of the Bill which seem to indicate that it is correct because it says, for service credited by the CTA, now that's at least vague... but it would seem to indicate to me that on the side... that they could credit private employment from private bus companies and that if this were permitted there is no reason in the world why someone working in private industry, say as security guard at Goldblatts, could not when he joined a municipal police department apply for credit for his service as a security guard.... and by extension since his private employment as a shoe clerk at Goldblatts. There is just simply no reason in the world... look we're very much afraid that what we're doing here is that we're... making a drastic change.... and I think that the Governor perceives this we're making a drastic change in the theory of public pensions and it is our firm belief that the Governor's veto should be sustained and I think the Gentleman who explained it best was your distinguished Assistant Minority Leader. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'."

Clerk Selcke: "Walters, Washburn, Washington, Williams, J.J. Wolf, B.B. Wolfe, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Lechowicz, for what purpose do rise, Sir?"

Lechowicz: Please record me as 'aye', please."



Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman has voting 'aye'.

Palmer, 'no'. Representative Merlo, would you... you want me to... okay... Representative Hudson, votes 'no'. On this question there are 72 'ayes'... Representative Caldwell, 'aye'... 73 'ayes', 9 'nays' and none answering 'present' and this motion having failed to receive the Constitutional 3/5 th's Majority is hereby declared lost. I believe that we have called all of the motions with respect to the various veto's which appear on the Calendar, if the Chair as inadvertently over looked one, I would like to ask the Members to look at their Calendars and let me know now. Anyone who has a date of October 24, next to their Senate Bill motion will have to have their Bill called today. Representative Rayson, for what purpose do you rise?"

Rayson: "Well... a question.... is it on the Calendar, Senate Bill 699, for a motion?"

Speaker Telcser: "699, has a date of October 30th... Representative Choate came here and checked to see if the motion was properly filed... it was not but there is a week left on that one. Now, Representative Bluthardt, your motion is on postponed consideration... do you want to take another shot at it now? Let it die, okay. Now, Representative Berman, on the floor? Representative Berman has a motion he wanted to put with respect to a Resolution. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman."

Berman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This motion is in reference to House Resolution 591, of whom the principal Sponsors are Speaker Blair, and Minority Leader Choate... state the motion as to waive the provisions of Rule 41 (a), to allow for immediate consideration of House Resolution 591. House Resolution is a suggestive Resolution calling on the Governing



Boards of Trustee of the Retirement of pension funds that the State of Illinois has jurisdiction over to consider under the law that we previously passed in this General Assembly, consider investing it reserve pension or retirement fund instead of Israel bonds. They have that authority... this does not... this Resolution does not mandate them to do anything that they do not have authority to do but it merely calls upon these Boards to consider the investment of their funds in these bonds... and I would move the suspension of Rules 41 (a) for immediate consideration of House Resolution 591."

Speaker Telcser: The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Skinner: "Is there any possibility that any of the Legislators Pension Fund will go to these bonds?"

Berman: "Yes, Sir."

Skinner: "There is."

Berman: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman has moved that the provisions of Rule 41 (a), be suspended for the purpose of the immediate consideration of House Resolution #591. Now, the Gentleman has asked leave for the last unanimous Roll Call which we established earlier today. Are there any objections? There are objections in back of the Chamber... a number of objections has been heard. Okay, the Gentleman has moved that the provision of the Rule 41 (a), be suspended so that House Resolution 591, can be considered today. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. The Clerk will take an oral Roll Call, it will take 107 votes."

Clerk Selcke: "Aisup, Anderson, Arnell, Barnes, Barry,



Beatty, Beaupre, Berman, Bluthardt, Borchers..."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House. As I understand, this is to purchase Israel Bonds... have I been properly informed on this or not?"

Speaker Telcser: "I don't know, Representative Berman will respond."

Berman: "Representative Borchers, and who ever else may have had objections to the immediate consideration. Let me read to you the Resolution clause very carefully and... the language of this has been drafted very carefully so that we do not impose upon the prerogative of the Trustees of these pension funds... and the pertinent language is, that we strongly urge the governing Board Trustees of each retirement or pension fund and the Illinois State Board of Investments and authorize... created by the Illinois Pension Code and authoritarian and authorize them and invest its reserve pension or retirement fund in Israel bonds that they and each of them give immediate consideration to the investment of available funds in State of Israel bonds and they and each of them continue to observe such investments consideration to the extent possible commensurate with law until the economic drain on the State of Israel occasion by the recent conflict ceases. Now, let me explain specifically what that says... last year we passed Public Act 77-1765, that authorizes the investment of the reserve or certain other portions of pension funds in State of Israel Bonds. All this Resolution is asking these trustees to do, is to consider their authority under that Public Act. It does not say that they should do it, or they should not... it urges them to consider using it at this time."



Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House. Now, I served with Patton... I think that I know something about tank warfare, I would like to see the Egyptian's third army utterly destroyed. I think that it is a mistake of our President, I think instead of delayed a little bit... he could have easily done it by taking... notifying the Russians that they could go... that he was sending Kessinger, that would have taken a day... confer a day with the Russians... come back and make a decision of what we're going to do which is another day. We could have stretched that four days... in the meantime the Egyptian's third army would have been destroyed and they didn't do it. But, this is not the point... I am completely pro Israel in this fight I believe we deserve defense in depth and everything else, but there is one thing... that charity begins at home and this is our money and much as I would like to help them... Israel... as much as I am in favor of Israel, I still think that we have an obligation to ourselves, this is a financial matter... if we want to donate personally to the war funds of Israel or help Israel, I think that we should do it but I do not think we should jeopardize the future of the retirement fund of this Chamber or anyone else in relation to this kind... possible purchase of bonds now, I understand that it is not mandatory... it is a suggestion but to see the suggestion is sometimes... its fathers of a fault and then to the Act and I just think that it is wrong for us to take this and I want it throughly understood, I am for Israel in every way when it comes to victory for Israel, shouldn't say that maybe but I am and I don't think we should mix the two as much as I sympathize with the position so I vote 'no' on the basis of economic and financial good sense."

Clerk Selcke: "Boyle, Bradley, Brandt, Brinkmeier, Brummet,



Caldwell, Calvo, Campbell, Capparelli, Capurzi, Carter, Catania, Chapman, Clabaugh, Collins..."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Choate, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Choate: "My son-in-law said to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Telcser: "Vote Clyde's son-in-law, 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "Craig, Cunningham, D'Arco, Davis, Day, Deavers, Dee, Deuster, DiPrima, Douglas, Duff, Ralph Dunn, R.L. Dunne, Dyer, Ebbesen, Epton, Ewell, Farley, Fary, Fennessey, Fleck, Flinn, Friedland, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Gibbs, Giglio, Giorgi, Griesheimer, Grotberr, Hanahan, Harpstrite, Hart, Hill, Hirschfeld, Gene Hoffman, Ron Hoffman, Jimmy Holloway, Robert Holloway, D. Houlihan, J. Houlihan, Hudson, Hunsicker..."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Hunsicker, for what purpose do rise?"

Hunsicker: "I would like to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker.

When a Bill was up two years ago allowing investment pension funds in the State of Israel bonds and at that time I stated that Egypt might wind up owning our pension funds for which I got booed. You know that isn't beyond the realm of possibility even in this conflict... before its over with and I don't think that we've got any business investing our pension fund or even suggesting that we invest them in any foreign nation, I don't care whether it is Israel or Germany or you name it. We've got a government of our own, if we wanted to invest our pension funds... let's invest in our bonds. This is the quickest way to get a bloody nose as I know of... where are all the demonstrators we had when we were over in Vietnam, I haven't heard one peep out of any of them since we got into trying to help out over in the middle east. Let's keep America for Americans, I'm happy to vote 'no'."

Clerk Selcke: "Huskey, Hyde, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones,



Dave Jones, Juckett, Katz, Keller, Kelly, Kempiners, Kennedy, Kent, Klosak, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Krause, Kriegsman, Kucharski, LaFleur, Lauer, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Lemke, Leon, Londrigan, Lundy, Macdonald, Madigan, Mahar, Mann, Maragos, Martin, Matijevich, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McClain, McCormick, McCourt, McGah, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, McPartlin, Merlo, Kenney Miller, Tom Miller, Molloy, Mugalian, Murphy, Nardulli, Neff, North, Palmer, Pappas, Patrick, Peters, Philip, Pierce, Polk, Porter, Randolph, Rayson, Redmond, Rigney, Rose, Ryan, Sangmeister, Schisler, Schlickman, Schneider, Schoeberlein, Schraeder, Sevcik, Sharp, Shea, Shurtz, Timothy Simms, Ike Sims, Skinner, Soderstrom, Springer, Stedelin, Stiehl, Stone, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, Thompson, Tipword, Totten, Tuerk, Von Boeckman, Waddell, Wall, R. Walsh, W. Walsh, Walters, Washburn, Washington, Williams, J.J. Wolf, B.B. Wolfe, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative McGrew, for what purpose do rise.... oh, Representative Martin, for what purpose do rise?"

Martin: "Thank you, very much. How am I recorded, please?"

Speaker Telcser: "How's Representative Martin recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Lady is recorded as not voting."

Martin: "Mr. Speaker, because of all my friends from Israel I throughly stand up and cast my vote for...."

Speaker Telcser: "Record Representative Martin as voting 'aye'. If the Speaker is 'aye' already, I think. Is the Speaker recorded as 'aye', Fred? All right, what's the Roll Call. Peters, 'aye'. Record Representative Collins, as voting 'aye'. Put it 'aye', I better... I will be excommunicated. On this question there are 50 'ayes', 4 'nays' and one answering 'present' and the Gentlemans motion to suspend the provisions of Rule 41 (a), fails. All right now, is there any further business



with respect... messages from the Senate."

Clerk Selcke: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in a Bill of the following title, the veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding: In House Bill 1506, action taken by the Senate November 7, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in a Bill of the following title, the veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding: In House Bill 1505, action taken by the Senate November 7, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representative that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the Governor's amendment to a Bill of the following title: House Bill 541, concurred in by the Senate November 7, 1973. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary."

Speaker Telcser: "All right now, this is my last reminder now any further business of special motions during the Regular Session? Okay, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh, now moves that the Regular Session do stand adjourned... now, before we adjourn, I want to be sure... is there any announcements... any further motions? Anything else, Bill? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I will post for a meeting of the Executive Committee today to be held next Tuesday morning at 11 A.M. in our usual meeting place to consider House Resolution 591, which I understand is being assigned to us right now."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, that will be assigned to your Committee, Phil. Is there further discussion? Okay,



the Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh now moves that the Regular Session do stand adjourned until the hour of 9 A.M. tomorrow morning. Is there any discussion? All in favor of the Gentlemans motion signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'... and the House stands adjourns until... the Regular Session stands adjourned until the hour of 9 A.M. tomorrow morning. Okay, the Third Special Session will now come to order, the Members please be in their seats. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh asks leave to have the attendance Roll Call from this mornings Regular Session serve as the Roll Call for the Third Special Session. Are there any objections? Hearing none, the attendance Roll Call will be that of the Regular Session this morning. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk Selcke: "A message from Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following title, passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House, Senate Bill 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25, passed Senate Third Special Session, November 7, 1973, by a 3/5 th's vote. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary."

Speaker Telcser: "Anything else, Fred? Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 41, Juckett. Amends Revenue Act 39, First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Senate Bills, First Reading."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 4, an act to transfer certain appropriation to the Department of Labor. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 5, an Act to amend Section 9, of the School Construction Bond Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 6, an Act making supplemental appropriations to Capitol Development Board. First Reading



of the Bill. Senate Bill 16, an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. Where's the next one?"

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, House Bills, Second Reading. In the Third Special Session House Bill, Second Reading..."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill..."

Speaker Telcser: "House Bill 38."

Clerk Selcke: "Yeah, House Bill 38. A Bill for an Act to amend and re-enact Section 17-2.11, as amended by the Public Act and so forth in the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Telcser: "Are there Amendments from the floor? Third Reading. Okay, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh now moves that the Third Special Session resolve itself into a Committee as a whole. All in favor of the Gentlemen's motion signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no' and the Third Special Session is now resolved into a Committee of the whole, the acting temporary Chairman for this Committee of the whole will be Representative Clarence Neff."

Neff: "The Committee of the whole on the Third Special Session will now come to order and the way we're going to operate this afternoon, we're going to try to get all the transit Bills out first and they will be taken in numerical order... House Bill 1, will be heard then House Bill 4, House Bill 5, 6, and then House Bills 8 through 12 and then House Bills 15 through 25, and finally House Bills 39, 40. We hope to get through all the transit Bills this afternoon, I hope that we can keep order here because every time we have to stop and get order that loses time and from appearances right now, we're going to be late here tonight in order to get to tomorrow with a reasonable time. Yes, Representative Choate."

Choate: "So that I can mark my Calendar, would you go a wee



bit slower and give me again the order in which you intend to call the Bills."

Neff: "I will be happy to... House Bill 1, House Bill 4, 5..."

Choate: "Pardon me, whoo... what happen to 2 and 3, what are they I really don't know?"

Neff: "Those are tax relief Bills not pertaining to...."

Choate: "Okay... all right."

Neff: "1, 4, 5, and 6, House Bills 8 through 12..."

Choate: "What happened to 7?"

Neff: "7, is a highway Bill and if we don't get to it today we'll get to it tomorrow."

Choate: "Okay."

Neff: "8 through 12, and then House Bills 15 through 25..."

Choate: "Now, wait a minute.... then 13 and 14, I understand that deals with other subject matter other than RTA."

Neff: "Yes, that's tax relief."

Choate: "All right, then 26?"

Neff: "26, is appropriation."

Choate: "Okay, after 25, where do we go."

Neff: "39 and 40."

Choate: "39 and 40?"

Neff: "Right."

Choate: "I don't have them on here... are they... assume that it's okay."

Neff: "Those are Representative Katz, Bills introduced yesterday."

Choate: "Okay, thank you."

Neff: "The Chair will now recognize Representative Juckett, who will present House Bill 1."

Juckett: "Thank you, Mr. Chariman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1, deals with reimbursement to mass transit districts and bus companies for carrying students and senior citizens at reduced fares. Already on the books is a statute s by which private bus companies are reimbursed by the State for student discounts. This



Bill would amend that statute in two ways, one... it would add to the reimbursement available to private companies, a reimbursement for carrying senior citizens at a reduced fare. Two, it would offer reimbursements for both students and senior discounts to public transit districts the reimbursement program cited in purpose two, has been offered by the State Administratively since 1965, to the Chicago Transit Authority. Dispite a continuing appropriations for this purpose..."

Neff: "Representative Juckett, will you hold up just a second so, we can get some order. Could we please have some order here, there is Members here on the floor that would like to hear... and with the noise going on, it is impossible to sit back here and hear the man that is explaining the Bill so, if we have business to do... why if we'll step outside and do that and then come back in, why it would be appreciated."

Juckett: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The reimbursement program cited in purpose two above, has been offered by the State administratively since 1965, to the Chicago Transit Authority. Dispite a continuing appropriations for the program, there has been and is now, no statutory authority for the reimbursements and as a result, the State Comptroller, George Lindberg, two months ago refused to release to the CTA, the funds appropriated last spring for this purpose. House Bill 1, will put all Transit Agencies... offering student and senior citizens discounts on an equal footing and will encourage the worthy practice of transporting senior citizens at a reduced fare on a more wide spread basis than merely in Chicago."

Neff: "Are there any questions?"

Unknown: "I will accept this."

Juckett: "Thank you."

Neff: "Madam Clerk, I don't believe that we have any witnesses



on House Bill 1, there is no witness.... while I'm speaking on witnesses anybody that would like to appear that haven't signed the witness list, we would appreciate your coming up and doing that and we will try to call you in order. The next Bill to be heard will be by Representative Deuster, and House Bills 4, 5 and 6, I believe will be considered in a package although Representative Deuster wants to go into detail possibly a little more and have a witness or two on House Bill 4. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think as all the Members know... we're simply going to have a brief discription of the Regional Transit Bills at this time and next week we'll get into the real heart of the matter when Amendments are offered. So, I do want to be as brief as possible and I would like to make this observation... particular for the media that have been covering the development of this sufficient subject. I think that all of us, certainly the public does and the Members I sense in this House recognize that the time has come for some compromise the time has come for some bipartisanship and the time has come for some statemenship and I think we'll have fine opportunity for that next week when on Second Reading we amend... consider Amendments to all the Bills. I have a map in front of me here of the six county regions which might make it a little easier for all of you to understand, by those of us from all of the counties are interested in developing a system that serves all the counties and fair to all the counties. I would say, I think that progress is being made, I might say that I have in my hands three Bills here. I have Governor Walker's Bill which is forty-five pages long, I have Speaker Blair's Bill which is forty-five pages long, Representative Harold Katz and the distinguished



group of bipartisan Members of both sides of the aisle have introduced a Bill which is 62 pages long and the Bill which Representative Sangmeister, Representative Williams, Dyer and myself have sponsored has 66 pages. Obviously none of the Members have read all these... very few of you have, what I have tried to do to be of service to the Membership as we move down into the final two weeks, is to give you a little piece of paper that might help you compare what are the key substantive point in contingent and those of you that have pick it up from your box... see that I compare House Bill 12, that is the Governor's Bill, House Bill 15, Mr. Speaker's Bill and House Bill 4, and I want to say that just yesterday a new Bill, the Katz's Bill was introduced and we have a comparison of that too. Representative Sangmeister, will say a word as soon as I finish about the important of all of the people in this area having an opportunity to consider Regional Transit through a referendum but I would say that over the summer the Governor's task force has identified and learned about things that are vital to the people of all six counties and top of the list is the fact that we don't want to buy a pig in the poke, we want some guarantee that if a revenue is taken from the six county districts, that we're going to get something for our money and a real struggle is simply the question of who's money is going to be spent where... for what mass transit services. So, during the last spring we developed a provision and I want to thank Representative Robert Dunne, of Chicago... particularly and Representative Dyer, for helping me develop this and I want to congratulate the Governor for sensing its importance because it is in the Governor's Bill and that's a provision that, if you raise any money in any county 2/3 rd's of that money must be spent for mass transit



services within or which benefit that county. I'm delighted that that is in the Walker Bill, next week I will offer Amendment to put it into the Blair Bill and I think you will see by comparing... this comparison that as we move along, all the Bills are getting more and more alike and if this House works its will and if we have a few Members on both sides of the aisle that stand up and maybe even buck your own leadership, we'll be able to shape all of these Bills so it won't make any difference which one goes to the Governor's desk. They will all be virtually alike and there are not going to take unfair advantage of any county. So, I would say that the provision that 2/3 rd's of the revenue be spent where it is raised, is very important. It's the real guarantee, it's the real heart of the matter. Secondly, that each of the counties and you look at this map and see all that geography and if you can tell any of us from any of the counties, Will, Kane, DuPage, or anywhere that we aren't entitled to at least have one person sitting on the Board to answer to our counties, something is wrong with you or you don't understand how important it is to us. We will have Amendments which won't upset the voting strength of either the Governor's Bill or the Speaker's Bill, which will allow every county to at least have a person and that will be a weighted vote and you will hear about that next week. Now, another provision is one upon Representative Sangmeister, will touch and I'd like to yield to him at this time and that is the matter of going back to the voters and the people in this area and having them radify our enabling Act through a referendum. At this time I yield to Representative Sangmeister, who is the joint Co-sponsor of this Bill."

Sangmeister: "Thank you, Don. Chairman of the Committee and Members of the House, the sitting of the Committee of a



whole. Personally I think... has very actually gone over the Bill, I think that it is a compromise Bill one that we want you all to take a good look at, in case you can't buy the Speaker's Bill or you can't buy the Governor's, we'd like to see you buy our Bill. It has the three essentials that I have been looking for... for the constituents of Will County and I think that 2/3 rd's of revenue being raised in the county is an absolute necessity. We can go back to our people and face the.... with this Bill you will at least be sure that some of the money that you're contributing will be used in the area. Whether Representative made it interesting observation in looking at the chart here and it said... all those green and red lines indicate all the money that will be coming for the outline counties in the Cook County. We want to assure you that that's our feeling on it and we want to make sure that those lines are going to have some cars rolling back into our counties. Representative Deuster wanted me to emphasize and speak mainly on the referendum portion which I spoke on several times in the spring Session. I think that if you will look at the map, it's hard for me to see it because it's over to the front left of me, but if you will look at the counties... particularly Kane and Will, you can see why we're concerned. If you look into those areas there is a lot of blank white space on, we just have a couple of railroads coming out of there and it is very difficult for those of us who represent constituents who are in these rural areas, particularly down in my county which I want to speak of because I have the most familiarity with, you try to convince people in Willington, Peotone, Crete, Elwood, Channahon go on and on that they have and should participate in a RTA. Our county is certainly somewhat divided on the issue in that we do have Joliet and Rockport municipalities



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

that possibly would endorse an RTA and therefore, I think that it is absolutely essential that we have a referendum that anyone of the Bills that are passed out of here does have a referendum in it so that corneys like ourself who of course sit on the very edge of this district, it makes it very difficult or have a voice in this matter. Democratic process and we ask support of your Bill when it comes up on Third Reading. Thank you."

Deuster: "We will be happy to respond to questions, it might be helpful for Representative Dyer, our other Sponsor was going to say a word about the representation on the Board, but I don't see him here now so, I'll be very happy to respond and yield to any questions that might be put.

Neff: "Representative Dee."

Dee: "Mr. Chairman, would you consider an Amendment to your Bill. I'm in sympathy with the referendum, I think that it is essential. Would you accept an Amendment to your Bill so that when it comes to the question of referendum... the proposition of the creation of the RTA, be separated... from the funding referendum, so that in the same referendum you vote on the proposition of funding separately from the creation of the RTA. Would you.... how would you look upon such an Amendment?"

Deuster: "Well, I do... I might say this, that the outset that my confidence in the intelligence of the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle is such that I think if you... my feeling is, I don't want to give any guidance of how they should vote on an Amendment, if it makes sense why I'm sure that the Membership will adopt it and I'm not going to resist in the Amendment if I feel that they are fair and ought to be given an opportunity to discuss. I do think that it might be confusing... oh the other hand I might say this, the referendum feature that we have in our Bill does this... it says yes, the



voters of the whole area are going to vote and what happens if in Kane County or Will County, they vote against it, the answer is... the six county system stays together. The board member from that county even though they rejected it, stays on the board and he has no vote... but for planning purposes the six county system continues and that will satisfy all the federal grant requirements and everything else, we will have a six county system that will engage in regional transportation planning and every county will be represented except where the voters have rejected it, that man will have no vote, or woman will have no vote and secondly, there will be no tax imposed... whatever the variety of the tax in that county and third, there will be no obligation to provide any services at all to that county and then later under another provision of the Bill, providing for annexation or new territory, they could come back in, if they change their mind... later. So, I do have sort of a fractional referendum but if you want to draft an Amendment and offer it... why, I think that's the best way to pursue it. I have no instinctive or strong objection against your suggested Amendment."

Dee: "Thank you."

Neff: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "In discussing your Bill, Representative... do you have any provisions to show to the people of the collar belt area any services that you can guarantee, such as the people in Hebron, Illinois... what services is your Bill going to provide in the area of regional transportation to the citizens of Hebron, Illinois."

Deuster: "Yes, Sir. That is an excellent question. I want to say that the reason that the map is up here is to suggest some examples of where service is likely to result. First of all there is a guarantee that if any money is raised in McHenry, 2/3 rd's of that money is



going to be spent there. Now, whether it's in Hebron or Crystal Lake or McHenry, Woodstock or whatever it might be... that's about as fragile as the RTA legislation that's on... I might say this, Representative Hanahan, in order to make sure that the people of any area that are interested in having a bus service or anything else, can get it... we have one, the guarantee they will have a voice on the board, two, the guarantee that 2/3 rd's of their money is going to be spent in their county and three, the provision that localities may secure new services by petitioning the Regional Transit Authorities and by agreeing to pay part of the cost, now as you know many of the townships have received some federal revenue sharing monies, some communities like Evanston, feel so strongly about mass transit they are willing to impose a gas tax, just in their municipalities if the people are willing to come up with the money besides all these other things, and they agree to pay between 65 and 90% of the cost of running the bus or the mini bus or whatever it might be, then the Regional Transit Authority is obliged to provide that service and that's comparable and similar to the provision of which all the members are familiar under the National Amtrak Act by which we in Illinois, put a little money up and are running some extra trains and so it is a way to allow for local initiative and flexibility and to do something that the board itself may not have determined to do."

Hanahan: "Would you be acceptable, Sir... to an Amendment to include people transportation as part of the service of the RTA would provide in the five county and suburban area."

Deuster: "Yes, I think that you have discussed that with me and with other Members and I think you have made an excellent suggestion because as we know in these out



line areas especially, every school district either by contract or ownership have got a whole fleet of school buses and they have some housewives running them around in the morning for about an hour and a half and in the middle of the afternoon, but otherwise... these assets are idle and it seems to me and I know that you share this, that this would be a wonderful way of providing service especially in the out lying counties and if you have an Amendment..."

Hanahan: "I do have the Amendment..."

Deuster: "You do have the Amendment, I haven't looked at the exact language but it sounds good and I think I could support it."

Hanahan: "The Amendment would read something like... raising fifteen million, you know... to provide the... remove the real estate tax levy for the given area that leveys the tax on real estate for the services of the bus... pupil transportation and then to take the rest of the money that is now given to the school districts and give it to the RTA to provide the total bus transportation of both special and regular transportation of pupils. Now, another point would be, you said that... 2/3 rd's of the money raised in the county would be reimbursed back to the county for services. Are you talking about any other monies except new taxes that your Bill provides for or the total amount of money on real estate... or on license plates or where is your basis revenues going to be derived from to operate the RTA."

Deuster: "Yes, the answer is... that we know the House will work at will on what revenue is but supposing it were a sales tax, supposing it were a gas tax... supposing it were a parking tax... whatever it is, in our Bill we have a provision that 2/3 rd's of any of the revenue that is raised and goes to RTA, you know, not real estate taxes goes to the county or something, we're just



talking about special revenue that comes to the RTA, the RTA in its budget expend 2/3 rd's of that money attributable to a county, to that county from whence it came."

Hanahan: "Even if it's off the State licenses plate. That the State..."

Deuster: "Yes, even if it went to Springfield and to Washington, and Moscow and back to the RTA, if it came out of McHenry County and it winds up in RTA, McHenry County under our Bill... gets 2/3 rd's of it."

Hanahan: "All right, to make one other point on this. In your Bill as drafted and introduced, you had the labor protection Amendments, the so called Amendment 18, to the last Bill of the last Session, provided for in the Bill."

Deuster: "Yes, I do..."

Hanahan: "So, we'll know where we're going on labor protection"

Deuster: "And, I want to tell you what we said last spring, it doesn't seem to you or me that this is a labor problem, this is a transportation problem and if we find that for any reasons the unions are unreasonable or something goes wrong, we can come back next year and take up the matter of unions or labor or something else, right now it's transportation matter so, I have the provision in my Bill that would simply respect all the existing rights of the laboring man who work in the transportation field in the Chicago region."

Hanahan: "Thank you."

Deuster: "Before closing, there is one last point that I would like to make it is not mentioned in here. As we had in the Bill last spring, we have a provision of highway option by which if any of the out lying counties feel that mass transit is such a low priority with them and yet they want to come into the system, they can come into the system and they can petition for a third of the



111.

money raised in their county and use that for the purpose of the repair and the improvement of the existing roads. And, we believe that would benefit mass transit because buses have got to run on roads and likewise the obligation as a result of that provides service to that county would drop accordingly."

Neff: "I believe we still have some questions, Representative Deuster, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Representative Deuster, I want to be sure that I understand when you talk about a referendum... exactly what it is that you're talking about. Now, question number one, would be... is the referendum provision in your proposal similar to that in other proposals as far as you know or do they vary? Are we talking about... and I'll throw another couple in here so you can see where I'm trying to go. Are we talking... when we say referendum, are we talking about a total referendum vote, that is a regional vote... would this be... this would be put to all the voters on a given day, presumably in March of '74, all the voters in the six county area as they go to the polls on that particular day, is my understanding correct so far?"

Deuster: "No, you have asked me if my referendum the same as the referendum which appears in the Speaker's Bill, at this moment there are only two Bills that provide for a referendum, Speaker Blair's and mine, they are entirely different kinds of referendums. The referenda.. the Speaker's referendum provides for a total regional vote so that the people of all the six counties go in and vote, whatever the majority is in all six counties it might pass in Cook, fail in the five others and still it would be established. That is his referendum, our referendum provides that it will be on a county by county basis and... just to make it clear, the system will be established no matter how the vote goes but, there will



tax and no obligation to provide service in a county that rejects it and does not adopt it. Does that answer your question?"

Hudson: "In other words if the voters in DuPage overwhelmingly voted 'no', let's say hypothetically..."

Deuster: "Yes."

Hudson: "DuPage County is still a part of the system, that's what you've said."

Deuster: "Yes."

Hudson: "But, and as such then would it obligations be commiserate or what would the obligations of the counties that might not have voted for it...be to the system."

Deuster: "The consequents of the majority of the electors in DuPage County voting 'no' on the referendum are one, they would still have a person on the board but without a vote. Two, none of the taxes would be imposed in DuPage County and three, the RTA would have no obligation to provide service to DuPage County and that's about it. It would be put together on building block basis and I would say, simply for planning purposes only, there would be a six county system in a county that rejected it and I might add, that all of this negative talk about the voting rejecting RTA... must not overwhelm us, the voters of Atlanta, Georgia were presented with a half cent sales tax and they accepted it, just in September the voters in Denver, Colorado were presented with this and they accepted it and if we draft a good Bill and pass a good Bill and it goes out to the voters... we'll have an opportunity to explain it and if it is a good Bill, I think they are going to pass it."

Hudson: "Well, I respect your confidence in the out come of this particular issue, however, it seems to me to be the better part of wisdom to at least understand..."

Deuster: "Yes."

Hudson: "What would happen."



Deuster: "Yes, actually the understanding is that for most purposes there would be no RTA in DuPage County if your people rejected it. The only thing is that simply in order to keep a planning system together, very much you might say like the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commissioners, they would still have this planning authority to plan as if it were a region which it is, but they wouldn't be able to tax your people and they would have no obligations, likewise to provide your people with service."

Hudson: "Now, one last question on the referendum... is it your thought that the referendum would be based on a total number of people coming to the polls to vote or would it be on that particular issue, this would be on the ballot would be a separate ballot, what do you envision in that regard." I ask this question because it's one that comes up repeatedly in matters of these kind..."

Deuster: "The best answer is to read to you the language of the Bill which is just two paragraphs. Section 53, adoption by electors, the authority shall not exercise any of the powers granted by this Act within any county in Northeastern Illinois until this Act is adopted by the electors of such counties. The question shall be submitted to the voters of the six counties of Northeastern Illinois at the primary election in March, 1974, in accordance with Section 16-7 of the Election Code if a majority of those voting on the question within a county favor adoption of this Act, the authority may exercise all of its powers in such county, if a majority of those voting on the question within a county do not favor adoption of this Act, the authority may not exercise any of its powers within such counties except with respect to planning, the authority is under no responsibility for the provision of transportation service



within such counties, and the member or members of the board of directors appointed from such counties shall have no vote except with respect to planning."

Hudson: "Does that mean land use planning? Per chance."

Deuster: "No, it means regional transportation planning."

Hudson: "Thank you."

Neff: "Mr. Palmer."

Palmer: "Representative Deuster, what is the total amount of money in your Bill, as far as the funding of this system?"

Deuster: "The answer to that Representative Palmer, is one hundred and sixty-five million dollars... comprised in this way..."

Palmer: "All right."

Deuster: "And, we hope that the balance plan between General Revenue on one hand and Auto Related impositions on the other. All right, the General Revenue we contemplate is, a one quarter of a percent sales tax in the region. I contemplate the passage of the Blair Bill, amended from a half a cent to a quarter of percent. That would produce fifty million dollars, secondly the contributions from a State Mass Transit Fund of forty million dollars that takes ninety million there from what you would say are general non transportation related revenue. Then we have a parking tax which would produce about fifteen or twenty million and a regional penny and a half gas tax of fifty-five million, making a total of seventy-five... seventy-five and ninety, is a hundred and sixty-five."

Palmer: "All right, what... let's take it on the basis now..."

I mean the present existing systems, that... money projection there would be sufficient to pay the cost of the existing system, is that correct?"

Deuster: "I believe the answer is 'yes', it's a hundred and sixty-five million more than we've got now."



Palmer: "Well, all right... what about gross money?"

Deuster: "There is gross money in the fact that the regional sales tax is something that goes with the economy; it's a percentage... and so that would be the area of the gross money."

Palmer: "All right, are there any plans now... that you know of or do you have any plans, which lays out or projects the development of the six county area in so far as the RTA system?"

Deuster: "Your question is, is there a plan for the development of service in the six county area."

Palmer: "That's correct."

Deuster: "Yes, the closes thing to a plan that I know of... is the plan that was developed by the Northwestern University Transportation Center for the commuter railroad from which a few of the ideas in this map are shown and that is basically that there would be lateral cross county bus shuttle service around the area."

Palmer: "I'm talking about a coordinated plan involving the railroads, CTA and also the bus system. Do we know that Hebron is going to get a road or some sort of a bus service, do we know that Crete will get some sort of a bus service... this is the kind of plan that I'm talking about, I'm talking about a projected plan."

Deuster: "That's an excellent question to which I don't believe there is any answer..."

Palmer: "You don't have a plan?"

Deuster: "I have no answer as to whether Hebron is going to three buses or five buses, I think what we have tried to do is take the existing legislation that is floating around in Springfield and make it as specific as possible without completely hand stringing them... many people have said to me... Members and others, that this is an abomination this idea that 2/3 rd's of the money raised in an area ought to be spend there."



Palmer: "Well I'm not concerned with that aspect, I'm concerned about planning and whether or not... to your knowledge there is presently a plan that embodies these three agencies of transportation that physically applies to any or all part of the six county area."

Deuster: "From a planning."

Palmer: "Yes, Sir."

Deuster: "I would agree with you that to my knowledge there is no such specific plan and that is one of the deficiency of the subject that we're considering."

Palmer: "All right."

Deuster: "That we have been debating about how much we're going to take out of the tax payers pocket.....spends very little time telling him specifically what he's going to get for it."

Palmer: "One final question, does it transfer your Bill.... your Bill transfer to the RTA, the governing body those functions now presently performed by the Illinois Commerce Commission? ..... Licenses and regulation."

Deuster: "It's been so long since we've discussed that point, I believe that the Regional Transit Authority is exempt from the regulation of fares and other regulations of the Illinois Commerce Commission, so to some extent they have... free enterprize opportunity to innovate and set the fares that they want to and run where they want to, I believe it is 'yes', they are exempt."

Palmer: "All right, thank you."

Deuster: "Mr. Chairman, before yielding... that's all I have but I do know that the Co-sponsor of this Bill, from DuPage County, Representative Dyer, did want to say just a word about the significance of the board representation, at this time I yield to Mrs. Dyer."

Neff: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Chairman, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Committee of the whole. Believe me, I'm going to be brief I just



want to remind you about my concern in this whole subject of RTA. The 1970 census showed that the City of Chicago proper lost population, the suburban Cook County and the five counties around it... each gained population. All projections for the future indicate that this trend is going to continue, so if we are going to plan a viable structure... a framework in which we can have Regional Transportation in this area, we've got to give equitable representation on any governing board for the five counties surrounding Cook County. The reason that I agreed to Co-sponsor this particular Bill is that the governing board has one Representative from each one of the five surrounding counties. I think that any Bill that is going to pass out of the General Assembly should have representation for each suburban county. We can't have taxation without representation, Ladies and Gentlemen that what this country is all about. Now, I think the final thing for us to remember, I have no pride of Co-sponsorship or authorship. I don't really care whether it is this Bill or another Bill that gets passed, to me a passager trip is more important than an ego trip in this subject. Let's just get something passed but lets do let suburban be represented. Thank you."

Neff: "Are there any other questions or comments to be made on House Bills 4, 5 and 6?"

Deuster: "I should explain 5 and 6, I didn't do that."

Neff: "Representative Deuster, would like to explain 5 and 6, which he hasn't gone into yet."

Deuster: "House Bill 5, set up an Illinois Mass Transit Fund, it does just about the same thing that Governor Walker, has in mind and is accomplished in the Governor's Bill except I think that it is very important that a mass transit fund be established and the way that it is done here, is orderly business like way that benefits all



of Illinois just not the Chicago Region. I don't believe we should just send to the RTA, a check and forget about downstate in this one area. This Bill, House Bill 4, Co-sponsored by Representative Williams, Catania and Mrs. Dyer and myself, establishes an Illinois Mass Transit Fund and puts approximately sixty million dollars into it, and this is done by earmarking a percentage of the federal revenue sharing that the State of Illinois has already received and is supposed to be committing to high priority objects or subjects like mass transit. This would provide sixty million... if you spread that out around the State, 2/3 rd's of it would go to RTA, forty million, twenty million would go to the downstate areas for your transit services, buses or whatever you want to do around the State. I think this would be fair and a proper way to establish a fund. Also, that the fund wouldn't be a one shot deal... it has a percentage in it and if this Bill would go to the Governor's desk, he believes in fine tuning. He's the one that knows what's in the budget, how much we can afford or the Members of this House can amend it, you can change it from sixty-five, to sixty, to seventy, to eighty, to twenty, whatever you think by changing one word and it is tied to a continuing program of federal revenue sharing and I think that it is a responsible Bill and I hope next week when we consider it, you'll give it your support. Lastly, House Bill 6, provides for in the region, a regional increase of a penny and a half in the gasoline tax. I think with the soaring automobile tax you'll find that many constituents will feel this to be minimal but this will produce about fifty-five million dollars and it is one of the automobile related tax imposition in this three Bill package. I think you very much for your time and attention and next week we'll get into the Amendment."



Neff: "Questions... or discussion on House Bills 4, 5, and 6? Thank you, Mr. Deuster. We will now move on to House Bills 8 through 12, and the Chair will recognize Representative Garmisa, to explain these Bills. These are the so called Governor's Program Bills."

Garmisa: "Mr. Chairman... Members of the Transportation Committee sitting as a body of the whole. House Bill 12, would create a Regional Transportation Authority Act, to provide for and coordinate public transportation services for the six county area of Northeastern Illinois. This Act reaffirms the Constitutional Declaration that public transportation is an essential public service for which public funds may be expended. Now, is the time for this General Assembly to act to meet the crisis that is before us. It is a well known fact that the economic growth and the well being of the State... does directly apply to the economic growth of the Chicago Metropolitan area. History will show that transportation of farm products, trade and people... has played a tremendous roll in making the Chicago Metropolitan area in our great State one of the most dynamic region of the entire nation. The great economic strength of our State currently enjoy... must not be jeopardized by failure to meet current mass transportation problems. These problems must be resolved, the people wants a solution and we must act. The unique features of House Bill 12, may be found in its new funding proposal, in a .... board appointments, there regulatory powers and in the formation of local transportation councils. The new funding proposal for House Bill 12, is made up of the following componets... we could raise forty-five millions of dollars at a dollar per auto registration that would be returned to the six counties... there would be twenty-nine point three millions of dollars that would be returned to the ninety-six downstate



counties which could be used for mass transit or highway purposes. There will be an appropriation out of the General Revenue Fund of sixty millions of dollars and hopefully, if we're able to get passage of the proposed lottery Bill, we hope supplant that sixty million in that manner. There could be forty-three millions of dollars that would be raised by board imposed taxes and fees that would be related to ownership and operation of motor vehicles. Now, 2/3-rd's of all these taxes collected, in any county... must be returned to that county. This could come to a total of a hundred and forty-eight millions of dollars that we have to finance the first year of the operation of RTA. We would ask for in this Bill an RTA governing board that would be composed of a nine member board of directors and they would be receptive outlying counties concerned... and like other RTA proposals that appoint two directors by a majority vote of the five county board Chairman outside of Cook, House Bill 12, would require that each board chairman outside of Cook, concur with the selection of at least one director out of a total of two. The key feature of the regulatory power section in House Bill 12, is that any transportation agency which contracts part of its facilities to the RTA, under purchase of service agreements would remain subject to... ICC regulations for those facilities that would not come under such purchase of service agreement. The effect would be that transportation agencies that are not able to discontinue service in outlying counties because they enter purchase of service agreements with the RTA for only their enter lined route. We would call for two in House Bill 12, for the formation of local transportation councils and this is another key feature of the Bill, now these councils would provide for region wide discussions of RTA problems and a means for voice... the peoples



concern to the regional transportation authority and Mr. Chairman, we do have quiet a few proponents that are here to speak in favor of the Bill and I would ask you to call them in the order that we so submitted to you, Mr. Chairman."

Neff: "Representative Juckett."

Juckett: "Mr. Chairman, is the Sponsor of the Bill asking that all the witnesses be put on before questioning or is he willing to answer some questions now?"

Garmisa: "I think, Representative Juckett, that is a proper procedure or the most expeditious procedure would be to call on the witnesses and then you will have your area of questioning that the Sponsor or witnesses would answer."

Juckett: "If that's the way you desire it, I'll be happy to comply and we'll just stand in line to ask some questions when they're done."

Neff: "Are there any other questions... to Representative Garmisa, if not.... we have some witnesses that we would like to call and Milton Pukonsky, the Chairman of the Chicago CTA, Milton."

Milton Pukorsky: "Mr. Chairman and Members of House of the Illinois General Assembly. My name is Milton Pukorsky, I'm Chairman of the Board of the Chicago Transit Authority. I'm especially grateful for the opportunity to appear before you at this time because the matter that you are considering is a subject of grave urgency, it is matter so much in need of Resolution at this Special Session of the General Assembly that we no longer can afford the luxury of mincing words. Permit me to degress for one moment to sharpen our prospective still further with a few rhetorical questions. Would anyone sit by and do nothing if it were known that none of our police would report for duty in the morning. Would nothing be done... if it was known that the doors of our



public schools and universities would not be open in the morning. Would nothing be done if we knew our hospitals would not admit anymore patients, would nothing be done if we knew our water supply was about to be shut off... would nothing be done if when known, that our sanitary districts were about to be shut down. I submit, Ladies and Gentlemen that these are rhetorical are highly irrelevant to the important matter before you today. Public transportation is faced with collapse and serious deterioration in Chicago and the metropolitan area. This is true for the Chicago Transit Authority, for the suburban bus system and for the commuter rail operation. Chicago has long been blessed with one of the best transportation systems in the world, the Rapid Transit and surface routes now operated by the CTA and the network of commuter railroad lines operated by six railroads, although limited in scope of operation, the services of suburban bus companies also have been excellent but, even the best of systems... once they are neglected, can fall to pieces in a hurry... picking up those pieces and building a new... would be a most difficult and expensive project. Daily headlines, as well as news by television and radio, tell the dire plight of the CTA and its nearly one million riders a day in our bare-bones existence, the CTA will be lucky if its present emergency subsidy last through December. Several suburban bus companies have already abandon service and the few remaining systems are on financial rocks. The Commuter railroads are experiencing more and more difficulties... all are burden with raising cost in providing the essential service throughout the suburban area. Like the CTA and the suburban bus company, the commuter railroads are being hit by continuing blows of inflation, several of the railroads recently have had to reduce their commuter operations... at least



one major railroad is seriously considering filing petition to go out of the commuter operation entirely. For the CTA and other transit operators both here and throughout the nation, is it no longer possible to raise fares to meet raising costs. Higher fares only drive more riders away and place greater hardships on those who have no other means of travel. It is universally recognized that the fare box alone can no longer pay all of the costs that operating subsidy are an absolute necessity if public transportation systems are to survive. This is the emergency situation, a collapsing of public transportation that mandates immediate action by the Illinois General Assembly. The Legislature during its last Regular Session virtually reached the consensus on the organizational and operating structure of an effective Regional Transportation Authority, unfortunately the crucial question of the amount and source of funding for the proposed authority is still unresolved. This issue of providing a sound, sufficient and continuing funding plan is the essential element that must be resolved without any further delay, to transform the promise of a Regional Authority into reality, I think that you would agree that the desperate needs to maintain and improve the services of the CTA within Chicago is self evidence... without public transportation the city and the entire metropolitan area would virtually die. This would be true also for Chicago magnificent and growing downtown area. Despite all the automobiles you see jamming the expressways and boulevards, the automobile accounts for no more than 13% of the daily accumulation of people in the downtown area... of the more than two hundred and eighty-three thousand persons who work, shop, to business or visit the culture institutions during a week stay downtown, 86% travel by rapid transit, bus and commuter railroads. Remember our big



snow storm of January, 1967... Chicago's downtown would have been shut down had it not been for the continued operation of the CTA rapid transit routes and the commuter railroads. Besides meeting the sheer necessity of maintaining present services and short plan of sufficient operating subsidy through the RTA, could enable the CTA to reduce its fare to twenty-five cents in non rush periods. Such a reduced fare in our opinion would be desirable for all transit operations throughout the metropolitan area under the RTA jurisdiction... only within the last week or so, the need for a reduced fare became even more evident when we were visited at the CTA by community leaders, representing welfare families. The point that they made is that the CTA with its present forty-five cent fare has actually priced itself beyond the reach of many thousands of welfare recipients who have no other means of travel. Several other major cities have recently proved that many thousands of additional riders, persons of lower income bracket, can be attracted to public transportation through a reduction in fare. The most notable example has been in Atlanta, with the Metropolitan Transportation Authority was able to reduce the fare to fifteen cents from forty cent, with a subsidy provided by a one cent sales tax. We at the CTA are very grateful to the Legislature for two precedents in reduced fare... one which has been effective for some years, is the reduced student fare made possible by a substantial State reimbursement, the other is the more recent allocation of State funds which has made possible to reduce fares for senior citizens at all hours of travel. As a footnote to the reducing of citizen fare, you may be interested in knowing that we have attracted many new riders... even from Chicago's so called 'Gold Coast' on the northside it is not at all unusual seeing a woman in a mink coat



getting on Lake Shore Drive or Michigan Avenue bus, showing her CTA identity card that entitles her to the reduced senior citizens fare, in fact we're told that having an identification card for the reduced senior citizens fare has now become somewhat of a status symbol along Lake Shore Drive. Beside maintaining present services and reducing the non rush hour fare, sufficient subsidy would also enable us at the CTA to plan new services, one new service that we are eager to try is known as 'dial a bus', this is a type of personalize service where by, in response to a telephone call a bus stops at your very door stop, it would be an especially desirable type of service for the elderly, the handicapped and other persons finding it difficult to use regular transit service. Toronto with the financial help of the emprial provental government is experiencing considerable success with the 'dail a bus service' as are a number of smaller cities in the United States. Let us now turn away from Chicago to the many suburban communities in the six counties, what benefits does an RTA with its tax subsidy hold for them. It is obvious that one of the initial benefits could be a stabilization of commuteraffairs, a hope to any further increases in fares... conceivably there could be reductions in fares or perhaps an equalization in fare structures. The deterioration of the present suburban bus systems could be halted with loss service being restored and these systems placed on the road toward improvement and expansion. Recent studies have underscored the feasibility of providing new bus routes to and from the commuter railroad station, in as much as most commuter stations are located within business districts of suburban communities... such fed of bus services also would have the effect of providing new local transit service. A wide spread desire amongst



suburban communities for the new public transportation services was voiced at the hearings conducted in August, throughout the six county areas by Mr. Langhorn Bond, the Illinois Secretary of Transportation. For instance, in DuPage County there appeared to be unanimity among the various spokesmen, the local government and civic groups about a need for creating both intra and inter-suburban transit system. What was especially sufficient about such testimony was that while there was still a recognition of a need for travel between the suburbans and Chicago, there is a realization that metropolitan transportation also... must mean easier access both within and around the suburbans themselves. In DuPage as well as other counties, the foresighted and enlighten governmental officials and civic leaders obviously are well aware of the prospects of continued growth and population... for at least the next twenty years or so, the population is expected to grow and be concentrated in the suburban area, by 1995, it is projected that the six Illinois counties of the Chicago metropolitan area will have a population of approximately ten million persons, of this total the City of Chicago would retain its present level of three million, six hundred and fifty-seven thousand persons with the remainder of suburban area showing an increase in population to six million, three hundred and fifty thousand. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, twenty years is a short time in the life of an urban community particularly when such rapid growth is expected. No time can be wasted in preparing for that growth, especially when it comes to planning, creating, stopping and equipping transportation systems that will be necessary. The acquisition of transportation, equipment alone requires considerable lead time, for instance, I call your attention that the lead time required for the delivery of buses today



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

is twenty-nine months while the lead time for obtaining new computer commuter cars or rapid transit trains is forty-six months. Obviously we cannot afford to waste anymore time in creating the Regional Transportation Authority that is needed not only to save the existing systems but to spearhead the planning necessary for the extension of mass transportation operations throughout the growing suburban area. If for nothing else, it also would be in own self interest to get such planning under way to a Regional Transportation Authority if the Chicago area is to receive the full share of increase federal aid that can be expected for public transportation improvement in the immediate years ahead. But, Ladies and Gentlemen there is still another compelling and more immediate reason for the Illinois Legislature to act quickly, to create an RTA and provide a sound and sufficient subsidy plan for public transportation. This reason should also be of interest to the non user of public transportation... more specifically, to the motorist who never thinks of transit as having any value to him... for some months many of us have been speaking and we have spoken to you of an approaching energy crisis... of a shortage of motor fuel, as a crucial factor in the need for an RTA, for improved and expanded mass transportation facilities and for the necessary subsidy. The crisis is no longer approaching, it has arrived... you have seen the latest new stories on this subject, it was a news story for example last Friday from Washington, "Government energy experts admits they under estimated the size and impact of the masive oil shortage that will be felt in the United States within three weeks"... three weeks, I submit. The Presidents chief energy advisor, 'John Loft', said after a closed meeting with members of the Senate Interior Committee that the Arab oil cut-off could mean a deficit



of as much as 18% of the oil product the nation uses daily. Senator Henry Jackson, Chairman of the Committee said that when last ship load of Arab oil comes in, about three weeks from now the shortage will really be hitting us like a ton of bricks. It's fair to say that the crisis is much worse than all of us had anticipated, to those of us in transit... who are already worried about our own fuel supplies... such news articles came as no surprise. Last week for instance, the CTA joined other transit operators throughout the country in making an appeal to the White House for an emergency allocation directive that would assure us a full and continuing supply of diesel fuel to operate our buses as a top priority public service. In view of this fact of developing energy crisis the persons who depend solely on their automobile may soon be forced by the virtual certainty of rationing to turn to public transportation, to rapid transit, to buses, or the commuter railroad. The energy crisis is not going to go away nor is there probably any end in site to the rising prices of motor fuel. Furthermore, there is certain to be greater and great of public pressure to protect the environment, couple the environmental pressures with the energy crisis and there is one ultimate answer for the private automobile user... more and more restricted use, with restricted use of the automobile the motorist will be forced to seek an alternate road of travel, we must be prepared to provide that service to improve an expanded public transportation facility not only in Chicago but throughout the six counties of the metropolitan area. Let us look back for a moment to thirty years ago to the early 1940's when there was another major crisis in public transportation in Chicago. Even though transit riding was near an all time high, the two main private transit operators, the Chicago Surface



and the Chicago Rapid Transit Companies were bankrupt. There was a dire need then as there is today to save the cities public transportation system without regards to partisan party lines, the Mayor of the public officials, Civic leaders in Chicago, the Governor and the State Legislatures in Springfield... here... pitched in to solve the problem, the results of this all out by-partisan effort was the creation of the Chicago Transit Authority as a new public body which acquired the properties of former private transit company. Until overcome by spiraling inflation of recent years the CTA won national recognition as an unusual transit operation that operated out of the fare box on a break even basis. For many years the CTA was not only able to pay all operating cost from fare collections but also earned death service requirements and was able to set aside appreciation fund which resulted in more than two hundred million dollars worth of capitol improvement, but because of the devastating affects of inflation those notable days of the CTA, as a break even operation are now history. Operating subsidy as well as capitol imporvement subsidy have now become an absolute necessity. We feel confident that history will repeat itself, that all of you in the Legislature will set aside partisan differences... to act quickly on the proposed creation of a Regional Transportation Authority based on a sound sufficient and continuing funding plan. They're many question which you perhaps have as a subsidy need, which I have not touched upon and others... and I would be happy to answer any question that anyone might have."

Neff: "Mr. Totten, do you have a question?"

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Chairman, Pukorsky, you indicated that you were for a, I found in your remarks, funding plan. You are testifying in favor of House Bill 12, as a proponent.... are you going to be testifying



in favor of any of these other plans that are before us?"

Pukorsky: "No. I have indicated to the Leadership and I understand that they have indicated that there are some possible changes that the present Bill, is the only one before you that has adequate funding for public transportation and that... to have a Bill pass that provides the powers, the right, the duties of a Regional Transportation Authority without providing the adequate level of funding would be a defeat on the public."

Garmisa: "So then.... Mr. Chairman, I thought we were in agreement that we were going through the witnesses to expedite the hearing here this afternoon and then go into a question period from whatever witnesses they care to ask a question."

Neff: "Is that agreeable with you, Representative Totten, are do you...."

Totten: "Just as long as we have the understanding that the witnesses will stay for all these...."

Neff: "They will be available for questioning."

Totten: "Okay, I thought was the understanding."

Neff: "Yes; it will be very important that all the witnesses do stay because they will be called back I'm sure for some questions. At this time we're fortunate to have Secretary of Transportation with us this afternoon, who is appearing as a proponent to House Bills 8 through 12, Secretary Langhorn Bond."

Bond: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. In view of the lateness of the hour and the fact that this Legislation has been explored in depth exhaustibly by Chairman Pukorsky, I propose to introduce my testimony to the record and then... and not read it to the House and be available for questioning when that time comes, and if that is acceptable to you and Members of the House."

Neff: "Thank you, Secretary Bond. We have the Mayor of



Evanston here... the city of Evanston, Mayor Vaneman, is that right Mayor... am I pronouncing the name right? I'm not sure I got your name right but... Vaneman... Mayor Vaneman, speaking as a proponent on House Bills 8 through 12."

Vaneman: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. My name is Edgar Vaneman, Jr. and I'm Mayor of the City of Evanston and also the Chairman of the Cook County Council of Government which includes seventy-seven local governments representing well over half the population of suburban Cook County. This Council was instrumental in establishing a six county ad hoc suburban mass transportation coordinating Committee which has had frequent meeting of Mayor's and Village Presidents in northeastern Illinois over a two year period, concerning the crisis of mass transportation in prior metropolian area. The Council of Government in my city believe that there are three principal points which this Legislation should encompass. First the agency must have authority over the entire six county metropolian area and should be established as soon as possible by the Legislature without a referendum. Two, the Board of the agency must be based upon the one man one vote principal, the suburbs have a right to fair representation on the governing board of the RTA. Three, the Legislation should encourage an increase in mass transportation services rather than simply be a holding action for the status quo, this not only means that it must be adequately funded but immediage attention should be given of satisfying the great movement of people between the various suburbs as well as between the suburbs in the central city. In order to assure that the commuter rail services are maintained, the RTA Legislation now before you for consideration should require that the authority enter into purchase of service contracts with



the commuter rail lines and bus companies at the earliest date and that the terms of such contracts assure the rail line and suburban bus companies that they will be fully compensated for their services with the fare rentals for the use of their equipment. The suburbs believe that they should receive a fair share of the revenue which fund the RTA, we are willing to pay for an RTA but a part of our contributions should be distributed to the suburbs. By requiring the RTA to purchase the commuter rail and suburban bus services we will insure that this equitable distribution is made and Mr. Chairman, therefore while I do speak on behalf of much of the Bills that are presently here, I also speak therefore on behalf of much that is present H.B. 15, as well as the H.B. 39 and 40, and as well as some of those mentioned by Representative Deuster. I would simply like to stress that I think there is a tremendous body of public opinion requesting action at this Session of the Legislature. The gas shortage... the recent collapse of the Evanston bus line and the bankruptcy of the Glenview and other bus lines as well as environmental factors and the realization that we can't simply stand any longer on building more expensive highways, all impell us to plead with you to work together and compromise on a RTA Bill. We sincerely believe that the successful Legislator and public official is one who is able to work with Members of parties and reaching a solution to our problems and not one who insist that a particular person or party be given credit for the solution reached nor one who has the power to force the acceptance of his particular solution. I'm convinced that this is time in history when people want to see results from working together rather than the creation of polarize positions this organization and unwillingness to compromise. I am confident that you will



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

reach a solution and I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you. Thank you."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr.... Mayor Vaneman. Now, we have another Mayor here, Mayor McCoy, from Aurora. If he would step up we would like to hear from him, Mayor McCoy will be speaking as a proponent on House Bill 12."

McCoy: "I am Mayor McCoy, from Aurora. My stand has been perfectly clear since the inception of talks on the RTA that I have supported it, my local newspaper has so reported it on the front page. I have also testified at all the public hearings in our area in support of the RTA. In our area there are over six million people in the six county area presently living, there are approximately a hundred thousand more people in the suburban area than there is in the city of Chicago at this time. As the previous speaker has said, by 1995, there will be ten million people living in our area. Seven million in the suburbs, three million in the City of Chicago so, what might not be directly our problem today will be our problem as each and every day goes on. The City of Aurora has supported public transportation out of its general corporate funds since 1967, each and every year we have had to dig into our coffers a little deeper in order to keep public transportation alive. Had it not been for the Illinois State Legislature, in helping us fund our new buses and also our new service area, we would be out of business at this time. We have also kept the public transportation system between Aurora and Elgin, in service... each of the cities in our area is contributing to the loss every month. We must have a proper balance of roads and public transportation in our area, we cannot let the automobile strangle us, I've had the opportunity to visit other cities... large metropolian areas and also study programs in Philadelphia, New York, Boston, San



Francisco, Atlanta, Denver, Washington, Seattle, each and every one of these areas the State Legislature has acted to form a Regional Transit Authority. We live in the area which is the second largest metropolian area in the country, New York one, Chicago area number two, Los Angeles, three. We have just surpassed Los Angeles. I'm not an expert in drafting legislation, but I would suggest that in connection with the purpose of the Bills that are presently before us... that we must make sure and I must be able to assure the poeple in the area in which I live and represent, that the present RTA plan is not just to save the CTA. That it will take care of the suburban rail service and it will take care of the bus lines in our area. The RTA must not have the freedom to ignore us, I do support the RTA, I that that it is high time that we think about the people who are living in the second largest metropolian area and I do ask for your support and consideration towards the formation of RTA. Thank you."

Neff: "Jack, would you hold your question till after we get through, these witnesses will all stay and answer them later, thank you. Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Did I understand that the Secretary Bond, would have printed statements to pass out here, is that right?"

Neff: "Secretary Bond, I believe I did understand that you would have printed statements... do you have those, Sir?"

Ryan: "Thank you."

Neff: "The Secretary will get them and have them passed out. The next man that we will hear from... speaking as a proponent to House Bill 8 through 12, is Preston Piedon, Association of Commerce and Industry... Preston."

Piedon: "Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. My name is Preston Piedon, I'm director of Governmental Affairs with the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry. I appear here today as a representative of the association



and appreciate this opportunity to make a statement expressing our views on the vital subject of a Regional Transportation Authority for the Chicago metropolitan area. Our association strongly supports the creation of a Regional Transportation Authority that will provide a truly coordinated system adequately financed and efficiently managed to be responsible for the transportation of people in the six county, northeastern Illinois area. The citizenry of this six county metropolitan area recognize the need for the establishment of a Regional Transit Authority, recent hearings on the subject, radio and television polls as well as an individual poll taken by the tax payers federation of Illinois, establish that there is a real need for RTA and that the majority supports the establishment of such an agency, that's if the people of this area...."

Neff: "Pardon me, for what reason does Representative Totten, arises?"

Totten: "Just a procedure here, I hate to interrupt Mr.

Piedon, but I think that most of the Members do have copies of his remarks and I wonder... I think I have four other copies of remarks of witnesses who are going to appear before the Committee, if we couldn't... in order to proceed up the hearing, do as the secretary has done, Mr. Bond... provide the Members... so that we could proceed with the rest of the Bill."

Neff: "Preston, if you will kind of hold up on count of time... but if you want to express on certain parts of it, you go ahead and...."

Piedon: "I will abide by the wishes of the Chairman. I would like to make two or three points. And, I beg of you to give me your consideration. I hear many Members in this Body talk... that what happens in Chicago metropolitan area is none of their business, we're from downstate. I want to give you some facts that will



establish that what happens in the metropolitan area affects you... and downstate, and affects this whole State and I ask you to look at these facts... the six county metropolitan area of which Chicago is the core, contains sixty-three percent of the States population. It generates sixty-eight percent of a total State industrial earnings, excluding corporate earnings. At least seventy-five percent of a corporate income is also consecrated in the six county area our metropolitan strength represents seventy-two percent of all the construction occurring in Illinois... sixty-five percent of manufactory, eighty-three percent of wholesale, sixty-five percent of the retail trade, seventy-eight percent of utilities and transportation, sixty-nine percent of government and fifty-seven percent of the total manufactured exports made in Illinois. It is clear that the economic well being of this State is substantially dependant upon the economic well being of this metropolitan area. I don't think that you can, in good conscious fail to recognize that the economics of this area is threaten and serverly threaten... and our plea is that you consider this statement which I will read no further, except to say that this is a vital problem, it begs for an answer now and we hope that you will meet the issue now. Thank you."

Neff: "The next witness will be call..... to be called is Harry Gahagen, I believe it is, Chicago Real Estate Board and also past President and Chairman of the Transportation Committee, is appearing as support of the RTA Bills as a proponent of House Bills 11 through 12. Mr. Gahagen."

Gahagen: "Mr. Chariman, distinguished Members, Ladies and Gentlemen of the.... My name is Harry Gahagen, I'm a realtor, past President of the Chicago Real Estate Board and Chairman of their 1958. I say 1958, gentlemen



for your benefit because in that year the Chicago Real Estate Board made a very exhaustive study of the transportation problem in the metropolian of Chicago. This study was made not only in the northeastern part of this great State but it was made in connection with the then study and planning for the park system that is now in affect in the San Francisco area and particularly in the New York transit area. As a result of this study, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Chicago Real Estate Board Committee which I had.... we developed Senate Bills 989 and 990, creating a metropolitan transportation authority in the six counties of the northeastern part of our State. Many of you Gentlemen here will recall that.... and I'm pleased to remind you of the fact that those Bills passed all Committees in both sides of the House and were approved by the Senate and 2/3 rd's in the House. The Second Reading was accomplished just before the clock turned back and in the morning when the Session was resumed these Bills creating a transit authority in 1959, were killed on a technicality that the Amendments were not before the Legislators therefore, the matter was killed. Now, since 1959, our problem has generated to a point where you hear it every day, it has become chaotic, we have a crisis... crisis I don't think is the word for it... this great system of transportation that we have today, that we're trying to put into a metropolitan transit organization, is without a question one of the finest systems in the United States. This statement... not coming from me, I'm repeating it... it was made by the transit officials from John Volpe, our past Secretary of Transportation.... by many of our leaders. This is a system that must be coordinated.... there is a few excerpts that I'll just touch on very lightly, in the statement that was made



in 1959, because they are absolutely the same as they are today except that the crisis is before us to a point where immediate action must be taken. We emphasize the fact that transportation was a regional matter, required in one comprehensive policy for dealing with the transportation systems the confusion which results, through non coordinated efforts of all the various responsibly agencies must be eliminated if this problem is to be solved. We did advise both the Senate and the House and reminded them as we remind you today, that this certainly is the problem of this great body and it is up to you Gentlemen, to solve it. This great system that I mentioned was created through public... through private interest, through men of leadership and brouth about the CTA and our great suburban railroads is faltering today. One they say a crisis, I'll use a medical term... those systems that includes everyone of the suburban railroads in the CTA are to use a medical term... they're in a state of rigor mortis, Ladies and Gentlemen. The time has come... the Chicago Real Estate Board who has supported a Regional Transit during all these years... they are here to urge you to beg and plead with you to not leave Springfield in the next ten days without giving the people who are waiting this great Bill to become a reality. I thank you, very much."

Neff: "We have with us Mr. Jack Cornelious, who has distributed his statement in order to save some time on the House floor here... Mr. Cornelious, is Chicago Central area representative of Chicago Central area Committee as executive secretary and we do appreciate... yes we would like to have.... if you would like to make a statement Mr...."

Cornelious: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen. Let me paraphrase the statement which you have just received in



order to save time. I think the most important thing that I have to say is, to call your attention to the kinds of companies that are represented by this group. We're talking about major employers of tens of thousands of people in the Chicago area and they are deeply concerned with the necessity for establishing as quickly as possible a viable transportation system an attractive alternative to the automobile. We're under the gun right now from the federal EPA and from the Illinois EPA, to cut down on auto traffic, in our own planning process in corporation with the City of Chicago. We recognize the necessity to cut automobile traffic in the next few years in the downtown area by as much as 20%, but we can't do it... we can't accomplish it unless we get that attractive alternative. Now, we can't write the Legislation as businessmen because that really is your job and we as a group and as a group which has a very strong stake in... what happens in the Chicago metropolitan area and particularity what happens in the central business district... urge you to get on with that job."

Neff: "Thank's Mr. Cornelious. The next party that we would like to hear from is Mrs. Elenor Wolf, I see sitting back there... Elenor, we would like to have you come up and make a statement. Mrs. Wolf is appearing as a proponent on House Bill 12."

Elenor Wolf: "Gentlemen, my name is Elenor Wolf, Jr., I'm Chairman of the Greater Lake County Mass Transit District. We encompass the entire county of Lake..... or that we do not represent, I belong to north suburban mass transit district but we're in full concurrence with them on the RTA implementation. It is indeed a privilege to appear to you today as a participate in your efforts to create a rapid transit authority for the six county



area of Greater Lake of Greater Chicago. I appear before you today not only as a expert in urban mass transportation but also as a concerned and interested member of suburban Lake County, as many of you know I have always supported the concept of a Regional Transportation Authority, it is my contingention that efficient and economical mass transportation can only be provided to six county area through a Regional Authority which impowered to finance, regulate and coordinate all those of transportation. While I favor RTA, I am concerned that if the organized so as to insure that all of our citizens share in its benefits. As a long time resident of a suburban county, I urge you to assure your constituents in the suburbs that their needs will be met. The life blood of suburban area is a suburban commuter rail service and our suburban bus lines, while the news media is full of stories which tell the financial crisis facing the CTA... little is said of the deteriorating service from continued deficit operations which plege buses, commuter rail services it is essential that legislation now before you for consideration, provide for revenues which will eliminate these operations subsidy and maintain existing services. To achieve this result, I must say that both House Bill 12 and 15, should require that the RTA to enter into purchase of service contracts with the commuter rail lines and suburban bus lines within a year or within a reasonable period of time after the formation of the RTA. In order to maintain and improve its existing services these contracts accuractely compensate the buses and the rail lines by providing for those costs incurred in providing commuter service and in the instance of private companies, a reasonable rate of return on a facility used in public transportation only by requiring that the RTA to purchase the suburban



service... will the suburban taxpayers be assured that the revenue of the RTA are equably distributed so as to benefit public transportation in the suburbs. The Members of this House who represent the suburbs of the six county region must realize that transportation needs of the suburban areas are directly ties to the continued operation of commuter bus lines and rail service, with the Chicago area rail commuter lines suffering... operating losses in the amounts of seventeen million dollars a year we cannot afford to let the funding priorities of the RTA be left the conjecture and speculation, language must be inserted in the legislation to insure that our commuter services and bus lines will not be discontinued. The legislature can be proud of the fact that they have come a long way in dealing with the problem of mass transportation in the greater Chicago area. Many difficult problems and issues have been resolved by political compermise however, you work will be in vain if an affective and viable Regional Transportation Authority is not enacted in this Session. I urge you and you colleagues to put aside political differences and as you have been able to do in the past and enact an RTA Bill which will finally solve the crisis in mass transportation which has pledge the six county region for so many years. I thank you for listening."

Neff: "Thank you, Elenor. The next witness that we would like to hear is appearing as a proponent on House Bill 12, is John Robinson, a lawyer for the commuter railroad in the Chicago region."

Robinson: "Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, my name is John E. Robinson. I'm pleased to be here on behalf of the commuter railroads of the Chicago area, specifically the Burlington Northern, Chicago and Northwestern, the Illinois Central Gulf, the Milwaukee Road of Rock Island



and the South Shore line. I have served under Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation and of this General Council. I'm presently a partner in the Chicago Law Firm of Sidley and Austin. Commuter railroads of Chicago support the creation of a Regional Transportation Authority, only through a responsible regional body can a essential existing public transportation services be preserved and improved and coordinated. Without an adequately funded RTA, public transportation to the citizens in Chicago metropolitan region will suffer irreversible decay. Commuter rail service represents the most important public transportation resource within the metropolitan region outside the City of Chicago. Commuter rail services is the life blood of public transportation in our suburban areas and is vital to the City of Chicago its self, thousands of residents of the suburbs and the city are completely dependant on commuter rail service for access to their jobs, and Chicago area citizens make nearly seventy million rides on commuter rail service each year. With the prospect of gasoline rationing eminent, commuter rail service takes on even more critical importance. But, the commuter rail service in Chicago area is in serious financial trouble, this year commuter rail services there will be about seventeen million dollars in the red and that deficient is expected to increase in succeeding years. Only one commuter railroad is not yet losing money, in the case of another of the commuter railroads financial condition is so serious that the ability to continue any commuter service at all is in immediate jeopardy. Experience has taught us that the inedible result of continue deficient operations will be sharply deteriorated service, service cut backs, worn out equipment inadequate maintenance of stations and road beds



NOV 07 1973

143.

and loss of jobs. Without an RTA commuter rail service cannot buck the tide of these unpleasant economic facts. My purpose today is to bring to your attention a number of our concerns that RTA legislation should deal with specifically, if it is to be a law that will benefit the citizens of the entire Chicago metropolitan region and if it is to be a law of equity and fairness. First, it is imperative that commuter rail service be assured of a conclus... unclusion within RTA, we believe that the appropriate way to accomplish this at the outset, is through purchase of service contracts between RTA and the commuter railroad covering the existing commuter rail service, however there is no assurance in the legislation which has been introduced that such purchase of service contracts will be fore coming or there terms will be equable. The legislation should provide that is a commuter railroad request entry into the purchase of service contract with RTA, that RTA be obliged to tender a contract, if the parties find themselves in disagreement on certain terms of the contract, we propose that those unresolved contract terms be referred to binding arbitration. In this way RTA legislation can assure the commuter rail service will be brought into the system at an early date and that RTA commuter railroads can negotiate terms of a purchase of service agreement fair to both parties. To suggest that the Illinois Commerce Commission could act as the arbitrater, in addition RTA legislation should specify that the purchase of service contracts with RTA covering commuter rail service, be on a basis which covers those costs which are incurred in or allocable to the service provided under the contract which allows a resonable return on the property and facilities that the railroad used in the service. Only through such a provision can commuter rail services be preserved and



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NOV 07 1973

144.

incentive for their improvement and expansion be provided. We believe that the most fairest, the most effective, the most clearly understandable way to articulate this standard in RTA legislation, is to adopt the principles in the language contained in the Illinois Public Utilities Act. We're saying simply this, commuter rail transportation cannot provide quality service or operate adequately or for long, if the cost of the services are not covered and if in the case of any public use of privately owned property, a fair rental or return... not paid on the property used in public service. Another point of critical importance not only to the Chicago region but to the entire State, is the assurance that efficient freight service will continue to be made available to consumers, shippers, farmers and manufacturers. Most of the trackage in the Chicago area over which commuter rail service is performed, is also used for freight service because of the joint use of trackage and other physical facilities by both passenger and freight service, it is essential that the legislation specifically provides that the action of RTA do not unreasonably interfere with the ability of a railroad to provide efficient freight service. There is such a provision in the interest of RTA and the economy of the Chicago area and the entire State, which is so heavily dependent on rail freight service can be reasonably and appropriately accommodated. Because rail facilities are jointly used and because commuter rail services become under RTA regulatory jurisdiction, freight services would remain under the jurisdiction of the Illinois Commerce Commission. The present provision of the Illinois Imminent Domain Act which calls for the Illinois Commerce Commission to approve in case condemnation of real property of a railroad or other public utility, should be maintained.



These procedures now apply to every other state and local agency Imminent domane powers, including the Highway Department, we believe they should be simmerly applied to RTA. We also suppose that RTA legislation contain equable provisions requiring RTA to purchase within a reasonable time such as the commuter cars and rolling stock now privately own, which are modern, serviceable in good condition and are currently utilized in commuter rail service. Federal and State capital grants should be available to RTA to cover nearly all of the purchase price of such equipment and such a provision offers RTA an opportunity for possible equalization in the level of commuter rail fares... for where the commuter rail equipment is privately owned, its cost and the cost of money used to financed this acquisition must be reflected in those commuter fares. Almost all of the Chicago area commuter rail service equipment is now publicly owned by various mass transit districts putting it all in the public ownership, should reduce the cost of RTA for riding commuter rail service and provide flexibly in the utilization of the commuter rail equipment. To met the concerns of some with the respect to such requirements we have no objections the legislation providing that in case there is an disagreement as to the price to be paid, the price will be determined either through condonation proceedings or outside arbitration. Nor would we have any objection to such required purchases being condition on the sellers agreement not to distribute the proceeds to its share holders or dividens or otherwise, and to limit the use of such proceeds to road improvement, such as right a way, maintiance, equipment and for the acquisition of new freigh cars and locomotives or simular purposes. We have prepared specific Amendments to the legislation introduced in this body which we believe deal responsibly



with the concerns that I have discussed today, which cover other points of a more technical nature. Let me say a final word concerning labor protection provisions in RTA legislation, in House Bill 1958, the RTA legislation which came close to passing this last June... there were labor protection provisions adopted under Amendment 18, to that Act which represented long serious and thoughtful negotiations...."

Neff: "Mr. Robinson, would you hold up just a minute and see if I can get you a little order. I think it's getting a little noisy out here. Can we have a little more order please, there is people here that are trying to listen to these witnesses and I'm sure they would like to hear so could we have a little more order. Little less conversation... it would be appreciated. Thank you."

Robinson: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Those labor protection provisions adopted under Amendment 18, to that Act... represented long serious and thoughtful negotiations between the commuter railroads, the labor representatives and representatives from other labor groups affected by RTA. These protected provisions were overwhelmingly adopted by the House, railroad management believe that these are reasonable protections and not burdens after all the purpose of RTA is to improve and expand public transportation in the Chicago region and if such circumstances it will be more jobs not fewer. To William Mahoney, representing rail under the labor group whom will fully address this issue, that we wish to express railway management full support for the inclusion of such labor protective provision as an essential part of RTA legislation. The issues discussed above are of deep concern to us, if these issues are adequately addressed in an RTA Bill we can enthusiastically supported. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Neff: "Mr. Robinson, I noticed when you filled out your ..."



witness slip, you said with Amendments, I think it would be good.... interested in the Bill.... with Amendments on it, you might state the Amendments you are interested in."

Robinson: "Well, in just brief discription, Mr. Chairman, those would include one... a requirement that the RTA upon request enter tender and enter into a purchase of service contract with a commuter rail service and if there is disagreement as to the terms that those terms be arbitrated in a binding fashion by the Illinois Commerce Commission. Secondly, we feel that there should be specific provision in the Act which precludes RTA action on reasonably interfering with the provision of the efficient freight service by the railroad. Thirdly, we have mentioned the... a requirements... an equable requirement that there be a purchase by RTA of rolling stocks which is not now already in public hands. Fourthly, I have addressed myself to the problem of continuing the present requirements of the Imminent Domain Act of Illinois in respect of the condonation of public utility property which requires Illinois Commerce Commission approval in those cases and fifthly, I have addressed the labor protection provision, there are a few others of a technical nature and those would be reflected in Amendments which we hope will be considered favorably by this body."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Robinson. The next witness we'll call as appearing as an opponent... as a proponent to House Bill 12, and in his statement.... his witness slip, he says only with Amendments. Mr. Mahoney, comes from the railroad labor organization. Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Again, Mr. Mahoney's statement has been distributed to the Members and I wonder if we could speed up the proceedings by.... if he wants to..."

Neff: "We'll take your point as well taken and we'll see if



can..."

Robinson: "I think he wanted to discuss the Amendments he had in mind, Representative Totten."

Neff: "Yes, I think the Amendments particularly, the Members would like to hear Mr. Mahoney."

Mahoney: "My name is William G. Mahoney, I'm a lawyer with offices at 1015 18th Street, Northwest Washington, D.C. For over twenty-one years I have represented railroad and airline labor unions before federal and State Agencies and the courts and have represented them during their participation in a development of the rail passenger service Act of 1970, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, and the high speed ground transportation Act of 1966. At the present time I represent railroad labor in their efforts to secure effective employee protection in the northeast region of the United States legislation that is pending before the United States Congress. I appear here today to present the joint position of rail labor organization, representing the vast majority of the employees of the commuter railroads interested in the Regional Transportation Authority legislation now pending before this legislature. As well as the great majority of railroad employees in the State of Illinois, the organizations whose joint position I here present, are the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the United Transportation Union, the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, the Brotherhood of Railway and Airline Clerks and the Brotherhood of Signalman. In this Special Session of the Legislature and in the 1973, Spring Session of the 78th General Assembly, these brotherhoods supported the basic concepts of a Regional Transportation Authority for northeastern Illinois and have been most willing to work with the Sponsors on Legislation introduced before the



General Assembly. The establishment of a Regional Transportation Authority for northeastern Illinois would affect the rights and interest of virtually all employees presently engaged in mass transportation in that region of this State, therefore, essential that legislation enacted by this General Assembly contain fair, adequate and effective protection to the interest of the employees who will be directly affect...."

Neff: "Yes, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "I was under the understanding that since this statement has been handed out and since I have already read it, I wouldn't have to listen to it again.... while I was not following mine closely, it seems to me that he's going line for line. Now, if he wants to speak to the Amendment, let him speak to the Amendment, perhaps he will even tell me if the Chicago and northwestern railroads employees will be able to vote on a contract to this Amendment."

Neff: "Your point is well taken, Mr. Mahoney, if you can confine it to the Amendment... we'll appreciate it."

Mahoney: "I hadn't realized that it had been passed out, I apologize for reading a statement. I would like to add merely this to the statement that has been passed out, and that is... in addition to the Amendment to the Bill presently pending that I mention in the statement, House Bill 16, which is comparable to House Bill 1959, of the Spring 1973, Session. Should also contain the employees protection adopted by the House on June 23rd, as an Amendment to H.B. 1959. Amendment has been prepared to House Bills 12, 15 and 16, which would incorporate into those Bills the employee protective provisions adopted by the House in the 1973, Spring Session of the 73rd General Assembly as Amendment 18, to House Bill 1958 and there is Amendment to, to House



Bill 1959. As well as accomplishing the other essential obligations or objectives rather, that I point out in my statement. Representative Hanahan, will introduce these Amendments and I respectfully urge the House to adopt them in any RTA legislation which is an Act.

Thank you."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Mahoney. The next Gentleman that we'll call... appearing as a proponent and again with Amendments... statement is Mr. Clinton Curtain, U.S. Gypsum Company."

Curtain: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My statement is submitted on behalf of six companies, the United State Gypsum Company, Harry B. Goldbrick, Director of Transportation and Civil Distribution, Allied Mills Incorporated, A.E. Licer, Vice President of Traffic, Kraft Foods, D.C. Smith, General Traffic Manager, International Harvester Company, J.M. Gamble, General Traffic Manager. Amoco Oil Company, James J. Soboto, Manager of Traffic and Distribution, Quaker Oats Company, Sam Hall Flint, Vice President. The above named individuals are responsible, among other things, for providing efficient freight transportation for the companies that they serve. Each of these companies is vitally interested in maintaining its strong and efficient railroad freight network in the State of Illinois. I am Clinton Curtain, appearing on behalf of these six Chicago area rail freight shippers. We favor the establishment of the metropolitan transportation authority in the six county area of northeastern Illinois to include the CTA suburban railroads and suburban bus lines. Our objectives in the establishment of Regional Authority are two fold, first as shippers of freight we are dependant upon a vital and strong railroad system, the railroad system must be relieved to a burdensome commuter service deficient if it is to remain vital and strong and serve the needs



of Commerce and Industry. Secondly, the citizens of Chicago area we believe to be in the public interest to establish an efficient, coordinated mass transit system in the region. Both of these objectives can only be reached if the legislation creating an RTA, provides assurance that the commuter rail service of the six county area will be provided by the RTA. We support the concept which will permit the RTA to provide rail commuter services to the purchase of service contracts as embodied in both H.B. 12 and 15, and possibly others. However, we feel that it is imperative that the RTA be required to enter into these purchase of service contracts in early stages of its development to insure that the commuter railroads become more vital and meaningful part of an RTA at the outset. In addition these purchase of service contracts must be provided... must provide the railroads with full cost for their commuter services and a reasonable rate of return. Rail transportation faces great challenges as our economy in Illinois expands, many railroads suffering operating losses and poor rate of return must be able to generate more capital to provide for needed investment in freight cars, track and roadway property and terminal facilities. Four major Illinois freight carriers, the Burlington Northern, The Illinois Central Gulf, The Milwaukee Road and The Rock Island have indicated that they will lose over seventeen million dollars in 1973, in commuter service. It follows these losses effectively prevent an investment in freighting equipment and facilities which shippers need and expect in return for payment of freight charges in an amount of at least equal to such losses. It is intolerable for us to be required to support through freight charges the deficit commuter operations or social services desired



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

by the public. Competition for freight business is intense among the railroads, truck lines and barge lines a rail system can compete effectively with other modes of transportation only through relative heavy investment in capital facilities. Commuter deficits burden the railroads and lessen their ability to acquire equipment and maintain their facility. Some persons may say that the railroads can carry deficit commuter operation as they're equiped per quo, for the franchise to carry freight, such thinking however, can only lead to servere financial strain on the rail system and in the case of marginal railroad, can lead to bankruptcy. The national structure of the problem was indicated by the statement of George Baker, trustee for the Penn Central, that the drain on Penn Central from its provision of commuter and passager services under unadequate compensation arrangement was one of the four major problems that Penn Central must solve before it can become healthy. We also support in RTA which is able to unify and integrate the various systems of transportation in the area, we do not question the fact that in order to provide effective and economical mass transportation in the six county region, the RTA must be able to regulate the services it purchases from the railroad. We are concerned that such regulations however, does not limit the railroads ability to provide efficient and competitive freight service, it is important to realize that the Chicago area relies heavily on the railroads to supply the goods and material that make it one of the most prosperous area of the country, while the public needs... convenient and modern commuter service, it also demands a quality of rail freight delivery which will enhance the economic progress of the community. The legislation in creating the RTA



must not.... such a system of freight service to the region, House Bill 12 or 15, must recognize the two competing social services and carefully balance these interest so that each will be served with a minimum of restrain on the other. Finally, we would note that both H.B. 12 and 15, provide for single operation agency for the mass transit in the region, as managers of corporate organizations it appears to us that the single agency approach incompusing the six county areas is far preferable to the multy sub agency technique, the later forms would invariably create numerous conflicts between agencies which would fork the objective of the overall authority. The organizational constructure should be as simple as possible and avoid unnecessarily complex inter relationships. At the same time we support RTA which is adequately and properly funded, it is imparative that all systems of transportation in the region be able to maintain and improve their services for a healthy and prospective Regional Transportation Authority. I thank you."

Neff: "The next witness is Jodie Berman, Illinois Department of Transportation. Is Mr. Berman here? Mr. Berman is appearing as a proponent on House Bill 8 through 12. Mr. Washington... Harold Washington. Mrs. Berman will be available to answer questions."

Washington: "Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee of the Whole. House Bills 8 and 9, are part of the Governor's package of RTA... that package dealing with House Bills 8 through 12, in the Third Special Session and they are a part of a package in the sense that they provide for interim loans through mass transit in the six... northeast six county area. House Bill 8,.. well, House 9, creates the emergency public transportation loan Act of 1973, to provide a loan assistance program for



mass transportation carriers in the six county north-eastern region, requires the Regional Transportation Authority to repay in full all loans made for operating subsidy by July 1, 1979, is effective upon becoming law. House Bill 8, creates the Act appropriating fifty million dollars to the Department of Transportation for loans to public transportation carriers authorized by the emergency public transportation loan Act of 1973, which is House Bill 9. Very briefly because you have the Bills before you, the Act provides as I said before, interim finance measures to subsidy operating deficient of Chicago area mass transportation operations during the period of October 1, '73, to June 30, 1974. The theory here being that even if we do invoke in RTA that will be an interim period when these mass transit systems will be short of funds and these two Bills are designed to provide those funds. Now, under the Bill the maximum of fifty million dollars made available to the carriers as follows, the Chicago Transit Authority would receive during that period a maximum amount of forty-six million five hundred thousand dollars, the Commuter Railroads, excluding the CTA and Amtrak would receive the sum of three million dollars and the Suburban Bus Lines would receive the sum of five hundred thousand dollars, a total of fifty million. Now, the fifty million is a loan from the General Revenue Fund to be repaid by the proposed Regional Transit Authority. The Secretary of the Department of Transportation is empowered to make and approve the loans to the Chicago Transit Authority in the amount of forty-six million and five hundred thousand for operating expenses. The loans should not be used for death service or revenue bonds and shall not be subject to terms of the Chicago Transit Authority revenue bonds trust agreements. I won't go



any further into the details of the Bill, I think the Bill is pretty clear there may be some detail questions and we have people from the Department of Transportation and Mr. Milton Pukorsky, from a Chicago Transit Authority who can deal with those questions but, this must be considered as part of the Governor's package and in a sense adjunct to the Regional Transit Authority Bill, the main Bill being House Bill 12. Thank you, very much."

Neff: "Thank you, Harold. Now, at this time even though we do have some opponents that would like to testify, I think that we will open it up to questions the proponents. If you have a question and would like to have a particular person to answer it, if you would state who you would like to have... I hope all of the witnesses have stuck around so that we can... they will be here when the questions are brought forward. Just before we get into the questions, 10 and 11, haven't been covered and we have a Gentleman here that would like to take a brief moment to explain those. Mr. Stone."

Stone: "You know, I don't pay much attention to... Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Committee as a whole, I very seldom pay very much attention to rumors but there is a rumor going around at the place that they call, across the rotunda, that they are passing out one RTA Bill... that it is coming over here, they will take care of it next week... they will send it over here adjourn and go home... so I think... although I don't pay much attention to rumors, it has been my experience in the end the Members of the House of Representatives get it in the end so, I'm just hoping that we won't get it this time and that the... both Houses of this Legislature will have an opportunity to consider all RTA Bills. House Bill 10, merely creates the downstate highways that bond Act and authorizes the bond issue of



four hundred and fifty million dollars and House Bill 11, amends the State Finance Act to add the downstate highways bond fund to the bond retirement and interest fund. Thank you, very much."

Neff: "Thank you, Paul. Now, at this time we will start on questions and Representative Hill..."

Hill: "Yes, I would like to ask some questions of Mayor McCoy, from Aurora."

Neff: "Mayor McCoy... he wanted to beat the rush hours, Jack."

Hill: "Well, I noticed on his slip that he had assigned to testify, he said that he was in favor of it with Amendments and not ever having had any discussion with Mayor McCoy, on this I certainly would have liked to question him about the Amendments that he would like put on these various Bills. Secondly, because polls have been taken in Kane County area and overwhelmingly opposed to the various RTA Bills that appear in front of the Legislature. I was wondering if he was down here speaking as a Mayor or as an individual citizen of that particular area. I would also like to find out whether or not the taxpayers of Aurora paid for his trip down here and his trip back or if he done this out of his own pocket. And, I'm sorry that he has left, I distinctly asked right while... after he finished testifying whether or not I could ask a few questions and Mr. Chairman, you explained to me that after all testimony was taken, that all of these individuals would remain here so we could ask these questions. Apparently I'll have to either get him on the phone or write him a letter to find out what he was talking about when he said, that he would be in favor of it with Amendments. I feel confident that he would allow the people of our area to vote on something like this I don't think he's the Mayor that would want to take



rights away from the people but, I'll find that out when I go home this week-end. I'm sorry that he left, I'm sorry that you didn't allow me to ask a question at that particular time... it seem to me that if you had an agreement with these people that were testifying that they would stay here to answer questions, then certainly they should have stayed here. Thank you."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Hill, and I think your point is well taken, I'm sorry that Mayor McCoy, isn't here... I thought Sparkie Garmisa would hold these folks here but one or two of them might have slipped out. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to continue with the questions that I started with Chairman Pukorsky. Also, some of these questions so that any of the witnesses don't leave may have to be answered by Secretary Bond and the Sponsors. I indicated when I started that for an indication from you as to whether you were testifying just for this package of Bills rather than any other... and I wondered if you would proceed with your answer on that."

Pukorsky: "The subsidy provisions with very few exceptions the so called, Blair-Harris Bill and the Walker Bill, are the products the work products of the professional staff, I think everyone involved... the Senate Staff, the House Staff, the Department of Transportation people, the City people, many Community and Civic Organizations... so substantially with few exceptions, we have a Bill that is a model Bill in this nation. I say substantively there is an issue on the home rule provision there are some issue that I think will be resolved in some of the labor propositions and some of the purchase of service provision involving the railroad. A side to the best of my knowledge... aside from



those, substantively there is consenses among the Governor's Bill and the House Leadership Bill. Financially there is some mark differences, both from the sales tax provision.... but the defect presently in the Leadership Bill, is that it is inadequately funding. To my knowledge the Leadership certainly is not bound, not to modify it or change it in some later date but, in asking is there a Bill today that meets the financial requirements... the only Bill before you that I know of that is adequate of the Bill that is House Bill 12."

Totten: "So that, you would be testifying in favor of House Bill 12, over any other House Bill, is that correct?"

Pukorsky: "In the light of the financing."

Totten: "Okay, let's get down to the finacing, what provisions in House Bill 12, regarding the financing do you feel make it... more adequate than any of the other Bills we may be considering?"

Pukorsky: "I mention publicly that if House Bill... well, that House Bill 12, has auto related tax which could be a gas tax, a parking tax, a vehicle tax, or in auto related tax such as presently imposed within the State of Illinois. That type of a tax would make that Bill adequate."

Totten: "When you talk about adequate and not of dollars required, would indicate to me whether it would be adequate it would be adequate financing. These taxes would raise or these fees would raise... how much do you anticipate in the year 1975?"

Pukorsky: "Well, we have indicated that you can't do all the things that the public and the Legislature and community leaders would want because of the pressing needs of other social problems with education... we really said that about two hundred and fifty million dollar average



for the four year period is what you would go... it might be two hundred to two hundred and twenty-five for fiscal '74, and now drop further so there would again be in about 1977, the need for some further consideration but that consideration would not require any Legislative action in the situation, the Legislature says that if they want someone to hear crisis problem again and you're transferring the responsibility to the Regional Transportation Authority."

Totten: "Could not... I believe in this House Bill 12, we're talking about sixty million dollars in General Revenue, could not that be a matter for the Legislature to consider as to whether to increase that at future date... should the finances of the RTA demand additional funds."

Pukorsky: "Well, on that issue this is the discussion that the leadership... Democratic leadership and the Governor have selected. That is not a vehicle that I have publicly said, is the wisest vehicle."

Totten: "Are you then... would it then be your opinion that this sixty million dollars was a lid?"

Pukorsky: "Well, it could be or in my judgement without that if you gave the Transportation Authority the auto related tax basis, you could still adequately fund the needs for the six county area."

Totten: "Would that sixty million dollars remain as a lid?"

Pukorsky: "Right."

Totten: "Okay, now how much revenue would you anticipate would be raised by the registration fee?"

Pukorsky: "Well, that has been estimated by the Department of Transportation as forty-five million dollars in the six county area."

Totten: "For the year 1975."

Pukorsky: "That is correct."

Totten: "What gross factor do you anticipate in that?"



Pukorsky: "I would say... actually I don't think that that influences again the ability of having a financing, if we're getting an increase roughly at a rate of... I think about 3% new automobiles a year, if that were to continue you would take 3% which would be about 1.3 million dollars."

Totten: "Well, what I'm trying to arrive at Chairman, is exactly how much money we're going to be able to raise including the sixty million and the forty-five million which you have indicated, I think you have indicated previously that we may in the year 1975, need somewhere between a hundred and fifty million and maybe a hundred and seventy-five million to get the RTA off of the ground. Let's assume then that we have sixty million and forty-five million, that's a hundred and five million. The auto related taxes that would be imposed by this Authority then would have to make up the gap, is that correct?"

Pukorsky: "That is correct."

Totten: "How much would that gap be in the year 1977?"

Pukorsky: "Somewhere in the vicinity of a hundred and seventy-five to two hundred million dollars."

Totten: "What then would the auto related taxes that the Authority would have to impose to make up that gap?"

Pukorsky: "Well, we've indicated parking taxes as one, there is the general feeling that those people who drive to the downtown area, in Chicago that come in and park their cars and don't move that car for eight or nine hours should be paying the freight for that space that is taken for that purpose. We've talked as high as ten dollars as a added parking cost for the all day parking, decreasing to zero for many a four hour parking trip for the person that comes down to transact business. We're talking about that type of situation of raising some resources. We're talking about motor fuel tax where



a one cent tax would represent about thirty-six million dollars in the six county area and we're talking about some level of vehicle tax to the six county area where if we say that there is a rebate of fifteen dollars in the six county area, generates forty-five million dollars then if there was an additional tax that was five dollars, it would generate fifty million dollars so then again you have the ability of choosing the equitable tax increment to serve the needs of the six county area."

Totten: "Would you put a lid on the parking tax..."

Pukorsky: "Pardon."

Totten: "Would you put a lid on the amount of revenue and just take it from the parking tax?"

Pukorsky: "I don't think that you should because really you want to determine what the social objective in community objective are plaintiff of the region are... and if you find that because of environmental concern, energy crisis any other combination of facts that an inflationary cost that there should be a certain level of tax put on for parking, that should be imposed... that should be directly determined by public hearings, which are required by the Regional Authority, it requires a six out of nine vote of all the Members to impose something like that and to have it in the budget so this involves the public at large, the Legislative pressure, the political pressures and I'm sure that it will be wisely chosen."

Totten: "Then... these taxes that could be imposed by the Authority could be parking taxes, it could be a cent per gallon... on the motor fuel which in order to make up these revenue gaps... I show a revenue gap, using the figures... you've got a House Bill 12, with some two hundred and seven million dollars by 1980... that's



a considerable amount of money to raise... just use the cent per gallon that means the Authority would be able to impose a tax of 4.9 cents per gallon to make up that deficit."

Pukorsky: "Let me suggest something... just as interest.

It cost you twenty cents a mile to operate a large car, of which a little over two cents a mile under the cost of gasoline of it being about thirty-five is for gas, it cost you fifteen cents a mile to operate a compact car, a five cents... a five cent, not a five percent a five cent increase in motor fuel tax would mean the cost of operating a large car increase 1/3 rd of a cent a mile out of the twenty cents and 1/4 of a cent a mile out of the fifteen cents. The City of Evanston, hearing of all of the concerns on the populous of increasing motor fuel tax elected to save the transportation system composed of one cent a gallon tax. They have indicated that they made an error, that they were too concerned about what the public reaction was, it is a much minor reaction and were they to do it again they would have imposed an adequate tax to give them the public transportation system which they would have liked to provide for their populous and they may in fact, take some for taxes."

Totten: "Well, in order to make up this revenue gap which you have agreed that is approximately correct, two hundred and seven million dollars by 1980, then the Authority would have the sole authority to impose these taxes under this Bill."

Pukorsky: "But it requires a public hearing it requires six out of nine votes of members who have been appointed by the county in the area, certainly they would be responsive to the needs of the counties in the region."

Totten: "Well, let me ask you this... do you know of any



unit of government in Illinois which is not an elected body... ever being given the authority... the taxing power without referendum that the Precedent would be set in this type of..."

Pukorsky: "Well, this has been discussed and the feeling was the confidence in giving this authority to RTA is in question, that some percentage limitation... perhaps to the State road fund or something that would be adequate level would certainly be something that could be considered. The feeling generally is that this type of an agency for the needs would have enough review, supervision, over view from the Legislature, from the press, from the county boards, from the citizenry at large that... that would not be required. But, again this is a judgement of the legislative leaders."

Totten: "Let me ask you this, if in the House Bill 12, you also have a provision regarding the 2/3 rd's revenue being returned to the county from I believe, origination of the money, what position in the Bill would pertain this 2/3 rd's being retained or returned to suburban Cook County as a unit?"

Pukorsky: "I don't know specifically that this was spelled out when it was said in counties and I don't think ther is any problem in that. If someone wanted to amend the Bill, in fact this is already... to my knowledge being taken care of by the services. For example, the CTA extension of service really have a great benefit to the entire Cook County area, the suburban Cook County area but, I'm sure that this could be adequately covered. If it isn't specific... I think it's being done today."

Totten: "Okay, it isn't in the Bill right now?"

Pukorsky: "I'm not that sure."

Totten: "Let me ask you this now... why is the suburban Transportation Corporation not included in this Bill



was there a reason perhaps?"

Pukorsky: "I would say there was very definitely a reason, the RTA has the ability of creating and operating if it feels wise to create one. It has the opportunity of utilizing the existing suburban bus companies to enlarge their area, if they chose too. They have the ability to use the CTA to expand its service in other areas, it becomes then a judgement on what is the best solution by creating a suburban transportation corporation you are in affect encircling the CTA operation and saying that you mandate something outside which may not be an efficient operation in all areas and in some areas it may and so we're saying that is an unreasonable restriction to place on the authority. They have the ability of doing everything that the suburban transportation corporation Bill would provide, but if they find that it is in the public interest in some areas to extend CTA service, then they have that opportunity of doing so."

Totten: "This was apparently acceptable to you in House Bill 1958, but is not acceptable to you now, is that correct?"

Pukorsky: "No, I think that if you talk to the Speaker, you'll find that this was something that was not acceptable at that time either."

Totten: "It would seem that the suburban area would very much be precluded from a voice in this without a suburban transportation preparation in there. I think that it would be necessary. Chairman, just let me continue on one other line... a couple more questions here. Under the definition of public transportation facilities, when I compared those definition with the ones that appeared in the Blair Bill, there were no provisions against toll roads or toll bridges in House Bill 12, could you explain to me why... those provision



were not... are not in House Bill 12."

Pukorsky: "I believe that you would defer that question to Secretary Bond, who in those technical days will be able to answer that more directly, if you would like him to do it now or would you like to hold."

Totten: "Let me hold that one and I will ask one other question then. Under House Bill 12, how much of the money revenue collected would go to the City of Chicago in the CTA operation and under House Bill 12, how much of the money... percentage would come from the suburban and outlined county areas?"

Pukorsky: "About... 67% would be collected in the areas served by the CTA, approximately 61% would go to the CTA and so that the burden of 6% would stay in the outline counties and that does not... take into consideration the fact that the CTA territory within Chicago, in fact contributes to the usage of many suburban travelers within Chicago."

Totten: "What do you attribute that percentage... what provisions in House Bill 12, do you attribute that percentage to that are different from the provisions in House Bill... which was 1958."

Pukorsky: "I won't believe that there is really a sufficient difference in the distribution particular, I'm not that dumb but sure the leadership in trying to get in the substantive provisions and the equity in the situation between the suburban communities in Chicago... all were operating on approximately the same aim, I think it is the specific financial means of raising the funds where there is the difference."

Totten: "Okay, let me... I don't find that distribution necessarily true and I sure would like to see some distribution figures if you could prepare them, on that."

Pukorsky: "We will be happy to provide them for you."

Totten: "Give them to the Chairman. I would like to ask



Secretary Bond then my other question... Secretary Bond, on the provisions in the definition in House Bill 12, under public transportation facilities, I noticed that there was an omission... I noticed that there was an omission in House Bill 12, of toll roads and toll bridges from the definition and I wondered why this was omitted and what you could be thinking of by omitting it."

Bond: "Well, I don't think that there is any special sufficient to it frankly."

Totten: "Well, you know, I think there could be a very sufficient reason for its omission and..."

Bond: "We would be happy to examine it, if you think it ought to be included why we will consider it."

Totten: "Let me ask you this then, could you use monies under the RTA under House Bill 12, to retire skyway bonds."

Bond: "I did not have that in mind, I don't think any of us contemplated that."

Totten: "Could you do that under the provisions of House Bill 12?"

Bond: "I don't believe so, but..."

Totten: "What prevents it from being done?"

Bond: "It isn't a public transportation facility."

Totten: "Why isn't it a public transportation facility?"

Bond: "Well, let's look at the definition of public transportation facilities. What have we got..."

Totten: "Why isn't it a public transportation facility under one Bill and not under another?"

Bond: "Well, if it is an error here or an omission, we will certainly provide an Amendment to clarify that matter. That... this has not occurred to us."

Totten: "Then... you're saying that it was not a..."

Bond: "Should not be that way."

Totten: "Would you be willing to amend that back into the



Bill."

Bond: "Right."

Totten: "Okay, I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman."

Bond: "Well, we would be willing... you know, examine the Bills to make sure that it isn't in it, that's all."

Neff: "Representative Juckett."

Juckett: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If the Sponsor of the Bill would be happy to answer some questions, I would be glad to ask him some.... Sparkie..."

Garmisa: "How was I robbed, I missed the first party here."

Juckett: "No, I asked if you would be happy to answer some questions, I would be glad to ask you some."

Garmisa: "I would be privileged."

Juckett: "Thank you. Now, I noticed in your Bill that the RTA would exercise no regulatory power over any of the units that it subsidizes or give financial grants to, why is this?"

Garmisa: "Well, under the regulatory powers that are provided in House Bill 12, (a) the Authority shall provide for fares and charges and made standards of public transportation including terms for cost of inter motor transfers, collections, disposition of fares and charges and enter changable tickets. The Authority under the regulatory powers would not be subject to ICC regulations and transportation agencies...."

Juckett: "Sparkie, I think that you have missed the point... this applies to the grants from RTA and there are no powers of regulations over the units that you give the grants to... why?"

Garmisa: "I think..."

Juckett: "These are not the organizations that RTA is running but organizations which they give grants to, to operate why wouldn't there be any control?"

Garmisa: "Director Bond, has the answer to that one."

Bond: "Well, I think that the contemplation is that the grants



would be used primary in the very beginning, before purchase of service agreements were enter into as an interim step."

Juckett: "Now, is there any limination on the grants then... there is none so, the grants could continue."

Bond: "Nevertheless, the contemplation is..."

Juckett: "Mr. Secretary, we here in the Legislature can't go on contemplation, we have to have it in black and white so that we know exactly what the service is, exactly what powers are... there is no limitation on this power, so you continue grants for the life of RTA and you would exerise no control."

Bond: "Well, that also however, is a matter to the descration of the RTA and I have confidence in the RTA Board that they would move promptly from grants to purchase of service or possibly, I presume..."

Juckett: "Okay, let's get the purchase of service agreement, I understand that if you do not go into a purchase agreement... purchase of service agreement, within a three year period... then the RTA has to pick up 50% of the operating deficit, is that correct?"

Bond: "Yes."

Juckett: "Now, it is my understanding that the ICC will still retain control over all of these private or other operating agencies, is that correct?"

Bond: "That is correct."

Juckett: "Then wouldn't it be true... wouldn't the ICC be very reluctant as they are now to allow an agency to go out of business... wouldn't they be extremely reluctant almost to the point of impossibility of getting a certificate handle if the RTA was providing 50% of the operating deficiency."

Bond: "Your question is, would the ICC be reluctant."

Juckett: "Extremely recludant..."

Bond: "To terminate service...."



Juckett: "That is correct."

Bond: "That is simply a decision for the ICC, decision of that kind are faced every day by the ICC."

Juckett: "So, therefore.... Okay, so therefore by the RTA not agreeing to a service agreement... couldn't they force a private company into absolute bankruptcy, the ICC will not allow the termination... the RTA will not pick it up and there you have got quite a dilemma... there is no provision in this Bill to force a service agreement."

Bond: "That is correct and it is only half as catechist a prospect of what exist today which is that there is no subsidy in the financial crunch... provides certain persuasions for the ICC to permit termination."

Juckett: "Why has..."

Bond: "But, on the other hand, you know... this is a... we do this as something of a protection for the suburban areas for it to provide for the continuation of services during an interim period until the RTA, which is... to purchase service entirely."

Juckett: "Okay, if you're talking about an interim period of maybe three years, why don't you require that after that three year period that service is pick up by the RTA and is expanded in the suburban areas as the CTA is in Chicago."

Bond: "Well, my contemplation is that... that would happen, Sir and you cannot examine any portion of this Bill without considering other portions of it and the relatant portion there is the 66% tax contributions turned back for services to the benefit of any single county..."

Juckett: "Well, Mr. Secretary, I have to be concerned..."

Bond: "The.... for the RTA to pick up all the services during... before the three year period."

Juckett: "Yeah, but you don't take care of it after the



three year period either, you just take care of 50% of the operating deficit... you don't take care of the cost of operation and there is a big difference. Now... if we can get back to the Sponsor of the Bill... I think Mr. Garmisa, is the Sponosor, Mr. Secretary."

Neff: "Mr. Garmisa."

Juckett: "I understand you've got a complicated problem or program in this Bill where you take seventy-five million dollars in revenue out of the road fund and then you borrow back into the road fund forty-five million. Now, that leave to my way of addition and substraction, I come up with about a thirty million dollar deficit and if we're not able to take care of all our suburban roads now with the seventy-five million, how are we going to take care of the suburban roads with thirty million less... you don't have the answer, Sparkie."

Garmisa: "The Director is qualified to answer this one."

Juckett: "Okay."

Director: "It's important to recognize that there is no net change in investment in roads as a consequents of this Bill. The forty-five million dollars that is taken out and devoted to the RTA purposes are replaced by an equal amount of bond money each year. The impact on suburban roads systems are therefore, should be nil."

Juckett: "Mr. Secretary... my understanding is, you're taking seventy-five million out and you're putting forty-five million in.... now, there is thirty million dollars... that's a difference."

Bond: "We're talking, Sir on fanatic issues here and while thirty million dollars is taken out of the downstate road program, it is to be devoted to counties downstate for investments either on the State road system, municipal roads, county roads, or what have you at the descration of county boards."

Juckett: "Okay...."



Bond: "Not a withdraw of investment in the highway program in Illinois, this is under different management."

Juckett: "Okay, you're telling me..."

Bond: "Very important not to confuse those issues, Sir."

Juckett: "Okay, Mr. Secretary, you're telling me then that over the life of this program there will be no need to increase road taxes, there will be no need to increase the taxes to be serviced on these roads?"

Bond: "We do not anticipate that."

Juckett: "So, there is no need to increase the taxes."

Bond: "In my opinion, there is not."

Juckett: "Okay, now as I understand it that money is going to what... the counties and municipalities."

Bond: "No, our Bill provides that it goes to the counties."

Juckett: "And they are going to repair State roads with their own money?"

Bond: "They will have the option of doing just that."

Juckett: "And don't you think they are going to apply the money to the county roads?"

Bond: "Well, they can apply it where ever they like but I would anticipate that they would..."

Juckett: "Okay, let's just assume that they do not apply any of that money to the State roads... how do those State roads get repaired?"

Bond: "If the State roads... if the money is chosen to be invested on the county road system exclusive then that chose will... the county road... the county board will have chosen to improve county roads at the expense of State roads."

Juckett: "And, then you're telling me that the State roads in those counties will not be improved."

Bond: "They will be...."

Juckett: "And they will not be repaired or they will not be built."

Bond: "The choice is up to the county board, they can invest



it on the State roads system..."

Juckett: "Okay, well Mr. Secretary, I think you have answered that question very well. Now, I understand out of that four hundred and fifty million dollars that what you're doing is that you are giving that money to all of the counties, with the exception of Cook, now that leaves me with the question of what is going to happen to the suburban roads because no suburban road will get one penny of that money... where is the monies going to come from."

Bond: "I believe that it is all the counties except the six county... the ninety-six remaining counties. The suburban road system will continue to receive the same investment as they do today. The road program will contain sufficient funds to continue the improvement of suburban roads."

Neff: "Why does Mr. Maragos, arise?"

Maragos: "A point of order. I have no question to ask because I'm willing to learn but I think it is fair to many other people who would like to ask questions on the floor and I think that we should limit the question... per individual then if there are no further question then you can come back because I think that it is unfair to have one man to have a half hour of questioning when others are just as interested in asking similar questions. So, as a point of order if the Chair would so rule, because I have no questions to ask...."

Juckett: "Mr. Chairman, I have waited through all the testimony of the witnesses just as many other Members have also and I'm also willing to wait through the questioning of any other Member and I pledge to you that I will not leave the floor until they have asked their questions."

Neff: "I think the questioning are in order as long as they are different question, I would refrain from asking the



same questions of different witnesses."

Juckett: "Okay, now Sparkie, another question which Representative Totten, touched on... and that is on that definition of public transportation facilities. My understanding is that RTA would be able to take over the operation of the toll roads and toll bridges, it is not just a question of the definition but they could take it over now, again as Representative Totten, brought out... why would you want to take over a toll road?"

Garmisa: "Let me answer it this way, Representative Juckett. It is not the intent or the purpose of House Bill 12, Third Special Session, to take over any toll road operation or any highway, now if there is a deficiency in the Bill as it is now drawn up that would permit such as thing we would certainly make... put in an Amendment correcting that."

Juckett: "Okay, you will accept an Amendment then to take out that provision so that there would be no take over of the toll road or toll bridges and there would be no repayment of the skyway bond which are currently, I guess in default."

Garmisa: "Chairman Pukorsky, would like to elabotate on this last question."

Pukorsky: "To our knowledge it is not in the Bill to begin with and secondly, the indenture of the toll road... one of the reasons it was not put in, is that while the RTA has the ability of establishing exclusive lanes for buses and so, to do so on the toll road would cause a financial problem which contrary to the indenture so, I don't believe you're concern is in the Bill and if there is something in there certainly a modification to do what you are suggesting could be done but, I don't believe you'll find it in the Bill."

Juckett: "Okay, you'd have no objection to an Amendment..."

Pukorsky: "If it is needed, if it isn't in the Bill at the



present time."

Juckett: "Okay, now.... Sparkie, what are the main sources of income for RTA?"

Garmisa: "The Bill would provide sixty millions of dollars from a State appropriation out of General Revenue. We try to provide forty-five millions of dollars at fifteen dollars through auto registration that would be returned to the six county. There would be twenty-nine point three million that would be returned to ninety-six downstate counties out of that same type of funding. We would also have forty-three million dollars provided for by the boards could impose taxes and fees related to ownership and operation of motor vehicles and such taxes must be of the same nature as those presently imposed by local or State government and 2/3 rd's of those taxes collected in any county would be returned to that county. This would show a total of a hundred and forty-eight millions of dollars."

Juckett: "Okay now, does that 2/3 rd's return to the county of its collection apply to all revenues of RTA or to just specific revenues?"

Garmisa: "Those specific revenues that the boards would impose on motor related taxes."

Juckett: "Now, that would then be the fifteen dollar... no that wouldn't..."

Garmisa: "No, that would be the forty million dollars that would be provided by the operation of motor vehicles and or related taxes."

Juckett: "Okay, what taxes are those?"

Garmisa: "That could be parking taxes, that could be a tax on your gasoline, that could be any motor related tax that the board would see fit to impose."

Juckett: "Okay now, how many cars are registered in Cook County?"

Garmisa: "We have approximately three million cars registered



in the County of Cook."

Juckett: "Three million. I have a figure of two million, one hundred and eighty-one thousand three hundred and seventy-nine."

Garmisa: "We'll have a difference of figures from time to time.... we're close to three million."

Juckett: "That's only a 50% difference."

Garmisa: "Well.... we didn't do too good them."

Juckett: "Now, does that figure apply only to automobiles or to all vehicles."

Garmisa: "Auto's only."

Juckett: "Auto's only..."

Garmisa: "No trucks involved there."

Juckett: "No trucks involved."

Garmisa: "That is correct."

Juckett: "Okay, how many vehicles or passenger auto's that you're going to tax are from the suburbs?"

Garmisa: "I don't have the breakdown in front of me but I could have that in just a very short period."

Juckett: "Well, it is slightly over 50%... vehicles in Cook County."

Garmisa: "That's correct, you're saying that slightly over 50% are registered out of the City of Chicago."

Juckett: "No, registered out of the suburban area of Cook County. And there is no guarantee that those fifteen dollars.... that 2/3 rd's of the fifteen will be returned to the suburban area because that goes into the kitty, right?"

Garmisa: "No, the 2/3 rd's of those fifteen dollar fees that would be collected from the auto registration would stay in the county that it had been collected."

Juckett: "That's right so, there is no guarantee that even though it stays in Cook County, it's going to stay.... no, before you said that the automobile fees were not



subject to the 2/3 rd, requirement... the automobile license fee."

Garmisa: "That is subject to it, Juckett, if I said that it hadn't been well then I've been incorrect in that..."

Juckett: "Okay, so 2/3 rd's..."

Garmisa: "That is subject to the... 2/3 rd's to go to the county."

Juckett: "Okay, but there is no guarantee, Sparkie, that is there that it will stay in the suburban area of Cook County? It will stay in the county but not necessarily in the suburban part of Cook County. Is that correct?"

Garmisa: "It would be in Cook County period."

Juckett: "Right, which eliminates the suburban part of it."

Garmisa: "Not necessarily..."

Juckett: "Okay, now...."

Garmisa: "You're already making the discretion of the board... that is at the discretion of the board."

Juckett: "Okay, now gas tax... how are you going to know what county that gas is being used in... how are you going to levy a gas tax... do you levy it on the retailer..."

Garmisa: "This too, would be at the discretion of the board you might levy it at the wholesale level or it could be levy at the retail level."

Juckett: "Okay, the current..."

Garmisa: "This is another area that the board would have these discretionary powers."

Juckett: "Okay, now my understanding on these gas.... automobile related taxes...."

Neff: "Do you have a point of order, Mr. Barnes?"

Barnes: "My point of order, Mr. Chairman, in all due respect to question...many of us are waiting to ask questions but it seems to me that these aruging points that would be the decision of a board that is not even appointed yet, and I think what he should be doing



is asking substantive questions pertinent to the Bill and not to the decision making power to the board that doesn't exist."

Neff: "Your point of order, I believe is well taken. Representative Juckett, go ahead."

Juckett: "Mr. Garmisa, on the gas tax I understood that the RTA could levy the same type of tax and same procedures as currently being done. My understanding that the State levys the gas tax and the wholesaler pays the tax and then transfers it on in his product to the retailer. Now, isn't it a fact that there are a lot of gas wholesalers that operate in many counties and how are they going to determine and how are they going to process this kind of a tax?"

Garmisa: "There will be an Amendment offered that will apply to any automobile related tax and it covers this area."

Juckett: "Well, what would the Amendment say... what would it cover?"

Garmisa: "The board may impose any auto related."

Juckett: "Well I'm asking about the operation of the one because it seems to be one of the main phase of your program... is a gas tax and I'm asking you how the gas tax would operate... who would it be imposed on, the wholesaler..."

Garmisa: "There again we're getting into an operation.... into an area where it would be the prerogative of the board. The board would hold public hearings in the areas affected and they would come up with a decision and it would be their prerogative as how the imposition of these taxes would be."

Juckett: "You don't have an answer to that specific question."

Garmisa: "I can't answer for any board that hasn't been as yet, constituted."

Juckett: "Now, I understand also that this Bill does not



preempt any home rule powers, is that true?"

Garmisa: "That is true."

Juckett: "Okay, now we have the City of Chicago which is a home rule unit... cities of Evanston, Park Ridge, DePlains, Arlington Heights, Mt. Prospect and I could go on probably for another thirty or forty communities... the County of Cook too, is a home rule unit. Now, if this is so... how can you possibly have an RTA agreement for six counties when anyone of these units could preempt themselves out of this legislation."

Garmisa: "I'm not sure that anyone of these units could be preempt themselves out of this..."

Juckett: "Well, if... if this Legislation does not apply to a home rule unit, then you tell me how they're bound by this Legislation."

Garmisa: "What we're talking about here... is legislation affecting the six county area, under this Bill we're not providing for a referendum to find whether anyone or all of the counties would not come under this RTA Bill, we're asking that all six be included, the public hearings have been held and we feel that with the adoption of House Bill 12, we will be doing what the people in the areas that we've held hearings on want done at the rate of creation of an Regional Transportation Authority."

Juckett: "Okay, would you be willing to accept an Amendment which takes the preemption out and would obligate every municipality in that six county area to participate and be bound by every action of the RTA."

Garmisa: "I would be happy to consider any Amendment that would be approved by all of us that were concerned with the drafting of this Legislation."

Juckett: "That isn't what I asked, I asked if you would accept it."

Garmisa: "If... we would again have to use our discretionary



powers, who would have to consider the Amendment at the time it was presented to us... now, Juckett, have you ever voted on an Amendment without your knowing the contents of the Amendment?"

Juckett: "Representative Garmisa, I have tried to make myself knowledgeable of the Amendments but, I'm asking you a general question about the preemption power. Now, you have agreed to other Amendments to this Bill when questions were raised, it seems that you are unwilling to accept this kind of an Amendment."

Garmisa: "Representative Juckett, what we have agreed to in the way of Amendments have been the consideration of Amendments in all cases..."

Juckett: "Would it be possible for Chairman Pukorsky, to answer a couple of questions?"

Neff: "Is Milton Purkorsky, still in the House? Is Milton Purkorsky, still in the House? Representative Juckett, are you through?"

Juckett: "I have two more questions."

Neff: "Would you rush them right along because we have about fifteen people who want to talk yet."

Juckett: "Chairman Purkorsky, I've had a specific question about some service of the CTA from a State facility. I'm sure that you're probably aware of the location of the Chicago State Hospital in the Reed Zone Center on Irving Park Boulevard."

Purkorsky: "Okay, yes."

Juckett: "Okay, the question that comes from a State facility is that they have been concerned with a lot of theft and a lot of problems connected with the bus service and I understand that the CTA is unwilling to move its bus stop, from Irving Park by the old entrance... around on to Oak Park Avenue where the new entrances to Chicago State are and the new entrance to the Chicago



Reed is, do you have any information as to why they refused to do this."

Purkorsky: "I do not at the moment but, let me assure you that from your calling it to my attention, and I have one of our Directors of marking here who will note it and we'll follow that. It may be that there is a bus turn around in one area and it was not the possibility at the other area, but if the hospital officials are in a position of needing this and make provisions for a turn around... if there isn't one presently available, I'm sure that we can resolve that. The purpose of the CTA is to serve the community and if the decision was made at a lower level based on inadequate communication we will correct that."

Juckett: "Okay, good I'll get together with you after the meeting..."

Purkorsky: "Fine..."

Juckett: "I can give you the details on it."

Purkorsky: "Fine."

Juckett: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Neff: "State your point, Mr. Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I purposely did not interrupt the last speaker because he seemed to object to being interrupted but, it seems to me that for the last hour while two Members have asked questions there has been at least a half a dozen Members waiting to ask questions. Wouldn't the fairest procedure be to limit each Member the first time around to five minutes and then if there are additional question... to let the Members who have those additional questions stay and ask them later because the last two speakers, between them have had the floor for about hour. It seems to me that's a little unreasonable."

Neff: "I think your point is well taken, Representative



Lundy and if there.... the rest of the people who have questions, if they will limit at least not over five minutes and then we will come back and you folks who have more questions to answer, I'm sure these witnesses will all stay here as long as you wish. Representative Barnes, I know you have been waiting for quiet awhile.... Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had one question to Chairman Pukorsky, to clarify an answer which he gave in response to a question to Representative Totten. Representative Totten, asked I believe about the adequacy of funding under the various RTA proposals that are pending before the House and I believe Mr. Chairman that you indicated that to your knowledge, only House Bill 12, provided adequate funds at a level of about a hundred and seventy million a year. Did I understand that correctly?"

Pukorsky: "That is correct, House Bill 12... does not really have top limit necessarily of a hundred and seventy million, it has the ability of the authority in the crisis of something of providing additional revenues. It is the only Bill at present that does have adequate funding."

Lundy: "I just wanted to ask you if you are familiar with House Bill 39 and 40, which were introduced yesterday in the House which... my understanding produced approximately sixty-five to a hundred and seventy million."

Pukorsky: "I am... is that one of which Representative Katz, was one of the Sponsors?"

Lundy: "That's correct."

Pukorsky: "I've indicated that there was some problems with it, that it is certainly a effort and compromise in the direction and that maybe I'm not specifically confident and responsive to that Bill because I haven't



examined it in detail."

Lundy: "But, based on your understanding the funding, isn't that about the same as what's produced under House Bill 12."

Pukorsky: "Well, I feel that it has some deficiency and it has some limitations in the amount of funding that we're talking about really, is an amount that would allow for a four year period of operation before the Legislature would at all have to be.... and that level would average about two hundred and fifty million dollars a year with a little over two million the first year and rising to three hundred million the fourth year, so it may be under funded to that extent. I'm not... I'm really not able to respond specifically to that Bill without having an opportunity of examining it."

Lundy: "All right, thank you."

Neff: "Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask Secretary Bond, a few questions about how this Bill and similar ilk impinge upon the freeway construction that is involved in our district... Secretary Bond... two years ago I had the occasion to attend a Democratic Rally at which the speaker was the beloved former U.S. Senator Douglas, and he discussed what's called judais goats and he explained that a judais goat was an animal that lead the sheep up to the slaughterhouse and just as they got to the point where the man hit it in the head to kill the animals, the judais goat stepped aside and all the sheep were slaughtered. Now, the people in my district are fearful that this RTA Bill and other Bills which do not protect downstate against an increased participation in the cost of RTA, is a judais goat and all the people who sponsor it are assessories to that. Is there any basis for that fear?"

Bond: "None whatsoever. I don't believe that if you consider



the structure of the financing for the State participation, you can come to that conclusion."

Cunningham: "Well, specifically Secretary, as it has been pointed out here... seventy-five million dollars as I understand the proposal under consideration, would be transferred from the Road Fund to finance the proposal in Chicago..."

Bond: "No, that's..."

Cunningham: "Let me finish the question, an addition sixty million dollars would be taken from the General Fund... to that extend at least, is not the cause of downstate road construction... thereby weaken in that amount."

Bond: "No, not at all."

Cunningham: "Well, I presume that the basis of your answer is the provision of House Bill 10, for additional bonding issue, is it not so?"

Bond: "Well, there's... first of all there is no change in the net investment of downstate road construction and to use your term, that's exactly right.... however, specifically the replacement for the forty-five million dollars that would be going to the RTA is provided by the four hundred and fifty million dollar bond issue, that's correct."

Cunningham: "But our concern was... that the twenty-five or twenty-nine point five million which is transferred to the local governmental unit, would through practical politics be applied to county roads to the detriment of State roads, is that not a foreseeable concern."

Bond: "I suppose that you could predict a number of consequences from it, but that is going to a decision up to the county board, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, specifically in regards to the freeway construction, which is the hope of the future for our district at least, has there been any progress whatever



in the year since your administration was elected towards the construction of either 411 or 409, you identify those as being parallel to 1 and 50."

Bond: "I have some exhibits, Mr. Cunningham, to discuss the freeway program and I have them on the stage here and I think your answer can best be answered if I go up here and discuss these."

Cunningham: "Please."

Bond: "I'm glad you asked that question, Mr. Cunningham..."

Cunningham: "I'm glad you brought the map."

Bond: "I have come prepared. Phase one of Governor Walker's freeway program is displayed on the map over here and the Blair-Harris freeway program is.... over here on this part here..."

Cunningham: "Mr. Secretary, you apparently have me confused with Mary Lou Kent or Mr. McClain."

Bond: "I wish I could convince Mrs. Kent, of the justification of and justice of the Governors freeway program. Here is the Governor's freeway program, it is consistent with the findings of the Legislative Study Commission and in our estimate it is sound from a highway planning point of view. The major investments on this program are the Rockford to Wenona length parallel to highway 51, here in the northern part of the State and the testimony before the Senate, I designated this and I think there was general agreement as a most critical and need from a traffic point of view, freeway in the State."

Cunningham: "Isn't that just the widening and resurfacing of a present two lane..."

Bond: "No, that is not... this is all new freeway on no new location and I'm now able to reveal today that we have refined somewhat the figures for the Governor's freeway program and we said, when these were first announced, that it was not... they were not hard but



we would have been able too... couldn't management of the freeway program add an additional seven miles on this route 51, here carrying it from LaSalle, Peru intersection all the way down to Wenona. All of this is on new location, all of it will be four lane construction. Generally the route to the Quad Cities here is to be completed... route to.... this lengthen the Morton streets in here, Springfield to Jacksonville and then from Jacksonville as far as Barry although the Governor's statement on that has been put in the newspaper in Quincy and there is possibility of some change. Another feature that we have not previously made public, is that we will be able to build the Decatur by-pass to full four lane specifications because there is sufficient money to do that in the program as well and finally this link here, these pieces in southern Illinois."

Cunningham: "Now, Mr. Secretary, could I invite your attention to Route 1, on the eastern part of the State do you identify the section to which I make reference?"

Dunn: "In all difference to my colleague Representative Cunningham, we've discussed that we voted and talked about the freeway program last week, we've got a lot of it from the six county area here to ask questions about the RTA, and we've certainly wondered far a field from the RTA..."

Cunningham: "Just a moment, Mr. Chairman, we have House Bill 10, which is directly related to this and we have a right to be heard on it. The good witness has brought his exhibits to show and I would think that Representative Dunn, would be willing to recognize the State of Illinois is larger that just..."

Dunn: "I realize it is very important to you...."

Cunningham: "... than the six counties and we have a right to be heard for if testified from Chicago and I am the only one who has spoken for downstate. If he wish to



withdraw... than you, Dan... if he wants to withdraw your objection, let the Secretary continue. My question was to Route 1, on the east part of the State, what do you plan for us?"

Bond: "The Governor has stated publicly many times that he will continue to supplemental freeway program and he will... he intends to do that and that he will propose additional bond issues to continue the freeway program, he will do so immediately and that would have to lie in a subsequent phase, this only phase I, of Governor Walker's program."

Cunningham: "But, you will agree that there is nothing on Route 1, there on your map won't you?"

Bond: "I think that the prospects for the future are excellent."

Cunningham: "In this term? Now, in regard to 50, is there anything in the Governor's future for 50, from the Carlyle eastward on 50."

Bond: "From here to Carlyle eastward..."

Cunningham: "Is there nothing there...."

Bond: "That would have to be considered in phase two, three and four. Governor Walker is fully committed to all of the future programs."

Cunningham: "Now, Mr. Secretary, to accomodate Representative Dunn, lets move back a minute to the RTA. If the expenses of the RTA rise as the deficit rises and was predicted by Chairman Pukorsky, and I think he said a hundred and seventy-seven million in '77, and if it proves to be like a fat hog, that the more you feed it the more it wants... is it not enescapable and does not follow the matter of reason that it will continue to warp any possibility of freeway construction in the State of Illinois, so long as we are committed to an open end contribution to its cost as is invisioned by



this particular set of Bills."

Bond: "Absolutely not, I don't think you understand the financing provision, there is no open end provision here for State participation. The only open end to that affect to our Bill is given to the RTA to oppose auto related taxes in the six county area, everything else has a fixed amount."

Cunningham: "No, the... if I understand it, sixty million dollars is being appropriated from the General Fund immediately and that money is taken statewide whether than just from the six counties."

Bond: "That is correct..."

Cunningham: "If sixty million can be taken now, it follows a matter of logic that next year, whatever additional amount and that's why it is justified to say open ended. From that light wouldn't you agree that the language was acceptable."

Bond: "No, I don't think so, I think sixty million means sixty million... that's what's in the Bill."

Cunningham: "Now, you heard the prediction or rather dire prognostication by Representative Stone, that the Senate was about to confront us with an accomplished fact and say that we must accept a different set of Bills House Bill 15 through 25, or none at all and if it came to that path, what would be your position as head of transportation in Illinois, would you take none or in preference."

Bond: "I'm not sure... would you just mind putting the question again... what..."

Cunningham: "I said, you heard the dire prognostication of Representative Stone, that the Senate was about to confront the House with fait accompli of either taking House Bills 15 through 25, or none at all, and you will recognize those as being the Blair Bills that have



the delightful feature of guaranteeing downstate Illinois against having to pay any share of the cost and also advance road construction for our salvation and economic well-being... if that happened would you.... I've used Representative Stone's prediction not mine, if that happened would your position be... as the top transportation man, if you prefer nothing."

Bond: "Well, that's an conjector speculation, Mr. Cunningham, but I have a great belief in the perfectability of man and I have confidence that the Bill will come out of the Senate... Governor Walker's Bill."

Cunningham: "You don't think that that problem is eminent?"

Bond: "No, I do not."

Cunningham: "Maybe tomorrow we will resolve which...."

Bond: "Well..."

Cunningham: "In view of these matters, is there anything that you can suggest that I might go back to report to the constigents of my area as to why the Leadership across the aisle and all who follow his lead are not in a position to quote the phase that I opened with 'a judais goat' against freeway construction in the 54th district, the eastside of the State of Illinois and Route 50, from Carlyle to the Indiana boarder, what can we say to them as to what can be done to solve our dilemma."

Bond: "I would say, Mr. Cunningham, that the voters in southern Illinois should put their fate in the Governor and go forward with an expanded vigorous program which is in the Governor's plan and that the southern Illinois will prosper and grow under that stewardship."

Cunningham: "Our faith is weakening in this matter, Mr. Secretary and we feel that there needs to be support from other than the thousand of concerned citizens that are involved who have written you and written the Governor



to plead the cause of freeway construction, we notice that organize labor comes down here for RTA, but organized labor doesn't come for the freeway program we're are not espousing the cause of the freeway construction but we think that the Sponsor offered the best hope and I would publicly urge you as head of transportation of Illinois, in the name of God, give us some help in this freeway construction. One year has elapsed... we're no closer to the construction than we were a year ago when the election was held but the cross town express is far far closer to construction and we fear that it will take away the funds that we're entitled to and we need. Thank you, for your kindness."

Bond: "Mr. Cunningham, thank you, Sir."

Neff: "Representative Robert Dunn."

Dunn: "Are the Mayor's of Aurora and Evanston, here?"

Neff: "The Mayor of Evanston, is here, Bob." He's coming to the podium."

Vaneman: "And, I'm sorry that I did not have the powers of body attachment to make sure that all the witnesses would be present until we were finished."

Dunn: "Mayor, as a leader of a suburban area, I'm quiet interested that you support a Bill that doesn't call for a referendum. Do you feel that the people are willing to let the Legislature act in this matter without a referendum?"

Vaneman: "Yes, Sir. Our Cook County government who has council has taken a vote on this several times and each case they have thought that a referendum was unnecessary and I think the point of view was that the people elect the State Legislators to make this discision, that's why you're here to make this discision. You're in the best position to make the discision especially in so far



as it concerns financing and that we really think that it is sort of a cop-out to say, well let's not decide it, let's send it back and try to word a referendum that somebody can understand."

Dunn: "You say, your's was the unanimous view or viturally of the..."

Vaneman: "It was the unanimous view of the executive council of the Cook County Council of Government."

Dunn: "Could you name just a few of the suburbs that these fellows...."

Vaneman: "Arlington Heights, Park Forest, Maywood, Homewood..."

Dunn: "Thank you, that's..."

Vaneman: "Schaumburg..."

Dunn: "That's fine, thank you."

Vaneman: "Thank you."

Dunn: "That's all I had for him."

Vaneman: "Thank you."

Dunn: "Is Mr. Robinson, from the Railroads here? Apparently he's not."

Neff: "You have a point of order, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Put me on your questioning list."

Dunn: "He's not here apparently... then Mr. Pukorsky... First about fares, do you contemplate in this Bill that you support an immediate reduction in fares?"

Pukorsky: "If the level of funding is in the two hundreds of two hundred and twenty-five million dollar category, it is recommended that CTA and suburban non rush hour fares... off peak fares be reduced to twenty-five cents."

Dunn: "Could we conceivably reduce fares across the board including rush hour, that's when we have our congestion."

Pukorsky: "I think this again is where the RTA... through a their budget to the hearing would have to make that decision and let me suggest that the problem that we



have, is that if we reduce our fares on the CTA loan from forty-five cents to twenty-five cents... we have two million rides today that would mean a net reduction of revenue of four hundred thousand dollars. If we increase our ridership one million, a 50% increase that would bring in two hundred and fifty thousand dollars more, so we have a net operating loss of an additional one hundred and fifty thousand dollars a day by increasing the ridership a million and that doesn't take into consideration that during the rush hour equipment and manpower is taxed now, so it may not be possible to recognize this increase in public transportation at the early date. It is important to generate more support of new service in the suburban areas in the commuter railroad areas and the suburban... initially as far as extension and expansion of service and to maintain the CTA as a viable entity without forcing it to curtail further so, hopefully as the energy crisis builds up as the recognition and support for public transportation booms up we would go into the direction that you're suggesting. But, I don't believe it's practical to expect that this could be done initially."

Dunn: "Could the CTA cars and equipment... if you.... be run somehow rails of some of the private railroads into this area..."

Pukorsky: "Well, as far as the gauge, I think the gauge of the track with similar.... I don't know what the safety standards, what the block controls.... how those would work. I'm sure that it is something that can be explored and there can be some enter action to degreee at which I am not confident to response to today."

Dunn: "I have one last question and may be of you and perhaps Secretary Bond, too. When we talk about purchasing



of services with respect to privately owned as opposed to public CTA, if we purchase services from suburban bus companies or the commuter railroads... is the cost or the purchase price if you will, how does that relate, to net cost or do we have to build into that purchase some profit for the stockholders?"

Pukorsky: "Well, I think I can react for both of us in this area. The position... I think this involves the Leadership in the Senate and the House as well on both sides of the aisle, that what is done should not unjustly enrich anyone in the private sector. On the other hand, if we're saying that by taking over equipment that has been acquired and in that way there are additional stockholder benefits by that a necessary outcome of having a better transportation system for the entire area. I'm sure that the language of the Bill to provide for the Regional Transportation Authority to negotiate at an arms length relationship in serving the public interest but give them the option of providing for Regional Transportation Authority."

Dunn: "In your opinion if the financing was there... the financial resources were there wouldn't it be much more functional to purchase out right the equipment and operate it as a public entity under one operating authority all of the private systems now in existence."

Pukorsky: "Well, your hypothesis is I guess the key issue. You said, if the funding was available and while that may be... we don't believe that funding will be available initially to do all of those things, the out right purchase..."

Dunn: "... for bond issues, I think."

Pukorsky: "Well, possibly." The other point is, there should be some time to determine what route and what systems are deservant to stay in operation, there may be two systems that are a block apart now that are competing



with one another and both adversely affecting one another and it may be that one could just be allowed to be abandon, protecting the rights of the labor people on there and the other ones can enhanced to provide a more adequate service for the territory that it passes through and give the public better public transportation."

Neff: "Mr. Miller, Tom Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, one or two questions of Chairman Pukorsky. Back at a meeting in January, sponsored by the CTA for the benefit of Legislators a statement was made that, 99% of all Chicagoans live within three blocks of a CTA facility. I believe that is correct."

Pukorsky: "Then it was."

Miller: "And, that is to be commended. How would that compare with other Regional Transit systems throughout the country, Atlanta, Denver, Washington, Cleveland, wherever it might be."

Pukorsky: "I would say that, probably New York is the only other entity that properly approaches that type of coverage. Atlanta is attempting to move into that area... I'm sure that cities like Philadelphia, Detroit and Cleveland are not doing as well now, but this is generally... we probably have number one and number two."

Miller: "All right, Chicago ranks right at the top in terms of providing transit service and here we have a financial crisis... I'm sure that the CTA board has considered reducing levels of service and why hasn't further steps been done or be taken to enact reduce level of service to reduce operating deficits."

Pukorsky: "I think that is the basis issue of where the public transportation can exist as an institution such as a commercial establishment where you curtail service or increase fares to make it pay. We could have the CTA



194. \*

making money very quickly by eliminating the off peak service, the night service, week-end service but we'd have a sick city and a sick metropolitan area. The decision should be based on how public transportation serves the community needs and providing for an increase tax base. In providing for less capital expenditures for road and providing other things. If you take that into consideration the service that we provide, probably cost more than a hundred folds more if you let it go down in the alternate facilities. You must take the equate.... the tangible benefits and detriments outside you can consider the CTA as a company by itself and that's why the suburban communities are finding that their privately operated bus companies are not providing the service in that area because they are providing just those services in the peak hours when they have the ridership that pays its way. But, they can't develop their shopping centers, they can't develop industrial parks, they can't develop their residential communities because the developers have no way of getting the workers or residents to their places of business or residents."

Miller: "All right, then you envision House Bill 8 through 12, as an answer to... be able to allow CTA to maintain its level of service presently existing for example... or in that...."

Pukorsky: "Hopefully to enhance its service in frequency."

Miller: "All right, and at the same time with the adoption of House Bills 8 through 12, funding of a hundred and forty-five or a hundred and fifty million dollars will not begin to improve the level of service in the suburban and collar county areas or not measurable not anywhere near the level of service that the people of Chicago are benefiting from."

Pukorsky: "No, the commitments that has been made to double



the level of service in the suburban communities to indicate that there would be no less frequent service on the commuter railroad than one train an hour on each direction on the schedule and so, that to that extent if the level of funding that you mentioned is inadequate to provide that and we don't know specifically yet the Bill that has been proposed allows Regional Transportation Authority to public hearings to a six member vote to provide additional income to do those things that were mandated to do."

Miller: "All right, Sherman, have you taken a public position on view of the referendum for the adoption of an RTA."

Pukorsky: "Well, I have... I have indicated that because of the nature of the energy crisis of the fact that the public generally is not aware of all of the issues and not aware of the fact that if there was a breakdown in public transportation, the need for money for additional roads would far exceed the money for that and.... as a side, the leadership on both sides through the Illinois Study Commission prepared a recommendation which the leadership used... I happen to have it here if you would like to know their comments, they have why a referendum is enadvisable in creating a Regional Transportation Authority. It says, holding a referendum to determine whether or not a Regional Transportation Authority with taxing ability should be created, is both unnessecary and enadvisable. There are several reasons why this is so, delay... public transportation in northeastern Illinois, is literary in a crisis situation, the need for public transportation is not a question, it is universally agreed both in this region and others that public transportation can no longer be supported from the fare box alone. Financial assistants from the public must be immediately fore coming if the substantial additional service cut backs,



abandonment and fare increases ought to be adverted. A referendum will only delay the provision of this necessary financial aid and postpone the creation of a comprehensive Regional Agency, which can effectively provide and coordinate necessary public transportation services, the 1970, State Constitution... the voters of Illinois in ratifying the new 1970, State Constitution gave implicit approval to the concept of providing financial support for public transportation. Article 13, Section 7, states that "public transportation is an essential public purpose for which public funds may be expended" cost, conducting a special referendum election of this question would impose a substantial and unnecessary financial burden on the taxpayers of the six county area. It is estimated that such a special referendum would cost an excess of three and a half million dollars, in addition the referendum is to be successful a major promotional and educational effort would be necessary to convey the benefits of public transportation to all the voters, at present there is not an organization or entity could effectively mount such comprehensive campaign. It is more likely that well organized and well financed opponents of public transportation such as highway interest would spend large funds to defeat such a goal, experience elsewhere... experience in creating Regional Transportation Authority in other areas whether through referendum process or otherwise, indicates that such actions are generally not successful until a crisis of major proportions exist. This region cannot afford to let its public transportation system reach a point of functional collapse before it acts. To do so would result in the much greater cost of trying to recreate the system after it has failed. This was the consensus of the leadership earlier this year, it should equally apply now."



Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to Langhorn Bond, if I might please?"

Neff: "Secretary Bond."

Miller: "Mr. Secretary, could you tell us your views on a referendum on the adoption of a RTA?"

Bond: "Well, the views have changed. Originally it was endorsed, today the policy is not necessary and in view of the urgent crisis in the area, Sir. And, in view of the wide spread public support that we detected in the Chicago metropolitan area, the Governor has decided that the course of leadership is not to have one."

Miller: "All right now, you mentioned a delay... a March 1974, referendum will not in fact delay the adoption or the implementation of a RTA Bill that we passed in November, isn't that correct. They are both effective July 1."

Bond: "Yes, that's correct. Quiet right."

Miller: "Well there is in fact no delay with the referendum..."

Bond: "Oh, no... no... I'm not at all convinced of that because you could not begin planning or any preliminary work for the implementation of a RTA until after that referendum. Under the Governor's, you can do so right away it has... hopefully enacted."

Miller: "I want to commend you for the summary of the report that you have prepared on your hearings and it documented the types of people that you had before your hearings and isn't it a fact that most of the testimony generated from transit people, union people, league of women voters and not in fact the average citizen."

Bond: "Well, I'm proud that the league of women voters appeared so substantially and I want to associate myself with those Ladies who interest in the public affairs is so great but, I would like... you are correct in



suggesting that we do not have what could be called a statistically sound cross section through our hearings that is inevitable but, the taxpayers league of Illinois has just conducted a survey which was a telephone survey and has a broader and more... let us say, no biased base as ours and that also discovers strong support for an RTA both in the suburban area and in Cook County."

Miller: "If that is your belief then Mr. Secretary, why aren't you willing to re-enforce that belief by permitting a referendum to back up your view point."

Bond: "I'm sorry, I didn't..."

Miller: "Well, if you believe and if others believe that an RTA Bill that comes out of this General Assembly will meet voter approval, then why are you not willing to submit it to referendum?"

Bond: "I think time frame is so critical and the crisis is so much upon us that it is incumbent to move quickly. I think that the language that was contained in the Legislative Study Commissions report and the policies that the Members of the Legislative Study Commission put forward in their Bill apply here."

Neff: "Are you through, Representative Miller? Representative Duester."

Duester: "Mr. Secretary, I would like to propound a couple of questions to you which I hope can be answered 'yes' or 'no', and if not I will understand your inclination to expand."

Bond: "You're asking a lot of a bureaucrat."

Duester: "On page 23, of House Bill 12, might I direct your attention to the provision... Mr. Chairman, might we have some order? I think every Member of the House ought to be interested in page 23, of House Bill 12, which gives the RTA board an unlimited... unlimited power. Not a limit here that I see... to impose taxes



related to ownership and operation of motor vehicles of the same nature that could be imposed by the State or local units of government. As this Bill now reads would you agree with me that this tax authority is unlimited?"

Bond: "There is no limitation."

Duester: "There is no limitation... now..."

Bond: "Yes."

Duester: "All right, would you think that it would be appropriate to consider a limit and have you considered putting any kind of a limit on?"

Bond: "No... Yes..."

Duester: "Thank you. Now, you will also believe that the Legislature should create a Transit Authority with unlimited tax power and not present that to the people for their consideration of referendum, is that correct?"

Bond: "Yes."

Duester: "Now, I want to ask you this... last time that we were together in amicable like this was in Waukegan, at St. Dismas Church and I was delighted that the Governor instructed you to go to each of the six counties and ascertain the feelings of the people. And, I think that you detected, at least your report did, the people are greatly interested in this and the people of the six counties... did they not suggest to you at these hearings that they would like to have a voice on the board?"

Bond: "Yes."

Duester: "Under your proposal does Lake County have a direct voice on the board?"

Bond: "Depends on the two suburban numbers. Can't answer that 'yes' or 'no'."

Duester: "All right, I'll ask you in a way that it could be answered 'yes' or 'no'. Is it possible under your



Bill for two members from Will County to represent the five surrounding counties, in other words DuPage, Lake, Kane and McHenry, would not have a voice... is that possible?"

Bond: "Well, it's not contemplated. I don't believe it is."

Duester: "You don't contemplate it, but is it possible?"

Bond: "No, it's not possible."

Duester: "It's not possible?"

Bond: "Nope."

Duester: "Why not?"

Bond: "I have my experts here and they tell me it is not possible."

Duester: "I would like to hear... oh, your expert just rendered the opinion that it is not possible."

Bond: "Yes."

Duester: "All right, I believe that you cannot point to the language and I think for the edification of the Members you ought to indicate in here where it spells out that Lake, McHenry, DuPage, Kane, absolutely have to have a voice on. I know that they... there is some provision providing some concurrence. Well, we have no voice, is that right?"

Bond: "Each Chairman shall have concurred in the appointment of at least one such director, that is a veto provision here and that answers your question about...."

Duester: "Now, I think I have three quick questions that will just require a 'yes' or 'no'. When the mass transit system was established in San Francisco, was there a referendum?"

Bond: "There was a referendum in San Francisco, also there was a referendum in Atlanta, setting up 'MARTA'..."

Duester: "And, was there referendum in Denver?"

Bond: "There was referendum in Denver, that is correct."

Duester: "Now, when the CTA was established twenty-seven years ago without any tax power with the referendum in



City of Chicago? I think Chairman Pukorsky, could answer that."

Bond: "Yes or 'no', Milton?"

Pukorsky: "Yes, the CTA is a creator of the General Assembly."

Duester: "Thank you."

Totten: "Representative Mahar... I have a list of the following people who would like to ask questions, if there is anyone else who..."

Pukorsky: "The question was asked was the CTA a creator of Legislator, yes it was, the ability to provide funds and create in the area it operated was by an initial referendum."

Totten: "Representative Mahar, next and Representative Skinner, Representative Dee, Representative Wolf, Ebbesen, Grotberg, Barnes, Duff and Hanahan. Anybody else, please come to the Chair and I'll put your name on the list. Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have a couple of quick questions for Secretary Bond that doesn't have to be answered 'yes' or 'no'. You mentioned in previous discussion or testimony the fact that we are now at a crisis situation and we don't really have time to do anything other than act. As I recall this thing was on the docket when I came on the scene last January, would you care to say who you think the fault it is that we're now in a crisis situation and we have to act hurriedly."

Bond: "I would prefer to look to the future and hope that swift and prompt action will be taken."

Mahar: "Do you feel that that out rules the fact that a referendum situation is serious as this, as wide spread as overall incompusing... doesn't need a referendum."

Bond: "That is what I suggested."

Mahar: "One of the Sections... Section 212, eludes to the ability of the railroads to sell their rights and sell



their stock... they can do only certain things, one of the things that they can do, is use the money to improve grade crossings, would you be agreeable to an Amendment in which some of the funds, could be used to improve grade crossings in the district."

Bond: "Are you referring to the section that says..."

Mahar: "Section 212."

Bond: "Payment for..."

Mahar: "Payment for rolling stock and when the rolling stock is... the money is received by the railroads they must use it for certain areas. One of course is grade crossings, which would be a very small amount."

Bond: "I think that our language here would include that but certain would..."

Mahar: "It does include that, I'm saying is, would there... would you have any objection to going one step further and earmarking funds to improve grade crossings in connection..."

Bond: "Oh, a certain portion or something in that order?"

Mahar: "Yes, of capital improvement funds."

Bond: "Well, I would have to look at that..."

Mahar: "To be sure that grade crossings were quickly taken care of... properly expanded."

Bond: "Well, we would like to perhaps look at an Amendment on that, I'm not sure of the implications of it, but it is eligible now."

Mahar: "Think that it has some merit."

Bond: "Conceivably."

Mahar: "Planning and development is a very important part Section 209, is devoted to to planning and development and the authority is going to develop a five year plan annually for each five years following and at the end they... it says that the five year plan should be presented to the Governor and General Assembly and so forth, do you think that there is a need that an outfit



like the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission might want to look at the plan for... Northeastern Illinois have the option to discuss it, the opportunity to coordinate."

Bond: "I absolutely think so and I would certainly expect that they would work very closely with NIPSY."

Mahar: "Do you think that it would be appropriate that they be allowed to receive a plan along with the county board and General Assembly and Mayor's and other people in the area as a... be appropriate that that be added to the language."

Bond: "I would have no objection to that."

Mahar: "Thank you."

Totten: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Secretary Bond, when are we going to get a detailed written explanation of the Governor's bond program?"

Bond: "A detailed written explanation of the... which one, they're two types of bond programs. One is the existing and subsequent phases of a supplemental freeway program, all that money goes supplemental freeways."

Skinner: "I have...."

Bond: "Then there is a downstate bond issue and that is another one."

Skinner: "Your elapsing into your bureaucratic background."

Bond: "I can't help it."

Skinner: "I'm interested in the forty-five million dollars that may or may not being created out of thin air. Are we going to get a detailed explanation of that that will show me that the extra money that will be generated in MFT funds will more... will exceed the projected replacement cost of repaving all of these roads every thirteen years."

Bond: "You're talking about a financial projection... Okay, well it is very difficult to run as many years as it has..."

Skinner: "Well, I would suggest that the General Assembly is



not going to be willing to accept Governor Walker's plan just on your say so... It seems to me that you're going to have to prove to us that it is financially feasible and so far, it hasn't been done."

Bond: "Well, we're certainly working on that."

Skinner: "Is that a promise that we're going to get an explanation in writing? If you can't do it, you shouldn't be proposing it."

Bond: "Well, we... you know, we're quiet confident of the consequent of this... we haven't submitted any...."

Skinner: "Well, I know the consequents are... the Governor won't be in office when it comes home to roost. Now, the question is, are you going to explain this thing in writing so we can have a chance to pick holes in it. You know, you put it forty thousand feet up in the air and I can't shoot a gun that high... and that's where it is, up in the blue sky. You refuse to provide a detailed explanation..."

Bond: "Not only would we be happy to provide...."

Totten: "Representative Lechowicz, for what purpose do rise?"

Lechowicz: "A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would hope that the questioner would conduct himself in a proper manner. This man is here to try to explain a Bill to the best of his ability and think that it is completely out of order for these type of gyrations."

Skinner: "I'm asking for detailed explanation, now if this is beyond the competents of the witness, I'm sure his backup people or at least the budget bureau people... I mean, you know... if we have to go to 'Mr. Holby' to do it, I'm sure that he can produce it and it seems to me that you don't... you should not be preposing such a thing if you can't explain it."

Bond: "We can explain it and I think that the Department can be proud of the record of cooperation that we have extended to the professional Members...."



Skinner: "Roscoe, I think that he wants you up here..."

Well, can you... will you provide it."

Bond: "We would be pleased to do so."

Skinner: "Thank you, very much. Now, may we expect to get that before passage of the Bill?"

Bond: "I would hope that the Bill would be enacted tomorrow."

Skinner: "Can we have it within a week?"

Bond: "We will do it of that to provide a projection."

Skinner: "Thank you. Mr. Pukorsky... for what density can mass transportation be justified."

Pukorsky: "The point is, that we have been thinking in terms of density, that isn't the answer. This is one of the fictions, what you want to do is to determine what type of land use you want... how you want your open space, how you want your industrial development, how you want your residential density. Then you provide the transportation to serve those areas and its been... land values and tax receipts and better quality of life for all of us, is what... and that return is ten fold, a hundred fold more than the cost of supporting public transportation. So, that this is why in many areas they say rail systems can only be substained in large population center with a million or more. That's not true and Atlanta is showing what their doing, the European countries have done this for a long time, so it's relating public transportation as part of the total transportation system and the societal system."

Skinner: "You think that it can be justified for a county with an density of a hundred and eighty-two people per square mile?"

Pukorsky: "The point is, that if there are people in that area that can't get to the hospitals and can't visit their grandchildren and can't get to the shopping centers and then there may be a system of transportation such as the dollar ride system which is a demand



responsive system where we have something between a taxi and a bus would be available to go those people and pick them up and get them to the commuter station, to get them to the doctors, to get them somewhere else at a level where it can be afforded and that spin off is a responsibility of us as members of society."

Skinner: "You mentioned an extremely sufficient sentence in your answer to my first question which had to do with maintaining real estate value. When I saw the map in the Tribune, two week ago of the commuter railroads all going into Chicago... the thing that hit me immediately was that this higher RTA plan is merely a way of maintaining the real estate values in the Loop. When I see Mr. Cornelious testify and I believe Mr. Cornelious, present primarily land owners in downtown Chicago, it strengeen my suspicion. Is this true or false"

Pukarsky: "It's false, let me make it quiet clear that I think you perhaps misunderstood some of my earlier statements in making your statement. But, by enlarge the commuter rail line had closed down most of their stops within Chicago so, what they provide is an ability to those people who would like to live in less density populated areas to have what benefits they have of the so called urban.... and have the benefits of the hospitals and employment facilities and educational institutions and culture attractions in Chicago to make the Chicago metropolian area a desirable place to live so that in these areas what we're doing is providing for much improved public transportation situations outside Chicago, most of the extentions of service and extentions of ability of transferring commuter railroad stations and increasing suburban bus companies will be outside of the CTA territory."

Skinner: "What will your plans... what will this plan specifically



guarantee McHenry, or Kane County."

Pukarsky: "Well, it originally..."

Skinner: "Now, wait a minute in increase services."

Pukarsky: "Well, it calls the frequency of service that would be dependant on the amount of funds that are available as far as the planning of the type of transportation system that we would like there is presently a plan and I have offered several Representatives here the opportunity of my trying to obtain copies for them, there is a plan that has been developed by the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission, the Chicago Air Transportation Study, both of which have representative in each of the six county areas. Northwest Indiana is involved, the City of Chicago Department of Revenue and Planning is involved... what is the twenty year plan for transportation in this area, do we want to be highway oriented do we want to be transit oriented, what is the mix. It was in public hearings that has been held all of these areas, the plan is in some final formative stages which will tell you what lines and what services that you have but the frequency of service is dependant on the ability to provide that."

Skinner: "If the plan is the same one that my Mayor's have see it at every NIFTY meeting on mass transit that they have gone to. There are three... there are one fork and one line runing from McHenry county from mass transit, the toll way is one of them and other is the fork line, it is the Chicago Northwestern Railroad. Now, that is all that you're offering and it's the plan... there is no incentive whatsoever for us to be in it because we have it."

Pukarsky: "I think you have missed some of the points..."

Skinner: "I hope so."

Pukarsky: "... the point is, that if you elimtate the Chicago Northwestern Railroad, perhaps those people were using



roads in McHenry county that are paid for principally by the rest of the populous counties, DuPage, Cook... county particularly for providing for those roads and they would be inadequate if you don't have the Northwestern railroad and the cost for additional roads in McHenry county will cost much more real estate taxes in others than the small contribution that's made... in addition I said earlier that there would be bus service and there would be dollar right service that's considered for many of the less populated areas..."

Skinner: "Is that a guarantee."

Pukarsky: "... for the benefits... RTA...."

Skinner: "A guarantee for McHenry county."

Pukarsky: "Well, the point is.... that in the membership there has to be public hearings, there is the statement that 2/3 rd's of the funds raised in the counties... at least 2/3 rd's, should be used for the beneficial use. In my judgment, McHenry would be one of the beneficiary counties which will find that the benefits far exceeds the contribution that comes from that county."

Skinner: "You mentioned that there would be a possibility of stabilization of commuter fares, now as you know the Chicago Northwestern Railroads have the rolling stocks built into its fare structure, for that reason if fare structure is higher than the other commuter railroads which are in Carter Mass Transit district. Will this plan allow for the rolling stock to be taken out of the fare structure so that our fare structure may be comparable to those of the other railroads."

Pukarsky: "A condition that a fare structure be established that equitably handles the area but basically and this is just a left rule of thumb, that in connection with the distances that you travel, the fare would be about the same and hopefully that through dollar bus service to suburban bus companies may be able to pay one fare



get a ticket, get on a bus... go to a commuter railroad station, if you're going to downtown Chicago or going to another city, you can get off that commuter train use the same ticket and get on another bus and finish the area, so to answer the question 'yes' the intent is to have uniform fare structures based ruffly on zones of milage throughout the entire six county area."

Skinner: "We now think we have the best commuter service in the Chicago Metropolian area, it has been the tradition when a public service takes over a private enterprize... the service doesn't go up to the highest it goes down to the middle some place or down below, well I won't comment on the CTA but there are people who would suggest that could be better. What prospect with regards to maintenance of the present level of service can you give."

Pukarsky: "Well, I can say that the reason that this fiction is being projected is that when you require a service operator of the fare box, what can the private operator or public operator do when the expenses exceed the fare box. As one, can raise fares, two he can laughten the intervals between his buses or his rail trains and loses additional passagers who find that it is less convenient much than... and the never ending circle takes place. Where you have a system with a community recognize that this is out of the framework, you can have an operation that is efficient and as far as the CTA is concerned, without exception any place that you ask in this nation by efficiency and comparison with private or public enterprize and the commuter railroad managment and Chicago can attest to this, we have the reputation of being the number one transportation entity admistrator wise, efficiency wise in the nation. That doesn't mean that we don't have a great deal to do to improve our service and to overcome inherit difficulty in any large



bureaucratic and we're trying to do that. But, the fiction that a public service can operate as a private enterprise is one that we have to get away from, most of the nation at Washington, is realized that, the eastern seaboard has realized that, west coast states have realized that, Illinois has only in the last years realized that and that's to the credit of the Speaker of the House, the Minority Leader and the Leadership in the Senate in recognizing this and what I have heard is, that this is the year that the Illinois Legislature can distinguish themselves in the field of public transportation. This is what you will be able to say as one of the great accomplishments of this particular Legislative Session."

Skinner: "And, in about two years from now the Representatives from the outlying area will face the consequences of their constituents finding out how much they have to pay for it."

Pukarsky: "I think you'll find throughout the country where this fear was raised both on political influences and on service outlines that the fears have not been realized and conversely that the service outlying areas have been much greater."

Skinner: "I have been told that you have said that you favor a sales tax to finance the RTA, is that correct?"

Pukarsky: "I have stated very clearly that as far as the financial methods of providing for an RTA, that the Legislative leaders are the ones who make the determination, so if the financing is adequate we can accept it. When I was asked, from my point of view... what is a method of funding in a sense, I said that the sales tax which is being used in other parts of the country is a growth factor which has some very great advantages. So, as to specific financing the Legislative leaders and Legislators do that."



Skinner: "You don't care where the money comes from, as long as it comes."

Pukarsky: "Pardon."

Skinner: "You don't care where the money comes from, as long as it comes."

Pukarsky: "I think that's a decision which the Legislative and Executive Branch think but, the Speaker knows my position on the sales tax."

Skinner: "I was just trying to extend it to the Membership. Thank you."

Neff: "Now, we have about eight more people here that want to ask questions. Again I'm going to ask everyone that takes the floor to try to limit his time to five minutes, hopefully that we can get out of this Session at 6:30, tonight when we finish up this package of Bills that will be all that we hear tonight but you folks recall we do have two more Sessions yet to come up tonight and I'm afraid if we go too much longer after 6:30, on this we will be here till ten or eleven o'clock tonight. Mr. Dee's is recognized."

Dee: "Mr. Chairman, I have some questions I would like to perpond for Chairman Pukarsky. I would like to publicly acknowledge having spent some seven and a half years with the traffic, the only State of Illinois Traffic Commission, I called Chairman Pukarsky, and I would like to public acknowledge the courtesy and kind treatment that he gave me in granting me the a knowledge interview. Many of these questions that I have gone over with him... and I bring them out and perpond them in the interest of advising my colleagues of the situation that we face with the RTA Bill. And, not in any way to badger the Chairman, Chairman Pukarsky... it seems that mass transportation has been suffering a decline can you tell us how long public acceptance as the use of mass transportation has been declaining in this



country?"

Pukarsky: "Well, peek of public transportation properly existed in 1926, when the ratio of automobile, the population was 1 and 12, it declined from that point forward to the leveling off during the World War with gasoline rationing and no cars and then further declined to a point now where we have 1 automobile for every three residents in the area and there was two nationally policy changes that had affect. One, was the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, which established the highway trust funds and had an assured adequate level of funding to provide for the expressway system we had and allowed people to live further from the central area and still get to work within the traditional one hour time. The second was the FHA insured mortgages which worked to the detriment the central cities in providing that lenders and people develop property in the growing virgin territories would expend their fund there rather than extend credit in the central cities where land values were in some ways declining and for people who wanted to live in the central city could not get mortgages and so in many cases they were forced to go out where the mortgage money was available. This is being overturned by two national policies changes being the environmental problems and specifically the energy crisis which traditionally has caused grave concern at the highest levels in Washington and the feeling is, and I mention this in June, and I think we've seen some of the proofs that the energy crisis is one which is causing grave concern about the future security of this nation, traditionally and historically the lack of energy has led inevitably to world conflict and we've seen what's happened since June in the mid east."

Dee: "Well, regardless to these things which I think are very important factors. The point is that the public



is not using mass transportation... now.... if by some means, you would be able to increase the use of mass transportation, would this actually eliminate the deficient of the CTA or the proposed deficient of the RTA?"

Pukarsky: "As I've indicated to you and others earlier, that much of the increase ridership would come during the rush hour period and that would require additional labor and additional manpower and if we hold the level of fares at the same level, our deficit would be increased. But, again the trade off for not having sublimity expressways of having pure air and the air doesn't stay over just the Chicago area, it goes over a lot larger territory is worth the small amount relative to provide adequate public transportation."

Dee: "I understand the environmental problem but we are here faced tonight with the RTA, the establishment of a Transportation Authority and I think that's what we ought to keep our minds on rather than the environmental impact, I'm sure they're by-products of this that will be helpful. Now, you did say that the CTA could operate in the black..."

Pukarsky: "That's right, if we cut service... right."

Dee: "Now, if you did this... if you did cut the service and did start to operate in the black, what percentage of your riders would be inconvenienced?"

Pukarsky: "Well, I would say that to cut the service, we would probably be in a situation where our expressways would come to a halt if you recognize what I said earlier only 13% of the people that come to work in the six county area, work in the downtown area and any of you that have ridden the expressway in the rush hour, see the congestion now. Can you imagine if you had seven times the cars... you just stop and so the entire metropolitan area would cease to function."

Dee: "Have you... other than modernizing the equipment, buying



new buses and more advanced ones, have you at anytime... or has at anytime the basis concept of mass transportation been changed and I'm referring in this case to another question that I have, I only know of one that I can think of off hand... maybe you know of more, tell us if you do." Such as a depot area in close to the central city, or close to the mass transportation people are traveling... to install parking lots or shuttle service, would this tend to solve the problem."

Pukarsky: "There is no question, one of the areas which we feel is essential is to provide what we call, park and ride facilities and that in the City of Chicago for example, there is a plan for building a major parking facility over the Kennedy Expressway at the end of that line which will allow people to come in under cover, park at a very low rate and then just... in an enclosed safe security area... go down into the station. This will be before that Kennedy-Eden Junction, will help relieve some of the traffic on the expressway system and help that... there is another plan at 87th street on the Dan Ryan, and in some of the outlying area, Skokie and Evanston, those people have provided some of their stations with parking lots too... hopefully there will be a great many more. That is an essential ingredient of mixing the car with public transportation."

Dee: "How close is that to reality?"

Pukarsky: "It's being done now but, the level of work that is needed would depend on the level of local funding and in RTA would give that a giant step forward."

Dee: "Would this help or would we have any hope of this kind of promotion of mass transportation... help to remove the deficit. I'm very much concerned with the deficit."

Pukarsky: "No, it will probably increase the deficit but what I have again tried to point out... if you equate what the saving is on real estate taxes and other taxes, to



provide the local street system and the police protection and fire protection and all the traffic controls that is more than probably a hundred folds, the cost for providing for public transportation. That's the message that we're not able to get across to many of our Legislators and people in the community. The saving is not helping public transportation the losses in savings will be additional cost a hundred folds larger than the small amount relatively to this."

Dee: "I understand that concept, but we are the people who have to vote to the taxes and if we have to increase the taxes we are accountable to our constituents. These are the things that concern us, not the nebulous benefits which you... and they are not nebulous but, not the benefits which you prescribe. One other question along those lines, we have had a few.... statements from you that concern me a little bit... you talk about a very high parking fee in the... for people who stay eight hours, is it essential to have a penalty for driving an automobile in order to assist the Transportation Authority or can it stand on its own merits."

Pukarsky: "No, a merits greatest love affair is with the automobile and that when you consider that our gross national products exceed a trillion dollars and over a hundred billion dollars is spent in auto and auto related areas, you recognize what a tremendous affect on economy is; what type of advertising we have, how a value judgment... I'm afraid that the convenience of automobile and such is not going to prevent people from wanting to go to the congested area, the automobile is certainly the only means that we can use for the recreational 'unintelligible'... but if someone is going use that to get to the downtown area to park there all day to make additional highway lanes... to do many of these other things, they could pay the price."



Dee: "In other words, even if the cost in the long run maybe greater, the public still rejects mass transportation preferred to automobile. Is that what you're telling me?"

Pukarsky: "Yes, if they could get all the lanes they wanted and all the parking space they wanted, they would prefer that."

Dee: "Now, as to the Bills before this House... I presume you... you're familiar with the Bills that we're considering here... all three or four of them and they're satellite Bills... as the head of the second largest mass transportation unit in the nation, do you believe that the RTA and its findings is more than a temporary solution to a problem which in fact, is not a solution at all but a stop gap in a manner of raising funds to cover a rising deficit."

Pukarsky: "Well, actually we've had the good fortune of having the benefits of Transportation Authority throughout the nation, we have talked not only to the operators, the political people and civic organizations that were involved and that the Bill that was drafted, as I said earlier, which in absents with minor differences is a consensus of the House and Senate Leadership, civic interest in all, is a model Bill. The defects basically is the level of funding."

Dee: "Was temporary funding accomplished about the same thing as this Transportation Authority, we could provide a way of... underwriting deficits... not only for the CTA but for the other bus lines and so forth."

Pukarsky: "I want to say that the crisis is much more serious than suburban bus line and some commuter railroads... the point is, if you're saying that there is another vehicle... if the vehicle means coming back to the Legislature each year, I understand that the Legislators said that they are tired of hearing this crisis year



after year, after year they want some solution which takes it away from the Legislator."

Dee: "Well, I'd just like to make one statement, Chairman Pukarsky, I feel that in considering the RTA Bill.... just over a very short time and you point out that least time for a car on the rapid transit is four years we're very close to it. I'm thinking in terms of five years and I'm looking at funding of one billion not million, one billion dollars over a period of five years for this Authority and I'm very much concerned with it. Thank you, very much, Sir."

Neff: "Mr. Wolf, Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "A couple of quick question of Secretary Bond. Mr. Bond, you favor the sales tax funding of method of funding proposal over those in House Bill 12, or do you think that the other ones are superior."

Bond: "I favor House Bill 12, we did a poll asking people in the six county area what their opinion of the sales tax imposition was and only one person out of four responded favorably to that and as a consequents of that poll of public opinion, we do not have a sales tax in our Bill."

Wolf: "I get an opposite reaction, that's why wanted to know... how many people did you poll by the way?"

Bond: "We poll about thirty-five hundred, all who came to our hearings and I believe that Representative Skinner, pointed out today... attended to be those who rode transit, but I don't know that the type of tax is much basis by that..."

Wolf: "Okay, secondly... do you think that giving an appointed board taxing powers volits our representative form of government?"

Bond: "No, I do not."

Wolf: "You do now, okay. Now, it's apparent... you know, to all of us who have some political standing that some



kind of a meeting of the minds arrangement has been made between the Chief Executive of the State and the Chief Executive of the City of Chicago and I don't necessary feel that that's bad or anything like that, and I hope that you are privilege to some information at least as far as those agreements that would cover transportation problems. Is one of those agreements possibly the consideration that the Governor might reconsider his position on the proposed cost on expressway?"

Bond: "No."

Wolf: "Not at all."

Bond: "No, Sir."

Wolf: "Good cause I have to ask that because it's a very important question in my particular district."

Bond: "Mayor Daley and the Governor are in agreement on this Regional Transportation Authority Legislation but I know of no agreement expressed or implied on anything else."

Wolf: "The reason that I had to ask the question, I might as well tell you why, because it seemed like right after the agreement the Mayor made the announcement that they have got all this money ready to go for cost and I just wondered if there was a possibility the Governor could be... you know, reconsidering but if you say no, I accept your word."

Bond: "Well, the Governor certainly hasn't given me indications of saying he has changed his mind."

Wolf: "That's all the questions that I have for you, I just want Chairman Pukarsky... just a moment, you don't have to answer any questions I just wanted to answer something that you answered someone else... Mr. Pukarsky, you had mentioned before that the Legislators would... the Legislative Leaders would make the decision as to how to finance this thing, I think that you are absolutely



right and I think that it is to our discredit as individual Legislators that we sit by and let only the Legislative Leaders tell us what to do and when I ask questions about these things, I think, you know that we have to interject ourself and look at various proposals. But, I think that you are absolutely right, historically the individual Legislators sits back and let it become a leadership show or a show between the Legislative Leaders and the Governor... we never get involved and we sit back and let them tell us what to do."

Pukarsky: "I would like to say that, it is my understanding that the Legislature is a group delegated to the Illinois Transportation Study Commission, the responsibility for coming up with recommendations, this was done with professional staff... had the Legislator Leaders plus several other Legislators on that and so, if I inferred that the Legislative Leaders have done that without, I've had many talks with many of the Legislators on both sides of the aisle and I know that a good many of them have shared but... I don't know if... you know, to the extent that you mentioned."

Wolf: "Okay, just one final message for you. I got a call from a Mr. Pukarsky, I got a telephone message here from a Mr. Joe Clutchfield, who's from the Northwest CAPin my district and he said, he sent a Page down with a message for you, he would like to have you call him. He's been trying to set up a meeting with you for some time, I understand..."

Pukarsky: Well, he certainly... we'll see that he get his..."

Wolf: "Thank you."

Neff: "Joe Epton.... John Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to address my remarks to Sparkie Garmisa and to Director Bond... and probably to Speaker Blair, but each of you three people know that my commitment to RTA has been for almost a



eight month period now. In trying to motivate people to get out of their automobiles and on to whatever mass transit we provide. I think made that commitment to each of you and in doing so... in a moment of high statesmanship and a complete laps of political candor I introduced House Bill 1998, which involved the fifteen dollar share of the license plate fee, the political error there was that we were going to charge the motorist for that... an extra fifteen dollars, that Bill is reclining in an Interim Study Committee but, I have taken that concept because it later showed up in your Bill... not much later but I commend you if pledgerism is the best form of fatery and I congratulate you all for ripping it off in my behalf. I would like to present tomorrow to you, Sparkie, and Amendment to get at my concept and in brief this Amendment will do as follows; I have built in a referendum into your Bill... when I apply for my license plates I have the option by making a little check mark... too contribute to RTA, if I opt for that the Secretary of State sends me fifteen dollars worth of commuter tickets, which I think would be very nice. If I do not opt for it, my fifteen dollars of course goes to the road fund, so I will take care of immediately 2/3 rd's of the money going back to county of origent and those who want to ride mass transit will start out with a fifteen dollar kitty of transit fare... and this is a concept only I would appreciate it if you would respond... can we have some dialogue on Second Reading on such an issue because it will not completely devastate your financial program."

Pukarsky: "In response to that, Representative Grotberg, I would like to say that the Legislation that you brought forth Sir... was brilliantly conceived and we realize the value



of it, we're just happy to incorporate it in our House Bill 12."

Grotberg: "Thank you."

Pukarsky: "You should be highly commended for thinking of this wonderful approach, however, I do have my doubts about an approach that would ask for a check off system as to whether or not the fifteen dollars would apply and then perhaps windup with acceptance of scrip that could apply to mass transit fare."

Grotberg: "I'll get it to you early enough so your staff can analyze it. I don't want to take anybody by surprise."

Pukarsky: "We would be happy to have them analyze it."

Grotberg: "Thank you."

Neff: "Representative Barnes.... Mr. Duff, Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Chairman, I not going to take a lot of time but I would like to ask Mr. Pukarsky, a question or two. Mr. Pukarsky, my questions might seem a little provincial in the light of the very earth shaking things that we've been talking about. But, I'm talking to you... let me move over a little bit so I can see you... Thank you, I'm really going to ask you some questions which affect my personal vote.... and they aren't now in there category. I wrote to you two weeks ago and asked you some questions about why... the Isabella Street Station, was closed in Willmette, which has caused a great deal of concern of a large number of people in that area and I understand that there is an answer coming back, but yesterday I got a phone call from a trustee in the Village of Willmette, he told me that tomorrow... the CTA will put a hot third rail at ground level into Willmette, three blocks from my home. And my neighbors are just up in arms, now this may seem not too important but... I've got a three year old that plays in that park right next to your CTA line, where you've



had an overhead wire for thirty years... now you're putting a hot line down there where three year olds, five year olds, six year olds play and I want to know why?"

Pukarsky: "Well, I think perhaps some of the information about that well... was not available to you, we've had many meetings with the community people, we have provided entire fencing in the area including gates transversly between trains or gates for that, this is a system which allows us to up grade the equipment. As you know some of the CTA cars in that line are probably forty year or more in age, this allows us to give service to the community that would not require the stopping and taking the trolley lines down... this design and the protection is something that is used universally in large metropolian as we have the area, we've gone through every step that we could to insure that we have excelled and exceeded any of the safety requirements. I would submit that you'll find that while the change is one that you have a preception of apprehension and it is a valid one, I as a parent would do it too, you will find that this has all the adequates safety protection and perhaps more so, than allowing children to run on a line when there are no trains there and getting hit by a car. I think the safety record will prove out to be as great or greater than it is presently."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Pukarsky, you say that in public meetings and yet the trustees in the Village of Willmette, tell me that there has not been... you tell me that you're sensing it and they tell me it's inadequate... you can't tell me that it is going to be safer because no child has been electrocuted there.... just a minute, Mr. Pukarsky, we have someone who wants to object to my asking you questions about...."



Neff: "You have a point of order...."

Terzich: "Well, a point of order, Mr. Chairman. This has nothing to do with the RTA, if he's got questions about safety features or that of the CTA or mass transit, he could ask him on the side, this has nothing to do with the RTA and I wish he would limit his questions. We've been here quiet a long time and we would like to move along."

Neff: "Will you try to limit it to the Bill..."

Duff: "We're talking about my vote on the RTA Bill, Mr. Chairman and I sat through these meetings all yesterday afternoon when Representative Terzich, wasn't even here so, if he wants to sit tonight... we'll be happy to let him. Now..."

Neff: "Representative...."

Terzich: "Regardless of what his opinion is, I would like to have him keep his questions germane to what the subject matter is, and this I don't believe has anything do with the RTA program. He can vote anyway he wants to, but let's limit the questions to the Bill."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Pukarsky, let me just not say anymore then and tell you that it is going to be very tuff for you to get my vote, unless somebody satisfies my questions in this area of CTA service from my constitugents."

Pukarsky: "We're going to try as I told you earlier, try to tell you what we've done. Hopefully we will persuade you that we have a safe situation."

Neff: "Representative Hammerhan."

Hanahan: "Hanahan, Sir."

Neff: "I'm sorry, Hanahan."

Hanahan: "When Sparkie gets through with the phone calls, because it is really directed at Sparkie Garmisa, the questions and.... Representative Garmisa, are you prepared to take the Labor Amendment... the old Amendment #18, that was prepared and adopted to the Bill last



spring and debated on the labor protection clauses as an Amendment to this Bill."

Garmisa: "It was my understanding, Representative Hanahan, that there had been a conference of the labor leaders and the other interested parties back there and I haven't been advised as to what the consequent of that conference was. But, I understand that the intent and the purpose of the conference was to straighten out the labor provisions of this Bill."

Hanahan: "Well, I would just like to suggest that it was not completely satisfactory in my behalf, I will pursue Amendment #18, or the so call Amendment #18, as being the Labor Amendment... speaking in behalf of the total labor community that is involved in the question of labor protection clauses and upon meeting... since that conference, they have advise me to pursue the Amendment that we did have prepared last spring for the Blair Bill, as being acceptable to this Bill. All right now, how about the mandatory purchase of service, are you prepared to accept the view points of the railroad association and the trade union movement on the manatory purchase of service aspect."

Garmisa: "I would say, not at this point in time."

Hanahan: "I see... how about the satisfaction that... with protection on unreasonable interference on the freight service?"

Garmisa: "Do that again."

Hanahan: "The satisfaction protection clause that the... both the union and the management of the railroads are speaking, on the unreasonable interference on the freight service."

Garmisa: "I not too well acquainted with the provisions of that... part of it, Tom."

Hanahan: "Well, these are three points that the trade union movement are very concerned about before you proceed..."



Garmisa: "Well, then we will be sure that this is one of the subjects of the conference...."

Hanahan: "I would just like to make it public that we have not satisfactory...."

Garmisa: "Well then, this is not a question... this is a comment."

Hanahan: "Right... well, it's a question of you because the moment of truth is going to have to arise shortly... sooner or later we're going to come to grips with the issue, these are the Amendments that are prepared in.... will be offered and we're hopeful that you as the Sponsor will accept them. I have just a couple questions, two or three questions of my own. On the home rule provision that I heard Representative Juckect, I believe or somebody question, I have a serious question in my mind about the taxi cabs that would be affected by your Bill, if a franchise taxi service in a community such as Berwyn, or Cicero, is franchised by that community under a home rule provision and they have the right to franchise, will the RTA be able to... under your Bill, will they be able to set-up their own taxi cab service without the exception of the home rule clause?"

Garmisa: "I don't believe that that would apply, Tom."

Hanahan: "I believe it does apply, I think you better check with your advisor. Maybe Milton Pukarsky, could help you on that... on the taxi cab question. Especially were... specifically on the home rule provision, whether or not this Bill... this statute will need a home rule provision in order to do what we have discussed about the taxi cab franchise right."

Pukarsky: "Well, I think the Bill as presented allows the regulation of taxis in individual municipalities. It allows the RTA to enter into purchase of service contracts to provide services, such as the dollar clause... a dollar ride that we mentioned."



Hanahan: "All right now, without a home rule provision specifically in this Bill, how could you do this?"

Pukarsky: "Well..."

Hanahan: "How could he preempt the home rule community on their right to franchise their right to setting down fares and their right of taxi service, how without the home rule provision could you get away with this?"

Pukarsky: "Well...."

Neff: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Isn't there a provision in the Bills 8 through 12, that specifically says that no home rule power are taken away so that, Tom, I think that question is answered there."

Hanahan: "Well, this is what's confusing... I got that impression under the Bill that the home rule powers are not taken away but, then specifically under this Bill the RTA may setup a franchise taxi service."

Pukarsky: "No, I don't think that we said, setup a franchise. We're saying that they can by agreement go to the Evanston taxi line within Evanston, and contract for them to have a service to pick up people from the Evanston Station to be their home."

Hanahan: "In Oak Park there are two taxi services, Blue and Dolage, could the RTA under the provisions of this Bill... only utilize the Blue cab in lieu of utilizing village and blue cab."

Pukarsky: "I would presume that they would have that opportunity."

Hanahan: "Well, wouldn't that in some way infringe upon the home rule power and then yet set a standard by another governmental unit preempting the right of that community to say that the franchise of both blue and village cabs companies must be utilized."

Pukarsky: "If the franchise could preclude that this type of service was in there, the home rule community would



govern, if they have any concern it seems to me that they can enact whatever regulations would bring in the home rule municipality into such an agreement where they would have to participate."

Hanahan: "I'll go through this further with my man of council here on home rule. I organized blue and village cab companies many years ago. Sparkie, you've heard my questions of Representative Deuster, earlier on the provisions of the mass transit of pupil transportation Amendment as I will be offering as a personal on a Labor Amendment for the collar belt area and thirty townships both preempting the real estate tax levey of pupil transportation plus mandating that the RTA provide pupil transportation and receive now the State funds that are now allocated to schools. Do you have a position you want to make public on that provision. Does the Governor or anyone have any position on that yet?"

Garmisa: "Tom, I would be sympathetic to that formula that you just mentioned and it seems to me that this will be part of the Bill."

Hanahan: "All right, thank you, very much."

Neff: "Mr. Palmer, Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Mr. Chairman, I will try to make my questions brief. I should like to, from Mr. Pukarsky, if I may and maybe address most or all of the questions to him. I did get some information earlier and I won't go into that there is no need to go into those questions. I should like to know under the terms of the Bill as written, the extent if any... that the RTA ordinances would supercede ordinances of municipalities, either home rule or not home rule... take the area traffic, just as an example."

Pukarsky: "Well, the aim was that the RTA would be subject to the traffic regulations..... as far as non home rule



areas, I don't know if there is any particular provision but, for example in designating one way street, to designate one way streets contrary to the traffic pattern of the city is one which we try to prevent and in fact, Representative Shea, was one of those who put in those provisions to cover that, so I believe that that is adequately covered in the RTA."

Palmer: "I've got just a few more questions here. I should like to know whether or not the CTA has any contractual arrangements with Chicago where by it leases or uses city equipment or facilities in its operation?"

Pukarsky: "It has a lease that goes back many years when the elevated when the Congress street expressway was built and the elevated line... the CTA did not have some of the funds to do its share of the work. The city advanced the funds and there has been some payments that have been made, I don't believe that there has been any payments made under that obligation for the last several years and that the city hasn't pressed for payments on that."

Palmer: "Do you know the amount of that obligation?"

Pukarsky: "It's somewhere, I believe the outstanding amount of... probably two or three million dollars over a period of time and I don't know the extent... it might have ten years to go or eight years..."

Palmer: "Well, that would be paid off if this Bill became law the RTA would then assume that obligation, is that correct?"

Pukarsky: "I really couldn't say whether the city would forgive that or not and I think that by enlarge the city has been contributing a great deal of capital funds, we have a hundred and fifty new cars at the cost of nineteen and a half million dollars, which the city in essence turn over to the CTA even though the city and federal funds were the raise of purchasing."



Palmer: "What is the number of employees now... employed."

Pukarsky: "Approximately twelve thousand, five hundred."

Palmer: "Under the.... this plan what would be the projection of ottoman number of employees. I realize that is sort of a vague thing..."

Pukarsky: "Well, I think that there are some activities such as providing... we're having radio comunacations put in our buses and we're being able to montar our buses by controls at traffic polls sending signals back which will enable us to elimtate a group of checkers on the other hand, that if we increase our service then we will need more riders... I find this very difficult to respond, it depends on what direction and what the ojectives of the RTA will be. It may be that some of the increase in services in my judgment should initally come in the suburban communities. And, that the CTA should be given the oppourtunity of holding the line without decreasing service initally."

Palmer: "All right, what about other than the CTA, the number of employees?"

Pukarsky: "There are about a thousand in the suburban bus companies and approximately two thousand in the commuter railroads."

Palmer: "So, you're talking about fifteen thousand employees."

Pukarsky: "Approximately."

Palmer: "All right. Now, there is a fear... and Sparkie, this can go to you too, there is a fear in the suburban area of Cook County. I suspect that there is also fear in the suburban counties that the RTA could be used as instrument of political partisanship.... would you not agree that if it has any chance of succeeding at all, that we should elimtate any thought of any political partisanship."

Pukarsky: "Let me respond to this in an interesting way, the fact that this was one of the issues that we thought



were going to pollerize lines as one in which... because of the need of the RTA and the awareness cause concessions... political concessions made in all sides, so there is unanimity across political lines and between the Legislator and the Executive Branch now for the makeup aside from that which indicates the fact that bipartisan support was given throughout this nation. This is a concern which was always raised and without exception was found not to be because in the field of public transportation the authorities that were created had certain priorities and certain needs that went beyond the partisan point of view, so that I really challenge anyone to find any differences around the nation and I think this is what the staff of the Illinois Transportation Study Commission arrived from looking at all completions of political activity and authorities throughout the nation."

Palmer: "Well, I'm talking about political partisanship... either Democrat or Republican, that was a thrust of my question."

Pukarsky: "Well, I think the answer was on the bipartisan basis there has been complete agreement..."

Palmer: "All right."

Pukarsky: "... to the area."

Palmer: "Then I would take it that you would not disagree to amending this Bill to put on a hatch Act Amendment."

Pukarsky: "If you're asking a personal question, certainly I would..."

Palmer: "You would not have any, Mr. Chairman."

Pukarsky: "No."

Palmer: "Sparkie, would you have any?"

Garmisa: "I'm not quiet sure, Romie, whether or not a hatch Act should apply to this Bill. The fact is, as far as I'm concerned or as far as I know, there is no partisan involved in the CTA nor will there be in a RTA, I hope."



Of course... being the kind of an animal he is... there will be no doubt some areas where you may have some concern with partisan..."

Palmer: "If we're trying to get an RTA or instrument of transportation instrument to do the job that has been thought out and has been written about; then we should eliminate political partisanship consideration, you would agree with that wouldn't you."

Garmisa: "I'm not aware that... that political partisan attitude that you're making reference to, is really existing."

Palmer: "But, to insure this... but to insure this we should try to eliminate this, is that correct, Sparkie?"

Garmisa: "Well, I would like to see it held at a minimum."

Palmer: "All right, I have one further question and this... I've read this Bill and maybe I didn't understand it, but it seems to me that you have a power in this Bill to acquire public transportation facilities, is that correct?"

Garmisa: "That is correct."

Palmer: "Would that mean also, the acquisition of the CTA?"

Garmisa: "I believe so, yes."

Palmer: "Has there been any talk about the acquisition of the CTA under this plan?"

Garmisa: "The acquisition of the CTA would come under the RTA plan that we're founding here."

Palmer: "And, the amount... the acquisition would be for a... some consideration of price, is that correct? In other words you're not transferring for a dollar another good and valuable consideration... you're not transferring duties and functions and so forth?"

Garmisa: "Mr. Pukarsky will respond to that."

Pukarsky: "This again is in area, if the RTA as setup, appears equitable the CTA properties and the public agency would



exist..... it will be no recovery."

Palmer: "No monetary recovery from..."

Pukarsky: "We intend or expect at this time, if there is in the direction something that is done which gives an unreasonable benefit to some other area and we'll say one of the areas maybe in the railroad field, then it may be that there is some equities that may be in the other half but, at this point in time... it's felt that the CTA is an operating agency which the City of Chicago and the surrounding suburbs that the CTA serves will come under the RTA fold, without any payment to anyone... who would receive the money, it would be perhaps the City of Chicago that you're talking about and I don't see any request or any intention..."

Palmer: "Well, the reason that I'm concerned about it is I don't see any language in the Bill which provides for the phasing out of the Chicago Trans... the disalution of the Chicago Transit Authority and its absorption into the Regional Transportation Authority."

Pukarsky: "Oh, well let me...."

Palmer: "It doesn't say this."

Pukarsky: "All right, let me make it clear... first of all, the CTA is losing money so the RTA in entering into a purchase of service contract with them had really all cars for what they want to do. From the point of an RTA initially there would be a three headed group there would be one that represents the commuter railroads, to operate the commuter roads as is, there would be one to head up the... or to coordinate the suburban bus companies outside of the CTA as they are, there would be a third that is the CTA, that the RTA policy committee on top of that board of direction would impose as part of the purchase of service agreement, certain regulations which will allow for uniform fare, for example that you can use one ticket to get on a bus in the suburban area



transfer with that same ticket to commuter railroad and then transfer to the CTA. In time the RTA as they examined this through the direction and board, may elect to become an operating entity may elect to become two operating entity, may elect to become several operating entity and that's why they have the option of combining them later of keeping them separate but the issue is that they will be able to coordinate them."

Palmer: "Well, all right initially then it is to be a regulating agency and a conduit for graft."

Pukarsky: "I would say, yes and in the conduit it has the ability through the purchase of service contracts of pretty much..."

Palmer: "All right, all right."

Pukarsky: "... having the ability."

Palmer: "Yeah, thank you very much."

Neff: "Representative Kennedy, did you have a question?"

Kennedy: "Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee as a whole do now arise."

Neff: "Representative Kennedy, would you hold that.... we have three...."

Kennedy: "I would rather not hold, Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee as a whole do now arise. If you want to hold it, get a vote. We've been here long enough and I'm hungry. I move that the Committee as a whole do now arise."

Neff: "We have three opponents here and I'm sure they are just going to take a short time and then we're going to wrap this up and go into... we've got two more Sessions to go into. Russell Stauffer, from the Illinois Highway Users Conference Chairman. Russell, would you like to make a brief statement... as Representative Kennedy, said many of the folks are getting pretty tired here and we'll try to wrap it up in about ten minutes or so, so we can get in these other Sessions."



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

additional highway users taxes may place an area or the entire State on a point of diminishing returns when one considers attracting industry or keeping existing industry. The general taxes should be levey to fund mass transit is not within our capability, this is a discussion to made by the Legislature or the local areas involved. We as a Conference are willing to abide by that decision and will pay our share of the general taxes, however, we are opposed to any Regional Transportation Authority to be set up without ascertaining the will of the people in proposed areas, through referendum. We are diametrically an opposition to any taxing plan that has no stated limits and either the kind of taxes or the amounts which may be leved. It is our belief that the Illinois highway users would be paying more than their fair share of the cost of RTA if set up and funded by House Bill #12. By all estimates he would be paying from sixty to eighty percent of the cost through highway related tax. In view of the present energy crisis and a possibility of some form of rationing and an increase cost of gasoline, which could result in possible decreased revenue from motor fuel taxes, this could be in large increases in motor fuel taxes in the very near future, especially since the amount needed for the operation of RTA in the future cannot be reasonably estimated. We do favor a funding program that would put the main responsibility for supporting taxes be leved in the areas served by the RTA in the form of any special tax that is necessary. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity of stating the views of the Illinois Highway Users Conference."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Stauffer. Representative Shea, do you have a question?"

Shea: "I would... you say Highway Users Conference, what group



are you talking about, Sir?"

Stauffer: "The Illinois Highway Users Conference."

Shea: "And, what... you know, what type of individuals or groups is this composed of?"

Stauffer: "We are composed of Farm Groups, Oil Companies, Truckers Groups, Chicago Motor Club is a member of our organization... Ford Motor Company is a member of our organization, Chicago Auto Trading Association, just a moment, I have a list here..."

Shea: "Well, I think that's enough... you know, I understand I just wondered what the composition of the group was. Recently we had some very bad damage to a highway in Cook County, where in a bridge collapsed and the Engineering reports... at least I've looked at so far, indicates that one of the major problems with our roads are that they are being torn up by the heavy trucks and wearing them out at a devastatingly fast pace. Do you think your Conference would have any objection if the industries that use these roads, particularly the heavier trucks were to pay a fair share of their use of the highway?"

Stauffer: "Representative Shea, I'm not involved in the trucking industry, I am told by the trucking industry that they feel that they are paying a fair share and that's the only statement that I can make in answer to your question fairly."

Shea: "Now, you talked about highway users not wanting any road funds or highway related funds used things other than highway purposes or road purposes, was that your statement, Sir?"

Stauffer: "Basically, yes."

Shea: "Well, could you tell me when the highway such as... and I'll use ones in Cook County that I'm familiar with, such as the Kennedy or the Stevenson, or the Dan Ryan, remove from the tax rolls substantial large amounts of



real estate and shift a greater burden of the cost of local government to other taxpayers, do you think that it might be proper for those roads to somehow elevate the property taxpayers that they are shifting some of the burden too."

Stauffer: "I would think probably that they would elevate some of the tax burden by bring more people into Chicago and probably a few more motor fuel taxes that are to be spent in the town... city of Chicago."

Shea: "Yeah, but you're talking about motor fuel tax and I'm talking about some kind of help for the property taxpayer and that's what I was concerned about. Thank you."

Neff: "Thank you, Russell. Is 'Mr. Swork', here from the Illinois Association of County Superintendants of Roads? Mr. Swork, as Legislative Chairman of the Illinois Association of County Superintendants of Highways, he is speaking as a opponent to House Bill 12."

Swork: "Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. I'm grateful for this opportunity to appear before you, I am County Superintendent of Highways for Kankakee County as the Chairman said, Chairman of the Legislative Committee of the Illinois Association of County Superintendants of Highways. I will try to be brief in my remarks, the Illinois Association of County Superintendent of Highways understand that political complexity and the economic problems involved in establishing Transit Authority for the six northeast counties. As an association we would perhaps have very little to contribute to the alternate solution of this problem. The political agencies involved are best informed to prepare the appropriate legislation, we are not here in opposition to the concept but we do seriously question some of the financial provisions. In reviewing the proposed legislation our association did take a firm stand



against any diversion of existing highway revenue. When Governor Walker's, Bill was introduced the remaining ninety-six counties by being offered fifteen dollars of a license fee became involved in RTA. The Governor's proposal would be what we as an association consider diversion of funds. I will attempt to explain this reasoning. The motor license fee is now collected it's placed in the road fund to be used by the Illinois Division of Highways on the system that they now maintain including the unmarked highways that are in the main... at a very sorry state of repair. The Governor's proposal takes part of the road fund and distributes to county boards in the ninety-six downstate counties with the understanding it may be used on township roads, city streets, unmarked highways, county roads, etc., is what we would consider diversion and a dilution of this road fund. We feel this proposal would reduce the effectiveness of the road fund as is now being used and it will result in many agencies receiving a very little bit of revenue which would be a very little benefit to the public in general. It is our opinion that county boards will be beseeched by request from other agencies for participation in this revenue sharing. We believe county boards are totally capable of allotting this funds but under the Governor's proposal, the county boards are expected to share these funds with other agencies that are not now participating in the road fund. We're further concerned about the manner in which the proposed legislation tends to make up the fund that would be given to the road fund, we are told that a proposed bond would make up this deficit and the bonds would be paid from increased revenue. This rationale in the face of threatening gas shortage may not be a sure fire solution to make up the diminishing revenues. We are concerned that the State may, out of necessity take



part of the federal aid secondary fund, now going to counties to help supplement the State program. If the State should do this many of our smaller downstate counties would be in a desperate condition since federal aid secondary funds are the sole source of construction money. The proposed return to the counties from the road fund based on motor vehicle registration, as provided for in Governor Walker's Bill, would come no where near matching the amount of federal aid secondary income that would be lost to many of our counties. Especially those with low registration, we are concerned if public pressures persist concerning the improvement of a State unmarked highway which are in the main, in a sad state of repair... the State may pressure the counties to take over the maintenance of these roads. As I stated earlier, this new money being offered to the counties is not being turned over to the counties in tax for the specific purpose of taking over these highways but instead, is being offered as a revenue sharing proposal with something for everyone including those agencies not now participating in the road fund. Even if the road fund diversions proposed by the Governor were to be earmarked for the State highways, we are not sure that it would be adequate to do the job in every county... though it would be adequate in many counties. This gets us into the area of clasification and would require further study, as an association we are not taking a divinity stand on this particular issue at this time nor do we want to muddy the waters in discussing clasification, however, we feel that clasification is essential for good and balanced highways system in the State of Illinois. In summary, the members of Illinois Association of County Superintendants of Highways are opposed to diversion of present inadequate highway revenue, the association will



support meaningful and physically responsible transportation Legislation for the counties involved in the northeastern part of the State. This Association is concerned about all those transportation throughout the entire State and we will be helpful in any way that we can to help solve the many problems in this connection. Thank you."

Neff: "Any questions? Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank Mr. Swork, for his patiences in remaining here most of the afternoon to testify and Howard is from my county and I want to thank you, Howard. Briefly could you tell us what would happen to counties like ours, downstate outside of proported region with the diversification of these funds, if they are cyphened off or..."

Swork: "Well, Representative Ryan, in our county... we have a number of highways that are pretty bad state of repair, I could name 113, I can name a lot the spurs that are going into some of the small communities which we would like very much to see improved. Now, the proposal that is being submitted here would indicate that perhaps these funds would be made available to the counties for this specific purpose. However, we are also told that townships and municipalities can as well participate, in our county we have approximately eighteen municipalities and seventeen townships and we have one township in particular that is in dire need of outside funds. The total amount that would be allocated under the Governors proposal is around three hundred and ninety thousand, six hundred dollars, which is a sizable fund. But, by the time the county board at its discretion would divide these monies up among these various agencies, it appears obvious to me that we would have very little funds to do the work that's necessary on the existing system of highways for which this road



money could now be used. I may go a bit further... in our discussion on the possibility the county helping the State in this area, we were told that the State did not have funds for this purpose and now it appears that we do have funds and we were wondering why we can't be a little bit more divinity in the use of the funds."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Neff: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, Sir, I think I understood what you said, but perhaps I didn't. You said that under the proposed Bill by the Governor, some three hundred and sixty thousand dollars would go to Kankakee County, is that correct?"

Swork: "That is correct, three hundred and ninety thousand, six hundred."

Shea: "All right, three... almost four hundred thousand dollars."

Swork: "Yes, Sir."

Shea: "Now, if you use that four hundred thousand dollars locally... without any loss of State building of roads and State maintenance of roads, would it help your county?"

Swork: "It would help, very definitely it would."

Shea: "Okay, now... you wouldn't have any objections to four hundred thousand dollars in additional money to be used for road purposes in your county?"

Swork: "As county superintendant of Kankakee County, I would not but as a member of the Illinois Association, I would first want to know how this would affect the remaining hundred and two counties in the State because I think that it is essential at this point in time that a very good look be taken at this approach so that all transportation roads throughout the State could be taken care of as well."



Shea: All right, but basically... you know, lets wear your Kankakee hat for a minute. If you had four hundred thousand dollars in your county for county and local roads, it would be a substantial help, is that correct, Sir?"

Swork: "Yes, in reviewing the needs that we are facing on our State unmarked highways system which the State maintains, four hundred thousand would be definitely adequate to go into a reclassification program in Kankakee County, yes."

Shea: "All right, thank you, very much."

Neff: "Representative Ryan, do you have another question or..."

Ryan: "Certainly four hundred thousand dollars is a substantial fund but, to Kankakee is... in my district the largest county... but what about a county that would be much smaller say like Ford County."

Swork: "It would be entirely unadequate; I could perhaps make reference too... with your permission to Iroquois County. I know that Iroquois county has a hundred and ninety-eight mile of these unmarked highways, they have low motor vehicle registration and with low motor vehicle registration there income necessarialy would be reduced considerable as compared to Kankakee County and the number of miles by comparison would be approximately fifty-four as opposed to close to two hundred, so that is my reason for saying I would like to look at the other hundred and two counties because in Iroquois County, it would not work and in talking to some of my colleagues in the southern part of the State where their motor vehicle registration is low, the amount returned under the present... under the Governor's proposal would be very... very small indeed."

Ryan: "And, it would also be very.... the smaller the county the less significant that it is, is that..."

Swork: "Yes."



Ryan: "The further down you get into this southern part of the State it would be sheer folly almost..."

Swork: "Correct, and we don't want to lose sight of the fact that their major concern is the federal aid secondary funds that are now available to them for construction in these areas because even under the motor fuel tax law, they receive inadequate funds to do any construction work whatsoever, all of their construction work is done by federal aid secondary funding. Now, the State will have control over these funds under the new Federal Highway Act, I understand that they must turn back at least 50% in the ensuing year or so, but from there on out it is uncertain as to how much they need to turn back and conceivably they could use these funds in order to replace the loss of funds in the road fund... should this happen, then the smaller downstate counties would be completely void of any construction funds whatsoever, and would be unable to provide a satisfactory system for their people."

Ryan: "Of the programs that you know of, that were presented here or will be, does your association favor one over another or are you going to appear for or against any of these other Bills?"

Swork: "Representative Ryan, we are employees of county boards and as an association we are totally aware of the political complexity of the problem of RTA and we felt that the best that we could do, in supporting or in opposing would be to present these... our views factually as to some of the financial difficulties that exist and aid if at all possible in the distribution of funds that might be available and other than that we would be very hesitate to become involved in the mechanics of trying to work out an RTA, because in effect RTA at this point in time only affects six of our hundred and two counties, our ninety-six downstate counties have



pledged support to whatever would be best for the six counties involved in RTA. But, we don't feel that should become involved in the political complexities... we stand ready to furnish and offer any technical aid that we might and we feel that any proposal that will in no way divert existing revenue which are insufficient for the present needs... we would have to oppose any proposal of that sort and that is my purpose for being here today."

Ryan: "Thank you, Howard, thank you."

Neff: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "The Speaker, had his hand up first."

Neff: "Mr. Speaker."

Blair: "Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Howard, it's always good to see you and..."

Swork: "Thank you."

Blair: "... I want to complement you for the great number of years that you've spent as a member of the Techic County, Technical Advisory Committee of the Illinois Highway Study Commission, and you and I both well know the years that we went through in fighting to get the needs met... first from our stand point on the State system and certainly to see what we could do in the process of providing for the motor fuel tax allocations that went to our local government. I am delighted to hear you take recognition of the fact that the large carriers of traffic the State system, is not meeting its needs today and that any funds that divert from the State road system would make that an even worst situation. Now, the second point that I think ought to be made is, you know that we struggle through a function reclassification program, finally got the map adopted but no administrative jurisdiction changes so that there was no dollar pick-up on those but, as a general proposition... would you concur in the statement



that would say that if you were to change administrative jurisdiction, to take off the State system all the miles that we were going to take off and considering that as far as State has been concerned that those have been priority miles as far as being kept in repair... that comparing that with the allocation of dollars, they're talking about the verdict out of the State road funds, that there is no way that that amount of money would be able to take care of the needs of those very low very bad shaped miles that would come off of the State system, is that a fair general statement?"

Swork: "That is fair and I might explain just a step further and the maps that were presented to the counties, the County Association of Superintendant of Highways, accepted those reclassification maps subject to the fact that the funding would be available and at the time the State considered the increase of motor fuel tax from five to seven and a half cents, the State of Illinois received two fifteens or one cent off of the top of the two and a half increase and the balance was distributed on the same formula of distribution to the other agencies and yet... the State said insufficient were available to enter into a classification and now, it appears as though we have a surplus of funds and this we can't believe is true."

Speaker Blair: "I can assure you it's not."

Neff: "Thanks, Howard, I might say at this time that the three Gentlemen that we're calling on now have been here all day and they have waited patiently and even though it's kind of tuff on us sitting here, we want to realize too, that these Gentlemen have sat here since ten o'clock this morning. At this time we do have one more opponent on House Bill 12, and that's Robert Corbitt, Assistant General Counsel of the Chicago Motor Club. Mr. Corbitt."



Corbitt: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I appreciate your patiences and indulgents in allowing me to make one last speech... or one of the last speeches to the Session. On behalf of the Chicago Motor Club, I would like to say that the Club agrees that the operation of suitable public transportation facilities is essential to the public welfare in metropolitan areas. It does improve access to jobs, stores, business establishments, schools, medical facilities and culture attractions. Certainly the creation of the Regional Transportation Authority is needed to coorinate and facilitate public transportation in northeaster Illinois, the Club is opposed however, to certain provisions of House Bill 12, relating to financing. It is our view that these certain... these provisions are unequable and are against the public interest. First of all we contend that although RTA would be a general benefit, most of the cost is going to be met by taxes on motorist and other highway users. The Chicago Motor Club agrees that motorist should pay fair share of the cost of a RTA, the question of course is what is a fair share. We respectfully submit for a plan such as this which would put 60 to 80% of the entire cost on motorist or motor vehicle users, is unfair and unjust. The cost of the RTA range from various amounts, from a hundred and twenty-four million to two hundred and sixty-eight million dollars for the first year alone and this is going to increase according to all estimates. Maybe within a few years we will see that their expenses per year will be three hundred or four hundred million dollars per year. No mass transit system we know of... as sucessfully deverst the trend of raising cost and increasing deficits. This program provides us only sixty million would come from general funds, all the rest which would amount to hundreds



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

of millions of dollars, would come from motorist and motor vehicle users. Businessmen and merchants, workers, shoppers, school children, property owners, all members of the community benefit from public transportation not just motorist, why then should motorist and motor vehicle users be required to bear most or nearly all of the load. In connection, I would like to quote Chairman Pukarsky, was quoted from the Chicago Tribune magazine quiet recently, he says, "the issue is whether we consider public transportation as an entity by its self or do we consider it in its roll as an element of our societal framework, like police, fire, health and sanitation services. We have a fire department on a stand-by basis, even though we may not ever have a fire in our house during our life time, we're providing then to all the citizens the benefits from this whether we use it or not and we're willing to support that. Public transportation is no different... we should should have a contribution from society as a whole, the price that we have to pay for viable system is a small one and it's a price that should be spread not only among lighters but among all the other beneficiary." Other major cities besides Chicago has dealt with mass transit problems and none of them have employed revenue measures which would place so heavy of a burden on motorist as would this Bill. I invite the attention of the Committee to the Governor's transportation task force report filed in January of this year, which details the methods of financing in a number of other cities, to prepare us that gasoline taxes and auto related taxes are not foremost among the revenue measures chosen in other such cities. There are other alternatives and we recommend that this Body consider some of these alternatives and not approve this plan which unfairly singles out it one class of citizens, the motorist to



pay most of the cost. Our second point of objection is that if this board would just give an appointed RTA board the power to impose motor vehicle related taxes and just amounts and at such rates that the board might determine without any limit, without any referendum and without any public accountability. This would be contrary to fundamental principles on which this country is founded. It has always been considered that anyone who is given authority to impose taxes should be accountable to the people. We find it difficult to believe that the framers of our new Illinois Constitution ever intended otherwise and yet in this Bill the RTA Board would, in effect, be given a blank check, drawn against the motorists of the six county area and signed by our state government. I'd like to emphasize again that the amount of taxes to be imposed under this plan by the RTA Board are not likely to be an insignificant amount. They could easily run to two hundred or three hundred million dollars per year within just a few years. A third point of objection was that this program is likely to result in increased taxes for the whole state to provide funds for RTA, in part, this plan would take the first \$15.00 of each license fee collected in the six county RTA area; and the first \$15.00 of each auto license fee in the downstate areas to be paid over to the county. You're all familiar with that problem. But this would make a total of about \$75,000,000 that would be taken out of the Road Fund. Now 45,000,000, approximately per year, would be put back in from a bond issue. But now this program provides that the money to pay...the principle and interest on that bond issue to come, first of all, from the Road Fund. And only after the Road Fund is exhausted, there's General Revenue to use. It seems logical that sooner or later additional taxes probably in the form of increased motor fuel tax rates for the



NOV 07 1973

249.

whole state or increased vehicle registration fees for the whole, or both, will be required to meet these demands for funds. We'd also like to point out the possibility that matching federal funds may be lost in this program. It's approximately \$30,000,000 a year is turned over to the individual county boards to use for transportation purposes as they see fit. We don't know how that money is going to be used. It might be used for highways which would be eligible for federal support. Or, again, they may not be. We don't know. But the possibility exists that it may not be used for highways which will be eligible for federal funding and we have to remember that the federal funding at this time is on a 70-30 basis. So you will...could conceivably lose a lot of federal funds through this plan. To summarize, we recommend that these Bills not be approved in their present form because, first of all, most of the money would be unfairly charged against motorists. Second, an appointed board, not accountable to the people, would be empowered to levy unlimited motor vehicle related taxes. And third, the program would probably result in higher taxes for the whole state. Thank you very much for your patience and thank you for listening."

Neff: "Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "A couple of quick questions for the last speaker. To clarify your statement, do you object to any auto related taxes for funding?"

Corbitt: "No, we do not...well, have a complete objection to auto related taxes. We recognize that motorists should pay a share. The point is, though, how much of a share should they pay? And we think that this is too large a share."

Dunn: "Which part of the motor vehicle related tax is too much?"

Corbitt: "Well, we..."

Dunn: "...The license fee, as such, or the gas tax."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Corbitt: "We have no express preference as to the type of auto related taxes, but I would say this, in all likelihood considering the amount of funds that would probably have to be raised, it would seem likely that it would be probably a gasoline tax. ...Probably... we're not....gasoline tax."

Dunn: "...Still it...amount is too high? You don't oppose the gas...some gasoline tax if the amount is just divided, is that correct?"

Corbitt: "We wouldn't oppose some gasoline tax."

Dunn: "And how do you, as a club, how do you go about what your vehicle of determining that this is the position of the majority of your membership?"

Corbitt: "Well, obviously, we didn't have time to poll members on these Bills.."

Dunn: "Do you poll your members on any issue..."

Corbitt: "Occasionally we do. Incidentally, we had a poll, oh, about ten months ago on the use of highway trust funds for nonhighway purposes and we got a return of 76% against diversion for nonhighway purposes. Similar poll was taken elsewhere throughout the county tend to establish the validity of the results of our poll because the same results were obtained in other areas."

Dunn: "How many people were polled?"

Corbitt: "Well, in our case, I think there were...these were voluntary responses, I think we had somewhere around four or five thousand responses."

Dunn: "Thank you."

Neff: "Representative Shea, do you have a question?"

If there isn't any more questions, why thanks, Mr. Corbitt, and again we thank you folks for waiting patiently here all day. Representative Deuster, do you have a question of Mr. Corbitt?"

Deuster: "I would like to ask the Gentleman this, I was pleased and encouraged and heartened to hear you say that



you would support some regional increase in the gaso-  
line tax however...wouldn't have any objection to an  
auto related tax."

Corbitt: "Yes."

Deuster: "I thought you suggested that the gasoline tax might  
be an appropriate one."

Corbitt: "I'm not suggesting it, Representative, but it seems  
likely that considering the practicality that this may  
be one of the..."

Deuster: "Yes, would you think that an increase of a penny  
and one-half in the region would be in the realm of  
reason?"

Corbitt: "I'm not prepared..."

Deuster: "You're not prepared...oh, thank you."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Corbitt, now the Chair recognizes  
Representative Garmisa to make a very short closing re-  
mark."

Garmisa: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I just want to state that  
after all the mind-boggling questions that have been  
propagated here this afternoon and this evening, the...  
and the subsequent highly illuminating answers, I am  
sure that House Bill 12 has been very thoroughly ventil-  
ated. And I would merely ask the Members of this House  
that when House Bill 12 does come up for a vote we would  
certainly appreciate your support. Thank you."

Walsh: "Mr. Chairman."

Neff: "Yes, Representative...The Chair recognizes Represen-  
tative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if Sparky and I had at-  
tended the same meeting? I move the Joint Session rise."

Neff: "Is there a second to that? All in favor signify by  
saying aye. All opposed by the same sign. The Committee  
of the Whole has arisen. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Now, Mr. Speaker, I move that the Third Special  
Session adjourn until the hour of 10 a.m. tomorrow."



Speaker Telcser: "Okay, Senate Bills, First Reading."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 21. Appropriation, Department of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 22. Appropriation, Illinois Legislative Council. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 23. Appropriation, Court of Claims. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 24. Appropriation, Administration of Crime Victim's Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 25. Appropriation, Board of Trustees, Southern Illinois University. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "I move that the Third Special Session adjourn until the hour of 10 A.M. tomorrow."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved the Third Special Session adjourn until the hour of 10 A.M. tomorrow morning. All in favor 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Third Special Session is adjourned until the hour of 10 A.M. tomorrow morning. Now, the last order of business today... earlier we recess the Second Special Session until adjournment time of the Third Special Session, that hour has now arrived and now if the Members will please be in their seats, the Second Special Session will now come to order. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Juckett, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to Table House Bill 2, in this Session."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman has asked leave to Table House Bill 2, in the Second Special Session. Are there any objections? Hearing none, House Bill 2, Second Special Session is Tabled. Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I discussed with the Majority Leader, which Bills would go from a Committee of a whole to the Calendar and he said, again in accordance with the rules



and the Speaker said the same thing, am I to understand Mr. Majority Leader, that the Bills that are non Appropriation Bills will go on the order of the Calendar in the Appropriation Bills will be referred to the Appropriations Committee."

Walsh: "Well, here we go again, Mr. Speaker. The eligible Bills will be in accordance with the rules and in accordance with the long standing tradition, placed on the Calendar on the order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Those Bills that are not eligible for that treatment will be according to the rules, treated otherwise."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Majority Leader, at least with regards to the two Bills that now appear on the Calendar, I would respectfully ask that fiscal notes be supplied for those Bills that are on the Calendar now, as I assume that's where they are going to be... but what I'm concerned about... Bill, and the Speaker told me similar to what you did that certain Bills would go and certain ones wouldn't... and my concern is, that all the Bills are treated the same way and that we don't get back to the point where we have poor Art, being super judge up there or something like that... because the purpose of this rules, as I understand it, have fairness, to have uniformative and this what I hope we are getting too."

Walsh: "Well, may I briefly respond."

Speaker Telcser: "Proceed, Sir."

Walsh: "... and say that, I'm sure the Gentleman will agree and that anyone will agree who has been here for more than one term... that Members and their Bills have been treated more fairly in this Session of the Legislature beginning again in January, than in any previous Session within the memory of any Member here..."

Shea: "Since you became Majority Leader, right Bill?"

Walsh: "That I don't think has anything to do with it. You didn't let me finish... Well, now Roscoe, agrees with



you, he thinks maybe that's the reason... but I think seriously that Bills will all be treated alike as they have been throughout this Session."

Shea: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Schlickman, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Schlickman: "Would the Majority Leader yield?"

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Schlickman: "Will he define for me, what is an eligible Bill."

Walsh: "I don't recall saying that I would yield."

Speaker Telcser: "I'm sorry, he indicated that he will not yield, Representative Schlickman. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh, now moves that the Second Special Session stand adjourned until the hour of 9:30 A.M. tomorrow morning. All in favor of the Gentlemans motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Second Special Session stands adjourned. At 9 o'clock we're starting with Regular Session."



the Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh now moves that the Regular Session do stand adjourned until the hour of 9 A.M. tomorrow morning. Is there any discussion? All in favor of the Gentlemans motion signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'... and the House stands adjourns until... the Regular Session stands adjourned until the hour of 9 A.M. tomorrow morning. Okay, the Third Special Session will now come to order, the Members please be in their seats. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh asks leave to have the attendance Roll Call from this mornings Regular Session serve as the Roll Call for the Third Special Session. Are there any objections? Hearing none, the attendance Roll Call will be that of the Regular Session this morning. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk Selcke: "A message from Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following title, passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House, Senate Bill 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25, passed Senate Third Special Session, November 7, 1973, by a 3/5 th's vote. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary."

Speaker Telcser: "Anything else, Fred? Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 41, Juckett. Amends Revenue Act 39, First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Senate Bills, First Reading."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 4, an act to transfer certain appropriation to the Department of Labor. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 5, an Act to amend Section 9, of the School Construction Bond Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 6, an Act making supplemental appropriations to Capitol Development Board. First Reading



of the Bill. Senate Bill 16, an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. Where's the next one?"

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, House Bills, Second Reading. In the Third Special Session House Bill, Second Reading..."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill..."

Speaker Telcser: "House Bill 38."

Clerk Selcke: "Yeah, House Bill 38. A Bill for an Act to amend and re-enact Section 17-2.11, as amended by the Public Act and so forth in the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Telcser: "Are there Amendments from the floor? Third Reading. Okay, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh now moves that the Third Special Session resolve itself into a Committee as a whole. All in favor of the Gentlemans motion signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no' and the Third Special Session is now resolved into a Committee of the whole, the acting temporary Chairman for this Committee of the whole will be Representative Clarence Neff."

Neff: "The Committee of the whole on the Third Special Session will now come to order and the way we're going to operate this afternoon, we're going to try to get all the transit Bills out first and they will be taken in numerical order... House Bill 1, will be heard then House Bill 4, House Bill 5, 6, and then House Bills 8 through 12 and then House Bills 15 through 25, and finally House Bills 39, 40. We hope to get through all the transit Bills this afternoon, I hope that we can keep order here because every time we have to stop and get order that loses time and from appearances right now, we're going to be late here tonight in order to get to tomorrow with a reasonable time. Yes, Representative Choate."

Choate: "So that I can mark my Calendar, would you go a wee



bit slower and give me again the order in which you intend to call the Bills."

Neff: "I will be happy to... House Bill 1, House Bill 4, 5..."

Choate: "Pardon me, whoo... what happen to 2 and 3, what are they I really don't know?"

Neff: "Those are tax relief Bills not pertaining to...."

Choate: "Okay... all right."

Neff: "1, 4, 5, and 6, House Bills 8 through 12..."

Choate: "What happened to 7?"

Neff: "7, is a highway Bill and if we don't get to it today we'll get to it tomorrow."

Choate: "Okay."

Neff: "8 through 12, and then House Bills 15 through 25..."

Choate: "Now, wait a minute.... then 13 and 14, I understand that deals with other subject matter other than RTA."

Neff: "Yes, that's tax relief."

Choate: "All right, then 26?"

Neff: "26, is appropriation."

Choate: "Okay, after 25, where do we go."

Neff: "39 and 40."

Choate: "39 and 40?"

Neff: "Right."

Choate: "I don't have them on here... are they... assume that it's okay."

Neff: "Those are Representative Katz, Bills introduced yesterday."

Choate: "Okay, thank you."

Neff: "The Chair will now recognize Representative Juckett, who will present House Bill 1."

Juckett: "Thank you, Mr. Chariman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1, deals with reimbursement to mass transit districts and bus companies for carrying students and senior citizens at reduced fares. Already on the books is a statute s by which private bus companies are reimbursed by the State for student discounts. This



101.

Bill would amend that statute in two ways, one... it would add to the reimbursement available to private companies, a reimbursement for carrying senior citizens at a reduced fare. Two, it would offer reimbursements for both students and senior discounts to public transit districts the reimbursement program cited in purpose two, has been offered by the State Administratively since 1965, to the Chicago Transit Authority. Dispite a continuing appropriations for this purpose..."

Neff: "Representative Juckett, will you hold up just a second so, we can get some order. Could we please have some order here, there is Members here on the floor that would like to hear... and with the noise going on, it is impossible to sit back here and hear the man that is explaining the Bill so, if we have business to do... why if we'll step outside and do that and then come back in, why it would be appreciated."

Juckett: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The reimbursement program cited in purpose two above, has been offered by the State administratively since 1965, to the Chicago Transit Authority. Dispite a continuing appropriations for the program, there has been and is now, no statutory authority for the reimbursements and as a result, the State Comptroller, George Lindberg, two months ago refused to release to the CTA, the funds appropriated last spring for this purpose. House Bill 1, will put all Transit Agencies... offering student and senior citizens discounts on an equal footing and will encourage the worthy practice of transporting senior citizens at a reduced fare on a more wide spread basis than merely in Chicago."

Neff: "Are there any questions?"

Unknown: "I will accept this."

Juckett: "Thank you."

Neff: "Madam Clerk, I don't believe that we have any witnesses



on House Bill 1, there is no witness.... while I'm speaking on witnesses anybody that would like to appear that haven't signed the witness list, we would appreciate your coming up and doing that and we will try to call you in order. The next Bill to be heard will be by Representative Deuster, and House Bills 4, 5 and 6, I believe will be considered in a package although Representative Deuster wants to go into detail possibly a little more and have a witness or two on House Bill 4. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I think as all the Members know... we're simply going to have a brief discription of the Regional Transit Bills at this time and next week we'll get into the real heart of the matter when Amendments are offered. So, I do want to be as brief as possible and I would like to make this observation... particular for the media that have been covering the development of this sufficient subject. I think that all of us, certainly the public does and the Members I sense in this House recognize that the time has come for some compromise the time has come for some bipartisanship and the time has come for some statemanship and I think we'll have fine opportunity for that next week when on Second Reading we amend... consider Amendments to all the Bills. I have a map in front of me here of the six county regions which might make it a little easier for all of you to understand, by those of us from all of the counties are interested in developing a system that serves all the counties and fair to all the counties. I would say, I think that progress is being made, I might say that I have in my hands three Bills here. I have Governor Walker's Bill which is forty-five pages long, I have Speaker Blair's Bill which is forty-five pages long, Representative Harold Katz and the distinguished



group of bipartisan Members of both sides of the aisle have introduced a Bill which is 62 pages long and the Bill which Representative Sangmeister, Representative Williams, Dyer and myself have sponsored has 66 pages. Obviously none of the Members have read all these... very few of you have, what I have tried to do to be of service to the Membership as we move down into the final two weeks, is to give you a little piece of paper that might help you compare what are the key substantive point in contingent and those of you that have pick it up from your box... see that I compare House Bill 12, that is the Governor's Bill, House Bill 15, Mr. Speaker's Bill and House Bill 4, and I want to say that just yesterday a new Bill, the Katz's Bill was introduced and we have a comparison of that too. Representative Sangmeister, will say a word as soon as I finish about the importants of all of the people in this area having an opportunity to consider Regional Transit through a referendum but I would say that over the summer the Governor's task force has identified and learned about things that are vital to the people of all six counties and top of the list is the fact that we don't want to buy a pig in the poke, we want some guarantee that if a revenue is taken from the six county districts, that we're going to get something for our money and a real struggle is simply the question of who's money is going to be spent where... for what mass transit services. So, during the last spring we developed a provision and I want to thank Representative Robert Dunne, of Chicago... particularly and Representative Dyer, for helping me develop this and I want to congratulate the Governor for sensing its importance because it is in the Governor's Bill and that's a provision that, if you raise any money in any county 2/3 rd's of that money must be spent for mass transit



services within or which benefit that county. I'm delighted that that is in the Walker Bill, next week I will offer Amendment to put it into the Blair Bill and I think you will see by comparing... this comparison that as we move along, all the Bills are getting more and more alike and if this House works its will and if we have a few Members on both sides of the aisle that stand up and maybe even buck your own leadership, we'll be able to shape all of these Bills so it won't make any difference which one goes to the Governor's desk. They will all be virtually alike and there are not going to take unfair advantage of any county. So, I would say that the provision that 2/3 rd's of the revenue be spent where it is raised, is very important. It's the real guarantee, it's the real heart of the matter. Secondly, that each of the counties and you look at this map and see all that geography and if you can tell any of us from any of the counties, Will, Kane, DuPage, or anywhere that we aren't entitled to at least have one person sitting on the Board to answer to our counties, something is wrong with you or you don't understand how important it is to us. We will have Amendments which won't upset the voting strength of either the Governor's Bill or the Speaker's Bill, which will allow every county to at least have a person and that will be a weighted vote and you will hear about that next week. Now, another provision is one upon Representative Sangmeister, will touch and I'd like to yield to him at this time and that is the matter of going back to the voters and the people in this area and having them radify our enabling Act through a referendum. At this time I yield to Representative Sangmeister, who is the joint Co-sponsor of this Bill."

Sangmeister: "Thank you, Don. Chairman of the Committee and Members of the House, the sitting of the Committee of a



whole. Personally I think... has very actually gone over the Bill, I think that it is a compromise Bill one that we want you all to take a good look at, in case you can't buy the Speaker's Bill or you can't buy the Governor's, we'd like to see you buy our Bill. It has the three essentials that I have been looking for... for the constituents of Will County and I think that 2/3 rd's of revenue being raised in the county is an absolute necessity. We can go back to our people and face the.... with this Bill you will at least be sure that some of the money that you're contributing will be used in the area. Whether Representative made it interesting observation in looking at the chart here and it said... all those green and red lines indicate all the money that will be coming for the outline counties in the Cook County. We want to assure you that that's our feeling on it and we want to make sure that those lines are going to have some cars rolling back into our counties. Representative Deuster wanted me to emphasize and speak mainly on the referendum portion which I spoke on several times in the spring Session. I think that if you will look at the map, it's hard for me to see it because it's over to the front left of me, but if you will look at the counties... particularly Kane and Will, you can see why we're concerned. If you look into those areas there is a lot of blank white space on, we just have a couple of railroads coming out of there and it is very difficult for those of us who represent constituents who are in these rural areas, particularly down in my county which I want to speak of because I have the most familiarity with, you try to convince people in Willington, Peotone, Crete, Elwood, Channahon go on and on that they have and should participate in a RTA. Our county is certainly somewhat divided on the issue in that we do have Joliet and Rockport municipalities



that possibly would endorse an RTA and therefore, I think that it is absolutely essential that we have a referendum that anyone of the Bills that are passed out of here does have a referendum in it so that cornes like ourself who of course sit on the very edge of this district, it makes it very difficult or have a voice in this matter. Democratic process and we ask support of your Bill when it comes up on Third Reading. Thank you."

Deuster: "We will be happy to respond to questions, it might be helpful for Representative Dyer, our other Sponsor was going to say a word about the representation on the Board, but I don't see him here now so, I'll be very happy to respond and yield to any questions that might be put.

Neff: "Representative Dee."

Dee: "Mr. Chairman; would you consider an Amendment to you Bill. I'm in sympathy with the referendum, I think that it is essential. Would you accept an Amendment to your Bill so that when it comes to the question of referendum... the proposition of the creation of the RTA, be separated... from the funding referendum, so that in the same referendum you vote on the proposition of funding separately from the creation of the RTA. Would you... how would you look upon such an Amendment?"

Deuster: "Well, I do... I might say this, that the outset that my confidence in the intelligence of the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle is such that I think if you... my feeling is, I don't want to give any guidance of how they should vote on an Amendment, if it makes sense why I'm sure that the Membership will adopt it and I'm not going to resist in the Amendment if I feel that they are fair and ought to be given an opportunity to discuss. I do think that it might be confusing... oh the other hand I might say this, the referendum feature that we have in our Bill does this... it says yes, the



voters of the whole area are going to vote and what happens if in Kane County or Will County, they vote against it, the answer is... the six county system stays together. The board member from that county even though they rejected it, stays on the board and he has no vote... but for planning purposes the six county system continues and that will satisfy all the federal grant requirements and everything else, we will have a six county system that will engage in regional transportation planning and every county will be represented except where the voters have rejected it, that man will have no vote, or woman will have no vote and secondly, there will be no tax imposed... whatever the variety of the tax in that county and third, there will be no obligation to provide any services at all to that county and then later under another provision of the Bill, providing for annexation or new territory, they could come back in, if they change their mind... later. So, I do have sort of a fractional referendum but if you want to draft an Amendment and offer it... why, I think that's the best way to pursue it. I have no instinctive or strong objection against your suggested Amendment."

Dee: "Thank you."

Neff: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "In discussing your Bill, Representative... do you have any provisions to show to the people of the collar belt area any services that you can guarantee, such as the people in Hebron, Illinois... what services is your Bill going to provide in the area of regional transportation to the citizens of Hebron, Illinois."

Deuster: "Yes, Sir. That is an excellant question. I want to say that the reason that the map is up here is to suggest some examples of where service is likely to result. First of all there is a guarantee that if any money is raised in McHenry, 2/3<sup>rd</sup>'s of that money is



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

going to be spent there. Now, whether it's in Hebron or Crystal Lake or McHenry, Woodstock or whatever it might be... that's about as fragile as the RTA legislation that's on... I might say this, Representative Hanahan, in order to make sure that the people of any area that are interested in having a bus service or anything else, can get it... we have one, the guarantee they will have a voice on the board, two, the guarantee that 2/3 rd's of their money is going to be spent in their county and three, the provision that localities may secure new services by petitioning the Regional Transit Authorities and by agreeing to pay part of the cost, now as you know many of the townships have received some federal revenue sharing monies, some communities like Evanston, feel so strongly about mass transit they are willing to impose a gas tax, just in their municipalities if the people are willing to come up with the money besides all these other things, and they agree to pay between 65 and 90% of the cost of running the bus or the mini bus or whatever it might be, then the Regional Transit Authority is obliged to provide that service and that's comparable and similar to the provision of which all the members are familiar under the National Amtrak Act by which we in Illinois, put a little money up and are running some extra trains and so it is a way to allow for local initiative and flexibility and to do something that the board itself may not have determined to do."

Hanahan: "Would you be acceptable, Sir... to an Amendment to include people transportation as part of the service of the RTA would provide in the five county and suburban area."

Deuster: "Yes, I think that you have discussed that with me and with other Members and I think you have made an excellent suggestion because as we know in these out



line areas especially, every school district either by contract or ownership have got a whole fleet of school buses and they have some housewives running them around in the morning for about an hour and a half and in the middle of the afternoon, but otherwise... these assets are idle and it seems to me and I know that you share this, that this would be a wonderful way of providing service especially in the out lying counties and if you have an Amendment..."

Hanahan: "I do have the Amendment..."

Deuster: "You do have the Amendment, I haven't looked at the exact language but it sounds good and I think I could support it."

Hanahan: "The Amendment would read something like... raising fifteen million, you know... to provide the... remove the real estate tax levy for the given area that levies the tax on real estate for the services of the bus... pupil transportation and then to take the rest of the money that is now given to the school districts and give it to the RTA to provide the total bus transportation of both special and regular transportation of pupils. Now, another point would be, you said that... 2/3 rd's of the money raised in the county would be reimbursed back to the county for services. Are you talking about any other monies except new taxes that your Bill provides for or the total amount of money on real estate... or on license plates or where is your basis revenues going to be derived from to operate the RTA."

Deuster: "Yes, the answer is... that we know the House will work at will on what revenue is but supposing it were a sales tax, supposing it were a gas tax... supposing it were a parking tax... whatever it is, in our Bill we have a provision that 2/3 rd's of any of the revenue that is raised and goes to RTA, you know, not real estate taxes goes to the county or something, we're just



talking about special revenue that comes to the RTA, the RTA in its budget expend 2/3 rd's of that money attributable to a county, to that county from whence it came."

Hanahan: "Even if it's off the State licenses plate. That the State..."

Deuster: "Yes, even if it went to Springfield and to Washington, and Moscow and back to the RTA, if it came out of McHenry County and it winds up in RTA, McHenry County under our Bill... gets 2/3 rd's of it."

Hanahan: "All right, to make one other point on this. In your Bill as drafted and introduced, you had the labor protection Amendments, the so called Amendment 18, to the last Bill of the last Session, provided for in the Bill."

Deuster: "Yes, I do..."

Hanahan: "So, we'll know where we're going on labor protection."

Deuster: "And, I want to tell you what we said last spring, it doesn't seem to you or me that this is a labor problem, this is a transportation problem and if we find that for any reasons the unions are unreasonable or something goes wrong, we can come back next year and take up the matter of unions or labor or something else, right now it's transportation matter so, I have the provision in my Bill that would simply respect all the existing rights of the laboring man who work in the transportation field in the Chicago region."

Hanahan: "Thank you."

Deuster: "Before closing, there is one last point that I would like to make it is not mentioned in here. As we had in the Bill last spring, we have a provision of highway option by which if any of the out lying counties feel that mass transit is such a low priority with them and yet they want to come into the system, they can come into the system and they can petition for a third of the



money raised in their county and use that for the purpose of the repair and the improvement of the existing roads. And, we believe that would benefit mass transit because buses have got to run on roads and likewise the obligation as a result of that provides service to that county would drop accordingly."

Neff: "I believe we still have some questions, Representative Deuster, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Representative Deuster, I want to be sure that I understand when you talk about a referendum... exactly what it is that you're talking about. Now, question number one, would be... is the referendum provision in your proposal similar to that in other proposals as far as you know or do they vary? Are we talking about... and I'll throw another couple in here so you can see where I'm trying to go. Are we talking... when we say referendum, are we talking about a total referendum vote, that is a regional vote... would this be.... this would be put to all the voters on a given day, presumably in March of '74, all the voters in the six county area as they go to the polls on that particular day, is my understanding correct so far?"

Deuster: "No, you have asked me if my referendum the same as the referendum which appears in the Speaker's Bill, at this moment there are only two Bills that provide for a referendum, Speaker Blair's and mine, they are entirely different kinds of referendums. The referenda.. the Speaker's referendum provides for a total regional vote so that the people of all the six counties go in and vote, whatever the majority is in all six counties it might pass in Cook, fail in the five others and still it would be established. That is his referendum, our referendum provides that it will be on a county by county basis and... just to make it clear, the system will be established no matter how the vote goes but, there will



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

tax and no obligation to provide service in a county that rejects it and does not adopt it. Does that answer your question?"

Hudson: "In other words if the voters in DuPage overwhelmingly voted 'no', let's say hypothetically..."

Deuster: "Yes."

Hudson: "DuPage County is still a part of the system, that's what you've said."

Deuster: "Yes."

Hudson: "But, and as such then would it obligations be commiserate or what would the obligations of the counties that might not have voted for it... be to the system."

Deuster: "The consequents of the majority of the electors in DuPage County voting 'no' on the referendum are one, they would still have a person on the board but without a vote. Two, none of the taxes would be imposed in DuPage County and three, the RTA would have no obligation to provide service to DuPage County and that's about it. It would be put together on building block basis and I would say, simply for planning purposes only, there would be a six county system in a county that rejected it and I might add, that all of this negative talk about the voting rejecting RTA... must not overwhelm us, the voters of Atlanta, Georgia were presented with a half cent sales tax and they accepted it, just in September the voters in Denver, Colorado were presented with this and they accepted it and if we draft a good Bill and pass a good Bill and it goes out to the voters... we'll have an opportunity to explain it and if it is a good Bill, I think they are going to pass it."

Hudson: "Well, I respect your confidence in the out come of this particular issue, however, it seems to me to be the better part of wisdom to at least understand..."

Deuster: "Yes."

Hudson: "What would happen."



Deuster: "Yes, actually the understanding is that for most purposes there would be no RTA in DuPage County if your people rejected it. The only thing is that simply in order to keep a planning system together, very much you might say like the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commissioners, they would still have this planning authority to plan as if it were a region which it is, but they wouldn't be able to tax your people and they would have no obligations, likewise to provide your people with service."

Hudson: "Now, one last question on the referendum... is it your thought that the referendum would be based on a total number of people coming to the polls to vote or would it be on that particular issue, this would be on the ballot would be a separate ballot, what do you envision in that regard. I ask this question because it's one that comes up repeatedly in matters of these kind..."

Deuster: "The best answer is to read to you the language of the Bill which is just two paragraphs. Section 53, adoption by electors, the authority shall not exercise any of the powers granted by this Act within any county in Northeastern Illinois until this Act is adopted by the electors of such counties. The question shall be submitted to the voters of the six counties of Northeastern Illinois, at the primary election in March, 1974, in accordance with Section 16-7 of the Election Code if a majority of those voting on the question within a county favor adoption of this Act, the authority may exercise all of its powers in such county, if a majority of those voting on the question within a county do not favor adoption of this Act, the authority may not exercise any of its powers within such counties except with respect to planning, the authority is under no responsibility for the provision of transportation service



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

within such counties, and the member or members of the board of directors appointed from such counties shall have no vote except with respect to planning."

Hudson: "Does that mean land use planning? Per chance."

Deuster: "No, it means regional transportation planning."

Hudson: "Thank you."

Neff: "Mr. Palmer."

Palmer: "Representative Deuster, what is the total amount of money in your Bill, as far as the funding of this system?"

Deuster: "The answer to that Representative Palmer, is one hundred and sixty-five million dollars... comprised in this way..."

Palmer: "All right."

Deuster: "And, we hope that the balance plan between General Revenue on one hand and Auto Related inpositions on the other. All right, the General Revenue we contemplate is, a one quarter of a percent sales tax in the region. I contemplate the passage of the Blair Bill, amended from a half a cent to a quarter of percent. That would produce fifty million dollars, secondly the contributions from a State Mass Transit Fund of forty million dollars that takes ninety million there from what you would say are general non transportation related revenue. Then we have a parking tax which would produce about fifteen or twenty million and a regional penny and a half gas tax of fifty-five million, making a total of seventy-five... seventy-five and ninety, is a hundred and sixty-five."

Palmer: "All right, what... let's take it on the basis now... I mean the present existing systems, that... money projection there would be sufficient to pay the cost of the existing system, is that correct?"

Deuster: "I believe the answer is 'yes', it's a hundred and sixty-five million more than we've got now."



Palmer: "Well, all right... what about gross money?"

Deuster: "There is gross money in the fact that the regional sales tax is something that goes with the economy, it's a percentage... and so that would be the area of the gross money."

Palmer: "All right, are there any plans now... that you know of or do you have any plans, which lays out or projects the development of the six county area in so far as the RTA system?"

Deuster: "Your question is, is there a plan for the development of service in the six county area."

Palmer: "That's correct."

Deuster: "Yes, the closes thing to a plan that I know of... is the plan that was developed by the Northwestern University Transportation Center for the commuter railroad from which a few of the ideas in this map are shown and that is basically that there would be lateral cross county bus shuttle service around the area."

Palmer: "I'm talking about a coordinated plan involving the railroads, CTA and also the bus system. Do we know that Hebron is going to get a road or some sort of a bus service, do we know that Crete will get some sort of a bus service... this is the kind of plan that I'm talking about, I'm talking about a projected plan."

Deuster: "That's an excellent question to which I don't believe there is any answer..."

Palmer: "You don't have a plan?"

Deuster: "I have no answer as to whether Hebron is going to three buses or five buses, I think what we have tried to do is take the existing legislation that is floating around in Springfield and make it as specific as possible without completely hand stringing them... many people have said to me... Members and others, that this is an abomination this idea that 2/3 rd's of the money raised in an area ought to be spend there."



Palmer: "Well I'm not concerned with that aspect, I'm concerned about planning and whether or not... to your knowledge there is presently a plan that embodies these three agencies of transportation that physically applies to any or all part of the six county area."

Deuster: "From a planning."

Palmer: "Yes, Sir."

Deuster: "I would agree with you that to my knowledge there is no such specific plan and that is one of the deficiency of the subject that we're considering."

Palmer: "All right."

Deuster: "That we have been debating about how much we're going to take out of the tax payers pocket.....spends very little time telling him specifically what he's going to get for it."

Palmer: "One final question, does it transfer your Bill... your Bill transfer to the RTA, the governing body those functions now presently performed by the Illinois Commerce Commission? ..... Licenses and regulation."

Deuster: "It's been so long since we've discussed that point, I believe that the Regional Transit Authority is exempt from the regulation of fares and other regulations of the Illinois Commerce Commission, so to some extent they have... free enterprize opportunity to innovate and set the fares that they want to and run where they want to, I believe it is 'yes', they are exempt."

Palmer: "All right, thank you."

Deuster: "Mr. Chairman, before yielding... that's all I have but I do know that the Co-sponsor of this Bill, from DuPage County, Representative Dyer, did want to say just a word about the significance of the board representation, at this time I yield to Mrs. Dyer."

Neff: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Chairman, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Committee of the whole. Believe me, I'm going to be brief. I just



want to remind you about my concern in this whole subject of RTA. The 1970 census showed that the City of Chicago proper lost population, the suburban Cook County and the five counties around it... each gained population. All projections for the future indicate that this trend is going to continue, so if we are going to plan a viable structure... a framework in which we can have Regional Transportation in this area, we've got to give equable representation on any governing board for the five counties surrounding Cook County. The reason that I agreed to Co-sponsor this particular Bill is that the governing board has one Representative from each one of the five surrounding counties. I think that any Bill that is going to pass out of the General Assembly should have representation for each suburban county. We can't have taxation without representation, Ladies and Gentlemen that what this country is all about. Now, I think the final thing for us to remember, I have no pride of Co-sponsorship or authorship. I don't really care whether it is this Bill or another Bill that gets passed, to me a passenger trip is more important than an ego trip in this subject. Let's just get something passed but lets do let suburban be represented. Thank you."

Neff: "Are there any other questions or comments to be made on House Bills 4, 5 and 6?"

Deuster: "I should explain 5 and 6, I didn't do that."

Neff: "Representative Deuster, would like to explain 5 and 6, which he hasn't gone into yet."

Deuster: "House Bill 5, set up an Illinois Mass Transit Fund, it does just about the same thing that Governor Walker, has in mind and is accomplished in the Governor's Bill except I think that it is very important that a mass transit fund be established and the way that it is done here, is orderly business like way that benefits all



of Illinois just not the Chicago Region. I don't believe we should just send to the RTA, a check and forget about downstate in this one area. This Bill, House Bill 4, Co-sponsored by Representative Williams, Catania and Mrs. Dyer and myself, establishes an Illinois Mass Transit Fund and puts approximately sixty million dollars into it, and this is done by earmarking a percentage of the federal revenue sharing that the State of Illinois has already received and is supposed to be committing to high priority objects or subjects like mass transit. This would provide sixty million... if you spread that out around the State, 2/3 rd's of it would go to RTA, forty million, twenty million would go to the downstate areas for your transit services, buses or whatever you want to do around the State. I think this would be fair and a proper way to establish a fund. Also, that the fund wouldn't be a one shot deal... it has a percentage in it and if this Bill would go to the Governor's desk, he believes in fine tuning. He's the one that knows what's in the budget, how much we can afford or the Members of this House can amend it, you can change it from sixty-five, to sixty, to seventy, to eighty, to twenty, whatever you think by changing one word and it is tied to a continuing program of federal revenue sharing and I think that it is a responsible Bill and I hope next week when we consider it, you'll give it your support. Lastly, House Bill 6, provides for in the region, a regional increase of a penny and a half in the gasoline tax. I think with the soaring automobile tax you'll find that many constituents will feel this to be minimal but this will produce about fifty-five million dollars and it is one of the automobile related tax imposition in this three Bill package. I think you very much for your time and attention and next week we'll get into the Amendment."



Neff: "Questions... or discussion on House Bills 4, 5, and 6? Thank you, Mr. Deuster. We will now move on to House Bills 8 through 12, and the Chair will recognize Representative Garmisa, to explain these Bills. These are the so called Governor's Program Bills."

Garmisa: "Mr. Chairman... Members of the Transportation Committee sitting as a body of the whole. House Bill 12, would create a Regional Transportation Authority Act, to provide for and coordinate public transportation services for the six county area of Northeastern Illinois. This Act reaffirms the Constitutional Declaration that public transportation is an essential public service for which public funds may be expended. Now, is the time for this General Assembly to act to meet the crisis that is before us. It is a well known fact that the economic growth and the well being of the State... does directly apply to the economic growth of the Chicago Metropolitan area. History will show that transportation of farm products, trade and people... has played a tremendous roll in making the Chicago Metropolitan area in our great State one of the most dynamic region of the entire nation. The great economic strength of our State currently enjoy... must not be jeopardized by failure to meet current mass transportation problems. These problems must be resolved, the people wants a solution and we must act. The unique features of House Bill 12, may be found in its new funding proposal, in a .... board appointments, there regularatory powers and in the formation of local transportation councils. The new funding proposal for House Bill 12, is made up of the following componets... we could raise forty-five millions of dollars at a dollar per auto registration that would be returned to the six counties... there would be twenty-nine point three millions of dollars that would be returned to the ninety-six downstate



counties which could be used for mass transit or highway purposes. There will be an appropriation out of the General Revenue Fund of sixty millions of dollars and hopefully, if we're able to get passage of the proposed lottery Bill, we hope supplant that sixty million in that manner. There could be forty-three millions of dollars that would be raised by board imposed taxes and fees that would be related to ownership and operation of motor vehicles. Now, 2/3 rd's of all these taxes collected, in any county... must be returned to that county. This could come to a total of a hundred and forty-eight millions of dollars that we have to finance the first year of the operation of RTA. We would ask for in this Bill an RTA governing board that would be composed of a nine member board of directors and they would be receptive outlying counties concerned... and like other RTA proposals that appoint two directors by a majority vote of the five county board Chairman outside of Cook, House Bill 12, would require that each board chairman outside of Cook, concur with the selection of at least one director out of a total of two. The key feature of the regulatory power section in House Bill 12, is that any transportation agency which contracts part of its facilities to the RTA, under purchase of service agreements would remain subject to... ICC regulations for those facilities that would not come under such purchase of service agreement. The effect would be that transportation agencies that are not able to discontinue service in outlying counties because they enter purchase of service agreements with the RTA for only their enter lined route. We would call for two in House Bill 12, for the formation of local transportation councils and this is another key feature of the Bill, now these councils would provide for region wide discussions of RTA problems and a means for voice... the peoples

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

concern to the regional transportation authority and Mr. Chairman, we do have quiet a few proponents that are here to speak in favor of the Bill and I would ask you to call them in the order that we so submitted to you, Mr. Chairman."

Neff: "Representative Juckett."

Juckett: "Mr. Chairman, is the Sponsor of the Bill asking that all the witnesses be put on before questioning or is he willing to answer some questions now?"

Garmisa: "I think, Representative Juckett, that is a proper procedure or the most expeditious procedure would be to call on the witnesses and then you will have your area of questioning that the Sponsor or witnesses would answer."

Juckett: "If that's the way you desire it, I'll be happy to comply and we'll just stand in line to ask some questions when they're done."

Neff: "Are there any other questions... to Representative Garmisa, if not.... we have some witnesses that we would like to call and Milton Pukonsky, the Chairman of the Chicago CTA, Milton."

Milton Pukorsky: "Mr. Chairman and Members of House of the Illinois General Assembly. My name is Milton Pukorsky, I'm Chairman of the Board of the Chicago Transit Authority. I'm especially grateful for the opportunity to appear before you at this time because the matter that you are considering is a subject of grave urgency, it is matter so much in need of Resolution at this Special Session of the General Assembly that we no longer can afford the luxury of mincing words. Permit me to degress for one moment to sharpen our prospective still further with a few rhetorical questions. Would anyone sit by and do nothing if it were known that none of our police would report for duty in the morning. Would nothing be done... if it was known that the doors of our



public schools and universities would not be open in the morning. Would nothing be done if we knew our hospitals would not admit anymore patients, would nothing be done if we knew our water supply was about to be shut off... would nothing be done if when known, that our sanitary districts were about to be shut down. I submit, Ladies and Gentlemen that these are rhetorical are highly irrelevant to the important matter before you today. Public transportation is faced with collapse and serious deterioration in Chicago and the metropolian area. This is true for the Chicago Transit Authority, for the suburban bus system and for the communer rail operation. Chicago has long been blessed with one of the best transportation systems in the world, the Rapid Transit and surface routes now operated by the CTA and the network of communer railroad lines operated by six railroads, although limited in scope of operation, the services of suburban bus companies also have been excellant but, even the best of systems... once they are neglected, can fall to pieces in a hurry... picking up those pieces and building a new... would be a most difficult and expensive project. Daily headlines, as well as news by television and radio, tell the dire plight of the CTA and its nearly one million riders a day in our bare-bones existance, the CTA will be lucky if its present emergency subsidy last through December. Several suburban bus companies have already abandon service and the few remaining systems are on financial rocks. The Commuter railroads are experiencing more and more difficulties... all are burden with raising cost in providing the essential service throughout the suburban area. Like the CTA and the suburban bus company, the commuter railroads are being hit by continuing blows of inflation, several of the railroads recently have had to reduce their commuter operations... at least



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

one major railroad is seriously considering filing petition to go out of the commuter operation entirely. For the CTA and other transit operators both here and throughout the nation, is it no longer possible to raise fares to meet raising costs. Higher fares only drive more riders away and place greater hardships on those who have no other means of travel. It is universally recognized that the fare box along can no longer pay all of the costs that operating subsidy are an absolute necessity if public transportation system are to survive. This is the emergency situation, a collapsing of public transportation that mandates immediate action by the Illinois General Assembly. The Legislature during its last Regular Session virtually reached the consensus on the organizational and operating structure of an effective Regional Transportation Authority, unfortunately the crucial question of the amount and source of funding for the proposed authority is still unresolved. This issue of providing a sound, sufficient and continuing funding plan is the essential element that must be desolved without any further delay, to transform the promise of a Regional Authority into reality, I think that you would agree that the desperate needs to maintain and improve the services of the CTA within Chicago is self evidence... without public transportation the city and the entire metropolian area would virtually die. This would be true also for Chicago magnificent and growing downtown area. Despite all the automobiles you see jamming the expressways and boulevards, the automobile accounts for no more than 13% of the daily accumulation of people in the downtown area... of the more than two hundred and eighty-three thousand persons who work, shop, to business or visit the culture institutions during a week stay downtown, 86% travel by rapid transit, bus and commuter railroads. Remember our big



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

snow storm of January, 1967... Chicago's downtown would have been shut down had it not been for the continued operation of the CTA rapid transit routes and the commuter railroads. Besides meeting the sheer necessity of maintaining present services and short plan of sufficient operating subsidy through the RTA, could enable the CTA to reduce its fare to twenty-five cents in non rush periods. Such a reduced fare in our opinion would be desirable for all transit operations throughout the metropolitan area under the RTA jurisdiction... only within the last week or so, the need for a reduced fare became even more evident when we were visited at the CTA by community leaders, representing welfare families. The point that they made is that the CTA with its present forty-five cent fare has actually priced itself beyond the reach of many thousands of welfare recipients who have no other means of travel. Several other major cities have recently proved that many thousands of additional riders, persons of lower income bracket, can be attracted to public transportation through a reduction in fare. The most notable example has been in Atlanta, with the Metropolitan Transportation Authority was able to reduce the fare to fifteen cents from forty cent, with a subsidy provided by a one cent sales tax. We at the CTA are very grateful to the Legislature for two precedents in reduced fare... one which has been affective for some years, is the reduced student fare made possible by a substantial State reimbursement, the other is the more recent allocation of State funds which has made possible to reduce fares for senior citizens at all hours of travel. As a footnote to the reducing of citizen fare, you may be interested in knowing that we have attracted many new riders... even from Chicago's so called 'Gold Coast' on the northside it is not at all unusual seeing a women in a mink coat



getting on Lake Shore Drive or Michigan Avenue bus, showing her CTA identity card that entitles her to the reduced senior citizens fare, in fact we're told that having an identification card for the reduced senior citizens fare has now become somewhat of a status symbol along Lake Shore Drive. Beside maintaining present services and reducing the non rush hour fare, sufficient subsidy would also enable us at the CTA to plan new services, one new service that we are eager to try is known as 'dial a bus', this is a type of person-  
alized service where by, in response to a telephone call a bus stops at your very door stop, it would be an especially desirable type of service for the elderly, the handicapped and other persons finding it difficult to use regular transit service. Toronto with the financial help of the empiral provental government is experiencing considerable success with the 'dail a bus service' as are a number of smaller cities in the United States. Let us now turn away from Chicago to the many suburban communities in the six counties, what benefits does an RTA with its tax subsidy hold for them. It is obvious that one of the inirial benefits could be a stabilization of commuter affairs, a hope to any further increases in fares... conceivably there could be reductions in fares or perhaps an equalization in fare structures. The deterioration of the present suburban bus systems could be halted with loss service being restored and these systems placed on the road toward improvement and expansion. Recent studies have underscored the feasibility of providing new bus routes to and from the commuter railroad station, in as much as most commuter stations are located within business districts of suburban communities... such fed of bus services also would have the effect of providing new local transit service. A wide spread desire amongst



suburban communities for the new public transportation services was voiced at the hearings conducted in August, throughout the six county areas by Mr. Langhorn Bond, the Illinois Secretary of Transportation. For instance, in DuPage County there appeared to be unanimity among the various spokesmen, the local government and civic groups about a need for creating both intra and inter suburban transit system. What was especially sufficient about such testimony was that while there was still a recognition of a need for travel between the suburbans and Chicago, there is a realization that metropolitan transportation also... must mean easier access both within and around the suburbans themselves. In DuPage as well as other counties, the foresighted and enlighten governmental officials and civic leaders obviously are well aware of the prospects of continued growth and population... for at least the next twenty years or so, the population is expected to grow and be concentrated in the suburban area, by 1995, it is projected that the six Illinois counties of the Chicago metropolitan area will have a population of approximately ten million persons, of this total the City of Chicago would retain its present level of three million, six hundred and fifty-seven thousand persons with the remainder of suburban area showing an increase in population to six million, three hundred and fifty thousand. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, twenty years is a short time in the life of an urban community particularly when such rapid growth is expected. No time can be wasted in preparing for that growth, especially when it comes to planning, creating, stopping and equipping transportation systems that will be necessary. The acquisition of transportation, equipment alone requires considerable lead time, for instance, I call your attention that the lead time required for the delivery of buses today



is twenty-nine months while the lead time for obtaining new computer commuter cars or rapid transit trains is forty-six months. Obviously we cannot afford to waste anymore time in creating the Regional Transportation Authority that is needed not only to save the existing systems but to spearhead the planning necessary for the extension of mass transportation operations throughout the growing suburban area. If for nothing else, it also would be in own self interest to get such planning under way to a Regional Transportation Authority if the Chicago area is to receive the full share of increase federal aid that can be expected for public transportation improvement in the immediate years ahead. But, Ladies and Gentlemen there is still another compelling and more immediate reason for the Illinois Legislature to act quickly, to create an RTA and provide a sound and sufficient subsidy plan for public transportation. This reason should also be of interest to the non user of public transportation... more specifically, to the motorist who never thinks of transit as having any value to him... for some months many of us have been speaking and we have spoken to you of an approaching energy crisis... of a shortage of motor fuel, as a crucial factor in the need for an RTA, for improved and expanded mass transportation facilities and for the necessary subsidy. The crisis is no longer approaching, it has arrived... you have seen the latest new stories on this subject, it was a news story for example last Friday from Washington, "Government energy experts admits they under estimated the size and impact of the masivé oil shortage that will be felt in the United States within three weeks"... three weeks, I submit. The Presidents chief energy advisor, 'John Loft', said after a closed meeting with members of the Senate Interior Committee that the Arab oil cut-off could mean a deficit



of as much as 18% of the oil product the nation uses daily. Senator Henry Jackson, Chairman of the Committee said that when last shipload of Arab oil comes in, about three weeks from now the shortage will really be hitting us like a ton of bricks. It's fair to say that the crisis is much worse than all of us had anticipated, to those of us in transit... who are already worried about our own fuel supplies... such news articles came as no surprise. Last week for instance, the CTA joined other transit operators throughout the country in making an appeal to the White House for an emergency allocation directive that would assure us a full and continuing supply of diesel fuel to operate our buses as a top priority public service. In view of this fact of developing energy crisis the persons who depend solely on their automobile may soon be forced by the virtual certainty of rationing to turn to public transportation, to rapid transit, to buses, or the commuter railroad. The energy crisis is not going to go away nor is there probably any end in sight to the rising prices of motor fuel. Furthermore, there is certain to be greater and great of public pressure to protect the environment, couple the environmental pressures with the energy crisis and there is one ultimate answer for the private automobile user... more and more restricted use, with restricted use of the automobile the motorist will be forced to seek an alternate road of travel, we must be prepared to provide that service to improve an expanded public transportation facility not only in Chicago but throughout the six counties of the metropolitan area. Let us look back for a moment to thirty years ago to the early 1940's when there was another major crisis in public transportation in Chicago. Even though transit riding was near an all time high, the two main private transit operators, the Chicago Surface



and the Chicago Rapid Transit Companies were bankrupt. There was a dire need then as there is today to save the cities public transportation system without regards to partisan party lines, the Mayor of the public officials, Civic leaders in Chicago, the Governor and the State Legislatures in Springfield... here... pitched in to solve the problem, the results of this all out by-partisan effort was the creation of the Chicago Transit Authority as a new public body which acquired the properties of former private transit company. Until overcome by spiraling inflation of recent years the CTA won national recognition as an unusual transit operation that operated out of the fare box on a break-even basis. For many years the CTA was not only able to pay all operating cost from fare collections but also earned death service requirements and was able to set aside appreciation fund which resulted in more than two hundred million dollars worth of capital improvement, but because of the devastating affects of inflation those notable days of the CTA, as a break even operation are now history. Operating subsidy as well as capital improvement subsidy have now become an absolute necessity. We feel confident that history will repeat itself, that all of you in the Legislature will set aside partisan differences... to act quickly on the proposed creation of a Regional Transportation Authority based on a sound sufficient and continuing funding plan. There're many question which you perhaps have as a subsidy need, which I have not touched upon and others... and I would be happy to answer any question that anyone might have."

Neff: "Mr. Totten, do you have a question?"

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Chairman, Pukorsky, you indicated that you were for a, I found in your remarks, funding plan. You are testifying in favor of House Bill 12, as a proponent... are you going to be testifying



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

in favor of any of these other plans that are before us?"

Pukorsky: "No. I have indicated to the Leadership and I understand that they have indicated that there are some possible changes that the present Bill, is the only one before you that has adequate funding for public transportation and that... to have a Bill pass that provides the powers, the right, the duties of a Regional Transportation Authority without providing the adequate level of funding would be a defeat on the public."

Garmisa: "So then.... Mr. Chairman, I thought we were in agreement that we were going through the witnesses to expedite the hearing here this afternoon and then go into a question period from whatever witnesses they care to ask a question."

Neff: "Is that agreeable with you, Representative Totten, are do you...."

Totten: "Just as long as we have the understanding that the witnesses will stay for all these...."

Neff: "They will be available for questioning."

Totten: "Okay, I thought was the understanding."

Neff: "Yes, it will be very important that all the witnesses do stay because they will be called back I'm sure for some questions. At this time we're fortunate to have Secretary of Transportation with us this afternoon, who is appearing as a proponent to House Bills 8 through 12, Secretary Langhorn Bond."

Bond: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. In view of the lateness of the hour and the fact that this Legislation has been explored in depth exhaustibly by Chairman Pukorsky, I propose to introduce my testimony to the record and then... and not read it to the House and be available for questioning when that time comes, and if that is acceptable to you and Members of the House."

Neff: "Thank you, Secretary Bond. We have the Mayor of



Evanston here... the city of Evanston, Mayor Vaneman, is that right Mayor... am I pronouncing the name right? I'm not sure I got your name right but... Vaneman... Mayor Vaneman, speaking as a proponent on House Bills 8 through 12."

Vaneman: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee.

My name is Edgar Vaneman, Jr. and I'm Mayor of the City of Evanston and also the Chairman of the Cook County Council of Government which includes seventy-seven local governments representing well over half the population of suburban Cook County. This Council was instrumental in establishing a six county ad hoc suburban mass transportation coordinating Committee which has had frequent meeting of Mayor's and Village Presidents in northeastern Illinois over a two year period, concerning the crisis of mass transportation in prior metropolian area. The Council of Government in my city believe that there are three principal points which this Legislation should encompass. First the agency must have authority over the entire six county metropolian area and should be established as soon as possible by the Legislature without a referendum. Two, the Board of the agency must be based upon the one man one vote principal, the suburbs have a right to fair representation on the governing board of the RTA. Three, the Legislation should encourage an increase in mass transportation services rather than simply be a holding action for the status quo, this not only means that it must be adequately funded but immediage attention should be given of satisfying the great movement of people between the various suburbs as well as between the suburbs in the central city. In order to assure that the commuter rail services are maintained, the RTA Legislation now before you for consideration should require that the authority enter into purchase of service contracts with



the commuter rail lines and bus companies at the earliest date and that the terms of such contracts assure the rail line and suburban bus companies that they will be fully compensated for their services with the fare rentals for the use of their equipment. The suburbs believe that they should receive a fair share of the revenue which fund the RTA, we are willing to pay for an RTA but a part of our contributions should be distributed to the suburbs. By requiring the RTA to purchase the commuter rail and suburban bus services we will insure that this equable distribution is made and Mr. Chairman, therefore while I do speak on behalf of much of the Bills that are presently here, I also speak therefore on behalf of much that is present H.B. 15, as well as the H.B. 39 and 40, and as well as some of those mentioned by Representative Deuster. I would simply like to stress that I think there is a tremendous body of public opinion requesting action at this Session of the Legislature. The gas shortage... the recent collapse of the Evanston bus line and the bankruptcy of the Glenview and other bus lines as well as environmental factors and the realization that we can't simply stand any longer on building more expensive highways, all impell us to plead with you to work together and compromise on a RTA Bill. We sincerely believe that the successful Legislator and public officials is one who is able to work with Members of parties and reaching a solution to our problems and not one who insist that a particular person or party be given credit for the solution reached nor one who has the power to force the acceptance of his particular solution. I'm convinced that this is time in history when people want to see results from working together rather than the creation of polarize positions this organization and unwillingness to compromise. I am confident that you will



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

reach a solution and I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you. Thank you."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr.... Mayor Vaneman. Now, we have another Mayor here, Mayor McCoy, from Aurora. If he would step up we would like to hear from him," Mayor McCoy will be speaking as a proponent on House Bill 12."

McCoy: "I am Mayor McCoy, from Aurora. My stand has been perfectly clear since the inception of talks on the RTA that I have supported it, my local newspaper has so reported it on the front page. I have also testified at all the public hearings in our area in support of the RTA. In our area there are over six million people in the six county area presently living, there are approximately a hundred thousand more people in the suburban area than there is in the city of Chicago at this time. As the previous speaker has said, by 1995, there will be ten million people living in our area. Seven million in the suburbs, three million in the City of Chicago so, what might not be directly our problem today will be our problem as each and every day goes on. The City of Aurora has supported public transportation out of its general corporate funds since 1967, each and every year we have had to dig into our coffers a little deeper in order to keep public transportation alive. Had it not been for the Illinois State Legislature, in helping us fund our new buses and also our new service area, we would be out of business at this time. We have also kept the public transportation system between Aurora and Elgin, in service... each of the cities in our area is contributing to the loss every month. We must have a proper balance of roads and public transportation in our area, we cannot let the automobile strangle us, I've had the opportunity to visit other cities... large metropolitan areas and also study programs in Philadelphia, New York, Boston, San



Francisco, Atlanta, Denver, Washington, Seattle, each and every one of these areas the State Legislature has acted to form a Regional Transit Authority. We live in the area which is the second largest metropolian area in the country, New York one, Chicago area number two, Los Angeles, three. We have just surpassed Los Angeles. I'm not an expert in drafting legislation, but I would suggest that in connection with the purpose of the Bills that are presently before us... that we must make sure and I must be able to assure the poeple in the area in which I live and represent, that the present RTA plan is not just to save the CTA. That it will take care of the suburban rail service and it will take care of the bus lines in our area. The RTA must not have the freedom to ignore us, I do support the RTA, I that that it is high time that we think about the people who are living in the second largest metropolian area and I do ask for your support and consideration towards the formation of RTA. Thank you."

Neff: "Jack, would you hold your question till after we get through, these witnesses will all stay and answer them later, thank you. Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Did I understand that the Secretary Bond, would have printed statements to pass out here, is that right?"

Neff: "Secretary Bond, I believe I did understand that you would have printed statements... do you have those, Sir?"

Ryan: "Thank you."

Neff: "The Secretary will get them and have them passed out. The next man that we will hear from... speaking as a proponent to House Bill 8 through 12, is Preston Piedon, Association of Commerce and Industry... Preston."

Piedon: "Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. My name is Preston Piedon, I'm director of Governmental Affairs with the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry. I appear here today as a representative of the association



and appreciate this opportunity to make a statement expressing our views on the vital subject of a Regional Transportation Authority for the Chicago metropolitan area. Our association strongly supports the creation of a Regional Transportation Authority that will provide a truly coordinated system adequately financed and efficiently managed to be responsibly for the transportation of people in the six county, northeastern Illinois area. The citizenry of this six county metropolitan area recognize the need for the establishment of a Regional Transit Authority, recent hearings on the subject, radio and television polls as well as an individual poll taken by the tax payers federation of Illinois, establish that there is a real need for RTA and that the majority supports the establishment of such an agency, that's if the people of this area....."

Neff: "Pardon me, for what reason does Representative Totten, arises?"

Totten: "Just a procedure here, I hate to interrupt Mr. Piedon, but I think that most of the Members do have copies of his remarks and I wonder... I think I have four other copies of remarks of witnesses who are going to appear before the Committee, if we couldn't... in order to proceed up the hearing, do as the secretary has done, Mr. Bond... provide the Members..... so that we could proceed with the rest of the Bill."

Neff: "Preston, if you will kind of hold up on count of time... but if you want to express on certain parts of it, you go ahead and...."

Piedon: "I will abide by the wishes of the Chairman. I would like to make two or three points. And, I beg of you to give me your consideration. I hear many Members in this Body talk... that what happens in Chicago metropolitan area is none of their business, we're from downstate. I want to give you some facts that will



establish that what happens in the metropolitan area affects you... and downstate, and affects this whole State and I ask you to look at these facts... the six county metropolitan area of which Chicago is the core, contains sixty-three percent of the States population. It generates sixty-eight percent of a total State industrial earnings, excluding corporate earnings. At least seventy-five percent of a corporate income is also concentrated in the six county area our metropolitan strength represents seventy-two percent of all the construction occurring in Illinois... sixty-five percent of manufactory, eighty-three percent of wholesale, sixty-five percent of the retail trade, seventy-eight percent of utilities and transportation, sixty-nine percent of government and fifty-seven percent of the total manufactured exports made in Illinois. It is clear that the economic well being of this State is substantially dependant upon the economic well being of this metropolitan area. I don't think that you can, in good conscious fail to recognize that the economics of this area is threaten and serverly threaten... and our plea is that you consider this statement which I will read no further, except to say that this is a vital problem, it begs for an answer now and we hope that you will meet the issue now. Thank you."

Neff: "The next witness will be call..... to be called is Harry Gahagen, I believe it is, Chicago Real Estate Board and also past President and Chairman of the Transportation Committee, is appearing as support of the RTA Bills as a proponent of House Bills 11 through 12. Mr. Gahagen."

Gahagen: "Mr. Chariman, distinguished Members, Ladies and Gentlemen of the.... My name is Harry Gahagen, I'm a realtor, past President of the Chicago Real Estate Board and Chairman of their 1958. I say 1958, gentlemen



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

for your benefit because in that year the Chicago Real Estate Board made a very exhaustive study of the transportation problem in the metropolian of Chicago. This study was made not only in the northeastern part of this great State but it was made in connection with the then study and planning for the park system that is now in affect in the San Francisco area and particularly in the New York transit area. As a result of this study, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Chicago Real Estate Board Committee which I had.... we developed Senate Bills 989 and 990, creating a metropolitan transportation authority in the six counties of the northeastern part of our State. Many of you Gentlemen here will recall that.... and, I'm pleased to remind you of the fact that those Bills passed all Committees in both sides of the House and were approved by the Senate and 2/3 rd's in the House. The Second Reading was accomplished just before the clock turned back and in the morning when the Session was resumed these Bills creating a transit authority in 1959, were killed on a technicality that the Amendments were not before the Legislators therefore, the matter was killed. Now, since 1959, our problem has generated to a point where you hear it every day, it has become chaotic, we have a crisis... crisis I don't think is the word for it... this great system of transportation that we have today, that we're trying to put into a metropolitan transit organization, is without a question one of the finest systems in the United States. This statement... not coming from me, I'm repeating it... it was made by the transit officials from John Volpe, our past Secretary of Transportation.... by many of our leaders. This is a system that must be coordinated.... there is a few excerpts that I'll just touch on very lightly, in the statement that was made



in 1959, because they are absolutely the same as they are today except that the crisis is before us to a point where immediate action must be taken. We emphasize the fact that transportation was a regional matter, required in one comprehensive policy for dealing with the transportation systems the confusion which results, through non coordinated efforts of all the various responsibly agencies must be eliminated if this problem is to be solved. We did advise both the Senate and the House and reminded them as we remind you today, that this certainly is the problem of this great body and it is up to you Gentlemen, to solve it. This great system that I mentioned was created through public... through private interest, through men of leadership and brouth about the CTA and our great suburban railroads is faltering today. One they say a crisis, I'll use a medical term... those systems that includes everyone of the suburban railroads in the CTA are to use a medical term... they're in a state of rigor mortis, Ladies and Gentlemen. The time has come... the Chicago Real Estate Board who has supported a Regional Transit during all these years... they are here to urge you to beg and plead with you to not leave Springfield in the next ten days without giving the people who are waiting this great Bill to become a reality. I thank you, very much."

Neff: "We have with us Mr. Jack Cornelious, who has distributed his statement in order to save some time on the House floor here... Mr. Cornelious, is Chicago Central area representative of Chicago Central area Committee as executive secretary and we do appreciate... yes we would like to have.... if you would like to make a statement Mr...."

Cornelious: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen. Let me paraphrase the statement which you have just received in



order to save time. I think the most important thing that I have to say is, to call your attention to the kinds of companies that are represented by this group. We're talking about major employers of tens of thousands of people in the Chicago area and they are deeply concerned with the necessity for establishing as quickly as possible a viable transportation system an attractive alternative to the automobile. We're under the gun right now from the federal EPA and from the Illinois EPA, to cut down on auto traffic, in our own planning process in corporation with the City of Chicago. We recognize the necessity to cut automobile traffic in the next few years in the downtown area by as much as 20%, but we can't do it... we can't accomplish it unless we get that attractive alternative. Now, we can't write the Legislation as businessmen because that really is your job and we as a group and as a group which has a very strong stake in... what happens in the Chicago metropolitan area and particularity what happens in the central business district... urge you to get on with that job."

Neff: "Thank's Mr. Cornellious. The next party that we would like to hear from is Mrs. Elenor Wolf, I see sitting back there... Elenor, we would like to have you come up and make a statement. Mrs. Wolf is appearing as a proponent on House Bill 12."

Elenor Wolf: "Gentlemen, my name is Elenor Wolf, Jr., I'm Chairman of the Greater Lake County Mass Transit District. We encompass the entire county of Lake..... or that we do not represent, I belong to north suburban mass transit district but we're in full concurrence with them on the RTA implementation. It is indeed a privilege to appear to you today as a participate in your efforts to create a rapid transit authority for the six county



area of Greater Lake of Greater Chicago. I appear before you today not only as a expert in urban mass transportation but also as a concerned and interested member of suburban Lake County, as many of you know I have always supported the concept of a Regional Transportation Authority, it is my contingention that efficient and economical mass transportation can only be provided to six county area through a Regional Authority which impowered to finance, regulate and coordinate all those of transportation. While I favor RTA, I am concerned that if the organized so as to insure that all of our citizens share in its benefits. As a long time resident of a suburban county, I urge you to assure your constituents in the suburbs that their needs will be met. The life blood of suburban area is a suburban commuter rail service and our suburban bus lines, while the news media is full of stories which tell the financial crisis facing the CTA... little is said of the deteriorating service from continued deficit operations which plege buses, commuter rail services it is essential that legislation now before you for consideration, provide for revenues which will eliminate these operations subsidy and maintain existing services. To achieve this result, I must say that both House Bill 12 and 15, should require that the RTA to enter into purchase of service contracts with the commuter rail lines and suburban bus lines within a year or within a reasonable period of time after the formation of the RTA. In order to maintain and improve its existing services these contracts accuractely compensate the buses and the rail lines by providing for those costs incurred in providing commuter service and in the instance of private companies, a reasonable rate of return on a facility used in public transportation only by requiring that the RTA to purchase the suburban



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

service... will the suburban taxpayers be assured that the revenue of the RTA are equably distributed so as to benefit public transportation in the suburbs. The Members of this House who represent the suburbs of the six county region must realize that transportation needs of the suburban areas are directly tied to the continued operation of commuter bus lines and rail service, with the Chicago area rail commuter lines suffering... operating losses in the amounts of seventeen million dollars a year we cannot afford to let the funding priorities of the RTA be left to conjecture and speculation, language must be inserted in the legislation to insure that our commuter services and bus lines will not be discontinued. The legislature can be proud of the fact that they have come a long way in dealing with the problem of mass transportation in the greater Chicago area. Many difficult problems and issues have been resolved by political compromise however, your work will be in vain if an effective and viable Regional Transportation Authority is not enacted in this Session. I urge you and your colleagues to put aside political differences and as you have been able to do in the past and enact an RTA Bill which will finally solve the crisis in mass transportation which has plagued the six county region for so many years. I thank you for listening."

Neff: "Thank you, Elenor. The next witness that we would like to hear is appearing as a proponent on House Bill 12, is John Robinson, a lawyer for the commuter railroad in the Chicago region."

Robinson: "Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, my name is John E. Robinson. I'm pleased to be here on behalf of the commuter railroads of the Chicago area, specifically the Burlington Northern, Chicago and Northwestern, the Illinois Central Gulf, the Milwaukee Road of Rock Island



and the South Shore line. I have served under Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation and of this General Council, I'm presently a partner in the Chicago Law Firm of Sidley and Austin. Commuter railroads of Chicago support the creation of a Regional Transportation Authority, only through a responsible regional body can a essential existing public transportation services be preserved and improved and coordinated. Without an adequately funded RTA, public transportation to the citizens in Chicago metropolitan region will suffer irreversible decay. Commuter rail service represents the most important public transportation resource within the metropolitan region outside the City of Chicago. Commuter rail services is the life blood of public transportation in our suburban areas and is vital to the City of Chicago its self, thousands of residents of the suburbs and the city are completely dependant on commuter rail service for access to their jobs, and Chicago area citizens make nearly seventy million rides on commuter rail service each year. With the prospect of gasoline rationing eminent, commuter rail service takes on even more critical importance. But, the commuter rail service in Chicago area is in serious financial trouble, this year commuter rail services there will be about seventeen million dollars in the red and that deficient is expected to increase in succeeding years. Only one commuter railroad is not yet losing money, in the case of another of the commuter railroads financial condition is so serious that the ability to continue any commuter service at all is in immediate jeopardy. Experience has taught us that the inedible result of continue deficient operations will be sharply deteriorated service, service cut backs, worn out equipment inadequate maintenance of stations and road beds



and loss of jobs. Without an RTA commuter rail service cannot buck the tide of these unpleasant economic facts. My purpose today is to bring to your attention a number of our concerns that RTA legislation should deal with specifically, if it is to be a law that will benefit the citizens of the entire Chicago metropolitan region and if it is to be a law of equity and fairness. First, it is imperative that commuter rail service be assured of a conclus... unclusion within RTA, we believe that the appropriate way to accomplish this at the outset, is through purchase of service contracts between RTA and the commuter railroad covering the existing commuter rail service, however there is no assurance in the legislation which has been introduced that such purchase of service contracts will be forthcoming or their terms will be equitable. The legislation should provide that is a commuter railroad request entry into the purchase of service contract with RTA, that RTA be obliged to tender a contract, if the parties find themselves in disagreement on certain terms of the contract, we propose that those unresolved contract terms be referred to binding arbitration. In this way RTA legislation can assure the commuter rail service will be brought into the system at an early date and that RTA commuter railroads can negotiate terms of a purchase of service agreement fair to both parties. To suggest that the Illinois Commerce Commission could act as the arbitrator, in addition RTA legislation should specify that the purchase of service contracts with RTA covering commuter rail service, be on a basis which covers those costs which are incurred in or allocable to the service provided under the contract which allows a reasonable return on the property and facilities that the railroad used in the service. Only through such a provision can commuter rail services be preserved and



incentive for their improvement and expansion be provided. We believe that the most fairest, the most effective, the most clearly understandable way to articulate this standard in RTA legislation, is to adopt the principles in the language contained in the Illinois Public Utilities Act. We're saying simply this, commuter rail transportation cannot provide quality service or operate adequately or for long, if the cost of the services are not covered and if in the case of any public use of privately owned property, a fair rental or return... not paid on the property used in public service. Another point of critical importance not only to the Chicago region but to the entire State, is the assurance that efficient freight service will continue to be made available to consumers, shippers, farmers and manufacturers. Most of the trackage in the Chicago area over which commuter rail service is performed, is also used for freight service because of the joint use of trackage and other physical facilities by both passenger and freight service, it is essential that the legislation specifically provides that the action of RTA do not unreasonably interfere with the ability of a railroad to provide efficient freight service. There is such a provision in the interest of RTA and the economy of the Chicago area and the entire State, which is so heavily dependent on rail freight service can be reasonably and appropriately accommodated. Because rail facilities are jointly used and because commuter rail services become under RTA regulatory jurisdiction, freight services would remain under the jurisdiction of the Illinois Commerce Commission. The present provision of the Illinois Imminent Domain Act which calls for the Illinois Commerce Commission to approve in case condemnation of real property of a railroad or other public utility, should be maintained.



These procedures now apply to every other state and local agency Imminent domane powers, including the Highway Department, we believe they should be simmerly applied to RTA. We also suppose that RTA legislation contain equable provisions requiring RTA to purchase within a reasonable time such as the commuter cars and rolling stock now privately own, which are modern, serviceable in good condition and are currently utilized in commuter rail service. Federal and State capital grants should be available to RTA to cover nearly all of the purchase price of such equipment and such a provision offers RTA an opportunity for possible equalization in the level of commuter rail fares... for where the commuter rail equipment is privately owned, its cost and the cost of money used to financed this acquisition must be reflected in those commuter fares. Almost all of the Chicago area commuter rail service equipment is now publicly owned by various mass transit districts putting it all in the public ownership, should reduce the cost of RTA for riding commuter rail service and provide flexibly in the utilization of the commuter rail equipment. To met the concerns of some with the respect to such requirements we have no objections the legislation providing that in case there is an disagreement as to the price to be paid, the price will be determined either through condonation proceedings or outside arbitration. Nor would we have any objection to such required purchases being condition on the sellers agreement not to distribute the proceeds to its share holders or dividens or otherwise, and to limit the use of such proceeds to road improvement, such as right a way, maintiance, equipment and for the acquisition of new freigh cars and locomotives or simular purposes. We have prepared specific Amendments to the legislation introduced in this body which we believe deal responsibly



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

with the concerns that I have discussed today, which cover other points of a more technical nature. Let me say a final word concerning labor protection provisions in RTA legislation, in House Bill 1958, the RTA legislation which came close to passing this last June... there were labor protection provisions adopted under Amendment 18, to that Act which represented long serious and thoughtful negotiations...."

Neff: "Mr. Robinson, would you hold up just a minute and see if I can get you a little order. I think it's getting a little noisy out here. Can we have a little more order please, there is people here that are trying to listen to these witnesses and I'm sure they would like to hear so could we have a little more order. Little less conversation... it would be appreciated. Thank you."

Robinson: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Those labor protection provisions adopted under Amendment 18, to that Act... represented long serious and thoughtful negotiations between the commuter railroads, the labor representatives and representatives from other labor groups affected by RTA. These protected provisions were overwhelmingly adopted by the House, railroad management believe that these are reasonable protections and not burdens after all the purpose of RTA is to improve and expand public transportation in the Chicago region and if such circumstances it will be more jobs not fewer. To William Mahoney, representing rail under the labor group whom will fully address this issue, that we wish to express railway management full support for the inclusion of such labor protective provision as an essential part of RTA legislation. The issues discussed above are of deep concern to us, if these issues are adequately addressed in an RTA Bill we can enthusiastically supported. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Neff: "Mr. Robinson, I noticed when you filled out your



witness slip, you said with Amendments, I think it would be good.... interested in the Bill.... with Amendments on it, you might state the Amendments you are interested in."

Robinson: "Well, in just brief discription, Mr. Chairman, those would include one... a requirement that the RTA upon request enter tender and enter into a purchase of service contract with a commuter rail service and if there is disagreement as to the terms that those terms be arbitrated in a binding fashion by the Illinois Commerce Commission. Secondly, we feel that there should be specific provision in the Act which precludes RTA action on reasonably interffering with the provision of the efficient freight service by the railroad. Thirdly, we have mentioned the... a requirements... an equable requirement that there be a purchase by RTA of rolling stocks which is not now already in public hands. Fourthly, I have addressed myself to the problem of continuing the present requirements of the Imminent Domain Act of Illinois in respect of the con-donation of public utility property which requires Illinois Commerce Commission approval in those cases and fifthly, I have addressed the labor protection provision, there are a few others of a technical nature and those would be reflected in Amendments which we hope will be considered favorably by this body."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Robinson. The next witness we'll call as appearing as an opponent... as a proponent to House Bill 12, and in his statement.... his witness slip, he says only with Amendments. Mr. Mahoney, comes from the railroad labor organization. Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Again, Mr. Mahoney's statement has been distributed to the Members and I wonder if we could speed up the proceedings by.... if he wants to..."

Neff: "We'll take your point as well taken and we'll see if



can..."

Robinson: "I think he wanted to discuss the Amendments he had in mind, Representative Totten."

Neff: "Yes, I think the Amendments particularly, the Members would like to hear Mr. Mahoney."

Mahoney: "My name is William G. Mahoney, I'm a lawyer with offices at 1015 18th Street, Northwest Washington, D.C. For over twenty-one years I have represented railroad and airline labor unions before federal and State Agencies and the courts and have represented them during their participation in a development of the rail passenger service Act of 1970, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, and the high speed ground transportation Act of 1966. At the present time I represent railroad labor in their efforts to secure effective employee protection in the northeast region of the United States legislation that is pending before the United States Congress. I appear here today to present the joint position of rail labor organization, representing the vast majority of the employees of the commuter railroads interested in the Regional Transportation Authority legislation now pending before this legislature. As well as the great majority of railroad employees in the State of Illinois, the organizations whose joint position I here present, are the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the United Transportation Union, the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, the Brotherhood of Railway and Airline Clerks and the Brotherhood of Signalman. In this Special Session of the Legislature and in the 1973, Spring Session of the 78th General Assembly, these brotherhoods supported the basic concepts of a Regional Transportation Authority for northeastern Illinois and have been most willing to work with the Sponsors on Legislation introduced before the



General Assembly. The establishment of a Regional Transportation Authority for northeastern Illinois would affect the rights and interest of virtually all employees presently engaged in mass transportation in that region of this State, therefore, essential that legislation enacted by this General Assembly contain fair, adequate and effective protection to the interest of the employees who will be directly affect...."

Neff: "Yes, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "I was under the understanding that since this statement has been handed out and since I have already read it, I wouldn't have to listen to it again.... while I was not following mine closely, it seems to me that he's going line for line. Now, if he wants to speak to the Amendment, let him speak to the Amendment, perhaps he will even tell me if the Chicago and northwestern railroads employees will be able to vote on a contract to this Amendment."

Neff: "Your point is well taken, Mr. Mahoney, if you can confine it to the Amendment... we'll appreciate it."

Mahoney: "I hadn't realized that it had been passed out, I apologize for reading a statement. I would like to add merely this to the statement that has been passed out, and that is... in addition to the Amendment to the Bill presently pending that I mention in the statement, House Bill 16, which is comparable to House Bill 1959, of the Spring 1973, Session. Should also contain the employees protection adopted by the House on June 23rd, as an Amendment to H.B. 1959. Amendment has been prepared to House Bills 12, 15 and 16, which would incorporate into those Bills the employee protective provisions adopted by the House in the 1973, Spring Session of the 73rd General Assembly as Amendment 18, to House Bill 1958 and there is Amendment to, to House



Bill 1959. As well as accomplishing the other essential obligations or objectives rather, that I point out in my statement. Representative Hanahan, will introduce these Amendments and I respectfully urge the House to adopt them in any RTA legislation which is an Act.

Thank you."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Mahoney. The next Gentleman that we'll call... appearing as a proponent and again with Amendments... statement is Mr. Clinton Curtain, U.S. Gypsum Company."

Curtain: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My statement is submitted on behalf of six companies, the United State Gypsum Company, Harry B. Goldbrick, Director of Transportation and Civical Distribution, Allied Mills Incorporated, A.E. Licer, Vice President of Traffic, Kraft Foods, D.C. Smith, General Traffic Manager, International Harvester Company, J.M. Gamble, General Traffic Manager. Anoco Oil Company, James J. Soboto, Manager of Traffic and Distribution, Quaker Oats Company, Sam Hall Flint, Vice President. The above named individuals are responsible, among other things, for providing efficient freight transportation for the companies that they serve. Each of these companies is vitally interested in maintaining its strong and efficient railroad freight network in the State of Illinois. I am Clinton Curtain, appearing on behalf of these six Chicago area rail freight shippers. We favor the establishment of the metropolitan transportation authority in the six county area of northeastern Illinois to include the CTA suburban railroads and suburban bus lines. Our objectives in the establishment of Regional Authority are two fold, first as shippers of freight we are dependant upon a vital and strong railroad system, the railroad system must be relieved to a burdensome commuter service deficient if it is to remain vital and strong and serve the needs



of Commerce and Industry. Secondly, the citizens of Chicago area we believe to be in the public interest to establish an efficient, coordinated mass transit system in the region. Both of these objectives can only be reached if the legislation creating an RTA, provides assurance that the commuter rail service of the six county area will be provided by the RTA. We support the concept which will permit the RTA to provide rail commuter services to the purchase of service contracts as embodied in both H.B. 12 and 15, and possibly others. However, we feel that it is imperative that the RTA be required to enter into these purchase of service contracts in early stages of its development to insure that the commuter railroads become more vital and meaningful part of the RTA at the outset. In addition these purchase of service contracts must be provided... must provide the railroads with full cost for their commuter services and a reasonable rate of return. Rail transportation faces great challenges as our economy in Illinois expands, many railroads suffering operating losses and poor rate of return must be able to generate more capital to provide for needed investment in freight cars, track and roadway property and terminal facilities. Four major Illinois freight carriers, the Burlington Northern, The Illinois Central Gulf, The Milwaukee Road and The Rock Island have indicated that they will lose over seventeen million dollars in 1973, in commuter service. It follows these losses effectively prevent an investment in freighting equipment and facilities which shippers need and expect in return for payment of freight charges in an amount of at least equal to such losses. It is intolerable for us to be required to support through freight charges the deficit commuter operations or social services desired



by the public. Competition for freight business is intense among the railroads, truck lines and barge lines a rail system can compete effectively with other modes of transportation only through relative heavy investment in capital facilities. Commuter deficits burden the railroads and lessen their ability to acquire equipment and maintain their facility. Some persons may say that the railroads can carry deficit commuter operation as they're equiped per quo, for the franchise to carry freight, such thinking however, can only lead to servere financial strain on the rail system and in the case of marginal railroad, can lead to bankruptcy. The national structure of the problem was indicated by the statement of George Baker, trustee for the Penn Central, that the drain on Penn Central from its provision of commuter and passager services under unadequate compensation arrangement was one of the four major problems that Penn Central must solve before it can become healthy. We also support in RTA which is able to unify and integrate the various systems of transportation in the area, we do not question the fact that in order to provide effective and economical mass transportation in the six county region, the RTA must be able to regulate the services it purchases from the railroad. We are concerned that such regulations however, does not limit the railroads ability to provide efficient and competitive freight service, it is important to realize that the Chicago area relies heavily on the railroads to supply the goods and material that make it one of the most prosperous area of the country, while the public needs... convenient and modern commuter service, it also demands a quality of rail freight delivery which will enhance the economic progress of the community. The legislation in creating the RTA



must not.... such a system of freight service to the region, House Bill 12 or 15, must recognize the two competing social services and carefully balance these interest so that each will be served with a minimum of restrain on the other. Finally, we would note that both H.B. 12 and 15, provide for single operation agency for the mass transit in the region, as managers of corporate organizations it appears to us that the single agency approach incompusing the six county areas is far preferable to the multy sub agency technique, the later forms would invariably create numerous conflicts between agencies which would fork the objective of the overall authority. The organizational constructure should be as simple as possible and avoid unnecessarily complex inter relationships. At the same time we support RTA which is adequately and properly funded, it is imparative that all systems of transportation in the region be able to maintain and improve their services for a healthy and prospective Regional Transportation Authority. I thank you."

Neff: "The next witness is Jodie Berman, Illinois Department of Transportation. Is Mr. Berman here? Mr. Berman is appearing as a proponent on House Bill 8 through 12. Mr. Washington... Harold Washington. Mrs. Berman will be available to answer questions."

Washington: "Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee of the Whole. House Bills 8 and 9, are part of the Governor's package of RTA... that package dealing with House Bills 8 through 12, in the Third Special Session and they are a part of a package in the sense that they provide for interim loans through mass transit in the six... northeast six county area. House Bill 8,... well, House 9, creates the emergency public transportation loan Act of 1973, to provide a loan assistance program for



mass transportation carriers in the six county north-eastern region, requires the Regional Transportation Authority to repay in full all loans made for operating subsidy by July 1, 1979, is effective upon becoming law. House Bill 8, creates the Act appropriating fifty million dollars to the Department of Transportation for loans to public transportation carriers authorized by the emergency public transportation loan Act of 1973, which is House Bill 9. Very briefly because you have the Bills before you, the Act provides as I said before, interim finance measures to subsidy operating deficient of Chicago area mass transportation operations during the period of October 1, '73, to June 30, 1974. The theory here being that even if we do invoke in RTA that will be an interim period when these mass transit systems will be short of funds and these two Bills are designed to provide those funds. Now, under the Bill the maximum of fifty million dollars made available to the carriers as follows, the Chicago Transit Authority would receive during that period a maximum amount of forty-six million five hundred thousand dollars, the Commuter Railroads, excluding the CTA and Amtrak would receive the sum of three million dollars and the Suburban Bus Lines would receive the sum of five hundred thousand dollars, a total of fifty million. Now, the fifty million is a loan from the General Revenue Fund to be repaid by the proposed Regional Transit Authority. The Secretary of the Department of Transportation is empowered to make and approve the loans to the Chicago Transit Authority in the amount of forty-six million and five hundred thousand for operating expenses. The loans should not be used for death service or revenue bonds and shall not be subject to terms of the Chicago Transit Authority revenue bonds trust agreements. I won't go



any further into the details of the Bill, I think the Bill is pretty clear there may be some detail questions and we have people from the Department of Transportation and Mr. Milton Pukorsky, from a Chicago Transit Authority who can deal with those questions but, this must be considered as part of the Governor's package and in a sense adjunct to the Regional Transit Authority Bill, the main Bill being House Bill 12. Thank you, very much."

Neff: "Thank you, Harold. Now, at this time even though we do have some opponents that would like to testify, I think that we will open it up to questions the proponents. If you have a question and would like to have a particular person to answer it, if you would state who you would like to have... I hope all of the witnesses have stuck around so that we can... they will be here when the questions are brought forward. Just before we get into the questions, 10 and 11, haven't been covered and we have a Gentleman here that would like to take a brief moment to explain those. Mr. Stone."

Stone: "You know, I don't pay much attention to... Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Committee as a whole, I very seldom pay very much attention to rumors but there is a rumor going around at the place that they call, across the rotunda, that they are passing out one RTA Bill... that it is coming over here, they will take care of it next week... they will send it over here adjourn and go home... so I think... although I don't pay much attention to rumors, it has been my experience in the end the Members of the House of Representatives get it in the end so, I'm just hoping that we won't get it this time and that the... both Houses of this Legislature will have an opportunity to consider all RTA Bills. House Bill 10, merely creates the downstate highways that bond Act and authorizes the bond issue of



four hundred and fifty million dollars and House Bill 11, amends the State Finance Act to add the downstate highways bond fund to the bond retirement and interest fund. Thank you, very much."

Neff: "Thank you, Paul. Now, at this time we will start on questions and Representative Hill..."

Hill: "Yes, I would like to ask some questions of Mayor McCoy, from Aurora."

Neff: "Mayor McCoy... he wanted to beat the rush hours, Jack."

Hill: "Well, I noticed on his slip that he had assigned to testify, he said that he was in favor of it with Amendments and not ever having had any discussion with Mayor McCoy, on this I certainly would have liked to question him about the Amendments that he would like put on these various Bills. Secondly, because polls have been taken in Kane County area and overwhelmingly opposed to the various RTA Bills that appear in front of the Legislature. I was wondering if he was down here speaking as a Mayor or as an individual citizen of that particular area. I would also like to find out whether or not the taxpayers of Aurora paid for his trip down here and his trip back or if he done this out of his own pocket. And, I'm sorry that he has left, I distinctly asked right while... after he finished testifying whether or not I could ask a few questions and Mr. Chairman, you explained to me that after all testimony was taken, that all of these individuals would remain here so we could ask these questions. Apparently I'll have to either get him on the phone or write him a letter to find out what he was talking about when he said, that he would be in favor of it with Amendments. I feel confident that he would allow the people of our area to vote on something like this I don't think he's the Mayor that would want to take



rights away from the people but, I'll find that out when I go home this week-end. I'm sorry that he left, I'm sorry that you didn't allow me to ask a question at that particular time... it seem to me that if you had an agreement with these people that were testifying that they would stay here to answer questions, then certainly they should have stayed here. Thank you."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Hill, and I think your point is well taken, I'm sorry that Mayor McCoy, isn't here... I thought Sparkie Garmisa would hold these folks here but one or two of them might have slipped out. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to continue with the questions that I started with Chairman Pukorsky. Also, some of these questions so that any of the witnesses don't leave may have to be answered by Secretary Bond and the Sponsors. I indicated when I started that for an indication from you as to whether you were testifying just for this package of Bills rather than any other... and I wondered if you would proceed with your answer on that."

Pukorsky: "The subsidy provisions with very few exceptions the so called, Blair-Harris Bill and the Walker Bill, are the products the work products of the professional staff, I think everyone involved... the Senate Staff, the House Staff, the Department of Transportation people, the City people, many Community and Civic Organizations... so substantially with few exceptions, we have a Bill that is a model Bill in this nation. I say substantively there is an issue on the home rule provision there are some issue that I think will be resolved in some of the labor propositions and some of the purchase of service provision involving the railroad. A side to the best of my knowledge... aside from



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

those, substantively there is consenses among the Governor's Bill and the House Leadership Bill. Financially there is some mark differences, both from the sales tax provision.... but the defect presently in the Leadership Bill, is that it is inadequately funding. To my knowledge the Leadership certainly is not bound, not to modify it or change it in some later date but, in asking is there a Bill today that meets the financial requirements... the only Bill before you that I know of that is adequate of the Bill that is House Bill 12."

Totten: "So that, you would be testifying in favor of House Bill 12, over any other House Bill, is that correct?"

Pukorsky: "In the light of the financing."

Totten: "Okay, let's get down to the finacing, what provisious in House Bill 12, regarding the financing do you feel make it... more adequate than any of the other Bills we may be considering?"

Pukorsky: "I mention publicly that if House Bill... well, that House Bill 12, has auto related tax which could be a gas tax, a parking tax, a vehicle tax, or in auto related tax such as presently imposed within the State of Illinois. That type of a tax would make that Bill adequate."

Totten: "When you talk about adequate and not of dollars required, would indicate to me whether it would be adequate it would be adequate financing. These taxes would raise or these fees would raise... how much do you anticipate in the year 1975?"

Pukorsky: "Well, we have indicated that you can't do all the things that the public and the Legislature and community leaders would want because of the pressing needs of other social problems with education... we really said that about two hundred and fifty million dollar average



for the four year period is what you would go... it might be two hundred to two hundred and twenty-five for fiscal '74, and now drop further so there would again be in about 1977, the need for some further consideration but that consideration would not require any Legislative action in the situation, the Legislature says that if they want someone to hear crisis problem again and you're transferring the responsibility to the Regional Transportation Authority."

Totten: "Could not... I believe in this House Bill 12, we're talking about sixty million dollars in General Revenue, could not that be a matter for the Legislature to consider as to whether to increase that at future date... should the finances of the RTA demand additional funds."

Pukorsky: "Well, on that issue this is the discussion that the leadership... Democratic leadership and the Governor have selected. That is not a vehicle that I have publicly said, is the wisest vehicle."

Totten: "Are you then... would it then be your opinion that this sixty million dollars was a lid?"

Pukorsky: "Well, it could be or in my judgement without that if you gave the Transportation Authority the auto related tax basis, you could still adequately fund the needs for the six county area."

Totten: "Would that sixty million dollars remain as a lid?"

Pukorsky: "Right."

Totten: "Okay, now how much revenue would you anticipate would be raised by the registration fee?"

Pukorsky: "Well, that has been estimated by the Department of Transportation as forty-five million dollars in the six county area."

Totten: "For the year 1975."

Pukorsky: "That is correct."

Totten: "What gross factor do you anticipate in that?"



Pukorsky: "I would say... actually I don't think that that influences again the ability of having a financing, if we're getting an increase roughly it a rate of... I think about 3% new automobiles a year, if that were to continue you would take 3% which would be about 1.3 million dollars."

Totten: "Well, what I'm trying to arrive at Chairman, is exactly how much money we're going to be able to raise including the sixty million and the forty-five million which you have indicated, I think you have indicated previously that we may in the year 1975, need somewhere between a hundred and fifty million and maybe a hundred and seventy-five million to get the RTA off of the ground. Let's assume then that we have sixty million and forty-five million, that's a hundred and five million. The auto related taxes that would be imposed by this Authority then would have to make up the gap, is that correct?"

Pukorsky: "That is correct."

Totten: "How much would that gap be in the year 1977?"

Pukorsky: "Somewhere in the vicinity of a hundred and seventy-five to two hundred million dollars."

Totten: "What then would the auto related taxes that the Authority would have to impose to make up that gap?"

Pukorsky: "Well, we've indicated parking taxes as one, there is the general feeling that those people who drive to the downtown area, in Chicago that come in and park their car and don't move that car for eight or nine hours should be paying the freight for that space that is taken for that purpose. We've talked as high as ten dollars as a added parking cost for the all day parking, decreasing to zero for many a four hour parking trip for the person that comes down to transact business. We're talking about that type of situation of raising some resources. We're talking about motor fuel tax where



a one cent tax would represent about thirty-six million dollars in the six county area and we're talking about some level of vehicle tax to the six county area where if we say that there is a rebate of fifteen dollars in the six county area, generates forty-five million dollars then if there was an additional tax that was five dollars, it would generate fifty million dollars so then again you have the ability of choosing the equitable tax increment to serve the needs of the six county area."

Totten: "Would you put a lid on the parking tax..."

Pukorsky: "Pardon."

Totten: "Would you put a lid on the amount of revenue and just take it from the parking tax?"

Pukorsky: "I don't think that you should because really you want to determine what the social objective in community objective are plaintiff of the region are... and if you find that because of environmental concern, energy crisis any other combination of facts that an inflationary cost that there should be a certain level of tax put on for parking, that should be imposed... that should be directly determined by public hearings, which are required by the Regional Authority, it requires a six out of nine vote of all the Members to impose something like that and to have it in the budget so this involves the public at large, the Legislative pressure, the political pressures and I'm sure that it will be wisely chosen."

Totten: "Then... these taxes that could be imposed by the Authority could be parking taxes, it could be a cent per gallon... on the motor fuel which in order to make up these revenue gaps... I show a revenue gap, using the figures... you've got a House Bill 12, with some two hundred and seven million dollars by 1980... that's



a considerable amount of money to raise... just use the cent per gallon that means the Authority would be able to impose a tax of 4.9 cents per gallon to make up that deficit."

Pukorsky: "Let me suggest something... just as interest.

It cost you twenty cents a mile to operate a large car, of which a little over two cents a mile under the cost of gasoline of it being about thirty-five is for gas, it cost you fifteen cents a mile to operate a compact car, a five cents... a five cent, not a five percent a five cent increase in motor fuel tax would mean the cost of operating a large car increase 1/3 rd of a cent a mile out of the twenty cents and 1/4 of a cent a mile out of the fifteen cents. The City of Evanston, hearing of all of the concerns on the populous of increasing motor fuel tax elected to save the transportation system composed of one cent a gallon tax. They have indicated that they made an error, that they were too concerned about what the public reaction was, it is a much minor reaction and were they to do it again they would have imposed an adequate tax to give them the public transportation system which they would have liked to provide for their populous and they may in fact, take some for taxes."

Totten: "Well, in order to make up this revenue gap which you have agreed that is approximately correct, two hundred and seven million dollars by 1980, then the Authority would have the sole authority to impose these taxes under this Bill."

Pukorsky: "But it requires a public hearing it requires six out of nine votes of members who have been appointed by the county in the area, certainly they would be responsive to the needs of the counties in the region."

Totten: "Well, let me ask you this... do you know of any



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

unit of government in Illinois which is not an elected body... ever being given the authority... the taxing power without referendum that the Precedent would be set in this type of..."

Pukorsky: "Well, this has been discussed and the feeling was the confidence in giving this authority to RTA is in question, that some percentage limitation... perhaps to the State road fund or something that would be adequate level would certainly be something that could be considered. The feeling generally is that this type of an agency for the needs would have enough review, supervision, over view from the Legislature, from the press, from the county boards, from the citizenry at large that... that would not be required. But, again this is a judgement of the legislative leaders."

Totten: "Let me ask you this, if in the House Bill 12, you also have a provision regarding the 2/3 rd's revenue being returned to the county from I believe, origination of the money, what position in the Bill would pertain this 2/3 rd's being retained or returned to suburban Cook County as a unit?"

Pukorsky: "I don't know specifically that this was spelled out when it was said in counties and I don't think ther is any problem in that. If someone wanted to amend the Bill, in fact this is already... to my knowledge being taken care of by the services. For example, the CTA extension of service really have a great benefit to the entire Cook County area, the suburban Cook County area but, I'm sure that this could be adequately covered. If it isn't specific... I think it's being done today."

Totten: "Okay, it isn't in the Bill right now?"

Pukorsky: "I'm not that sure."

Totten: "Let me ask you this now... why is the suburban Transportation Corporation not included in this Bill



was there a reason perhaps?"

Pukorsky: "I would say there was very definitely a reason, the RTA has the ability of creating and operating if it feels wise to create one. It has the opportunity of utilizing the existing suburban bus companies to enlarge their area, if they chose too. They have the ability to use the CTA to expand its service in other areas, it becomes then a judgement on what is the best solution by creating a suburban transportation corporation you are in affect encircling the CTA operation and saying that you mandate something outside which may not be an efficient operation in all areas and in some areas it may and so we're saying that is an unreasonable restriction to place on the authority. They have the ability of doing everything that the suburban transportation corporation Bill would provide, but if they find that it is in the public interest in some areas to extend CTA service, then they have that opportunity of doing so."

Totten: "This was apparently acceptable to you in House Bill 1958, but is not acceptable to you now, is that correct?"

Pukorsky: "No, I think that if you talk to the Speaker, you'll find that this was something that was not acceptable at that time either."

Totten: "It would seem that the suburban area would very much be precluded from a voice in this without a suburban transportation preparation in there. I think that it would be necessary. Chairman, just let me continue on one other line... a couple more questions here. Under the definition of public transportation facilities, when I compared those definition with the ones that appeared in the Blair Bill, there were no provisions against toll roads or toll bridges in House Bill 12, could you explain to me why... those provision



were not... are not in House Bill 12."

Pukorsky: "I believe that you would defer that question to Secretary Bond, who in those technical days will be able to answer that more directly, if you would like him to do it now or would you like to hold."

Totten: "Let me hold that one and I will ask one other question then. Under House Bill 12, how much of the money revenue collected would go to the City of Chicago in the CTA operation and under House Bill 12, how much of the money... percentage would come from the suburban and outlined county areas?"

Pukorsky: "About... 67% would be collected in the areas served by the CTA, approximately 61% would go to the CTA and so that the burden of 6% would stay in the outline counties and that does not... take into consideration the fact that the CTA territory within Chicago, in fact contributes to the usage of many suburban travelers within Chicago."

Totten: "What do you attribute that percentage... what provisions in House Bill 12, do you attribute that percentage to that are different from the provisions in House Bill... which was 1958."

Pukorsky: "I won't believe that there is really a sufficient difference in the distribution particular, I'm not that dumb but sure the leadership in trying to get in the substantive provisions and the equity in the situation between the suburban communities in Chicago... all were operating on approximately the same aim, I think it is the specific financial means of raising the funds where there is the difference."

Totten: "Okay, let me... I don't find that distribution necessarily true and I sure would like to see some distribution figures if you could prepare them, on that."

Pukorsky: "We will be happy to provide them for you."

Totten: "Give them to the Chairman. I would like to ask



Secretary Bond then my other question... Secretary Bond, on the provisions in the definition in House Bill 12, under public transportation facilities, I noticed that there was an omission... I noticed that there was an omission in House Bill 12, of toll roads and toll bridges from the definition and I wondered why this was omitted and what you could be thinking of by omitting it."

Bond: "Well, I don't think that there is any special sufficient to it frankly."

Totten: "Well, you know, I think there could be a very sufficient reason for its omission and..."

Bond: "We would be happy to examine it, if you think it ought to be included why we will consider it."

Totten: "Let me ask you this then, could you use monies under the RTA under House Bill 12, to retire skyway bonds."

Bond: "I did not have that in mind, I don't think any of us contemplated that."

Totten: "Could you do that under the provisions of House Bill 12?"

Bond: "I don't believe so, but..."

Totten: "What prevents it from being done?"

Bond: "It isn't a public transportation facility."

Totten: "Why isn't it a public transportation facility?"

Bond: "Well, let's look at the definition of public transportation facilities. What have we got..."

Totten: "Why isn't it a public transportation facility under one Bill and not under another?"

Bond: "Well, if it is an error here or an omission, we will certainly provide an Amendment to clarify that matter. That... this has not occurred to us."

Totten: "Then... you're saying that it was not a...."

Bond: "Should not be that way."

Totten: "Would you be willing to amend that back into the



Bill."

Bond: "Right."

Totten: "Okay, I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman."

Bond: "Well, we would be willing... you know, examine the Bills to make sure that it isn't in it, that's all."

Neff: "Representative Juckett."

Juckett: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If the Sponsor of the Bill would be happy to answer some questions, I would be glad to ask him some.... Sparkie..."

Garmisa: "How was I robbed, I missed the first party here."

Juckett: "No, I asked if you would be happy to answer some questions, I would be glad to ask you some."

Garmisa: "I would be privileged."

Juckett: "Thank you. Now, I noticed in your Bill that the RTA would exercise no regulatory power over any of the units that it subsidizes or give financial grants to, why is this?"

Garmisa: "Well, under the regulatory powers that are provided in House Bill 12, (a) the Authority shall provide for fares and charges and made standards of public transportation including terms for cost of inter motor transfers, collections, disposition of fares and charges and enter changable tickets. The Authority under the regulatory powers would not be subject to ICC regulations and transportation agencies...."

Juckett: "Sparkie, I think that you have missed the point... this applies to the grants from RTA and there are no powers of regulations over the units that you give the grants to... why?"

Garmisa: "I think..."

Juckett: "These are not the organizations that RTA is running but organizations which they give grants to, to operate why wouldn't there be any control?"

Garmisa: "Director Bond, has the answer to that one."

Bond: "Well, I think that the contemplation is that the grants



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

would be used primary in the very beginning, before purchase of service agreements were enter into as an interim step."

Juckett: "Now, is there any limination on the grants then... there is none so, the grants could continue."

Bond: "Nevertheless, the contemplantion is..."

Juckett: "Mr. Secretary, we here in the Legislature can't go on contemplantion, we have to have it in black and white so that we know exactly what the service is, exactly what powers are... there is no limitation on this power, so you continue grants for the life of RTA and you would exerise no control."

Bond: "Well, that also however, is a matter to the descretion of the RTA and I have confidence in the RTA Board that they would move promptly from grants to purchase of service or possibly, I presume..."

Juckett: "Okay, let's get the purchase of service agreement, I understand that if you do not go into a purchase agreement... purchase of service agreement, within a three year period... then the RTA has to pick up 50% of the operating deficit, is that correct?"

Bond: "Yes."

Juckett: "Now, it is my understanding that the ICC will still retain control over all of these private or other operating agencies, is that correct?"

Bond: "That is correct."

Juckett: "Then wouldn't it be true... wouldn't the ICC be very reluctant as they are now to allow an agency to go out of business... wouldn't they be extremely reluctant almost to the point of impossibility of getting a certificate handle if the RTA was providing 50% of the operating deficiency."

Bond: "Your question is, would the ICC be reluctant."

Juckett: "Extremely recludant..."

Bond: "To terminate service...."



Juckett: "That is correct."

Bond: "That is simply a decision for the ICC, decision of that kind are faced every day by the ICC."

Juckett: "So, therefore.... Okay, so therefore by the RTA not agreeing to a service agreement... couldn't they force a private company into absolute bankruptcy, the ICC will not allow the termination... the RTA will not pick it up and there you have got quite a dilemma... there is no provision in this Bill to force a service agreement."

Bond: "That is correct and it is only half as catechist a prospect of what exist today which is that there is no subsidy in the financial crunch... provides certain persuasions for the ICC to permit termination."

Juckett: "Why has..."

Bond: "But, on the other hand, you know... this is a... we do this as something of a protection for the suburban areas for it to provide for the continuation of services during an interim period until the RTA, which is... to purchase service entirely."

Juckett: "Okay, if your talking about an interim period of maybe three years, why don't you require that after that three year period that service is pick up by the RTA and is expanded in the suburban area as the CTA is in Chicago."

Bond: "Well, my contemplation is that... that would happen, Sir and you cannot examine any portion of this Bill without considering other portions of it and the relatant portion there is the 66% tax contributions turned back for services to the benefit of any single county..."

Juckett: "Well, Mr. Secretary, I have to be concerned..."

Bond: "The.... for the RTA to pick up all the services during.. before the three year period."

Juckett: "Yeah, but you don't take care of it after the



three year period either, you just take care of 50% of the operating deficit... you don't take care of the cost of operation and there is a big difference. Now... if we can get back to the Sponsor of the Bill... I think Mr. Garmisa, is the Sponsor, Mr. Secretary."

Neff: "Mr. Garmisa."

Juckett: "I understand you've got a complicated problem or program in this Bill where you take seventy-five million dollars in revenue out of the road fund and then you borrow back into the road fund forty-five million. Now, that leave to my way of addition and subtraction, I come up with about a thirty million dollar deficit and if we're not able to take care of all our suburban roads now with the seventy-five million, how are we going to take care of the suburban roads with thirty million less... you don't have the answer, Sparkie."

Garmisa: "The Director is qualified to answer this one."

Juckett: "Okay."

Director: "It's important to recognize that there is no net change in investment in roads as a consequents of this Bill. The forty-five million dollars that is taken out and devoted to the RTA purposes are replaced by an equal amount of bond money each year. The impact on suburban roads systems are therefore, should be nil."

Juckett: "Mr. Secretary... my understanding is, you're taking seventy-five million out and you're putting forty-five million in.... now, there is thirty million dollars... that's a difference."

Bond: "We're talking, Sir on fanatic issues here and while thirty million dollars is taken out of the downstate road program, it is to be devoted to counties downstate for investments either on the State road system, municipal roads, county roads, or what have you at the descretion of county boards."

Juckett: "Okay...."



Bond: "Not a withdraw of investment in the highway program in Illinois, this is under different management."

Juckett: "Okay, you're telling me..."

Bond: "Very important not to confuse those issues, Sir."

Juckett: "Okay, Mr. Secretary, you're telling me then that over the life of this program there will be no need to increase road taxes, there will be no need to increase the taxes to be serviced on these roads?"

Bond: "We do not anticipate that."

Juckett: "So, there is no need to increase the taxes."

Bond: "In my opinion, there is not."

Juckett: "Okay, now as I understand it that money is going to what... the counties and municipalities."

Bond: "No, our Bill provides that it goes to the counties."

Juckett: "And they are going to repair State roads with their own money?"

Bond: "They will have the option of doing just that."

Juckett: "And don't you think they are going to apply the money to the county roads?"

Bond: "Well, they can apply it where ever they like but I would anticipate that they would..."

Juckett: "Okay, let's just assume that they do not apply any of that money to the State roads... how do those State roads get repaired?"

Bond: "If the State roads... if the money is chosen to be invested on the county road system exclusive then that chose will... the county road... the county board will have chosen to improve county roads at the expense of State roads."

Juckett: "And, then you're telling me that the State roads in those counties will not be improved."

Bond: "They will be...."

Juckett: "And they will not be repaired or they will not be built."

Bond: "The choice is up to the county board, they can invest



it on the State roads system..."

Juckett: "Okay, well Mr. Secretary, I think you have answered that question very well. Now, I understand out of that four hundred and fifty million dollars that what you're doing is that you are giving that money to all of the counties, with the exception of Cook, now that leaves me with the question of what is going to happen to the suburban roads because no suburban road will get one penny of that money... where is the monies going to come from."

Bond: "I believe that it is all the counties except the six county... the ninety-six remaining counties. The suburban road system will continue to receive the same investment as they do today. The road program will contain sufficient funds to continue the improvement of suburban roads."

Neff: "Why does Mr. Maragos, arise?"

Maragos: "A point of order. I have no question to ask because I'm willing to learn but I think it is fair to many other people who would like to ask questions on the floor and I think that we should limit the question.... per individual then if there are no further question then you can come back because I think that it is unfair to have one man to have a half hour of questioning when others are just as interested in asking simular questions. So, as a point of order if the Chair would so rule, because I have no questions to ask...."

Juckett: "Mr. Chairman, I have waited through all the testimony of the witnesses just as many other Members have also and I'm also willing to wait through the questioning of any other Member and I pledge to you that I will not leave the floor until they have asked their questions."

Neff: "I think the questioning are in order as long as they are different question, I would refrain from asking the



same questions of different witnesses."

Juckett: "Okay, now Sparkie, another question which Representative Totten, touched on... and that is on that definition of public transportation facilities. My understanding is that RTA would be able to take over the operation of the toll roads and toll bridges, it is not just a question of the definition but they could take it over now, again as Representative Totten, brought out... why would you want to take over a toll road?"

Garmisa: "Let me answer it this way, Representative Juckett. It is not the intent or the purpose of House Bill 12, Third Special Session, to take over any toll road operation or any highway, now if there is a deficiency in the Bill as it is now drawn up that would permit such as thing we would certainly make... put in an Amendment correcting that."

Juckett: "Okay, you will accept an Amendment then to take out that provision so that there would be no take over of the toll road or toll bridges and there would be no repayment of the skyway bond which are currently, I guess in default."

Garmisa: "Chairman Pukorsky, would like to elabotate on this last question."

Pukorsky: "To our knowledge it is not in the Bill to begin with and secondly, the indenture of the toll road... one of the reasons it was not put in, is that while the RTA has the ability of establishing exclusive lanes for buses and so, to do so on the toll road would cause a financial problem which contrary to the indenture so, I don't believe you're concern is in the Bill and if there is something in there certainly a modification to do what you are suggesting could be done but, I don't believe you'll find it in the Bill."

Juckett: "Okay, you'd have no objection to an Amendment..."

Pukorsky: "If it is needed, if it isn't in the Bill at the



present time."

Juckett: "Okay, now.... Sparkie, what are the main sources of income for RTA?"

Garmisa: "The Bill would provide sixty millions of dollars from a State appropriation out of General Revenue. We try to provide forty-five millions of dollars at fifteen dollars through auto registration that would be returned to the six county. There would be twenty-nine point three million that would be returned to ninety-six downstate counties out of that same type of funding. We would also have forty-three million dollars provided for by the boards could impose taxes and fees related to ownership and operation of motor vehicles and such taxes must be of the same nature as those presently imposed by local or State government and 2/3 rd's of those taxes collected in any county would be returned to that county. This would show a total of a hundred and forty-eight millions of dollars."

Juckett: "Okay now, does that 2/3 rd's return to the county of its collection apply to all revenues of RTA or to just specific revenues?"

Garmisa: "Those specific revenues that the boards would impose on motor related taxes."

Juckett: "Now, that would then be the fifteen dollar... no that wouldn't..."

Garmisa: "No, that would be the forty million dollars that would be provided by the operation of motor vehicles and or related taxes."

Juckett: "Okay, what taxes are those?"

Garmisa: "That could be parking taxes, that could be a tax on your gasoline, that could be any motor related tax that the board would see fit to impose."

Juckett: "Okay now, how many cars are registered in Cook County?"

Garmisa: "We have approximately three million cars registered



in the County of Cook."

Juckett: "Three million. I have a figure of two million, one hundred and eighty-one thousand three hundred and seventy-nine."

Garmisa: "We'll have a difference of figures from time to time.... we're close to three million."

Juckett: "That's only a 50% difference."

Garmisa: "Well.... we didn't do too good them."

Juckett: "Now, does that figure apply only to automobiles or to all vehicles."

Garmisa: "Auto's only."

Juckett: "Auto's only..."

Garmisa: "No trucks involved there."

Juckett: "No trucks involved."

Garmisa: "That is correct."

Juckett: "Okay, how many vehicles or passenger auto's that you're going to tax are from the suburbs?"

Garmisa: "I don't have the breakdown in front of me but I could have that in just a very short period."

Juckett: "Well, it is slightly over 50%... vehicles in Cook County."

Garmisa: "That's correct, you're saying that slightly over 50% are registered out of the City of Chicago."

Juckett: "No, registered out of the suburban area of Cook County. And there is no guarantee that those fifteen dollars.... that 2/3 rd's of the fifteen will be returned to the suburban area because that goes into the kitty, right?"

Garmisa: "No, the 2/3 rd's of those fifteen dollar fees that would be collected from the auto registration would stay in the county that it had been collected."

Juckett: "That's right so, there is no guarantee that even though it stays in Cook County, it's going to stay.... no, before you said that the automobile fees were not



subject to the 2/3 rd, requirement... the automobile license fee."

Garmisa: "That is subject to it, Juckett, if I said that it hadn't been well then I've been incorrect in that..."

Juckett: "Okay, so 2/3 rd's..."

Garmisa: "That is subject to the... 2/3 rd's to go to the county."

Juckett: "Okay, but there is no guarantee, Sparkie, that is there that it will stay in the suburban area of Cook County? It will stay in the county but not necessarily in the suburban part of Cook County. Is that correct?"

Garmisa: "It would be in Cook County period."

Juckett: "Right, which eliminates the suburban part of it."

Garmisa: "Not necessarily..."

Juckett: "Okay, now..."

Garmisa: "You're already making the discretion of the board... that is at the discretion of the board."

Juckett: "Okay, now gas tax... how are you going to know what county that gas is being used in... how are you going to levy a gas tax... do you levy it on the retailer..."

Garmisa: "This too, would be at the discretion of the board you might levy it at the wholesale level or it could be levy at the retail level."

Juckett: "Okay, the current..."

Garmisa: "This is another area that the board would have these discretionary powers."

Juckett: "Okay, now my understanding on these gas.... automobile related taxes...."

Neff: "Do you have a point of order, Mr. Barnes?"

Barnes: "My point of order, Mr. Chairman, in all due respect to question...many of us are waiting to ask questions but it seems to me that these arguing points that would be the decision of a board that is not even appointed yet, and I think what he should be doing



is asking substantive questions pertinent to the Bill and not to the decision making power to the board that doesn't exist."

Neff: "Your point of order, I believe is well taken. Representative Juckett, go ahead."

Juckett: "Mr. Garmisa, on the gas tax I understood that the RTA could levy the same type of tax and same procedures as currently being done. My understanding that the State levys the gas tax and the wholesaler pays the tax and then transfers it on in his product to the retailer. Now, isn't it a fact that there are a lot of gas wholesalers that operate in many counties and how are they going to determine and how are they going to process this kind of a tax?"

Garmisa: "There will be an Amendment offered that will apply to any automobile related tax and it covers this area."

Juckett: "Well, what would the Amendment say... what would it cover?"

Garmisa: "The board may impose any auto related."

Juckett: "Well I'm asking about the operation of the one because it seems to be one of the main phase of your program... is a gas tax and I'm asking you how the gas tax would operate... who would it be imposed on, the wholesaler..."

Garmisa: "There again we're getting into an operation.... into an area where it would be the prerogative of the board. The board would hold public hearings in the areas affected and they would come up with a decision and it would be their prerogative as how the imposition of these taxes would be."

Juckett: "You don't have an answer to that specific question."

Garmisa: "I can't answer for any board that hasn't been as yet, constituted."

Juckett: "Now, I understand also that this Bill does not



preempt any home rule powers, is that true?"

Garmisa: "That is true."

Juckett: "Okay, now we have the City of Chicago which is a home rule unit... cities of Evanston, Park Ridge, DePlains, Arlington Heights, Mt. Prospect and I could go on probably for another thirty or forty communities... the County of Cook too, is a home rule unit. Now, if this is so... how can you possibly have an RTA agreement for six counties when anyone of these units could preempt themselves out of this legislation."

Garmisa: "I'm not sure that anyone of these units could be preempt themselves out of this..."

Juckett: "Well, if... if this Legislation does not apply to a home rule unit, then you tell me how they're bound by this Legislation."

Garmisa: "What we're talking about here... is legislation affecting the six county area, under this Bill we're not providing for a referendum to find whether anyone or all of the counties would not come under this RTA Bill, we're asking that all six be included, the public hearings have been held and we feel that with the adoption of House Bill 12, we will be doing what the people in the areas that we've held hearings on want done at the rate of creation of an Regional Transportation Authority."

Juckett: "Okay, would you be willing to accept an Amendment which takes the preemption out and would obligate every municipality in that six county area to participate and be bound by every action of the RTA."

Garmisa: "I would be happy to consider any Amendment that would be approved by all of us that were concerned with the drafting of this Legislation."

Juckett: "That isn't what I asked, I asked if you would accept it."

Garmisa: "If... we would again have to use our discretionary



powers, who would have to consider the Amendment at the time it was presented to us... now, Juckett, have you ever voted on an Amendment without your knowing the contents of the Amendment?"

Juckett: "Representative Garmisa, I have tried to make my self knowledgeable of the Amendments but, I'm asking you a general question about the preemption power. Now, you have agreed to other Amendments to this Bill when questions were raised, it seems that you are unwilling to accept this kind of an Amendment."

Garmisa: "Representative Juckett, what we have agreed to in the way of Amendments have been the consideration of Amendments in all cases..."

Juckett: "Would it be possible for Chairman Purkorsky, to answer a couple of questions?"

Neff: "Is Milton Purkorsky, still in the House? Is Milton Purkorsky, still in the House? Representative Juckett, are you through?"

Juckett: "I have two more questions."

Neff: "Would you rush them right along because we have about fifteen people who want to talk yet."

Juckett: "Chairman Purkorsky, I've had a specific question about some service of the CTA from a State facility. I'm sure that you're probably aware of the location of the Chicago State Hospital in the Reed Zone Center on Irving Park Boulevard."

Purkorsky: "Okay, yes."

Juckett: "Okay, the question that comes from a State facility is that they have been concerned with a lot of theft and a lot of problems connected with the bus service and I understand that the CTA is unwilling to move its bus stop, from Irving Park by the old entrance... around on to Oak Park Avenue where the new entrances to Chicago State are and the new entrance to the Chicago



Reed is, do you have any information as to why they refused to do this."

Purkorsky: "I do not at the moment but, let me assure you that from your calling it to my attention, and I have one of our Directors of marking here who will note it and we'll follow that. It may be that there is a bus turn around in one area and it was not the possibility at the other area, but if the hospital officials are in a position of needing this and make provisions for a turn around... if there isn't one presently available, I'm sure that we can resolve that. The purpose of the CTA is to serve the community and if the decision was made at a lower level based on inadequate communication we will correct that."

Juckett: "Okay, good I'll get together with you after the meeting..."

Purkorsky: "Fine..."

Juckett: "I can give you the details on it."

Purkorsky: "Fine."

Juckett: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Neff: "State your point, Mr. Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I purposely did not interrupt the last speaker because he seemed to object to being interrupted but, it seems to me that for the last hour while two Members have asked questions there has been at least a half a dozen Members waiting to ask questions. Wouldn't the fairest procedure be to limit each Member the first time around to five minutes and then if there are additional question... to let the Members who have those additional questions stay and ask them later because the last two speakers, between them have had the floor for about hour. It seems to me that's a little unreasonable."

Neff: "I think your point is well taken, Representative



Lundy and if there.... the rest of the people who have questions, if they will limit at least not over five minutes and then we will come back and you folks who have more questions to answer, I'm sure these witnesses will all stay here as long as you wish. Representative Barnes, I know you have been waiting for quiet awhile.... Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had one question to Chairman Pukorsky, to clarify an answer which he gave in response to a question to Representative Totten. Representative Totten, asked I believe about the adequacy of funding under the various RTA proposals that are pending before the House and I believe Mr. Chairman that you indicated that to your knowledge, only House Bill 12, provided adequate funds at a level of about a hundred and seventy million a year. Did I understand that correctly?"

Pukorsky: "That is correct, House Bill 12... does not really have top limit necessarily of a hundred and seventy million, it has the ability of the authority in the crisis of something of providing additional revenues. It is the only Bill at present that does have adequate funding."

Lundy: "I just wanted to ask you if you are familiar with House Bill 39 and 40, which were introduced yesterday in the House which... my understanding produced approximately sixty-five to a hundred and seventy million."

Pukorsky: "I am... is that one of which Representative Katz, was one of the Sponsors?"

Lundy: "That's correct."

Pukorsky: "I've indicated that there was some problems with it, that it is certainly a effort and compromise in the direction and that maybe I'm not specifically confident and responsive to that Bill because I haven't



examined it in detail."

Lundy: "But, based on your understanding the funding, isn't that about the same as what's produced under House Bill 12."

Pukorsky: "Well, I feel that it has some deficiency and it has some limitations in the amount of funding that we're talking about really, is an amount that would allow for a four year period of operation before the Legislature would at all have to be.... and that level would average about two hundred and fifty million dollars a year with a little over two million the first year and rising to three hundred million the fourth year, so it may be under funded to that extent. I'm not... I'm really not able to respond specifically to that Bill without having an opportunity of examining it."

Lundy: "All right, thank you."

Neff: "Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask Secretary Bond, a few questions about how this Bill and similar ilk impinge upon the freeway construction that is involved in our district... Secretary Bond... two years ago I had the occasion to attend a Democratic Rally at which the speaker was the beloved former U.S. Senator Douglas, and he discussed what's called judais goats and he explained that a judais goat was an animal that lead the sheep up to the slaughterhouse and just as they got to the point where the man hit it in the head to kill the animals, the judais goat stepped aside and all the sheep were slaughtered. Now, the people in my district are fearful that this RTA Bill and other Bills which do not protect downstate against an increased participation in the cost of RTA, is a judais goat and all the people who sponsor it are assessories to that. Is there any basis for that fear?"

Bond: "None whatsoever. I don't believe that if you consider



the structure of the financing for the State participation, you can come to that conclusion."

Cunningham: "Well, specifically Secretary, as it has been pointed out here... seventy-five million dollars as I understand the proposal under consideration, would be transferred from the Road Fund to finance the proposal in Chicago..."

Bond: "No, that's..."

Cunningham: "Let me finish the question, an addition sixty million dollars would be taken from the General Fund... to that extend at least, is not the cause of downstate road construction... thereby weaken in that amount."

Bond: "No, not at all."

Cunningham: "Well, I presume that the basis of your answer is the provision of House Bill 10, for additional bonding issue, is it not so?"

Bond: "Well, there's... first of all there is no change in the net investment of downstate road construction and to use your term, that's exactly right.... however, specifically the replacement for the forty-five million dollars that would be going to the BTA is provided by the four hundred and fifty million dollar bond issue, that's correct."

Cunningham: "But our concern was... that the twenty-five or twenty-nine point five million which is transferred to the local governmental unit, would through practical politics be applied to county roads to the detriment of State roads, is that not a foreseeable concern."

Bond: "I suppose that you could predict a number of consequences from it, but that is going to a decision up to the county board, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, specifically in regards to the freeway construction, which is the hope of the future for our district at least, has there been any progress whatever



in the year since your administration was elected towards the construction of either 411 or 409, you identify those as being parallel to 1 and 50."

Bond: "I have some exhibits, Mr. Cunningham, to discuss the freeway program and I have them on the stage here and I think your answer can best be answered if I go up here and discuss these."

Cunningham: "Please."

Bond: "I'm glad you asked that question, Mr. Cunningham..."

Cunningham: "I'm glad you brought the map."

Bond: "I have come prepared. Phase one of Governor Walker's freeway program is displayed on the map over here and the Blair-Harris freeway program is.... over here on this part here..."

Cunningham: "Mr. Secretary, you apparently have me confused with Mary Lou Kent or Mr. McClain."

Bond: "I wish I could convince Mrs. Kent, of the justification of and justice of the Governors freeway program. Here is the Governor's freeway program, it is consistent with the findings of the Legislative Study Commission and in our estimate it is sound from a highway planning point of view. The major investments on this program are the Rockford to Wenona length parallel to highway 51, here in the northern part of the State and the testimony before the Senate, I designated this and I think there was general agreement as a most critical and need from a traffic point of view, freeway in the State."

Cunningham: "Isn't that just the widening and resurfacing of a present two lane..."

Bond: "No, that is not... this is all new freeway on no new location and I'm now able to reveal today that we have refined somewhat the figures for the Governor's freeway program and we said, when these were first announced, that it was not... they were not hard but



we would have been able too... couldn't management of the freeway program add an additional seven miles on this route 51, here carrying it from LaSalle, Peru intersection all the way down to Wenona. All of this is on new location, all of it will be four lane construction. Generally the route to the Quad Cities here is to be completed... route to.... this lengthen the Morton streets in here, Springfield to Jacksonville and then from Jacksonville as far as Barry although the Governor's statement on that has been put in the newspaper in Quincy and there is possibility of some change. Another feature that we have not previously made public, is that we will be able to build the Decatur by-pass to full four lane specifications because there is sufficient money to do that in the program as well and finally this link here, these pieces in southern Illinois "

Cunningham: "Now, Mr. Secretary, could I invite your attention to Route 1, on the eastern part of the State do you identify the section to which I make reference?"

Dunn: "In all difference to my colleague Representative Cunningham, we've discussed that we voted and talked about the freeway program last week, we've got a lot of it from the six county area here to ask questions about the RTA, and we've certainly wondered far a field from the RTA..."

Cunningham: "Just a moment, Mr. Chairman, we have House Bill 10, which is directly related to this and we have a right to be heard on it. The good witness has brought his exhibits to show and I would think that Representative Dunn, would be willing to recognize the State of Illinois is larger than just..."

Dunn: "I realize it is very important to you...."

Cunningham: ".... than the six counties and we have a right to be heard for if testified from Chicago and I am the only one who has spoken for downstate. If he wish to



withdraw... than you, Dan... if he wants to withdraw your objection, let the Secretary continue. My question was to Route 1, on the east part of the State, what do you plan for us?"

Bond: "The Governor has stated publicly many times that he will continue to supplemental freeway program and he will... he intends to do that and that he will propose additional bond issues to continue the freeway program, he will do so immediately and that would have to lie in a subsequent phase, this only phase I, of Governor Walker's program."

Cunningham: "But, you will agree that there is nothing on Route 1, there on your map won't you?"

Bond: "I think that the prospects for the future are excellent."

Cunningham: "In this term? Now, in regard to 50, is there anything in the Governor's future for 50, from the Carlyle eastward on 50."

Bond: "From here to Carlyle eastward..."

Cunningham: "Is there nothing there...."

Bond: "That would have to be considered in phase two, three and four. Governor Walker is fully committed to all of the future programs."

Cunningham: "Now, Mr. Secretary, to accomodate Representative Dunn, lets move back a minute to the RTA. If the expenses of the RTA rise as the deficit rises and was predicted by Chairman Pukorsky, and I think he said a hundred and seventy-seven million in '77, and if it proves to be like a fat hog, that the more you feed it the more it wants... is it not enescapable and does not follow the matter of reason that it will continue to warp any possibility of freeway construction in the State of Illinois, so long as we are committed to an open end contribution to its cost as is invisioned by



this particular set of Bills."

Bond: "Absolutely not, I don't think you understand the financing provision, there is no open end provision here for State participation. The only open end to that affect to our Bill is given to the RTA to oppose auto related taxes in the six county area, everything else has a fixed amount."

Cunningham: "No, the... if I understand it, sixty million dollars is being appropriated from the General Fund immediately and that money is taken statewide whether than just from the six counties."

Bond: "That is correct..."

Cunningham: "If sixty million can be taken now, it follows a matter of logic that next year, whatever additional amount and that's why it is justified to say open ended. From that light wouldn't you agree that the language was acceptable."

Bond: "No, I don't think so, I think sixty million means sixty million... that's what's in the Bill."

Cunningham: "Now, you heard the prediction or rather dire prognostication by Representative Stone, that the Senate was about to confront us with an accomplished fact and say that we must accept a different set of Bills House Bill 15 through 25, or none at all and if it came to that path, what would be your position as head of transportation in Illinois, would you take none or in preference."

Bond: "I'm not sure... would you just mind putting the question again... what..."

Cunningham: "I said, you heard the dire prognostication of Representative Stone, that the Senate was about to confront the House with faitaccompli of either taking House Bills 15 through 25, or none at all, and you will recognize those as being the Blair Bills that have



the delightful feature of guaranteeing downstate Illinois against having to pay any share of the cost and also advance road construction for our salvation and economic well-being... if that happened would you.... I've used Representative Stone's prediction not mine, if that happened would your position be... as the top transportation man, if you prefer nothing."

Bond: "Well, that's an conjector speculation, Mr. Cunningham, but I have a great belief in the perfectability of man and I have confidence that the Bill will come out of the Senate... Governor Walker's Bill."

Cunningham: "You don't think that that problem is eminent?"

Bond: "No, I do not."

Cunningham: "Maybe tomorrow we will resolve which...."

Bond: "Well...."

Cunningham: "In view of these matters, is there anything that you can suggest that I might go back to report to the constigents of my area as to why the Leadership across the aisle and all who follow his lead are not in a position to quote the phase that I opened with 'a judais goat' against freeway construction in the 54th district, the eastside of the State of Illinois and Route 50, from Carlyle to the Indiana boarder, what can we say to them as to what can be done to solve our dilemma."

Bond: "I would say, Mr. Cunningham, that the voters in southern Illinois should put their fate in the Governor and go forward with an expanded vigorous program which is in the Governor's plan and that the southern Illinois will prosper and grow under that stewardship."

Cunningham: "Our faith is weakening in this matter, Mr. Secretary and we feel that there needs to be support from other than the thousand of concerned citizens that are involved who have written you and written the Governor



to plead the cause of freeway construction, we notice that organize labor comes down here for RTA, but organized labor doesn't come for the freeway program we're are not espousing the cause of the freeway construction but we think that the Sponsor offered the best hope and I would publicly urge you as head of transportation of Illinois, in the name of God, give us some help in this freeway construction. One year has elapsed... we're no closer to the construction than we were a year ago when the election was held but the cross town express is far far closer to construction and we fear that it will take away the funds that we're entitled to and we need. Thank you, for your kindness."

Bond: "Mr. Cunningham, thank you, Sir."

Neff: "Representative Robert Dunn."

Dunn: "Are the Mayor's of Aurora and Evanston, here?"

Neff: "The Mayor of Evanston, is here, Bob. He's coming to the podium."

Vaneman: "And, I'm sorry that I did not have the powers of body attachment to make sure that all the witnesses would be present until we were finished."

Dunn: "Mayor, as a leader of a suburban area, I'm quiet interested that you support a Bill that doesn't call for a referendum. Do you feel that the people are willing to let the Legislature act in this matter without a referendum?"

Vaneman: "Yes, Sir. Our Cook County government who has council has taken a vote on this several times and each case they have thought that a referendum was unnecessary and I think the point of view was that the people elect the State Legislators to make this discision, that's why you're here to make this discision. You're in the best position to make the discision especially in so far



as it concerns financing and that we really think that it is sort of a cop-out to say, well let's not decide it, let's send it back and try to word a referendum that somebody can understand."

Dunn: "You say, your's was the unanimous view or viturally of the..."

Vaneman: "It was the unanimous view of the executive council of the Cook County Council of Government."

Dunn: "Could you name just a few of the suburbs that these fellows...."

Vaneman: "Arlington Heights, Park Forest, Maywood, Homewood..."

Dunn: "Thank you, that's..."

Vaneman: "Schaumburg..."

Dunn: That's fine, thank you."

Vaneman: "Thank you."

Dunn: "That's all I had for him."

Vaneman: "Thank you."

Dunn: "Is Mr. Robinson, from the Railroads here? Apparently he's not."

Neff: "You have a point of order, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Put me on your questioning list."

Dunn: "He's not here apparently... then Mr. Pukorsky... First about fares, do you contemplate in this Bill that you support an immediate reduction in fares?"

Pukorsky: "If the level of funding is in the two hundreds of two hundred and twenty-five million dollar category, it is recommended that CTA and suburban non rush hour fares... off peak fares be reduced to twenty-five cents."

Dunn: "Could we conceivably reduce fares across the board including rush hour, that's when we have our congestion."

Pukorsky: "I think this again is where the RTA... through a their budget to the hearing would have to make that decision and let me suggest that the problem that we



have, is that if we reduce our fares on the CTA loan from forty-five cents to twenty-five cents... we have two million rides today that would mean a net reduction of revenue of four hundred thousand dollars. If we increase our ridership one million, a 50% increase that would bring in two hundred and fifty thousand dollars more, so we have a net operating loss of an additional one hundred and fifty thousand dollars a day by increasing the ridership a million and that doesn't take into consideration that during the rush hour equipment and manpower is taxed now, so it may not be possible to recognize this increase in public transportation at the early date. It is important to generate more support of new service in the suburban areas in the commuter railroad areas and the suburban... initially as far as extension and expansion of service and to maintain the CTA as a viable entity without forcing it to curtail further so, hopefully as the energy crisis builds up as the recognition and support for public transportation booms up we would go into the direction that you're suggesting. But, I don't believe it's practical to expect that this could be done initially."

Dunn: "Could the CTA cars and equipment... if you.... be run somehow rails of some of the private railroads into this area..."

Pukorsky: "Well, as far as the gauge, I think the gauge of the track with simular.... I don't know what the safety standards, what the block controls.... how those would work. I'm sure that it is something that can be explored and there can be some enter action to degreee at which I am not confident to response to today."

Dunn: "I have one last question and may be of you and perhaps Secretary Bond, too. When we talk about purchasing



of services with respect to privately owned as opposed to public CTA, if we purchase services from suburban bus companies or the commuter railroads... is the cost or the purchase price if you will, how does that relate, to net cost or do we have to build into that purchase some profit for the stockholders?"

Pukorsky: "Well, I think I can react for both of us in this area. The position... I think this involves the Leadership in the Senate and the House as well on both sides of the aisle, that what is done should not unjustly enrich anyone in the private sector. On the other hand, if we're saying that by taking over equipment that has been acquired and in that way there are additional stockholder benefits by that a necessary outcome of having a better transportation system for the entire area. I'm sure that the language of the Bill to provide for the Regional Transportation Authority to negotiate at an arms length relationship in serving the public interest but give them the option of providing for Regional Transportation Authority."

Dunn: "In your opinion if the financing was there... the financial resources were there wouldn't it be much more functional to purchase outright the equipment and operate it as a public entity under one operating authority all of the private systems now in existence."

Pukorsky: "Well, your hypothesis is I guess the key issue. You said, if the funding was available and while that may be... we don't believe that funding will be available initially to do all of those things, the outright purchase..."

Dunn: "... for bond issues, I think."

Pukorsky: "Well, possibly. The other point is, there should be some time to determine what route and what systems are deserving to stay in operation, there may be two systems that are a block apart now that are competing



with one another and both adversely affecting one another and it may be that one could just be allowed to be abandon, protecting the rights of the labor people on there and the other ones can enhanced to provide a more adequate service for the territory that it passes through and give the public better public transportation."

Neff: "Mr. Miller, Tom Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, one or two questions of Chairman Pukorsky. Back at a meeting in January, sponsored by the CTA for the benefit of Legislators a statement was made that, 99% of all Chicagoans live within three blocks of a CTA facility. I believe that is correct."

Pukorsky: "Then it was."

Miller: "And, that is to be commended. How would that compare with other Regional Transit systems throughout the country, Atlanta, Denver, Washington, Cleveland, wherever it might be."

Pukorsky: "I would say that, probably New York is the only other entity that properly approaches that type of coverage. Atlanta is attempting to move into that area... I'm sure that cities like Philadelphia, Detroit and Cleveland are not doing as well now, but this is generally... we probably have number one and number two."

Miller: "All right, Chicago ranks right at the top in terms of providing transit service and here we have a financial crisis... I'm sure that the CTA board has considered reducing levels of service and why hasn't further steps been done or be taken to enfact reduce level of service to reduce operating deficits."

Pukorsky: "I think that is the basis issue of where the public transportation can exist as an institution such as a commercial establishment where you curtail service or increase fares to make it pay. We could have the CTA



making money very quickly by eliminating the off peak service, the night service, week-end service but we'd have a sick city and a sick metropolitan area. The decision should be based on how public transportation serves the community needs and providing for an increase tax base. In providing for less capital expenditures for road and providing other things. If you take that into consideration the service that we provide, probably cost more than a hundred folds more if you let it go down in the alternate facilities. You must take the equate.... the tangible benefits and detriments outside you can consider the CTA as a company by itself and that's why the suburban communities are finding that their privately operated bus companies are not providing the service in that area because they are providing just those services in the peak hours when they have the ridership that pays its way. But, they can't develop their shopping centers, they can't develop industrial parks, they can't develop their residential communities because the developers have no way of getting the workers or residents to their places of business or residents."

Miller: "All right, then you envision House Bill 8 through 12, as an answer to... be able to allow CTA to maintain its level of service presently existing for example... or in that...."

Pukorsky: "Hopefully to enhance its service in frequency."

Miller: "All right, and at the same time with the adoption of House Bills 8 through 12, funding of a hundred and forty-five or a hundred and fifty million dollars will not begin to improve the level of service in the suburban and collar county areas or not measurable not anywhere near the level of service that the people of Chicago are benefiting from."

Pukorsky: "No, the commitments that has been made to double



the level of service in the suburban communities to indicate that there would be no less frequent service on the commuter railroad than one train an hour on each direction on the schedule and so, that to that extent if the level of funding that you mentioned is inadequate to provide that and we don't know specifically yet the Bill that has been proposed allows Regional Transportation Authority to public hearings to a six member vote to provide additional income to do those things that were mandated to do."

Miller: "All right, Sherman, have you taken a public position on view of the referendum for the adoption of an RTA."

Pukorsky: "Well, I have... I have indicated that because of the nature of the energy crisis of the fact that the public generally is not aware of all of the issues and not aware of the fact that if there was a breakdown in public transportation, the need for money for additional roads would far exceed the money for that and... as a side, the leadership on both sides through the Illinois Study Commission prepared a recommendation which the leadership used... I happen to have it here if you would like to know their comments, they have why a referendum is enadvisable in creating a Regional Transportation Authority. It says, holding a referendum to determine whether or not a Regional Transportation Authority with taxing ability should be created, is both unnessecary and enadvisable. There are several reasons why this is so, delay... public transportation in northeastern Illinois, is literary in a crisis situation, the need for public transportation is not a question, it is universally agreed both in this region and others that public transportation can no longer be supported from the fare box alone. Financial assistants from the public must be immediately fore coming if the substantial additional service cut backs,



abandonment and fare increases ought to be averted. A referendum will only delay the provision of this necessary financial aid and postpone the creation of a comprehensive Regional Agency, which can effectively provide and coordinate necessary public transportation services, the 1970, State Constitution... the voters of Illinois in ratifying the new 1970, State Constitution gave implicit approval to the concept of providing financial support for public transportation. Article 13, Section 7, states that "public transportation is an essential public purpose for which public funds may be expended" cost, conducting a special referendum election of this question would impose a substantial and unnecessary financial burden on the taxpayers of the six county area. It is estimated that such a special referendum would cost an excess of three and a half million dollars, in addition the referendum is to be successful a major promotional and educational effort would be necessary to convey the benefits of public transportation to all the voters, at present there is not an organization or entity could effectively mount such comprehensive campaign. It is more likely that well organized and well financed opponents of public transportation such as highway interest would spend large funds to defeat such a goal, experience elsewhere... experience in creating Regional Transportation Authority in other areas whether through referendum process or otherwise, indicates that such actions are generally not successful until a crisis of major proportions exist. This region cannot afford to let its public transportation system reach a point of functional collapse before it acts. To do so would result in the much greater cost of trying to recreate the system after it has failed. This was the consensus of the leadership earlier this year, it should equally apply now."



Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to Langhorn Bond, if I might please?"

Neff: "Secretary Bond."

Miller: "Mr. Secretary, could you tell us your views on a referendum on the adoption of a RTA?"

Bond: "Well, the views have changed. Originally it was endorsed, today the policy is not necessary and in view of the urgent crisis in the area, Sir. And, in view of the wide-spread public support that we detected in the Chicago metropolitan area, the Governor has decided that the course of leadership is not to have one."

Miller: "All right now, you mentioned a delay... a March 1974, referendum will not in fact delay the adoption or the implementation of a RTA Bill that we passed in November, isn't that correct. They are both effective July 1."

Bond: "Yes, that's correct. Quiet right."

Miller: "Well there is in fact no delay with the referendum..."

Bond: "Oh, no... no... I'm not at all convinced of that because you could not begin planning or any preliminary work for the implementation of a RTA until after that referendum. Under the Governor's, you can do so right away it has... hopefully enacted."

Miller: "I want to commend you for the summary of the report that you have prepared on your hearings and it documented the types of people that you had before your hearings and isn't it a fact that most of the testimony generated from transit people, union people, league of women voters and not in fact the average citizen."

Bond: "Well, I'm proud that the league of women voters appeared so substantially and I want to associate myself with those Ladies who interest in the public affairs is so great but, I would like... you are correct in



suggesting that we do not have what could be called a statistically sound cross section through our hearings that is inevitable but, the taxpayers league of Illinois has just conducted a survey which was a telephone survey and has a broader and more... let us say, no-biased base as ours and that also discovers strong support for an RTA both in the suburban area and in Cook County." MILL

Miller: "If that is your belief then Mr. Secretary, why aren't you willing to re-enforce that belief by permitting a referendum to back up your view point."

Bond: "I'm sorry, I didn't..."

Miller: "Well, if you believe and if others believe that an RTA Bill that comes out of this General Assembly will meet voter approval, then why are you not willing to submit it to referendum?"

Bond: "I think time frame is so critical and the crisis is so much upon us that it is incumbent to move quickly. I think that the language that was contained in the Legislative Study Commissions report and the policies that the Members of the Legislative Study Commission put forward in their Bill apply here."

Neff: "Are you through, Representative Miller? Representative Duester."

Duester: "Mr. Secretary, I would like to propound a couple of questions to you which I hope can be answered 'yes' or 'no', and if not I will understand your inclination to expand."

Bond: "You're asking a lot of a bureaucrat."

Duester: "On page 23, of House Bill 12, might I direct your attention to the provisions.. Mr. Chairman, might we have some order? I think every Member of the House ought to be interested in page 23, of House Bill 12, which gives the RTA board an unlimited.... unlimited power. Not a limit here that I see... to impose taxes



related to ownership and operation of motor vehicles of the same nature that could be imposed by the State or local units of government. As this Bill now reads would you agree with me that this tax authority is unlimited?"

Bond: "There is no limitation."

Duester: "There is no limitation... now..."

Bond: "Yes."

Duester: "All right, would you think that it would be appropriate to consider a limit and have you considered putting any kind of a limit on?"

Bond: "No... Yes..."

Duester: "Thank you. Now, you will also believe that the Legislature should create a Transit Authority with unlimited tax power and not present that to the people for their consideration of referendum, is that correct?"

Bond: "Yes."

Duester: "Now, I want to ask you this... last time that we were together in amicable like this was in Waukegan, at St. Dismas Church and I was delighted that the Governor instructed you to go to each of the six counties and ascertain the feelings of the people. And, I think that you detected, at least your report did, the people are greatly interested in this and the people of the six counties... did they not suggest to you at these hearings that they would like to have a voice on the board?"

Bond: "Yes."

Duester: "Under your proposal does Lake County have a direct voice on the board?"

Bond: "Depends on the two suburban numbers. Can't answer that 'yes' or 'no'."

Duester: "All right, I'll ask you in a way that it could be answered 'yes' or 'no'. Is it possible under your



Bill for two members from Will County to represent the five surrounding counties, in other words DuPage, Lake, Kane and McHenry, would not have a voice... is that possible?"

Bond: "Well, it's not contemplated. I don't believe it is."

Duester: "You don't contemplate it, but is it possible?"

Bond: "No, it's not possible."

Duester: "It's not possible?"

Bond: "Nope."

Duester: "Why not?"

Bond: "I have my experts here and they tell me it is not possible."

Duester: "I would like to hear... oh, your expert just rendered the opinion that it is not possible."

Bond: "Yes."

Duester: "All right, I believe that you cannot point to the language and I think for the edification of the Members you ought to indicate in here where it spells out that Lake, McHenry, DuPage, Kane, absolutely have to have a voice on. I know that they... there is some provision providing some concurrence. Well, we have no voice, is that right?"

Bond: "Each Chairman shall have concurred in the appointment of at least one such director, that is a veto provision here and that answers your question about...."

Duester: "Now, I think I have three quick questions that will just require a 'yes' or 'no'. When the mass transit system was established in San Francisco, was there a referendum?"

Bond: "There was a referendum in San Francisco, also there was a referendum in Atlanta, setting up 'MARTA'..."

Duester: "And, was there referendum in Denver?"

Bond: "There was referendum in Denver, that is correct."

Duester: "Now, when the CTA was established twenty-seven years ago without any tax power with the referendum in



City of Chicago? I think Chairman Pukorsky, could answer that."

Bond: "Yes or 'no', Milton?"

Pukorsky: "Yes, the CTA is a creator of the General Assembly."

Duester: "Thank you."

Totten: "Representative Mahar... I have a list of the following people who would like to ask questions, if there is anyone else who..."

Pukorsky: "The question was asked was the CTA a creator of Legislator, yes it was, the ability to provide funds and create in the area it operated was by an initial referendum."

Totten: "Representative Mahar, next and Representative Skinner, Representative Dee, Representative Wolf, Ebbesen, Grotberg, Barnes, Duff and Hanahan. Anybody else, please come to the Chair and I'll put your name on the list. Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have a couple of quick questions for Secretary Bond that doesn't have to be answered 'yes' or 'no'. You mentioned in previous discussion or testimony the fact that we are now at a crisis situation and we don't really have time to do anything other than act. As I recall this thing was on the docket when I came on the scene last January, would you care to say who you think the fault it is that we're now in a crisis situation and we have to act hurriedly."

Bond: "I would prefer to look to the future and hope that swift and prompt action will be taken."

Mahar: "Do you feel that that out rules the fact that a referendum situation is serious as this, as wide spread as overall incompusing... doesn't need a referendum."

Bond: "That is what I suggested."

Mahar: "One of the Sections... Section 212, eludes to the ability of the railroads to sell their rights and sell



their stock... they can do only certain things, one of the things that they can do, is use the money to improve grade crossings, would you be agreeable to an Amendment in which some of the funds, could be used to improve grade crossings in the district."

Bond: "Are you referring to the section that says..."

Mahar: "Section 212."

Bond: "Payment for..."

Mahar: "Payment for rolling stock and when the rolling stock is... the money is received by the railroads they must use it for certain areas. One of course is grade crossings, which would be a very small amount."

Bond: "I think that our language here would include that but certain would..."

Mahar: "It does include that, I'm saying is, would there... would you have any objection to going one step further and earmarking funds to improve grade crossings in connection...."

Bond: "Oh, a certain portion or something in that order?"

Mahar: "Yes, of capital improvement funds."

Bond: "Well, I would have to look at that..."

Mahar: "To be sure that grade crossings were quickly taken care of... properly expanded."

Bond: "Well, we would like to perhaps look at an Amendment on that, I'm not sure of the implications of it, but it is eligible now."

Mahar: "Think that it has some merit."

Bond: "Conceivably."

Mahar: "Planning and development is a very important part Section 209, is devoted to to planning and development and the authority is going to develop a five year plan annually for each five years following and at the end they... it says that the five year plan should be presented to the Governor and General Assembly and so forth, do you think that there is a need that an outfit



like the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission might want to look at the plan for... Northeastern Illinois have the option to discuss it, the opportunity to coordinate."

Bond: "I absolutely think so and I would certainly expect that they would work very closely with NIPSY."

Mahar: "Do you think that it would be appropriate that they be allowed to receive a plan along with the county board and General Assembly and Mayor's and other people in the area as a.... be appropriate that that be added to the language."

Bond: "I would have no objection to that."

Mahar: "Thank you."

Totten: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Secretary Bond, when are we going to get a detailed written explanation of the Governor's bond program?"

Bond: "A detailed written explanation of the... which one, they're two types of bond programs. One is the existing and subsequent phases of a supplemental freeway program, all that money goes supplemental freeways."

Skinner: "I have...."

Bond: "Then there is a downstate bond issue and that is another one."

Skinner: "Your elapsing into your bureaucratic background."

Bond: "I can't help it."

Skinner: "I'm interested in the forty-five million dollars that may or may not being created out of thin air. Are we going to get a detailed explanation of that that will show me that the extra money that will be generated in MFT funds will more... will exceed the projected replacement cost of repaving all of these roads every thirteen years."

Bond: "You're talking about a financial projection... Okay, well it is very difficult to run as many years as it has..."

Skinner: "Well, I would suggest that the General Assembly is



not going to be willing to accept Governor Walker's plan just on your say so... It seems to me that you're going to have to prove to us that it is financially feasible and so far, it hasn't been done."

Bond: "Well, we're certainly working on that."

Skinner: "Is that a promise that we're going to get an explanation in writing? If you can't do it, you shouldn't be proposing it."

Bond: "Well, we... you know, we're quiet confident of the consequent of this... we haven't submitted any...."

Skinner: "Well, I know the consequent are... the Governor won't be in office when it comes home to roost. Now, the question is, are you going to explain this thing in writing so we can have a chance to pick holes in it. You know, you put it forty thousand feet up in the air and I can't shoot a gun that high... and that's where it is, up in the blue sky. You refuse to provide a detailed explanation..."

Bond: "Not only would we be happy to provide...."

Totten: "Representative Lechowicz, for what purpose do rise?"

Lechowicz: "A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would hope that the questioner would conduct himself in a proper manner. This man is here to try to explain a Bill to the best of his ability and think that it is completely out of order for these type of gyrations."

Skinner: "I'm asking for detailed explanation, now if this is beyond the competents of the witness, I'm sure his backup people or at least the budget bureau people... I mean, you know... if we have to go to 'Mr. Holby' to do it, I'm sure that he can produce it and it seems to me that you don't... you should not be preposing such a thing if you can't explain it."

Bond: "We can explain it and I think that the Department can be proud of the record of cooperation that we have extended to the professional Members...."



Skinner: "Roscoe, I think that he wants you up here..."

Well, can you... will you provide it."

Bond: "We would be pleased to do so."

Skinner: "Thank you, very much. Now, may we expect to get that before passage of the Bill?"

Bond: "I would hope that the Bill would be enacted tomorrow."

Skinner: "Can we have it within a week?"

Bond: "We will do it of that to provide a projection."

Skinner: "Thank you. Mr. Pukorsky... for what density can mass transportation be justified."

Pukorsky: "The point is, that we have been thinking in terms of density, that isn't the answer. This is one of the fictions, what you want to do is to determine what type of land use you want... how you want your open space, how you want your industrial development, how you want your residential density. Then you provide the transportation to serve those areas and its been... land values and tax receipts and better quality of life for all of us, is what... and that return is ten fold, a hundred fold more than the cost of supporting public transportation. So, that this is why in many areas they say rail systems can only be substained in large population center with a million or more. That's not true and Atlanta is showing what their doing, the European countries have done this for a long time, so it's relating public transportation as part of the total transportation system and the societal system."

Skinner: "You think that it can be justified for a county with an density of a hundred and eighty-two people per square mile?"

Pukorsky: "The point is, that if there are people in that area that can't get to the hospitals and can't visit their grandchildren and can't get to the shopping centers and then there may be a system of transportation such as the dollar ride system which is a demand



responsive system where we have something between a taxi and a bus would be available to go those people and pick them up and get them to the commuter station, to get them to the doctors, to get them somewhere else at a level where it can be afforded and that spin off is a responsibility of us as members of society."

Skinner: "You mentioned an extremely sufficient sentence in your answer to my first question which had to do with maintaining real estate value. When I saw the map in the Tribune, two week ago of the commuter railroads all going into Chicago... the thing that hit me immediately was that this higher RTA plan is merely a way of maintaining the real estate values in the Loop. When I see Mr. Cornelious testify and I believe Mr. Cornelious, present primarily land owners in downtown Chicago, it strengens my suspicion. Is this true or false"

Pukarsky: "It's false, let me make it quiet clear that I think you perhaps misunderstood some of my earlier statements in making your statement. But, by enlarge the commuter rail line had closed down most of their stops within Chicago so, what they provide is an ability to those people who would like to live in less density populated areas to have what benefits they have of the so called urban.... and have the benefits of the hospitals and employment facilities and educational institutions and culture attractions in Chicago to make the Chicago metropolian area a desirable place to live so that in these areas what we're doing is providing for much improved public transportation situations outside Chicago, most of the extentions of service and extentions of ability of transferring commuter railroad stations and increasing suburban bus companies will be outside of the CTA territory."

Skinner: "What will your plans... what will this plan specifically



guarantee McHenry, or Kane County."

Pukarsky: "Well, it originally..."

Skinner: "Now, wait a minute in increase services."

Pukarsky: "Well, it calls the frequency of service that would be dependant on the amount of funds that are available as far as the planning of the type of transportation system that we would like there is presently a plan and I have offered several Representatives here the opportunity of my trying to obtain copies for them, there is a plan that has been developed by the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission, the Chicago Air Transportation Study, both of which have representative in each of the six county areas. Northwest Indiana is involved, the City of Chicago Department of Revenue and Planning is involved... what is the twenty year plan for transportation in this area, do we want to be highway oriented do we want to be transit oriented, what is the mix. It was in public hearings that has been held all of these areas, the plan is in some final formative stages which will tell you what lines and what services that you have but the frequency of service is dependant on the ability to provide that."

Skinner: "If the plan is the same one that my Mayor's have see it at every NIFTY meeting on mass transit that they have gone to. There are three... there are one fork and one line runing from McHenry county from mass transit, the toll way is one of them and other is the fork line, it is the Chicago Northwestern Railroad. Now, that is all that you're offering and it's the plan... there is no incentive whatsoever for us to be in it because we have it."

Pukarsky: "I think you have missed some of the points..."

Skinner: "I hope so."

Pukarsky: "... the point is, that if you elimtate the Chicago Northwestern Railroad, perhaps those people were using



roads in McHenry county that are paid for principally by the rest of the populous counties, DuPage, Cook... county particularly for providing for those roads and they would be inadequate if you don't have the Northwestern railroad and the cost for additional roads in McHenry county will cost much more real estate taxes in others than the small contribution that's made... in addition I said earlier that there would be bus service and there would be dollar right service that's considered for many of the less populated areas..."

Skinner: "Is that a guarantee."

Pukarsky: "... for the benefits... RTA...."

Skinner: "A guarantee for McHenry county."

Pukarsky: "Well, the point is.... that in the membership there has to be public hearings, there is the statement that 2/3 rd's of the funds raised in the counties... at least 2/3 rd's, should be used for the beneficial use. In my judgment, McHenry would be one of the beneficiary counties which will find that the benefits far exceeds the contribution that comes from that county."

Skinner: "You mentioned that there would be a possibility of stabilization of commuter fares, now as you know the Chicago Northwestern Railroads have the rolling stocks built into its fare structure, for that reason if fare structure is higher than the other commuter railroads which are in Carter Mass Transit district. Will this plan allow for the rolling stock to be taken out of the fare structure so that our fare structure may be comparable to those of the other railroads."

Pukarsky: "A condition that a fare structure be established that equitably handles the area but basically and this is just a left rule of thumb, that in connection with the distances that you travel, the fare would be about the same and hopefully that through dollar bus service to suburban bus companies may be able to pay one fare



get a ticket, get on a bus... go to a commuter railroad station, if you're going to downtown Chicago or going to another city, you can get off that commuter train use the same ticket and get on another bus and finish the area, so to answer the question 'yes' the intent is to have uniform fare structures based roughly on zones of mileage throughout the entire six county area."

Skinner: "We now think we have the best commuter service in the Chicago Metropolitan area, it has been the tradition when a public service takes over a private enterprise... the service doesn't go up to the highest it goes down to the middle some place or down below, well I won't comment on the CTA but there are people who would suggest that could be better. What prospect with regards to maintenance of the present level of service can you give."

Pukarsky: "Well, I can say that the reason that this fiction is being projected is that when you require a service operator of the fare box, what can the private operator or public operator do when the expenses exceed the fare box. He one, can raise fares, two he can lengthen the intervals between his buses or his rail trains and loses additional passengers who find that it is less convenient much than... and the never ending circle takes place. Where you have a system with a community recognize that this is out of the framework, you can have an operation that is efficient and as far as the CTA is concerned, without exception any place that you ask in this nation by efficiency and comparison with private or public enterprise and the commuter railroad management and Chicago can attest to this, we have the reputation of being the number one transportation entity administrator wise, efficiency wise in the nation. That doesn't mean that we don't have a great deal to do to improve our service and to overcome inherent difficulty in any large



bureaucratic and we're trying to do that. But, the fiction that a public service can operate as a private enterprise is one that we have to get away from, most of the nation at Washington, is realized that, the eastern seaboard has realized that, west coast states have realized that, Illinois has only in the last years realized that and that's to the credit of the Speaker of the House, the Minority Leader and the Leadership in the Senate in recognizing this and what I have heard is, that this is the year that the Illinois Legislature can distinguish themselves in the field of public transportation. This is what you will be able to say as one of the great accomplishments of this particular Legislative Session."

Skinner: "And, in about two years from now the Representatives from the outlying area will face the consequences of their constituents finding out how much they have to pay for it."

Pukarsky: "I think you'll find throughout the country where this fear was raised both on political influences and on service outlines that the fears have not been realized and conversely that the service outlying areas have been much greater."

Skinner: "I have been told that you have said that you favor a sales tax to finance the RTA, is that correct?"

Pukarsky: "I have stated very clearly that as far as the financial methods of providing for an RTA, that the Legislative leaders are the ones who make the determination, so if the financing is adequate we can accept it. When I was asked, from my point of view... what is a method of funding in a sense, I said that the sales tax which is being used in other parts of the country is a growth factor which has some very great advantages. So, as to specific financing the Legislative leaders and Legislators do that."



Skinner: "You don't care where the money comes from, as long as it comes."

Pukarsky: "Pardon."

Skinner: "You don't care where the money comes from, as long as it comes."

Pukarsky: "I think that's a decision which the Legislative and Executive Branch think but, the Speaker knows my position on the sales tax."

Skinner: "I was just trying to extend it to the Membership. Thank you."

Neff: "Now, we have about eight more people here that want to ask questions. Again I'm going to ask everyone that takes the floor to try to limit his time to five minutes, hopefully that we can get out of this Session at 6:30, tonight when we finish up this package of Bills that will be all that we hear tonight but you folks recall we do have two more Sessions yet to come up tonight and I'm afraid if we go too much longer after 6:30, on this we will be here till ten or eleven o'clock tonight. Mr. Dee's is recognized."

Dee: "Mr. Chairman, I have some questions I would like to perpond for Chairman Pukarsky. I would like to publicly acknowledge having spent some seven and a half years with the traffic, the only State of Illinois Traffic Commission, I called Chairman Pukarsky, and I would like to public acknowledge the courtesy and kind treatment that he gave me in granting me the a knowledge interview. Many of these questions that I have gone over with him... and I bring them out and perpond them in the interest of advising my colleagues of the situation that we face with the RTA Bill. And, not in any way to badger the Chairman, Chairman Pukarsky... it seems that mass transportation has been suffering a decline can you tell us how long public acceptance as the use of mass transportation has been declaining in this



country?"

Pukarsky: "Well, peak of public transportation properly existed in 1926, when the ratio of automobile, the population was 1 and 12, it declined from that point forward to the leveling off during the World War with gasoline rationing and no cars and then further declined to a point now where we have 1 automobile for every three residents in the area and there was two nationally policy changes that had affect. One, was the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, which established the highway trust funds and had an assured adequate level of funding to provide for the expressway system we had and allowed people to live further from the central area and still get to work within the traditional one hour time. The second was the FHA insured mortgages which worked to the detriment the central cities in providing that lenders and people develop property in the growing virgin territories would expend their fund there rather than extend credit in the central cities where land values were in some ways declining and for people who wanted to live in the central city could not get mortgages and so in many cases they were forced to go out where the mortgage money was available. This is being overturned by two national policies changes being the environmental problems and specifically the energy crisis which traditionally has caused grave concern at the highest levels in Washington and the feeling is, and I mention this in June, and I think we've seen some of the proofs that the energy crisis is one which is causing grave concern about the future security of this nation, traditionally and historically the lack of energy has led inevitably to world conflict and we've seen what's happened since June in the mid east."

Dee: "Well, regardless to these things which I think are very important factors. The point is that the public



is not using mass transportation... now.... if by some means, you would be able to increase the use of mass transportation, would this actually eliminate the deficit of the CTA or the proposed deficit of the RTA?"

Pukarsky: "As I've indicated to you and others earlier, that much of the increase ridership would come during the rush hour period and that would require additional labor and additional manpower and if we hold the level of fares at the same level, our deficit would be increased. But, again the trade off for not having sublimity expressways of having pure air and the air doesn't stay over just the Chicago area, it goes over a lot larger territory is worth the small amount relative to provide adequate public transportation."

Dee: "I understand the environmental problem but we are here faced tonight with the RTA, the establishment of a Transportation Authority and I think that's what we ought to keep our minds on rather than the environmental impact, I'm sure they're by-products of this that will be helpful. Now, you did say that the CTA could operate in the black..."

Pukarsky: "That's right, if we cut service... right."

Dee: "Now, if you did this... if you did cut the service and did start to operate in the black, what percentage of your riders would be inconvenienced?"

Pukarsky: "Well, I would say that to cut the service, we would probably be in a situation where our expressways would come to a halt; if you recognize what I said earlier only 13% of the people that come to work in the six-county area, work in the downtown area and any of you that have ridden the expressway in the rush hour, see the congestion now. Can you imagine if you had seven times the cars... you just stop and so the entire metropolitan area would cease to function."

Dee: "Have you... other than modernizing the equipment, buying



new buses and more advanced ones, have you at anytime... or has at anytime the basis concept of mass transportation been changed and I'm referring in this case to another question that I have, I only know of one that I can think of off hand... maybe you know of more, tell us if you do. Such as a depot area in close to the central city, or close to the mass transportation people are traveling... to install parking lots or shuttle service, would this tend to solve the problem."

Pukarsky: "There is no question, one of the areas which we feel is essential is to provide what we call, park and ride facilities and that in the City of Chicago for example, there is a plan for building a major parking facility over the Kennedy Expressway at the end of that line which will allow people to come in under cover, park at a very low rate and then just... in an enclosed safe security area... go down into the station. This will be before that Kennedy-Eden Junction, will help relieve some of the traffic on the expressway system and help that... there is another plan at 87th street on the Dan Ryan, and in some of the outlying area, Skokie and Evanston, those people have provided some of their stations with parking lots too... hopefully there will be a great many more. That is an essential ingredient of mixing the car with public transportation."

Dee: "How close is that to reality?"

Pukarsky: "It's being done now but, the level of work that is needed would depend on the level of local funding and in RTA would give that a giant step forward."

Dee: "Would this help or would we have any hope of this kind of promotion of mass transportation... help to remove the deficit. I'm very much concerned with the deficit."

Pukarsky: "No, it will probably increase the deficit but what I have again tried to point out... if you equate what the saving is on real estate taxes and other taxes, to



provide the local street system and the police protection and fire protection and all the traffic controls that is more than probably a hundred folds, the cost for providing for public transportation. That's the message that we're not able to get across to many of our Legislators and people in the community. The saving is not helping public transportation the losses in savings will be additional cost a hundred folds larger than the small amount realatively to this."

Dee: "I understand that concept, but we are the people who have to vote to the taxes and if we have to increase the taxes we are accountable to our constituents. These are the things that concern us, not the nebulous benefits which you... and they are not nebulous but, not the benefits which you prescribe. One other question along those lines, we have had a few.... statements from you that concern me a little bit... you talk about a very high parking fee in the... for people who stay eight hours, is it essential to have a penalty for driving an automobile in order to assist the Transportation Authority or can it stand on its own merits."

Pukarsky: "No, a merits greatest love affair is with the automobile and that when you consider that our gross national products exceed a trillion dollars and over a hundred billion dollars is spent in auto and auto related areas, you recognize what a tremendous affect on economy is; what type of advertising we have, how a value judgment... I'm afraid that the convenience of automobile and such is not going to prevent people from wanting to go to the congested area, the automobile is certainly the only means that we can use for the recreational 'unintelligible'... but if someone is going use that to get to the downtown area to park there all day to make additional highway lanes... to do many of these other things, they could pay the price."



Dee: "In other words, even if the cost in the long run maybe greater, the public still rejects mass transportation preferred to automobile. Is that what you're telling me?"

Pukarsky: "Yes, if they could get all the lanes they wanted and all the parking space they wanted, they would prefer that."

Dee: "Now, as to the Bills before this House... I presume you... you're familiar with the Bills that we're considering here... all three or four of them and they're satellite Bills... as the head of the second largest mass transportation unit in the nation, do you believe that the RTA and its foundings is more than a temporary solution to a problem which in fact, is not a solution at all but a stop gap in a manner of raising funds to cover a rising deficit."

Pukarsky: "Well, actually we've had the good fortune of having the benefits of Transportation Authority throughout the nation, we have talked not only to the operators, the political people and civic organizations that were involved and that the Bill that was drafted, as I said earlier, which in absents with minor differences is a consense of the House and Senate Leadership, civic interest in all, is a model Bill. The defects basically is the level of funding."

Dee: "Was temporary funding accomplished about the same thing as this Transportation Authority, we could provide a way of... underwriting deficits... not only for the CTA but for the other bus lines and so forth."

Pukarsky: "I want to say that the crisis is much more serious than suburban bus line and some commuter railroads.... the point is, if you're saying that there is another vehicle... if the vehicle means coming back to the Legislature each year, I understand that the Legislators said that they are tired of hearing this crisis year



after year, after year they want some solution which takes it away from the Legislator."

Dee: "Well, I'd just like to make one statement, Chairman Pukarsky, I feel that in considering the RTA Bill.... just over a very short time and you point out that least time for a car on the rapid transit is four years we're very close to it. I'm thinking in terms of five years and I'm looking at funding of one billion not million, one billion dollars over a period of five years for this Authority and I'm very much concerned with it. Thank you, very much, Sir."

Neff: "Mr. Wolf, Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "A couple of quick question of Secretary Bond. Mr. Bond, you favor the sales tax funding of method of funding proposal over those in House Bill 12, or do you think that the other ones are superior."

Bond: "I favor House Bill 12, we did a poll asking people in the six county area what their opinion of the sales tax imposition was and only one person out of four responded favorably to that and as a consequents of that poll of public opinion, we do not have a sales tax in our Bill."

Wolf: "I get an opposite reaction, that's why wanted to know... how many people did you poll by the way?"

Bond: "We poll about thirty-five hundred, all who came to our hearings and I believe that Representative Skinner, pointed out today... attented to be those who rode transit, but I don't know that the type of tax is much basis by that..."

Wolf: "Okay, secondly... do you think that giving an appointed board taxing powers volits our representative form of government?"

Bond: "No, I do not."

Wolf: "You do now, okay. Now, it's apparent... you know, to all of us who have some political standing that some



kind of a meeting of the minds arrangement has been made between the Chief Executive of the State and the Chief Executive of the City of Chicago and I don't necessary feel that that's bad or anything like that, and I hope that you are privilege to some information at least as far as those agreements that would cover transportation problems. Is one of those agreements possibly the consideration that the Governor might reconsider his position on the proposed cost on expressway?"

Bond: "No."

Wolf: "Not at all."

Bond: "No, Sir."

Wolf: "Good cause I have to ask that because it's a very important question in my particular district."

Bond: "Mayor Daley and the Governor are in agreement on this Regional Transportation Authority Legislation but I know of no agreement expressed or implied on anything else."

Wolf: "The reason that I had to ask the question, I might as well tell you why, because it seemed like right after the agreement the Mayor made the announcement that they have got all this money ready to go for cost and I just wondered if there was a possibility the Governor could be... you know, reconsidering but if you say no, I accept your word."

Bond: "Well, the Governor certainly hasn't given me indications of saying he has changed his mind."

Wolf: "That's all the questions that I have for you, I just want Chairman Pukarsky... just a moment, you don't have to answer any questions I just wanted to answer something that you answered someone else... Mr. Pukarsky, you had mentioned before that the Legislators would... the Legislative Leaders would make the decision as to how to finance this thing, I think that you are absolutely



right and I think that it is to our discredit as individual Legislators that we sit by and let only the Legislative Leaders tell us what to do and when I ask questions about these things, I think, you know that we have to interject ourselves and look at various proposals. But, I think that you are absolutely right, historically the individual Legislators sits back and let it become a leadership show or a show between the Legislative Leaders and the Governor... we never get involved and we sit back and let them tell us what to do."

Pukarsky: "I would like to say that, it is my understanding that the Legislature is a group delegated to the Illinois Transportation Study Commission, the responsibility for coming up with recommendations, this was done with professional staff... had the Legislator Leaders plus several other Legislators on that and so, if I inferred that the Legislative Leaders have done that without, I've had many talks with many of the Legislators on both sides of the aisle and I know that a good many of them have shared but... I don't know if... you know, to the extent that you mentioned."

Wolf: "Okay, just one final message for you. I got a call from a... Mr. Pukarsky, I got a telephone message here from a Mr. Joe Clutchfield, who's from the Northwest CAPin my district and he said, he sent a Page down with a message for you, he would like to have you call him. He's been trying to set up a meeting with you for some time, I understand..."

Pukarsky: Well, he certainly... we'll see that he get his..."

Wolf: "Thank you."

Neff: "Joe Epton.... John Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to address my remarks to Sparkie Garmisa and to Director Bond... and probably to Speaker Blair, but each of you three people know that my commitment to RTA has been for almost a



eight month period now. In trying to motivate people to get out of their automobiles and on to whatever mass transit we provide. I think made that commitment to each of you and in doing so... in a moment of high statesmanship and a complete laps of political candor I introduced House Bill 1998, which involved the fifteen dollar share of the license plate fee, the political error there was that we were going to charge the motorist for that... an extra fifteen dollars, that Bill is reclining in an Interim Study Committee but, I have taken that concept because it later showed up in your Bill... not much later but I commend you if pledgerism is the best form of fatery and I congratulate you all for ripping it off in my behalf. I would like to present tomorrow to you, Sparkie, and Amendment to get at my concept and in brief this Amendment will do as follows; I have built in a referendum, into your Bill... when I apply for my license plates I have the option by making a little check mark... too contribute to RTA, if I opt for that the Secretary of State sends me fifteen dollars worth of commuter tickets, which I think would be very nice. If I do not opt for it, my fifteen dollars of course goes to the road fund, so I will take care of immediately 2/3 rd's of the money going back to county of origent and those who want to ride mass transit will start out with a fifteen dollar kitty of transit fare... and this is a concept only I would appreciate it if you would respond... can we have some dialogue on Second Reading on such an issue because it will not completely -- devastate your -- financial program."

Eukarsky: "In response to that, Representative Grotberg, I would like to say that the Legislation that you brought forth Sir... was brilliantly conceived and we realize the value



of it, we're just happy to incorporate it in our House Bill 12."

Grotberg: "Thank you."

Pukarsky: "You should be highly commended for thinking of this wonderful approach, however, I do have my doubts about an approach that would ask for a check off system as to whether or not the fifteen dollars would apply and then perhaps windup with acceptance of scrip that could apply to mass transit fare."

Grotberg: "I'll get it to you early enough so your staff can analyze it. I don't want to take anybody by surprise."

Pukarsky: "We would be happy to have them analyze it."

Grotberg: "Thank you."

Neff: "Representative Barnes.... Mr. Duff, Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Chairman, I not going to take a lot of time but I would like to ask Mr. Pukarsky, a question or two. Mr. Pukarsky, my questions might seem a little provincial in the light of the very earth shaking things that we've been talking about. But, I'm talking to you... let me move over a little bit so I can see you... Thank you, I'm really going to ask you some questions which affect my personal vote.... and they aren't now in there category. I wrote to you two weeks ago and asked you some questions about why... the Isabella Street Station, was closed in Willmette, which has caused a great deal of concern of a large number of people in that area and I understand that there is an answer coming back, but yesterday I got a phone call from a trustee in the Village of Willmette, he told me that tomorrow... the CTA will put a hot third rail at ground level into Willmette, three blocks from my home. And my neighbors are just up in arms, now this may seem not too important but... I've got a three year old that plays in that park right next to your CTA line, where you've



had an overhead wire for thirty years... now you're putting a hot line down there where three year olds, five year olds, six year olds play and I want to know why?"

Pukarsky: "Well, I think perhaps some of the information about that well... was not available to you, we've had many meetings with the community people, we have provided entire fencing in the area including gates transversely between trains or gates for that, this is a system which allows us to up grade the equipment. As you know some of the CTA cars in that line are probably forty year or more in age, this allows us to give service to the community that would not require the stopping and taking the trolley lines down... this design and the protection is something that is used universally in large metropolian as we have the area, we've gone through every step that we could to insure that we have excelled and exceeded any of the safety requirements. I would submit that you'll find that while the change is one that you have a preception of apprehension and it is a valid one, I as a parent would do it too, you will find that this has all the adequates safety protection and perhaps more so, than allowing children to run on a line when there are no trains there and getting hit by a car. I think the safety record will prove out to be as great or greater than it is presently."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Pukarsky, you say that in public meetings and yet the trustees in the Village of Willmette, tell me that there has not been... you tell me that you're sensing it and they tell me it's inadequate... you can't tell me that it is going to be safer because no child has been electrocuted there.... just a minute, Mr. Pukarsky, we have someone who wants to object to my asking you questions about...."



Neff: "You have a point of order...."

Terzich: "Well, a point of order, Mr. Chairman. This has nothing to do with the RTA, if he's got questions about safety features or that of the CTA or mass transit, he could ask him on the side, this has nothing to do with the RTA and I wish he would limit his questions. We've been here quiet a long time and we would like to move along."

Neff: "Will you try to limit it to the Bill..."

Duff: "We're talking about my vote on the RTA Bill, Mr. Chairman and I sat through these meetings all yesterday afternoon when Representative Terzich, wasn't even here so, if he wants to sit tonight... we'll be happy to let him. Now..."

Neff: "Representative...."

Terzich: "Regardless of what his opinion is, I would like to have him keep his questions germane to what the subject matter is, and this I don't believe has anything do with the RTA program. He can vote anyway he wants to, but let's limit the questions to the Bill."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Pukarsky, let me just not say anymore then and tell you that it is going to be very tuff for you to get my vote, unless somebody satisfies my questions in this area of CTA service from my constitugents."

Pukarsky: "We're going to try as I told you earlier, try to tell you what we've done... hopefully we will persuade you that we have a safe situation."

Neff: "Representative Hammerhan."

Hanahan: "Hanahan, Sir."

Neff: "I'm sorry, Hanahan."

Hanahan: "When Sparkie gets through with the phone calls, because it is really directed at Sparkie Garmisa, the questions and.... Representative Garmisa, are you prepared to take the Labor Amendment... the old Amendment #18, that was prepared and adopted to the Bill last



spring and debated on the labor protection clauses as an Amendment to this Bill."

Garmisa: "It was my understanding, Representative Hanahan, that there had been a conference of the labor leaders and the other interested parties back there and I haven't been advised as to what the consequent of that conference was. But, I understand that the intent and the purpose of the conference was to straighten out the labor provisions of this Bill."

Hanahan: "Well, I would just like to suggest that it was not completely satisfactory in my behalf, I will pursue Amendment #18, or the so call Amendment #18, as being the Labor Amandment... speaking in behalf of the total labor community that is involved in the question of labor protection clauses and upon meeting... since that conference, they have advise me to pursue the Amendment that we did have prepared last spring for the Blair Bill, as being acceptable to this Bill. All right now, how about the mandatory purchase of service, are you prepared to accept the view points of the railroad association and the trade union movement on the manatory purchase of service aspect."

Garmisa: "I would say, not at this point in time."

Hanahan: "I see... how about the satisfaction that... with protection on unreasonable interference on the freight service?"

Garmisa: "Do that again."

Hanahan: "The satisfaction protection clause that the... both the union and the management of the railroads are... speaking, on the unreasonable interference on the freight service."

Garmisa: "I not too well acquainted with the provisions of that... part of it, Tom."

Hanahan: "Well, these are three points that the trade union movement are very concerned about before you proceed..."



Garmisa: "Well, then we will be sure that this is one of the subjects of the conference...."

Hanahan: "I would just like to make it public that we have not satisfactory...."

Garmisa: "Well then, this is not a question... this is a comment."

Hanahan: "Right... well, it's a question of you because the moment of truth is going to have to arise shortly... sooner or later we're going to come to grips with the issue, these are the Amendments that are prepared in.... will be offered and we're hopeful that you as the Sponsor will accept them. I have just a couple questions, two or three questions of my own. On the home rule provision that I heard Representative Juckett, I believe or somebody question, I have a serious question in my mind about the taxi cabs that would be affected by your Bill, if a franchise taxi service in a community such as Berwyn, or Cicero, is franchised by that community under a home rule provision and they have the right to franchise, will the RTA be able to... under your Bill, will they be able to set-up their own taxi cab service without the exception of the home rule clause?"

Garmisa: "I don't believe that that would apply, Tom."

Hanahan: "I believe it does apply, I think you better check with your advisor. Maybe Milton Pukarsky, could help you on that... on the taxi cab question. Especially were... specifically on the home rule provision, whether or not this Bill... this statute will need a home rule provision in order to do what we have discussed about the taxi cab franchise right."

Pukarsky: "Well, I think the Bill as presented allows the regulation of taxis in individual municipalities. It allows the RTA to enter into purchase of service contracts to provide services, such as the dollar clause... a dollar ride that we mentioned."



Hanahan: "All right now, without a home rule provision specifically in this Bill, how could you do this?"

Pukarsky: "Well..."

Hanahan: "How could he preempt the home rule community on their right to franchise their right to setting down fares and their right of taxi service, how without the home rule provision could you get away with this?"

Pukarsky: "Well...."

Neff: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Isn't there a provision in the Bills 8 through 12, that specifically says that no home rule power are taken away so that, Tom, I think that question is answered there."

Hanahan: "Well, this is what's confusing... I got that impression under the Bill that the home rule powers are not taken away but, then specifically under this Bill the RTA may setup a franchise taxi service."

Pukarsky: "No, I don't think that we said, setup a franchise. We're saying that they can by agreement go to the Evanston taxi line within Evanston, and contract for them to have a service to pick up people from the Evanston Station to be their home."

Hanahan: "In Oak Park there are two taxi services, Blue and Dolage, could the RTA under the provisions of this Bill... only utilize the Blue cab in lieu of utilizing village and blue cab."

Pukarsky: "I would presume that they would have that opportunity."

Hanahan: "Well, wouldn't that in some way infringe upon the home rule power and then yet set a standard by another governmental unit preempting the right of that community to say that the franchise of both blue and village cabs companies must be utilized."

Pukarsky: "If the franchise could preclude that this type of service was in there, the home rule community would



govern, if they have any concern it seems to me that they can enact whatever regulations would bring in the home rule municipality into such an agreement where they would have to participate."

Hanahan: "I'll go through this further with my man of council here on home rule. I organized blue and village cab companies many years ago. Sparkie, you've heard my questions of Representative Deuster, earlier on the provisions of the mass transit of pupil transportation Amendment as I will be offering as a personal on a Labor Amendment for the collar belt area and thirty townships both preempting the real estate tax levey of pupil transportation plus mandating that the RTA provide pupil transportation and receive now the State funds that are now allocated to schools. Do you have a position you want to make public on that provision. Does the Governor or anyone have any position on that yet?"

Garmisa: "Tom, I would be sympathetic to that formula that you just mentioned and it seems to me that this will be part of the Bill."

Hanahan: "All right, thank you, very much."

Neff: "Mr. Palmer, Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Mr. Chairman, I will try to make my questions brief. I should like to, from Mr. Pukarsky, if I may and maybe address most or all of the questions to him. I did get some information earlier and I won't go into that there is no need to go into those questions. I should like to know under the terms of the Bill as written, the extent if any... that the RTA ordinances would supercede ordinances of municipalities, either home rule or not home rule... take the area traffic, just as an example."

Pukarsky: "Well, the aim was that the RTA would be subject to the traffic regulations..... as far as non home rule



areas, I don't know if there is any particular provision but, for example in designating one way street, to designate one way streets contrary to the traffic pattern of the city is one which we try to prevent and in fact, Representative Shea, was one of those who put in those provisions to cover that, so I believe that that is adequately covered in the RTA."

Palmer: "I've got just a few more questions here. I should like to know whether or not the CTA has any contractual arrangements with Chicago where by it leases or uses city equipment or facilities in its operation?"

Pukarsky: "It has a lease that goes back many years when the elevated when the Congress street expressway was built and the elevated line... the CTA did not have some of the funds to do its share of the work. The city advanced the funds and there has been some payments that have been made, I don't believe that there has been any payments made under that obligation for the last several years and that the city hasn't pressed for payments on that."

Palmer: "Do you know the amount of that obligation?"

Pukarsky: "It's somewhere, I believe the outstanding amount of... probably two or three million dollars over a period of time and I don't know the extent... it might have ten years to go or eight years..."

Palmer: "Well, that would be paid off if this Bill became law the RTA would then assume that obligation, is that correct?"

Pukarsky: "I really couldn't say whether the city would forgive that or not and I think that by enlarge the city has been contributing a great deal of capital funds, we have a hundred and fifty new cars at the cost of nineteen and a half million dollars, which the city in essence turn over to the CTA even though the city and federal funds were the raise of purchasing."



Palmer: "What is the number of employees now... employed."

Pukarsky: "Approximately twelve thousand, five hundred."

Palmer: "Under the.... this plan what would be the projection of ottoman number of employees. I realize that is sort of a vague thing..."

Pukarsky: "Well, I think that there are some activities such as providing... we're having radio comunacations put in our buses and we're being able to montar our buses by controls at traffic polls sending signals back which will enable us to elimtate a group of checkers on the other hand, that if we increase our service then we will need more riders... I find this very difficult to respond, it depends on what direction and what the ojectives of the RTA will be. It may be that some of the increase in services in my judgment should initally come in the suburban communities. And, that the CTA should be given the oppportunity of holding the line without decreasing service initally."

Palmer: "All right, what about other than the CTA, the number of employees?"

Pukarsky: "There are about a thousand in the suburban bus companies and approximately two thousand in the commuter railroads."

Palmer: "So, you're talking about fifteen thousand employees."

Pukarsky: "Approximately."

Palmer: "All right. Now, there is a fear... and Sparkie, this can go to you too, there is a fear in the suburban area of Cook County. I suspect that there is also fear in the suburban counties that the RTA could be used as instrument of political partisanship.... would you not agree that if it has any chance of succeeding at all, that we should elimtate any thought of any political partisanship."

Pukarsky: "Let me respond to this in an interesting way, the fact that this was one of the issues that we thought



were going to pollerize lines as one in which... because of the need of the RTA and the awareness cause concessions... political concessions made in all sides, so there is unanimity across political lines and between the Legislator and the Executive Branch now for the makeup aside from that which indicates the fact that bipartisan support was given throughout this nation. This is a concern which was always raised and without exception was found not to be because in the field of public transportation the authorities that were created had certain priorities and certain needs that went beyond the partisan point of view, so that I really challenge anyone to find any differences around the nation and I think this is what the staff of the Illinois Transportation Study Commission arrived from looking at all completions of political activity and authorities throughout the nation."

Palmer: "Well, I'm talking about political partisanship... either Democrat or Republican, that was a thrust of my question."

Pukarsky: "Well, I think the answer was on the bipartisan basis there has been complete agreement..."

Palmer: "All right."

Pukarsky: "... to the area."

Palmer: "Then I would take it that you would not disagree to amending this Bill to put on a hatch Act Amendment."

Pukarsky: "If you're asking a personal question, certainly I would..."

Palmer: "You would not have any, Mr. Chairman."

Pukarsky: "No."

Palmer: "Sparkie, would you have any?"

Garmisa: "I'm not quiet sure, Romie, whether or not a hatch Act should apply to this Bill. The fact is, as far as I'm concerned or as far as I know, there is no partisan involved in the CTA nor will there be in a RTA, I hope."



Of course... being the kind of an animal he is... there will be no doubt some areas where you may have some concern with partisan..."

Palmer: "If we're trying to get an RTA or instrument of transportation instrument to do the job that has been thought out and has been written about; then we should eliminate political partisanship consideration, you would agree with that wouldn't you."

Garmisa: "I'm not aware that... that political partisan attitude that you're making reference to, is really existing."

Palmer: "But, to insure this... but to insure this we should try to eliminate this, is that correct, Sparkie?"

Garmisa: "Well, I would like to see it held at a minimum."

Palmer: "All right, I have one further question and this... I've read this Bill and maybe I didn't understand it, but it seems to me that you have a power in this Bill to acquire public transportation facilities, is that correct?"

Garmisa: "That is correct."

Palmer: "Would that mean also, the acquisition of the CTA?"

Garmisa: "I believe so, yes."

Palmer: "Has there been any talk about the acquisition of the CTA under this plan?"

Garmisa: "The acquisition of the CTA would come under the RTA plan that we're founding here."

Palmer: "And, the amount... the acquisition would be for a... some consideration of price, is that correct? In other words you're not transferring it for a dollar another good and valuable consideration.... you're not transferring duties and functions and so forth?"

Garmisa: "Mr. Pukarsky will respond to that."

Pukarsky: "This again is in area, if the RTA as setup, appears equitable the CTA properties and the public agency would



exist..... it will be no recovery."

Palmer: "No monetary recovery from..."

Pukarsky: "We intend or expect at this time, if there is in the direction something that is done which gives an unreasonable benefit to some other area and we'll say one of the areas maybe in the railroad field, then it may be that there is some equities that may be in the other half but, at this point in time... it's felt that the CTA is an operating agency which the City of Chicago and the surrounding suburbs that the CTA serves will come under the RTA fold, without any payment to anyone... who would receive the money, it would be perhaps the City of Chicago that you're talking about and I don't see any request or any intention..."

Palmer: "Well, the reason that I'm concerned about it is I don't see any language in the Bill which provides for the phasing out of the Chicago Trans... the disalution of the Chicago Transit Authority and its absorption into the Regional Transportation Authority."

Pukarsky: "Oh, well let me..."

Palmer: "It doesn't say this."

Pukarsky: "All right, let me make it clear... first of all, the CTA is losing money so the RTA in entering into a purchase of service contract with them had really all cars for what they want to do. From the point of an RTA initially there would be a three headed group there would be one that represents the commuter railroads, to operate the commuter roads as is, there would be one to head up the... or to coordinate the suburban bus companies outside of the CTA as they are, there would be a third that is the CTA, that the RTA policy committee on top of that board of direction would impose as part of the purchase of service agreement, certain regulations which will allow for uniform fare, for example that you can use one ticket to get on a bus in the suburban area



transfer with that same ticket to commuter railroad and then transfer to the CTA. In time the RTA as they examined this through the direction and board, may elect to become an operating entity may elect to become two operating entity, may elect to become several operating entity and that's why they have the option of combining them later of keeping them separately but the issue is that they will be able to coordinate them."

Palmer: "Well, all right initially then it is to be a regulating agency and a conduit for graft."

Pukarsky: "I would say, yes and in the conduit it has the ability through the purchase of service contracts of pretty much..."

Palmer: "All right, all right."

Pukarsky: "... having the ability."

Palmer: "Yeah, thank you very much."

Neff: "Representative Kennedy, did you have a question?"

Kennedy: "Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee as a whole do now arise."

Neff: "Representative Kennedy, would you hold that.... we have three...."

Kennedy: "I would rather not hold, Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee as a whole do now arise. If you want to hold it, get a vote. We've been here long enough and I'm hungry. I move that the Committee as a whole do now arise."

Neff: "We have three opponents here and I'm sure they are just going take a short time and then we're going to wrap this up and go into... we've got two more Sessions to go into. Russell Stauffer, from the Illinois Highway Users Conference Chairman. Russell, would you like to make a brief statement... as Representative Kennedy, said many of the folks are getting pretty tired here and we'll try to wrap it up in about ten minutes or so, so we can get in these other Sessions."



Stauffer: "Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, my name is Russell Stauffer, I'm master of Illinois State Grange and I'm Assistant Executive Secretary of the Township Officials of Illinois. I'm also the Chairman of the Illinois Highway Users Conference, I make this statement in behalf of the Members of the Conference. It is the position of the Conference that no special highway use taxes, such as motor fuel tax, or licensing fees be enacted to fund mass transit, or should any existing highway users taxes be diverted for mass transit purposes. Mass transit problems are the problems of entire areas and should be solved with fund from general taxes. As general taxes are levey for mass transit purposes, highway users will pay fare. For example sales taxes on automotive equipment, vehicles, parts, accesories, gas, oil and so forth amounts to over two million dollars annually to the State of Illinois. These funds are used for General Revenue purposes and Conference has no objection to this tax as a sales tax to the general tax upon the receipt of sales of tangible personal property. Highway use taxes request amount and time of use of highway, they aren't luxury taxes, they do not reflect a bill that you pay as do income taxes. They do not reflect indirect benefits to income taxes, they do not reflect indirect benefits as some real estate or business taxes do. There only fare if used to benefit those who pay them. Illinois highway user taxes are among the highest in the nation, revenue from these taxes are needed to expand and maintain the existing highway system.... Illinois highway needs for the next twenty years are estimated at twenty-four billion dollars, these figures were prepared by the Illinois Department of Transportation and re-affirmed by the U.S. Departmne of Transportation. Deversion of these funds will limit the feasibility of satisfying their needs



additional highway users taxes may place an area or the entire State on a point of diminishing returns when one considers attracting industry or keeping existing industry. The general taxes should be levey to fund mass transit is not within our capability, this is a discussion to made by the Legislature or the local areas involved. We as a Conference are willing to abide by that decision and will pay our share of the general taxes, however, we are opposed to any Regional Transportation Authority to be set up without ascertaining the will of the people in proposed areas, through referendum. We are diametrically an opposition to any taxing plan that has no stated limits and either the kind of taxes or the amounts which may be leved. It is our belief that the Illinois highway users would be paying more than their fair share of the cost of RTA if set up and funded by House Bill #12. By all estimates he would be paying from sixty to eighty percent of the cost through highway related tax. In view of the present energy crisis and a possibility of some form of rationing and an increase cost of gasoline, which could result in possible decreased revenue from motor fuel taxes, this could be in large increases in motor fuel taxes in the very near future, especially since the amount needed for the operation of RTA in the future cannot be reasonably estimated. We do favor a funding program that would put the main responsibility for supporting taxes be leved in the areas served by the RTA in the form of any special tax that is necessary. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity of stating the views of the Illinois Highway Users Conference."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Stauffer. Representative Shea, do you have a question?"

Shea: "I would... you say Highway Users Conference, what group



are you talking about, Sir?"

Stauffer: "The Illinois Highway Users Conference."

Shea: "And, what... you know, what type of individuals or groups is this composed of?"

Stauffer: "We are composed of Farm Groups, Oil Companies, Truckers Groups, Chicago Motor Club is a member of our organization... Ford Motor Company is a member of our organization, Chicago Auto Trading Association, just a moment, I have a list here..."

Shea: "Well, I think that's enough... you know, I understand I just wondered what the composition of the group was. Recently we had some very bad damage to a highway in Cook County, where in a bridge collapsed and the Engineering reports... at least I've looked at so far, indicates that one of the major problems with our roads are that they are being torn up by the heavy trucks and wearing them out at a devastatingly fast pace. Do you think your Conference would have any objection if the industries that use these roads, particularly the heavier trucks were to pay a fair share of their use of the highway?"

Stauffer: "Representative Shea, I'm not involved in the trucking industry, I am told by the trucking industry that they feel that they are paying a fair share and that's the only statement that I can make in answer to your question fairly."

Shea: "Now, you talked about highway users not wanting any road funds or highway related funds used things other than highway purposes or road purposes, was that your statement, Sir?"

Stauffer: "Basically, yes."

Shea: "Well, could you tell me when the highway such as... and I'll use ones in Cook County that I'm familiar with, such as the Kennedy or the Stevenson, or the Dan Ryan, remove from the tax rolls substantial large amounts of



real estate and shift a greater burden of the cost of local government to other taxpayers, do you think that it might be proper for those roads to somehow elevate the property taxpayers that they are shifting some of the burden too."

Stauffer: "I would think probably that they would elevate some of the tax burden by bring more people into Chicago and probably a few more motor fuel taxes that are to be spent in the town... city of Chicago."

Shea: "Yeah, but you're talking about motor fuel tax and I'm talking about some kind of help for the property taxpayer and that's what I was concerned about. Thank you."

Neff: "Thank you, Russell. Is 'Mr. Swork', here from the Illinois Association of County Superintendants of Roads? Mr. Swork, as Legislative Chairman of the Illinois Association of County Superintendants of Highways, he is speaking as a opponent to House Bill 12."

Swork: "Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. I'm grateful for this opportunity to appear before you, I am County Superintendant of Highways for Kankakee County as the Chairman said, Chairman of the Legislative Committee of the Illinois Association of County Superintendants of Highways. I will try to be brief in my remarks, the Illinois Association of County Superintendant of Highways understand that political complexity and the economic problems involved in establishing Transit Authority for the six northeast counties. As an association we would perhaps have very little to contribute to the alternate solution of this problem. The political agencies involved are best informed to prepare the appropriate legislation, we are not here in opposition to the concept but we do seriously question some of the financial provisions. In reviewing the proposed legislation our association did take a firm stand



against any diversion of existing highway revenue. When Governor Walker's, Bill was introduced the remaining ninety-six counties by being offered fifteen dollars of a license fee became involved in RTA. The Governor's proposal would be what we as an association consider diversion of funds. I will attempt to explain this reasoning. The motor license fee is now collected it's placed in the road fund to be used by the Illinois Division of Highways on the system that they now maintain including the unmarked highways that are in the main... at a very sorry state of repair. The Governor's proposal takes part of the road fund and distributes to county boards in the ninety-six downstate counties with the understanding it may be used on township roads, city streets, unmarked highways, county roads, etc., is what we would consider diversion and a dilution of this road fund. We feel this proposal would reduce the effectiveness of the road fund as is now being used and it will result in many agencies receiving a very little bit of revenue which would be a very little benefit to the public in general. It is our opinion that county boards will be beseech by request from other agencies for participation in this revenue sharing. We believe county boards are totally capable of allotting this funds but under the Governor's proposal, the county boards are expected to share these funds with other agencies that are not now participating in the road fund. We're further concerned about the manner in which the proposed legislation tends to make up the fund that would be given to the road fund, we are told that a proposed bond would make up this deficit and the bonds would be paid from increased revenue. This rationale in the face of threatening gas shortage may not be a sure fire solution to make up the diminishing revenues. We are concerned that the State may, out of necessity take



part of the federal aid secondary fund, now going to counties to help supplement the State program. If the State should do this many of our smaller downstate counties would be in a desperate condition since federal aid secondary funds are the sole source of construction money. The proposed return to the counties from the road fund based on motor vehicle registration, as provided for in Governor Walker's Bill, would come no where near matching the amount of federal aid secondary income that would be lost to many of our counties. Especially those with low registration, we are concerned if public pressures persist concerning the improvement of a State unmarked highway which are in the mane, in a sad state of repair... the State may pressure the counties to take over the maintenance of these roads. As I stated earlier, this new money being offered to the counties is not being turned over to the counties in tax for the specific purpose of taking over these highways but instead, is being offered as a revenue sharing proposal with something for everyone including those agencies not now participating in the road fund. Even if the road fund diversions proposed by the Governor were to be earmarked for the State highways, we are not sure that it would be adequate to do the job in every county... though it would be adequate in many counties. This gets us into the area of clasification and would require further study, as an association we are not taking a divinity stand on this particular issue at this time nor do we want to muddy the waters in discussing clasification, however, we feel that clasification is essential for good and balanced highways system in the State of Illinois. In summary, the members of Illinois Association of County Superintendants of Highways are opposed to diversion of present inadequate highway revenue, the association will



support meaningful and physically responsible transportation Legislation for the counties involved in the northeastern part of the State. This Association is concerned about all those transportation throughout the entire State and we will be helpful in any way that we can to help solve the many problems in this connection. Thank you."

Neff: "Any questions? Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank Mr. Swork, for his patiences in remaining here most of the afternoon to testify and Howard is from my county and I want to thank you, Howard. Briefly could you tell us what would happen to counties like ours, downstate outside of proported region with the diversification of these funds, if they are cyphened off or..."

Swork: "Well, Representative Ryan, in our county... we have a number of highways that are pretty bad state of repair, I could name 113, I can name a lot the spurs that are going into some of the small communities which we would like very much to see improved. Now, the proposal that is being submitted here would indicate that perhaps these funds would be made available to the counties for this specific purpose. However, we are also told that townships and municipalities can as well participate, in our county we have approximately eighteen municipalities and seventeen townships and we have one township in particular that is in dire need of outside funds. The total amount that would be allocated under the Governors proposal is around three hundred and ninety thousand, six hundred dollars, which is a sizable fund. But, by the time the county board at its discretion would divide these monies up among these various agencies, it appears obvious to me that we would have very little funds to do the work that's necessary on the existing system of highways for which this road



money could now be used. I may go a bit further... in our discussion on the possibility the county helping the State in this area, we were told that the State did not have funds for this purpose and now it appears that we do have funds and we were wondering why we can't be a little bit more divinity in the use of the funds."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Neff: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, Sir, I think I understood what you said, but perhaps I didn't. You said that under the proposed Bill by the Governor, some three hundred and sixty thousand dollars would go to Kankakee County, is that correct?"

Swork: "That is correct, three hundred and ninety thousand, six hundred."

Shea: "All right, three... almost four hundred thousand dollars."

Swork: "Yes, Sir."

Shea: "Now, if you use that four hundred thousand dollars locally... without any loss of State building of roads and State maintenance of roads, would it help your county?"

Swork: "It would help, very definitely it would."

Shea: "Okay, now... you wouldn't have any objections to four hundred thousand dollars in additional money to be used for road purposes in your county?"

Swork: "As county superintendant of Kankakee County, I would not but as a member of the Illinois Association, I would first want to know how this would affect the remaining hundred and two counties in the State because I think that it is essential at this point in time that a very good look be taken at this approach so that all transportation roads throughout the State could be taken care of as well."



Shea: All right, but basically... you know, lets wear your Kankakee hat for a minute. If you had four hundred thousand dollars in your county for county and local roads, it would be a substantial help, is that correct, Sir?"

Swork: "Yes, in reviewing the needs that we are facing on our State unmarked highways system which the State maintains, four hundred thousand would be definitely adequate to go into a reclassification program in Kankakee County, yes."

Shea: "All right, thank you, very much."

Neff: "Representative Ryan, do you have another question or..."

Ryan: "Certainly four hundred thousand dollars is a substantial fund but, to Kankakee is... in my district the largest county... but what about a county that would be much smaller say like Ford County."

Swork: "It would be entirely unadequate, I could perhaps make reference too... with your permission to Iroquois County. I know that Iroquois county has a hundred and ninety-eight mile of these unmarked highways, they have low motor vehicle registration and with low motor vehicle registration there income necessarialy would be reduced considerable as compared to Kankakee County and the number of miles by comparison would be approximately fifty-four as opposed to close to two hundred, so that is my reason for saying I would like to look at the other hundred and two counties because in Iroquois County, it would not work and in talking to some of my colleagues in the southern part of the State where their motor vehicle registration is low, the amount returned under the present... under the Governor's proposal would be very... very small indeed."

Ryan: "And, it would also be very... the smaller the county the less significant that it is, is that..."

Swork: "Yes."



Ryan: "The further down you get into this southern part of the State it would be sheer folly almost..."

Swork: "Correct, and we don't want to lose sight of the fact that their major concern is the federal aid secondary funds that are now available to them for construction in these areas because even under the motor fuel tax law, they receive inadequate funds to do any construction work whatsoever, all of their construction work is done by federal aid secondary funding. Now, the State will have control over these funds under the new Federal Highway Act, I understand that they must turn back at least 50% in the ensuing year or so, but from there on out it is uncertain as to how much they need to turn back and conceivably they could use these funds in order to replace the loss of funds in the road fund... should this happen, then the smaller downstate counties would be completely void of any construction funds whatsoever, and would be unable to provide a satisfactory system for their people."

Ryan: "Of the programs that you know of, that were presented here or will be, does your association favor one over another or are you going to appear for or against any of these other Bills?"

Swork: "Representative Ryan, we are employees of county boards and as an association we are totally aware of the political complexity of the problem of RTA and we felt that the best that we could do, in supporting or in opposing would be to present these... our views factually as to some of the financial difficulties that exist and aid if at all possible in the distribution of funds that might be available and other than that we would be very hesitate to become involved in the mechanics of trying to work out an RTA, because in effect RTA at this point in time only affects six of our hundred and two counties, our ninety-six downstate counties have



pledged support to whatever would be best for the six counties involved in RTA. But, we don't feel that should become involved in the political complexities... we stand ready to furnish and offer any technical aid that we might and we feel that any proposal that will in no way divert existing revenue which are insufficient for the present needs... we would have to oppose any proposal of that sort and that is my purpose for being here today."

Ryan: "Thank you, Howard, thank you."

Neff: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "The Speaker, had his hand up first."

Neff: "Mr. Speaker."

Blair: "Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Howard, it's always good to see you and..."

Swork: "Thank you."

Blair: "... I want to complement you for the great number of years that you've spent as a member of the Techic County, Technical Advisory Committee of the Illinois Highway Study Commission, and you and I both well know the years that we went through in fighting to get the needs met... first from our stand point on the State system and certainly to see what we could do in the process of providing for the motor fuel tax allocations that went to our local government. I am delighted to hear you take recognition of the fact that the large carriers of traffic the State system, is not meeting its needs today and that any funds that divert from the State road system would make that an even worst situation. Now, the second point that I think ought to be made is, you know that we struggle through a function reclassification program, finally got the map adopted but no administrative jurisdiction changes so that there was no dollar pick-up on those but, as a general proposition... would you concur in the statement



that would say that if you were to change administrative jurisdiction, to take off the State system all the miles that we were going to take off and considering that as far as State has been concerned that those have been priority miles as far as being kept in repair... that comparing that with the allocation of dollars, they're talking about the verdict out of the State road funds, that there is no way that that amount of money would be able to take care of the needs of those very low very bad shaped miles that would come off of the State system, is that a fair general statement?"

Swork: "That is fair and I might explain just a step further and the maps that were presented to the counties, the County Association of Superintendant of Highways, accepted those reclassification maps subject to the fact that the funding would be available and at the time the State considered the increase of motor fuel tax from five to seven and a half cents, the State of Illinois received two fifteens or one cent off of the top of the two and a half increase and the balance was distributed on the same formula of distribution to the other agencies and yet... the State said insufficient were available to enter into a classification and now, it appears as though we have a surplus of funds and this we can't believe is true."

Speaker Blair: "I can assure you it's not."

Neff: "Thanks, Howard, I might say at this time that the three Gentlemen that we're calling on now have been here all day and they have waited patiently and even though it's kind of tuff on us sitting here, we want to realize too, that these Gentlemen have sat here since ten o'clock this morning. At this time we do have one more opponent on House Bill 12, and that's Robert Corbitt, Assistant General Counsel of the Chicago Motor Club. Mr. Corbitt."



Corbitt: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I appreciate your patiences and indulgents in allowing me to make one last speech... or one of the last speeches to the Session. On behalf of the Chicago Motor Club, I would like to say that the Club agrees that the operation of suitable public transportation facilities is essential to the public welfare in metropolitan areas. It does improve access to jobs, stores, business establishments, schools, medical facilities and culture attractions. Certainly the creation of the Regional Transportation Authority is needed to coorinate and facilitate public transportation in northeaster Illinois, the Club is opposed however, to certain provisions of House Bill 12, relating to financing. It is our view that these certain... these provisions are unequable and are against the public interest. First of all we contend that although RTA would be a general benefit, most of the cost is going to be met by taxes on motorist and other highway users. The Chicago Motor Club agrees that motorist should pay fair share of the cost of a RTA, the question of course is what is a fair share. We respectfully submit for a plan such as this which would put 60 to 80% of the entire cost on motorist or motor vehicle users, is unfair and unjust. The cost of the RTA range from various amounts, from a hundred and twenty-four million to two hundred and sixty-eight million dollars for the first year alone and this is going to increase according to all estimates. Maybe within a few years we will see that their expenses per year will be three hundred or four hundred million dollars per year. No mass transit system we know of... as sucessfully deverst the trend of raising cost and increasing deficits. This program provides us only sixty million would come from general funds, all the rest which would amount to hundreds



of millions of dollars, would come from motorist and motor vehicle users. Businessmen and merchants, workers, shoppers, school children, property owners, all members of the community benefit from public transportation not just motorist, why then should motorist and motor vehicle users be required to bear most or nearly all of the load. In connection, I would like to quote Chairman Pukarsky, was quoted from the Chicago Tribune magazine quiet recently, he says, "the issue is whether we consider public transportation as an entity by its self or do we consider it in its roll as an element of our societal framework, like police, fire, health and sanitation services. We have a fire department on a stand-by basis, even though we may not ever have a fire in our house during our life time, we're providing then to all the citizens the benefits from this whether we use it or not and we're willing to support that. Public transportation is no different... we should should have a contribution from society as a whole, the price that we have to pay for viable system is a small one and it's a price that should be spread not only among lighters but among all the other beneficiary." Other major cities besides Chicago has dealt with mass transit problems and none of them have employed revenue measures which would place so heavy of a burden on motorist as would this Bill. I invite the attention of the Committee to the Governor's transportation task force report filed in January of this year, which details the methods of financing in a number of other cities, to prepare us that gasoline taxes and auto related taxes are not foremost among the revenue measures chosen in other such cities. There are other alternatives and we recommend that this Body consider some of these alternatives and not approve this plan which unfairly singles out it one class of citizens, the motorist to



pay most of the cost. Our second point of objection is that if this board would just give an appointed RTA board the power to impose motor vehicle related taxes and just amounts and at such rates that the board might determine without any limit, without any referendum and without any public accountability. This would be contrary to fundamental principles on which this country is founded. It has always been considered that anyone who is given authority to impose taxes should be accountable to the people. We find it difficult to believe that the framers of our new Illinois Constitution ever intended otherwise and yet in this Bill the RTA Board would, in effect, be given a blank check, drawn against the motorists of the six county area and signed by our state government. I'd like to emphasize again that the amount of taxes to be imposed under this plan by the RTA Board are not likely to be an insignificant amount. They could easily run to two hundred or three hundred million dollars per year within just a few years. A third point of objection was that this program is likely to result in increased taxes for the whole state to provide funds for RTA, in part, this plan would take the first \$15.00 of each license fee collected in the six county RTA area; and the first \$15.00 of each auto license fee in the downstate areas to be paid over to the county. You're all familiar with that problem. But this would make a total of about \$75,000,000 that would be taken out of the Road Fund. Now 45,000,000, approximately per year, would be put back in from a bond issue. But now this program provides that the money to pay...the principle and interest on that bond issue to come, first of all, from the Road Fund. And only after the Road Fund is exhausted, there's General Revenue to use. It seems logical that sooner or later additional taxes probably in the form of increased motor fuel tax rates for the



whole state or increased vehicle registration fees for the whole, or both, will be required to meet these demands for funds. We'd also like to point out the possibility that matching federal funds may be lost in this program. It's approximately \$30,000,000 a year is turned over to the individual county boards to use for transportation purposes as they see fit. We don't know how that money is going to be used. It might be used for highways which would be eligible for federal support. Or, again, they may not be. We don't know. But the possibility exists that it may not be used for highways which will be eligible for federal funding and we have to remember that the federal funding at this time is on a 70-30 basis. So you will...could conceivably lose a lot of federal funds through this plan. To summarize, we recommend that these Bills not be approved in their present form because, first of all, most of the money would be unfairly charged against motorists. Second, an appointed board, not accountable to the people, would be empowered to levy unlimited motor vehicle related taxes. And third, the program would probably result in higher taxes for the whole state. Thank you very much for your patience and thank you for listening."

Neff: "Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "A couple of quick questions for the last speaker. To clarify your statement, do you object to any auto related taxes for funding?"

Corbitt: "No, we do not...well, have a complete objection to auto related taxes. We recognize that motorists should pay a share. The point is, though, how much of a share should they pay? And we think that this is too large a share."

Dunn: "Which part of the motor vehicle related tax is too much?"

Corbitt: "Well, we..."

Dunn: "...The license fee, as such, or the gas tax."



Corbitt: "We have no express preference as to the type of auto related taxes, but I would say this, in all likelihood considering the amount of funds that would probably have to be raised, it would seem likely that it would be probably a gasoline tax. ...Probably... we're not...gasoline tax."

Dunn: "...Still it...amount is too high? You don't oppose the gas...some gasoline tax if the amount is just divided, is that correct?"

Corbitt: "We wouldn't oppose some gasoline tax."

Dunn: "And how do you, as a club, how do you go about what your vehicle of determining that this is the position of the majority of your membership?"

Corbitt: "Well, obviously, we didn't have time to poll members on these Bills.."

Dunn: "Do you poll your members on any issue..."

Corbitt: "Occasionally we do. Incidentally, we had a poll, oh, about ten months ago on the use of highway trust funds for nonhighway purposes and we got a return of 76% against diversion for nonhighway purposes. Similar poll was taken elsewhere throughout the county tend to establish the validity of the results of our poll because the same results were obtained in other areas."

Dunn: "How many people were polled?"

Corbitt: "Well, in our case, I think there were...these were voluntary responses, I think we had somewhere around four or five thousand responses."

Dunn: "Thank you."

Neff: "Representative Shea, do you have a question?"

If there isn't any more questions, why thanks, Mr. Corbitt, and again we thank you folks for waiting patiently here all day. Representative Deuster, do you have a question of Mr. Corbitt?"

Deuster: "I would like to ask the Gentleman this, I was pleased and encouraged and heartened to hear you say that



you would support some regional increase in the gasoline tax however...wouldn't have any objection to an auto related tax."

Corbitt: "Yes."

Deuster: "I thought you suggested that the gasoline tax might be an appropriate one."

Corbitt: "I'm not suggesting it, Representative, but it seems likely that considering the practicality that this may be one of the..."

Deuster: "Yes, would you think that an increase of a penny and one-half in the region would be in the realm of reason?"

Corbitt: "I'm not prepared..."

Deuster: "You're not prepared...oh, thank you."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Corbitt, now the Chair recognizes Representative Garmisa to make a very short closing remark."

Garmisa: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I just want to state that after all the mind-boggling questions that have been propagated here this afternoon and this evening, the... and the subsequent highly illuminating answers, I am sure that House Bill 12 has been very thoroughly ventilated. And I would merely ask the Members of this House that when House Bill 12 does come up for a vote we would certainly appreciate your support. Thank you."

Walsh: "Mr. Chairman."

Neff: "Yes, Representative...The Chair recognizes Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if Sparky and I had attended the same meeting? I move the Joint Session rise."

Neff: "Is there a second to that? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed by the same sign. The Committee of the Whole has arisen. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Now, Mr. Speaker, I move that the Third Special Session adjourn until the hour of 10 a.m. tomorrow."



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
SEVENTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
THIRD SPECIAL SESSION - EIGHTH DAY

NOVEMBER 7, 1973

1:42 O'CLOCK P.M.

REPRESENTATIVE ARTHUR A. TELCSER, SPEAKER

IN THE CHAIR



GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FOURTH SPECIAL SESSION - THIRD DAY

NOVEMBER 7, 1973

10:07 O'CLOCK A.M.

REPRESENTATIVE ARTHUR A. TELCSEP, SPEAKER

IN THE CHAIR



GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1		Speaker Telcser	House to order
		Dr. Johnson	Prayer
		Speaker Telcser	Reg. session roll call
2		Clerk Selcke	Roll call
		Speaker Telcser	
		Choate	
		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Walsh, W.	Move reg. session stand in recess till 9:55
		Speaker Telcser	
3		Clerk Selcke	Messages from Senate
		Speaker Telcser	Introductions and 1st readings
		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	Agreed Resolutions
		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	
4		Walsh, W.	
		Speaker Telcser	Resolution adopted
		Clerk Selcke	Introduction and 1st reading
		Speaker Telcser	
		Clerk Selcke	Death Resolution
5		Speaker Telcser	Recessed
		Matijevich	Point of information
		Speaker Telcser	1st sp. session in order
6			1st sp. session adjourned
			2nd sp. session in order
		Clerk Selcke	Committee reports
		Speaker Telcser	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
7.		Shea	2.
8		Speaker Telcser	
9-10		Walsh, W.	Responds to Shea
		Speaker Telcser	
		Berman	Point of inquiry
11		Speaker Telcser	
		Clerk Selcke	
		Berman	Question to Fred
		Clerk Selcke	
12		Shea	Meeting of the rules
		Speaker Telcser	
		Walsh, W.	
		Speaker Telcser	
13-14		Shea	
15		Speaker Telcser	
16-17		Matijevich	Point of order
		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Walsh	
18-19		Shea	
20-21		Speaker Telcser	2nd sp. session in recess
22		Clerk Selcke	4th sp. session to order Messages from Senate
		Speaker Telcser	4th sp.-session adjourned
		Speaker Telcser	Reg. session in order
23		Wolf, J.J.	SB 501
		Speaker Telcser	

Kosinski

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Wolf	
		Speaker Telcser	
24		Choate	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Clerk Selcke	Calls roll
		Dee	Explain vote
		Speaker Telcser	
25		Clerk Selcke	Proceeds
		Speaker Telcser	SB 501 Motion to OVR adopted
26		Merlo	SB 577 move to OVR
		Speaker Telcser	
		Palmer	Question
27		Merlo	
		Speaker Telcser	
28		Choate	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Walsh	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Merlo	I'll hold it
		Speaker Telcser	TOOR
29		Tuerk	SB 597 move to OVR
		Choate	Urge to sustain Governors veto
30		Tuerk	To close
		Speaker Telcser	
31		Clerk Selcke	Roll call
		Speaker Telcser	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
32		Tuerk	Explain my vote
		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Day	How am I recorded
		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Dunn, Robert	Vote aye
		Speaker Telcser	
		Tuerk	Poll absentees
33		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	Fails
34		Bradley	SB 620
35		Speaker Telcser	
36		Choate	
		Speaker Telcser	
37		McGrew	Point of order
		Speaker Telcser	
38		Bradley	To close
		Speaker Telcser	
		Clerk Selcke	Calls roll
		Speaker Telcser	
		Geo-Karis	Aye vote
39		Clerk Selcke	Continues
		Speaker Telcser	
		Bradley	Poll the absentees
		Speaker Telcser	
		Bradley	Withdraw motion



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Telcser	Motion fails
41		Bluthardt	SB 276 move to OVR
42		Speaker Telcser	
		Mahar	Yield
		Bluthardt	
		Speaker Telcser	
43		Rayson	Yield
44		Bluthardt	
		Speaker Telcser	
45		Choate	
		Speaker Telcser	
46		Bluthardt	To close
		Speaker Telcser	
		Clerk Selcke	Calls roll
47		Speaker Telcser	
		Day	
48		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Bluthardt	Poll absentees
		Speaker Telcser	
49		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Merlo	How am I recorded
		Clerk Selcke	
50		Speaker Telcser	
		Huskey	How recorded
		Speaker Telcser	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	6.
		Clerk Selcke		
		Lundy	Vote me no	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Schissler	Record me no	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Clerk Selcke		
		Ryan	How recorded	
		Clerk Selcke		
51		Speaker Telcser		
		Barry	How recorded	
		Clerk Selcke		
		Speaker Telcser		
		Bluthardt	PPC	
		Speaker Telcser		
52		Choate		
		Speaker Telcser		
		Bluthardt		
		Speaker Telcser		
		Jacobs		
		Speaker Telcser		
		Choate		
		Speaker Telcser		
		Kucharski	Vote me aye	
		Speaker Telcser		
53		Bluthardt		
		Speaker Telcser		
		Choate	Suggest we proceed	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Bluthardt	
		Speaker Telcser	PPC
54		Ebbesen	HB 698
		Speaker Telcser	
55-56		Choate	
57		Speaekr Telcser	
58		Hirschfield	
		Speaker Telcser	
59		Choate	Point of personal privilege
		Speaker Telcser	
60-61		Walsh, W.	
		Speaker Telcser	
62		Cunningham	
		Speaker Telcser	
63		Katz	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Skinner	
64		Speaker Telcser	
		Lauer	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Maragos	MPQ
65		Ebbesen	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	
66-67		Shea	Question
		Clerk Selcke	Reads motion



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Shea	8.
68		Speaker Telcser	
		Ebbesen	
69-70		Shea	
71		Speaker Telcser	
		Clerk Selcke	
72		Speaker Telcser	
		Barry	
		Alsup	Change to present
		Clerk Selcke	Roll call
		Speaker Telcser	
73		Bradley	
		Speaker Telcser	Record as no
		Clerk Selcke	
74		Speaker Telcser	
		Duff	Explain vote
		Speaker Telcser	
		Dyer	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	
75		Ewell	No
		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	
76		Hirschfeld	
		Speaker Telcser	Record him aye
		Clerk Selcke	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
			9.
		Speaker Telcser	
77		Juckett	
		Speaker Telcser	Record aye
		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	
		McClain	Explain vote no
		Speaker Telcser	
		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	
78		McGrew	Explain vote
		Speaker Telcser	
		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	
79		Peters	Explain vote
		Speaker Telcser	
		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Shea	Explain no vote
		Speaker Telcser	
		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Skinner	Vote aye
		Speaker Telcser	
80		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	
81		Hanahan	Explain vote
		Speaker Telcser	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	10.
		Ebbesen	Poll absentees	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Clerk Selcke		
		Speaker Telcser		
		Ebbesen	PPC	
82		Speaker Telcser		
		Kempiners	Introduce Miss Aurora	
83		Miss Aurora	Paula Dunn	
		Kempiners	Introduce parents	
		Speaker Telcser		
84		Merlo	SB 577	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Juckett	Yield	
85-86		Merlo		
		Speaker Telcser		
		Merlo	Leave for last roll call	
		Speaker Telcser	Objections	
87		Clerk Selcke	Roll call	
		Speaker Telcser		
		Leon	Explain vote aye	
		Clerk Selcke		
		Speaker Telcser		
88		Merlo	Explain vote	
		Clerk Selcke		
		Speaker Telcser		
		Schlickman	Vote no	
		Speaker Telcser		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
			11.
89		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Shea	Explain yes vote
		Speaker Telcser	
		Clerk Selcke	
90		Walsh, W.	Vote no
		Speaker Telcser	
		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Lechowicz	Aye
91		Speaker Telcser	Motion lost
92		Berman	Motion HR 5911
		Speaker Telcser	
		Skinner	Yield
		Berman	
		Speaker Telcser	
93		Clerk Selcke	
94		Borchers	
		Berman	
95		Clerk Selcke	Roll call
		Speaker Telcser	
		Choate	
		Clerk Selcke	
		Hunsicker	
96		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Martin	Aye



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
			12.
		Clerk Selcke	
97		Speaker Telcser	Motion fails
		Clerk Selcke	Messages from Senate
		Speaker Telcser	
		Collins	
98		Speaker Telcser	Reg. session adjourned 1st sp. session to order
		Clerk Selcke	Messages from Senate
		Speaker Telcser	Introduction and 1st reading
		Clerk Selcke	
99		Speaker Telcser	SB 1st reading
		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Clerk Selcke	HB 38, 2nd reading no CA
		Speaker Telcser	3rd reading. 3rd sp. session committee as a whole, to order
		Neff	
100		Choate	
101		Juckett	HB #1
		Neff	Order
		Juckett	
102		Neff	
103-194		Deuster	
105-106		Sangmeister	
		Deuster	
		Neff	
		Dee	
107		Deuster	
		Neff	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	13.
		Hanahan	Question	
108-109		Deuster		
110-111		Neff		
		Hudson	Question	
112-113		Deuster		
114		Neff		
115-116		Palmer	Question	
		Deuster		
		Neff		
117		Dyer		
		Neff		
118		Deuster	HB 5 & 6	
119		Neff		
120-121		Garmisa		
		Neff		
		Juckett	Question	
		Garmisa		
		Neff		
122-123-124		Milton Pukorsky		
125-126-128		Neff		
130		Totten	Question.	
		Pukorsky		
		Neff		
		Garmisa		
		Neff		
		Totten		
131		Neff		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Bond, Longhorn	
		Neff	
132-133		Mayor Vaneman	
		Neff	
134		Mayor McCoy	
		Neff	
		Ryan	Question
		Neff	
135		Piedon, Preston E.	
		Neff	
		Totten	Inquiry
		Neff	
136		Piedon	
		Neff	
137		Gahagen	HB 11 thru 12
		Neff	
133		Cornelius, Jack	
		Neff	
139-140-141		Wolf, Elenor	HB 12
		Neff	
142-143-144		Robinson	
145-146		Neff	
147		Totten	
148		Neff	
149		Mahoney	
		Neff	
		Skinner	Objects



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	15.
		Neff	Point well taken	
150		Mahoney		
		Neff		
151-152-153		Curtain, Clinton		
		Neff		
154-155		Washington		
		Neff		
156		Stone		
		Neff		
		Hill	Question Mayor McCoy	
		Neff		
		Totten	Question	
157-158-159		Pukorsky		
160-161-162				
163-164-165				
166		Totten		
167		Bond		
		Neff		
		Juckett	Question	
		Garmisa		
		Juckett		
		Garmisa		
168		Bond		
		Neff		
169-170-171		Juckett		
172-173-174				
175-176		Bond		
		Garmisa		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Neff	16.
177		Barnes	
		Neff	
178		Juckett	
179		Garmisa	
		Neff	
180		Juckett	Question
		Pukorsky	
		Neff	
		Lundy	Question
181		Neff	
182		Pukorsky	
		Neff	
183-184-185		Cunningham	Question
186-187-188			
189		Bond	
		Neff	
		Dunn	Question
190		Mayor Vaneman	
		Neff	
		Barnes	Question list
		Dunn	Question
191-192-193		Pukansky	
		Neff	
		Miller, T.	Question
194-195-196		Pukorsky	
		Totten	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
197		Miller	Question
198		Bond	
		Totten	
199-200-201		Deuster	
		Bond	
		Totten	
		Pukorsky	
202-203		Totten	
		Mahar	Question
		Bond	
		Totten	
204		Skinner	Question
		Bond	
		Totten	
		Lechowicz	Point of order
		Skinner	
205		Bond	
		Skinner	
206-207-208		Pukorsky	
209-210-211		Neff	
212-213-214		Dee	
215-216-217		Pukorsky	
		Neff	
218-219		Wolf	Question
		Bond	
		Neff	
220-221		Grotberg	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	18.
		Pukorsky		
		Neff		
222		Duff		
223		Neff		
		Terzick	Point of order	
		Neff		
		Terzich		
		Pukorsky		
		Neff		
224-225-226		Hanahan	Question	
		Garmisa		
		Neff		
		Shea	Point of order	
227		Hanahan		
		Pukorsky		
		Hanahan	Question	
		Garmisa		
		Neff		
		Palmer	Question	
228-229-230		Pukorsky		
		Palmer		
231		Garmisa		
232-233		Pukorsky		
		Palmer		
		Neff		
		Kennedy	Move Committee as whole over	
		Neff	Hold it	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
234-235		Stauffer, Russell Neff	19.
236-237		Shea Stauffer Neff	Questions
238-239-240		Swork Neff Ryan	Opponent HB 12
241		Swork Neff	
242		Shea Swork Neff	Question
243-244		Ryan Swork Neff Shea Neff	
245		Speaker Blair Swork Neff	Question
246-247-248 249		Corbitt Neff	
250		Dunn Corbitt Neff	Question
251		Deuster	Question



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
			20.
		Corbitt	
		Neff	
		Garmisa	To close
		Walsh, W.	Move joint session rise
		Neff	
		Walsh, W.	Move 3rd sp. session adjourn
		Speaker Telcser	SB 1st reading
		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Telcser	
252		Walsh, W.	Move 3rd sp. session adjourn
		Speaker Telcser	adjourned. 2nd sp. session to order
		Juckett	Leave to table HB #2
		Speaker Telcser	Tabled
253		Shea	
254		Walsh, W.	Responds
		Speaker Telcser	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Telcser	2nd sp. session adjourned



101ST LEGISLATIVE DAY

November 7, 1973

- 9:22 A.M. - Regular Session - Rep. Telcser  
9:33 A.M. - Recess
- 9:33 A.M. - 1ST SPECIAL SESSION - 11TH DAY  
Telcser  
9:35 A.M. - Adjourned
- 9:35 A.M. - 2ND SPECIAL SESSION - 8TH DAY  
Telcser  
10:07 A.M. - Recessed
- 10:07 A.M. - 4TH SPECIAL SESSION - 3RD DAY  
Telcser  
10:08 A.M. - Adjourned
- 10:09 A.M. - Regular Session - Telcser  
1:42 P.M. - Adjourned
- 1:42 P.M. - 3RD SPECIAL SESSION - 8TH DAY  
Telcser  
Committee of the Whole  
Clarence Neff  
7:15 P.M. - Adjourned
- 7:15 P.M. - Second Special Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ONE HUNDRETH FIRST LEGISLATIVE DAY

NOVEMBER 7, 1973

9:22 O'CLOCK A.M.

REPRESENTATIVE ARTHUR A. TELCSER, SPEAKER

IN THE CHAIR



GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

1  
A Roll Call for Attendance was taken and indicated that  
all were present with the exception of the following:



GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
STATE OF MICHIGAN

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FIRST SPECIAL SESSION - ELEVENTH DAY

NOVEMBER 7, 1973

9:33 O'CLOCK A.M.

REPRESENTATIVE ARTHUR A. TELCSER, SPEAKER

IN THE CHAIR



GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SECOND SPECIAL SESSION - EIGHTH DAY

NOVEMBER 7, 1973

9:35 O'CLOCK A.M.

REPRESENTATIVE ARTHUR A. TELCSER, SPEAKER

IN THE CHAIR



GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES